



**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 37th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 22 June 2000

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 22 juin 2000

Speaker
Honourable Gary Carr

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable Gary Carr

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Thursday 22 June 2000

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 22 juin 2000

*The House met at 1000.
Prayers.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

REPLICA FIREARMS REGULATION
AND PROTECTION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION
ET LA PROTECTION À L'ÉGARD
DES RÉPLIQUES D'ARMES À FEU

Mr Bryant moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 67, An Act to protect the public by regulating the sale of replicas of firearms / Projet de loi 67, Loi visant à protéger le public en réglementant la vente des répliques d'armes à feu.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The member has 15 minutes to make his presentation.

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): I rise today to speak to Bill 67, a private member's bill that seeks to deal with a serious issue on the streets of Ontario. It's an issue involving what I call phony guns: air guns, b-b guns, pellet guns and starter pistols. These guns wreak havoc for police, for victims, for many merchants, the person working behind the counter at the 7-Eleven or behind the counter at the bank, because when faced with these weapons, what happens is they have to assume that they are real weapons. They are almost identical to real weapons.

Last week on a point of order, the parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General sought unanimous consent to show the interlock devices to the House so that we could see just what we were dealing with here. I seek unanimous consent so that I can show the people of Ontario and this House how much these items resemble real firearms.

The Deputy Speaker: The member has asked for unanimous consent to a display these replicas. Is there consent? Agreed? It is agreed.

Mr Bryant: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have deposited them with the Sergeant at Arms for self-evident reasons, I hope. I'll continue.

These items so resemble real firearms that they have caused serious trauma for victims and, frankly, these items have ended up injuring and killing a number of people in Ontario.

Here they are. I'd ask members of the House and the people of Ontario to ask themselves, if they were looking down the barrel of one of these items, "Am I looking down the barrel of a real gun or am I looking down the barrel of a phony gun?" These items can be bought like candy at a corner store. You can buy them like any other hardware in any hardware store, but make no mistake about it, these phony guns kill.

Mr Speaker, 40% of all the weapons picked up by the police in Toronto and in Ottawa are these phony guns. The number is 25% of all the weapons picked up by the police in Niagara and in Windsor. This is a serious problem. These guns are being used by criminals in the commission of offences. If somebody uses these weapons in the commission of an offence, that is already an offence under the Criminal Code.

Here's the problem. These weapons are so accessible, all you need to do is walk into a hardware store or a gun shop and purchase these guns, no questions asked. This is the problem. The proliferation of these guns—and I'm going to talk about what the result is—is a result of the fact that there are no regulations whatsoever prohibiting these particular guns.

They're different from replica guns per se. Replica guns are intended only to look like guns. Those are banned under the Criminal Code. These weapons do have a legitimate purpose in some contexts. In rural areas in particular they are often used to deal with rodent problems. They're often used for target practice, plinking. But in the cities of Ontario it doesn't make sense to have these guns proliferating as they are.

What happens? In Emery Collegiate back in February there was a shootout, as you know, in a parking lot there. One of the weapons allegedly was one of these phony guns. It was a starter pistol. Starter pistols can be purchased like any other item, the barrel easily hollowed out with a simple tool and suddenly they're real guns, real firearms. You can purchase this weapon at a hardware store, whether you're a kid or an ex-convict, and transform it into a firearm with a simple tool. Then you've got a firearm in your hands.

On January 1 of this year Henry Masuka was shot dead by police when he pulled out one of these weapons in St Mike's hospital. The police had to assume that in fact it was a real gun.

January 2, the next day, the police had to respond to a complainant who was waving around a phony gun. It was reported in the news.

January 5—this is just the first week of this year—police seized a pellet pistol and b-b gun from three young men spotted by residents near the Glen Stewart ravine. A couple days later: a complaint that someone was waving around a .357 Magnum handgun, and on it goes.

A teacher in another province quit her job when a kid stood up and pointed one of these weapons at the person.

Just this week a gun scare left Glebe students shaken. A boy of 15—again, that boy can purchase this gun without showing any ID, without having any background check, no matter what. This kid could purchase the gun as easily as a burger in a drive-through.

This bill has non-partisan support from police, from safety organizations. I'm happy to say that the Premier of Ontario set aside partisan considerations. He has expressed words of support for this bill as well. He said in this House on April 18, "Let me applaud the initiative" of the member for St Paul's for bringing this forward. On May 10, he said of this initiative: "We thought it was a good initiative, a good idea.... I certainly applaud your backbench member for raising this issue. I think he is on the right track...." Later, on May 11, he said to the media that he had asked the Solicitor General to look into this bill, to support it. He said, "We thought it was a good initiative, a good idea." The Premier supports it.

He's not alone. Editorials from across the province have supported it, and I'm not going to read them all. I'll just say that not a single editorial has spoken out against it. Again, the Premier said, "Anything that would make the police's job easier and anything that would remove the threat of guns from the street, I think is a good thing."

The Canada Safety Council has written a letter—I've circulated it to all the members—endorsing the bill. I don't think I'm going to have time to get through all of them.

Another letter, dated May 2, 2000: "I am pleased to advise that I support and endorse this bill. I believe that it filled a gap in ... legislation regarding weapons, and will assist in reducing offences committed using replica guns," signed by Julian Fantino, chief of police of Toronto.

A similar letter of support: "I am pleased to advise that I support and endorse this bill. I believe that it will assist in reducing offences committed using replica guns," from Kenneth Robertson, chief of police of Hamilton-Wentworth.

Another letter: "I would like you to know that I strongly support this private member's bill as an excellent initiative which will go a long way in making our communities a safer place to live," says the chief of police of Ottawa-Carleton, Brian Ford.

Chief Bill Closs of Kingston: "The value of your effort is recognized when one understands that these 'look-alikes' may be represented as firearms during the commission of a criminal offence. Unfortunately, to a victim facing a threatening or criminal act or to a police officer responding to a reported incident, the look-alike is the real thing, and this could result in fatal consequences."

1010

Chief Noel Catney of the region of Peel: "It is my view that these replica guns present a significant danger to both the public and police officers that respond to incidents where they are involved. Public safety is a paramount concern to law enforcement officers and the regulation of these items will hopefully reduce or ultimately eradicate future incidents where the well-being of individuals is unnecessarily placed in jeopardy."

I could go on on this front. As I've said, 40% of the weapons picked up in Toronto and Ottawa are these weapons. These are nightmares for victims. These are nightmares for the police. People can buy these weapons without any questions asked. What this bill would do is simply regulate these weapons, just as the ammunition for these weapons is regulated. Right now, if you want to buy a b-b for one of these weapons, you have to show ID, your name is put down on a ledger, you have to be an adult to purchase them. That just makes sense. But if you want to buy the guns themselves, you don't have to show any ID. You could be a kid or an ex-con. That doesn't make any sense.

What this bill does is regulate the weapons themselves in a similar fashion as the province of Ontario is already regulating the ammunition. I would urge all members here to support this bill. It has bipartisan support, the support of victims' groups, the safety council, chiefs of police. The Ontario Provincial Police Association called me last week to say they endorsed it, and the Premier of Ontario has expressed words of support. I ask for this House's support today.

Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe): I will be sharing my time with the member from Barrie and the member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant.

I was in the House when the member presented this bill, and the Premier has certainly endorsed the concept of how to regulate replica handguns. The reason he supported that concept was that in many cases, not only in this city but across the province, where a replica firearm is used in the commission of an offence, as the member properly pointed out—and brought in some replica-type firearms—a police officer or a member of the public confronted with that look-alike firearm would have no idea whether it is in fact a real or fake firearm.

In the past, replica handguns were certainly not covered in any way in the Criminal Code, and it was because of the continuing increase in them being used in the commission of offences that they were covered. Let me go to the definition of a "replica handgun" in the Criminal Code: "Any device that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, a firearm, and that itself is not a firearm, but does not include any such device that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, an antique firearm."

On that definition, the Solicitor General has certainly asked for some clarification from the Honourable Anne McLellan in relation to how to apply that definition. Does that mean that a replica handgun has to have the

same weight for it to be defined as a replica? Does it have to be the same materials used? Because it says "exactly" in the definition. These are the difficulties that police services are presently confronted with. It's certainly defined but it's not clear as to how it's to be enforced.

I say that this concept is one that police associations, police chiefs, the Premier and the Solicitor General endorse. However, having said that—and I've spoken to the member who has presented this—the bill also has many difficulties. Those difficulties are a different definition for a replica handgun in the province of Ontario. His definition is "'replica of a firearm' means an object that is not a firearm but might reasonably be mistaken for a firearm and includes compressed air and compressed-carbon-dioxide-powered b-b and pellet guns and starter pistols." You can see the broad definition of what a replica handgun is that has been extended in the member's bill.

The other difficulty with the bill is that "seller" is not defined in the bill and therefore one could arguably say that a family member passing it on to another member is actually a seller and would be covered by the legislation.

I urge everyone to take an extremely close look at the bill. Police associations, police chiefs and the government endorse the concept. I suspect the difficulties with the legislation, as we see with many private members' bills, is that the intent is good until one starts drafting the legislation and difficulties arise from that legislation. There are some issues we can work with. The Solicitor General is consulting with police organizations across the province, police chiefs and so on, to see what we can do in Ontario to monitor replica handguns that are not covered under the Criminal Code.

Mr Joseph Cordiano (York South-Weston): I am very delighted to be able to speak to this bill. My colleague the member from St Paul's is to be commended, as he already has been, but let me take this opportunity to commend him yet again because this is truly an important piece of legislation that all of us can be proud of and that all of us should support unanimously.

I would like to correct some of the things the member for London-Fanshawe has said, and I suppose that what he was referring to was a misinterpretation of some of the elements that are contained in this bill. Specifically, he's talking about what this legislation fails to do. What this legislation actually does is fill the void that exists now in the federal legislation and the Criminal Code regarding imitation firearms and replica firearms, which are covered in the Criminal Code. What this bill directs its attention to are those firearms which currently do not come under the auspices of the federal code, are not contained in the federal code, but fall between the cracks. It is an attempt to deal with those firearms, which currently can be purchased directly, that are used, as my colleague from St Paul's said, particularly in rural areas, sometimes to deal with rodent problems—b-b guns, air-guns and the like. These are weapons that can be purchased today from retailers. There is no regulation

regarding the purchase of these firearms and therefore there is no record kept of these firearms.

Again, this legislation makes it illegal to tamper with these firearms. Furthermore, it calls for the regulation and the recording of such a purchase, which I think can only help in our society. It would go a long way to dealing with the very real and dangerous situation if these firearms are tampered with and used in the commission of a real crime. All too often we are beginning to see that these violent situations with the use of firearms are being thrust upon the citizens of more than one urban centre in this province. It's not just in Toronto; this problem is occurring throughout the province, as has been enumerated by my colleague, and these incidents have been recent. Hamilton-Wentworth, Ottawa—this is happening throughout the province. Toronto is a big city and there are big-city problems associated with it, but these problems are occurring in other major centres across the province.

1020

That speaks to the need for some regulatory framework for dealing with the recording of the purchase of these weapons. As was demonstrated by my colleague, as he was permitted by unanimous consent to show us these firearms that can be legally purchased today, they are truly scary, and tampered with, they can become real firearms to be used in criminal acts.

Again, this is not dealing with just the sale of replicas. The Criminal Code deals very specifically with the sale of replica guns. I'm quoting from subsection 84(1) of the Criminal Code:

"'Imitation firearm' means anything that imitates a firearm, and includes a replica firearm.

"'Replica firearm' means any device that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, a firearm, and that itself is not a firearm, but does not include any such device that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, an antique firearm."

Subsection 85(2) makes it an indictable offence to use an imitation firearm while committing an indictable offence, attempting to commit an indictable offence, or during flight after committing or attempting to commit an indictable offence. I think this is clearly a distinction between what is covered in the Criminal Code and what is not, with respect to the firearms that are specifically referred to by this legislation that is being brought forward by my colleague from St Paul's, Bill 67.

This is a piece of legislation, I would like to reiterate to my colleagues from all sides in the House, that should be a non-partisan act. We should all unanimously agree with this legislation because it covers the essentials. If you agree that imitation and replica guns ought to be made illegal in the act of a crime and therefore regulated, then I don't see how you could disagree with this piece of legislation. It is inconceivable that you would. It has nothing to do with the use of weapons for hunting purposes and otherwise that would be used in rural communities or on shooting ranges. Bill 67 simply requires that

the purchase of these weapons be recorded and therefore we have some record and are able to keep track of some of these weapons, where they end up.

Police commissions throughout the province have supported this piece of legislation, as was pointed out by my colleague earlier. In fact, the Premier is thinking of supporting this. I ask the members opposite: Why wouldn't you think of supporting this? I can think of no other time during this Legislature in private members' hour where a piece of legislation was brought forward that could not be supported by all members of this House, and therefore I urge members on all sides of this House to support this legislation. I want to once again commend the member for St Paul's for his work and his initiative in this regard.

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):

I'm certainly pleased to join in the debate with respect to the member for St Paul's private member's Bill 67 dealing with replica guns. Safe streets is one of the government's top priorities, and the fact is that replica guns are already prohibited devices under the federal Firearms Act. It is an offence to manufacture or sell replica firearms unless authorized to do so.

The troubling issue, however, is the increasingly prevalent use of guns, real or replicas, in the commission of crime. Ontario has continued to call on the federal government to increase penalties for the possession of real or replica guns used in criminal acts, in order to deter their use, as well as to see stricter repercussions for those who use them. With respect to the private member's bill, its intent, which is basically to do something about phony guns to make our streets safer, is laudable, and certainly there is going to be further debate on this bill in terms of whether we can accomplish this goal.

One aspect of the bill which I think brings reality to the situation, although what the member is trying to do is noble and has merit, is that when we look at the bill in terms of "Prohibition, purchase of replica," it indicates, "No person shall purchase a replica of a firearm unless he or she satisfies the following conditions." Paragraph 2 under subsection 2(1): "The purchaser must make a signed statement describing the intended use of the replica and confirming that he or she does not intend to use the replica for an unlawful purpose." It goes on to say, under subsection 2(2): "The purchaser of a replica of a firearm shall not use the replica for a purpose that is inconsistent with the intended use described in the statement referred to in paragraph 2 of subsection (1)."

Therein lies the weakness of what the reality is and the intent of legislation. To control the use of replica guns like real guns, certainly the intended use is where the problem is. It's not always what the person is going to indicate they're going to use that particular replica or real gun for; it's what they end up using it for. We have a case with respect to the tragic situation at a hospital here in Toronto where an individual used a replica gun against the throat of a doctor in the emergency. I don't believe that when the person bought the replica they ever intended to use it for the purpose they used it for, but in fact

they did use it for that purpose. That's the difficulty when we're trying to deal with this type of conduct.

As I said, the possession and use of firearms is controlled by the federal Criminal Code and the Firearms Act and the federal government's criminal law power to prevent crime, including keeping the peace. Replica firearm is defined under the Criminal Code, in part, to mean "any device that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, a firearm." So the aspects of the bill dealing with replica guns indicate that there is no control in Ontario over the sale of air guns, pellet guns or starter pistols, and we're not aware of any other jurisdiction in Canada that regulates those sales.

Subject to express conflict with federal legislation—and there may be a direct conflict in terms of this issue because the federal government already has legislation with respect to replica firearms—the province could regulate the purchase and sale of objects that look like firearms so as long as the regulation is attributed to a valid provincial head of power, such as the regulation of a local business. While the definition of a replica firearm in the private member's bill would include devices that fall into this Criminal Code definition, it is much wider and includes many devices, ie, compressed air guns and starter pistols, the sale of which is not controlled by either the Criminal Code or the Firearms Act. There may be situations, and I think the member is probably aware of this, where there are going to be conflicts with federal legislation and that's going to have to be ironed out.

The fundamental focus of this government, obviously, to make our streets safer, is to make sure that there are consequences that go with using either a replica or a real gun for improper purposes or in a criminal act. We have to focus on the use of these guns and make sure that they're not used for an improper purpose, and to make our streets safer.

I give up my time at this point.

1030

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): Regrettably, I'm starting to hear some things that I feel are missing the point. What we're starting to hear from the other side, unfortunately, is: "It's already covered. We think it's covered here." What we're trying to point out, very clearly, is that we have a gap. We've identified the gap. The gap is you can't buy the ammunition for these guns without registering but you can buy the guns. It's not regulated.

What we're asking of the members opposite is to say: "We have found a problem. We admire and respect the fact that this legislation is going to solve that problem for our citizens of Ontario, and we're going to bring forward the legislation that the chiefs of police, the people who have to face these things day in and day out, are onside with."

We've given evidence, and it's researched, that 40% of the guns seized are of this nature—not regulated. What we're asking the government members on the other side to do is to go ahead and stay with your ideological notions that you have all the answers for crime and

justice in this province, but at least when something gets pointed out to you, that there's a crack in the foundation, let's get it filled in a non-partisan way. Unfortunately, I'm beginning to hear some of those rumblings again. Please, step back from that road and go down the road we're offering you for the benefit of all the citizens of Ontario. Let's get that one aside and start talking about the issue.

The issue is that in Ontario there are no controls over the sale of air guns, pellet guns or starter pistols because they don't fall within the realm of the federal regulations. It's not covered in the Criminal Code because of the little loopholes that are in the description. Now that we've found it, let's fill it. If it's going to committee, we'll take care of the small amendments in terms of the definition of a word, but let's not play games here. We're talking about actual life-and-death situations for the citizens of the province. There are people who have been shot as a result of these items when they weren't even bored down the barrel and used as an actual weapon, because a police officer is trained for split-second decisions. They are trained to acknowledge that these replica guns are so much like the actual thing—and they're not covered—that they can cause death.

Let's move off the rhetoric. Let's move off the idea that anything else is going to be covered, that it's covered with the federal laws. We pointed it out: It's not there. So let's move off that discussion and simply say: "You've got a great piece of legislation going here. Let's take a look at it in committee to make sure that the wording and the definitions are correct." Let's stand up and say: "Thank you very much for bringing forth legislation. Thank you very much for giving us that concept and filling that crack. Let's work together."

Let's make sure that the province of Ontario and the people who represent us are safe and secure in doing that job. Let's take this menace off the road. At least we get to legislate some regulations with this.

What I'm really concerned about is this turning into a debate as to who's got the biggest stick when it comes to justice issues. What I'm trying to say is, let's take a look at this legislation and say very clearly: "You're on the right track. You've got the best legislation that's been put forward in this House, and it doesn't matter what party is doing it." Let's start looking at the legislation in the way it was done. As an example, I stood in this House on behalf of the Liberals, when the Solicitor General introduced legislation that was for the protection of people, and I said: "Thank you very much for that piece of legislation. Let's move it forward. We support you."

What's really difficult here is that we've got members on the other side who can't even bring themselves to say: "Thank you very much for that piece of legislation. We'll work with you, hand in hand, and make sure it gets passed."

Let's make perfectly clear that we've got a major problem here that many people outside this Legislature support. Let's get on with the job of legislation. Let's get

on with the job of making sure this piece of legislation gets passed on behalf of the citizens of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Ted Chudleigh): Further debate?

Hon Margaret Marland (Minister without Portfolio [Children]): I think Mike did better without your help.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I'll cede the floor to Ms Marland if she insists.

Hon Mrs Marland: I'd like to speak—

Mr Kormos: Does Ms Marland want to rise on a point of order?

Hon Mrs Marland: No, not on a point of order.

Mr Kormos: I trust she'll be speaking to the bill in due course when the rotation permits Conservative members to address this private member's bill, or she can try to out-volume me and overwhelm the debate with her heckling.

I should tell you right off the bat I'm going to support the bill. I've been listening to the debate. This has been described as a major problem. When Gillian Hadley was slaughtered by her estranged spouse a couple of days ago, it wasn't with a replica. It was with a real handgun by a madman pulling the trigger who had no firearms acquisition certificate or permit, who hadn't acquired a legally registered firearm. We clearly have a problem that transcends whether or not people have to sign to buy a b-b gun or an air pistol. I understand. I don't think anybody really disputes that.

I find myself in an interesting position in terms of the lay of the land in terms of political parties and the whole issue around gun registration and the Supreme Court decision and the incredible resentment that's been expressed by bona fide gun owners across the country and here in Ontario, and in my riding as well, over the course of the last couple of years over forced registration of legitimate handguns.

I recall, and some of the members will—Ms Marland will—Mike Farnan's bill before the Legislature dealing with replica firearms, but not the replicas that are contemplated by the Criminal Code, not the non-firing—what do you call them?—the disengaged automatic machine guns, but the look-alike handguns, most of which are toys, the sort of things that any of us as kids—mind you, when I had my little cap gun as a kid, I wasn't playing cowboys and cattle rustlers; I was playing revolutionaries versus the Battista army. That was where I came from.

Mike Farnan's bill, you should recall, had a mixed response. Quite frankly, people from all three caucuses were for it and, similarly, against it. It was one that addressed the concern about using, or youngsters even having in their possession, a look-alike, albeit a toy gun, such that they put the police in an incredible position of jeopardy, where a police officer, seeing in the dark in a dangerous situation a younger person holding one of these things, would be put in the incredible predicament of having to make a snap judgment about whether he or she was being confronted by a real firearm or a cap

pistol. Mr Bryant appears to be addressing the issue, as I understand it, of b-b guns, air guns and starter pistols. That's the scope of it.

I suppose times have changed. Most of us as youngsters—the shrill admonition of our mothers saying, “You’ll put somebody’s eye out with that b-b gun,” can still be recalled. Mr Bryant explains, and he has police officers supporting the proposition, that in the instance of, let’s say, starter pistols, they can be easily converted to—what do you call them, Mr Mazzilli, zip guns? Is that the phrasing out on the streets in terms of what people do when they convert a starter pistol into a real pistol that can fire a live bullet, a zip gun? In that respect, that falls into the area of replica firearms as the federal government has addressed them; you talk about something that can be readily converted into a real firearm.

I really am not sure, I’m cautious, about putting air guns and b-b guns in the same category as firearms, handguns, rifles, that can be converted into bona fide firearms that are capable of shooting a 22-calibre bullet or what have you.

At the same time, there’s probably nothing offensive about ensuring that people who purchase b-b guns and air guns are at least 18 years old. Surely they’re dangerous enough—like your mother told you, you can put somebody’s eye out with that—that they warrant somebody over the age of 18 having to purchase it. In many cases it will be parents who want their kids to acquire some familiarity with long-barrelled firearms. Again, in rural scenarios, in rural Ontario and all of the north, among families for whom hunting and fishing and that sort of outdoor activity is part of their life, part of their culture, I don’t find it objectionable in any way, shape or form. Nobody should. I don’t find anything objectionable with a parent purchasing, for instance, a b-b gun to familiarize their child—not a person so young as to be irresponsible in the use of them—but to be buying a b-b gun to familiarize their child with the rigours and the responsibilities inherent in using a firearm if that child is going to grow up into a position where she or he is going to be using firearms in the course of hunting or target shooting, that sort of thing.

1040

So it’s not an objectionable piece of legislation. One of the problems, and people have heard it, is that we’ve got all of this fragmented stuff. I recall well the bill that had all-party consent, the bill that Mr Bryant has referred to about purchasing ammunition. Mr Bryant says that b-bs and pellets fall within that definition of ammunition. So one of the problems is that this is fragmented all over the place. I think one of the good things about this being passed would be to send it to committee—and not these silly one-day committees, but a real committee—to also talk about perhaps bringing all of this legislation together provincially. That wouldn’t be such a bad idea, would it, Mr Bryant? To put the prohibition against purchasing ammunition into the same piece of legislation so that we have a comprehensive provincial approach to how people go about purchasing these quasi-firearms—I’ll call them

that; I hope that’s not objectionable to anybody—b-b guns, pellet guns, starter pistols; how they go about purchasing them, how they go about registering them.

Mr Bryant also asked for a criminal record search. I’ve had some problems with this government on criminal record searches. We’ve talked now for a good chunk of time about my private member’s bill which would facilitate criminal record searches for people participating in volunteer activities like Big Brothers and Big Sisters and Boy Scouts and Air Cadets, the whole nine yards. I’ve presented a bill that would require police services, police forces, to produce these criminal record searches free of charge as part of their service to the community.

Here we’ve got another instance where somebody has to provide a criminal record search. That ranges in cost from zero in some municipalities—some police services are still doing it for free—to \$40, \$50, \$60 at the last count. We’re told that police forces are seriously under-resourced, understaffed, that they feel increasingly pressured by the volume of, among other things, record searches, which is why they’re charging user fees and why, in some cases, they’re particularly lengthy processes.

This seems to be a halfway approach to the style of applying for a firearms acquisition certificate, where you have to provide references—many MPPs are called upon to provide references for their constituents when their constituents are applying for firearms acquisition certificates—and where a police officer in that services board is assigned to review these applications to determine whether or not he or she is going to consent to the request for a firearms acquisition certificate.

I noticed earlier this week how the government—in the instance earlier this week it was the Minister of Correctional Services—was responding to a question from one of his backbenchers. Of course, he knew the question, because his ministry wrote it. That’s what happens when backbenchers ask questions of their ministers, or at least now. I recall one government where one backbencher asked real questions of their ministers, but those days have long passed. But again, it was an opportunity on the part of the minister of corrections to try, very fecklessly, to take a shot—well, in that instance it was at my bill, which called for transparency in parole hearings. This government doesn’t like at all having its flaws around so-called law and order, safe communities, victims’ rights pointed out to them.

Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa West-Nepean): We’re big on law and order.

Mr Kormos: They’re big on law and order, the judge says. Of course you’re big on it because you know it’s got—what do they call it?—resonance out there in the community. Far be it from me to criticize an effort by any member of either of the opposition parties to seize a headline for a day—as many days as possible, running consecutively. But I have a very uncomfortable feeling when this government responds to these kinds of efforts with the attitude it displays a little bit today.

The Victims' Bill of Rights: It's been over a year now since the courts in this province declared what opposition members said from day one, and that is, the Victims' Bill of Rights has no teeth. It contains no rights. There's no enforceability. Yet as recently as a couple of weeks ago, a minister of this government again spoke about the Victims' Bill of Rights as being one of the hallmarks of this government. Come on. Let's acknowledge that there isn't a member of this assembly who isn't interested in building safer communities, who isn't interested in ensuring not only that victims have rights but that victims don't become victims—in other words, crime prevention.

I'll throw this bill into the crime prevention bill. Let's face it. I promise that this firearm, this pellet gun that I'm going to buy is not going to be used for an unlawful purpose. Please. If I'm really intent on using it as a fake gun to rob a bank, I'm going to do that. But its purpose is to provide some controls over who acquires these guns and at least some record of who purchases them.

Maybe this very much should go to committee, but maybe this government, when we come back in—are we coming back in 2001, 2002? Whenever we come back, maybe this government should lay out on the table in a broad-based committee process the whole range of community safety efforts that have been offered up by government members, of course, by ministers, by Liberal members and by New Democratic Party members, and sit down and do some comprehensive, tripartite discussion about truly building safer communities. This government has acquired a real reputation of using law and order, community safety, victims' rights for political purposes, and that's made a lot of people really distrustful, cynical, because they know they're being used. Their fears of being victimized are being exploited.

As was pointed out yesterday, all the so-called law and order agenda to date didn't protect Ms Hadley, and that's the point. It's one thing to grab headlines and exploit the phenomenon of youth crime, the fear of youth crime and the repugnance we have towards it, and to talk about being tough on criminals, but it's quite another to truly work together to build safer communities to avoid people becoming victims in the first place. The committee process might be helpful.

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): I join this debate on private member's Bill 67 on replica guns. As the member knows, our government is committed to improving public safety. However, as members also know, our government and Liberals have taken a vastly different approach to law and order. We have focused on getting more police on the streets, putting the rights of victims before those of criminals, and toughening up our laws.

The federal government, in contrast, has passed Bill C-68, the gun registration bill, which has constantly side-stepped our efforts for effective crime control. What's troubling is the federal government can't say how much their firearms registry will cost. First, they said \$85 million. They've already spent three times that amount of money, without one illegal gun being

registered or taken off the street. Some experts think this registration system will climb as high as \$500 million.

1050

What would that original \$85 million have bought? In answer: another 1,000 customs agents on the border. What would \$500 million buy? The equivalent of 6,000 police officers out on our streets.

I contrast these approaches to crime control. Where Liberals believe gun registration is the only answer, we advocate stronger penalties for criminals who use guns or replica guns in the commission of a crime. That's the real issue to debate today. We all know that crime, and more specifically crime involving real and realistic-looking firearms, is a problem that must be addressed. The issue is how best to address it. That's where we differ from Liberals. The most important question that has to be asked of legislation with an eye to improving public safety must be, what exactly would these requirements do?

There's no doubt police, merchants and the general public are all too aware of the tragic incidents that have occurred using phony guns. The material provided by the member for St Paul's, for example, detailed some recent events that ended in catastrophe, a situation where a man was fatally shot by police while holding a doctor hostage with a phony gun. This is a terrible incident. We've got to ask the question, what will this bill do to correct it?

Will requiring someone to fill out forms at the point of purchase for an air gun or a starter's pistol stop them from using it in a crime if they choose to commit one? Will people who want to commit crimes be buying their guns, imitation or not—do criminals buy their guns legally, anyway? I believe this bill—and it is brought forward with good intentions—misses the target. The problem is not that people out there have air guns and starter pistols. The problem is criminal use, that during a crime, police and shopkeepers can't tell the difference.

It's an issue similar to the federal gun control legislation. I know it may look good on the Toronto news—this was mentioned earlier—but when you get down to it, what will it accomplish? Having a registry for all those who have bought air guns in the last five years won't do much for the shopkeepers, the cop who is face to face with someone with a gun pointed at them with no idea whether that firearm is real or not. I think we need to be proactive on this issue with the manufacturers of real-looking firearms, in the interests of public safety. I believe guns that are not actual firearms should be easily discernible from real ones. There should be no room for error because the life of a policeman, a policewoman, a shopkeeper or a passer-by is too important. We need a change in thinking. We need to attack the root of the problem and not dance around on this issue.

The real problem here, in my opinion, is that these guns, when used in a crime, cannot be told apart from the real guns. Consequently, police have treated these guns as real and, accordingly, would react. Firearms experts I've talked to suggest things like ensuring that all air-guns, starter pistols and other real-looking firearms be made with a different shape or perhaps a different colour

from real handguns. These measures could make a difference and they would certainly let police know that a gun was not real at a quick glance. That will save lives.

I can't support this legislation today because I think there are better methods for catching criminals and registering guns, whether they are real guns or phony guns.

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): I'd like to say that it's a pleasure to join the debate, a pleasure in the sense that I'm very proud of the work that my colleague from St Paul's has done on this issue. I would say that it's a sobering issue to discuss, in particular because the incident that many people have referred to in their speeches this morning with respect to the shooting of Mr Henry Masuka in the emergency ward of St Michael's Hospital this past New Year's Eve occurred in my riding. He was a constituent of mine and his family members continue to be constituents of mine.

I've listened carefully to the debate this morning and I have been somewhat surprised—surprised that members of the government party, some of them at least, seem disinclined to support this legislation, this private member's bill by my colleague the member for St Paul's. I'm a bit surprised, and I would urge them to give some thought in the next hour or so to whether they can see clear to support this. I present the following reasons for doing so.

First, in this very Legislature, and I think most members were there on that day, the Premier of the province and their party leader, the head of their government, indicated his support for this legislation. Typically, that's enough on its own, but I won't stop there. I will remind members and those people who are watching at home that this piece of legislation, one more tool, if you will, in a toolbox on an arsenal of tools available to try and limit outbreaks of violent crime and such, has an extraordinarily broad range of support from senior law enforcement officials across the province of Ontario.

Last night I had the opportunity to attend an event with Julian Fantino, the new police chief in the city of Toronto. He's in support of this legislation. I note from earlier speeches that the police chief from Hamilton-Wentworth, one of the most significant police services in the province of Ontario, stands in support of this legislation. So I must say, historically from the government opposite we've heard members champion, if you will, the support for their legislative initiatives from those same people. Yet as they stand today in their place, they seem to paint that over. I would urge them, in the time remaining, to reconsider that.

This is not a bill that will result in making our streets safer all on its own, but it is one more piece in a very complex puzzle.

Members opposite have heard about the challenges in my own riding; many murders take place. If we can prevent any through the passage of this legislation, as police chiefs from across the province of Ontario seem to think, it's good enough for me, and I hope it's good enough for members opposite.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for St Paul's has two minutes to wrap up.

Mr Bryant: I would like to thank the members who spoke to this bill. I appreciate the member for York South-Weston, the member for Brant and the member for Toronto Centre-Rosedale going through the bill and clarifying some questions that have been raised in this House with respect to the bill.

Many thanks also to the member for London-Fanshawe and the member for Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford for raising some question and issues with respect to matters that can best be dealt with in committee, where many bills are addressed in terms of "the devil in the details." I look forward to addressing your comments in committee and making whatever changes are necessary.

Thanks also to the member for Niagara Centre for giving us a historical perspective, reminding this House that a similar bill has been before this House and has received support from all three sides, including in particular the support from Mike Harris, Dianne Cunningham and Norm Sterling. I use their names because I can't remember what their riding names were at the time they voted for that bill.

I also thank the member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant, who made an important distinction on this issue between the firearms registry and licensing system and this bill. They are two separate ways of approaching two separate problems.

I would also remind the members that this bill has the support of police chiefs. They say they desperately need this legislation in place to stem the tide. We have a real proliferation of these guns. As the member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant pointed out, you cannot distinguish these phony guns from real firearms, and that creates nightmares for police officers and it creates nightmares for victims. That's why we have to regulate these guns at least as much as we regulate the ammunition for these guns.

With the support of the police chiefs, the Premier, who I guarantee you would not be supporting the bill if there were fatal jurisdictional problems, I seek the members' support for this bill and thank you for your time.

1100

OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ PROTECTION
AND PRESERVATION ACT, 1999

LOI DE 1999 SUR LA PROTECTION
ET LA PRÉSERVATION
DE LA MORAINÉ D'OAK RIDGES

Mr Colle moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 12, An Act to protect and preserve the Oak Ridges Moraine for future generations by creating the Oak Ridges Moraine Commission / Projet de loi 12, Loi visant à protéger et à préserver la moraine d'Oak Ridges pour les générations à venir en constituant la Commission de la moraine d'Oak Ridges.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The Chair recognizes the member for Eglinton-Lawrence.

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): This has been an interesting journey for this bill. When I first introduced it in November, at that time I certainly knew about the Oak Ridges moraine, but I have learned a great deal about it over the last eight or nine months. I've learned that this moraine, which is like a giant sponge, a giant natural filter that takes in rainwater and snow and cleans, basically, the water and stores it in giant underground ponds or aquifers that provide drinking water for over a quarter of a million people directly, and is the headwaters for over 65 rivers and streams. So almost all the rivers and streams that come through the greater Toronto area and beyond have origins in the moraine.

That's why the moraine is so important. If we protect the moraine, we protect all those rivers and streams, we protect people's well water and we also protect the water that flows downstream to Lake Ontario or upstream to Lake Simcoe. The importance of the moraine is something that I certainly have been very pleased to understand in greater depth. I thank people for doing that for me. Part of the exercise of this private member's bill is to essentially get people to understand what we do in the Legislature and how we deal with important issues. I've learned a lot by going to meetings and asking people to comment about my bill, and it's been, as I said, a very worthwhile experience.

I've asked people to come to public meetings, and we've held town hall meetings in Richmond Hill, we've been in meetings in Ballantrae, meetings in Goodwood and meetings right here in Toronto. We had the Amati Quartet and people from all over came to Toronto to talk about the importance of the moraine.

It's been a good exercise in getting people from the so-called 905 area and the people in 416 to understand that we're connected, that the water and our concern for environmental issues like our forests, our birds and our trees connect us all; that whether we live in Pefferlaw or downtown Toronto, whether we live in Swansea or in Scugog, we're all connected. That's what I've certainly learned.

I've met some very passionate people along the way. I've met Eddie Long in Caledon, who is fighting a life-and-death struggle to stop the giant Rockford quarry from destroying the Caledon area, that beautiful area of the province. I've met councillor Brenda Hogg, who's here from Richmond Hill. Councillor Hogg was the only member of Richmond Hill council who stood up to the development pressures long before it was fashionable. Now that whole council is out to protect the moraine. I want to commend people like Brenda Hogg for her efforts and thank her, and her council, now that it sees the light.

I've met Jane Underhill from King City, who is fighting the good battle to stop the sprawl in King City; Debbe Crandall from STORM; Lea Ann Mallett from Earthroots. There's Ben Kestien from Aurora, who fights a single-handed battle up there; Teresa Johnson in the

little hamlet of Goodwood. You may not know of Goodwood, but Goodwood right now sits at the highest point of the moraine. There are a couple of developers that want to put all these houses on Goodwood, a little hamlet 7 kilometres south of Gan Eden in Uxbridge. I'm sad to say that, as much as Uxbridge council has done something positive to stop the Gan Eden development, I heard that Uxbridge council is supporting the development of homes down in Goodwood.

That, again, shows directly that we need more than just local councils or regional councils to protect the moraine. We need a comprehensive plan that the province puts in place whereby there are guidelines right across the moraine. Remember, people sometimes think the moraine is just Richmond Hill. It is not. That is just 1% of it. It stretches all the way to the headwaters of the Trent River in the Peterborough area, to Peel. It goes from Caledon to Cobourg. It's over 160 km long. Here's the map. I know I'm not supposed to use these maps, but the moraine is very long, from Peterborough to Peel, and it provides water to Lake Ontario and to Lake Simcoe. So it's a long stretch; it's not just that 1% in Richmond Hill. That's why my bill calls for a protective plan under a stewardship body that takes care of the moraine to ensure that whatever local councils or regional councils do, they are a part of and complementary to this plan.

This is modelled after a very successful plan that the Bill Davis government introduced in the early 1970s, the Niagara Escarpment Commission plan, which has been recognized internationally as a great success. As you know, even the United Nations has said that that piece of legislation introduced by the Conservative government back in the 1970s has protected one of the most genuine natural masterpieces that we have in all of Canada, the Niagara Escarpment. People who live along the escarpment have grown to appreciate it and thank the government of that day for doing the right thing. It's not perfect, but it's a plan that has worked.

There are some very dedicated people who work on the Niagara Escarpment Commission. Their work could be enhanced by expanding what they did easterly across the moraine and having a similar plan. That's what I'm asking for, to look at establishing a protective plan whereby we will do the same thing as in the escarpment, and maybe even do it better, in the moraine.

It's undoubtedly the thing to do, because there's unanimity on this: 465 scientists from all over North America said you must freeze development on the moraine and put in a protective plan. We've got regional councils in Peel and Durham; they want to protect the plan. Local councils want to protect the plan; ratepayer groups like the Jefferson Forest ratepayer group; all across, they are in unanimity. They want to protect the plan, and then they can have rules and guidelines. Right now, there are basically no rules and guidelines. The old 1991 guidelines are inadequate.

We need updated planning protection for the moraine, because right now, sad to say again, it's the Ontario Municipal Board that is going to decide the future of the

drinking water for over four million people and the future of the Oak Ridges moraine. That is not right. That's why many people have called into question the function of the Ontario Municipal Board.

The other day we heard that there was going to be \$10,000 spent on photocopying submissions to the OMB hearings on Richmond Hill. The Ontario Municipal Board has become basically a money pit and a pension source for highly paid Bay Street lawyers and for highly paid consultants. The OMB should not be deciding the future of our fish, our wildlife and our communities. That should be done by a provincial government in conjunction with local municipalities.

This unelected, unaccountable body now is in charge of protecting over 150 species of birds and our drinking water. They can't do it. It is so expensive and so unacceptable from a planning perspective that this body of one or two people makes this type of decision. We've got to stop letting the OMB do the dirty work of the government. They were not intended to do that. The government's job is to protect the moraine. So far, we've had no protective plan, no direction from this government in terms of what municipalities should do.

We need a strong, complete, total plan that not only protects, as I said, the middle corridor, but protects everybody and all the communities of the moraine and protects the drinking water, the old-growth forest, the kettle lakes and the Caledon Hills. We've got everything happening up there. It's not only water extraction; it's not only the destruction of wetlands. We've got these giant quarries now being proposed up in Caledon. We've got extraction of sand and gravel. Everything is happening in a haphazard fashion.

You're very fond of protecting agricultural land, Mr Speaker. We're about to lose 200,000 hectares of prime agricultural land by this urban sprawl. That is not good economically or environmentally.

I ask members of all sides to let this bill go forward like the Shelley Martel bill did. Let it go to committee and let's work out a plan together, because people from all political walks of life are now supportive of a protective plan. They want action on the moraine. So let's do it together, and this bill could be part of the answer.

1110

The Deputy Speaker: I just wanted to introduce to the Legislature, in the west public gallery, the grades 4 and 5 classes of Mr Woods and Mrs Lil Henry from Wallace public school in beautiful uptown Gowanstown, Ontario. Welcome to the Legislature this morning.

Further debate?

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): I'm assisting the MPP for Carleton-Gloucester, Brian Coburn, the parliamentary assistant for municipal affairs, on this Bill 12. He can't be here this morning. I can say, as parliamentary assistant to the environment minister, that we believe it is very important to protect the environmental interests related to the Oak Ridges moraine. The moraine has a significant importance with regard to hydrogeology, terrestrial features and linkages for much

of the area across the GTA, and we all hold this in very high regard.

As members know, the moraine is described as the rain barrel of southern Ontario. It is a ridge of crushed rock, sand and clay stretching 160 kilometres from the Niagara Escarpment in the west to Cobourg in the east. As many as 65 watercourses run from the moraine to recharge major bodies of water such as Lake Simcoe, Lake Ontario and Georgian Bay. In the GTA, its underground streams feed 30 rivers, including the Don, the Humber and the Rouge rivers, which in turn recharge Lake Ontario, where much of greater Toronto gets its water. The moraine is the source of drinking water, in fact, for about a quarter of a million people, and this importance cannot be overstated.

It's home to the greatest concentration of forests, wetlands, kettle lakes and wildlife habitat in the GTA, and there's no question that the moraine is a significant environmental area that needs careful planning to manage and protect. Certainly much thought is needed before decisions are made regarding an area as significant as this, and the people making those decisions must take into account the environmental impact of development. Our government is committed to a balance between environmental and economic interests on the moraine, and we believe a balance will be achieved through Ontario's land use planning process, a process already in place.

It's important to note the long history of involvement by all levels of government with this moraine, the studies that have been done and their conclusions, and it's important to rely on what works and to keep a level head to best provide the balanced approach needed when dealing with contentious issues like this one.

This bill is modelled after the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act. That's a drawback that adds a whole other level of bureaucracy and one reason I will not support this bill.

In the late 1980s, an ecological green space strategy recommended the establishment of a green space framework for the GTA made up of the Niagara Escarpment, the Lake Ontario waterfront and the river valleys running north from Lake Ontario and running north from the Oak Ridges moraine. At that time the moraine was not protected by either legislation or planning controls.

In 1991 the NDP government pursued the recommendations of the report, declaring the Oak Ridges moraine to be an area of provincial interest. The NDP government released their report entitled Implementation Guidelines: Provincial Interest on the Oak Ridges Moraine of the Greater Toronto Area to review development and land-use change applications. Those 1991 guidelines have eight key principles which help determine whether development should be allowed:

- (1) Prohibit development in significant natural areas.
- (2) Resist scattered development.
- (3) Encourage maintaining or enhancing ecological integrity.
- (4) Encourage landform conservation.

(5) Encourage the protection and management of woodlands.

(6) Prohibit unacceptable development in and around watercourses and lakes.

(7) Restrict expansion of settlements on to highly permeable soils.

(8) Prohibit development that has an unacceptable impact on groundwater.

These 1991 Oak Ridges moraine implementation guidelines and provincial policy statement set out the direction for both regional and local governments when they make decisions on planning documents and development proposals for the moraine. They provide sufficient protection against any development that would endanger the moraine. These tools have been used. I commend the initiative of York, Durham and Peel for working together to develop a coordinated strategy to protect the Oak Ridges moraine, as well as incorporating the 1991 guidelines into their official plans. These regions are using the tools provided and do not require the province to mandate their affairs.

Ontario's planning process provides the tools needed for the protection of the moraine. The Planning Act sets out provincial and municipal roles and responsibilities. These guidelines, if used properly, can protect the moraine. Local councils do have tools and powers to protect the moraine. We need all partners to work together on a balanced approach, as I've indicated, to ensure the moraine remains the important environmental feature that is so important for Ontario today.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I want to commend my colleague Mike Colle for bringing forward this particular bill, because I think it's extremely timely. He has been on a crusade for the last few years to save the Oak Ridges moraine from the kind of development which I think would be extremely detrimental in terms of quality of life and certainly in terms of the environment for the area.

We have had unfortunate circumstances arise in the town of Walkerton, we have heard of water quality and drinking water safety issues emerging in communities across the province, and here is an opportunity that we have, as legislators, through the approval of the bill by the member for Eglinton-Lawrence, to take some preventive action. Instead of scrambling now to meet an immediate need out there, a crisis situation, the member for Eglinton-Lawrence is allowing us an opportunity to take the kind of preventive measures which will help to maintain the quality of water for so many communities, because as most people who are familiar with the issue understand, the headwaters of rivers and streams that feed into several communities are located along the Oak Ridges moraine and therefore it is deserving of preservation.

We have those opportunities. The problem is that if we allow the paving over of this land, it is virtually lost forever. It's similar to wonderful farmland in various parts of the province that we see now being paved over very rapidly. It's unlikely we're going to take the build-

ings off that farmland and reintroduce it as farmland, so it's something that is lost forever. That's why the decision is extremely important now.

There's always the issue of development versus conservation. My concern is that financial interests sometimes play a role which is far too strong in development. In other words, large contributions by developers to the party in power may tend to influence the decision to such an extent that there's a decision made to proceed with widespread development as opposed to retaining the natural sites that we have at this time.

I think the province of Ontario has a significant role to play. To force local municipalities to deal with this of their own volition is very difficult. To leave it to the Ontario Municipal Board, which is an appointed body, stacked in recent years with friends of the government of the Conservative Party, I think is unfortunate. Frankly, when you have a party in power, you're going to have that party appointing people to the board, and you would think they might reflect the views of the party in power.

My concern is that the province make a profound statement. I believe the Niagara Escarpment Commission has been a good tool in preserving the Niagara Escarpment. A recent decision was made, in fact by cabinet, dealing with the Niagara Escarpment Commission, which was a preservationist decision, and I approve of that decision. If the government takes flak for it, I approve of that particular decision. Whether the situation in Walkerton influenced it or not I have no idea, but we are all more acutely aware today of the environmental implications of various decisions that we make.

1120

A commission which would have the power to control development on the Oak Ridges moraine would be extremely beneficial. I don't think the present Planning Act in Ontario, which has been weakened considerably since the new government came into office, is necessarily the tool. I don't think the teeth are in that act that were there previously, and I would like to see that Planning Act strengthened considerably to preserve its environmental components and its agricultural components the way we believe it should be.

We have an opportunity this morning to support a bill by Mike Colle, the member for Eglinton-Lawrence, which will have the effect of preserving the Oak Ridges moraine, a wonderful natural area in this province, and I want to indicate my very strong support for that legislation.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): Here we are again talking about a bill to protect the Oak Ridges moraine. You will recall that recently I stood in this House with Shelley Martel and put forward a bill on saving the Oak Ridges moraine, and indeed not just saving the Oak Ridges moraine but bringing the green back into the Planning Act, which had been done when we were in government.

People will recall—and I know the Tories, who were then the third party, didn't support or approve of what we were doing—that we had John Sewell and others go out

and criss-cross the province for about two years, I believe, and come up with recommendations. They even came in under budget. They came in on time and under budget, which is usually unheard of for commissions and committees of this place. It actually was a balanced Planning Act, but it had very strong—and I consider having strong green components, environmental protection components to a Planning Act as balanced. Of course, before this act came into being, the act was not balanced at all because it didn't take the environment much into account.

When the Tory government came into power, not surprisingly—and they warned they would do this—they repealed that act, not only went back to the previous Planning Act that was on the books before that but even brought in some more regressive parts to the Planning Act.

That bill passed, and I thank the two Tory colleagues who were very brave and, I believe, genuinely supported Shelley's and my bill, who came in and voted for it. I would certainly like to thank Mike Colle and almost the entire Liberal caucus for coming in that morning. I know how difficult it is to round up people on Thursday mornings, as whip of my little party here. To round up enough people to come in and actually attempt to win votes here is very difficult, and I just want to express once again my gratitude for the co-operation here on this issue.

As I've said before, this is one of those issues, of which I think there are very few, where we try to work together in a non-partisan way. I certainly know that Mike and I have been able to do that in terms of keeping the interest of saving the Oak Ridges moraine at the forefront and not scoring political points on this. In that vein, I want to commend Mike Colle for all his tremendously hard work on this issue over the past couple of years and to thank him again for the support of Shelley Martel's and my bill that passed just recently.

The bill that's before us today I very strongly support. I see it as complementary to Shelley Martel's bill on the Oak Ridges moraine. It does some different things. Taken together, I really want the two of those bills to go to committee, and as quickly as possible, because there are OMB hearings going on. We need to get these bills before a committee so that we can discuss them. I know there were certain components that government members said they could not support in my bill—I believe it was an excuse; I'm not so sure it would have been supported anyway—because mine went too far in terms of not just protecting the Oak Ridges moraine but as well delving into the bigger issue, and that is putting environmental protection back into the Planning Act.

Let me say, if that Planning Act were still on the books today, we wouldn't be in this terrible mess that we are now in the Oak Ridges moraine, because the wording in that bill would have automatically prevented most—not all, but a good deal—of the development that's going on or proposed in the Oak Ridges moraine area from ever being considered. So it's too bad that Planning Act was

thrown out. I think it's really important that the government take another look at that act through the committee hearings on both Mike Colle's bill and Shelley Martel's bill, so we can have a good discussion.

I've also said that right now the foremost issue before us is protecting the Oak Ridges moraine. For the government members who said they couldn't support my bill because it went too far in terms of delving into larger provincial planning, I'm willing to sit down at committee and make amendments to the bill. I would be disappointed, because I believe that the Oak Ridges moraine problem is going to become an issue clear across the province and, on a smaller scale, it already is. We know of areas where developers are bypassing the municipalities completely now and going straight to the OMB.

I would urge members today to support this bill. I heard one of the government members say that he wouldn't. I hope that at the end of this debate he will change his mind. Mike Colle's bill sets up a structure that's almost identical to the Niagara Escarpment Commission to govern planning on the Oak Ridges moraine. It has 17 members appointed by cabinet. The purpose of the act is, "to provide for the maintenance of the Oak Ridges moraine and land in its vicinity substantially as a continuous natural environment, and to ensure only such development occurs as is compatible with that natural environment." The act provides a list of more detailed environmental and planning objectives, which I won't go into now because I don't have time.

The commission and all other bodies would be bound by the Oak Ridges Moraine plan, which would be developed by the commission after extensive public consultations and approved by cabinet. The plan would go through a formal review every five years. The Oak Ridges Moraine Commission would hear requests for a plan amendment and cabinet would have the final say over these. The commission has expropriation powers.

Who could argue with that? I believe Mr Colle took into account when he was constructing this bill that the government would want to have input in terms of appointments to the commission, final say; all that's built into the bill. I can't understand why government members would not support this today.

We know the bill is very strongly supported by the Oak Ridges moraine activists, the people who live in the area and the people who live in surrounding areas, because of the issues that have been raised. This is an issue of importance to those of us who live in Toronto as well because, as has been said before, the headwaters flow into Lake Ontario and Lake Simcoe. It has a profound effect on drinking water and our water quality in a huge area. I can't understand why the government members—and I hope others will speak in support of it today—would not support this bill and allow my bill—I keep saying "my bill." Actually Shelley Martel, in partnership with me, presented this bill before the House and we were very grateful and happy that it passed that day.

1130

We need this bill to pass as well today. Now that we have one Oak Ridges moraine bill on the books and it's going to committee, it would be silly to just have that one go to committee, when we have another one before us today which takes on a whole other aspect of what can be done to save the Oak Ridges moraine. I would really not want to go to committee with just my bill when we've got this other really good bill on the books. My bill—Shelley's bill; I've got to stop saying that, because it's Shelley Martel's private member's bill—requires a freeze on the Oak Ridges moraine until certain planning details are worked out. I still think that is a very important step here. I am still calling on the government to do that because the moraine has not been saved.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing says he's putting forward a progressive position at the OMB. He's fully prepared to go to the OMB to decide on the future of the moraine, when he can do it himself. It's very frustrating knowing that the minister can step in any time and put a freeze on development in the area until we have a plan worked out. The problem is—I've said this before in the House and I will say it again, and it's a very serious issue—if the OMB gives the developers the right to develop the moraine, it's game over. It's gone. It's lost. Through the minister's failure to legislate a solution to the moraine before the board rules, he will make it absolutely, totally too expensive to turn around and restrict development through subsequent legislation. That's because he will then be taking away the existing rights from developers. They will be able to make a very strong case to the courts that they should be compensated at the highest and best use.

We had a planner, I believe it was a planner from the Richmond Hill area, say that just for the 1% in that area alone, if the OMB should rule in favour of the developers, it would cost at least \$1 billion for the government to expropriate that land and take it back to protect it. That's just talking about Richmond Hill. This is going on all over the Oak Ridges moraine area. It's hard to imagine how much it would actually cost for the government then, after the horses are out and the barn door is closed, to try to protect the Oak Ridges moraine.

The minister still has an opportunity to step in and freeze development. Here's what I would propose today. I hear government members say that they are committed to protecting the Oak Ridges moraine. I hear government members say that the Planning Act gives the municipalities tools in order to do that. The problem is, that isn't so. The really strong, concrete tools that were in that toolbox under the NDP Planning Act have been taken away. It makes it a lot harder for municipalities to now say no to developers based on existing legislation, because of the change in wording within the Planning Act. It makes it harder for the OMB to take the Planning Act as seriously, in terms of preservation of environmentally sensitive land, because of critical changes in the wording in the Planning Act. Those tools have been taken away.

I know Mr Gilchrist likes to say that at the end of the day the developers and/or the communities, the proponents before the OMB, used to be able to apply to cabinet for an appeal and that the NDP took that away. That's quite correct. I know from my experience in government that a cabinet rarely, if ever, overturns complex decisions made by a body that took days and sometimes months of hearings and evidence. The other problem is, it can work both ways. The developers, if they didn't like it—and that's what I really worry about with this government—could come and appeal to the cabinet. A positive decision for the Oak Ridges moraine made by the OMB could be as well overturned by cabinet. If you have a strong Planning Act in place—which was in place—in fact you don't need to have that appeal to cabinet.

But here we are now and we're going to vote at 12 o'clock on this bill. I would suggest two things today: that we all continue to urge, and the minister can do it, the Minister of Municipal Affairs to freeze development now until we have a proper plan in place. Much of that work was done when the NDP was in government. It would need some more consultation and fine-tuning, but it's mostly done. The second thing is to support Mike Colle's bill today and immediately, over the summer, go to the general government committee. This bill today should be referred to that committee as well. Both bills should go together to that committee over the summer. We should see what amendments are made and work together to come up with a positive solution to save the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): I'm certainly pleased to join in the debate with respect to the private member's bill put forth by the member for Eglinton-Lawrence.

Essentially the bill will not stop development on the Oak Ridges moraine. It's very similar to the piece of legislation brought forth earlier with respect to freezing the Oak Ridges moraine in terms of development. It wasn't to stop development. What we're dealing with here is a method to deal with development on the Oak Ridges moraine. Let's make very clear what we're dealing with here with respect to this bill and the previous bill that was trying to freeze. There still will be development on the Oak Ridges moraine, whether this particular bill reaches law or whether there is a freeze put in place.

The debate focuses on the question: Does a commission improve on the current process? What is being proposed is the setting up of an authority known as the Oak Ridges Moraine Commission to oversee planning and development on the Oak Ridges moraine, aiding local and regional municipalities in their efforts to support sustainable development. The intent is clear that there's going to be development on the Oak Ridges Moraine through this commission in conjunction with local municipalities.

Second, it requires the aforementioned commission to prepare a plan—the Oak Ridges Moraine plan—in consultation with local municipalities and the public.

Finally, it provides for an ongoing protective planning stewardship that will ensure the natural integrity of the moraine from Caledon to Cobourg.

What's the current process in comparison to what the member is trying to put forth? The current process that has been put in place is that in 1991 the NDP government pursued the recommendations of the Kanter report by declaring the Oak Ridges moraine to be an area of provincial interest and released implementation guidelines: "Provincial interests on the Oak Ridges moraine of the greater Toronto area: to review development and land use applications." The guidelines set out 18 principles that effectively deal with protecting the environment and ensuring there's sustainable development, properly planned.

The 1991 Oak Ridges moraine implementation guidelines in the provincial policy statement set out the direction for regional and local governments when they make decisions on planning documents and developmental proposals on the moraine. Let's keep it clear that the regional government and the local government have a process in place which deals with planning in their respective areas and with getting public input. That process has always been in place.

1140

What it led to was that York, Durham and Peel worked together to develop a coordinated strategy to protect the Oak Ridges moraine as well as incorporating the 1991 guidelines into their official plans. They already have official plans as to how they're going to deal with the Oak Ridges moraine. That process has already been done. Anyone who knows municipal law knows that before an official plan can be passed into law, it has already had extensive public input, in dealing with an official plan. As a former councillor for the city of Barrie, I know the process, and I know the public has a strong say and interest in official plans.

What has been put in place is provincial guidelines and official plans that deal with those provincial guidelines and follow them through in terms of protecting the moraine, protecting the environmental interests, the natural resources and dealing with development. There is nothing different here than what the commission would do.

The member for St Catharines puts it succinctly because he doesn't trust the Ontario Municipal Board. The last time we were dealing with freezing development, the member from Eglinton-Lawrence viciously attacked the OMB. What is the Ontario Municipal Board? It's an independent decision-making body, similar to the Ontario Labour Relations Board, and it has appointees. Just like the court system has appointees, the OMB has appointees. No one has ever said you can't trust the judges who have been appointed to the courts. No one has ever said that. Whenever someone says, "Make them accountable," they say, "You can't interfere with the independent decision-making of our judges." The same attack is being made here. The Ontario Municipal Board was put in place to protect municipalities and their constituents.

Mr Colle: That's a farce.

Mr Tascona: The member across says it's a farce. What does he know? It's so negative in terms of an independent decision-making process. He attacks the very process that would protect individuals against municipalities in terms of decision-making they don't like. It's an appeal process that's been in place for many years. What he says is: "Let's put together a commission. Let's put together a plan. Let's get public input." It's already been done.

This is not only a silly proposal, it's also a proposal that smacks of Toronto smugness. We're dealing with it right now with the garbage issue with respect to them saying: "We don't want our garbage dealt with here. Let's put it in Vaughan." Heck, they tried to put the garbage in my riding through an incineration process when Toronto doesn't even allow incineration. That's that Toronto smugness—they know best for the rest of the province.

What is being proposed here is nothing that's not already in place. It doesn't improve on the process, and in effect it doesn't stop development on the Oak Ridges moraine. It's not intended to stop development. It just looks good, and I think it makes the member feel good because the member from Toronto feels he has an obligation to protect us from outside Toronto.

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): What a great honour to have an opportunity to follow the member from Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, the wet blanket of the Ontario Legislature. His job, from the Tory back row, is to put down the flames, to throw water on everything that is rising up.

Today I make a prediction to all those watching and to those who are here that before the life of this government comes to an end—I mean at election time or something like that, not in a moral way in terms of their governing—they will deal with this issue.

The reason I say this is that a few weeks ago I had an opportunity in this House to present a petition from residents of Richmond Hill, and the petition looked a lot to me like a list of electors. In Richmond Hill, in the riding of Oak Ridges, a riding held by the minister responsible for time allocation and closure, Frank Klees, almost every resident, on street after street, had signed a petition calling for meaningful protection of the Oak Ridges moraine.

Let's be clear about this. All governments, of all three political parties, have moved some way towards that over time. We have a private member's bill being debated today from my colleague Mike Colle, the member for Eglinton-Lawrence; we had one a few weeks ago from the NDP, which passed; and Steve Gilchrist, a member of the governing party and a former minister, has his own bill before this House.

This is the sign of an opportunity for all parties in this House to come together and support something Ontarians want: meaningful protection of the Oak Ridges moraine. It will come. I make that prediction on the basis of those

petitions that I saw. All governments have dealt with it in some way.

The minister opposite made, with great fanfare, the front page of the *Toronto Star*. I know he hates it, but he leaked it to them. The top above-the-fold story said that he'd given advice to the Ontario Municipal Board about ways they could protect that 1% in Richmond Hill that the member for Eglinton-Lawrence referred to. This is the thin edge of the wedge. It is beginning, and we know that before very long the government will stand up and it will take responsibility for this issue and it will show leadership. It's getting there rather slowly, but the constituents in the 905, the heartland for the government, are going to force this because they are right. They brought the municipal council in Richmond Hill around. They've done that because the Richmond Hill councillors—closer to the ground, apparently, than the government—have understood that this issue will result in the election or defeat, depending on how people deal with it, of members in the next election. I applaud the efforts of my colleague to bring this meaningful protection forward.

Look at the crisis we're going through with respect to water. That's what the Oak Ridges moraine issue is all about. It's about the safety and security of fresh water and drinking supplies for millions of Ontarians.

The last member tried to play this off and tried to get sort of a Toronto take on it, because he fails to—I won't say he fails to. He chooses not to understand the complex nature of the ecosystem in the greater Toronto area and the extent to which this thing really is the rain barrel of southern Ontario—the Don River, which is the eastern boundary of my riding, on which we have worked with citizen groups, with some modest support from the city of Toronto, to bring life back to, where salmon will soon again be spawning, where wildlife has returned. The headwaters of the Don River are in the Oak Ridges moraine. That's why this issue matters to me so much as a downtown Toronto representative.

We have a historic opportunity in this House to see the fact that members from all parties have, at the very same time, introduced private members' bills that would provide more meaningful protection for the Oak Ridges moraine. All that is left, all that we go wanting for on this issue, is leadership from the government opposite. We all know the limitations of private members' hours, but we have three pieces of legislation which could be considered. The government could demonstrate leadership and show that they understand the complexity of this issue and demonstrate that they are prepared to act in a meaningful way to secure the freshwater drinking supply for the residents of the greater Toronto area from here and well into the future. That's what's at stake.

I appeal to members opposite: Support this bill and push your government to move forward with those protections.

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton): It's a pleasure to rise and enter the debate on this most important environmental topic. Certainly the three elements of our environ-

ment are extremely important to the people of Ontario and indeed the people of Canada and, by extension, the people of the world. Certainly the air we breathe is essential to the environment. We've gone a long way with the Drive Clean program in Ontario and other aspects in order to improve the air we breathe. The soil we grow our food in is another element of the environment which is extremely important. The food we grow, the food we feed to our children, is essential to a clean environment and essential for the longevity of the human race, particularly in Ontario.

I believe, however, there is no more important a compound on Earth than water. Indeed, judging by this morning's news, perhaps it's even on Mars. Astronomers were on TV on the morning news, being quite excited about having found evidence that water existed in the very recent past on the planet of Mars. Certainly on Earth, clean water is something that is essential and extremely important.

1150

That brings us to the Oak Ridges moraine, which was laid down during the last ice age and years later is a receptacle for the water in the north of Toronto, running that distance from Caledon to Cobourg north of the area, and is the source of so many streams that flow north and south into Lake Simcoe and Lake Ontario. I'd like to emphasize how strongly I feel about this issue, about ensuring that our environment is one that is sustainable for the future for our children and our children's children.

I believe this bill, however, is somewhat overly bureaucratic. It somewhat duplicates some of the other elements that are available in the Planning Act. Ms Martel's bill, which was introduced several weeks ago, in my opinion was a salvageable bill. It had many elements in it that would go a long way to protect the Oak Ridges moraine, and with a few amendments in committee it would have been very salvageable and would have done an excellent job. For that reason, this bill being overly bureaucratic, I will not be supporting it.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I just say to the government members, because I gather that the whip is on and they're going to vote against this, you do this at your own peril. I guarantee you that those of us who care about the Oak Ridges moraine, and particularly the active group that has really mobilized to save this precious historical and important part of Ontario, will never let go. In the end they will win. If you choose today to reject this, you're making a huge mistake. It will be on the record. You are on the wrong strategy. You think you can get away with leaving this to the OMB. It's not going to work. The people who know this issue see right through that. The OMB may make its decision, but whatever that is, it will not stick. The people of Ontario will not allow development on the essential portions of the Oak Ridges moraine. You might as well accept that today and vote for this bill. This bill is an important additional step in saving the Oak Ridges moraine.

I have some experience. I watched the debate around the Rouge River park. I happened to be part of it and

happened to be supportive of the group that worked to save that. This was in the mid-1980s and it was a huge success for those who care about the environment. They worked tirelessly to make certain the Rouge park was saved. The same thing is going to happen on the Oak Ridges moraine, and Ontario will not stand for you allowing development on it.

Here's what I think you think is going to happen. The OMB will make its decision. You'll say it's an independent body and so be it. People have already seen through that. They are not going to accept that. I expect Mr Gilchrist will speak shortly in favour of this proposal because he has indicated publicly his support. So I expect when I stop speaking, he will speak in favour of this and be here to vote for it. Ms Martel's bill, in conjunction with this bill and in conjunction with Mr Gilchrist's bill, forms for the government surely a solution to a significant political problem.

I will say that if the government today brings in its supporters to reject this, I guarantee you that people who are involved in this issue understand what you're trying to do, and that is, you have made some commitments, it appears, to whoever it may be not to save the moraine. You hope you can distance yourself by leaving it to the OMB. But from my experience with the Rouge Valley, I will tell you that won't happen. We only get one chance. If this decision is made wrong, we'll never get a chance to save it. That's why people mobilize. That's why people intuitively understand that. This isn't like another policy decision that you can correct five years from now. If we make a mistake on this one, it's gone. We knew that about the Niagara Escarpment decades ago and we moved to save the Niagara Escarpment. Thank goodness they had some foresight at the time. We knew that about the Rouge park a decade ago. Surely we know that today about the Oak Ridges moraine.

My colleague's bill is a sensible, reasonable position. I will look forward to Mr Tascona being at a public meeting where he reads back his Hansard and says, "No, no, I rejected it because it was too bureaucratic." I tell you, the people of Ontario, the people who care about the environment, will say, "Why in the world did you reject a sensible, reasonable decision?"

I urge the members to vote for it. As I say, the people who care about this issue will forever hold you accountable. It is a sensible, reasonable decision and one that we only get one chance to make before it's gone. I would urge the support of all members of the Legislature.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Eglinton-Lawrence has two minutes to respond.

Mr Colle: I want to thank everybody who spoke on the bill: my esteemed colleague from St Catharines, the members for Haldimand-Norfolk, Broadview-Greenwood, Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, Toronto Centre-Rosedale, Halton, and Mr Phillips from Scarborough.

Listen, I've worked very hard with a lot of people for the last number of months on this bill. I really take offence at the member from Barrie talking about this being a silly thing. I don't mind if you criticize me or

criticize our party politics. It just shows how low they can go. I'm not going to go there, because you don't really care about what's important. All some people on the other side care about—and I hope you're not all like that—is pleasing the people in Mike Harris's office. I'm saying to you across there, put that aside for once.

Unanimously across the moraine, in Preston Lake, in Ballantrae, in Goodwood, in Uxbridge, in Richmond Hill, in Oak Ridges, people care passionately about their community, their water, their trees, where they live and where their children are going to live. They're scared out of their wits at what's happening and they're asking you as government and us as members to do our job and protect them. There is nothing in place to protect them right now. There is nothing except this Ontario Municipal Board, which is accountable to no one and gives the public no say. The public has lost their say because they can even leapfrog over municipal councils.

Let's put partisan politics aside and protect the most precious piece of real estate we have in southern Ontario. It's our drinking water; it's our future. Don't be intimidated by the party's central headquarters. Vote your conscience for a change.

The Deputy Speaker: The time for private members' business has expired.

REPLICA FIREARMS REGULATION AND PROTECTION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION ET LA PROTECTION À L'ÉGARD DES RÉPLIQUES D'ARMES À FEU

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Bryant has moved second reading of Bill 67. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be referred to the committee of the whole?

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): I move that the bill be sent to the justice and social policy committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Is a majority of the House in favour of this being referred to the justice and social policy committee? It is agreed.

OAK RIDGES MORAINÉ PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION ACT, 1999

LOI DE 1999 SUR LA PROTECTION ET LA PRÉSERVATION DE LA MORAINÉ D'OAK RIDGES

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): We will now deal with ballot item number 34.

Mr Colle has moved second reading of Bill 12. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. There will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1159 to 1204.

The Deputy Speaker: While those tardy members are taking their seats, I'd like to address the gallery, if I could, just for a moment. We have two sets of rules in here, one for the members and one for you guests. You guests are not allowed to demonstrate or to clap and things like that. I just wanted to warn you of that because I didn't want there to be any confusion. There is a great deal of latitude allowed us as members.

Mr Colle has moved second reading of Bill 12. All those in favour will please rise.

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Bradley, James J.	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Christopherson, David	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Churley, Marilyn	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ruprecht, Tony
Cleary, John C.	Lankin, Frances	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Levac, David	Smitherman, George
Cordiano, Joseph	Marchese, Rosario	
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please rise.

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Hodgson, Chris	Runciman, Robert W.
Baird, John R.	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Barrett, Toby	Jackson, Cameron	Snobelen, John
Chudleigh, Ted	Johns, Helen	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Klees, Frank	Sterling, Norman W.
Clement, Tony	Marland, Margaret	Stewart, R. Gary
Cunningham, Dianne	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Tilson, David
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Wilson, Jim
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan	Wood, Bob
Guzzo, Garry J.	O'Toole, John	Young, David
Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.	
Hastings, John	Palladini, Al	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 40; the nays are 46.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

All matters of private members' business having been completed, I do now leave the chair. The House resumes at 1:30.

The House recessed from 1208 to 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

PAUL STEINHAUER

Mr Monte Kwinter (York Centre): Canada has lost one of its most cherished champions of children's rights.

Dr Paul Steinhauer, eminent child psychiatrist, died of complications following surgery, at the age of 66.

A child psychiatrist for 38 years, Dr Steinhauer worked as hard for children through community work as he did through his own medical practice. His passion for the well-being of children, particularly those facing disadvantages such as poverty, led the Toronto native to launch a number of lobby groups from Voices for Children to the Sparrow Lake Alliance, a network of agencies that share a concern for child welfare.

Dr Steinhauer was a familiar figure in political circles, often submitting unsolicited new research on children's issues to policy-makers in hopes of influencing legislation or winning more money for social services.

He was a professor in the psychiatry and public health sciences department of the University of Toronto's faculty of medicine and was also a staff psychiatrist at the Hospital for Sick Children and a consultant to several children's aid organizations.

He and Dr Fraser Mustard worked closely for a number of years and were effective in convincing governments and society at large that we have to look after children early in life and promote their best interests.

Among his major accomplishments were helping to develop the family assessment measure and the parenting capacity assessment measure, guidelines which are widely used by child welfare professionals.

The passing of Dr Paul Steinhauer is a great loss for Canada and in particular for its children. His advocacy was recognized in several countries around the world, and it's not an exaggeration to say that he was a world leader in his field. He will be missed.

NORTHUMBERLAND HEALTH CARE CENTRE

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I rise in the House today, the last day in this session, to bring to your attention a marvellous example of our government's commitment to meet the changing health needs of the people of Ontario.

Earlier this week, the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care attended a ground-breaking ceremony for the new Northumberland Health Care Centre. This brand new hospital is scheduled to open in just a thousand days, and will provide a state-of-the-art facility for the people who reside in west Northumberland. To make this wonderful initiative a reality, the minister announced that the government is providing 70% of the funding, a total of \$38.4 million, for the construction of this new hospital.

I know that the parties across the floor will be disappointed at this news. They have been to my riding several times to interfere in the plans for this new facility. But unlike the opposition parties, this government has a positive plan to meet the changing health needs of the people of Ontario.

When this hospital opens, there will be more than 130 beds; acute, ambulatory and complex continuing care;

rehabilitation; mental health services; and a new emergency department.

With the support and commitment of this government, the people of Northumberland can look forward to the most modern, the most efficient and the most caring hospital facility of any across the province.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex): I rise today to bring to the attention of the House a marvellous bit of inaction on the part of this government. Across the province, motorists are playing a game of chance. They are driving around with almost empty tanks, hoping that gas prices will go down and praying they won't rise again before they are forced to spend their life savings to fill their tanks. This is often referred to as "running on fumes."

But they're not the only ones running on fumes. Despite the obvious problems created by gas-gouging, the only thing we get from this government is fumes. Vapour spews forth, but no action is forthcoming. The empty photo ops and impotent reports by the so-called gas-busters have done nothing to slow the pre-weekend price hikes. Experts have told us that gas prices could well be over \$1 per litre before the summer is done, and the gluttonous gas companies have done nothing to prove them wrong.

Mike Harris has tried to tell us there is nothing he can do about this situation. Well, he's wrong. Bill Davis acted, so why doesn't Mike Harris?

The reason is simple: Mike Harris is afraid to upset his business buddies. He is more concerned about the millions of dollars raised by his Tory party fundraisers than the family who has to pay the 10-cent-per-litre increase to fill the minivan the day before a long weekend.

The Premier will tell us that he understands the people who are driving around running on fumes, but he doesn't. His government is running on fumes. The gauge reads empty of action, empty of ideas and empty of leadership.

LISA BALTICH

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): For weeks now, young Lisa Baltich has lain in her hospital bed in San Francisco, California. Lisa's plight, a dramatic accident that resulted in burns to most of her body, is well known to Wellanders, and I want to make sure that the rest of the people of this province understand what has happened to this kind, beautiful young woman.

Firmly rooted in Welland, her parents have been at her bedside. Medical costs are expected to exceed \$1 million. Her parents, hard-working, good, decent people, good citizens of our community, have expended all of their modest resources and savings and are now relying upon the goodwill of their family, friends and neighbours in the community of Welland.

The Bank of Montreal has set up a trust fund and people in the community have been incredibly generous. Friends of the Baltich family are conducting a fund-

raising event this weekend. I'm going to be there. I want to make sure that as many people as possible in the Welland and Niagara area are there as well, and I invite anybody who is in the Welland area to join us on Saturday night at the Rose Villa. The business community has been very generous. We're trying to raise as much money as we can to sustain the Baltiches as they stay by their daughter's bedside and to assist them in this incredible crisis, and to pray for Lisa as she struggles for recovery.

DURHAM COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I am pleased to rise today in the house to tell my colleagues about the great community spirit that's being demonstrated in my riding of Durham this summer. From June 22 to 24, the annual Fabulous Fifties returns to downtown Bowmanville; also the popular sidewalk sale and activities for children, a car show, the Little Richard pancake breakfast, a beach volleyball tournament, and the return of Elvis.

Other events in Durham include the seventh annual North Shore Fishing Derby at the Port of Newcastle Marina in Newcastle, the strawberry festival at Ted Watson Farms, the Canada Day party at the Bowmanville Museum and the annual Summer Bash at the neighbourhoods of Park Ridge in Oshawa. Community coordinator April Cullen and her organizing team have done a wonderful job. The whole family will enjoy it. I want to commend Mrs Cullen and the organizing committee for the spirit they bring to their community.

Later in August, we look forward to the annual Festival Days in Port Perry and the Blackstock Fair.

I would also like to take the opportunity to invite everyone to my riding this summer. They might also take time to enjoy the Highland Games of Durham.

They also might enjoy visiting Port Perry, Blackstock, Orono, Bowmanville and Newcastle.

In the visitors' gallery today, I am very fortunate to have guests from Blackstock, Bev Truax and her son Mitchell. Welcome to the Legislature.

GAY PRIDE

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): I rise today to make an important announcement. I'm busting out with pride—with gay pride. In 1981, a modest group of gays and lesbians had an inaugural Toronto gay pride event that attracted hundreds of people. This Sunday, hundreds of thousands of people, gay and straight alike, will celebrate our diversity.

"Heroic Past, Proud Future" is the theme of this year's event. The theme speaks volumes about the strength the community has developed and, importantly, it speaks to the enormous optimism and capacity the dynamic gay and lesbian community has to contribute to cultural, social and economic vitality in Ontario.

Pride isn't just breaking out in Toronto. I have already attended pride events in Halton, Hamilton, Windsor and Kingston, and before the summer is out I intend to

participate in gay pride activities in Kitchener-Waterloo, London, Sarnia and Ottawa. And next year I'm planning to celebrate pride in Sudbury with that community's vibrant gay and lesbian community.

This has been a year marked by extraordinary legislative progress here in the Ontario Legislature and in Ottawa. Members should be proud of the role they have played in moving the gay and lesbian community towards equality.

I invite all members to march with me and other politicians from all walks of political life and all levels of government in the Gay Pride parade. We'll be meeting at 2:30 at the corner of Church and Bloor on Sunday, and I invite all members to attend.

1340

ANTI-POVERTY DEMONSTRATION

Mr David Young (Willowdale): One short week ago today, this Legislature was attacked by professional thugs masquerading as anti-poverty activists. They came here claiming they wanted to talk—talk about serious issues, talk about poverty, talk about homelessness.

They brought with them hockey sticks, hammers, two-by-fours, Molotov cocktails, rocks, and water pistols filled with urine and bleach. People who just want to talk don't bring Molotov cocktails. And we saw that talking about poverty was the last thing on the minds of those who came to Queen's Park. For the vast majority of them, their intention was very different.

Twenty-nine police officers were injured during the ensuing battle. That is bad enough. But then some members of this House decided to add insult to injury. First, some opposition members decided to blame the police for the riot rather than lay blame where it belongs: with John Clarke's goons.

To make it even worse, it has been reported that the leader of the third party allowed fundraising in support of the OCAP thugs to go on at his convention last weekend. Our police deserve better.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The member take his seat. Point of order? Leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: Is the member opposite raising an allegation concerning me as a member of the Legislature?

The Speaker: He was.

The member, continue.

Mr Young: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

I'd like to take a moment to thank the officers of the Toronto police force and the Legislative—

The Speaker: Point of order?

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Speaker, with respect, I have some great concern. I say to you this is a point of order.

I listened to Mr Gill on the Coren show last night. There appears to be an orchestrated effort—I heard Mr Gill last night; I hear this member today—to suggest that

the New Democratic Party finances OCAP. I say to you that is a point of order, because if it had happened only once by one Conservative member, it would be an accident or a misinterpretation. When it has happened twice, I sense some effort here to create some sort of smear that I find entirely inappropriate.

The Speaker: It's not a point of order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. The member take his seat, please. I appreciate that we're getting down to the end of a session and it would be helpful—the member's time is up. We can move on to another one. I'm not going to entertain any points of order on this issue.

Mr Young: Mr Speaker, on a different point of order: Given the interruptions during my statement, I would request a further 20 seconds to complete my statement.

The Speaker: I'll ask for unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent? No. I'm sorry, we didn't get it.

I think this is probably the first point of order we've had through members' statements. I hope it won't happen—he was almost down to the end.

I regret that the member didn't get a chance to finish that point of order.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Wait till I'm finished, please, if you'll be so kind.

In circumstances like this, we usually don't have that, and I will say it's the same with question period. I will have to be very quick to get up on points of order. Most members are very good with members' statements; we don't get into points of order, just like in question period.

Having said that, there isn't anything stopping any members. But what does happen is that if it starts with one side, it starts from both sides. Members' statements historically have been an opportunity for non-partisan discussions of issues, and we would like to be able to maintain that and not get into points of order.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Order when I'm doing a ruling. I appreciate it. Member for Brampton Centre, come to order.

It's different from heckling when you're doing it with another member. I'm trying to explain to the House what is happening. In situations like this, when you have about 20 seconds, it makes it very difficult. I apologize to the member, but there is not time up on that.

I'll say this: One more point of order, and I'll be very quick, because if you're not going to get it out of your mouth, if in fact it relates to the same point of order—I will give you the opportunity because all members are honourable, and I'll take the point of order very quickly. I will be up very quickly if it relates to the same point of order.

The member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale.

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): Mr Speaker, I want to say for the record that I said no such thing, and I'll be very happy to prove that.

The Speaker: Order. Take your seat.

Members' statements.

RAVES

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): Several weeks ago the jury for the inquest of Allan Ho reported several recommendations—19—none of which the provincial government has acted on yet. One of those was that they pass the rave bill into law. That was my private member's bill, debated in this House early in May. It received second reading and it was sent to committee. I'm very disappointed to report that the committee will not be holding hearings on this bill this summer. We expected this to be law before the House rose at the end of the day today.

What is most disconcerting is that we are now in a season where we will have more and more raves without regulation, illegal raves, throughout Ontario. These raves have led to deaths in the past, deaths of young people right here in Ontario. This government has the opportunity to do something about that and they have elected to do nothing. I'm very disappointed in the Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Ministry of Health, all of these organizations that have the wherewithal to have brought in regulations to bring in safe raves in Ontario. Municipalities asked you for this as early as the middle of March. They came forward with recommendations as to the tools they needed to make raves a safe place for young people. I'm very disappointed in this government. One death this coming summer will be at the feet of this government.

TAXATION

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): Every year around this time, we hear about tax freedom day, the day when people stop working for the government and start working for themselves—a day, I might add, which occurs substantially earlier since this government came to office.

However, I would like to talk about tax freedom day in one particular municipality. Many of the members in this House will remember the petitions that were presented here, circulated by the citizens of Flamborough, complaining about the Ted tax. Residents of that municipality, led by Ted the taxman, were upset because he chose not to lower taxes by passing on the savings that occurred due to this government's policies. That's not just my opinion. The region of Hamilton-Wentworth confirmed it at the time and the local newspaper, the Flamborough Review, ran a headline saying "Council Spends Almost \$1.4 Million in Buying Spree." This is the real story about what is happening in Wentworth-Burlington and particularly in Flamborough. When faced with the real option of giving honest, hard-working taxpayers a 5% break on their taxes, Ted chose not to.

Who is responsible? None other than Ted McMeekin, Dalton McGuinty's Liberal candidate in the upcoming byelection. It is another example of tax-and-spend Liberals who just don't get it when dealing with taxpayers' money.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I'd like to recognize in the east members' gallery the parents of page Melissa Martin, Mr and Mrs Neil Martin, and their young daughter. I'm very happy for them to be here and would like to thank all the pages for all members.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I was going to thank all the pages a little bit later, just before question period, but since we have done that, I will do that now. Maybe all the members could join. As you know, this will be the last day for our wonderful group of pages. I know all their parents are proud.

Might I add, to the parents who are here and those who are watching, they and all their families can be very proud of the group we have here. They were an excellent group of pages. On behalf of all members, we wish them all the best in their endeavours. Thanks to each and every one of them.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I just got some rather disturbing news. I just heard that the Russian MOX may be flown by helicopter to Chalk River today, and I'm asking for unanimous consent to have an emergency debate about this and the government's role in it.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I heard a no, unfortunately. The member may want to bring this up at question period, but I do thank her for that.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr Gerretsen from the standing committee on public accounts presented the committee's report on provincial personal income tax revenue and related credits and reductions and moved the adoption of its recommendations.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): I would like to first of all thank all the committee members. This was another unanimous report issued by the committee. I thank all the people who were involved in producing the report, including our Provincial Auditor, Erik Peters, and his staff; our legislative researcher, Ray McLellan; and our clerks, Donna Bryce and Doug Arnott.

There are three recommendations in the report, and they are as a result of public hearings that were held earlier this year. It basically requests that the payment flows with respect to our income tax revenue from the federal government be made on a more timely basis, based on actual cash flows, than is currently the case.

The Speaker: Mr Gerretsen moves adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to ask the House for unanimous consent to pass the Raves Act, 2000, through third reading.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

1350

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FIREFIGHTERS' MEMORIAL DAY ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LE JOUR DE COMMÉMORATION DES POMPIERS

Mr Levac moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 107, An Act to proclaim Firefighters' Memorial Day / Projet de loi 107, Loi proclamant le Jour de commémoration des pompiers.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

The member for a short statement.

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): This bill proclaims the first Sunday of October in each year as Firefighters' Memorial Day. Firefighting is known as one of the most dangerous professions. Firefighters work daily on behalf of the people of the province of Ontario taking extraordinary risks. I would also say that this day will provide an opportunity for all Ontarians to honour and recognize the important contributions these people make and have made in preserving our safety and well-being.

That explanation was longer than the bill. I thought I'd bring that to the attention of the members.

ADOPTION DISCLOSURE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE LA DIVULGATION DE RENSEIGNEMENTS SUR LES ADOPTIONS

Ms Churley moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 108, An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act and the Child and Family Services Act in respect of Adoption Disclosure / Projet de loi 108, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil et la Loi sur les services à l'enfance et à la famille en ce qui concerne la divulgation de renseignements sur les adoptions.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

The member for a short statement.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): First of all, I'd like to say that in the gallery are many people from the Coalition for Open Adoption Records. I'm pleased that they are here today. They've worked very hard on this issue for many years.

The Adoption Disclosure Statute Law Amendment Act, 2000, would provide access to birth registration and adoption records for adult adoptees, provide access to birth registration and adoption records for birth parents, implement a no-contact notice, and amend the Child and Family Services Act to provide, on request, counselling for adopted persons, birth parents and others who may be affected by disclosure of adoption information.

I urge all members to support this bill.

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): On a point of order, Speaker: Given the bill I introduced regarding Firefighters' Memorial Day, I would seek unanimous consent of the House to proceed to second and third readings for this very important bill.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I heard some noes.

NURSING HOMES MANDATORY ANNUAL INSPECTION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR L'INSPECTION ANNUELLE OBLIGATOIRE DES MAISONS DE SOINS INFIRMIERS

Ms Lankin moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 109, An Act to amend the Nursing Homes Act to require annual inspections / Projet de loi 109, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les maisons de soins infirmiers pour qu'elle exige des inspections annuelles.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members; this will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1356 to 1401.

The Speaker: Would the members kindly take their seats.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Levac, David
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	Marchese, Rosario
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	Martel, Shelley
Boyer, Claudette	Gerretsen, John	Martin, Tony
Bradley, James J.	Gravelle, Michael	McGuinty, Dalton
Bryant, Michael	Hampton, Howard	McLeod, Lyn
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Christopherson, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Cleary, John C.	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sergio, Mario
Crozier, Bruce	Lankin, Frances	Smitherman, George

The Speaker: All those opposed will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 36; the nays are zero.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
The member for a short statement.

Ms Lankin: This bill is pretty simple. It reads, "The minister shall ensure that every nursing home is inspected by an inspector at least once every calendar year to determine whether there is compliance with this act and the regulations and with the applicable licence and service agreements."

We have been waiting now for over two months for a report from the minister to even tell us how many nursing homes weren't inspected. We were promised that within three weeks of when I raised this issue in the House. It is, at this point in time, apparent to me that we need this clarity in the legislation.

Given the simplicity of it, I would ask at this point in time for unanimous consent; there's no opposition. Let's get second and third reading done right now.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Since the government House leader is in such a magnanimous mood this afternoon, I would like to ask for unanimous consent for second and third readings of Bill 16, An Act respecting the price of gasoline.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LES FORESTIERS PROFESSIONNELS

Mr Gilchrist moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 110, An Act respecting the regulation of the practice of Professional Forestry / Projet de loi 110, Loi concernant la réglementation de l'exercice de la profession de forestier.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): This bill is the product of another standing order 124 initiative within the standing committee on general government. In fact, it was first brought forward in the last Parliament by Mr Ramsey, one of the Liberal members, and this time sponsored first by Mr Chudleigh, one of the members of the committee. The bill found unanimous support among the environmentalists and the representatives of the forestry industry who spoke before us. The committee has asked me to ask the three House leaders to consider giving very prompt second and third reading to this very popular and long-overdue bill.

BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA TRUST COMPANY ACT, 2000

Mr Mazzilli moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company and National Trust Company.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Pursuant to standing order 86(a), this bill stands referred to the Commissioners of Estate Bills.

ONTARIO POLICE WEEK ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA SEMAINE DE LA POLICE DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Dunlop moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 111, An Act to proclaim a week of recognition for Ontario's Police Officers / Projet de loi 111, Loi proclamant une semaine de reconnaissance envers les agents de police de l'Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

The member for a short statement.

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): Every resident of or visitor to Ontario has a right to personal safety. Police officers who work throughout this province take extraordinary risks in the line of duty in order to safeguard this right. The people of Ontario owe a debt of gratitude and respect to all officers for the work they do to ensure our safety.

On May 7, 2000, the first Sunday in May, the Ontario government unveiled the police memorial in tribute to the brave police officers who gave their lives in the service of the people of Ontario. The memorial keeps alive the names and memories of these fallen officers for future generations. It also serves as a symbol of the high esteem in which the people of Ontario hold police officers and their families.

Given the important contribution of police officers to the well-being of people in Ontario and the strong commitment the people of Ontario have shown to police services, it is appropriate to establish a week to honour the province's police officers and to pay tribute to them for ensuring safer communities, today and in the future.

The week shall commence on the first Sunday in May of every year in commemoration of the unveiling of the memorial and to honour those officers who have fallen in the line of duty.

McMICHAEL CANADIAN ART
COLLECTION AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LA COLLECTION McMICHAEL
D'ART CANADIEN

Mrs Johns moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 112, An Act to amend the McMichael Canadian Art Collection Act / Projet de loi 112, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Collection McMichael d'art canadien.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Hon Helen Johns (Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, minister responsible for seniors and women): This act is intended to return the McMichael Canadian Art Collection to its original mandate of displaying art by the Group of Seven and other artists who have contributed to the development of Canadian art. If passed, this act would honour a 35-year-old commitment to protect and secure the collection's distinct identity.

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): Mr Speaker, given the unanimous support on second reading for Bill 67 today, the phony gun bill, given that I know the government doesn't want this bill to die a slow death on the books and given that this government knows that the phony gun issue is a serious problem, I now seek unanimous consent that the bill proceed immediately to third reading.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I heard some noes.

1410

ONTARIO HERITAGE
AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LE PATRIMOINE DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Gilchrist moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 113, An Act to amend the Ontario Heritage Act / Projet de loi 113, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): I'm sure this bill will find favour on both sides of the House because it amends the Ontario Heritage Act so that once a municipality in which a property is situated designates a property under the act, the owner of the property cannot demolish or remove a building or structure on the property unless the designating bylaw is repealed or the owner has obtained the written consent of the municipality before the bill is enacted. The bill removes the possibility for the owner of a heritage building to demolish or remove a building or structure on any property upon obtaining the written consent of the municipality.

VISITORS

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I would like all members to join with me in welcoming a distinguished guest in the west members' gallery from Ripley, Tennessee, Mr Tim Sneed, who is the head of an organization called Justice II, which works against the death penalty in the United States.

Hon Margaret Marland (Minister without Portfolio [Children]): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: My point of order is also to welcome visitors in the west gallery, Mr John Salter, Ms Linda Chapman and their cousin from Mississauga. They are visiting from England.

MOTIONS

STATUS OF BILL 101

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Government House Leader): I move that pursuant to standing order 72(a), Bill 101 be discharged from second reading and the bill be referred to the standing committee on general government.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is it the pleasure of the House—

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I was trying to follow the bill number. Did you just send it to committee or are you going to make a further motion on that in terms of the direction?

Hon Mr Sterling: First, I was going to discharge it, and refer it to the general government committee after first reading for hearings. This is the legislation dealing with snowmobiles and snowmobile trails.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to move a motion relating to standing committees and their authorization during the summer recess.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

Hon Mr Sterling: I move that the following standing committees be authorized to meet during the summer recess:

Justice and social policy for up to two weeks, for consideration of Bill 88, An Act to promote the use of information technology in commercial and other transactions by resolving legal uncertainties and removing statutory barriers that affect electronic communication;

Public accounts for up to two days, for the purposes of drafting its report on the Provincial Auditor's report, and

that the public accounts committee be authorized to release its report during the summer recess by depositing a copy of any report with the Clerk of the Assembly, and on the first sessional day of the fall sitting of the 37th Parliament, the Chair of the committee shall bring any such reports before the House in accordance with the standing orders;

The general government committee be authorized to meet for one week during the summer recess to consider Bill 101.

The Speaker: Mr Sterling moves that the following standing committees be authorized to meet during—dispense?

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My concern is that as a result of this last-minute change with Bill 101, the time the committee was going to spend on the Oak Ridges moraine may be blocked now. I'd like some assurance that's not going to happen. Could I seek that from the government House leader?

The Speaker: Government House leader, on the same point of order?

Hon Mr Sterling: There was no authorization for the general government committee to sit during the summer and therefore they couldn't consider any other business.

The Speaker: I thank the member for the clarification.

Mr Christopherson: If I may, then I would seek unanimous consent that we allow the committee to meet so that they can indeed hear that bill. Since we've already given them the ability to hear one important piece of business, let's let them do all the work that needs to be done. I seek unanimous consent.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

VISITORS

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): We have with us today, in the Speaker's gallery, Speaker Charles Perricone of Michigan. Please join me in welcoming our special guest.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The leader of the third party on a point of order.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): I have a point of order which I believe goes to the heart of what we're all about. My point of order lies under section 23(h), (i) and (j) of the rules:

“(h) Makes allegations against another member.

“(i) Imputes false or unavowed motives

“(j) Charges another member with uttering a deliberate falsehood.”

Yesterday I posed a series of questions to the Premier about a draft cabinet document proposing that the gov-

ernment start taking action to protect Ontario's environment. In response to my questions, the Premier said, referring to the document, and I quote, “Obviously someone made it up.” He went on to say, and I'm quoting again, “Somebody somewhere ... gave you a phony-baloney document.” Again, let me draw attention to his exact words, “As I've already indicated to you, you've got a phony-baloney cabinet document that somebody has given you for whatever purpose.” The Premier's final assertion was, and I quote again, “The document you have is as phony as a \$3 bill.”

According to the Premier's statement yesterday, the assembly should actually be asking to investigate this cabinet document to ensure it is not a false document. After the Premier made these comments and assertions, in estimates committee the Minister of the Environment was confronted with this document. The environment minister refused to let his deputy minister answer a question as to whether or not he had approved this document. When confronted with the document himself, the Minister of the Environment said it was a draft document that he hadn't seen personally. He refused to repeat the accusations of the Premier.

The seriousness of this goes to the order in this Legislature, but it also goes to something else—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Take your seat for a moment, please. Order. It's different when we're being partisan. I need to hear what the member's speaking about. I'd appreciate if the members wouldn't shout during points of order. I say to the leader of the third party that I was here and I heard what transpired, so if he could come very quickly to his point of order.

Mr Hampton: This goes further to the Legislative Assembly Act, which says in section 46(1) that someone can be investigated for “presenting to the assembly or to a committee thereof a forged or false document with intent to deceive the assembly or committee.” In other words, this is a very serious matter.

Speaker, I assert that this is, as the Minister of the Environment said, a perfectly legitimate document. It is not a forgery; it is not a fraud; it is not phony-baloney. In fact, I believe it's the real McCoy. I believe we're seeing another example where the Premier, when confronted with a difficult situation, lashes out and makes an accusation. Speaker, I'm asking—

The Speaker: If the member could come very quickly to the point, please.

Mr Hampton: I have been accused of bringing a phony, fraudulent, forged document into the Legislature and I want to know, Speaker, what is my remedy? I want to have this document investigated.

The Speaker: I thank the member. I listened very carefully yesterday. The member didn't accuse you. He referred to the documents. At the time there was no allegation against you, no accusation towards the member. He talked about a document. I will say to the member I listened very carefully yesterday and there was no allegation made towards the leader of the third party.

1420

ORAL QUESTIONS

MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My first question today is for the Minister of the Environment. It's once again about the issue of public safety and the matter of Walkerton, a tragedy in which as many as 18 people lost their lives.

We know that you and your government ignored warning after warning, but now we discover that you also ignored a very sound action plan put forward by your own ministry. I'm sure you had time to review this document. It talks about a commitment to a cleaner Ontario. Listen to this; this is solid stuff. It talks about creating the toughest environmental penalty structure in Canada. It talks about the strongest environmental enforcement in Canada through a SWAT team and it talks about a toll-free pollution hotline. It's a plan that quite possibly could have and might have saved us from the Walkerton tragedy.

Minister, what I want to know from you today is, who killed this plan? Who killed the plan that might possibly have saved lives?

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of the Environment): I had never seen this draft document until yesterday. It's clearly a draft document. On the front page it has "draft" written right on it. This is precisely why I would not have seen it. I can tell you the document has not been before cabinet.

I know some of the reports today refer to a SWAT team in the draft document, but in 1999 we made a commitment in our Blueprint document, this document right here, to create an environmental SWAT team that will carry out strict audits of industries to ensure that they're obeying the law. It's our commitment to the creation of an environmental SWAT team that was clearly laid out in this plan and several other commitments there.

It doesn't surprise me that my staff are diligently working to provide options and to ensure that our commitments are kept. We made this pledge and we intend to keep it.

Mr McGuinty: It's obvious that this is a very substantive document. A tremendous amount of ministry staff work would have gone into this document. Are you expecting us to believe that this kind of work was going on inside your ministry and you knew nothing about it? A plan that was so ambitious, so far-reaching that it talked about creating the toughest environmental penalty structure in Canada, it talked about creating the strongest environmental enforcement team in Canada and you knew nothing whatsoever about this plan and about this work? Is that what you're telling us?

Hon Mr Newman: Clearly the government is committed to fostering a healthy environment here in the province, and that's why we also promised in the Blueprint document to have the toughest penalties. I don't know if the Leader of the Opposition has seen the document or not, but we clearly made that promise in that campaign document.

We passed the Environmental Statute Law Amendment Act, which provides new and improved powers to crack down on corporate polluters, including higher fines and the forfeiture of seized property for non-payment of fines. The act also closed loopholes left in the legislation that had been brought forward by previous governments.

I intend to continue my efforts to keep Ontario clean and to improve upon the health of our land, water and air resources.

Mr McGuinty: There was a time when we might have cut you some slack because you were new to the job and these mistakes would really be attributed to some of your predecessors—Norm Sterling, Tony Clement—or maybe it was Mike Harris or maybe it was Tom Long and his influence in the Common Sense disaster. But you're in charge now. This was prepared on your watch. This document provides for your signature, Minister, before Cabinet. This is all about you. Now you are telling us that you weren't aware in any way, shape or form of some very substantive work that was being done on your watch by your ministry officials, a very far-reaching and ambitious plan? Why do you get the extra money? Why do you have the car? Why do you have the driver? Why have you got the job? Why have you got the title if you can't even keep track of what's going on inside your own ministry? I ask you, then, if you don't know this is going on, then why don't you just resign?

Hon Mr Newman: Everything the Leader of the Opposition mentioned was in our Blueprint document. We clearly spelled out an ambitious plan for the people of Ontario. Of all the documents, this program was soundly endorsed by the people of Ontario.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Minister, take a seat. Order.

I mistakenly thought that this, being the last day, might be an orderly day. I will say to all members, it shows what I know. We are coming to a conclusion, and I would ask all members to please come to order. The situation is very clear: If you're yelling against each other, nobody watching can even hear it, and we would just run the question period down. I'd say to the members of the opposition, that's to the government's benefit. There's no question they'll be able to get out today without any questions, so I leave it up to the opposition members whether they want to have question period or not.

Sorry for the interruption. The Minister of the Environment.

Hon Mr Newman: I was just mentioning that the Blueprint document was soundly endorsed by the people of Ontario. It has several ambitious targets in it for the economy. It was soundly endorsed, as was our Common

Sense Revolution. Unlike his 20/20 hindsight plan, our plan was ambitious—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I will let all members know we're now at the point where I'm going to start warning people, so beware. I'm going to start warning people. If we need to spend the entire last day moving people out of here, then we'll do that. We will not continue as long as we're shouting across. I can't hear, ministers can't hear and, quite frankly, the people at home can't hear either. It's just a massive dull roar.

I will say to all members now we've had our fun at the beginning, now I'm going to be quick to give people warnings and, of course following that, naming them.

Sorry for the interruption. The Minister of the Environment.

Hon Mr Newman: I was just indicating that the people of Ontario soundly endorsed our Blueprint plan, as they did the Common Sense Revolution in 1995. They rejected the Liberal plan, the red book of 1995, soundly rejected the Leader of the Opposition's 20/20 hindsight plan for Ontario.

Everything he mentioned was clearly in our Blueprint document that was endorsed by the people of Ontario. Does it surprise me that staff are diligently working to ensure that all of our commitments are kept? No, it doesn't. We intend to honour that pledge and we intend to keep it.

1430

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My second question is for the Attorney General. It's another question regarding another urgent issue of public safety.

It's very clear that the justice system failed Gillian Hadley, just as it has failed over the past several years so many women killed by men who had been ordered by the courts to stay away. This morning I spoke with a victim of assault, a woman in Sarnia. She told me she had been the victim of assaults that have been going on for 13 years. She worked up the courage just recently to speak to the police, and her estranged husband has now been facing a couple of charges of assault, sexual assault and charges of uttering death threats. Victims' services in her community has told her they believe that her estranged husband will be successful in obtaining bail and getting out of jail as early as tomorrow.

Minister, what assurances can you provide this woman so that if her husband is released from jail tomorrow, she will be safe?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I believe the Leader of the Opposition knows, as a lawyer, that I can't interfere in any individual case. He's referring, I gather, to an individual case.

What I can say to him is that the crown policy manual directs that in cases where there has been serious vio-

lence in domestic situations, the crown is to oppose the granting of bail. That is precisely what the crown does. That is the situation. In fact, crown attorneys are directed to seek a jail sentence in domestic violence cases where there is significant bodily harm, and longer sentences may be sought when the assaults are repetitious, persistent or escalating.

If there is anyone in Ontario in a situation like the situation which I understand the Leader of the Opposition to describe, they should immediately get in touch with the police and with the victim assistance program in the Ministry of the Attorney General in the local courthouse.

Mr McGuinty: Minister, I think you would agree that we are not doing enough in Ontario today to protect our mothers and sisters and daughters who are the subjects of abuse.

I have an idea, and I hope you will accept it in the spirit with which it is being tendered. I think we can do more to monitor the movements of dangerous men if they are released on bail. I think we could pass a law in Ontario in relatively short order, in cases such as this where a crown attorney opposes bail, to make any release absolutely conditional on the wearing of an electronic monitoring bracelet. I think that's a good idea. It's hardly the be-all and the end-all, but I think it's a step in the right direction. Will you do that? Could we not do that together quickly for this woman and many others who find themselves in these kinds of circumstances?

Hon Mr Flaherty: We have had remarkable success with the expansion of domestic violence courts in the province of Ontario. The reason for that is that it makes a difference in the behaviour of those persons who come before that court as accused persons. It changes behaviour; it puts them in touch with the anger management programs that can help actually change behaviour, which is fundamental. We are tripling the number of domestic violence courts in Ontario. That money was provided by the Ministry of Finance in the most recent budget. That's real progress. That makes a difference. We know it makes a difference.

Dangerous men, to whom the Leader of the Opposition has referred, ought not to get out on bail in the first place. That's the position of the crown. They should not get out on bail in the first place. Domestic violence is a serious crime to be denounced, and those who commit domestic violence should not get out on bail. That's the first point.

With respect to electronic bracelets or similar devices, the Minister of Correctional Services and I are already working on that. I thank you for joining us in that work.

Mr McGuinty: The problem, Minister, and you will recognize this, is that you cannot provide any kind of guarantee that these men will not be released on bail. That's the problem. Some will continue to be released on bail.

When a crown attorney has opposed someone's release on bail in these kinds of circumstances, where they make the assessment that this man presents a real danger to the spouse, I think what we should be doing is attach-

ing a condition to the release. I'd like us to explore the possibility here in Ontario of making sure that no release could be obtained by that kind of offender unless they wear this electronic monitoring bracelet.

I'm not sure whether that should be the subject of a regulation or the subject of a law. What I'm doing today, Minister—and again I ask you to receive this idea in the spirit with which it is being tendered. We are willing to co-operate in any way possible. If it's a matter of drafting a regulation, if it's a matter of the House reconvening if only for a brief period of time to make sure that we can get this done, I think it's something that we should do together. I'm offering to you my co-operation.

Hon Mr Flaherty: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for offering to participate in something that's already underway. Your participation is welcome. We're certainly looking at all means and we're interested in all reasonable ideas that will address this issue of not endangering people in our society who have been victims of domestic violence. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to take into consideration the reality that we need also to encourage proper consideration and reporting to the people of Ontario of our courts and the activities in our courts.

With respect to the accountability for decisions that are made in cases of serious violent crime, not only domestic violence, which is serious and violent crime, but all serious and violent crime in the province of Ontario, we have the sentences of incarceration and we have persons kept in jail who ought to be kept in jail for the safety of people in this province.

WALKERTON TRAGEDY

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of the Environment. I have a new document today. You and your Premier might want to think twice before you call it phony-baloney or a fraud. The document is the claim form that you are forcing people in Walkerton to fill out. On this claim form you are insisting that personal, private information be surrendered by the citizens of Walkerton before you will even accept their request for compensation. You are insisting that they tell you their marital status, their personal incomes, their employment history, give you their records of employment and their social insurance numbers. All of this is completely irrelevant to whether or not they need compensation. What's more, it is completely in breach of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. But we know how much your government respects the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

These are people who have suffered a tragic circumstance. Why are you forcing a breach of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act—

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Member, take your seat. Stop the clock. A point of order.

Mr O'Toole: My point of order is the leader of the third party just accused this government of not respecting the—

The Speaker: The member take his seat.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Member take his seat. Last warning to him.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Member for Durham, come to order. This is his last warning. Sorry for the interruption. Start the clock. Leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: My question is a simple one. You're supposed to be helping the people of Walkerton, not putting them through a dozen Catch-22s and not forcing them, in effect, to breach the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. What are you going to do about another situation where your government is in breach of the law?

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of the Environment): Thank you, Speaker. I'll refer that question to the Attorney General.

Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I'm sure the leader of the third party wants the legitimate citizens of Walkerton to receive the compensation to which they are entitled as soon as possible. I'm not familiar with the form that he's waving. I'd be happy to look at it. It's not a Ministry of the Attorney General form or government of Ontario form as far as I know, but I'd be happy to look at it. It may well be the form that the town of Brockton is using in Walkerton. I can assure the member that I can review the form if he wants me to do so.

Right now, what's happening in Walkerton, thank goodness, is emergency funding is being provided first of all to those persons and their families who need emergency funding. Secondly, the Ministry of Economic Development has people there in the Brockton Response Centre in Walkerton assessing business losses right now. The assessor is there and working. Thirdly, other ministries are there including people from the Ministry of the Attorney General taking basic information from people for the individual compensation that's going to be available through alternate dispute resolution. All of those things are happening right now, as the water situation is also being addressed in Walkerton.

1440

Mr Hampton: Minister, that's not good enough. You are the government that ignored the reports of contamination of their water supply. You are the government that blamed the municipality and accused them of not accessing funds to upgrade their sewer and water system. Now you are the government that's going to put a whole long list of Catch-22s in their way when they simply try to apply for compensation. You are the government that once again is in breach of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

I am saying to you right now I will send you a copy of this. I want you to say that you are going to withdraw this document, that you are not going to force people to

disclose private information that is irrelevant to the issue of compensation and that you are no longer going to invade the privacy of people who have already been the tragic victims of your government's negligence. Will you withdraw this form, Minister?

Hon Mr Flaherty: Unlike the member opposite, I'm not going to sit as judge and jury in this case. There's an inquiry headed by Justice O'Connor and he has a broad mandate. The leader of the third party, who is a lawyer, probably has read the terms of reference. You know that the justice will proceed with a full, broad inquiry.

There's a full, comprehensive compensation package available to the victims and their families in Walkerton. Unlike the leader of the third party, I was in Walkerton last night. I met with the mayor of Walkerton last night. I met with the head of the Kinsmen. I met with the head of the chamber of commerce. I met with victims. I met with the person running the Brockton Response Centre and the people who are operating the Ontario response there on the ground. I can tell you that the people in Walkerton appreciate the steps that are being taken on behalf of all the people of Ontario to respond compassionately to the real needs they have in Walkerton today and not play politics with the issue.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): Back to the Minister of the Environment. I would say that the leader of the third party has been in Walkerton twice throughout this tragedy. I don't think we should be playing those kinds of games with this issue. There are concerns expressed by the citizens of Walkerton about having to reveal that information, and we're asking you on their behalf today.

Minister, I want to talk again about the cabinet submission we released yesterday and today I want some answers, now that you know it's not a phony-baloney forged document. The submission was designed so that you could go to cabinet to get decisions that were needed because your ministry is stretched so thin that if existing staff have to work on something new like inspecting 630 water plants, they have to abandon other areas of work. It says there are 111 industrial plants that are often releasing contaminants affecting our drinking water. Many of them are out of compliance for two years or more, and that has not even been addressed.

Minister, I want to ask you a question, and you wouldn't answer it yesterday. When did you know about this document? Now that you have seen the document, tell me why you allowed the finance minister to cut another \$16 million out of the last budget when it's about the same amount that is needed to bring in 138 new staff as recommended.

Hon Mr Newman: I had never seen this draft document until yesterday. It's clearly a draft document. It's marked "draft" right on it. That's precisely why I would not have seen it. This document has not been before cabinet.

There have been some reports today referring to a SWAT team, again in the draft document. But in 1999

we made a campaign commitment in our Blueprint document to create an environmental SWAT team that would carry out strict audits of industries to ensure that they were obeying the law. Our commitment is to the creation of an environmental SWAT team; that's clearly laid in the Blueprint document. It doesn't surprise me that our staff are working diligently to provide options and to ensure our commitments are kept. I would expect no less from them.

I say to the member of the third party, as she raises the point of 630 inspections: Each and every water facility in our province will indeed be inspected by the end of this year by qualified personnel—all 630. We're also going to ensure that the certificates of approval for each one of those sites is inspected.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-East York): My question is to the Attorney General. I want to return to the murder of Gillian Hadley and the ongoing murders of three women every month, 40 women every year.

I want to say with all sincerity to the leader of the official opposition: Women don't want new mechanisms that will allow judges and JPs to use as a diversion from locking these violent partners up. We want these violent partners locked up. We want their victims kept safe.

There are specific recommendations that have been made to you, Minister, as long ago as two years ago, from the May-Iles jury and also from the Joint Committee on Domestic Violence, recommendations like mandatory restrictions on the use of peace bonds; mandatory detention until bail hearings; mandatory show-cause so that Mr Hadley wouldn't have been released by an officer in charge in January; mandatory risk assessment where that is warranted and whenever a condition is violated—absolutely mandatory risk assessment—and mandatory detention while that risk assessment is being completed; and mandatory counselling before someone is released from jail, not as an alternative to jail time but upon release. All of those recommendations have been there. They have not been implemented.

There was a specific recommendation for training of JPs and justices in this area, and the coroner said "despite judicial independence." Your ministry has done this with respect to native justice issues and you could do it with respect to domestic violence issues. You haven't done that either.

Minister, three women die every month; 40 women die every year. Women's lives depend on your answer. Will you implement these outstanding recommendations immediately?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Ontario of course takes domestic violence very seriously. We lead Canada in the expansion of the initiatives in that regard, and in particular, as the honourable member I think knows and is aware of, in the tripling of the domestic violence courts, which is very important in terms of actually changing the

behaviour of people who are prone to that kind of domestic violence.

Having said that, the member knows that the Joint Committee on Domestic Violence reported last year, that we set up an interministerial task force to ensure restraining orders—I'm talking about restraining orders specifically now—are consistently and effectively enforced across Ontario. That task force was set up some time ago and has prepared proposals that are currently under consideration not only by my ministry, the Ministry of the Attorney General, but also by the Solicitor General because of course policing is involved. That's an important initiative that we have been working on.

With respect to the May-Iles inquiry, as the member may know, 90% of the recommendations of that inquiry have already been implemented or are being implemented. We take the work of the May-Iles inquiry very seriously. As I mentioned earlier, crown attorneys are directed to seek a jail sentence in domestic violence cases where there is significant bodily harm, and longer sentences may be sought when the assaults are repetitious, persistent or escalating.

I welcome all suggestions from all members with respect to how we can take further steps and additional steps to try to combat this serious violent—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. I'm afraid the Attorney General's time is up.

Ms Lankin: Minister, those recommendations I read out have been outstanding. The task force on enforcement of restraining orders has been labouring and has not come forward with action, or you haven't decided on the proposals and brought them forward.

I just came from a press conference where women representing victims and women's shelters were unanimous in their condemnation of your government. The May-Iles recommendations and the recommendations from the Joint Committee on Domestic Violence called for the establishment of a seamless system, of all parts working together, not just moving forward on your law and order agenda.

Let me tell you the things that aren't happening out there, why women can't flee abusive situations. Crisis line phones are overloaded. Shelters are stretched to capacity. Resources once available, such as second-stage housing, are gone due to your government's cuts. Women of colour, women with disabilities, black women, aboriginal women, lesbians and bisexual women still have limited access to services. We've watched the social safety net erode in front of our very eyes, further feminizing poverty, which forces women to stay in these situations.

1450

These women today called on you to act on the other recommendations outstanding from the May-Iles jury inquest to provide the community supports women need to escape abusive relationships and create safety for their children and themselves. Gillian Hadley wanted out and she couldn't get out.

The Ontario government was asked to immediately review shelter funding and you haven't done that. They were asked to immediately reinstate second-stage housing funding and you haven't done that. They wanted immediately an implementation of the risk assessment and the lethality checklist so that the system can work together. Those recommendations haven't been implemented.

I said to you before and I'm going to say again, three women a month are murdered; 40 women a year are murdered. Women's lives depend on your answer. Will you implement these outstanding recommendations immediately, Minister, please?

Hon Mr Flaherty: Domestic violence is a serious crime, as the member knows, and will not be tolerated in Ontario, as all serious violent crime is not to be tolerated in Ontario.

We have taken a leadership role in Ontario in protecting women from domestic violence, including \$10 million in the most recent budget to support women and children. There are a lot of programs. The honourable member refers to phones. We are piloting a program already that gives victims of domestic violence free cell phones pre-programmed to call 911. The same potential victims can receive safety planning, which gives them an increased measure of safety. There are many initiatives. That's one initiative. In fact we have 40 projects and initiatives in the areas of safety, justice and prevention to help meet the needs. If the member has additional ideas, in addition to those 40 initiatives, all ideas are welcome. It's an absolutely crucial area in which much more can be done.

I say to the member opposite, the expansion, the tripling of the number of domestic violence courts is actually making a demonstrable difference for safety in domestic situations in Ontario.

The Speaker: Order. The minister's time is up. New question.

NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): My question is to the Minister of Health. I want to ask you once again about the inequity in funding for people from northern Ontario who have to travel out of their home communities and often out of their own region to get medically necessary care. Minister, we don't want you to tell us that there are two different programs. We know that. That's exactly the problem we've been raising over and over again since you temporarily began 100% funding for southern Ontario cancer patients travelling north.

The northern health travel grant program is the only source of support for people who have to travel for cardiac surgery, for neurological disorders, for kidney transplants or even for regular dialysis. Many of our constituents are paying thousands upon thousands of dollars to get the care they need. This is not a choice they make.

They cannot get the care any closer to home, so they are referred to the nearest place where care is available.

Minister, you established a principle with your treatment of southern Ontario cancer patients who are referred out of their region for treatment. The principle was that you shouldn't have to pay out of pocket if you can't get care at home. My question is, if that principle is right for people from southern Ontario, why is it not right for people from northern Ontario regardless of their medical need?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): The member knows full well that the northern health travel grant, which was actually established by his government and which is still in place today, is the very same program they initiated. As I have said on several occasions, the only change that was made to the program was by the NDP government which actually tightened the criteria.

In the interim Cancer Care Ontario, recognizing that not all cancer patients could be treated in the time that would be appropriate for radiation, temporarily put in place another program which is a program that re-refers patients for radiation treatment. It is a temporary program. I am very pleased to say that yesterday I was at Princess Margaret Hospital and they have worked very diligently there and have actually been able to increase the number of people who are receiving radiation treatment by 15%. So I am very optimistic that as Cancer Care Ontario and Princess Margaret continue to work very hard, we will be able to ensure that all people are treated within Ontario for cancer radiation in the future.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Final supplementary?

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Minister, it is simply not good enough to keep hiding behind bureaucratic jargon and suggesting that you can treat northern Ontario residents differently because they are not re-referred. It makes absolutely no sense to say, "If you can normally get care at home, you should not have to pay, but if you can never get care at home, you should pay for care out of your own pocket." That's exactly what you're telling northern Ontario residents. You expect northern Ontario residents to have to travel for care, so they should pay for it out of their own pockets. That is unequal treatment, Minister, and it is unfair.

You have suggested in recent weeks that at least northern Ontario cancer patients, if they have to leave their own region, will get their full costs covered. That is simply not the case. There are many northern Ontario cancer patients who have to travel and who get only the northern health travel grant. Not even children with cancer have their full costs covered.

Minister, you should know that the public accounts committee report that was tabled earlier this afternoon, a committee of the Legislature with a majority of government members, has now called for a report reviewing the cost of travel for northern Ontario residents who are referred for treatment out of their home area. You know that Cancer Care Ontario has had a task force

underway on this issue, and you yourself said earlier this month that you would review the northern health travel grant. I ask you today, before this session ends, will you table the task force report from Cancer Care Ontario, and when will you complete and make public your own review of the northern health travel grant?

Hon Mrs Witmer: As the member knows, we have certainly made every effort—in fact, our government has indicated that it is our objective to do everything we can to provide services closer to home, and that's exactly what we have been doing.

There is no difference in the re-referral program for anyone, whether they live in the south or the north or the east or the west. Every Ontarian has access to the temporary re-referral program that has been set up by Cancer Care Ontario. In fact, Cancer Care Ontario says very clearly in a statement here that in the north, Cancer Care Ontario is honouring their commitment by building a new radiation treatment facility in Sault Ste Marie. They are supporting 22 community chemotherapy clinics throughout northeastern Ontario, as well as 13 in the northwest. Cancer Care Ontario's program does not discriminate against anyone.

The program of re-referral has been made available for people in the north, the south, the west and the east. At the same time, we are making sure that we have the facilities in the north to meet the needs of northern Ontarians.

CROP INSURANCE

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. A member of my community has called my office on numerous occasions to discuss what the rain has done to his crops. The seeds for his crops were washed out in May. He replanted, and was rained out again last week. Minister, what assurances can I give this member of my community that his concerns will be addressed?

Hon Ernie Hardeman (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs): I want to thank the member from York North for the question. I'm sure the member is aware, as I am, of the continuous wet weather in some areas of the province that has prevented the farmers from getting their crops planted this spring. I certainly share the concern of the member for the farmers in her community who have not been able to finish the spring planting.

As the member is aware, the crop insurance program covers both unseeded acreage coverage and replanting benefits. The crop insurance program has been designed to assist producers with just the type of problems they've been experiencing this spring. Crop insurance staff are available from 7 to 7, Monday to Friday, to assist the farmers. The toll-free number to call is 1-888-247-4999. I would encourage her constituent to work closely with the crop insurance staff to ensure that they get all the benefits to which they are entitled.

Mrs Munro: Minister, as I am sure you are aware, the individual that I referred to is one of many farmers in my riding of York North and those across the province. What measures is the ministry taking to address the concerns of these farmers, taking into account the unusual weather we have experienced this spring?

1500

Hon Mr Hardeman: I want to assure the member of my concern for the farmers and the difficulties they are experiencing. It is in this light that our government continues to deliver an extensive package of safety net programs for the Ontario farmers.

I'm pleased to point out that this past winter, following extensive negotiations, we were able to negotiate a fair share federal safety net funding agreement. That means that over an additional \$30 million of federal funding will be available to our producers in Ontario. Our government will of course contribute our 40%, bringing the total amount of base safety net funding to approximately \$230 million.

Our ministry is currently working with leaders of the Ontario agricultural industry in order to use these funds to tailor a package for made-in-Ontario safety net programs. Ontario's farmers are supported by NISA—the net income stabilization program—crop insurance and self-directed risk management, and we are negotiating with the federal government on further details of the disaster relief program for this year which they would then be entitled to over and above their crop insurance program.

I thank the member for York North very much for the question.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and it too has to do with the subject of public safety. Minister, you will be familiar, I'm sure, with the story of Judith and Jean-Marc Charron, who live in my riding, who a couple of years ago lost their son in a terrible accident at the exhibition in Ottawa. Their son, Jerome, was on something called a reverse bungee jump, which they strap you into, and he was then propelled into the air some 100 feet. For purposes of perspective, the ceiling here is about 60 feet high. At the height of this 100-foot trajectory, he became detached from the harness and plunged to his death before hundreds of horrified onlookers.

You will be aware, Minister, that yesterday the coroner's inquest jurors put forward their recommendations. What they said in very clear terms was that they want the government of Ontario to get back into the business of public safety. They said that they wanted private sector inspectors to be inspected by somebody in the government. They felt there was inadequate monitoring ongoing when it came to the public safety at amusement rides in Ontario. Minister, will you do your job and accept the jury's recommendations?

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I appreciate the question from the Leader of the Opposition. This was a terrible accident, resulting in death. The inquest jury has made a number of very helpful recommendations surrounding that incident, providing advice to me and to the government. I have indicated to staff at the ministry that in terms of Bill 42, which is before the Legislature, I want to carefully consider the recommendations. Some of them may have an impact on the final form of that legislation. We're going to take the next period of time to review the recommendations of the inquest jury and see if we can make those changes.

We are responding, I think, in a very positive way. We're taking a look at a number of the recommendations that can be implemented immediately. Some cannot be handled other than through the passage of Bill 42, but we're looking at all available options to address the recommendations of the jury.

Mr McGuinty: You should know that when I chatted with Judith and Jean-Marc Charron about this matter and the coroner's inquest and Bill 42, they had very grave reservations about Bill 42. They see it the way I see it: It's going to compound what has happened with respect to this government abdicating its responsibility for public safety, in this particular case dealing with amusement rides.

We can't wait when it comes to making sure that the rides at our county fairs and our larger urban exhibition grounds are safe for children this summer. What I'm asking you to do, Minister, is to look at these recommendations—there are 29 in total—and implement them immediately. If there is anything that we might do to assist in that regard, consider this my genuine offer of assistance, but we owe it to the family, we owe it to all parents right across Ontario who will be accompanying or sending their children to fairgrounds this summer and having those children get on rides. I ask you, Minister, to implement these recommendations.

Hon Mr Runciman: I appreciate the leader's expression of interest in cooperating and I want to indicate that I do respect that offer as being sincere. I do want to point out that with respect to the 29 recommendations, 15 are already being pursued or implemented. Six, we're told, are possible to implement under the existing legislation, and we're trying to deal with this as quickly as possible in terms of deeming whether this is the appropriate way to go or not. Seven, I'm advised as of today, would require or benefit from passage of Bill 42. Mr Charron, the father, has indicated his disappointment with respect to no reference to banning of these travelling bungee rides, and I have indicated to my staff that I want to also pursue that request on the part of the Charron family.

We are trying to act on this in an expeditious manner. I want to assure you and anyone listening that we place public safety in terms of the highest priority. We want to deal with these in a very timely way.

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill): My question is for the Minister of Energy, Science and Technology. Last week, I was pleased to introduce to this Legislature four students from St Elizabeth Catholic high school in Thornhill who won first place in the prestigious Connaught student biotechnology competition. The work of Joy Lero, Rosanna Dolcetti, Bernadette Hagan and Valerie Tam centred around the discovery that genistein, a biochemical product of soybeans, can kill breast cancer cells. These young women are truly among the best and brightest young Ontarians and they will be pursuing careers in biotechnology and health sciences. Minister, can you explain what our government is doing to turn the brain drain into a brain gain and ensure that knowledge-based careers are available in Ontario for our talented young people?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): I want to add my voice of congratulations to the young women who were successful at the biotechnology exhibition at Connaught school. You should be very proud. I know the honourable member is very proud and she did introduce them to this Legislature earlier this week.

On Monday of this week, the government of Ontario tried to make the future brighter for these young women and other bright young people who want to study the sciences or biotechnology. I announced \$9 million for a new biotechnology commercialization centre, or what we call a biotechnology incubator, that will be built on the site of the Toronto Hospital, where the Bell wing is now. That incubator will foster about 125 businesses over the next five years, and we expect 4,000 highly skilled jobs will be created for young people like those we saw introduced earlier this week in the Legislature. There's a bright future there. This is part of SuperBuild, and we'll be having more biotechnology commercialization centre announcements in the near future throughout the rest of the province.

Mrs Molinari: Minister, could you explain how important Ontario's biotechnology industry is today and how it is growing?

Hon Mr Wilson: Ontario's biotechnology sector is a \$400-million sector today, and we expect, with investments from SuperBuild and our biotechnology commercialization centres, that the industry will grow to about a billion dollars over the next five years and about 6,500 new high-skilled jobs will be created in that sector. Today, we're home to about 70 core biotechnology companies and we have 21 research institutions that specialize in biotechnology.

To date, in the time that I've been Minister of Energy, Science and Technology, we've invested a total of about \$1.4 billion in biotechnology and science infrastructure in the province. We're building new labs, we're announcing commercialization centres and we really are providing a tremendous infusion of public money. Along with private sector money, and educational institutions

and health care institutions, we're all working together to ensure a bright future for our best and brightest, and we're really working hard to reverse the brain drain, something the federal government needs to do. They need to work along with us, because the Prime Minister still thinks there isn't a brain drain in this country. This government recognizes there is, and we're putting our money where our mouth is and making investments in science and technology to—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The minister's time is up.

1510

COLLECTION AGENCIES

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Attorney General. On June 3 you announced that three private collection agencies had been selected to try and collect outstanding arrears overdue for more than six months. What was interesting about the press release is that there was no mention made of how or how much the private collection agencies would be paid.

I raise this serious issue because we know that under your previous pilot project using collection agencies, the agencies were paid with money that was legally owed and should have gone, in full, to women and children. We know that as money started to come in from payers, 25% of it was diverted away from needy recipients and went instead to pay the collection agencies.

We know this because your deputy minister and the legal director of the Family Responsibility Office confirmed that this indeed was the payment scheme when they appeared before the public accounts committee on February 16. You paid for your pilot project off the backs of women and children. Are you going to do this a second time?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): As the member should know, when support money has been located, the recipient starts receiving payments immediately. The payer, the person responsible for paying the money, pays the collection agency fee, which is based on a sliding scale up to a threshold of 25%. That's the way the system works. I would have thought the member knew that.

The payer owes everything. The payer must pay the full amount of the support arrears, ongoing support, plus any collection agency fee. Let's remember that no monies would be flowing to families if not for the involvement of these collection agencies, which have collected some of the oldest debt owed to women and children in the province of Ontario.

Ms Martel: Perhaps if you staffed up the Family Responsibility Office properly, the FRO staff could do that themselves.

Minister, I'm surprised you don't know what went on in the committee, because if you had read the account from the committee, you wouldn't have said what you just did.

Here's the Hansard. I asked the question, "Are they"—the collection agencies—only paid when all of the arrears have been paid to the recipient?" Your deputy says, "No, there is a scale." The legal director at the FRO states, "With respect to those situations where there hasn't been a full payment, there is a scale by which the collection agency gets some money, up to a threshold of 25% of the payment." Again, when I ask the legal director if he's sure that the collection agency gets money when the full payment has been made, Mr Costen replies, "Up to 25% until such time as the whole payment is made."

Minister, it is absolutely clear that money that should have gone to women and children was diverted to pay your friends in the collection agencies. It's bad enough that you have to use collection agencies because you can't staff up the Family Responsibility Office for them to do their own work, but what's worse is you use money that's legally owed to women and children to pay them too. There's a second round that's due to begin. I ask you again: Are you going to pay collection agencies off the backs of women and children one more time?

Hon Mr Flaherty: I'm proud of the fact that over \$11 million that was owed to payees in Ontario, over \$11 million that your government did not collect for women and children in the province, has been collected by our government, through the Family Responsibility Office, for women and children. You didn't do it. We did it.

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain): My question is for the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. Yesterday you stood up in this House and responded to a question by telling the people of the province that you had public consultations with respect to private universities. You deliberately misled the people of Ontario.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. No, the member cannot say that. She needs to withdraw it.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Retracted, Speaker.

Your parliamentary assistant stated on a TV talk show that the consultations would be public. They were not public. They were invitation-only events, and you posted the OPP at the door to ensure that access was restricted. You even refused to release the names of those you consulted with. What are you hiding, Minister? Who are you hiding? Consultation means that you listen to the people of Ontario, not just to those who share your views.

You proudly proclaim that you have received over 50 written submissions. Of course you did. It's the only way people can communicate with you, e-mailing you, one way. Today, right here in the Legislature, there was a public hearing on private universities, and you weren't there, Minister. The organizers invited you and you weren't there. Instead, your staff threw this memo into the consultations, without letterhead, without a signa-

ture—nothing. What are you ashamed of? Who are you ashamed of?

How can you stand in this House and state, and I quote: "We have consulted broadly. We have consulted with those who have asked to be consulted with and we have reached out." You have not, Minister. The people in the Legislature today have not been heard on this issue. The people of Ontario have not been heard on this issue. I challenge you to open genuine, real, honest consultations with the public. Will you do that, Minister?

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities): We are totally committed to offering choices with regard to post-secondary education of our students in this province, no matter where they live, no matter how old they are.

I can tell you we have just finished having responses to papers that were sent out to over 400 stakeholders for their input. If these people wanted to meet with me, they did, including the Canadian Federation of Students, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, the Ontario Community College Student Parliamentary Association, the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario, the Ontario Graduate Association, the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance, the Council of Ontario Universities, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, the Council of Regents—the list goes on.

We are 100% in favour of getting the best advice we can. If anyone in this assembly or anyone listening to this question would like to speak to us or meet with us, we're ready. I will advise, though—

The Speaker: I'm afraid the minister's time is up.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Minister, I've been asking you for over a month for those names. You claim private universities will increase choice. You claim private universities will not cost the taxpayer anything. This is where you're wrong. Your plans will create a two-tier system of universities in Ontario. Private universities will increase choice only for those who can afford tuition of \$25,000 to \$40,000. They already have that choice. You obviously agree with your candidate for the Canadian Alliance, Tom Long, who says they should go to the United States to attend university. Taxpayers—

Interjections.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Such a wonderful source. Ask Mr Klees.

Taxpayers will pay for private universities through OSAP loans. Who do you think provides funding for OSAP loans, your research grants? It's even happening now. Given what Ontarians have said about your scheme to bring in the Phoenixes of the world, will you commit to putting your plans on hold until you hold genuinely open consultations?

Hon Mrs Cunningham: Actually, I just don't understand what the member opposite is concerned about. Our public universities are our first priority. Our public universities, our college system, our—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I can't hear the answer.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Sorry for the interruption. Minister.

Hon Mrs Cunningham: We're totally committed to finding better ways to provide opportunities to our students in Ontario. Our students need more opportunities, not fewer. Our colleges have been asking us for applied degrees so that the students who graduate will meet the needs of the world of work, no matter where they work—in Canada, around the world. Our public institutions have always been competitive around the world. They will remain competitive around the world, the best in the world right here in Ontario and across this country. We're totally committed to finding better ways, quality education for students, no matter where they live, no matter how old they are, in this great province.

1520

HIGHWAY 407

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): It's my distinct pleasure to ask the last question in this session, and it's an honour I don't take lightly. My question is to the Minister of Transportation.

Minister Ecker, Minister Flaherty, Jerry Ouellette, MPP for Oshawa, and I recently met with your ministry on the important issue of Highway 407. At the meeting there were people involved from the Durham Region Federation of Agriculture, people like Don Drake, Jacqueline Vaneyk, Brenda Metcalf, Arnold Kerry, Karen Yellowlees and a number of other people. We met with senior people in your ministry. We had a very productive session with the constituents, and their question was about long-term planning for their farm and rural operations in Durham.

Minister, could you inform both Minister Ecker and Minister Flaherty, and myself and my constituents, of course, and the members of the House here, what your plans are to extend Highway 407 eastward into Durham so they can significantly plan for their future in agriculture.

Hon David Turnbull (Minister of Transportation): I think it's totally appropriate that the member for Durham would have the last word in this House.

Agriculture, of course, was the main consideration in determining the proposal for Highway 407 completion. The MTO consulted with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ontario and regional federations of agriculture. The findings were in fact presented to the farming community at public meetings. The proposed route has the least agricultural impact and the province is committed to the environmental assessment process. The EA will examine alternative routes and consider all factors, but it is important to understand that the EA approval is required first before we can move forward with other implementation issues.

I would like to just point out that I certainly welcome some civil servants from the Ministry of Transportation who are in the members' gallery today.

PETITIONS

NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it reads like this:

"Whereas the northern health travel grant was introduced in 1987 in recognition of the fact that northern Ontario residents are often forced to receive treatment outside their own communities because of the lack of available services; and

"Whereas the Ontario government acknowledged that the costs associated with that travel should not be fully borne by those residents and therefore that financial support should be provided by the Ontario government through the travel grant program; and

"Whereas travel, accommodation and other costs have escalated sharply since the program was first put in place, particularly in the area of air travel; and

"Whereas the Ontario government has provided funds so that southern Ontario patients needing care at the Northwestern Ontario Cancer Centre have all their expenses paid while receiving treatment in the north which creates a double standard for health care delivery in the province; and

"Whereas northern Ontario residents should not receive a different level of health care nor be discriminated against because of their geographical locations;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Ontario, petition the Ontario Legislature to acknowledge the unfairness and inadequacy of the northern health travel grant program and commit to a review of the program with a goal of providing 100% funding of the travel costs for residents needing care outside their communities until such time as that care is available in our communities."

I fully endorse this petition and so has the member for Sudbury who has been fighting so strongly about it.

SAFE DRINKING WATER LEGISLATION

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): I have more petitions calling for bringing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2000. It reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the people of Ontario have the right to receive clean and safe drinking water; and

"Whereas clean, safe drinking water is a basic human entitlement and essential for the protection of public health; and

"Whereas the people of Ontario have the right to receive accurate and immediate information about the quality of water; and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the government of Ontario have failed to protect the quality of drinking water in Ontario; and

"Whereas Mike Harris and the government of Ontario have failed to provide the necessary financial resources to the Ministry of the Environment; and

"Whereas the policies of Mike Harris and the government of Ontario have endangered the environment and the health of the citizens of Ontario;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"(1) Immediately restore adequate funding and staffing to the Ministry of the Environment;

"(2) Immediately pass into law Bill 96, the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2000."

I agree with this petition completely and will affix my signature.

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I am presenting this on behalf of Mr Turnbull's riding.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontarians with a developmental disability are in growing danger of inadequate support because compensation to their workers is, based on a recent survey, on average, 20% to 25% less than compensation for others doing the same work in provincial institutions or similar work in other settings; and

"Whereas there are hundreds of senior parents in Ontario who saved the Ontario government millions of dollars by keeping their child with a developmental disability at home, and who are still caring for their adult child; and

"Whereas there is no plan of support for most of these adults with a developmental disability to go when the parents are no longer able to provide care; and

"Whereas these parents live with constant anxiety and despair;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To significantly increase compensation for workers in the developmental services sector so it is comparable to the compensation of government-funded workers in identical or similar occupations; and

"To provide the resources necessary to give appropriate support to Ontarians with a developmental disability who have no support when their parents are no longer able to care for them."

NATIONAL CHILD TAX BENEFIT SUPPLEMENT

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): This is a petition to the Legislature of Ontario.

"Whereas the national child tax benefit supplement is provided by the federal government; and

"Whereas the Harris government claws back all funds from this program from families on social assistance; and

"Whereas children faced with poverty in this province need and deserve these federal funds; and

"Whereas these funds provided by provincial programs are oftentimes not sufficient to meet the needs of our families on social assistance;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To provide the national child tax benefit supplement to all children living in poverty."

This is signed by over 700 individuals in Ontario, including Rachel Iris Mayer, a young lady from Peterborough who took the initiative to have this petition put forward. I have affixed my signature in support of it.

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

Ms Marilyn Churley (Broadview-Greenwood): I have a petition which reads:

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontarians with a developmental disability are in growing danger of inadequate support because compensation to staff of not-for-profit agencies is, based on a recent survey, on average, 20% to 25% less than compensation for others doing the same work in provincial institutions or similar work in other settings; and

"Whereas there are hundreds of senior parents in Ontario who saved the Ontario government millions of dollars by keeping their child with a developmental disability at home, and who are still caring for their adult child; and

"Whereas there is no place for most of these adults with a developmental disability to go when the parents are no longer able to provide care; and

"Whereas those parents live with constant anxiety and despair; and

"Whereas these adult children will end up in Ontario nursing homes and hospitals if there is no appropriate place to provide care;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario as follows:

"To significantly increase compensation for workers in not-for-profit agencies so that it is comparable to the compensation of government-funded workers in identical or similar occupations; and

"To provide the resources necessary to give appropriate support to Ontarians with a developmental disability who at present have no place to go when their parents are no longer able to care for them."

I have over 700 signatures here, and I will affix my signature because I agree with the petition.

DRIVER EXAMINATIONS

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas according to the Ministry of Transportation for the province of Ontario there is at least a 10-month backlog for persons wishing to take their road driving test. This situation is prevalent throughout the entire province. With Ontario's booming economy and the cur-

rent provincial government objectives this is an intolerable situation. This backlog situation could be rectified simply by the hiring of further testing staff or the reopening of examination offices.

"We, the undersigned, petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows;

"That the government of Ontario hire additional Ministry of Transportation road testing staff and open further testing offices to eliminate or substantially reduce the current testing backlog within the province."

1530

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTIONS

Mr Joseph Cordiano (York South-Weston): To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Conservative government has imposed a \$925 head tax on international adoptions; and

"Whereas the cost to the government for processing international adoptions is no greater than that for domestic adoptions, which are not subject to the head tax; and

"Whereas in other provinces, parents are offered a tax credit of up to \$3,000 to offset the enormous costs of international adoptions; and

"Whereas charging \$925 to parents who adopt a child is as unacceptable as it would be to charge mothers for their medical care at childbirth;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To demand that this head tax be immediately revoked; and

"To demand a full refund to everyone who has paid it."

This petition has been signed by 2,600 citizens of the province of Ontario and I sign my name to it.

FARMFARE PROGRAM

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, a petition signed by thousands of farm workers and their supporters:

"Whereas the government of Ontario introduced farmfare on September 21, 1999, to supplement their workfare program, forcing social assistance recipients to work on farms for their benefits; and

"Whereas the Harris government of Ontario has not provided any consultation or hearings regarding this initiative; and

"Whereas the Harris government has excluded agricultural workers from protections under the provincial labour code by passing Bill 7; and

"Whereas this exclusion is currently being appealed under the Canadian Charter of Rights for infringing on the right of association and equal benefit of law;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to retract the farmfare program until hearings have been held and to reinstate the right of agricultural workers to allow them basic human rights protection under the labour code of Ontario."

On behalf of the NDP caucus, I add my name to those of these petitioners.

KARLA HOMOLKA

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke North): I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

"Whereas Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo were responsible for terrorizing entire communities in southern Ontario; and

"Whereas the Ontario government of the day made a deal with the devil with Karla Homolka resulting in a sentence that does not truly make her pay for her crimes; and

"Whereas our communities have not yet fully recovered from the trauma—"

Interjection: It's over now.

Mr Hastings: Over for you maybe; not for these folks.

"—and sadness caused by Karla Homolka; and

"Whereas Karla Homolka believes that she should be entitled to pass to leave prison with an escort; and

"Whereas the people of Ontario believe that criminals should be forced to serve sentences that reflect the seriousness of their crimes;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the government of Ontario will:

"Do everything within its power to ensure that Karla Homolka serves her full sentence;

"Continue to reform parole and make it more difficult for serious offenders to return to our streets;

"Fight Ottawa's plan to release up to 1,600 more convicted criminals on to Ontario streets"—what an accomplishment—"and

"Ensure that the Ontario government's sex offender registry is functioning ASAP."

I'm certainly glad to affix my signature to this petition.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Even though Bill 74 has received third reading, people are still showing their displeasure with it.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Bill 74 attacks the very heart of local democracy and accountability by creating a system of informers and absolute powers for the Minister of Education;

"Whereas Bill 74 cuts not only the heart out of education but also the spirit by making teachers perform voluntary activities on threat of termination;

"Whereas Bill 74 is an unprecedented attack on the collective bargaining rights of Ontario teachers; and

"Whereas Bill 74 attacks human rights by demanding teachers be available seven days a week, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, to do assigned duties; and

“Whereas Bill 74 turns over all education in this province to one person, the Minister of Education;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“We call on the government to hold public hearings on Bill 74 throughout the province immediately.”

I put my signature on that too.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): I continue to receive petitions from Cathy Walker, petitions that were organized by Cecil Mackasey and Rick Roberts of CAW Local 222. It reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas this year 130,000 Canadians will contract cancer and there are at minimum 17 funerals every day for Canadian workers who died from cancer caused by workplace exposure to cancer-causing substances known as carcinogens; and

“Whereas the World Health Organization estimates that 80% of all cancers have environmental causes and the International Labour Organization estimates that one million workers globally have cancer because of exposure at work to carcinogens; and

“Whereas most cancers can be beaten if government had the political will to make industry replace toxic substances with non-toxic substances; and

“Whereas very few health organizations study the link between occupations and cancer, even though more study of this link is an important step to defeating this dreadful disease;

“Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That it become a legal requirement that occupational history be recorded on a standard form when a patient presents at a physician for diagnosis or treatment of cancer and that the diagnosis and occupational history be forwarded to a central cancer registry for analysis as to the link between cancer and occupation.”

I add my name to this petition.

LORD’S PRAYER

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

“Whereas the Lord’s Prayer, also called Our Father, has been used to open the proceedings of municipal chambers and the Ontario Legislative Assembly since the beginning of Upper Canada in the 18th century; and

“Whereas such use of the Lord’s Prayer is part of Ontario’s long-standing heritage and a tradition that continues to play a significant role in contemporary Ontario life; and

“Whereas the Lord’s Prayer is the most meaningful expression of the religious convictions of many Ontario citizens;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the Parliament of Ontario maintain the use of the Lord’s Prayer in its proceedings, in accordance with its long-standing established custom, and do all in its power to maintain use of this prayer in municipal chambers in Ontario.”

I am pleased to affix my signature to this petition.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My first point of order is, I would just ask you to tell the members of the House: Have you ever heard of anybody wanting to remove the Lord’s Prayer from this House? Do you know of any intention to remove the reading of the Lord’s Prayer from this House?

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Seeing as it’s the last day of this session, I’d seek unanimous consent to allow the member for Durham the rare opportunity to read a petition.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): I hear a no.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PROFESSIONAL GEOSCIENTISTS

ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000

SUR LES GÉOSCIENTIFIQUES
PROFESSIONNELS

Mr Hudak moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 86, An Act to establish the Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario / Loi visant à établir l’Ordre des géoscientifiques professionnels de l’Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is there any debate?

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT
LE CODE DE LA ROUTE

Mr Turnbull moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 91, An Act to require the mandatory reporting of severely damaged vehicles to counter motor vehicle fraud and theft / Projet de loi 91, Loi exigeant la déclaration obligatoire des véhicules gravement endommagés afin de lutter contre la fraude et le vol des véhicules automobiles.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is there any debate?

If not, is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

1540

Hon Frank Klees (Minister without Portfolio): I seek unanimous consent to call orders Pr3, Pr5, Pr16, Pr19, Pr20, Pr21, Pr22, and Pr24 so that they may be moved and debated concurrently for second and third reading.

The Acting Speaker: Do we have unanimous agreement? It's agreed.

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): Just before I read this, I'd like to introduce four people who are in the gallery and who are connected with this bill: CEO Rob Deavitt of Peterborough Regional Hospital; Dawn Straka, vice-chair of the board; and Tom McHugh, vice-president. They have been awarded by this government a brand new hospital to be built in the next few years. That's probably out of order but I did it anyway.

PETERBOROUGH REGIONAL
HEALTH CENTRE ACT, 1999

Mr Stewart moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Peterborough Regional Health Centre.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Stewart moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr 3, An Act respecting Peterborough Regional Health Centre.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

ROSS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL ACT, 1999

Mr Stewart moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Stewart moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting The Ross Memorial Hospital.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

TALPIOT COLLEGE ACT, 1999

Mr Colle moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr16, An Act to incorporate Talpiot College.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Colle moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr16, An Act to incorporate Talpiot College.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

REDEEMER UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE ACT, 2000

Mr Clark moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr19, An Act respecting Redeemer Reformed Christian College.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Clark moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting Redeemer Reformed Christian College.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

NER ISRAEL YESHIVA
COLLEGE ACT, 2000

Mr Young moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr20, An Act respecting Ner Israel Yeshiva College.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Young moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting Ner Israel Yeshiva College.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

1264030 ONTARIO INC. ACT, 2000

Mr Duncan, on behalf of Mr Bartolucci, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive 1264030 Ontario Inc.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Duncan, on behalf of Mr Bartolucci, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive 1264030 Ontario Inc.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

TOWN OF GREATER NAPANEE ACT, 2000

Mrs Dombrowsky moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Town of Greater Napanee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mrs Dombrowsky moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Town of Greater Napanee.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

HURON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE ACT, 2000

Mr Wood moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr24, An Act respecting Huron University College.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Wood moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting Huron University College.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

GERMAN PIONEERS DAY ACT, 1999
LOI DE 1999 SUR LE JOUR
DES PIONNIERS ALLEMANDS

Mr Wettlaufer moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 28, An Act to proclaim German Pioneers Day /
Projet de loi 28, Loi proclamant le Jour des pionniers
allemands.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): The bill recognizes that the contributions made by German Canadians who came to Ontario in several waves of immigration have been significant. As one of the founding groups of Ontario, German pioneers helped settle the province and made their rich cultural traditions and

values an integral part of Canadian society. Ontario citizens of German descent continue to make a significant contribution to Ontario and Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Further debate, or any questions or comments? No.

Mr Wettlaufer moved third reading of Bill 28. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

TARTAN ACT, 1999
LOI DE 1999 SUR LE TARTAN

Mr Murdoch moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 49, An Act to adopt an official tartan for Ontario /
Projet de loi 49, Loi visant à adopter un tartan officiel
pour l'Ontario.

Mr Bill Murdoch (Bruce-Grey): Mr Speaker, it looks like I may be the last order of the day, so I won't take up your time. All I want to do is thank Lillian Ross, who put a lot of work into this bill last year. I'd also like to thank all three parties for supporting it. It's something they all can support in this House and make sure everybody has a good summer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin): Further questions or comments? Any further debate? If not, Mr Murdoch moves third reading of Bill 49.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried. Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

Hon Frank Klees (Minister without Portfolio): Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This House is adjourned until September 25 at 1:30 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1551.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston
Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr
Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers
Clerk Assistant / Greffière adjointe: Deborah Deller
Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Agostino, Dominic (L)	Hamilton East / -Est	chief opposition whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Waterloo-Wellington	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Baird, Hon / L'hon John R. (PC)	Nepean-Carleton	Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Environnement
Bartolucci, Rick (L)	Sudbury	deputy opposition House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition
Beaubien, Marcel (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	
Bisson, Gilles (ND)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	
Bountrogianni, Marie (L)	Hamilton Mountain	
Boyer, Claudette (L)	Ottawa-Vanier	
Bradley, James J. (L)	St Catharines	
Brown, Michael A. (L)	Algoma-Manitoulin	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Bryant, Michael (L)	St Paul's	
Caplan, David (L)	Don Valley East / -Est	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary (PC)	Oakville	Speaker / Président
Christopherson, David (ND)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Richesses naturelles
Churley, Marilyn (ND)	Broadview-Greenwood	chief New Democratic Party whip / whip en chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Clark, Brad (PC)	Stoney Creek	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, assistant deputy government whip / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée, whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Cleary, John C. (L)	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	
Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony (PC)	Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Coburn, Brian (PC)	Carleton-Gloucester	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Colle, Mike (L)	Eglinton-Lawrence	
Conway, Sean G. (L)	Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	
Cordiano, Joseph (L)	York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	
Crozier, Bruce (L)	Essex	
Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne (PC)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Curling, Alvin (L)	Scarborough-Rouge River	
DeFaria, Carl (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Sarnia-Lambton	
Dombrowsky, Leona (L)	Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington	
Duncan, Dwight (L)	Windsor-St Clair	opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / -Nord	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjoint suppléant du gouvernement
Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet (PC)	Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation
Elliott, Brenda (PC)	Guelph-Wellington	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation and minister responsible for seniors and women / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs et ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées et à la Condition féminine
Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L. (PC)	Parry Sound-Muskoka	Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC)	Whitby-Ajax	Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Galt, Doug (PC)	Northumberland	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Gerretsen, John (L)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	
Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	Scarborough East / -Est	
Gill, Raminder (PC)	Bramalea-Gore- Malton-Springdale	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Travail
Gravelle, Michael (L)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	
Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	
Hampton, Howard (ND)	Kenora-Rainy River	Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Hardeman, Hon / L'hon Ernie (PC)	Oxford	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D. (PC)	Nipissing	Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif
Hastings, John (PC)	Etobicoke North / -Nord	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Transports
Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)	Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion
Hoy, Pat (L)	Chatham-Kent Essex	
Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim (PC)	Erie-Lincoln	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron (PC)	Burlington	Minister of Tourism / ministre du Tourisme
Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen (PC)	Huron-Bruce	Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, minister responsible for seniors and women / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs, ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées et à la Condition féminine
Johnson, Bert (PC)	Perth-Middlesex	Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président de la Chambre et Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Kells, Morley (PC)	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	
Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Parkdale-High Park	
Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank (PC)	Oak Ridges	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip, deputy government House leader / ministre sans portefeuille, whip en chef du gouvernement, leader parlementaire adjoint
Kormos, Peter (ND)	Niagara Centre / -Centre	
Kwinter, Monte (L)	York Centre / -Centre	
Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	
Lankin, Frances (ND)	Beaches-East York	
Levac, Dave (L)	Brant	
Marchese, Rosario (ND)	Trinity-Spadina	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Marland, Hon / L'hon Margaret (PC)	Mississauga South / -Sud	Minister without Portfolio (Children) / ministre sans portefeuille (Enfance)
Martel, Shelley (ND)	Nickel Belt	
Martin, Tony (ND)	Sault Ste Marie	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Cambridge	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General and minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire au procureur général et ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Maves, Bart (PC)	Niagara Falls	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Mazzilli, Frank (PC)	London-Fanshawe	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General / adjoint parlementaire au solliciteur général
McGuinty, Dalton (L)	Ottawa South / -Sud	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLeod, Lyn (L)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	
Molinari, Tina R. (PC)	Thornhill	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Munro, Julia (PC)	York North / -Nord	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjointe suppléante du gouvernement
Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Bruce-Grey	
Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	
Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan (PC)	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Durham	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al (PC)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Parsons, Ernie (L)	Prince Edward-Hastings	
Patten, Richard (L)	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	
Peters, Steve (L)	Elgin-Middlesex-London	
Phillips, Gerry (L)	Scarborough-Agincourt	
Pupatello, Sandra (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	
Ramsay, David (L)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	
Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Davenport	
Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	Minister of Correctional Services / ministre des Services correctionnels
Sergio, Mario (L)	York West / -Ouest	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Smitherman, George (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	
Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John (PC)	Mississauga West / -Ouest	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Spina, Joseph (PC)	Brampton Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Tourisme
Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC)	Lanark-Carleton	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, government House leader / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Peterborough	
Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de l'Éducation
Tilson, David (PC)	Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H. (PC)	Markham	Solicitor General / solliciteur général
Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David (PC)	Don Valley West / -Ouest	Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	deputy government whip / whip adjoint du gouvernement
Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	Minister of Energy, Science and Technology / ministre de l'Énergie, des Sciences et de la Technologie
Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener-Waterloo	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Wood, Bob (PC)	London West / -Ouest	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / adjoint parlementaire au président du Conseil de gestion
Young, David (PC)	Willowdale	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Finances
Wentworth-Burlington	Vacant	

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Alvin Curling
Gilles Bisson, Alvin Curling, Gerard Kennedy,
Frank Mazzilli, John R. O'Toole, Steve Peters,
R. Gary Stewart, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**Finance and economic affairs /
Finances et affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Marcel Beaubien
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Doug Galt
Ted Arnott, Marcel Beaubien, David Christopherson,
Doug Galt, Monte Kwinter, Tina R. Molinari,
Gerry Phillips, David Young
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Julia Munro
Toby Barrett, Marie Bountrogianni, Ted Chudleigh,
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,
Rosario Marchese, Julia Munro
Clerk / Greffier: Viktor Kaczkowski

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: James J. Bradley
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier
James J. Bradley, Bruce Crozier, Leona Dombrowsky,
Bert Johnson, Morley Kells, Tony Martin,
Joseph Spina, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Marilyn Mushinski
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Carl DeFaria
Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant, Carl DeFaria,
Brenda Elliott, Garry J. Guzzo, Peter Kormos,
Lyn McLeod, Marilyn Mushinski
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: R. Gary Stewart
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Brad Clark
Marilyn Churley, Brad Clark, Caroline Di Cocco,
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Jerry J. Ouellette, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N.
Tascona, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John C. Cleary
John C. Cleary, John Gerretsen, John Hastings,
Shelley Martel, Bart Maves, Julia Munro,
Marilyn Mushinski, Richard Patten
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Présidente: Frances Lankin
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop
Gilles Bisson, Claudette Boyer, Brian Coburn,
Garfield Dunlop, Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy,
Frances Lankin, Bill Murdoch
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

These lists appear in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month. A list arranged by riding appears when space permits.

Ces listes figurent dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et du premier lundi de chaque mois. Par contre, une liste des circonscriptions paraît si l'espace est disponible.

continued from overleaf

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

Peterborough Regional Health Centre Act, 1999 , Bill Pr3, <i>Mr Stewart</i> Agreed to	4120
Ross Memorial Hospital Act, 1999 , Bill Pr5, <i>Mr Stewart</i> Agreed to	4120
Talpiot College Act, 1999 , Bill Pr16, <i>Mr Colle</i> Agreed to	4120
Redeemer University College Act, 2000 , Bill Pr19, <i>Mr Clark</i> Agreed to	4120
Ner Israel Yeshiva College Act, 2000 , Bill Pr20, <i>Mr Young</i> Agreed to	4120
1264030 Ontario Inc. Act, 2000 , Bill Pr21, <i>Mr Bartolucci</i> Agreed to	4120
Town of Greater Napanee Act, 2000 , Bill Pr22, <i>Mrs Dombrowsky</i> Agreed to	4120
Huron University College Act, 2000 , Bill Pr24, <i>Mr Wood</i> Agreed to	4121

THIRD READINGS

Professional Geoscientists Act, 2000 , Bill 86, <i>Mr Hudak</i> Agreed to	4119
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 2000 , Bill 91, <i>Mr Turnbull</i> Agreed to	4119
German Pioneers Day Act, 1999 , Bill 28, <i>Mr Wettlaufer</i> Agreed to	4121
Tartan Act, 1999 , Bill 49, <i>Mr Murdoch</i> Agreed to	4121

OTHER BUSINESS

Legislative pages Mr Gill	4102
The Speaker	4102

Visitors Mr Smitherman	4105
Mrs Marland	4105
The Speaker	4106
Premier's comments Mr Hampton	4106

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 22 juin 2000

AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

Loi de 2000 sur la réglementation et la protection à l'égard des répliques d'armes à feu , projet de loi 67, <i>M. Bryant</i> Adoptée	4098
Loi de 1999 sur la protection et la préservation de la moraine d'Oak Ridges , projet de loi 12, <i>M. Colle</i> Rejetée	4099

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2000 sur le Jour de commémoration des pompiers , projet de loi 107, <i>M. Levac</i> Adoptée	4103
Loi de 2000 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne la divulgation de renseignements sur les adoptions , projet de loi 108, <i>M^{me} Churley</i> Adoptée	4103
Loi de 2000 sur l'inspection annuelle obligatoire des maisons de soins infirmiers , projet de loi 109, <i>M^{me} Lankin</i> Adoptée	4104

Loi de 2000 sur les forestiers professionnels , projet de loi 110, <i>M. Gilchrist</i> Adoptée	4104
Loi de 2000 sur la Semaine de la police de l'Ontario , projet de loi 111, <i>M. Dunlop</i> Adoptée	4104
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur la Collection McMichael d'art canadien , projet de loi 112, <i>M^{me} Johns</i> Adoptée	4105
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario , projet de loi 113, <i>M. Gilchrist</i> Adoptée	4105

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2000 sur les géoscientifiques professionnels , projet de loi 86, <i>M. Hudak</i> Adoptée	4119
Loi de 2000 modifiant le Code de la route , projet de loi 91, <i>M. Turnbull</i> Adoptée	4119
Loi de 1999 sur le Jour des pionniers allemands , projet de loi 28, <i>M. Wettlaufer</i> Adoptée	4121
Loi de 1999 sur le tartan , projet de loi 49, <i>M. Murdoch</i> Adoptée	4121

CONTENTS

Thursday 22 June 2000

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Replica Firearms Regulation and Protection Act, 2000, Bill 67, Mr Bryant	
Mr Bryant	4083, 4090
Mr Mazzilli	4084
Mr Cordiano	4085
Mr Tascona	4086
Mr Levac	4086
Mr Kormos	4087
Mr Barrett	4089
Mr Smitherman	4090
Agreed to	4098
Oak Ridges Moraine Protection and Preservation Act, 1999, Bill 12, Mr Colle	
Mr Colle	4091, 4098
Mr Barrett	4092
Mr Bradley	4093
Ms Churley	4093
Mr Tascona	4095
Mr Smitherman	4096
Mr Chudleigh	4097
Mr Phillips	4097
Negatived	4099

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Paul Steinhauer	
Mr Kwinter	4099
Northumberland Health Care Centre	
Mr Galt	4099
Gasoline prices	
Mr Crozier	4100
Lisa Baltich	
Mr Kormos	4100
Durham community activities	
Mr O'Toole	4100
Gay pride	
Mr Smitherman	4100
Anti-poverty demonstration	
Mr Young	4101
Raves	
Mrs Papatello	4102
Taxation	
Mrs Munro	4102

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on public accounts	
Mr Gerretsen	4102
Debate adjourned	4103

FIRST READINGS

Firefighters' Memorial Day Act, 2000, Bill 107, Mr Levac	
Agreed to	4103
Mr Levac	4103
Adoption Disclosure Statute Law Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 108, Ms Churley	
Agreed to	4103
Ms Churley	4103
Nursing Homes Mandatory Annual Inspection Act, 2000, Bill 109, Ms Lankin	
Agreed to	4104
Ms Lankin	4104
Professional Foresters Act, 2000, Bill 110, Mr Gilchrist	
Agreed to	4104
Mr Gilchrist	4104
Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company Act, 2000, Bill Pr26, Mr Mazzilli	
Agreed to	4104
Ontario Police Week Act, 2000, Bill 111, Mr Dunlop	
Agreed to	4104
Mr Dunlop	4104
McMichael Canadian Art Collection Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 112, Mrs Johns	
Agreed to	4105
Mrs Johns	4105
Ontario Heritage Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 113, Mr Gilchrist	
Agreed to	4105
Mr Gilchrist	4105

MOTIONS

Status of Bill 101	
Mr Sterling	4105
Agreed to	4105
Committee sittings	
Mr Sterling	4105
Agreed to	4105

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ministry of the Environment	
Mr McGuinty	4107
Mr Newman	4107
Domestic violence	
Mr McGuinty	4108
Mr Flaherty	4108, 4110
Ms Lankin	4110

Walkerton tragedy

Mr Hampton	4109
Mr Flaherty	4109
Ms Churley	4110
Mr Newman	4110

Northern health travel grant

Mr Gravelle	4111
Mrs Witmer	4112
Mrs McLeod	4112

Crop insurance

Mrs Munro	4112
Mr Hardeman	4112

Public safety

Mr McGuinty	4113
Mr Runciman	4113

Biotechnology

Mrs Molinari	4114
Mr Wilson	4114

Collection agencies

Ms Martel	4114
Mr Flaherty	4114

Private universities

Mrs Bountrogianni	4115
Mrs Cunningham	4115

Highway 407

Mr O'Toole	4116
Mr Turnbull	4116

PETITIONS

Northern health travel grant

Mr Curling	4116
------------	------

Safe drinking water legislation

Ms Churley	4116
------------	------

Developmentally disabled

Mr Dunlop	4117
Ms Churley	4117

National child tax benefit supplement

Mr Peters	4117
-----------	------

Driver examinations

Mr Martiniuk	4117
--------------	------

International adoptions

Mr Cordiano	4118
-------------	------

Farmfare program

Mr Christopherson	4118
-------------------	------

Karla Homolka

Mr Hastings	4118
-------------	------

Education legislation

Mr Lalonde	4118
------------	------

Occupational health and safety

Mr Christopherson	4119
-------------------	------

Lord's Prayer

Ms Mushinski	4119
--------------	------

continued overleaf