

No. 117A



N° 117A

---

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 12 December 2000**

**Mardi 12 décembre 2000**

Speaker  
Honourable Gary Carr

Président  
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

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

Tuesday 12 December 2000

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 12 décembre 2000

*The House met at 1330.  
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SEXUAL ASSAULT

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** Last week, on the anniversary of the Montreal massacre, women's minister Helen Johns told the women of this province that the Harris government is committed to ensuring a woman's right to safety. It's disturbing to hear them talk the talk over there when Mike Harris refuses to take action.

There has been a travesty of justice in my community, and this government refuses to address it. Women from across the province are incensed that a Chatham chiropractor abused his position of trust in a string of sexual assaults. He was convicted of nine counts of sexual assault but was only given a slap on the wrist. He walked away with an 18-month at-home sentence. The Chatham-Kent Sexual Assault Crisis Centre has logged more than 500 calls from angry citizens in the last two weeks, men and women who are outraged. They are demanding that this government take action. They have sent hundreds of signatures and letters to the Attorney General insisting that he appeal this travesty of a sentence.

This government claims to stand for law and order and the protection of victims, but since coming to power Mike Harris has diminished the remedies available to women. This issue transcends all party lines. The Theresa Vince inquest spoke of the need to recognize sexual harassment as a "dangerous circumstance" under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. I have a bill being prepared that will do that.

I stand here today challenging the Harris government to live up to its promises to protect the women of this province by appealing that offensive sentence.

CANADIAN FORCES

**Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre):** The following was written by a Canadian peacekeeper overseas, and he has asked that we share it with as many people as possible.

'Twas the night before Christmas,  
he lived all alone,  
In a one-bedroom house made of  
plaster and stone.

I had come down the chimney  
with presents to give,  
And to see just who  
in this home did live.

I looked all about,  
a strange sight I did see,  
No tinsel, no presents,  
not even a tree.

No stocking by mantel,  
just boots filled with sand,  
On the wall hung pictures  
of far distant lands.

With medals and badges,  
awards of all kinds,  
A sober thought  
came through my mind.

For this house was different,  
it was dark and dreary.  
I found the home of a soldier,  
once I could see clearly.

The soldier lay sleeping,  
silent, alone,  
Curled up on the floor  
in this one-bedroom home.

The face was so gentle,  
his room in such disorder,  
Not how I pictured  
a Canadian soldier.

Was this the hero  
of whom I'd just read?  
Curled up on a poncho,  
the floor for a bed?

I realized the families  
that I saw this night,  
Owed their lives to these soldiers  
who were willing to fight.

Soon round the world,  
the children would play,  
And grownups would celebrate  
a bright Christmas Day.

They all enjoyed freedom  
each month of the year,  
Because of the soldiers,  
like the one lying here.

I couldn't help wonder  
how many lay alone,  
On a cold Christmas Eve  
in a land far from home.

The very thought  
brought a tear to my eye,  
I dropped to my knees  
and started to cry.

The soldier awakened  
and I heard a rough voice,  
"Santa don't cry,  
this life is my choice;

I fight for freedom,  
I don't ask for more,  
My life is my God,  
my country, my corps."

The soldier rolled over  
and drifted to sleep,  
I couldn't control it,  
I continued to weep.

I kept watch for hours,  
so silent and still  
And we both shivered  
from the cold night's chill.

I didn't want to leave,  
on that cold, dark night,  
This guardian of honour  
so willing to fight.

Then the soldier rolled over,  
with a voice soft and pure,  
Whispered, "Carry on Santa,  
it's Christmas Day, all is secure."

One look at my watch,  
and I knew he was right.  
"Merry Christmas my friend,  
and to all a good night."

#### PAROLE SYSTEM

**Mr Dave Levac (Brant):** I would like to use this time to address the arrogance of this government when it comes to provincial service delivery.

Yesterday, the Premier received a letter from the president of the Probation Officers Association of Ontario. This letter stated that since April, the president of the association has been attempting to rectify problems

being caused by the intervention of Operation Springboard through alternative demonstration projects. The president stated that for the good of parole officers across the province, this matter had to be addressed. The president of the association went to extraordinary lengths to bring attention to this issue, to the Premier himself.

These actions included raising the issue with the regional director, the assistant deputy minister etc. These actions also included writing the minister several times, as well as informing the office of the minister that the program violates the Young Offenders Act and the Correctional Services Act.

How does this government respond to these concerns raised by those people? The EA to the Minister of Correctional Services tells her not to contact the minister by phone or e-mail regarding this issue. The Premier dismisses the issue as fictional and a myth. If this government was serious about working with instead of against the parole officers of this province, it would sit down with the association and discuss ways to correct the problem instead of simply ignoring it, hoping they'd go away or there'd be an investigation.

Premier, you owe it to Ontario's parole officers to make sure these problems are investigated fully and that such a breakdown in communication from your government never happens again.

#### RAIL SERVICE

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** Today we were to hear an announcement made by the Minister of Northern Development and Mines in regard to the fate of rail passenger service in northeastern Ontario, and I guess we were given one reprieve. Because of the weather, the minister was not able to make it to North Bay in order to make announcements on what is a very important issue for people in northeastern Ontario.

The message we want to bring from the north, especially to the Premier, is this: you are a Premier who is from northern Ontario. You live in North Bay, where a lot of jobs having to do with the Ontario Northland train reside, and people back home up north really wonder why a Premier who comes from North Bay, where the headquarters are of the ONTC, would allow such a decision to be made. I hope tomorrow we're going to hear some good news. I don't think that's the case.

We know that the government has been setting up the demise of rail passenger service in northern Ontario since they've come to government, first by cutting the subsidy and then by setting up the tables in order to make the announcement that we expect tomorrow. But I've got to say to the Premier that it's a disappointment. We would hope that somebody from northern Ontario who's elected and has the honour of sitting as the Premier of the province in this Legislature would come to work every now and then and say, "I am from northern Ontario and, yes, I will speak out on behalf of northerners." When you see a Premier doing things that hurt northern Ontario, you really have to wonder whom that Premier is representing:

the people living in North Bay or the people of Bay Street. I think we'll find out the answer tomorrow.

#### HIGH SCHOOL LAW STUDENTS

**Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe):** Last month during constituency week I had the opportunity to attend a law class at Clarke Road Secondary School. I attended Mrs Gerster's law class there. I must say that these students were interested in government and the legislative process. I was happy to attend the law class and discuss how a bill becomes law here in the Ontario Legislature.

1340

I want to thank Mrs Gerster for giving me the opportunity to participate in the class, and I was glad to have given them the chance to get first-hand experience on the parliamentary process. I was even more delighted to see their enthusiasm for learning. These students have proven to me that the youth of today are interested in government.

Here are some of the members of the class: Jacqueline Armer, Ryan Booth, Kale Brereton, Lindsay Cambridge, Ruth Davis, Natalia Girod, Lindy Grieve, Lindsay Griffiths, Erin Harkness, Rose Hooker, Amy Julien, Bob Mavrikkou, Kate Memmott, Jason Munn, Jason Phillips, Kinnaly Phommosack, Amanda Salmon, Melissa Sims, Otto Sosa, Brad Sparling, Chris Texeira, Peter Thrasylvoulou and Todd Verstegen.

I was happy to recognize these students and their teacher. I'm encouraged by the example of these young students in our community today. They are interested in government and the parliamentary process.

#### PROPOSED BERNARDO FILM

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** The news that Norstar Entertainment is considering the production of a movie profiling convicted serial killer Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka has been greeted with dismay and disgust by residents of St Catharines.

What purpose, other than exploitation for financial gain, could possibly be served by providing further publicity to Paul Bernardo, an individual who has inflicted so much pain and anguish on his innocent victims and their families?

Is it not enough that Donna and Doug French, members of their family and the many friends of Kristen have had to suffer through the endless real-life legal procedures that surrounded Bernardo's crimes, without being forced to endure the making of a film about the perpetrator of these crimes? Is it really necessary that we all relive the tragic and horrible events surrounding Bernardo's victims through the knowledge that a film is being produced to rekindle the morbid memories of days gone by?

For the people of St Catharines, and I suspect for all people of goodwill, I am confident that the answer is a resounding no.

This proposed movie, unlike some fictitious creations of a writer, would be based upon the tormented lives of real people and, whether the producer intends this to be the case or not, would serve to glorify the crimes of Paul Bernardo and, in doing so, to further the mental torture inflicted upon the families of Kristen French, Leslie Mahaffy and others who were viciously and callously attacked by a now convicted killer.

On behalf of the people of St Catharines and I know all members of the Ontario Legislature, I call upon Norstar Chairman Peter Simpson to abandon any plans to produce a movie based upon Paul Bernardo's crimes.

#### VANIER CUP FOOTBALL GAME

**Mr Brian Coburn (Ottawa-Orléans):** Mr Speaker, as you're well aware, the 2000 CIAU Vanier Cup champions are indeed the University of Ottawa Gee-Gees.

The Garnet and Grey captured the national championship December 3 just down the road here in Toronto at the SkyDome—a 41-38 victory over the Regina Rams.

I'm pleased to tell you that seven members of the champion Gee-Gees are residents of my riding of Ottawa-Orléans: Adam Maheu, Jeff Lee-Yaw, Darryl Ray, Dan Peterson, brothers Mike and Luc Shaver and James Baker.

It was indeed quite a ride through the playoffs for the Gee-Gees and their star quarterback, Phil Cote, who went down with an injury in the quarterfinals. But backup quarterback James Baker came on and led the team to a strong victory over Laval.

Next up were the McMaster Marauders. No problem. James Baker led them to victory and was named MVP after a 20-15 win in Hamilton.

Having lost the Vanier Cup in 1997, the Gee-Gees were ready to prove all doubters wrong.

In the big final, Mike Shaver ran the ball eight times for 42 yards and caught three passes for an additional 44 yards, including a 26-yard run for a touchdown. His older brother, Luc, a senior who tasted defeat in 1997, led the Gee-Gees defence in their march to the Vanier Cup for the second time in four years. He was named the quarterfinal defensive player of the year.

Place-kicker Jeff Lee-Yaw was a perfect six for six on point after in the title game.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the entire University of Ottawa Gee-Gees team and its coaches on capturing the 2000 Vanier Cup.

I would also like to personally wish Dan, Darryl, Mike, Luc, James, Jeff and Adam the best of luck in all their future endeavours.

Congratulations to the national champions, the University of Ottawa Gee-Gees.

#### HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** As we approach the Christmas break, I want to make one more plea to this government to move forward

with the four-laning of Highway 11/17 between Thunder Bay and Nipigon.

This is a project that was considered an important improvement to the northwestern Ontario highway system 10 years ago, and there is no question the need is even greater today with the increase in traffic that has taken place over that time period. For several years, the province continued to provide annual funding so that the project could proceed. However, it has become increasingly frustrating for all of us who believe the four-laning must be completed that the province has recently provided no new funding for highway expansion projects in northwestern Ontario. While we agree that the rehabilitation of our highway system is important, that must not mean this vital improvement to Highway 11/17 should be left in perpetual limbo.

Certainly this is a priority for the Northwestern Ontario Associated Chambers of Commerce. As the voice for business, they are particularly conscious of the need to improve our highway system in order to make our area more attractive for business and tourism. As a result, at their meeting this past September they passed a resolution calling on the province and the federal government to partner on a 10-year plan to twin these and other important sections of the Trans-Canada Highway.

This may very well be the process by which this project finally gets completed, but it will take leadership from the province in order for this to move forward. Today I am calling on the Premier and the Minister of Transportation to commit funding in the next provincial budget to this project. With that commitment we can then bargain strongly with the federal government to see that they help us build this enhanced and important highway project.

#### PERTH AND MIDDLESEX COUNTIES

**Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex):** Last week I attended the inaugural county council meetings in Perth and Middlesex counties. I rise today to welcome and congratulate the two new county wardens elected by their fellow councillors.

On Wednesday, Vince Judge was acclaimed as the new warden of Perth county. Warden Judge, who also serves as mayor of North Perth, has been involved with municipal politics for many years and served as warden nine years ago. Last Thursday, Al Edmunston was elected the new warden of Middlesex county. Warden Edmunston, who is the deputy mayor of Middlesex Centre, has been involved in municipal politics for about 10 years. I want to welcome Warden Judge and Warden Edmunston to their positions, and I encourage them to embrace the challenges that come with their new responsibilities.

I also want to take this opportunity to recognize Dave Shearer, the outgoing warden of Perth county, and Crispin Colvin, outgoing warden of Middlesex county. I commend Dave and Crispin for their dedication to their positions, their interest in local government and their

exemplary service. It was a pleasure working with Dave and Crispin on many issues of concern to the ratepayers of Perth-Middlesex. Both Dave and Crispin were welcomed by their colleagues to the Past Wardens Association.

Please join me in congratulating and welcoming the new wardens of Perth and Middlesex counties.

### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on general government and move its adoption.

**Clerk at the Table (Mr Todd Decker):** Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 2, An Act to amend the Medicine Act, 1991 /  
Projet de loi 2, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1991 sur les  
médecins.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

**Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on justice and social policy and move its adoption.

**Clerk at the Table (Mr Todd Decker):** Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 117, An Act to better protect victims of domestic violence /  
Projet de loi 117, Loi visant à mieux protéger  
les victimes de violence familiale.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated Tuesday, December 5, 2000, the bill is ordered for third reading.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### ST. JEROME'S UNIVERSITY ACT, 2000

Mr Wettlaufer moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the University of St. Jerome's College.

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

1350

LIMITATIONS ACT, 2000  
LOI DE 2000 SUR LA PRESCRIPTION  
DES ACTIONS

Mr Flaherty moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 163, An Act to revise the Limitations Act / Projet de loi 163, Loi révisant la Loi sur la prescription des actions.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The Attorney General for a short statement?

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** I will be making a minister's statement.

**MOTIONS**

DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL  
INFORMATION

**Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader):** I believe we have unanimous consent to move a motion without notice regarding police access to records of the assembly from December 4 of this year.

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

**Hon Mr Sterling:** I move that the portion of the records of remarks made in the House on December 4, 2000, publication of which has been withheld by order of the House dated December 4, be released to those police authorities who request its release to them, in writing, for the purpose of being used in furtherance of their investigation into remarks made in the House on that day.

**The Speaker:** Mr Sterling moves that the portion of the records of remarks made in—

**Interjection:** Dispense.

**The Speaker:** Dispense? Dispensed.

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

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY  
AND RESPONSES**

LIMITATIONS PERIODS

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** Our government made a commitment to the people of Ontario to create a more modern, accessible and efficient justice system. Today, with the introduction of the Limitations Act, 2000, we are taking one more step to fulfill that promise.

Limitations periods are time limits for starting legal proceedings in civil and family courts. Legal proceedings

not started within the prescribed time periods are forever barred.

For too many years the people of Ontario have been labouring under antiquated limitations laws. The province's limitations law is based on old English statutes which can be traced back 400 years, and there have been no major changes in the last 100 years.

In 1969 the Ontario Law Reform Commission noted that the language of the act was archaic and out of touch with modern conditions. Ultimately the ordinary citizen suffers because these laws are beyond comprehension. That was 31 years ago and not much has changed.

Currently there are dozens of limitations periods, scattered in various acts. This patchwork system of limitations periods causes confusion and may increase costs for individuals.

Our government wants to comprehensively reform and modernize this system to improve access to justice for the people and businesses of Ontario. We propose to do this through the Limitations Act, 2000.

The act would consolidate many limitations periods into one statute and create two fair and clear time limits which take into account the interests of both plaintiffs and defendants.

This is how the proposed legislation would work: there would be a general two-year time limit for most civil court proceedings. The limitation period would start from the date the person finds out, or should have found out, about the injury, loss or damage he or she suffered and who caused or contributed to it. This discoverability principle is consistent with a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

There would also be an ultimate limitation period of 15 years for most civil court proceedings. This means that Ontarians would have 15 years to identify injury, loss or damage and take legal action. Beyond this ultimate limitation period, a lawsuit may not be able to commence regardless of the plaintiff's state of knowledge. The 15-year ultimate limitation period is similar to the latest proposals made in other jurisdictions.

There are several very important exceptions set out in this act. These exceptions demonstrate our government's unwavering support for victims and vulnerable persons, as well as our commitment to minimize the financial burden on taxpayers.

First of all, the Limitations Act, 2000, would place no time restrictions on victims of sexual assault occurring in a relationship of trust to start a lawsuit.

Second, the act would provide special recognition and safeguards for minors and incapable persons.

Third, no limitation period would apply where the crown is involved in administering social, health or economic programs. This would help to ensure that those who benefit from government funding are responsible for repayment and do not unduly burden taxpayers.

Fourth, the proposed bill would not impose a limitation period on environmental claims that have not been discovered.

Introducing clear and fair time limits supports Ontario's position as an attractive place to do business. One

statute containing all limitation periods instead of many different periods in many acts would remove surprises and confusion about limitation periods. The proposed legislation would achieve a balance between preserving the right to sue with the need to know when potential liability will end.

It would modernize our justice system, support victims and support a strong economy. I urge all members of this House to support the bill.

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** The government has said it has committed to the people of Ontario to create an accessible justice system. I'd like to take my time to talk about whether or not we've got that in the province of Ontario today.

I am greatly concerned that increasingly it is becoming the case that we're getting two tiers to our justice system: a justice system for the rich and a justice system for the poor.

The concern here, of course, is that we all want justice for all. I think all members in this House would want that. But how are we going to get justice for all if the poor cannot afford the expensive Bay Street lawyer or, for that matter, the expensive Sudbury lawyer? How are they going to have access to justice if they can't have access to our legal system and our legal profession?

I'm concerned that perhaps the Chief Justice of Canada's wary prophesy of last summer might come true. She said she doesn't want our justice system to become "a pretty ornament" put up on the shelf that we talk about and brag about when we talk about the just society of Canada. Yet at the same time, increasingly the poor are not getting access to our courts, perhaps access to new rights and responsibilities and benefits under the Limitations Act.

We know our legal aid system has been decimated. Last summer the president of the Canadian Bar Association said, "We've warned government that too many ... who need legal aid can't obtain it and don't have real access to justice." She said those warnings have been blatantly ignored. We heard from the Ontario legal aid plan about the cuts to legal aid and what that has meant. We are nearing a real crisis when it comes to legal aid and the provision of legal aid to refugees.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. Stop the clock. The members waited patiently while the Attorney General made his statement. They owe the same courtesy to the critic from the official opposition. Sorry for the interruption.

**Mr Bryant:** We're concerned about the fact that early next year—I don't know if you know this—we have a crisis looming with respect to legal aid for refugees. They're not going to get any representation. I don't know if I misheard the minister, but maybe he says that it's up to the feds to provide the funding. The people of Ontario don't want the federal government and the provincial government to be fighting each other; they want them to be fighting for them in our justice system, and we don't have that right now in Ontario.

**1400**

**Contingency fees:** This might be a means by which the poor might get access to justice. We should look at that, and I thought we were looking at that in the province of Ontario. Then we found out that this minister was backing away. On September 25, 2000, the headline of the Law Times reads, "Flaherty Flip-flops on Contingency Fees." The rationale is troubling, because the concern, I would have thought, would have been about the balance between access to justice and having a fair compensation system. Instead, on November 17, 2000, the minister provided his justification. Do you know what he said? Do you know why we're not getting contingency fees? Here's what he said: "Lawyers don't lobby enough. I tell you the other professional groups lobby a lot more than lawyers do, and 'lobby' is not a bad word." I don't know if in fact we should proceed with contingency fees, but I don't think we should not proceed with contingency fees because lawyers are bad lobbyists.

Lastly, the minister in his statement said that in fact there is unwavering support for victims on that side of the House. I would say to him that maybe instead of standing here and debating the Limitations Act, we could be standing here debating Bill 24, Mr Hoy's act that would provide for safe school buses; Bill 73, Mrs Papatello's act to crack down on raves; the Bartolucci bill, Bill 6, to crack down on johns; Bill 146, the Bartolucci bill to crack down on adult entertainment parlours or Bill 67 on phony guns.

All those bills I'm mentioning right now, are these bills provided by the government to look after victims? No. They're provided by Ontario Liberals. I call on the government to bring these bills forward for debate right now.

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** It is interesting that the Attorney General considers limitation periods to be the most pressing of justice issues at this time. I will acknowledge that there is a problem with respect to limitation periods, and I will acknowledge that this issue needs to be addressed.

I think the real issue here today is that the Attorney General brings forward pieces of proposed legislation like this in order to cover over and ignore the real access-to-justice issues that are out there.

Let me first of all refer to what is happening in legal aid. We know from talking to legal aid clinics, we know from talking to women's organizations and we know from talking to women's crisis shelters that there is a problem—no, not a problem, a recurring crisis in terms of women in this province being able to access legal aid so they can begin the legal process to escape relationships of abuse.

Over and over again, we know that women in this province are being forced to return to abusive situations because this Attorney General and this government refuse to make an investment in access to justice which will allow those women to access legal assistance so that they may begin to move out of an abusive situation.

What does the Attorney General have to say about that? Obviously, nothing. Access to justice for those

women doesn't count for him and doesn't count for this government.

Then we have the Dudley George family, who have been trying to access justice from this government for over five years now; the Dudley George family, who are asking for a commission of inquiry into how it is that an unarmed native man could be gunned down, and how it is that there is a chain of information connecting the Premier and the former Minister of Natural Resources to the death of Dudley George.

What does this Attorney General have to say about that access to justice? He says no: no inquest, no inquiry, no independent inquiry into what the events were that led to the death of this unarmed man. This is not access to justice; this is a travesty of justice.

The same Attorney General is party to a strategy that is going to attempt to bankrupt the George family as they try to get the information through a civil court. Is that access to justice? I don't think so. But if you're a friend of this government and if you have the money to pay for lobbying, this government is prepared to listen to you.

Then we have the Minister of Finance, who a little over a year ago shopped around personal information of thousands of Ontario citizens who happen to keep their bank accounts in the Province of Ontario Savings Office. This House found this government in contempt. Those people want access to justice. They want to know how it is that this government would shop around their personal information. Where is the Attorney General on that issue? Nowhere to be found. Those people had their personal information shopped around by this government in breach of the law, and this Attorney General pulls a disappearing act.

Then there is the issue of victims of crime. This is a government that among much paid-for propaganda, much ballyhoo, said they were putting forth a victims of crime act which would protect victims of crime. It went before a judge who had an opportunity to refer to and look at that particular act. Do you know what he said? He said the act put forward from this government in terms of the victims of crime was empty, superficial, superfluous. He said it did not do one substantive thing for victims of crime—in other words, no access to justice for victims of crime from this government.

The limitations bill is all about granting access to those who have the money. For those who don't have the money, this government is saying, "No access to justice for you."

## DEFERRED VOTES

### SOCIAL HOUSING REFORM ACT, 2000 LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉFORME DU LOGEMENT SOCIAL

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 128, An Act respecting social housing / Projet de loi 128, Loi concernant le logement social.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1407 to 1412.*

**The Speaker:** Mr Coburn has moved third reading of Bill 128, An Act respecting social housing.

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

#### Ayes

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

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

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	McGuinty, Dalton
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McMeekin, Ted
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Brown, Michael A.	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Bryant, Michael	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Christopherson, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Colle, Mike	Levac, David	Smitherman, George
Conway, Sean G.	Marchese, Rosario	
Cordiano, Joseph	Martin, Tony	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 54; the nays are 34.

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

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

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to allow for the singing of O Canada at the daily meetings of this House.

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

## LEGISLATIVE PAGES

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: As you know, the pages play an important role in the House, and today many of them travelled great distances in some very difficult weather to be here, in particular the page from Windsor West. It's

also his birthday today so we should all wish Andrew Spinner, the page from Windsor West, a happy birthday.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I want Sandra and the Speaker to sing Happy Birthday.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I think we'll leave it at that. If any of you have heard me sing, you wouldn't want me to sing anything, let alone Happy Birthday. My talents lie elsewhere.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question today is for the Minister of Health. Yesterday I exposed the fact that the Attorney General was attempting to give himself sweeping and unprecedented powers when it came to collecting personal information and, more specifically, confidential information found inside our medical records. I called this the J. Edgar Hoover clause. You also know that after I raised this issue, the Attorney General went into damage control and subsequently said that in fact your act is going to protect people from what he would like to do in his act.

Later yesterday afternoon we met with some of your legal advisers and they told us that the clause the Attorney General specifically referred to, section 6, in no way affords any protection to Ontarians, in no way prevents the prying eyes of the Attorney General from looking at our confidential medical records.

The way I see it, Madam Minister, you are the defender and the protector of confidential medical records here in Ontario. What are you going to do to make sure this Attorney General doesn't get his eyes on our confidential medical records?

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I think we made it quite clear yesterday that we were moving forward with the Personal Health Information Privacy Act into consultation, into committee, and everyone will have every opportunity possible to ensure that the legislation that comes forward protects personal health information and protects the collection, use and disclosure of that information. I would hope that you and your caucus would come forward in the spirit of co-operation. As you know, it was your federal colleagues who introduced Bill C-6 which, we have heard from our health stakeholders, is totally inappropriate for personal health information. So we need to introduce this legislation before the introduction—

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

**Mr McGuinty:** Again, Madam Minister, you are the protector and defender of the confidentiality that should exist between patients in Ontario and their doctors. You're the person who should stand up to the Attorney General and say, "No, not now, not ever, no way. You can't get your eyes on the medical records of Ontario patients."

1420

You're telling me your bill is going to go through some special process. That's fine and dandy. What are you going to do to protect us from him and his bill? It's not going through that kind of process. If you won't listen to your own lawyers, then listen to the legal counsel who provided you with a letter today, the legal counsel for the HIV and AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario:

"It has recently come to my attention that Bill 155 contains a provision which authorizes the Attorney General to collect personal information. It is clear that this provision would permit the Attorney General virtually unfettered access to any personal records, including health information held by virtually anyone. I can find nothing in either Bill 155—that's his bill—or Bill 159—that's your bill—which would serve as a check for accountability purposes on this discretion."

My question to you is, as the protector of medical records and patient-doctor confidentiality, what are you going to do to make sure his eyes don't get on our medical records?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** The Attorney General would like to answer the question.

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** As was explained yesterday, and I regret that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't made reference to section 6 of Bill 159, the way the system works is as follows, and I'm certainly satisfied with this, based on the discussion I've had with counsel in the Ministry of the Attorney General: personal information is referred to in section 19 of Bill 155. That is subject to section 6 of Bill 159, which deals with personal health information. By virtue of those sections, personal health information is excluded from section 19 of Bill 155. So that personal health information is not available to the Attorney General or any other minister, pursuant to section 19 of Bill 155.

**Mr McGuinty:** Minister, I'm going to ask that you take the time and go over your own bill very carefully. Take a look at subsection 19(4). It says the following: "A person ... shall ... despite any confidentiality provision of any other act, disclose the information to the Attorney General." This supersedes any other legislation in the province of Ontario, according to the way you have written it. What this says is that you don't have to consult the Minister of Health; you don't have to go to a court; you don't have to bring an application before a judge. All you need to do is have some suspicion about somebody and then suddenly you are automatically, by virtue of this J. Edgar Hoover clause, entitled to get access to confidential medical records.

I'm back to you, Madam Minister of Health. It is your responsibility to protect confidentiality that should exist between doctors and patients. I ask you the same question one more time on behalf of Ontario patients and our doctors: what are you going to do to make sure this Attorney General doesn't get his eyes on our records?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** The accusations and the interpretation made by the member opposite are inaccurate.

As I have indicated, under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, referred to in section 6 of Bill 159, which specifically deals with personal health information—I invite the Leader of the Opposition, who is a lawyer, to read section 6 of Bill 159, which specifically deals with personal health information. If he doesn't want to read it, if he wants to ignore the section, I can't do anything about that. But the way the system works would require that personal health information would not be available under Bill 155, not falling within the definition. The only access would be, as it is today, through a court order, the ministry having satisfied a judge that he or she should grant the order. That's the way the bills are drafted.

#### LABOUR LEGISLATION

##### **Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):**

My question is to the Premier. Ontario families today lead hectic, just-in-time lives. The Vanier Institute of the Family recently put out a report telling us that our families are suffering from family-time famine. Parents are having to live through a real time crunch.

I believe we should be doing whatever we can to find ways to help Ontario parents spend more time with their kids, and I thought, until recently, that you believed in the same kind of thing. Through Ontario's Promise you tell us that one of your promises is to help Ontario children develop a better ongoing relationship with their parents.

Why is it, then, if you truly believe that, if you truly believe it's important for parents to have more time rather than less time with their kids, that you are putting your stamp of approval on a law here in the province of Ontario that is going to require that parents spend 60 hours a week at work, away from their kids?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** Like most pieces of legislation around here—in fact, just about everything the Leader of the Opposition reads—he's wrong. The legislation is indeed in response to parents, to those who would like more flexibility in their working hours. There is absolutely no change in the number of hours before we get to overtime. There is no change to the maximum number of hours of overtime after 44—maximum number of hours, 48. There's no change at all to that.

What there is is flexibility for those parents who may have one spouse on shift work, whose kids may require more time one week than another. This flexibility is entirely voluntary. It's the exact opposite to what the member alludes. This legislation facilitates more time—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Supplementary.

**Mr McGuinty:** If only it was that simple, Premier. In 1944, this House passed a law in the province of Ontario saying they were going to cap the workweek at 48 hours. That was considered progressive at that time. If there has been any kind of trend since 50 years ago, it's been one toward reducing that workweek even further.

You can't say you're simply creating an option. What you're doing is putting your stamp of approval, your formal imprimatur, on a new law, and you're telling

Ontario families, and Ontario parents in particular, "I don't give a damn about what your kids think, but as far as I'm concerned, you parents can work 60 hours a week. It's OK if you spend 60 hours a week away from your kids."

Sixty hours a week means 12 hours a day. Add on a couple of hours every day for transportation and you leave the house at 7 o'clock in the morning and you're not back until 9 o'clock at night. If the kids are young, they're in bed by then. If they are older, they've been unsupervised for too long. Parents should have been at home helping out with homework, supervising team sports, and those kinds of things.

You say you are in favour of making sure parents in Ontario spend more time with their kids. That's a laudable objective. How can you reconcile that with the fact that you are giving your formal approval today in Ontario to a law that's going to make parents work 60 hours a week, 60 hours away from their kids?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Let me assure the member that not only won't I give my approval to that kind of law; if you're proposing it, I'll vote against it.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, I thought you had some empathy for the plight of Ontario families. I thought you understood what they go through, how they struggle day in and day out to make ends meet and to find success in life. I thought you understood how hard it is for parents to get that time that is so essential for them to spend with their kids. I thought you understood all of that. Certainly you like to give the impression that you understand that.

I want to know, then, very directly, do you think it's a good idea for parents in Ontario to spend 60 hours a week away from their kids? Throw in two hours of transportation every day and you're looking at 70 hours a week away from their kids. This is your law. You're saying it's their option, but we need to know how you feel about this. Tell us, because parents want to know: do you think it's a good idea for Ontario parents to spend 70 hours a week away from their kids?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Just as I believed individuals should be free to spend their own money their own way, I believe parents should be free to make that decision in their own way, in their own circumstances. So if parents would like to only work 20 hours one week, this legislation gives them the flexibility to do that without losing any pay.

What I am most astounded at and what I think Ontario families and parents should be shocked at is that you today stand in your place saying that you, a politician, the Legislature, should tell parents when to work, how many hours to work and where to work them. That is astounding to me. That is absolutely astounding, and that is something that we on this side of the House totally reject.

1430

#### WALKERTON TRAGEDY

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Premier. I think we would all agree that the citizens of Walkerton have been through hell

over the last seven months. As a result of the contaminated water, we know that seven people died. We know that 2,300 people became gravely ill. We know, because of credible reports, that people are still experiencing some illnesses that can't be explained. We know that hundreds of them face the prospect of long-term, chronic health problems.

They have written to you and asked that your government provide a comprehensive health study so that citizens of the community may have a greater understanding of the overall impact and of the future challenges they face. Premier, are you prepared to put together a comprehensive health study for the community, are you prepared to finance that health study, and are you prepared to involve the citizens of Walkerton in the design and implementation of that comprehensive health study?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** As I said this morning, yes, we think it's a good idea.

**Mr Hampton:** I'm glad to hear that, and I hope the Premier will be forthcoming on when this will begin to happen and the details of the design and implementation.

One of the other things they've asked for is that in view of the continuing uncertainty and the continuing anxiety over the water, in view of the fact that their water contains much higher concentrations of chlorine than any other drinking water in the province, they are asking a commitment of your government to continue to provide bottled water for at least a period of six months, because whatever the authorities or the officials may say, there is a continuing high level of anxiety over the water from the tap.

I'm asking you, Premier, for a commitment that your government will provide at least a six-month supply of bottled water for those Walkerton citizens who continue to have concerns over water quality. Will you do that?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Yes. As I said this morning, I think it's a good idea.

**Mr Hampton:** The third issue they are very much concerned about is the issue of a compensation package for Mr Koebel, the former general manager of the public utility and the water supply. Their concern is that before Mr Koebel gives his testimony to the inquiry, any payment to him frankly has the perception of hush money, that he should not be receiving a \$98,000 payment, whether for vacation pay or severance pay, unless and until he has testified before the inquiry.

Premier, your government has not hesitated in ordering municipalities to do things, school boards to do things and hospitals to do things. I'm asking you today to call the mayor and council of Brockton and ask them not to proceed with any kind of financial payments to Mr Koebel until he has provided his testimony to the inquiry. Will you do that, Premier?

**Hon Mr Harris:** As I have indicated, no decision has been made by the council. This is a municipal decision. I think you would agree with me on that front. I have heard that you don't think it's a good idea. You've heard, I think, any members on our side of the House don't think it's a good idea. Nonetheless, we're not privy to the type

of information that council is, whether there are contracts, what's involved there. But the city council is privy to that.

What I can assure you of is that certainly this is not something the province of Ontario is doing. While we are prepared to compensate Walkerton for a considerable amount of the expenditures, working with insurance companies, this is not one of the expenditures for which provincial dollars will be allocated.

## EMERGENCY SERVICES

### **Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):**

Another question for the Premier: I want to ask you about another health care crisis and one that is clearly connected to your government. Last night, if you needed an ambulance in the greater Toronto area you might as well have been on the moon, Premier. Some 95% of the hospitals in the greater Toronto area were turning away ambulances last night. Patients across the greater Toronto area were on the Harris highway to nowhere if they were trying to get into an emergency room.

What is really frightening, in fact what is terrifying, is that over half of these hospitals were on critical care bypass. Fifteen hospitals in the greater Toronto area were even turning away the most critically ill patients.

Premier, we're talking about life and death. In the middle of a snowstorm, where transportation is made that much more difficult, people shouldn't have to go across the city to get access to an emergency room. They shouldn't have to sit in an ambulance for two hours because they've already been turned away by two hospitals. Premier, when are you going to put an end to this crisis which is only getting worse? This is as a result of your government's policies. When are you going to listen to the advice you're getting and put an end to a situation that is only getting worse?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think the Minister of Health can answer.

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I would recommend to the leader of the third party that he also recognize the tremendous work that is being done by our health care professionals in emergency rooms. As you know, there have been tremendous strides made since 1998 in order to respond to our growing and aging population and to the increasing utilization of our emergency rooms. I think it is necessary that we commend and congratulate the tremendous progress. We have seen an increased co-operation among physicians, nurses, administrators and the ambulance sector. They have broken down the silos. They have done all they can in order to ensure that the \$725 million we have invested since 1998 is being spent to enhance front-line patient services.

**Mr Hampton:** The Minister of Health knows that her answer is balderdash. You know that the studies that have been done out there show that this is not a question of increasing utilization. This is your plan, and your plan is not working.

The Joshua Fleuelling inquest: it's almost been a year since Joshua Fleuelling died and the coroner's jury issued its verdict in his death. The coroner's jury said very clearly that your government had to take action before the end of the year. They instructed you to call an immediate moratorium on all hospital and hospital bed closures, and still you proceed with your plans: closing Women's College, closing Wellesley, closing North York Branson. Minister, you are playing Russian roulette with people's lives. Week after week this doesn't get better; it gets worse. Through September, October, November and now, 80% and 85% of GTA hospitals were turning away patients. Yes, doctors are doing wonderful work and nurses are doing wonderful work out there, but you're not doing your job. Do you agree with the coroner's inquest from the Fleuelling inquiry or don't you? And if you don't, please tell us what your alternative plan is before more lives are put at risk.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** In all fairness, if you're going to quote from the Fleuelling inquest and if you're going to quote from the jury's recommendations, I think you need to acknowledge the preamble, which clearly states: "We also learned that the problems currently being encountered in the delivery of health care services are not unique to this city or province but, in fact, are evident in many jurisdictions worldwide. They are systemic in nature and not easily solved. They have developed over a period of time."

1440

The good news is, and the leader of the third party refuses to acknowledge this, that we have moved forward in co-operation with our health care providers since 1998 because we are the first government that undertook a comprehensive review of the problems within the emergency rooms and the pressures that we experience. We have invested \$725 million, we have put in place APPs for physicians, we have hired more nurses, we have increased the amount of money for the ambulance sector—

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

#### WELFARE REFORM

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Premier.

Ontarians are saddened by your continuing, mean-spirited refusal to grant welfare recipients in Ontario a cost-of-living allowance. That position is so out of keeping with the sentiments you yourself expressed in this House almost eight years ago to the very day.

This is what you said when you stood on this side of the House. You said, "Let me hope that we can do better for you in 1993. For those who didn't get any increase in welfare payments this year, those on welfare, the most vulnerable in our society, found out today for the first time in the eleven and a half years since I've been elected that they'll get 0% next year. That really is a disgrace."

Premier, if it was a disgrace not to deliver an increase back then for 1993, what do you call it if you haven't given an increase in 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000? What do you call it then?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** What I call it is truly helping people. As long as your only program is to pay people to sit at home and do nothing, which even Premier Rae said was ludicrous—in fact it seems to me only the Liberals think this was a good idea. As I recall, this was Bob Rae's statement: "It is ludicrous to continue to pay people more and more money to sit home and do nothing; able-bodied people, capable people. There must be a better way." At least he recognized the problem, which was more than the Liberals have done.

We not only recognized the problem, we tackled the problem. There is a better way than having people become dependent upon a government paycheque. We are constantly looking at ways we can get more and more money into the hands of those who have been dependent upon our welfare rolls.

We do it by education, we do it by training, we do it by jobs, we do it by workfare—all policies that you have opposed. The success to date is close to 600,000 men, women and children who have broken that cycle of dependency that you and the NDP created.

**Mr McGuinty:** I've got to ask you, Premier, what happened to you? Back in 1992 you expressed such warm, powerful and compelling sentiments. You said it would be nothing less than a disgrace not to give people on welfare a cost-of-living allowance. You made those statements in this Legislature just prior to Christmas. It's only 20 feet from here to there, but you underwent a tremendous conversion of a very negative kind.

You're responsible for 100,000 children who find themselves on welfare in Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**Mr McGuinty:** The government members feel that this is somehow a matter of humour. We've got 100,000 kids in this province who are on welfare. The sole provider for those children are the members of this government. Whether those households have enough for toys at Christmas, food at home or winter clothing rests—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Sorry to interrupt. Stop the clock. Order. It's getting a little loud in here. I need to hear the question.

I apologize to the leader of the official opposition for having to get up. I couldn't hear him.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, you're responsible for over 100,000 children in Ontario who find themselves living in families who rely entirely on welfare for their subsistence. What it means is that the amount of money they have in their household, whether for food or for clothing or for toys at Christmas, is entirely your responsibility. It's of your doing. These kids need a little bit of help. You told us back in 1992 that you thought it was a disgrace we couldn't award an annual increase for people on welfare. They've gone some seven or eight years now without an increase. I ask you the same thing again: if it

was a disgrace when they missed it for one year, what is it if they miss it for—

**The Speaker:** The member's time is up.

**Hon Mr Harris:** I think the member will know that we are now up to 35% higher with our basic welfare rates than the rest of Canada. But we've done so many other things as well. For example, you point out that there are still 100,000 children who today are dependent on welfare. This is quite true and this is a figure that concerns us very much. However, since we've taken office, 250,000 children have come off the welfare rolls. So we've gone from 350,000 children on the welfare rolls to 100,000 children on the welfare rolls. We did it by bringing in policies you opposed. The Scarborough members in your caucus particularly opposed them very vigorously.

In spite of that, 250,000 children have come off the welfare rolls, for which you seem to be so proud to create this dependency. The leader of the Liberal Party thought it was important to tell those at home watching on TV that some members in this House were laughing. They were; they were laughing at you, sir. They're laughing at your ridiculous policies, your silly suggestions and your refusal—

**The Speaker:** Order. The Premier's time is up.

#### ORGAN AND TISSUE DONATION

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** My question is also for the Premier. When I was reading yesterday's Toronto Star, I was confused to see some concerns they portrayed regarding organ donation in Ontario. As you may recall, the son of one of the my members of staff has recently undergone a successful kidney transplant. Premier, can you please tell the members of this House what actions the government has taken, given all the work you have done, to increase organ donations?

*Interjections.*

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I'm sorry the member from Scarborough-Agincourt and the member from High Park seem to think it is silly that the number of people on waiting lists for organ transplants—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The Premier has to answer the question that was asked him.

**Hon Mr Harris:** Interjections were coming across the floor, and since I have the floor I thought it important we answer that as well.

With regard to the member's question, I too was quite surprised to read the report in the Toronto Star, given that this has been a top priority for the government. No mention seemed to be made of that, that we committed in the throne speech of 1999 to set up a task force, that we set that up in January 2000, that we have accepted the recommendations of that task force.

Quite frankly, the report I saw in the Toronto Star erroneously reported a number of things that simply are factually not correct. I'm surprised. I've sent them a copy of the report. I'm sorry the Toronto Star missed that, along with the dollars that have been allocated. We have gone from a jurisdiction—

**The Speaker:** Order. The Premier's time is up.

**Mr Stewart:** Thank you, Premier. This is such an important initiative that I compliment anybody who's involved with it. The article suggests that cost is one disincentive to organ donation in Ontario. I understood the government had a plan to help facilitate more tissue and organ donations in the province of Ontario. Could you tell us what that plan is?

**Hon Mr Harris:** That is true. The reason I guess the Toronto Star knows that is because the report identified that, the importance of having an independent study to identify those barriers to organ donation. That clearly was one of the key ones there. We recently have announced increased funding for organ and tissue donation transplantation, over \$120 million by 2005, and new legislation, as you know, that we committed to bring forward. A key component of this is to reimburse hospitals for the cost of these transplants so that instead of being a disincentive it will now hopefully be an incentive.

In addition, another key recommendation was that we provide training and dollars for training for professionals in the hospital. The report noted that was one of the things that should be done. They would only know that probably from our report as well.

As I said, we have allocated these dollars. It's a top priority for us. We are sending a copy of the report—

**The Speaker:** New question.

1450

#### WELFARE REFORM

**Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):** My question is to the Premier. Earlier in questioning from my leader, you acknowledged that there are 100,000 kids living on social assistance today in the province of Ontario, and we would all agree that's too many. The reality is that there are.

Yesterday you brought your little empty red wagon express of Ontario's Promise to St James Town, ground zero in the war on poverty, in my riding of Toronto Centre-Rosedale.

I want to ask you a question, Premier. If you really want to do something to help those 100,000 kids living on social assistance in the province of Ontario today, will you stand before us today and tell us that your government will end today its awful clawback of dollars that the federal government has directed toward the poorest kids in our province and allow 100,000 children living on social assistance in Ontario to have the full benefit of federal government dollars in their pockets to deal with the poverty that they face every single day? Will you, Premier?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think the minister can respond.

**Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs):** In the design of the national child benefit supplement, the federal government, working with the provinces, established a benefit that was flexible in vari-

ous parts of the country, and this was tremendously important. We do a lot for families on social assistance, but we don't do enough for the working poor, those people with low and modest incomes. That's why in the design of the program we were very clear. We wanted to ensure that we provided a helping hand up.

Having these low- and modest-income families who can realize the benefit of moving from welfare to work, together with the Ontario child care supplement for working families, has been one of the very important reasons for more than a quarter of a million children being able to—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. Sorry to interrupt the minister. I can't hear when there are conversations. I know it's reasonably lighthearted, but I can't hear when they're going across. I apologize to the Minister of Community and Social Services. I don't know if he was done. He had a couple of more seconds if he needs them. No? Supplementary.

**Mr Smitherman:** Speaker, you couldn't hear him, but I was listening carefully and unfortunately I could. The answer from that minister and from that government is that they're quite content to see those children who are living on social assistance get nothing.

The word from the Premier yesterday in answer to the question was to talk about these generous benefits. I want to ask the government the question, and I want to ask that minister in particular: before you stand up one more time and tell us all that you're doing for those people who are living on social assistance, name a family you know and love that you would dare to stand in front of and say, "You receive a very generous benefit, and money that is directed to you ought not be provided to you." Name them, Minister.

**Hon Mr Baird:** I'm not going to stand in my place and suggest for one moment that living on social assistance in this province or in any province in the country is something that would be generous and something that we would want to encourage. What I would say very directly to the honourable member is that we are working exceptionally hard to rededicate our efforts to eliminate poverty in this province, to create jobs, to provide the supports so that people can realize the dignity that comes with a job, to give them a hand up, to give them supports, to give them more training, to give them more child care, to give them more transportation allowances, to give them more opportunity. As long as there's one single child in this province living in poverty, it's one child too many, and that's why we are rededicating our efforts. But I will tell the member opposite—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Last warning, guys.

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** You guys are too warm and fuzzy for me.

**The Speaker:** There we go. Last warning for the member for Windsor West. When I stand up, you can't just continue to yell across. It's almost like I'm not even here when you say it. This has got to be your last warn-

ing. I'm sorry, but I can't continue to do it. I know it's lighthearted today, but we can't continue on when you're doing that, especially when I'm standing. I'm afraid it's going to have to be your last warning.

Minister of Community and Social Services.

**Hon Mr Baird:** I would also say to my Liberal friends across the road that this is a policy that Jean Chrétien, this federal government, agreed to. This is the whole process in which this policy was designed, and every single Liberal MP from Ontario voted yes. They said this was a good policy, to provide more supports to those working families with low and modest incomes. We're not going to turn our backs on those families. We're going to continue to provide that helping hand up. We're going to continue to help provide people with the tools they need to get—

**The Speaker:** Order. The minister's time is up.

## TOURISM

**Mrs Julia Munro (York North):** My question is for the Minister of Tourism. During a recent interview with Thunder Bay's CBQ-FM radio, the president of the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association stated, "Quebec is doing a better job than Ontario of selling its snowmobile tourism."

Tourism is big business in my area of York North. Snowmobiling generates additional revenues for local businesses during the winter season, when it's most needed. Minister, what are you doing to promote snowmobiling in Ontario?

**Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister of Tourism):** I want to thank the member for her question and reassure her that this province has committed over \$170 million to market tourism and to market our province as a premier four-season destination.

It is true that Quebec has an excellent snowmobile trail system, but we have 49,000 kilometres of trail here, 15,000 more than the province of Quebec.

I also want to share with her the fact that our ministry has partnered with the Northern Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership in northern Ontario. We've transferred about \$3.2 million so that they can market winter activities throughout the entire province for us.

They expect to reach about 7.5 million households with information in snowmobile magazines, in newspaper inserts in the shoulder states and in our neighbouring provinces. We're also partnering with a \$60,000 television promotion program with the New VR to promote Ontario as a great winter destination.

**Mrs Munro:** Minister, it's estimated that 250,000 visitors come to Ontario each year for a snowmobile vacation and that winter travel from the US to Canada is projected to grow significantly in 2001. What are you doing to ensure the sustainability of the trails so that they are safe and in good condition, so that we can continue to attract a growing number of visitors?

**Hon Mr Jackson:** The province recognizes that the snowmobile industry alone brings in about \$22 million

worth of revenue to our province, so it's good business to promote this and to make sure it's safe and that our trails are well groomed. Our government has made a commitment that before Christmas we hope to have second reading of Bill 101, an act to improve the sustainability and safety of Ontario's snowmobile trails.

This is a major undertaking, and we're convinced that with additional resources, with commitment to improving the quality of our trails and expanding them, we will be able to demonstrate to North America that this is the premier location to do snowmobiling in North America.

We're partnered with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs, which developed the top trail guide, which gives useful safety tips, and we want to acknowledge the leadership of that association in promoting for recreational use and for tourism the great sport of snowmobiling.

#### ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Premier. There is great concern in northeastern Ontario that your government is going to announce that you're going to radically downsize the ONTC, the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, that you're going to discontinue the Northlander and that you're dramatically going to reduce the contribution the ONTC makes to the northeastern Ontario economy.

Premier, you are the one elected government member north of the French River. I'm asking you, as a member of this Legislature from northern Ontario, to give your commitment that your government is not going to dramatically downsize the ONTC, that you're not going to discontinue the Northlander and that you're going to continue to ensure that the ONTC plays a vital transportation and economic role in northeastern Ontario. As the government member for northeastern Ontario, are you prepared to make those commitments today?

1500

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think the member is aware that the ONTC itself has commissioned a study to take a look at how they can improve services and see services improve to those in northeastern Ontario. The consultant has made some recommendations, which the commission has made public and forwarded on to the government. They rest now with the Minister of Northern Development. The minister, I believe, is planning to be in North Bay, which is the head office of the ONTC, tomorrow to discuss the government's response to the recommendations.

What I can tell the member is that there are a couple of key priorities that we will bear in mind in any decision we make. Number one is that we are concerned about improving the passenger and freight service that is provided to northeastern Ontario. We have to look at how that may be done. We'll have to bear the report in mind. The second—

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

**Mr Hampton:** I heard a lot of rambling there, so I'm going to ask the question again. First, we're asking for a commitment that the Northlander will not be discontinued and will not be downsized. Second, we're asking for a commitment that the ONTC in general will not be downsized, that it will continue to make the same contribution in terms of transportation and in terms of jobs and economic activity that it makes now. Can you make those specific commitments, Premier, as the only elected government member from northeastern Ontario?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Quite frankly, we're not prepared to accept the paltry level of commitment that the ONTC makes now. We think freight rates are substantially too high. Many customers in northern Ontario have told us this. They have told us that service is not what it should be. I'm actually shocked that you, as the leader of the New Democratic Party, which actually still has members in northeastern Ontario—don't ask me why, but it still does—are now advocating that that level of service is OK, that it is enough, that we shouldn't be aggressively trying to improve that level of service, lower freight rates, be more responsive, so we can have even more jobs in northeastern Ontario. That's the goal of this government; that's the goal of our minister. I hope, like on a number of issues, your members from northeastern Ontario disagree with you.

#### ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY

**Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London):** My question today is for the Minister of Health. It's regarding the looming crisis facing the animal health lab at the University of Guelph. This is the Ontario centre for animal disease control. It monitors and investigates outbreaks, safeguarding the public against such deadly diseases as the West Nile virus, mad cow disease and E coli. Funded jointly by the university and the Ministry of Agriculture, the centre is the key to ensuring public health and food safety.

Incredibly, your government seems to have forgotten some very important lessons about safeguarding public health and food safety. The lab services division has already been cut by 20% in 1997. Now another \$5 million to \$7 million has come out of the OMAFRA-university agreement. This centre is in grave danger of again having its budget cut, diminishing its effectiveness and jeopardizing public safety.

Minister, have you learned nothing from Walkerton? It's your duty and your responsibility as the Minister of Health to be the guardian of public health in this province. How can you sit by as your cabinet colleagues endanger the health of our citizens and the safety of our food?

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** The Minister of Agriculture would like to respond.

**Hon Ernie Hardeman (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** I'm glad the member had the opportunity to visit the animal health laboratory in Guelph to see the good work that goes on there. I trust that you were impressed with the scope of the services and the high-calibre analysis carried out by the technical expertise of the staff. I'd like to point out to the member that the level of diagnostic testing at the animal health laboratory has not been reduced. Current funding is over \$5 million, as it has been since 1997, and there are no plans to change that level of funding.

**Mr Peters:** This is really unbelievable, you know? Last week we asked the Minister of the Environment about safe drinking water. He sloughed the question off to the Minister of Agriculture. Today we ask the Minister of Health about public health and public safety, and she sloughs it off to the Minister of Agriculture. I ask again, has this government learned nothing from the Walkerton tragedy? Do you not realize that what it takes to prevent such a tragedy from happening is that those people are in place?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. We need to hear the question. Sorry for the interruption.

**Mr Peters:** We're talking, Minister—it should be the Minister of Health—about public health, food safety and the potential for the outbreak of life-threatening diseases like mad cow disease and E coli if this centre's budget is cut once again. Your government, Premier and Minister of Agriculture, is putting public health and food safety at risk, all because of your ideological addiction to cost-cutting. Is waiting for the first death in Ontario from one of these diseases your answer for action? Minister, will you ensure that there will be no more cuts? This lab must have increased funding to ensure the well-being of all Ontarians. Will your government stop and learn from Walkerton? Will you guarantee that this lab will receive every publicly funded dollar necessary to do its job? Will you guarantee, Minister, that there will be a capital commitment to ensure that the technology that exists within that lab is first-class and they're not having to continue to buy used equipment like they are right now?

**Hon Mr Hardeman:** I find it somewhat interesting that the member opposite would suggest some impropriety in having a question that relates to the animal health laboratory answered by the Minister of Agriculture. I find that rather passing strange.

I want to say that the laboratory has been doing a business review this June to increase the effectiveness of the laboratory's testing program. The goal of this review is to improve the quality of the testing expertise and service to better meet the needs of veterinarians and live-stock and poultry producers. As part of this review, provisions were not reduced, as the member indicates, but relocated from Kemptville and Ridgetown to the main laboratory in Guelph. In addition to this, internal funding for Ontario's veterinary services program has increased by 35% over the past year. This increase reflects the increased commitment to animal health outbreak management and surveillance.

I thank the member opposite for visiting the laboratory and for asking the question today so the people of Ontario will know the improvements that we have made to the animal health laboratories in the province of Ontario.

#### GRAPE AND WINE INDUSTRY

**Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls):** My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Minister, a few weeks ago and in fact several times now in this assembly I've asked you about the status of the wine trade between the European Union and Ontario. As the minister knows, and most members of the assembly should know, we continually are denied access to the European Union for our wines, despite the fact we've passed legislation including the VQA, which assures quality standards. At the time, Minister, you didn't seem very optimistic about the situation with the European Union; however, I understand there's been some progress made between the European Union and Ontario specifically regarding Ontario icewines that carry VQA approval. Could you please share with the House what has come to pass in the past few weeks and how it may change things for Ontario's icewine makers?

**Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations):** I thank the member from Niagara Falls for the question. I am pleased to say that there does seem to be some progress on this issue. Our government had planned to begin an advertising campaign this week to let wine consumers know that Ontario, through the LCBO, is the largest purchaser of European wine in the world. Last year alone we bought almost \$400 million of EU products, while Europe has virtually closed the door on our world-class, award-winning wines. Our intent was to encourage consumers to consider this lack of fairness in their holiday purchase decisions. However, we've postponed our advertising based on a communication indicating that the European Union is now ready to open the door to Ontario icewines. The issue is now in the hands of the federal government.

*Applause.*

**Mr Maves:** That sounds somewhat encouraging. It sounds like the Ontario government and our winemakers, and of course our grape growers, have done a great job in pushing this fight for fair treatment to a successful conclusion. But I want to caution my colleagues on my side of the aisle for their applause, because at the end of your statement you made reference to the federal government. We haven't had the greatest of experiences with the federal government on assistance with this issue.

Could you please explain how the federal government is involved in this issue and what assurances you have received from them that they will make sure the progress Ontario has made to date will not be lost?

1510

**Hon Mr Runciman:** I believe this breakthrough agreement could be announced as early as next week, when the president of the European Union visits Canada. The European Union offer is now in the hands of the

federal government, and I'm hoping to speak with federal ministers later today or tomorrow to encourage their support. Because of our government's efforts and the support of Ontario's wine producers and grape growers, we've been able to make significant headway in negotiations with the European Union. I sincerely hope that the federal government doesn't allow, for whatever reason, this golden opportunity to slip away.

#### CHILDREN'S SERVICES

**Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** My question was intended for the Premier.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I think his books are still here; we'll just take a quick moment.

You may proceed.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Premier, today a report by UNICEF again confirms that your government, not business, needs to invest in Ontario's children. This report specifically mentions the Early Years Study and its call for a provincial program for early childhood development that would be as important to preparing the children of Ontario for success as are the elementary and secondary school systems. UNICEF states that government leaders seem blinded to the one investment that almost guarantees returns: ensuring children a good start in life.

It's time for action. Numerous recent reports have highlighted the pressing need for programs to support children. I have them here and I will deliver them to you. They include UNICEF's *The State of the World's Children 2000*; child poverty in Ontario, the *Urban Aboriginal Child Poverty* report; *You Bet I Care!*, a survey of child care centres in Canada; the *Education Improvement Commission* report; and your own *Early Years Study*. When are you going to listen? When will you act to implement affordable, quality early child development programs in Ontario?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I really appreciate the question. I find a couple of things, though, that I would comment on.

There is one United Nations study that says poverty is down substantially in the province of Ontario, particularly for children, as the child study and others indicate. Many of them credit the government of Ontario and policy changes and programs we've brought in for this improvement.

The second thing is, I was a little surprised that the same UN study held out the model of Cuba as an example. The last time I checked, not too many families are rushing out of Ontario trying to get into Cuba.

Nonetheless, let me say that a large part of our agenda right from day one, in the Common Sense Revolution, were numerous Head Start programs. In our very first budget, even with an \$11-billion deficit, were numerous Head Start programs to assist those kids who are at risk, so we have targeted our resources in that area and continue to do so. Obviously we reject—

**The Speaker:** Order. The Premier's time is up. Supplementary.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Last week, the Education Improvement Commission released its final report. To no one's surprise, the report confirmed yet again that your government needs to do more for Ontario's children. The first recommendation of the first chapter is that your government should strengthen its commitment to early child development by ensuring access to affordable, quality child care. Your support of Ontario's children, the challenge fund, is conditional on the participation of the business community. The Ontario Liberal Party and Dalton McGuinty believe that our children should have the unconditional support of the government.

The federal government has committed to the children of Ontario over \$800 million for the next five years in the early childhood development accord. You have been challenged to match those dollars and you have been silent. Your \$30-million challenge fund is a lot less than the \$800 million, and that \$30 million has been announced and re-announced and is still sitting in the bank.

Premier, Ontario's parents are tired of ribbon cutting. It's time to act. Will you commit today to use the \$800 million from the federal government for new children's programs, and will you match that money dollar for dollar?

**Hon Mr Harris:** You're quite right. After we led the way in the first ministers' conferences two years in a row, we finally did get the federal government to commit a few dollars to the Early Years Study. They didn't do it, though, until the campaign, and we haven't seen details of it. If it's the same as their universal child care program, we probably won't see a cent of it, but we do applaud at least mention of it in the last campaign, if no dollars in the previous years.

Since we've taken office, we have brought in numerous programs, including the Early Years Study and the challenge fund, as you mentioned. We've brought in a number of tax initiatives; you know our tax cuts are aimed primarily at low-income Ontarians, to help those children with lower incomes. *Healthy Babies, Healthy Children*; *Better Beginnings*—as you have heard, the list goes on and on.

**The Speaker:** Order. The Premier's time is up.

New question. The member for Durham.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Minister of Labour. I'm going to talk to him. I appreciate your help. I don't need your comments when I do something in here. I hear you yelling out. It's not going to be acceptable. I'm stopping the clock. I'm the Speaker now. I'm going to make the decisions.

And I say to the member for Niagara Centre, he is going to get the question in. As you know, on a lot of occasions, including yesterday, I worked hard for the member for Toronto-Danforth to get the question. He is going to get the question.

The member for Durham.

## HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. It's so seldom that I get to speak in the House. My question is for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. People didn't do that to your member at the end. We don't want to get into that. He still had the time; he's still going to get the question. I'd appreciate it if we wouldn't bang the desks because I say this in all sincerity: I do work hard to get down to your questions, and a lot of days I could have not had them.

The member for Durham, to ask the question.

**Mr O'Toole:** Minister, as I travelled across northern Ontario this summer on government committee business, I was so impressed with how beautiful the province is and also recognized the great distances that are involved. I'm sure in your extensive travels throughout the north in your role as Minister of Northern Development and Mines you're very much aware of the great distances and the inconveniences for communities that have to travel long distances to make connections. It's essential that our roads are safe and reliable, as should all infrastructure be. The harsh climate in northern Ontario can cause increasing wear and tear on our roads and further impact transportation costs. Road conditions, as you know, could impact everything from the economy to essential services in Ontario. As the minister responsible for the north, what steps have you taken to ensure that northerners have highway systems that make it possible to overcome these challenges?

**Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** I'm pleased to have a chance to respond to the member for Durham and his question. I'll let the record stand. The Peterson Liberals, in their five years in office, invested a total of \$420 million in northern Ontario highways. The Bob Rae government in their five years, with a guy like Gilles Bisson pushing for the dollars, did increase it to \$611 million. But under the Mike Harris government, there was not \$600 million but \$950 million, including the four-laning of Highway 11, the four-laning of Highway 69 and moving 69 south of Sudbury; and major investments, for example Highway 502 in Dryden.

In northern Ontario now, under Mike Harris, there are two seasons: there's the winter season and there's the construction season.

1520

## PETITIONS

## DOCTOR SHORTAGE

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** This is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas patients requiring eye care in Niagara are faced with a shortage of ophthalmologists and, as a

result, are compelled to wait several weeks to secure an appointment with an ophthalmologist;

"Whereas Niagara patients who require potentially vision-saving eye surgery have to, in many cases, wait for several months to have that surgery scheduled;

"Whereas, while the shortage of ophthalmologists is occurring, the removal of billing caps on these medical specialists provides a temporary but essential easing of the health care crisis;

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Health's solution of removing the exemptions of the billing cap and forcing patients from Niagara to travel along the very busy Queen Elizabeth Highway to receive treatment in Hamilton is unacceptable;

"Whereas Dr Jeffrey Sher, chief of eye surgery at Hamilton Health Sciences Corp, has written to the Minister of Health informing her that Hamilton does not have a sufficient number of practising ophthalmologists to handle additional cases from Niagara;

"Be it resolved that the Ontario Ministry of Health remove the cap on billing for ophthalmologists in Niagara until such time as Niagara is no longer an underserved area."

I affix my signature, as I am in full agreement.

## SAFE DRINKING WATER LEGISLATION

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth):** I continue to get petitions urging the government to pass into law the Safe Drinking Water Act. 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 will affix my signature to this because I fully support the petition.

## NOISE BARRIER

**Mr Wayne Wetlaufer (Kitchener Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the construction, in spring 2001, of a flyover at the intersection of Highway 8 and Conestoga Parkway in Kitchener will generate a high level of traffic noise for the residents in the Wilfred and Dellroy Avenue area, we the undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That a noise barrier be erected from the intersection of Highway 8 and Conestoga Parkway on the east side, south of Highway 8, for a distance of approximately a half-mile, more or less, to give noise relief to the residents on that side of the highway.”

I affix my signature.

## SAFE STREETS LEGISLATION

**Mr Dave Levac (Brant):** I have a petition regarding Bill 64 and the Safe Streets Act.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas charities such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada, Goodfellows, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, firefighters and many others participate in fundraisers on streets, sidewalks and parking lots;

“Whereas the Safe Streets Act, 1999, effectively bans these types of activities, putting police forces in the position of ignoring the law or hindering legitimate charities; and

“Whereas charitable organizations are dependent on these fundraisers to raise much-needed money ...;

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

“We ask that the government of Ontario amend provincial legislation by passing Bill 64, the Safe Streets Amendment Act, 2000, to allow charitable organizations to conduct fundraising campaigns on roadways, sidewalks and parking lots.”

I affix my name to these signatures with pride.

## RENT REGULATION

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** I’ve got petitions from many concerned citizens around this issue. It reads:

“Whereas the annual rent increase guideline for multi-unit residential dwellings in Ontario increases every year more than the rate of inflation and more than the cost-of-living increase for most tenants;

“Whereas no new affordable rental housing is being built by the private sector, despite the promise that the implementation of vacancy decontrol in June 1998 would encourage new construction;

“Whereas one in four tenants pays over 50% of their income on rent, over 100,000 people on the waiting list for social housing, and homelessness has increased as a result of unaffordable rents;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to implement an immediate province-wide freeze on rents which will stop all guideline increases, above-guideline increases and increases to maximum rent for all sitting tenants in Ontario for a period of at least two years.”

I support this strongly and my name goes on this petition.

## REGISTRATION OF VINTAGE CARS

**Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):** I have a number of petitions in support of Bill 99, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act with respect to number plates for historic vehicles. In fact, I’ve had a number of constituents contact my office in support of this legislation.

“Whereas there are many Ontarians who have a passion for perfection in the restoration of vintage vehicles; and

“Whereas unlike many other jurisdictions, Ontario vintage automobile enthusiasts are unable to register their vehicles using the original year of manufacture licence plates; and

“Whereas Durham MPP John R. O’Toole and former MPP John Parker have worked together to recognize the desire of vintage car collectors to register their vehicles using vintage plates; and

“Whereas the Honourable David Turnbull as Minister of Transportation has the power to change the existing regulation;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows: to pass Bill 99 or to amend the Highway Traffic Act to be used on vintage automobiles.”

I support this legislation and hereby affix my signature to these petitions.

## SAFE STREETS LEGISLATION

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas charities such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada, Goodfellows, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, firefighters and many others participate in fundraisers on streets, sidewalks and parking lots; and

“Whereas the Safe Streets Act, 1999, effectively bans these types of activities, putting police forces in the position of ignoring the law or hindering legitimate charities; and

“Whereas charitable organizations are dependent on these fundraisers to raise much-needed money and awareness;

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

“We ask that the government of Ontario amend provincial legislation by passing Bill 64, the Safe Streets Amendment Act, 2000”—standing in the name of Bruce Crozier—“to allow charitable organizations to conduct

fundraising campaigns on roadways, sidewalks and parking lots.”

This is signed by many of my constituents from Spanish and by Spanish’s favourite son, Brent St Denis.

#### DIABETES TREATMENT

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

I’m very pleased to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

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

“We are suggesting that all diabetic supplies as prescribed by an endocrinologist or a medical doctor be covered under the Ontario health insurance plan.

“Diabetes costs Canadian taxpayers a bundle. It is the leading cause of hospitalization in Canada. Some people with diabetes simply cannot afford the ongoing expense of managing diabetes. They cut corners to save money. They rip test strips in half, cut down on the number of times they test their blood and even reuse lancets and needles. These budget-saving measures can often have disastrous health care consequences;

“Persons with diabetes need and deserve financial assistance to cope with the escalating cost of managing diabetes. We think it is in all Ontarians’ and the government’s best interest to support people with diabetes with the supplies that each individual needs to obtain the best glucose control possible. As you all know, good control reduces or eliminates kidney failure by 50%, blindness by 76%, nerve damage by 60%, cardiac disease by 35% and even amputations. Just think how many dollars can be saved by the Ministry of Health if diabetics had a chance to gain optimum glucose control.”

I affix my signature.

1530

#### SAFE STREETS LEGISLATION

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas charities such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada, the Goodfellows, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, firefighters and many others participate in fundraisers on streets, sidewalks and parking lots; and

“Whereas the Safe Streets Act, 1999 effectively bans these types of activities, putting police forces in the position of ignoring the law or hindering legitimate charities; and

“Whereas charitable organizations are dependent on these fundraisers to raise much-needed money and awareness;

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

“We ask that the government of Ontario amend provincial legislation by passing Bill 64, the Safe Streets Amendment Act, 2000, in the name of Mr Crozier from Essex, to allow charitable organizations to conduct fund-

raising campaigns on roadways, sidewalks and parking lots.”

It’s signed by a number of petitioners from Blenheim, Leamington, Tilbury and Chatham, and I affix my name to this petition.

#### PROTECTION OF MINORS

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

“Whereas children are exposed to sexually explicit material in variety stores and video rental outlets;

“Whereas bylaws vary from city to city and have failed to protect minors from unwanted exposure to sexually explicit material;

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

“To enact legislation which will:

“Create uniform standards in Ontario to prevent minors from being exposed to sexually explicit material in retail establishments;

“Make it illegal to sell, rent, or loan sexually explicit materials to minors.”

I’m pleased to affix my signature to this petition.

#### SAFE STREETS LEGISLATION

**Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas charities such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada, the Goodfellows, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, firefighters and many others participate in fundraisers on streets, sidewalks and parking lots; and

“Whereas the Safe Streets Act, 1999 effectively bans these types of activities, putting police forces in the position of ignoring the law or hindering legitimate charities; and

“Whereas charitable organizations are dependent on these fundraisers to raise money and awareness;

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

“We ask the government of Ontario to amend provincial legislation by passing Bruce Crozier’s Bill 64, the Safe Streets Amendment Act, 2000, to allow charitable organizations to conduct fundraising campaigns on roadways, sidewalks and parking lots and we ask that all members in the Ontario government, including members of the Tory Conservative caucus, support this legislation.”

I hereby affix my signature.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I have a petition here from a number of people from the community of Kapuskasing and it reads as follows:

“Whereas the northern Ontario health travel grant offers a reimbursement of partial travel costs at a rate of 30.4 cents per kilometre one way for northerners forced to travel for cancer care while travel policy for southerners who travel for cancer care features full reimbursement costs for travel, meals and accommodation;

“Whereas a cancer tumour knows no health travel policy or geographic location;

“Whereas a recently released Oracle research poll confirms that 92% of Ontarians support equal health travel funding;

“Whereas northern Ontario residents pay the same amount of taxes and are entitled to the same access to health care and government services and inherent civil rights as residents living elsewhere in the province;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to fund full travel expenses for northern Ontario cancer patients and eliminate the health care apartheid which exists presently in the province of Ontario.”

#### REGISTRATION OF VINTAGE CARS

**Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale):** It is a true example that these petitions do make a difference because, as I understand, it might be because of these petitions that a new bill comes through, and I'm sure you'll be happy to support that. This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas there are many Ontarians who have a passion for perfection in the restoration of vintage vehicles; and

“Whereas unlike many other jurisdictions, Ontario vintage automobile enthusiasts are unable to register their vehicles using the original year of manufacture licence plates; and

“Whereas Durham MPP John R. O'Toole”—a good colleague of mine—“and former MPP John Parker have worked together to recognize the desire of vintage car collectors to register their vehicles using vintage plates; and

“Whereas the Honourable David Turnbull as Minister of Transportation has the power to change the existing regulation;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows: to pass Bill 99 or to amend the Highway Traffic Act to be used on vintage automobiles.”

I'm happy to sign my name to it and I'm going to pass this on to a good page here, Geoff.

#### SAFE STREETS LEGISLATION

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex):** I have petitions here from Huron-Bruce, Sarnia-Lambton, Bruce-Grey, Waterloo-Wellington, Lanark-Carleton, Oxford, Lambton-Kent, Kenora-Rainy River, Parry Sound-Muskoka and Nickel Belt, addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas charities such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada, Goodfellows, the Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, firefighters and many others participate in fundraisers on streets, sidewalks and parking lots;

“Whereas the Safe Streets Act, 1999 effectively bans these types of activities, putting police forces in the position of ignoring the law or hindering legitimate charities; and

“Whereas charitable organizations are dependent on these fundraisers to raise much-needed money and awareness;

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

“We ask that the government of Ontario amend provincial legislation by passing Bill 64, the Safe Streets Amendment Act, 2000, standing in the name of Mr Crozier, to allow charitable organizations to conduct fundraising campaigns on roadways, sidewalks and parking lots.”

In support, I affix my signature and ask James to deliver it to the Clerk.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### CORRECTIONS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2000

##### LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RESPONSABILISATION EN MATIÈRE DE SERVICES CORRECTIONNELS

Resuming the debate adjourned on November 29, 2000, on the motion for second reading of Bill 144, An Act to establish accountability in correctional services, to make offenders demonstrate that they are drug-free, to set rules for offenders to earn their release, to give the Board of Parole a say in earned release decisions, and to change the name of the Board of Parole / Projet de loi 144, Loi visant à instituer la responsabilisation au sein des services correctionnels, à obliger les délinquants à démontrer qu'ils ne font pas usage de substances intoxicantes, à fixer les règles que doivent suivre les délinquants pour mériter leur libération, à permettre à la Commission des libérations conditionnelles d'intervenir dans les décisions en matière de libération méritée et à changer le nom de la Commission des libérations conditionnelles.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** Pursuant to the order of the House dated December 4, 2000, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Sampson has moved second reading of Bill 144, An Act to establish accountability in correctional services, to make offenders demonstrate that they are drug-free, to set rules for offenders to earn their release, to

give the Board of Parole a say in earned release decisions, and to change the name of the Board of Parole.

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

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will 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 1537 to 1542.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour will rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Guzzo, Garry J.	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Harris, Michael D.	Runciman, Robert W.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hodgson, Chris	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Snobelen, John
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Johns, Helen	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Johnson, Bert	Stewart, R. Gary
Cunningham, Dianne	Kells, Morley	Stockwell, Chris
DeFaria, Carl	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Marland, Margaret	Tilson, David
Ecker, Janet	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
Elliott, Brenda	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Eves, Ernie L.	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Flaherty, Jim	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan	Young, David

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

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	McGuinty, Dalton
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McMeekin, Ted
Brown, Michael A.	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Christopherson, David	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Churley, Marilyn	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Kormos, Peter	Smitherman, George
Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David	
Cordiano, Joseph	Marchese, Rosario	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 54; the nays are 31.

**The Acting Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated December 4, 2000, the bill is ordered for third reading.

### EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT, 2000

#### LOI DE 2000 SUR LES NORMES D'EMPLOI

Resuming the debate adjourned on December 7, 2000, on the motion for second reading of Bill 147, An Act to revise the law related to employment standards / Projet de loi 147, Loi portant révision du droit relatif aux normes d'emploi.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** Pursuant to the order of the House dated December 11, 2000, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Stockwell has moved second reading of Bill 147, An Act to revise the law related to employment standards.

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

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will 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 1546 to 1551.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. We're voting on Bill 147, moved by Mr Stockwell.

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

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Baird, John R.	Harris, Michael D.	Runciman, Robert W.
Barrett, Toby	Hodgson, Chris	Sampson, Rob
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Snobelen, John
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sterling, Norman W.
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Stewart, R. Gary
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Stockwell, Chris
Cunningham, Dianne	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Tilson, David
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
Ecker, Janet	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Eves, Ernie L.	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan	Young, David
Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John	

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

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Cordiano, Joseph	McGuinty, Dalton
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	McMeekin, Ted
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Brown, Michael A.	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Bryant, Michael	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Christopherson, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	Levac, David	
Conway, Sean G.	Marchese, Rosario	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 53; the nays are 31.

**The Acting Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated December 11, 2000, this bill is ordered referred to the standing committee on general government.

### HOUSE SITTINGS

Resuming the debate adjourned on December 6, 2000, on the motion to extend the House sitting until Thursday, December 21, 2000.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** House motion number 10: I believe Mr McMeekin has the floor.

**Mr Ted McMeekin (Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot):** I'm pleased to rise to continue debate. As you may recall, we got to the witching hour the other night and I was cut off at a couple of minutes to midnight, so I'm pleased to pick up on that.

Since this debate is about time and how it can most effectively be used, I thought what I might do today is make some observations based on my brief time in this House; to state some principles and values that are of some import to me and, I suspect, other members of this House; and to make some helpful suggestions and even offer some free advice as to how we might work more effectively in this Legislative Assembly. You've heard of the song *50 Ways to Leave Your Lover*; I'd like to offer 40 ways to cut red tape and work more effectively together. I thought I'd take a bit of a stab at that.

This place is about change, about representing people and about being the crucible of democracy. So I want to talk a little about politics and some of the principles that got me involved in political life. I think it was the late, great Sonny Bono, the entertainer and former US congressman, who suggested that entertainment and politics were a lot alike: that people basically want great lyrics and a good beat. I want to say for the record that I often see neither great lyrics nor a good beat offered up in this House, and I lament that profoundly.

I want to talk a little about some of the principles that I think ought to guide us in terms of what we talk about in this place and how we use our time. I've always believed that government has a positive role to play and can be an instrument for good, allowing individuals to make a difference. I believe in government. As one who has professed that politics can make a difference, it's great to be in this place and to have a chance to prove that. I remember when I first told my dad, some 25 years ago, that I was going to get involved in municipal politics. He said, "Politics? You were always such an honest boy." That's just an observation; that's so often the perception about those of us in the public service.

I know that while politicians campaign in poetry, we usually govern in prose, and we see that kind of prose every day in this House. That said, if at the end of the day all we have left is what we truly believe in, then we can't have failed. I think it was Thomas Jefferson who once said that on matters of taste, swim with the stream, and on matters of principle, stand like a rock.

I also want to suggest in this chamber today that not enough people take politics seriously or get involved in politics or believe their involvement would make a difference. I suspect there may even be some members of this House who believe that—backbenchers who, for whatever reason or combination of reasons, feel excluded from some of the decision-making structures here—and I think there are some things we might do to change that.

I want to say too—and I've been giving a lot of thought to this—that politics only makes a difference and is only important to the extent it contributes significantly to building a stronger, healthier community. I've never believed that power should be concentrated in fewer and

fewer hands or decisions made in increased isolation from those impacted at the expense of community.

That having been said, I want to also say, particularly in this season, that the angels are seldom all on one side of any issue. Perhaps that's why politics is so frequently referred to as the art of compromise. I would hope that as the days unfold here we could learn from that.

**1600**

I'm struck with the reality that unless you're the Oklahoma bomber, most people choosing between good and evil would choose to be on the side of the angels and would choose to do the right thing. It's not decisions between good and evil that are so tough; it's those decisions between competing goods. In that context I've been struck, since arriving in this place, with how many vested interests there are that would have us pander to our worst instincts and really almost make an expression of compassion seem like something we should be embarrassed about. I don't think we should have government that's afraid to use words like common sense and compassion in the same sentence.

We hear a lot of talk from time to time about restructuring and about some of the things that need to happen. Private-public partnerships would be one. By the way, I want to say for the record that I think private-public partnerships can be done right. There are lots of wonderful examples. I think of the municipality I had the privilege of being mayor of for six years. Our number one priority was to build a multi-purpose health and fitness centre. It was something we couldn't do on our own; it would have cost us about \$10 million. We were able to partner with the YMCA, and by contributing \$4 million each, we were able to undertake what I think was one of the most creative entrepreneurial private-public partnerships anywhere in Ontario.

Private-public partnerships can work if you're careful about who you're partnering with and that there are good standards. Why do I say that? Because I believe we should only have the government we need. But while we should only have the government we need, we must insist on all the government we require. If there's no other lesson we learn from the tragedy of Walkerton, for example, it should be that. There are areas where we should be looking at making sure the standards are clear. That's not to preclude the private-public partnerships I spoke of earlier.

I want to note something that I think has stood me and some of my more learned colleagues in good stead over the years: all true learning begins with the simple phrase "I do not know the answer to that." I want to suggest here today that it would be very helpful if we could say that to each other a little more often, rather than assuming we always have the answers.

When all is said and done, love really does make the world go 'round. It may sound corny to say that, but I think that's true. In that context, we as people who have a particular role in terms of moving from case to cause advocacy—where we take a specific example of an injustice or concern and try to develop social policy so that

the benefits of that policy accrue to more than just the individual involved—should always be reminded that all of us must stand against oppression, despair and indifference, especially when it can rightly be suggested to us that we might stand to benefit from that. We need to commit to courses of action directed by reason, supported by principle and designed to achieve the greatest good.

In that context I think we, as political leaders, should be going out of our way to teach compassion and to resist the tide of opinion that would seek to make any denial of compassion seem respectable. When all is said and done, if we turn our backs on the most vulnerable—the aged, the disabled and the poor—who will be there to speak for us when we're weak or dependent?

In that context I want to point out, and maybe this is the philosophical difference, that I don't believe you help the unfortunate by helping the fortunate and expecting private charity to do the rest, all the while knowing that it can't and it won't. I believe that what's right with our community, with this great province of Ontario, can correct whatever is wrong with this province of Ontario and that we need to be conscious of that when we're looking at trying to bring out the best in people.

If I can move off principles to some observations and suggestions, I want to suggest that in today's politics there shouldn't be left and right any more, that there's only right and wrong. We all too often forget that while there are some things wrong in Ontario that need fixing—that's what we're about, I suppose—we need to celebrate what's right in Ontario. What's right with Ontario is its people.

I have seen children who dream the biggest of dreams and teachers who go out of their way to make those dreams come true. I've seen health care workers struggling on the edges, trying to cope with cutbacks. I've met literally hundreds of people living on the margins of poverty who struggle every single day just to put food on the table. We had some discussion about that earlier in question period.

Government is about listening to and caring for people. It's not some bourgeois boys' club meeting in some exclusive tree house somewhere, making decisions in isolation from people.

I worked here some 25 years ago. Mr Davis was the Premier then. I want to just say, for what it's worth, that Mr Davis, and I suggest Messrs Frost and Robarts before him, understood common sense and more importantly the common good. I don't always get the feeling in this assembly that we have that same sense. Someone asked me a couple of days ago what the major difference is between today and 25 years ago, and I suggested this place has really lost its sense of humour. I want to offer that up as an observation for members present.

There was a time when someone would get up and ask a question of the Premier and the Premier would say, "That's a darned good question. I wish I had a darned good answer. If you leave it with me, maybe tomorrow or the next day I'll have a darned good answer." There was a time in this House when someone would get up and

make a suggestion and someone would say, "You know what? You're absolutely right. We ought to roll that into the legislation. We ought to make that happen." There was a time when we didn't have to rely on no-fault insurance, when we didn't get into a place and a space where we were always finger pointing, where there was the possibility of actually pointing some direction and not just fingers.

Today I get the sense from both sides of the House—I'm not pointing at anyone in particular; in fact I think while no one's guilty, maybe we're all responsible—that we could learn something from our forefathers who didn't have as pronounced a need perhaps to always blame somebody else. I dream of the day when the Premier of this province, or one of his many cabinet ministers, might get up and say, "You're absolutely right. We really screwed up on that one. You know what? We're going to do better. We're going to fix that," rather than saying, "Well, 10 years ago you wanted to open the Keele Street dump," or whatever it was.

I think there are a number of things we can do that could really help us forge some partnerships in this place and, when all is said and done, enable us to be more effective representatives of those we have the privilege of serving. We need to learn to stop going to the wall on petty and insignificant issues, letting significant issues slip away in the process. We need to learn to refrain from drawing lines in the sand or from finding the sand and then burying our heads in it. We need to take a shot at what's ailing us rather than shots at each other. There are some ways I think we could do that. I don't want to be just rhetorical, I want to be helpful, so I want to just take a minute to outline a few of those.

#### 1610

When Mr Davis was Premier the use of select committees was far more pronounced. A good example of that would have been the garbage issue around the Adams mine. I suggested to the Minister of the Environment that that would be a perfect example of where a select committee might be useful. There was a lot of finger pointing going on, I think quite appropriately. No one seemed to have the answer. That clearly is an issue that is beyond municipalities, that we need to be working on together. I'd like to see a little less partisanship around here and a little more getting on with the job. The selective use of select committees I think would be a good way of doing that.

I'd like to see the government respond a little bit more positively to some of the good questions that are asked. It might even be helpful if once in a while people on this side of the House applauded initiatives from the other side of the House and vice versa. I don't think we do enough of that.

We need to be conscious of opportunities to invite each other into one another's tent, so to speak. I know politics is partisan and that isn't going to happen to as great an extent as maybe some would like, but by listening to each other and maybe even the government saying to the Liberal side or the NDP side, the third party,

“What is it you want to see happen in this session of the Legislature? Is there a piece of legislation you want to get through?” I think that would be an excellent way to go.

I’d like to see a lot more free votes in the House. In fact, I fantasize about a day when legislation would come in and up in the top corner there would be a little box. Beside the box would be the words, “Failure to pass this bill in its current form will constitute a vote of non-confidence in the government and lead to an immediate provincial election.” Any other legislation we would be free to vote on, so that the 103 men and women across this province who have the awesome responsibility and obligation to be in this place and to be about making a difference, which is what this is all about, could do that. I think we could do that through some free votes.

I’ll wind up by saying you cannot discover new oceans unless you’re prepared to lose sight of the shore. I’d like to do some of that a little bit more often, and I invite other members of the House.

My mother used to say, “Son, you will always be judged by the company that you don’t believe anybody else knows you keep.” I want to be judged by the company I keep in this place. I think that by working together we can express much more positively for the people of Ontario that we’re about the common good and about real common sense and about making a difference in this province.

**Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West):** Much in the vein of the previous speaker, I’d like to spend the short time I have, given we’re dealing with a calendar motion that pretty much opens up the prospect of discussing what we please and not being out of order—I’d like to first comment on the fact that this evening Hamilton city council will be holding their last historic meeting of the city council prior to the new city coming into existence on January 1, 2001.

A few weeks ago, under the leadership of Regional Chairman Terry Cooke, we in the community saw the last meeting of regional council. Let me say right at the outset that notwithstanding the philosophical and political differences I’ve had with Terry Cooke, and they’re strong, he and I go back quite a ways. We tend to refer to it as going through political boot camp together. We were both elected to city and regional councils in 1985, both of us for the first time—very young, very eager, very enthusiastic, very green and totally lost, quite frankly. I’m sure Ted can refer to his first time, which actually was on Hamilton city council, ward 7, I believe. So history is an interesting teacher.

I want to say that I think Terry Cooke has provided, on balance—I know he will appreciate the “on balance” part—excellent leadership. On a personal level, his integrity, his honesty and his friendship have meant a lot to me over the years. I wish him well as he steps down now. On January 1, he begins a new career in the private sector, a challenging and lucrative one. His mother didn’t raise any fool there. I wish him the very best.

In large part, we have a new city on January 1 because of his leadership. For some, that will make him an eternal

villain, and for others, a hero, and for most, the catalyst who brought about what inevitably should have happened for the best of our community in the long run.

With regard to this evening, I don’t know how much the snowstorm we’ve just experienced is going to limit the turnout. Certainly my business here this evening does not allow me to attend, which I regret very much because my heart is always with Hamilton. This is a historic evening and it has meant a lot to me that part of my life has been as a Hamilton alderman.

This evening, as a community, we say goodbye to a number of outstanding aldermen. By the way, historically, that’s the last reference in our community to aldermen. For those of us who have that title, we now officially become part of history. Of course, they will be known as councillors in the future. We are losing a number of outstanding aldermen as a result of the last election: some lost and some didn’t run. I want to mention their names and be sure they are recorded.

The following aldermen will be attending their last council meeting this evening: Dennis Haining, Duke O’Sullivan, Mary Kiss and Gerry Copps. I have to add that Gerry Copps was my ward mate for the five years I was on Hamilton council representing ward 4. I wish her particular personal happiness in the future; she deserves it. And Ron Corsini, Dave Wilson, Fred Eisenberger, Bob Charters, Terry Anderson.

Of course the biggest news of the municipal election was the election of Mayor Bob Wade as the mayor-elect of the new city of Hamilton. That means of course that this evening Mayor Bob Morrow is officiating at his last council meeting. Let me say publicly what I’ve been saying privately to people in this place who are interested and others who have asked what happened, because it was rather a shock. People knew it would be a tough election but I really don’t think any of us, up to and including election night itself, thought that Bob Wade or John Munro or Fred Eisenberger would be able to pull it off, certainly not if you reflected on the previous poll results that had shown Bob Morrow ahead by close to 20 points or better.

Bob Wade obviously ran an excellent campaign, but I don’t think it was one of those times when an individual burst through and everyone coalesced around them. That’s not in any way to diminish Mayor-elect Wade’s win but to point out the dynamics that I think were at play in our community. I also do not believe that it was an anti-Bob Morrow vote. Bob Morrow is the longest-serving mayor in the history of Hamilton. He’s been there for 18-plus years. He is an outstanding individual who loves his community more than anyone possibly could.

*Applause.*

**Mr Christopherson:** I’m pleased that my colleague Ted McMeekin felt strongly enough to applaud. By saying that, I get it into the record, because I want it noted. That’s a reflection of what I am saying: there really wasn’t an anti-Bob Morrow vote. What I think happened in Hamilton, at the end of the day, was there was just so

much pro-change. People wanted change in the leadership as much as they wanted change in the structure and the governance and the fortune, if you will, of our community, and that showed itself. People coalesced around the candidate they thought had the best chance of creating that change and winning. I think most would agree that Bob Wade, of the three main challengers, was seen as the front-runner there. No one should really be surprised, then, if the pro-change attitude was out there, that it ended up coalescing around Mayor Wade.

1620

Let me say that I served with Bob Morrow. We will be given an opportunity early next year to show Bob our thanks and our gratitude. I know that as I reflect and think, "What could you possibly do to honour someone who has devoted their entire adult life, 18 years of it, as the mayor of one of the most important centres in the whole country?" I still haven't thought of anything that's quite big enough to do that, but I know there are a lot of people who are looking to that and I would just say to them that I don't think that we can overdo it. This is an opportunity for us as a community to be proud of ourselves, and we show that in the respect and honour that we bestow upon one of our own, our first citizen, and someone who was our first citizen and chief magistrate for 18 years. On a personal note, I want to wish Bob Morrow all the best in the future.

Let me also say I think it's incumbent on this government or the federal Liberals—if Mayor Morrow does not have other plans, there are a lot of opportunities for the public to serve in appointed positions. Oftentimes—not always—it's political payback, and this bag person and this long-time hack, if you will, is given a berth because it's important politics within the party. Let me just say to both governments that we have an opportunity as Canadians and as Ontarians to appoint someone with a wealth of experience who deserves an opportunity to continue. This is not a wealthy person. Not many but I guess some in politics are wealthy, and whether they have a job or not doesn't matter. Bob Morrow is very much a working person who is entitled, in my opinion, to continue the rest of his professional career in a dignified fashion, reflective of the service that he has given to the people. I can't think of anyone better to assume a lot of public positions that I can think of where he could use that experience and put that compassion and his intelligence to good use and continue to serve the people of Hamilton, Ontario, and perhaps the people of Canada. I want to publicly go on record and say that if either government acknowledges the importance of the sentiment I'm expressing, then certainly I, for one, will be quite prepared to publicly endorse and acknowledge as a positive step any kind of appointment that might come the way of Mayor Morrow, and I would go so far as to urge governments to please take a look at this. We have an opportunity to continue to benefit from the public service of one of this country's finest public servants.

Let me also take this opportunity to talk about a few things that are happening in Hamilton, not in any par-

ticular priority but just a few things that I want to get on the record while I have an opportunity.

We have a continuing strike going on at the CCAC that this government needs to recognize they have a role in. You cannot just continue to turn your back and say it's local negotiations. The CCACs exist because you created them. The workers, the case managers and the support staff, almost 200 of them, are on strike. I would say that, much like the VON strike, this is as much a strike against this government, the Harris government, as it is against the management at the CCAC. Again, much like what we went through with the elementary teachers in Hamilton, where the trustees supposedly are the ones who have the responsibility for negotiating, when they only have X number of dollars and the teachers present a justified list of demands in front of those trustees, it's a given formula for disaster. Much of the responsibility for that—in my opinion, all of it—has to be placed at the doorstep of this government.

It's so easy for you to say, "We're not going to get involved in these negotiations with the OPSEU workers and the elementary teachers because their direct employers are not the provincial government." Yet we all know that both the board and the CCAC are 100% funded by the province of Ontario. So if you don't give them enough money to operate the organization, and that includes negotiating collective agreements with the people who work there, then you have decided in either case that management will not be able to provide programs and materials and supports to the citizens of Ontario, whether it's Hamiltonians who are sick and need the help that can be provided by that staff or it's our kids. We're talking about the professional services that teachers bring to our children. In both those instances, this government is saying no.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Christopherson:** You need to step forward. Rather than heckling, why don't you do something positive about these issues? The fact of the matter is that you didn't give the school board enough money, the CCAC doesn't have enough money, and all your yapping in the world isn't going to change that one bit. What's going to change it is money, money that this government has decided is better being given to the very wealthy in this province and to the corporations in this province, to the tune of over \$4 billion.

A bill we voted on today, the Employment Standards Act, speaks to the issue of the minimum wage. Same thing. It's in your hands. It was in your hands to make sure the elementary teachers got a fair deal, it's in your hands to make sure the OPSEU workers at the CCAC get a fair deal and it's in your hands to decide whether the working poor—and that's who they are at \$6.85 an hour—any of those people, get a chance to share in the economic boom that you have decided so frequently to share with those who already have. But you've decided that's not important; that's not a priority. You stand back and, in the case of the CCAC and in the case of the elementary teachers and our children and the parents and the community, you've decided to go ahead and let our

communities divide, let us split into different camps, let us fight each other. As long as the teachers are fighting the trustees in Hamilton and as long as the OPSEU workers are fighting with the board of directors of the CCAC, then you can continue to pretend you don't have any responsibility in this at all.

I want to say that to the people in my community, the working poor, you have no justification for saying to them when you bring in your changes to the Employment Standards Act, "You're not going to get a piece of the pie. As a government, we've taken that pie and given it to our friends and you aren't part of that."

Further to that, at the CCAC—and let me say that I often find it a difficult position, especially as the labour critic but also as a Hamiltonian and an MPP representing my community, when those kinds of battles are going on. It wasn't that long ago that we went through a three-month strike, longer than three months, between the regional councillors and the drivers for the Hamilton Street Railway, our public transit in Hamilton. The difficulty for me is that, sitting here, I have a very clear first-hand appreciation of the fact that it's this government that makes and creates the scenarios where we have these divisive battles in our communities. It shouldn't be. We're in a surplus situation. There are billions of dollars. But rather than putting it in those necessary areas, you've given it to the very wealthy, those very people who give you the millions of dollars that let you run your election campaigns, and primarily to pay for advertising, which we all know is the modern secret weapon, if you will. Whoever buys the most advertising gets a huge advantage over anyone else.

But in the case of the CCAC, in the couple of minutes I have remaining I have to point out and I want to say to the board—and I'm going to have my staff send these Hansards to the board, because I'm extremely disappointed. I know many of those board members, and that's why I've been reluctant to stand here and say they've got a role in this, that they're culpable. I know that most of them are doing the very best they can with very limited resources, and that takes me back to this government's responsibility. But they as a board recently made a decision to hire scabs.

**1630**

I appreciate the pressure they're under. I understand all that's happening in the community and the backup that's happening in the hospitals. But that is no solution, especially in Hamilton, where we went through the Stelco strike in 1946, one of the few major historic labour struggles that took place in Ontario—Windsor being another—where the modern labour movement and the Rand formula were created. To this day there are families who still don't speak as a result of the divisiveness of that 1946 strike, where the management tried to break the union and the union ultimately prevailed. Local 1005 went on to become one of the pre-eminent union locals, not only among the Steelworkers but in all Canada.

That the board has chosen to hire scabs in our community, especially since it's a public entity, serving the public, to me is a slap in the face to our community—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Christopherson:** I appreciate the support of my colleague, Ted McMeekin, who obviously feels similarly about this happening in our community.

But let me say, so as not to leave the government off the hook: before you took power in 1995, that couldn't happen, because scabs were illegal in Ontario. There really was fairness and balance in Ontario, and nobody would have the lawful right to hire scabs. We all know that when you introduce scabs into a picket line, at that moment we get violence. Anybody who has studied labour history will realize that prior to that the incidence of violence is very rare.

When you start bringing in busloads of people behind painted windows, who are going inside to take the jobs of people who are on a lawful picket line and perhaps have been out there, as in the case of the OPSEU workers at the CCAC, for months, and they see Christmas coming, how many days will it take before the average person on that picket line snaps as the police are called in to do their job, which is to let that bus in?

All those things happen only because scabs were made legal again in Ontario by this government. You have a lot to account for in terms of all the violence and the length of strikes that are happening in our community. In the case of the CCAC, it wouldn't matter about the board and their decision; they wouldn't be allowed to.

So I say, "Shame on this government," for re-introducing scabs and violence and long strikes into Ontario, and to the board members at the CCAC I say, "You could have done better. You owe us as Hamiltonians more than a decision like this."

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown):** Further debate? The member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale

**Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale):** Mr Speaker, it is a privilege today to rise to debate from the government side this House calendar motion. I listened to the member from Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot—that riding name is almost as long as my riding, as you just said, Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale.

About this House calendar motion, I'm sure people have been listening and must be wondering, "What are these people talking about? Are they still talking about the labour bill, are they talking about the CCAC? What are they talking about?"

This is a debate on a House calendar motion. I've got mixed emotions on that, and I'll tell you why. On one hand we are recommending that we have an additional week of work, until December 21st. Many people in the opposition are having problems and reservations about working an extra week. They keep bringing up the 60-hour week, and today somebody was even saying 70. That's fearmongering. Let me be on the record as saying that. Because somebody lives two hours away and it takes them four hours to go back and forth, is that part of their working day? I don't know. Maybe that's where they have decided to stay. Maybe they should be closer. I don't know.

Naturally it is my pleasure to support the House calendar motion we are discussing. I know that a lot of times most members would rather be in their ridings doing productive work, talking to their constituents and attending to their needs, and I intend to do that after the House recesses. But in the meantime, there's a lot of work to be done. In fact there are some rumblings, and I'll be happy to put in my share, that perhaps the House is going to be sitting until late at night, which is hopefully until midnight and later if need be. As you have seen, I'm usually here to make sure—and I might even have a record. I think I've been present for every vote. That's why the people of Ontario have sent me, and I'm very pleased to take part in that democratic process.

Just a few minutes ago the member opposite was talking about unions and non-unions and where the workers are better. I had the pleasure during the summer months to travel to different parts of Ontario on Bill 69, the construction workers act. One of the things that came out during that time was that we asked some of the unionized people, "What happens when there's no unionized work?" They said, "Well, we just go and work non-union." So they get the best of both worlds. I guess they have the right to. I'm not saying they don't have the right to. They absolutely have the right to work any way they like, and I was quite encouraged to see that. People say, "Well, if you're union, you can only work union; if you're non-union, you can't be union," or vice versa, or decertified or certified. I think it's a democracy. I think people should have the right to decide whether they want to work in a union or not, how to certify and decertify and what their rights and responsibilities are.

Premier Harris and our government have established a very busy legislative schedule, as I have said. I think we're going to be sitting maybe until midnight. I'll be very happy to put in my share, maybe past midnight. When people talk about a 60-hour workweek, the fact of the matter is—members opposite are the same. All of them, including myself, put in many more hours than 60 hours a week, and we have families. I've got a family. I've got a couple of children. At the same time, when we work we want to work very hard and make sure the people of Ontario are getting their fair share. Let's face it, we need to stay longer and later to pass many bills which are before this House.

Today, the priorities of the Ontario government are reflective of those of the ordinary citizens of Ontario. Hard-working, law-abiding, taxpaying citizens in Ontario understand that the government, under the leadership of Premier Mike Harris, is working to make this province better than it was under the Liberal and NDP governments. You've heard the phrase, and I'm sure people at home have heard the phrase, 10 lost years.

Like this friend of mine from Newfoundland used to say, sometimes we surprise ourselves. I admit that the turnaround we've been able to bring about in Ontario since 1995 is amazing. A lot of people, even friends who belong to the PC Party, could not believe we would be able to turn Ontario around, because it is like a big ship

and it takes a while to steer that ship in the right direction. I'm very happy that we were able to do that. I want to thank not only the leadership of Premier Mike Harris but at the same time the good Ontarians who took that challenge, believed in us, tightened their belts, made the sacrifices, worked hard and who were there with us in this Common Sense Revolution.

**1640**

A lot of people—and I've said it before—did not believe us. They said, "It's voodoo economics. It doesn't make sense. The numbers don't add up," but I'm very happy that we were able to do that, and I'm very happy to be a newer member of that team. We're working to improve the lives of workers, students, parents and seniors throughout Ontario.

The people of my riding—and I'll take the liberty of saying that name again, because I'm very proud of my riding: Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale. Sometimes I even use the abbreviation, BGMS, so feel free to use that if you need to.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Gill:** One of my colleagues asked if I have e-mail. I have two e-mails and a Web site, because we are moving into the modern age. Anybody who thinks they can keep doing things using archaic methods is wrong. My Web site—if they're recording it, that's fine, because they are busy. But if they want to look at the Web site, it's [www.ramindergill.com](http://www.ramindergill.com)—very simple. The e-mail is [ramigill@hotmail.com](mailto:ramigill@hotmail.com), or there's another one.

The year 2000 has been very busy. It was my first full year, as I said, as an MPP since my election on June 3, 1999. That is the beauty of Canada, the beauty of Ontario, the democratic country and province we live in: every four or five years, people get another kick at the can and they decide. They did that in 1990, when they brought in an NDP government, and they did that on June 8, 1995, when they brought in the Conservative government. I'm not going to be partisan and show all the negatives and positives, but people see the improvements we've been able to make. As I said before, there have been problems. One problem is there's a shortage of labour. Everybody is gainfully employed and there's a shortage of labour, so many friends who are in business and industry are complaining, "We need more people." A lot of times there are problems in the federal immigration system, where families are not being united. Hopefully, with the new government coming in again federally, they can tinker again and make a difference.

Certainly in the Ministry of Labour, where I've had the privilege of being a parliamentary assistant, we've been very busy. I'm sure people at home have been watching that. Bill 69 aimed to fix the impediments to competition in the construction industry. Bill 139 is basically a law to bring sunshine to the obscure corners of labour relations. Bill 147 is the new Employment Standards Act for a new Ontario in a new century.

Looking back on those 18 months, let me say what a privilege it has been to be the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour. The ministry has been a busy place, with a very motivated and dedicated minister. I

know he was talked about in the Toronto Sun the other day. I won't go there, but I know there were some things that the Toronto Sun wrote about his appearance and enthusiasm and everything else. The minister is, as are many other people on this side of the House, exceptionally hard-working at the ministry and throughout the labour field. Contrary to what the opposition is claiming, Mr Stockwell is bringing common sense to labour relations in Ontario. The sunshine law, Bill 139, is pure common sense. It fulfills our commitment to workplace democracy, as laid out in the Blueprint, our 1999 election platform.

In May 1999, as I went door to door—and I'm still doing that, which is a good thing, and people are quite surprised that I go and knock on their doors. They say, "There's no election going on. Why are you here?" My answer is, "I just want to stay in touch with my constituents." They're quite pleased to do that, and they're happy to give a lot of good suggestions and accolades for the good work we're doing. They say, "Please pass it on to the Premier." I try and do that. The Premier is very busy, but every time I get a chance to see him, I do pass it on to him.

At that time, when I was knocking on doors, one of the things that came out very clearly—we know that not everybody was voting for us, and that's quite all right, because it is a democratic country we live in. But even people who were not voting for us did say that this is a government, this is a party, which is very credible. There are a lot of people who have come from different parts of the world and had lived with governments or systems which were maybe not so credible, maybe corrupt. They said, "Here's a government that, whether we like it or not, does what they said they were going to do. We may not have liked their policies in the Common Sense Revolution or the Blueprint, but they're there to spell out what they're going to do and then carry it out, and they're willing to stick their necks out in the four years or five years, whatever it happens to be, before going to the people." And the people decide whether what we've done is something good, something to their liking, whether it's good for Ontario, whether it's good for business, whether it's good for workers, unionized and non-unionized. Then they will have another kick at the can, like I said, whether it's in 2003, 2004, whenever it is, and they'll make their choice.

As I said before, the sunshine law is to allow hard-working union members to learn to know how much of their dues are spent on the salaries and benefits of top union officials. It protects and strengthens their right to make informed decisions as to whether they want to be represented by a union or the same union or whether they want to change.

I read letters from the people who watch these proceedings at home. Every now and then someone writes in to say that maybe we are too hard on the union bosses. They could mean the union bosses who mobilized our teachers against Bills 74 and 81 and are now doing everything in their power to paralyze the school system,

or they could mean the union bosses who spread confusion about 60-hour workweeks and assorted other nonsense like that. I don't think we're too hard on those union bosses. I think to have a union, if that is the workers' wish, is everyone's democratic right. To not have a union is also everyone's democratic right as well. I believe that if there's going to be a union, then there will be union bosses. That is the way the system works. However, I do not wish to see workers' rights trampled or abused at the hands of a union.

I support shining some light on these fat-cat union bosses. With rights to unionize and mobilize workers also come responsibilities. Our government is only going to spray sunshine all over those unions so that the membership will gain more information and power. Union members are now going to know what's being done with their pension funds.

A position on a union executive is a position of trust. If the unions deserve their tax-exempt status and their special legal protections, they must show transparently that they are worthy of their trust. They need to prove themselves not to me, not to the government, but to their members and the taxpayers who support their tax-exempt status. Unions are there to protect the workers, and sometimes we need to protect the workers from the unions. It's just common sense.

#### *Interjections.*

**Mr Gill:** I see the third party doesn't like to hear this, or even the opposition, but they should. Out-of-control union bosses, a few bad apples, could really cause chaos at an NDP convention where they cast guaranteed blocks of votes. I think, watching tensions in the labour movement now, watching the federal NDP squirm and wonder whether they should obey Buzz Hargrove and lose their autonomy or risk losing him and all those precious union dollars, they have a real dilemma. I feel sorry for them in a way, but as they are often so keen to say, "What you sow, so shall you reap."

#### **1650**

As the government we have worked to cut taxes, and that's no secret, to increase employment and reduce dependency. We are proud of our record. I know there is more work to be done. That is why we are debating change to employment standards. Whenever I'm feeling mellow and wondering if maybe I've been too hard on the OFL or the OSSTF or the CAW or some other pampered bunch, I think of the panic they are trying to spread about this perfectly reasonable and straight-forward bill.

Good government and solid legislation don't make for very sexy, splashy headlines. Newspapers want scandals and they're tired of travelling to Ottawa or to the Prime Minister's riding to get them.

In Ontario we normally work a 40-hour workweek, and if we go over 44 hours we get overtime. That's normal and that won't change. What will change is the complex and outmoded system of requiring a minister's permit, a system that nobody understood, and so many people did not obey it.

We here in the Harris government take a very long, hard look at systems that don't work. We fix things. That's what good government is all about and that's what the Harris government is all about.

In my riding, Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale, good government means we're getting a new hospital. Peel Memorial Hospital on Queen Street in downtown Brampton used to be the most modern hospital in Ontario—in the 1930s. The new hospital, which will be on Bovaird Drive, right next to my office, will win that title for Brampton once again. This hopefully will be the largest hospital in the whole of Ontario. I'm very happy that I was able, in my short years as a member, to convince the district health council to locate that hospital in my riding. We're very excited and we're waiting for Minister Witmer's support so we can get started with the groundbreaking ceremony.

The people of BGMS deserve good government, and we're making sure we deliver that.

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** I guess the way to judge government, according to the last speaker, is to look at what has happened to hospitals. In the city of Toronto we've had an unfortunate experience with the Harris government, in that the Harris government created a so-called commission under, I can't recall—Sinclair was the person's name.

**Interjection:** Duncan Sinclair.

**Mr Colle:** Duncan Sinclair. He was the guru of health care. Mike Harris gave him the mantle to fix the health care system. This Mr Sinclair came to town and he was going to have all the solutions to health care in the province. No one in the Harris government now refers to this man Sinclair any more. They never refer to the hospital restructuring commission, because that commission was a total waste of taxpayers' dollars. It devastated the health care system in this province and is really the legacy of this government's attempt to do something with the health care system, and it was a total failure. As you can see, they are now spending more money and we have more problems in our hospitals and our health care system. We in fact know that in the city of Toronto this government has closed 10 hospitals. We have seen the closure and the bulldozing of Doctors Hospital, just down the street here, a fine community hospital bulldozed by this government, never to be seen again. We have the Queensway hospital—gone. We have Branson hospital, a fine hospital in North York—gone. Northwestern Hospital is now basically a television studio—a beautiful hospital on 35 acres, gone.

This government said they were going to fix the health care system; with Mr Sinclair they basically destroyed it. Now they're paying much more money, and we still have more problems than we ever had in health care in this province.

I should also mention that in my own riding of Eglinton-Lawrence in the city of Toronto, we face some of the realities that this government refuses to acknowledge: the reality that our own city is finding it impossible to deliver the services that they're used to giving to the over 2.5 million people of Toronto, because this gov-

ernment has downloaded so many essential services on to local property taxpayers. As you know, it has downloaded public transportation. It is trying to download all public housing at this point. It is downloading a variety of other services on to municipalities that can't afford to pay for these services.

The sad state of affairs is that the chief operating officer of the city of Toronto has warned the government this week that a city like Toronto could face bankruptcy because of the downloading of this government and the refusal of this government to acknowledge the fact that property taxpayers cannot pay for social services with their property taxes, yet this government continues to put more and more pressure on property taxes in Toronto with no help from the provincial government. The city of Toronto is the only city in North America, in Europe, anywhere in the world, that doesn't have upper-tier provincial or state funding for public transit, the only city in the whole world without that kind of funding. So public transit is on the backs of property taxpayers. That doesn't work. It's causing enormous hardships on the property taxpayers of the city.

I should also mention the area of housing. The city of Toronto has tens of thousands of people waiting to get basic housing. Most of these people are seniors who want a simple bachelor apartment, 400 or 500 square feet, where they can live their last decades. This government has shut the door completely on public housing, so seniors right now, who are vulnerable, who can't afford to pay market rates, are waiting on a list that is estimated to be anywhere from 50,000 to 70,000 people, the size of Kingston. If you imagine everybody in Kingston without a place to live and on a waiting list, that's what's happening in Toronto right now, up to 70,000 people unable to find reasonable accommodation so they can live in some kind of cleanliness and have some basic needs taken care of. This is the reality: people who cannot find even adequate housing, in a province that is awash in money.

This government has a huge surplus with all the PST it collects, with all the land transfer tax it collects; it collects \$3 billion a year in gasoline taxes. Yet it can't even provide for basic education, basic health care or basic housing. There is obviously a real dichotomy here between the reality of this government's treasury and the reality of the programs that are available in the city of Toronto.

If you look at these millions of dollars the government is taking in a day and you look at the state of our schools, our elementary and high schools have never undergone so many shortages in supplies, shortages in programs, the elimination of librarians, the elimination of music programs, the closing of swimming pools in schools because there are no funds to operate them. In Glenview school in my area, the after-school swimming program is being shut down because of no government money.

**1700**

You'll still see 30 to 35 kids in a classroom. Teachers, as you know, have been vilified and attacked on a regular

basis by this government. Parents are constantly being asked to raise money for school projects, and schools are closing on a regular basis. We've never had schools close. We are seeing schools and hospitals closed by this government in a time of plenty. As I said, when they are taking in \$3 billion a year in gasoline tax—what are they taking in from the gambling casinos they put up? Communities across Ontario now have casinos. They put one up there in Woodbine. There's Rama, there's Windsor, there's Niagara Falls. Millions are coming in today from those casinos. Why not put some of that money back into our schools and hospitals, into providing housing? We still cannot come to grips with the homeless problem we have here in Toronto. No matter how wealthy this government is, we have still not dented that problem of homelessness, although the city is trying its best.

This is a government that tends to blame others when problems occur. I know that this government, for instance, is now ready to blame the federal government at every turn. But you know, surprisingly, despite all the bashing of the federal government by the Alliance supporters across the way, the Reformers across the way, and some of the few Conservatives left, the people of Ontario resoundingly said no to the Harris policies of neo-conservatism, said no to the Stockwell Day dinosaur policies. They said they wanted a balanced approach, one that said yes, you need fiscal responsibility, but you need a social justice program that provides for our elderly, our sick and those who are vulnerable.

In this House I raised an issue about a recovering cancer patient in my riding who requires the drug Neupogen. The doctor has written repeatedly to the Minister of Health. I have written to the Minister of Health repeatedly. I've asked the Minister of Health in this House to allow for this drug to be paid for under OHIP, under the drug plan, and repeatedly the government says no, refuses to allow this family to have their right to have this drug paid for when this drug is readily available in almost every American state. The Americans are supposedly so far behind us in their health care system, yet a simple drug is costing this family over \$2,000 a month. The mother in this family is able to carry on with her chemotherapy and able to lead a fairly normal life with this drug, yet this government says no to giving her the drug. I can imagine this if we were back in the late 1980s or early 1990s, when there was a severe recession, but this is a government that's in a boom but won't even allow, as I said, that individual the Neupogen she needs for her cancer treatment. That is a typical case in point I'd like to show that gives people an idea of what they're facing.

Certainly there are things this government refuses to acknowledge. For instance, just north of Toronto we have an area that stretches from Cobourg all the way to Caledon. It's an area that provides basically the drinking water for Lake Ontario and for Lake Simcoe. It's the Oak Ridges moraine. There are over 60 rivers and streams—the Ganaraska, the Humber, the Don, the Rouge, the Credit, all these wonderful rivers—originating in the

ridge north of Toronto. The people of Richmond Hill, the people of Caledon, the people of Uxbridge are all saying, "Protect this vulnerable environmental area from unbridled development," and this government for two years has refused to stop development on the moraine. It does nothing but allow the development to continue without any role played by this government. If there isn't a role for government in protecting water, protecting natural areas, what good is this government if it won't take a strong stand to protect this vulnerable area that encompasses the source of our drinking water from Cobourg all the way to Caledon?

Yet the government steadfastly takes the side of the developers in saying we are not going to protect this environmentally sensitive area. Here's a government that has the power with a majority to do some good things and refuses to act unless it pleases all their special interests that they listen to primarily. They don't listen to the people of Richmond Hill, the people of Oak Ridges. They don't listen to the people of Cobourg. All they do is listen to the special interests who are saying, "Develop those lands because there is quick profit to be made." What about the value of our clean water for the next 20, 30, 40 or 50 years, and the wildlife that stretches and uses the greenspaces? What about birds? What about the trees in the forest that have to be protected? This government is doing nothing but allowing unbridled development to take place without any role by this government, and that is appalling.

I should mention another thing that this government tends to stand on the sidelines for. There is a horde of door-to-door salesmen going across this province hustling so-called energy, electricity or natural gas. These people prey especially on seniors. They even go to seniors and give them cheques that say, "Here's \$50, Mr John Smith," a cheque made out to Mr John Smith on Fairlawn Avenue for \$50. Mr John Smith doesn't look carefully, but on the back is the fine print. These are these gas brokers that say, "We'll sell you this natural gas at a cheaper price for five years or we'll sell you electricity at a cheaper price for five years." They give them this cheque for \$50 and say, "Here is the beginning." But on the back of the cheque, in the fine print it says, "If you cash this cheque, you are locked into this company's gas provision plans for the next 10 years." That is misleading. That borders on fraudulent. This government tolerates that. It tolerates these door-to-door hustlers. They do it by phone, they do it by mail. I don't care if you're a Bay Street lawyer, you can't figure out the pros and cons of these new long-term contracts in the provision of electricity or the provision of natural gas. It is impossible for the average citizen to know what is happening with those contractors that are hustling people door-to-door. But they're doing it rampantly and they're taking advantage of people. This government is silently complicit with those door-to-door hustlers by not stopping them.

The other thing that's happening is there is an exorbitant increase in the price of home heating natural gas. We are going to see people's bills increase by over \$500

probably this winter because of what's happening in the marketplace. I think this government owes it to seniors, especially, on low fixed incomes or people that are on very limited incomes to offer some kind of buffer protection for them. I know the federal government has given them a rebate for home heating costs. I think this government that's awash in billions of dollars in revenue it collects could at least put some money back into helping seniors and people on low, marginal incomes survive this winter as heating fuel, the cost of natural gas is going to make it very, very difficult on people.

Those are some of the suggestions we've been making on this side of the House. This government should take a more proactive role in not only looking after big money special interests, because they can take care of themselves. They can afford the lobbyists. If you ever look on the Web site, there is a government lobbyists' Web site. It goes on for pages and pages. All these Bay Street lawyers are coming in to see cabinet ministers on a daily basis. Most people can't afford those lobbyists. Those people who can't afford the lobbyists have a hard time reaching this government. It's like the people in my riding who have now received their new property tax assessment notices that show increases of 50%, 60%, 70% or 80%. There is no protection by this government for those people. All it tells people that are going to see these increases is that the municipality will be allowed to let you defer your taxes—in essence, put a lien or a reverse mortgage on your property. That is not acceptable. People don't want to put a mortgage on their property after they've spent a lifetime paying off their mortgage. This government has the money to help the people in those properties that are seeing fantastic property tax increases. It shouldn't just be left to the municipality. The municipalities are cash-strapped, because all they rely on is the property tax, and with the downloading this government has perpetrated on municipalities they have very little wiggle room.

1710

This government should be helping people who are going to be victimized by the fluctuating market value assessment which they thrust upon the people of Ontario and the people of Toronto. If you've got the system in place, at least put in some defences to protect people who are hurt by it. They can afford to do it.

There's another thing. Mr Speaker, I don't know if it's like this up in Espanola and beautiful Manitoulin Island, but I'm sure this happens up there too. In Toronto, when people buy a piece of property and they love the neighbourhood, they love the setting—it's not as beautiful as Manitoulin Island, especially near the Cup and Saucer, which is a beautiful part of this province that more people should visit—they want to fix it up. So they go to Home Depot or Revi or one of those stores, and they buy lumber, they buy drywall, they buy cement, and they fix up their homes. They add on a little extended kitchen. They put a back room on. They put a new family room on. They dig out basements. I've seen them do it with their own hands, pick and shovel. They improve the value of that property. They make that property better,

because they took an old property in north Toronto that's maybe 80 years old and they renovated it.

Do you know what this government does to that person who has gone to Home Depot, gone to Revi, got the lumber, got the wheelbarrow, worked in the house for six months, built that family room on the back? Do you know what they do? They send an assessor around to basically make people pay more for the home improvement. Not only do you pay the PST when you buy your lumber, your drywall, your wheelbarrow at Home Depot, now you've got to pay this provincial government that's awash in billions of dollars through all the billions they collect in gas tax, the billions they collect in land transfer tax.

They collect billions, yet there's poor Mrs Pasquale and her husband who dug out a basement to put on a new room at the back and paid for all this equipment they bought at Home Depot—I don't want to just push Home Depot—or Sam's Hardware down the street. This government has the gall—after collecting PST, collecting \$3 billion in gas tax—to come back and penalize Mr and Mrs Pasquale with a higher assessment penalty, because as soon they get that building permit with the municipality, that building permit goes to the assessment office, and the assessment office knocks on Mr Pasquale's door and says, "Mr Pasquale, good work. Here's that bigger tax bill." That's what this government does. It penalizes people for initiative. It penalizes people for hard work and doesn't recognize the fact that you should be thanking people for fixing up their homes, not penalizing them.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Colle:** I know the member from Niagara Falls may not recognize that this happens in Toronto, but we have fixed up homes that are 70, 80, 100 years old. We're proud of our homes.

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** It's happening everywhere.

**Mr Colle:** It's happening in Kingston all over the place, beautiful Kingston there. This government penalizes people for repairing, renovating, revitalizing neighbourhoods. It's a total disgrace that this government penalized these good people.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):** I'm going to be dividing my time with the member for Niagara Falls.

I'm certainly pleased to speak to this House calendar motion. Certainly a lot has been done in this session with respect to the agenda of this government. As you know, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care introduced legislation, the Personal Health Information Privacy Act. This legislation is necessary to protect the privacy and confidentiality of people's health information. Information about a person's health is a very sensitive issue, and by putting rules in place that tell people how their personal health information will be protected, we can assure them that their individual private information is protected.

The protection of personal health information has been in demand for a number of years, and our government is the first to respond to this demand.

The efforts by the Minister of Health support our government's Blueprint commitment to strengthen the rights of all Ontarians to access complete health information, including records and test results, but also to ensure their privacy concerning their personal health and personal health records. This legislation is critical because it will ensure that effective protections are in place when health information needs to be shared to provide better patient care. It is also critical because it will strengthen the confidentiality and security of health information. So I strongly support the health minister in her endeavour to pass this legislation, and I strongly believe she deserves to be commended for working hard to protect the confidential health information of every Ontarian.

Another initiative in this session had to do with school safety. On December 8, Education Minister Janet Ecker and Solicitor General David Tsubouchi announced a new, province-wide model police-school board protocol outlining how schools must work with police to prevent and respond to serious incidents. Under the model protocol, schools must involve police in incidents involving serious assaults where medical attention is required, sexual assaults, robbery, criminal harassment, weapons, drug offences and other serious offences. It provides a framework for school boards and local police to work together in successfully preventing and responding to school-related crime and violence.

The model protocol also sets out consistent standards so that when school incidents do occur, the response respects the rights of victims, witnesses and the alleged offenders. This new province-wide model police-school board protocol is one of a series of measures under the Safe Schools Act, 2000, that fulfil a key government commitment to increase respect, responsibility and civility in Ontario's schools. I strongly support this initiative by Minister Ecker and Minister Tsubouchi, because the safety of our children is of utmost importance. I commend them for working together in protecting the young individuals who will in time be the future leaders of this province.

I want to comment on a couple of local initiatives, because certainly my riding has benefited significantly from measures that have been taken by this government. In terms of health care funding, the Royal Victoria Hospital, which is in effect a regional hospital serving almost all of Simcoe county and also Muskoka, has benefited from increased funding. I was very pleased to present to the hospital on three separate occasions monetary amounts in the areas of \$8 million and \$3 million and, just last Friday, additional funding of \$300,000. All this money goes toward improving our orthopaedic surgery, toward dealing with prenatal services and also toward the general operation of the hospital, and it's very well received.

Also on the local level, on November 22 the mental health services in Simcoe county received a \$1.3-million

boost from our government. Of that money, \$1.2 million will go toward programs to prevent homelessness among people with serious mental illnesses. The Barrie branch of the Canadian Mental Health Association currently provides assistance and support for about 100 individuals. The funding gives non-profit organizations such as the Canadian Mental Health Association the flexibility to develop innovative projects to help provide housing and related mental health services based on regional needs. There have been other areas the government has moved into that are very significant.

**1720**

Last Thursday, I was very pleased to receive unanimous approval from the Legislature for my resolution dealing with prostate cancer, to have the ministry review OHIP funding for asymptomatic males. This is a very serious issue for males, because prostate cancer is the second most-frequent cause of cancer-related deaths among the male population.

A part of that resolution that was also very significant is funding by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care of a prostate cancer awareness program. At this time, we have materials with respect to what the government will fund with respect to prostate cancer, which go out to physicians who share those with their patients. But that's not enough. We have to do more to make sure the male population is aware that testing and early detection are necessary, and that PSA testing can be used, and obviously is used, when males have symptoms with respect to prostate cancer.

Another part of that resolution dealt with breast cancer. Every year I sponsor two pancake breakfasts in support of breast cancer fundraising and research. They both occur in June, one in Barrie, where the funds go to the Royal Victoria Hospital, and one in Bradford-West Gwillimbury, where the funds go to the Southlake Regional Health Centre.

In the United States they have a semi-annual commemorative postal stamp to raise funds for breast cancer, a very serious form of cancer for women between the ages of 36 and 54. I understand that in the last two years they have raised in excess of \$15 million from that stamp. I have written to every Premier and Minister of Health across this country, including the territories, and I have received support from every province and territory with respect to this initiative. I have also been in consultation with the Breast Cancer Foundation of this province, which wants to join me and partner in trying to convince Canada Post, which is a federal agency, to issue a stamp to raise funds for breast cancer. Obviously it would bring more awareness, but it's also designed to raise funds for research with respect to breast cancer.

There was only one occasion in this country when the Canadian postage stamp advisory committee issued a stamp to raise funds, not just for awareness but also for research, and that was with respect to literacy. So a precedent has been set. Certainly that was a worthy cause, but this is also a worthy cause. It's not something I am going to let die. The Canadian postage stamp ad-

visory committee has to be pushed. I'm certainly looking for support from the other side, because obviously the federal government has a role to play in this. I think it's a worthy initiative that has already received the support of this House—the province of Ontario—and has received support from every other province and territory in this country. I am very pleased to have been a part of this session with respect to that resolution.

I'm now going to give my time to the member for Niagara Falls.

**Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls):** It's a pleasure to rise and join the debate to talk about a few issues that have been discussed during the afternoon and to talk about the motion before us to extend the sitting of the Legislature until December 21, which is next Thursday. I know we've already had some motions to sit longer hours. It has become the habit of this government to sit longer hours. We used to finish the legislative day at 6 o'clock. We have changed that, and more often than not this Legislature sits till 9:30 at night. The reason for it, of course, is to get more debate and more input on all the bills that come before the Legislature.

I was on my feet on Thursday, when we were discussing a bill, talking about the record this government set between 1995 and 1999 with time we sat in the Legislative Assembly debating bills and the time we sat in public hearings on bills. From 1995 to 1999 the government set records not only as a government sitting more hours than any other government in the history of this province, in both this chamber debating bills and in public committees debating bills, but I think we set a record for any Legislature across the entire country, including the federal government.

We continue to have that work ethic, and that's what this bill is about. We want to extend the sittings for another week to next Thursday. We will be sitting not only until 9:30 tonight but later on next week I believe we'll be sitting until midnight. It's something we've already worked on. So we do have that work ethic.

One of the members from the opposition party, Mr Colle from Eglinton-Lawrence, went on about all these wonderful things in his chat a while ago. By the way, it will be interesting to look back and add up his promises, because in his speech he talked about all these wonderful things the government should do with all this money we have coming in. I think it's vitally important that you can't just pick and choose and say you're going to fund everything and not put a price tag on it and willy-nilly start throwing money, as is the Liberal way. When they governed, that's how they did govern. He picked on every topic. It sounded to me like if anybody had been into his office recently and needed money for a certain purpose, yes, he wanted to fund that purpose.

Yes, things are much better in Ontario, as everyone knows. It's no secret: 800,000 jobs have been created over the past five years since we've been in office and 600,000 fewer people are now dependent on welfare. As a result of that, even though we've reduced taxes dramatically since we've been in office, more money is

indeed flowing into provincial revenues. "Where is it all going?" he asked. Casino monies, for instance, from Windsor, and Niagara Falls, my riding, should go into health care. If he just looked at the most recent Ontario Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review provided by the finance minister recently, he would know that all that extra money does indeed actually flow into health care. So we've gone from \$17.4 billion annually to over \$22 billion annually. We had to replace the money the federal government ripped out of the health system, and on top of that we've added a lot more money.

Yes indeed, because of the tax cuts the economy has grown dramatically. More revenues are coming in. There are more revenues coming in through the casinos, including in my riding, and that money is going into health care. We used to run annual \$11-billion deficits and now we're running surpluses and we're balancing budgets.

Some of the members opposite are complaining about casinos, but I was very proud on Friday to announce that indeed the government had recently wrapped up deals with the municipality on some revenue sharing and to move forward on permanent casino development in Niagara Falls. That's going to be a huge investment in my riding. I really can't give a final figure of the cost of the development, but it will be probably \$700 million, in that area. It's a dramatic investment in the casino and the hotel, and there's a convention facility that will be there. There's a 1,200-seat theatre for entertainment. There's a 15,000-seat amphitheatre for concerts and perhaps boxing matches in the future. There's a large, \$22.5-million contribution to purchase a rail line that has always run through the tourist core in Niagara Falls and has been a great interruption and problem for our tourist area. We're going to contribute to purchasing that property.

I was very proud to be able to make that announcement, and that whole development has thus far been a wonderful boom for our economy. Our unemployment rate in 1993 was about 15.3%. It's down to under 6% right now in the Niagara region. Skyscrapers abound and hotels are going up—restaurants and all kinds of new development—and we continue to move forward with that. On Friday I actually gave a cheque to the municipality for \$216,000. It's a monthly cheque they'll get forevermore now for hosting a casino. On top of that they're going to get millions of dollars, as will the regional government, in revenues, in property taxes on that whole development. There will be millions of dollars in development charges flowing to the community. There will be about 5,000 direct jobs there.

That has indeed been a wonderful economic development initiative that this government has taken on in Niagara Falls. There is a return from that casino, not just from the casino revenues. As people who work there have good full-time jobs and then build homes, there's a lot of revenue, there's a lot of economic development that occurs, and that revenue flows into the government coffers.

Where is it all going? It's all going to health care. Not only is some of that money coming into government

revenues and going back out into health care, but a lot of money is flowing into the Trillium Foundation. This used to be a \$10-million-a-year foundation that gave money out to charities. It has now grown to \$100 million a year. That money is going out to charities in my riding, in the member from Niagara Centre's riding and in the riding of the member from St Catharines. It goes to all the deserving charities that apply to committees throughout the province, that decide on where that money will get divvied up in Ontario. So all of that money is indeed going to health care and to charitable organizations.

I would think that the member opposite who complained about a laundry list of things would actually vote in favour of this motion. If he wants to do some of the things he said in his speech he wanted to do, then he should be voting in favour of this motion to extend this sitting for another week. I look for him in about 20 minutes' time or so to stand up and actually support this motion that we will extend the sitting.

At this point in time I ask that the question now be put.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I will take just a minute to consider that.

Mr Maves has moved that the question now be put. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1733 to 1803.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Mr Maves has moved that the question now be put.

All those in favour will rise one at a time until recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted  
Baird, John R.  
Barrett, Toby  
Beaubien, Marcel  
Chudleigh, Ted

Guzzo, Garry J.  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Harris, Michael D.  
Hodgson, Chris  
Hudak, Tim

O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Runciman, Robert W.  
Sampson, Rob  
Snobelen, John

Clark, Brad  
Clement, Tony  
Coburn, Brian  
Cunningham, Dianne  
DeFaria, Carl  
Dunlop, Garfield  
Ecker, Janet  
Elliott, Brenda  
Flaherty, Jim  
Galt, Doug  
Gilchrist, Steve  
Gill, Raminder

Jackson, Cameron  
Johns, Helen  
Johnson, Bert  
Kells, Morley  
Klees, Frank  
Martiniuk, Gerry  
Maves, Bart  
Mazzilli, Frank  
Molinari, Tina R.  
Munro, Julia  
Mushinski, Marilyn  
Newman, Dan

Spina, Joseph  
Sterling, Norman W.  
Stewart, R. Gary  
Stockwell, Chris  
Tascona, Joseph N.  
Tilson, David  
Tsubouchi, David H.  
Turnbull, David  
Wettlaufer, Wayne  
Wilson, Jim  
Witmer, Elizabeth  
Wood, Bob

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

#### Nays

Bartolucci, Rick  
Bryant, Michael  
Caplan, David  
Churley, Marilyn  
Cleary, John C.  
Colle, Mike  
Conway, Sean G.

Crozier, Bruce  
Dombrowsky, Leona  
Gerretsen, John  
Hoy, Pat  
Kormos, Peter  
Levac, David  
McLeod, Lyn

McMeekin, Ted  
Peters, Steve  
Phillips, Gerry  
Ramsay, David  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Smitherman, George

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 51; the nays are 20.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Mr Baird has moved government order number 10. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. I've received a letter from the chief government whip deferring the vote until tomorrow during deferred votes.

It being after 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 of the clock.

*The House adjourned at 1806.*

*Evening meeting reported in volume B.*

**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

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A. (L)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Marie (L)
Ancaster-Dundas- Flamborough-Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	Christopherson, David (ND)
Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Hastings-Frontenac- Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Leona (L)
Beaches-East York	Lankin, Frances (ND)	Huron-Bruce	<b>Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen</b> (PC) 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
Bramalea-Gore-Malton- Springdale	Gill, Raminder (PC)	Kenora-Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Brampton Centre / -Centre	Spina, Joseph (PC)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, John (L)
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	<b>Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony</b> (PC) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kitchener-Waterloo	<b>Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth</b> (PC) Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Beaubien, Marcel (PC)
Burlington	<b>Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron</b> (PC) Minister of Tourism / ministre du Tourisme	Lanark-Carleton	<b>Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.</b> (PC) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister of Correctional Services, government House leader / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre des Services correctionnels leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	<b>Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.</b> (PC) Minister of Consumer and Com- mercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Chatham-Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	<b>Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne</b> (PC) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	London West / -Ouest	Wood, Bob (PC)
Don Valley East / -Est	Caplan, David (L)	London-Fanshawe	Mazzilli, Frank (PC)
Don Valley West / -Ouest	<b>Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David</b> (PC) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports	Markham	<b>Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.</b> (PC) Solicitor General / solliciteur général
Dufferin-Peel- Wellington-Grey	Tilson, David (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	Sampson, Rob (PC)
Durham	O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	DeFaria, Carl (PC)
Eglinton-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)	Mississauga South / -Sud	<b>Marland, Hon / L'hon Margaret</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio (Children) / ministre sans portefeuille (Enfance)
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Steve (L)	Mississauga West / -Ouest	<b>Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John</b> (PC) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Erie-Lincoln	<b>Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim</b> (PC) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines		
Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L)		
Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	<b>Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail		
Etobicoke North / -Nord	Hastings, John (PC)		
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Kells, Morley (PC)		
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)		
Guelph-Wellington	Elliott, Brenda (PC)		
Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)		
Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	<b>Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion		
Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)		
Hamilton East / -Est	Agostino, Dominic (L)		

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Nepean-Carleton	<b>Baird, Hon / L'hon John R.</b> (PC) Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones	Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)
Niagara Centre / -Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)	Scarborough South / -Sud-Ouest	<b>Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan</b> (PC) Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
Niagara Falls	Maves, Bart (PC)	Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry (L)
Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)	Scarborough-Rouge River	Curling, Alvin (L)
Nipissing	<b>Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.</b> (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif	Simcoe North / -Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)
Northumberland	Galt, Doug (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	<b>Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Minister of Energy, Science and Technology / ministre de l'Énergie, des Sciences et de la Technologie
Oak Ridges	<b>Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio / ministre sans portefeuille	St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)
Oakville	<b>Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary</b> (PC) Speaker / Président	St Paul's	Bryant, Michael (L)
Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Stoney Creek	Clark, Brad (PC)
Ottawa Centre / -Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	Cleary, John C. (L)
Ottawa-Orléans	Coburn, Brian (PC)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Rick (L)
Ottawa South / -Sud	McGuinty, Dalton (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	Thornhill	Molinari, Tina R. (PC)
Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	McLeod, Lyn (L)
Ottawa-Vanier	Boyer, Claudette (L)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Oxford	<b>Hardeman, Hon / L'hon Ernie</b> (PC) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales	Timiskaming-Cochrane	Ramsay, David (L)
Parkdale-High Park	Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Parry Sound-Muskoka	<b>Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L.</b> (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	Smitherman, George (L)
Perth-Middlesex	Johnson, Bert (PC)	Toronto-Danforth	Churley, Marilyn (ND)
Peterborough	Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Trinity-Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	<b>Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet</b> (PC) Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation	Vaughan-King-Aurora	<b>Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al</b> (PC) Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC)
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Whitby-Ajax	<b>Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Willowdale	Young, David (PC)
Sault Ste Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	Windsor West / -Ouest	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Dwight (L)
		York Centre / -Centre	Kwinter, Monte (L)
		York North / -Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
		York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
		York West / -Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month.

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois.

**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: Susan Sourial

**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 / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**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 / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**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 / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**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 / Greffier: Tom Prins

**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.  
Tasca, 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: Tonia Grannum

**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: Tonia Grannum

# CONTENTS

Tuesday 12 December 2000

<b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b>	
<b>Sexual assault</b>	
Mr Hoy .....	6333
<b>Canadian Forces</b>	
Mr Wettlaufer .....	6333
<b>Parole system</b>	
Mr Levac .....	6334
<b>Rail service</b>	
Mr Bisson .....	6334
<b>High school law students</b>	
Mr Mazzilli .....	6335
<b>Proposed Bernardo film</b>	
Mr Bradley .....	6335
<b>Vanier Cup football game</b>	
Mr Coburn .....	6335
<b>Highway improvement</b>	
Mr Gravelle .....	6335
<b>Perth and Middlesex counties</b>	
Mr Johnson .....	6336
<b>REPORTS BY COMMITTEES</b>	
<b>Standing committee on general government</b>	
Mr Gilchrist .....	6336
Report adopted .....	6336
<b>Standing committee on justice and social policy</b>	
Mrs Mushinski .....	6336
Report adopted .....	6336
<b>FIRST READINGS</b>	
<b>St Jerome's University Act, 2000, Bill Pr34, Mr Wettlaufer</b>	
Agreed to .....	6336
<b>Limitations Act, 2000, Bill 163, Mr Flaherty</b>	
Agreed to .....	6337
<b>MOTIONS</b>	
<b>Disclosure of confidential information</b>	
Mr Sterling .....	6337
Agreed to .....	6337
<b>STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES</b>	
<b>Limitations periods</b>	
Mr Flaherty .....	6337
Mr Bryant .....	6338
Mr Hampton .....	6338
<b>THIRD READINGS</b>	
<b>Social Housing Reform Act, 2000, Bill 128, Mr Clement</b>	
Agreed to .....	6339
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>	
<b>Protection of privacy</b>	
Mr McGuinty .....	6340
Mrs Witmer .....	6340
Mr Flaherty .....	6340
<b>Labour legislation</b>	
Mr McGuinty .....	6341
Mr Harris .....	6341
<b>Walkerton tragedy</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	6341
Mr Harris .....	6342
<b>Emergency services</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	6342
Mrs Witmer .....	6342
<b>Welfare reform</b>	
Mr McGuinty .....	6343
Mr Harris .....	6343
Mr Smitherman .....	6344
Mr Baird .....	6344
<b>Organ and tissue donation</b>	
Mr Stewart .....	6344
Mr Harris .....	6344
<b>Tourism</b>	
Mrs Munro .....	6345
Mr Jackson .....	6345
<b>Ontario Northland Transportation Commission</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	6346
Mr Harris .....	6346
<b>Animal health laboratory</b>	
Mr Peters .....	6346
Mr Hardeman .....	6347
<b>Grape and wine industry</b>	
Mr Maves .....	6347
Mr Runciman .....	6347
<b>Children's services</b>	
Mrs Dombrowsky .....	6348
Mr Harris .....	6348
<b>Highway improvement</b>	
Mr O'Toole .....	6349
Mr Hudak .....	6349
<b>PETITIONS</b>	
<b>Doctor shortage</b>	
Mr Bradley .....	6349
<b>Safe drinking water legislation</b>	
Ms Churley .....	6349
<b>Noise barrier</b>	
Mr Wettlaufer .....	6350
<b>Safe streets legislation</b>	
Mr Levac .....	6350
Mr Brown .....	6350
Mr Peters .....	6351
Mr Hoy .....	6351
Mr Crozier .....	6352
<b>Rent regulation</b>	
Mr Marchese .....	6350
<b>Registration of vintage cars</b>	
Mr Barrett .....	6350
Mr Gill .....	6352
<b>Diabetes treatment</b>	
Mr Tascona .....	6351
<b>Protection of minors</b>	
Ms Mushinski .....	6351
<b>Northern health travel grant</b>	
Mr Bisson .....	6352
<b>SECOND READINGS</b>	
<b>Corrections Accountability Act, 2000, Bill 144, Mr Sampson</b>	
Agreed to .....	6353
<b>Employment Standards Act, 2000, Bill 147, Mr Stockwell</b>	
Agreed to .....	6354
<b>GOVERNMENT MOTIONS</b>	
<b>House sittings, government notice of motion number 81, Mr Sterling</b>	
Mr McMeekin .....	6354
Mr Christopherson .....	6356
Mr Gill .....	6358
Mr Colle .....	6361
Mr Tascona .....	6363
Mr Maves .....	6365
Vote deferred .....	6366
<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
<b>Legislative pages</b>	
Mrs Pupatello .....	6339
<b>TABLE DES MATIÈRES</b>	
<b>Mardi 12 décembre 2000</b>	
<b>PREMIÈRE LECTURE</b>	
<b>Loi de 2000 sur la prescription des actions, projet de loi 163, M. Flaherty</b>	
Adoptée .....	6337
<b>TROISIÈME LECTURE</b>	
<b>Loi de 2000 sur la réforme du logement social, projet de loi 128, M. Clement</b>	
Adoptée .....	6339
<b>DEUXIÈME LECTURE</b>	
<b>Loi de 2000 sur la responsabilisation en matière de services correctionnels, projet de loi 144, M. Sampson</b>	
Adoptée .....	6353
<b>Loi de 2000 sur les normes d'emploi, projet de loi 147, M. Stockwell</b>	
Adoptée .....	6354