



**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 37th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 20 December 2000

Mercredi 20 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

Wednesday 20 December 2000

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 20 décembre 2000

Report continued from volume A.

1820

HUMAN TISSUE GIFT AMENDMENT ACT
(TRILLIUM GIFT OF LIFE NETWORK), 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LE DON DE TISSUS HUMAINS
(RÉSEAU TRILLIUM
POUR LE DON DE VIE)

Mrs Witmer moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 142, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act / Projet de loi 142, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le don de tissus humains.

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

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

IMITATION FIREARMS
REGULATION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION
DES FAUSSES ARMES À FEU

Resuming the debate adjourned on November 2, 2000 on the motion for second reading of Bill 133, An Act to regulate the sale of imitation firearms / Projet de loi 133, Loi visant à réglementer la vente des fausses armes à feu.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Further debate? There being none, is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Solicitor General): No, Speaker. Committee of the whole House.

VICTIMS' BILL OF RIGHTS
AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA CHARTE
DES DROITS DES VICTIMES
D'ACTES CRIMINELS

Resuming the debate adjourned on November 1, 2000 on the motion for second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Victims' Bill of Rights, 1995 / Projet de loi 114, Loi modifiant la Charte de 1995 des droits des victimes d'actes criminels.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Further debate? Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

MOTORIZED SNOW VEHICLES
AMENDMENT ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LES MOTONEIGES

Mr Jackson moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 101, An Act to promote snowmobile trail sustainability and enhance safety and enforcement / Projet de loi 101, Loi visant à favoriser la durabilité des pistes de motoneige et à accroître la sécurité et les mesures d'exécution.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Debate? Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

CITY OF KAWARTHA LAKES ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA CITÉ
DE KAWARTHA LAKES

Mr Clement moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 170, An Act respecting the new municipality of The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes / Projet de loi 170, Loi concernant la nouvelle municipalité appelée The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

ST. CLAIR PARKS COMMISSION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA COMMISSION
DES PARCS DE LA SAINTE-CLAIRE

Mr Jackson moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 177, An Act to repeal and replace the St. Clair Parkway Commission Act / Projet de loi 177, Loi abrogeant et remplaçant la Loi sur la Commission de la promenade Sainte-Claire.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

Government House leader?

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Pursuant to standing order 72(c), I'm now asking for unanimous consent to move to third reading of Bill 177.

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

ST. CLAIR PARKS COMMISSION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA COMMISSION
DES PARCS DE LA SAINTE-CLAIRE

Mr Jackson moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 177, An Act to repeal and replace the St. Clair Parkway Commission Act / Projet de loi 177, Loi abrogeant et remplaçant la Loi sur la Commission de la promenade Sainte-Claire.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

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

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Pursuant to standing order 72(c), I'm asking now for unanimous consent to move third reading of Bill 170.

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

CITY OF KAWARTHA LAKES ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA CITÉ
DE KAWARTHA LAKES

Mr Clement moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 170, An Act respecting the new municipality of The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes / Projet

de loi 170, Loi concernant la nouvelle municipalité appelée The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

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

1830

HUMAN TISSUE GIFT AMENDMENT ACT
(TRILLIUM GIFT OF LIFE NETWORK), 2000LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LE DON DE TISSUS HUMAINS
(RÉSEAU TRILLIUM
POUR LE DON DE VIE)

Mr Clark moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 142, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act / Projet de loi 142, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le don de tissus humains.

Mr Brad Clark (Stoney Creek): I rise in the House today for third reading of a profoundly important piece of legislation, the Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act. Introduced just over a month ago by Minister Witmer, this vital legislation builds on the outstanding work of the Premier's Advisory Board on Organ and Tissue Donation and moves the government closer to its millennium challenge goal of doubling organ and tissue donation rates by 2005.

As you may recall, at the beginning of this year Premier Harris established the Advisory Board on Organ and Tissue Donation, chaired by Mr Don Cherry. The advisory board was asked to consult with donors, recipients, families, hospitals, doctors, nurses, health professionals and international experts, and come back with recommendations on how to improve Ontario's donation system and ultimately save the lives of many more people, people of all ages, in Ontario. Those who participated on the Premier's advisory board have selflessly donated their time and expertise, and I want to thank them all on behalf of the government and on behalf of the people of this province.

The result of their hard work, the Action Plan for Ontario, provided the framework for the legislation which would establish a comprehensive organ and tissue procurement system. The legislation would create the Trillium Gift of Life Network, a new agency to plan, coordinate and support organ and tissue donation across Ontario; would begin phasing in routine referral, which means that designated hospitals would notify the network when a potentially suitable donor becomes available; would begin phasing in required request, which means that in the event of an imminent death, if advised by the network, designated hospitals would make reasonable efforts to contact the patient or the patient's family to

discuss organ and tissue donation; would ensure the development of organ and tissue donation policies and committees and in-hospital donor co-ordinators in designated Ontario hospitals. As well, the network would coordinate public education and awareness activities, and assist hospitals in developing professional education programs to support the organ and tissue donation process.

Right now in Ontario some 600 people receive organ transplants every year. For many patients this much-needed surgery means a second chance for a longer and better life. That's why it's so important to train health professionals on how to approach donor families in a compassionate and sensitive way and that's why it's so important to provide people with the information they need and the opportunities they need to make informed choices. This legislation would create the framework to ensure such training and to provide the necessary information.

It's important to emphasize that we continue to respect the rights of individuals and their families to make the decisions about organ and tissue donation that best suit them. That's why organ and tissue donation continues to be voluntary. We recognize that organ and tissue donation is an important and difficult choice for individuals and families to make, and it's a choice that's often made when a loved one is seriously ill or injured.

It's also important to realize and emphasize that we cannot substantially increase Ontario's organ donor rate and organ and tissue transplants without a system that will deal with the current complexities. It was clear from the Premier's advisory board report that no single action can address all the complex concerns of organ and tissue donation; nor will it increase the donor rate. Therefore, this legislation would establish the Trillium Gift of Life Network to lead a number of initiatives. The network would report to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. The Trillium Gift of Life Network is intended to plan, promote and co-ordinate organ and tissue procurement and distribution in Ontario. It would work closely with designated hospitals and health providers to develop methods to best deliver organ and tissue donation services.

I'm proud to say that our government has already taken a number of important steps to support organ and tissue donation. For instance, we have announced increased funding for organ and tissue donation and transplantation, from the current level of \$47 million to more than \$120 million by 2005. As well, we've added 41 new dialysis units across the province to expand kidney dialysis services. The topic of organ and tissue donation has been added to the grades 11 and 12 health and physical education and science curricula.

We have the clinical and technological advancements to help us move forward. Furthermore, the success rate of organ and tissue transplants is increasing, and that means more lives can be saved.

Should the Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act be enacted, we can be confident that the future of Ontarians who need organ and tissue transplants, be they children

or be they adults, will be vastly improved through this legislation.

I can't say it as well as people who have experienced it. I have in my hand a letter to the editor that was published in the Hamilton Spectator on December 16:

"My brother, Jeff VanderWiele, has been a diabetic since age two and has a long list of complications. He had been receiving dialysis three times a week for almost two years for kidney failure and was told he would no longer be eligible for a transplant due to related vascular problems.

"We had little hope that he would be here this Christmas.

"Three months ago, he was put back on the list for a transplant as his condition seemed somewhat less severe. But deep down, no one believed he would be here to get it.

"On November 8, Jeff went to Hamilton General Hospital for some routine work-up tests related to the transplant. He was getting ready to come home to Burlington when he was told the transplant coordinator wanted to see him first. When she arrived, she asked if he was 'ready.' Perplexed, he asked what other test he was supposed to have. 'No, not another test,' she said. 'We have some organs coming in for you....'

"After being momentarily stunned by the news, we headed to Toronto.

"About 8 pm, they wheeled Jeff into the operating room" for this incredible operation.

"During the 7½-hour surgery, we paced the waiting room and spent time with Salemi's amazing family, everyone making nervous "chit-chat," and trying to appear somewhat confident. It is amazing how close you can feel to people you've never met when you're going through something so similar and terrifying.

"Finally, the long-awaited news that everything had gone OK.

"My brother is doing very well so far with his new lease on life. It's a whole new regime with endless supplies of pills, but not the needles he's needed to survive for the last 33 years.

"It truly a miracle, this gift of life, and my whole family thanks God for it every day.

"We all have a long road ahead of us, especially Jeff, but the road will seem much shorter than if my brother had not been here to celebrate this Christmas with us.

"I beg everyone to sign his/her donor card and, most importantly, to let family members know. The donor who helped Louise Salemi and my brother saved three other lives as well"—a total of five.

"Most importantly, from the bottom of my heart and those of my family, I thank the family of this donor—whichever you are.

"I can't begin to imagine how hard it must be to make such a decision, to give selflessly the gift of life to so many desperate people whom they've never met.

"I offer my deepest sympathy for their loss and hope they take comfort in knowing that, every day, Jeff and

everyone in our family think of them and thank God for their kindness.”

“Kim Smith, Grimsby.”

As we approach the holiday season, the season of gift giving, we need only look to our hearts and minds to realize the priceless gift we can so readily give. That’s why I strongly urge all members of the Legislature to support the swift passage of this bill that can give this gift of life to so many more other Ontarians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Comments and questions?

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This evening we’re going to be debating four bills, including this bill. There’s been an agreement among the House leaders and the parties that the speeches be limited to 10 minutes each on each of the four bills and that there be no comments and questions. I seek unanimous consent for that procedure to go forward.

The Acting Speaker: Just for clarification, that’s Bill 142, Bill 133, Bill 114 and Bill 101. Is there consent? It is agreed.

Further debate?

1840

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): I’m very pleased to have this opportunity to speak to a very important bill. I would like to commend the work of the advisory board, chaired by Don Cherry. We all appreciate how important it is, when members of our family are ill, to understand that our government has done all it possibly can to ensure that we have the resources available to make them well again.

My family are very close friends with three individuals who have been blessed to have received transplants. One lady has received a liver. She is the mother of six and grandmother of—I’m not sure—three or four youngsters. Another individual is a young man who is a husband and the father of two. Another is a very fine young man. All of them are from my home of Tweed, Ontario, so I can certainly speak to how delighted a community is when we know that people who are not very healthy and need an organ are able to get it.

I think it’s important to tell a story about a lady from my riding. One year ago—it was right at Christmas-time—she was on the waiting list to receive a liver. In my community, the hospital facility that had been providing some services to her and had been monitoring her health condition was Kingston. However, the hospital that was to perform the surgery was Mount Sinai here in Toronto.

In December of last year, my constituent was in the intensive care unit at Kingston General Hospital and received the good news that a liver compatible to her had been found. But the family also came to understand that there was not an intensive care unit bed available to which she could be transferred in the only hospital where the surgery could be performed.

The family were very anxious, as you can imagine. They had waited and waited for their loved one to get a liver that would be compatible for her. This constituent is a wife and mother and had endured great suffering with her condition. They contacted me to see if there was any avenue they were not aware of that they should pursue so this loved one could get to an intensive care unit bed in Toronto and get that liver transplant. As we know, with organ transplants, time is of the essence. These harvested organs just don’t last forever. There is a very small window of opportunity.

Time passed, there was no bed available and my constituent missed the opportunity for the transplant. Sadly, in the spring of the year 2000, my constituent passed away—a very great sadness for the family and for our community. The other sadness too is that the organ was lost. It was wasted.

Certainly, I support this legislation, but I bring this story to this room today so the members of the government understand that if we are going to put in place laws that will make organs more readily available for the people who need them, let’s make sure we also have the supports in place so that the organs aren’t wasted and people in the province get the operations they need so they can live.

I support this bill, but I implore you to address the critical situation in our hospitals: the backlogs and the blockages. Please do that so people like my constituent don’t miss those once-in-a-lifetime chances, as my constituent did.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I rise to speak in favour of the legislation, Bill 142, An Act to amend the Human Tissue Gift Act. As members of the Legislature have indicated this evening, every one of us knows someone who has been the recipient of a donated organ or tissue of some kind which has benefited that person immensely in terms of their personal health. We’re probably all aware as well of people who have passed away as a result of not having that opportunity, and although we hate to speak of this issue on many occasions, we know of the lost opportunities that were there.

The most traumatic experience has to be the loss of a loved one in the family, particularly a younger person in the family, because younger people are normally in the best position to have the organs that are of benefit to others. It’s a difficult subject to speak about, particularly when people are in a very bad emotional state, but we want to make it possible, in every possible way, for people to donate organs and allow others to carry on their lives in a somewhat normal fashion.

It’s important as well, as other members have indicated, that we have not only the communications network there but that we have the facilities available in the hospital to undertake these operations. There are people who simply would not live, and while there are many organs that can be donated, including the heart, lungs, liver, pancreas, kidneys and so on—it makes me think of St Catharines and the Hotel Dieu Hospital, which has a kidney dialysis unit. This is a sidebar to this issue, but

unfortunately that unit is going to be moved out of Hotel Dieu Hospital to another hospital if the Ministry of Health has its way. I hope that decision is not made.

I want to emphasize that the people who are in that unit are very often, almost always in fact, people who would like to have a kidney transplant so they could live a life that would be much more normal than the life they experience at the present time. In order for the public to benefit from any increase in the donation rates, it is critical that adequate resources be in place in the hospital system to carry out those needed surgeries.

We have heard occasionally of organs being lost as a result of lack of surgical beds or operating room time. I think all of us in this House consider it a tragedy when that happens.

There is the issue of the donor card and what takes precedence—whether the family wants this or the donor wants it. It's important for all of us to sign that donor card, to give a clear indication not only to our families but to medical authorities that we wish to have organs donated in case of an accident, or in case a person is passing away for another reason and the organs can be used for others.

Many of us in this House will recall, as youngsters, the first heart transplant by Dr Christian Barnard from South Africa and how that was quite a medical feat at the time. We've seen major advances at the present time that allow people to live for far more years as a result of those organ transplants.

I know right here in the city of Toronto we have some spectacular situations that exist. Dr Joel Cooper was a professor at the U of T, because he taught medicine, but he was also at the Toronto General Hospital. Dr Cooper is now in the United States, I believe in St Louis, and I heard recently he had developed a new treatment for emphysema. Dr Cooper was the person who did the combined lung and heart transplant.

What we considered small steps in the very beginning are now major steps. People can live for far more years and live a somewhat normal life simply by having the organs of others, but what is essential is getting the rate of donation up. That is a difficult thing to do, but I think this legislation goes a significant way to help that to happen.

It's nice to be able to rise in the House from time to time to support government legislation. Those of us in the opposition are often opposed to government legislation. This is something I suspect will have the support of all members of this House. I notice the Minister of Health is here. She will be delighted when this bill is passed and we can see an even more favourable rate of organ donation and transplant taking place in Ontario.

1850

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I'm pleased to participate in the debate this evening and in the others that will follow. The reason I am participating with respect to this particular bill is because I want to take a moment to thank and congratulate my colleague from Beaches-East York, who actually had the first bill in this

House with respect to this particular issue. I regret that in the spirit of Christmas this evening the parliamentary assistant didn't make reference to that, nor did the minister on the day this was introduced. I regret that because it is a good idea, and it still is a good idea if an opposition member was the first one to have it and the first one to present it.

I think members should know, and the public watching tonight, that indeed in May of this year Ms Lankin, my colleague from Beaches-East York, did introduce a private member's bill called the Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act, which later became referenced as Bill 82. The details in that bill are very much the same as the details in the bill we are passing tonight. In fact, that bill sought to accomplish what the government is going to accomplish in its own government bill: the establishment of a routine referral system and an organization to organize and monitor that.

It is true that bill was never debated in this House, because my colleague chose instead to use her private member's hour to debate another bill which was very important to her because her mother has been directly affected by this. That was a bill with respect to limiting the use of restraints in acute care hospitals in this province. But the fact of the matter is that she certainly did some months ago introduce a private member's bill before the government did, and here we are today.

She wanted me as well to express her thanks to the members of the advisory committee tonight because, in the drafting that was done on her private member's bill, she had the opportunity to meet with members and discuss with them at great length what she wanted to do and get their reaction to it. She was able to do that with a number of other organizations that were also supportive of both bills. She certainly appreciated the co-operation she received from them during the course of the time that her bill was being drafted and believes, as they do, that the government bill that now replaces hers will in fact achieve what she wanted to do and achieve, frankly, what the whole advisory committee wanted to do as well.

At the time Ms Lankin introduced her bill, she made reference to a number of other jurisdictions that had utilized the same kind of legislation to point out how successful this legislation could be if and once it was passed in so many of these jurisdictions. Because it has not been mentioned here this evening, I would also read into the record again some of the success that has been achieved in other jurisdictions as a consequence of other governments moving in the direction we are going in now. Pennsylvania, for example, implemented a system of universal referral and training and has in that regard seen a 45% increase in suitable potential organ donor referrals, a 26% increase in organ donations and a 50% increase in organ transplants. It's worth noting that in Pennsylvania those tremendous increases in all three areas occurred within only three years after the bill had actually been passed. That has the highest success rate in any of the states in the United States. It's one of the highest in the world. Those rates, regrettably, are twice

the average of Canada's. We certainly hope the changes in our jurisdiction will have us much more closely reflect the changes we've now seen in Pennsylvania.

We know as well that North Carolina passed its legislation in October 1997 and that it experienced an increase in transplants as well of approximately 50%. Our colleagues in British Columbia have also recently implemented universal referral and training legislation and we hope they will see similar improvements. Other jurisdictions have moved in the same way. Similar legislation has been introduced or passed in Arizona, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Tennessee and Illinois. So, clearly, any number of jurisdictions are looking at what has actually happened with respect to Pennsylvania and have made a conscious decision to move that way because they know so many people who are desperately in need of help will get it through this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say that of course we are going to support the bill before us because it very much reflects a similar private member's bill that was put forth by a member of our caucus, Ms Lankin. She's certainly pleased with the co-operation she received from the advisory committee and knows the bill will work, knows that it has in other jurisdictions where it was passed. We continue to be very happy to work with the government in any way, shape or form to ensure that the organization as it is set up performs in a way that will lead us to the success that I know we all want to achieve.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate? No?

Mr Clark has moved third reading of Bill 142. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

House in committee of the whole.

IMITATION FIREARMS
REGULATION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION
DES FAUSSES ARMES À FEU

Consideration of Bill 133, An Act to regulate the sale of imitation firearms / Projet de loi 133, Loi visant à réglementer la vente des fausses armes à feu.

The Second Deputy Chair (Mr Bert Johnson): Are there any amendments to the bill? If so, which sections?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Solicitor General): The government has amendments to sections 4 and 6.

The Second Deputy Chair: Shall sections 1 to 3 carry? Carried.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: I move that subsection 4(2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Exception

"(2) Subsection (1) does not apply with respect to a temporary transfer of an imitation firearm to an individual to permit the individual to use the imitation firearm on the business premises or in an area that is under the control of the business."

The Second Deputy Chair: Debate? All in favour of that amendment? It is agreed.

Shall section 4, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall section 5 carry? Carried.

We're coming to section 6.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: I move that subsection 6(2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Same

"(2) Sections 3 and 4 come into force on the day that is 90 days after the day this act receives royal assent."

The Second Deputy Chair: Debate? All those in favour of the amendment? Carried.

Shall section 6, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall section 7 carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Agreed.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): I move the committee rise and report.

The Second Deputy Chair: All agreed? It is agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again. Shall the report be received and adopted? Is it agreed? Agreed.

Hon Mr Sterling: Notwithstanding standing order 77(b), I seek unanimous consent to move third reading of Bill 133 and that the bill proceed with respect that it hasn't been reprinted with the amendments.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed.

1900

IMITATION FIREARMS
REGULATION ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LA RÉGLEMENTATION
DES FAUSSES ARMES À FEU

Mr Tsubouchi moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 133, An Act to regulate the sale of imitation firearms / Projet de loi 133, Loi visant à réglementer la vente des fausses armes à feu.

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Solicitor General): Our government is introducing this bill, which regulates the sale and purchase of imitation handguns and convertible starter pistols, as another step in keeping our promise to make communities safer.

We have listened to the concerns expressed by the police and our fellow citizens about the dangers of imitation guns circulating unchecked on the streets of our cities, and we're responding to those concerns. Too many innocent citizens are being endangered and intimidated by these look-alike weapons. This legislation is part of our ongoing efforts to rid Ontario streets of imitation handguns.

Imitation guns are a public safety issue that is growing. Earlier this year, the Peel police seized more than 3,000 imitation guns from an Oakville toy store. Those guns could have been used in robberies or public intimidation. Just think of it: 3,000 imitation guns seized from just one store. But how many other stores in this province are selling realistic imitation guns? How many more people would be intimidated by these devices? We couldn't let this problem go unchecked any longer.

When someone has what appears to be an authentic weapon, the police respond the way they're trained to respond. They must assume it's a real gun and act accordingly. In many cases these phony weapons look identical and bear the brand names of real weapons. They pose a threat to police and innocent people.

The numbers don't lie. More than 40% of guns seized by police are imitations. The provincial weapons enforcement unit estimates that approximately 700 such devices will be seized in the city of Toronto this year. This is up from the 600 seized just two years ago. Furthermore, another investigation by the unit revealed many examples of people buying starter pistols and converting them into firing live rounds.

The provincial weapons enforcement unit was formed in response to the growing problem of violent incidents involving firearms in Ontario. This unit is the only one of its kind in Canada and works with the OPP, the RCMP, Canada Customs, the Department of National Defence and police services across the province to investigate and confiscate illegal weaponry in Ontario. This legislation will give the unit additional strength in removing illegal weaponry and imitation firearms from the streets.

We have support for this initiative from police services throughout the province. We have support from the general public, who have asked us for a solution to this problem. All of them recognize the need for legislation.

We had a dramatic demonstration of the problem with starter pistols that can be converted to fire real ammunition last year. A person committed suicide in the back seat of a police cruiser using a modified starter pistol. This is just one example of how imitation guns can kill.

Our government studied the current federal legislation regulating some types of imitation guns. We found its definition is too vague and excludes many devices that are currently causing dangerous situations with police and citizens. We drafted this legislation to assist our front-line police officers because the federal definition of replica guns is confusing.

Current replica gun definitions under the Criminal Code and Firearms Act don't go far enough, and frankly they fail to safeguard adequately our police and our communities. The private member's bill introduced earlier on this year referred to "replica guns," which would have been regulated under the federal statutes, and the federal statutes are a little confusing. That's why we're introducing legislation with three important objectives: first, to ban the sale, purchase, transfer or receipt of starter pistols that can be converted to fire live ammunition; secondly, to make it an offence for commercial vendors

to sell, lease or otherwise transfer a deactivated or imitation firearm to anyone under the age of 18; thirdly, to make it an offence for anyone younger than 18 years old to buy a deactivated firearm.

This legislation also requires vendors to check photo ID for proof of age of purchasers and provides for fines of up to \$50,000 and forfeiture for non-compliance. This legislation has been drafted very carefully, I believe, and after careful consideration and consultation with our policing community and others with an interest in this issue. We will continue to monitor the situation. If we find that the situation needs tougher measures, we won't fail to act on that.

As an example, unless you are a collector, there's no legitimate reason for you to have a deactivated firearm. Otherwise, its only purpose is probably to terrify or intimidate law-abiding citizens in this province. Your families need this legislation as much as mine does, and this legislation is necessary to protect all Ontarians.

Imitation guns are a threat to law-abiding citizens, and that's why this legislation is so important. We need it to reduce the number of such devices on the streets and to make them harder to buy and transfer.

If approved, Ontario will be the first Canadian province to introduce and approve this type of legislation to improve community safety.

I thank all members in this House for their support throughout the process of this legislation. It will in fact, at the end of the day, protect our police and our communities.

If the Legislature approves this bill, as I hope it will, we will take one more step toward making Ontario a safer place to live, work and raise a family.

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): I appreciate the comments from the Solicitor General. I just want to address something that he mentioned right off the bat, and that's with respect to Bill 67. Let me go back to the chronology. He mentioned that Bill 67 made reference to the use of replica guns and that because the phrase "replica guns" is used also in the Criminal Code provision, somehow that creates a constitutional problem. But as the Solicitor General knows very well, and he certainly would have been advised by the Attorney General to this effect, that same provision in the Criminal Code that refers to replica guns also refers to imitation guns and imitation firearms. Of course, that's exactly what the title of this bill is.

The suggestion that somehow using a word that's also used in the Criminal Code would make a bill unconstitutional is preposterous, of course. But that's the political game that has to be played in order for the government to fulfil its mandate as, when it comes to crime, the official opposition to the official opposition. More on that later.

Let's be real here for a moment and talk about the chronology of this law. Let me start at the very end. I am happy that this law is passing, as we all are in this House. It's a good moment for victims, it's a good moment for police, because it means that the day is soon going to come—it's going to be about 90 days after royal assent is

provided—whereby people can't buy these phony guns like candy from a corner store. But that's the way it works right now.

1910

Around March of last year I was in a hardware store and I saw a couple buying one of these imitation guns, what I call phony guns, air guns, BB guns, pellet guns, starter pistols. They were quite specifically looking for the imitation gun that looked the most like an imitation gun. They said, "No, I think this one looks more like a gun," and they took it from behind the counter and then they grabbed their diaper bag and went up to the cashier, and they purchased them at the same time. I thought, how can this be? Can anybody buy one of these? So I asked the hardware store attendant, and he said: "There's no problem. If you want to buy the ammunition for the guns, you've got to fill out a form. But if you want to buy the guns themselves, go ahead and buy the guns."

This struck me as incredible. I thought maybe there was a mistake. We looked into the laws. Sure enough, the province of Ontario does regulate the sale of ammunition for these BB guns, pellet guns and air guns, but they weren't regulating the imitation weapons themselves, so we had an opening. Then I found out that in fact these are really the weapon of choice, the cheap weapon of choice, I guess, for criminals today in Ontario. At certain times in the last 10 years, there have been more of these phony guns picked up by the police in Toronto than handguns. Can you believe it: more of these guns than handguns? So these are a real problem: 40% of the weapons picked up in Toronto and Ottawa are these phony guns. The number's around 25% in Hamilton and Windsor. So now we've got a real problem.

Coming up we have, not too long from now, January 1, the anniversary of the shooting death of a man at St Mike's hospital here in Toronto. He had one of these phony guns. The police officer saw him with a phony gun and shot him dead. These are the kinds of tragedies and nightmares that I know police officers—it's probably their worst nightmare, that they would be involved in a shooting incident in which the other person, who they thought had a gun, didn't have a gun.

They build these guns to look like real guns. I got unanimous consent from the House, and I appreciate that, during the debate on the phony gun bill, Bill 67, to show these weapons in the House. So unlike Dr Shulman, who pulled out a weapon without any authorization, I pulled it out with unanimous consent. The barrel of these guns—they look like real guns. Police officers can recognize that right away. I spoke to bank tellers who called me up and told me they've had one of these things pointed at them—just a nightmare. The starter pistols can easily be hollowed out to be transformed into a real firearm. What a nightmare. Thousands of these things, as the Solicitor General mentioned, were being sold in various gun shops around Ontario and in Montreal. As I've said before, there just aren't that many track meets in Toronto to justify the sale of that many starter guns.

So I proposed on April 12 a private member's bill in this House, Bill 67, which would regulate the sale of the guns. It would have gone much further than this bill, but the point was still there. The point was to crack down on the proliferation of these phony guns, what the government calls imitation guns and what I would call imitation guns too. At the time, the Solicitor General, the same Solicitor General who rose today and made passing reference to Bill 67 introduced by the Ontario Liberals, the same Solicitor General walked outside of this House, when faced with the prospect of this bill, knowing that in effect it had been introduced earlier in the day, and without blinking said, "No, no, we can't support that." He said it was a federal problem. "The feds aren't doing enough," said the Solicitor General. The Attorney General walked outside of the House and said the same thing: it's a problem with the Young Offenders Act.

My first reaction was, "Wow, this government really doesn't get it." This isn't a young offender issue; this is an issue that goes far beyond that of youth crime, although obviously if it's the cheap gun of choice for criminals, that's going to include both young offenders and adult offenders. But the real reason, of course, that they rejected the idea was because it came from the official opposition.

That leads me to this conclusion, and one can only draw this conclusion, because they are now introducing their own bill: we've got to the point in our parliamentary system and in our political system today where the government of the day doesn't feel it is in any way acceptable that an opposition private member's bill passes on an issue that enters into what they perceive as a mandate that they have a monopoly over. They don't have a monopoly over issues of law and order and they don't have a monopoly over issues of safety of our streets and safe neighbourhoods. I'll be speaking to what Ontario Liberals have been doing during the debate on the Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act later on this evening.

But the problem with that, of course, is just this. Put aside the fact that instead of Bill 67 getting royal assent, this bill gets passed. Here's the problem. We're not going to have enforcement of this for 90 days. Bill 67, after it was introduced on April 12, was immediately rejected by the justice ministers. The next day the Premier of Ontario's political antenna was in tune to the fact that chiefs of police from Hamilton and Ottawa, Chief Fantino in Toronto, the Canada Safety Council, the Ontario Provincial Police Association, all of these people and more supported my phony gun bill, Bill 67. So the Premier said, "You know what? This is a good idea." Not only that, but everybody from the Toronto Sun to the Toronto Star also endorsed the bill, so the Premier said he supported it.

Suddenly we had a situation where Bill 67 passed unanimously in June, obviously a good moment for the victims of crime and for police who face these terrors all the time in Toronto and Ottawa and all over Ontario. But instead of taking it to committee and addressing the

concerns they might have had and getting it passed when the House first came back, they played this political game where they reinvented the wheel, repackaged it and introduced it, and it's passing now.

What's tragic about that, and I mean this, is that with this kind of bill it means that weeks or months—depending on how long it takes to get enforced, it may be half a year to a year, months of delay, before a law passes, the sole purpose of which is to protect the people. This isn't about crackdowns and reacting to crime after the fact, which is all this government does. My bill is about preventing these phony guns from getting into the hands of criminals, and sadly, by playing this political game, Bill 67 was never passed as amended. Instead, we had to wait months for photo ops and press conferences and this process whereby we had three readings. We've already had two readings of Bill 67. We could have taken it to committee and fixed it.

That said, I think we have to enjoy a good moment. I hope the people of St Paul's, and I know the people of Toronto and across Ontario, are going to be safer because of this law. For that reason, obviously, we're supporting a law that we originally introduced. It's a good day for victims, a good day for police. In an unfortunate, broken, imperfect way, I think it is a pretty good day for the Legislature as well.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I want to begin by referring back to the comments that were made by the Solicitor General. He began his opening remarks by saying that this bill is being set forward to regulate the sale of imitation firearms, with an emphasis on the words "regulate the sale of." He then went on to describe to all of us in the House and to those watching tonight the really horrendous statistics about how many of these imitation firearms, replica guns, have been seized not only in Toronto but in any number of other communities. He talked about the horrendous numbers with respect to the conversion of starter pistols into deadly weapons and how much of that occurs. He talked about the proliferation of these weapons and how the government wants to respond by bringing forward this bill to deal with the situation.

When I listen to all of that, I say to myself, why doesn't the government do the really logical thing? If they really want to deal with the proliferation of imitation firearms, then just ban them altogether. I don't think we should be here tonight talking about how we regulate the sale of imitation firearms. I think we should be here dealing with a bill that bans them altogether in Ontario. If we did that, then we would really get at the problem of the proliferation of these weapons and we would really get at the problem that our police face now, which is having to guess and second-guess if that pistol in someone's hand is real or is imitation. I don't think we should be putting our police in that position, and the government tonight clearly could have been moving a bill that didn't put them in that position any more.

1920

I want to go back to some of the comments my colleague Peter Kormos made on the second reading debate of this bill because the government would leave you with the impression this evening that as a result of passage of this bill we're going to somehow protect police and protect victims because these imitation firearms aren't going to be sold to people 18 or under and that's somehow going to resolve the problem.

My colleague Mr Kormos raised three cases that occurred just in the fall session, since the government introduced this bill, two of them on Halloween and one a few weeks later. Those three cases involved adults who had imitation firearms, in two of the cases for the purposes of part of a costume for Halloween. The day after Halloween there was an article in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record that said we could have had a tragedy on our hands. "It ended up being a toy gun, but Constable Scott didn't know that when he was confronted by an armed man in the dark of night."

This is a quote from the article: "It is only by the grace of God this guy wasn't killed that night because the officer had every reason in the world to shoot," said the head of the detective branch of Waterloo Regional Police, because he thought it was a real gun and it wasn't. It was part of a costume for Halloween, but it was being brandished about by a 52-year-old. Where do we resolve the problem of the proliferation of replica guns or imitation firearms by prohibiting the sale to 18-year-olds? This guy's 52 and he's using one as part of a Halloween costume. He's lucky he didn't get his head blown off in the process.

A similar incident, Halloween this year, Victoria, British Columbia: A gentleman who worked at Chapters was costumed for Halloween. I guess they decided it would be a good idea if their staff came in dressed appropriately on that evening. But as he was going to work, he was dressed up in a Darth Vader type of costume. Some passerby saw the holster with the firearm in it, called the police, the SWAT team came in, took the guy down, as they should have, and discovered it was an imitation firearm. Now, we're lucky no one was firing. We're lucky the police didn't second-guess and decide not to take a chance and actually fire. There might have been an innocent passerby between the police and the gentleman in the Darth Vader costume and someone else might have ended up getting killed. This guy was 24 years old. The government bill that bans the sale to those 18 or under does nothing to deal with this situation. Again, we're lucky someone didn't get killed.

But a third incident that my colleague from Welland-Thorold related during his remarks on this bill did involve someone who got killed. The same thing again, this time an actor at a Halloween party. As part of the costume he was holding an imitation gun. The police were called to the event, they saw him with the imitation gun in his hand, they shot him and he was killed. This person was 39 years old, clearly not a minor who should not have possessed an imitation gun but an adult who

was using it for—I don't want to say "recreation purposes"; that's the wrong word—but using it for purposes that have nothing to do with wanting to break the law, and still ended up dead because the police didn't take a chance, didn't second-guess. They fired.

We shouldn't be putting police officers in that position. That's the point I'm trying to make here tonight. Frankly, that's the point that I think Peterborough Chief of Police Terry McLaren said. He was asked about this bill in their newspaper called the Examiner and he said the following: "I support the introduction of the bill and for making the possession of replicas for people under the age of 18 an offence.... I think it's a step in the right direction, but I don't know if it's enough." He said, even with the ban, if some people are bound and determined to get a replica handgun they can probably get one. He also told the newspaper that he was very "concerned the legislation won't prevent adults from buying imitations, because there are adults who use the fakes to commit crimes as well."

So you've got a problem: adults who purchase an imitation gun, not for the purpose of committing a crime, but who could potentially end up getting shot, and who did in the case that was related by my colleague from Welland-Thorold; you've got adults who do use it for the purposes of a crime and end up being shot; and you've got adults who can purchase imitation guns and give them to people under 18 because the bill doesn't prohibit that. Then you've got the problem of youngsters playing in the streets with imitation guns, the police being called and having to second-guess whether or not you've got something real and whether or not they're going to respond in an effort to take those kids down if they feel they are having to act in self-defence.

There's the chief of police in Peterborough saying it's a step in the right direction but it certainly doesn't resolve what is going to be an ongoing problem even when this bill is passed; that is, adults getting imitation guns for the purposes of committing crimes, adults getting imitation guns not to commit a crime and still being put at risk and putting police at risk and putting other members of the public at risk, and adults being able to purchase replica handguns and giving them to kids, the same group the government is trying to ban through a sale at a store, because there is nothing in this bill that prohibits an adult from purchasing one of these things and giving it to a child or a minor.

I think my colleague from Welland-Thorold was absolutely correct when he said the problem with the legislation is that it does "nothing to remove these imitation firearms from our communities," and that is a fact. It might ban the sale from a particular segment of the population. It doesn't stop them from getting replica guns at the end of the day and it doesn't stop adults from having access to them. He said, "We've got to do it"—ban replica firearms—"to protect the community and to protect the police. We've got to get rid of them. It's as simple as that."

He's right, because we shouldn't be putting police officers in the position of having to guess and then second-guess if they're dealing with the real thing or not. If we ban replica handguns in the community, the police won't have to second-guess any more. They will know if they are facing something that looks like a gun and that it can injure someone, then it probably is capable of injuring someone, and then they will be in a position to rely upon the law in terms of protecting themselves and protecting the public, and they can take all the appropriate actions that have to be taken to do just that.

I say in conclusion, if the minister really wanted to do something about the horrendous statistics he talked about, if he really wanted to do something to protect the police and the public, he would ban replica handguns altogether in Ontario.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know we have an agreement in terms of time and I know that the Solicitor General only used about six minutes of the 10 minutes. I'd just ask for consent to speak for a couple of minutes on this bill.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Sterling: We've only used six minutes.

The Acting Speaker: Is there consent? It is agreed.

Hon Mr Sterling: I want to speak about this bill in the context of this Legislature and some of the experience I've had here. I just want to encourage members of the opposition to bring forward ideas that have merit, ideas that can be carried to fruition.

I want to congratulate Mr Bryant in terms of bringing forward the idea to deal with imitation guns. In the past, I guess governments have been afraid to adopt some of the good ideas that have been brought forward by the opposition. While the opposition may complain the government has co-opted this idea and brought it forward, the other part of a private member's bill has been in the past that the public have not really expected private members' bills to actually become law, and therefore the consultation process, the expectations haven't been there.

1930

I think we're going through a period of transition and I would encourage members of the opposition to continue to bring forward ideas which can in fact be put into law. I think that governments, whether they be our government or a future government, should not be afraid to take an idea which has been brought up on the opposition benches and perhaps improve upon it, make certain that all of the t's are crossed, the i's are dotted, that the stakeholders who are involved in it have been consulted with, and then put the bill into law. This is perhaps one of those cases where in fact this has happened.

I look at this not only as a matter of strength from the position of the member who brought this forward; I think it's important for all members of the Legislature to understand it's a point of strength also in terms of the government side saying, "We won't just reject this idea out of hand. We will say yes, there is a good idea. We

will bring this on, we will pass this law and it will be good for all the people of Ontario.”

The bottom line over the long period of time that I and my friend Mr Bradley have served here, since 1977, is what really counts: that you keep moving the yardsticks forward and that you improve our laws and improve the situation for all the people of Ontario. I think that's what we're doing here tonight.

I want to congratulate Mr Bryant and I also want to congratulate the Solicitor General in that we actually brought this thing to fruition and we passed a law, and the people of Ontario are going to be the benefactors of it.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Tsubouchi has moved third reading of Bill 133. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry? It is carried.

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

VICTIMS' BILL OF RIGHTS
AMENDMENT ACT, 2000
LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA CHARTE
DES DROITS DES VICTIMES
D'ACTES CRIMINELS

Mr Flaherty moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 114, An Act to amend the Victims' Bill of Rights, 1995 / Projet de loi 114, Loi modifiant la Charte de 1995 des droits des victimes d'actes criminels.

Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I'm pleased to be here to participate in the debate on Bill 114, the Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act. The purpose of this bill is to establish permanently an Office for Victims of Crime in Ontario. This agency would serve and represent victims of crime in Ontario. Bill 114 is an essential part of our government's commitment to help victims of crime.

In the Blueprint we committed to supporting victims and providing the services they need, and we committed to create a permanent Office for Victims of Crime. We reaffirmed our commitment to victims with our budget promise of \$1 million to establish permanently the Office for Victims of Crime.

Victims of crime do not choose to participate in the criminal justice system. It is inflicted on them by the criminal actions of others. We know that victims of crime need services to assist them in coping with very traumatizing experiences. That is why, in tandem with our efforts to create safer communities, our government is also addressing the concerns of those who find themselves in the terrible position of being victims of crime. Victims must have a voice and they must be heard, and we are listening.

As part of our commitment, we have created and expanded community-based services for victims of crime; created and expanded the domestic violence court program in Ontario; and allocated funding to support victims of domestic violence and their children. We established

the Office for Victims of Crime to consult with victims and victims' service providers and report on the state of victims' services in Ontario.

In June of this year the office released its report entitled *A Voice for Victims*. A number of recommendations were made in this report. This legislation is an important step in addressing these recommendations.

It is time for the Office for Victims of Crime to take on a permanent role in supporting and assisting victims. It is time for an advisory agency that understands victims' issues and is sensitive to the circumstances that victims find themselves facing.

A permanent Office for Victims of Crime would provide advice to government on a number of matters: ways to ensure that the principles in the Victims' Bill of Rights are respected; the development, implementation and maintenance of provincial standards for services for victims of crime; the use of the victims' justice fund to provide improved services for victims of crime; research and education on the treatment of victims of crime and ways to prevent further victimization; and matters of legislation and policy on the treatment of victims of crime and on the prevention of further victimization.

If the bill is passed, the Attorney General would be able to assign special tasks to the Office for Victims of Crime. Its extensive mandate would allow the office to provide up-to-date, informed advice to government that reflects the needs and concerns of victims of crime.

Mr Scott Newark, who is the special counsel at the Office for Victims of Crime, has been a major force in advancing the cause of victims and the Office for Victims of Crime in Ontario. He's here in the public gallery tonight with Detective Sergeant John Muise and others from the Office For Victims of Crime: Fatima Ferreira and Suzanne Dias. I welcome them to the public gallery.

The first Office for Victims of Crime in Canada was established here in Ontario in November 1998. At that time the organization was mandated to consult with service providers across Ontario to assess the state of victims' services in the province. The office fulfilled this mandate when it submitted its report entitled *A Voice for Victims* in June this year, but there is still much that remains to be done.

There is a need for an agency to advocate on behalf of victims to try to create a balance between the rights of accused persons, which are quite properly advocated in our courts, with the rights of victims of crime to make sure that victims have a voice. There is a need for an organization to provide informed advice to government on issues relevant to victims. There is a need for an independent agency to ensure that the spirit and intention of the Victims' Bill of Rights are respected. A permanent Office for Victims of Crime would meet these needs.

With respect to victims, we have taken some important steps in this legislative session, not only with this Bill 114 but with respect to victims of domestic violence in Bill 117, the Domestic Violence Protection Act, which received third reading earlier this week, and with other bills that are before the House now for consideration:

Bill 155, An Act to provide civil remedies for organized crime and other unlawful activities; Bill 168, An Act to protect victims by prohibiting profiting from recounting of crime; and the bill that was introduced in the House yesterday, which I believe is now Bill 176, dealing with the victimization of children in this province by pimps and johns exploiting children in child prostitution.

All of these measures brought by our government to this House this session are designed to provide what protections can be provided and to reinforce our commitment to victims of crime, both children and adults, in Ontario. In addition, when children are obliged, which regrettably they are from time to time, to give evidence in court as witnesses or victims, we have expanded the child-friendly courts in the province which make it easier—it's still difficult but it makes it easier—for children to give evidence in our courtrooms, whether they use monitors or are behind screens. Every new courthouse that we're building in the province includes child-friendly courts in the design.

In addition, we have of course been urging the federal government to repeal the Young Offenders Act for the very simple reason that the usual victims of violent crime perpetrated by young people are other young people. So our concern for victims requires that we encourage the federal government, within its area of jurisdiction in the Young Offenders Act, to take the steps it ought to take in order to protect other young people in Ontario from becoming victims of crime.

1940

Bill 114 is an important bill. It will permanently establish the Office for Victims of Crime for this government and for successive governments, one would hope, in the province. It will provide an expertise to government with respect to victims that government otherwise would not benefit from.

This legislation is one more step to help us achieve our overall goal of supporting victims. Every step we take moves us closer to creating a system that truly balances the rights of the victim with the rights of the accused. This legislation is important because it would enshrine the Office for Victims of Crime permanently in legislation. Making the office permanent is critical to ensuring that it will be able to continue work on behalf of victims.

We know there is still much more to be done on behalf of victims of crime in Ontario. We've taken a number of important steps during this legislative session, including this bill which is before the House now for third reading. We will continue to take action to help victims by creating the Office for Victims of Crime in Ontario permanently. We are reaffirming our dedication to victims of crime in this province. We cannot deny victims such an essential support, and I urge all members of all parties in this House to support this bill at third reading this evening.

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): I listened closely to the comments of the Attorney General because I wanted some indication that this bill was more than a missed opportunity, because this bill is a missed opportunity. We

support this bill. Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals will support any step, however small, that advances the interests of victims in Ontario.

But let's look at this bill. It's in three sections. It's one of the smallest bills that has been passed this session; unfortunately there are a lot of bills like that. It represents and fulfills one recommendation out of 71 made by the Office for Victims of Crime in its report on victim services in Ontario, *A Voice for Victims*, which was released in June 2000—71 recommendations and but one has been fulfilled with this particular bill that's now being passed today.

As I said, we support it, but what of the other 70 recommendations? Would now not have been the time to try and address some of those? That opportunity was not taken advantage of. Moreover, the Office for Victims of Crime has a very important role to play, in my view, in terms of being a watchdog, on our judicial system, our criminal justice system. By that, I mean we have to make sure that prosecutors and judges and everybody involved in the criminal justice system understands that it's not just about, on the one hand, the accused and on the other hand the prosecutors. There's somebody else in our criminal justice system who is a player and who is an actor who is probably the most affected by the result, and that's the victim. So the Office for Victims of Crime must be a check and balance against the criminal justice system, which for many years ignored victims and as a result victims were revictimized. I would commend the report I just mentioned to everybody in the province to read. It has a very concise and compelling history of the victims' rights movement and where it came from and hopefully where we're going.

I think that the office as well ought to be a watchdog on government. I think the office should be able to say in an independent fashion that the current government of the day, whoever that government is, is not fulfilling its mandate on behalf of victims. So my great concern with this particular bill is that on the one hand it's a missed opportunity to fulfill all the promises that have been made to victims by this government and to fulfill the 71 recommendations put in the report, and on the other hand, the only thing it does is take an office that has been existing since 1998, obviously before the election, this mandate and this government, set up before this minister was in place, and makes it a permanent office. Fine. That's true; it can't be eliminated by regulation. But what government would get rid of an Office for Victims of Crime? In any event, it was still a recommendation of the office and we accept that.

My only concern is that the one thing that has been done with this bill may actually potentially dilute their independence. It's important that they're independent, it's important that they not just be the patsy of the government of the day, whatever that government is, that they be able to speak out against the government of the day. They're subsumed within the Ministry of the Attorney General. If you work under the Ministry of the Attorney General, it's not going to be easy to be critical of your

boss. So whatever independent means by which we can fight for victims' rights, I think we need to do this.

I'm glad that some champions of victims' rights who work in this office every day for victims are here. I welcome you here on behalf of the official opposition and I thank you for everything you are doing and trying to do. I can tell you that what we're going to try to do on this side of the House is make sure that these recommendations in fact come to fruition. I hope we don't have to have 70 different bills, one for each recommendation. I fear that what we may have is what has been, I'm sorry to report to you, consistent certainly from the day that I was elected. When it comes to victims' rights and when it comes to crime generally, this government has got a lot to say about it, but in terms of the concrete results, my fear is that more often than not the government is all talk, no action.

So you say, "Fine, official opposition, you're fulfilling your role as the official opposition in being critical of the government. So what have Ontario Liberals done for victims of crime?" Let's just talk about what has happened in the last legislative session alone. Bill 67, a bill that cracks down on imitation firearms, is becoming a law today. That's a good thing for victims of crime and it's a good thing for police. These things are nightmares for victims.

Grandview survivors, one of the saddest and most tragic tales in the history of our province, the Grandview survivors, the ultimate victims who were revictimized, found themselves in the last year going through a situation where they weren't getting the benefits they had been promised, or at least they were concerned that was the case. So we fought to make sure those victims in fact had the promise made by the government of Ontario involving something that obviously preceded this government and made sure that those promises were fulfilled.

Domestic violence: there's another report I would commend to the people of Ontario to read, and that is what I call the Baldwin committee report, the joint committee report on domestic violence that was submitted to this Attorney General in August of last year. It contains the holistic, full approach to try and help victims of domestic violence once they get into the criminal justice system, which has to be addressed, obviously, but also the vast majority of victims of domestic violence who never call up the police, who never get involved in the criminal justice system; for right or for wrong they don't. So we need to help them. Again, that's all about prevention, not just about reacting afterwards.

Dalton McGuinty stood up in this House and called upon the Attorney General to provide the compensation due to the families of those victims in the OC Transpo tragedy. The Attorney General said no; the next day the Premier said yes, and we had a bill thanks to Dalton McGuinty.

1950

Of course, yesterday, we had introduced in this House the Bartolucci bill bonanza, a bill introduced by the

Attorney General. It takes not one, not two but three of the member for Sudbury's bills, at least components of them, and puts them into law.

I don't have enough time to go through all the things the Ontario Liberals have been doing: our five-point plan to crack down on gun violence; our four-point plan to crack down on organized crime; our efforts to assist victims of child pornography, victims of date-rape drugs, those who are victims of deadbeat grinches and the Family Responsibility Office, victims of drunk driving. We called on the Attorney General to ensure that those victims saw a judicial system that ensured we got jail sentences.

Last, but certainly not least, our House leader, Mr Duncan, fought for Mr Montfortin. I know I've got a minute left, but I want to give him time to talk about the fight he has been fighting for the victims in his riding.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): The Attorney General and I worked for more than a year to increase the lifetime maximum for victims of crime. The Attorney General could have responded last November; he could have responded last December or January or February or March or April; he could have responded in May; he could have responded in June, when Mr Montfortin's benefits ran out; he could have responded in July, August, September, October; he could have responded in November. We did finally get it in November. So I wanted to say to the Attorney General, thank you, on behalf of my constituent, for your efforts in making that the law of the province of Ontario.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I want to begin my remarks this evening on Bill 114 by referencing something the Attorney General said in his remarks.

Near the end of his remarks, he said this bill was so very important because we are going to enshrine the Office for Victims of Crime permanently in legislation. I say with all due respect to the Attorney General and the good people from the office who are here this evening, if you really wanted to do something for the victims of crime, you would enshrine statutory rights for victims in legislation in this province. This bill doesn't do anything like that, and we haven't seen anything from this government to do anything like that since the Premier made a commitment during the election of 1999 that he would fix the bill that had essentially been condemned by a superior justice as being meaningless and toothless when it came to protecting victims of crime.

I'm of course referring to the government's original Victims' Bill of Rights that the government passed in a previous mandate. It was passed with oh, so much fanfare and oh, so much promise to victims that finally victims would have enshrined in law their statutory rights, so they would not be victimized once by a perpetrator and victimized again by a court system that might not care about them.

It's probably worthwhile at this point to go back to what the former Attorney General said when he introduced the government's Victims' Bill of Rights. I want to take us back to second reading debate on Bill 23, which

occurred Wednesday, December 13, 1995. Mr Harnick was the Attorney General at the time who was bringing forward this oh, so wonderful legislation that was going to protect so many victims. Mr Harnick said the following—I want to quote him at little bit here this evening: “We introduced this bill for first reading but a couple of weeks ago and the basis upon which this was introduced was the fact that this government will not accept a system that allows victims of crime to suffer twice: first at the hands of the criminal and second under a justice system that does not respond to and respect victims’ needs.”

He went further: “This bill meets our commitments to Ontarians to bring forward a Victims’ Bill of Rights, something we promised during the last election campaign, and it’ll bring, we believe, meaningful change to the way victims are treated in the criminal justice system.”

One more quote from Charles Harnick during second reading debate for Bill 23, the Victims’ Bill of Rights, December 13, 1995: “We are taking action to restore justice, fairness and victims’ confidence in the justice system. The people of Ontario have demanded these changes and we are taking action.” Thank you, Charles.

What happened when the law, this government’s bill of rights that was going to stop the victimization of victims a second time, was actually tested in an Ontario court? Well, two very courageous women, Linda Even of Welland, who had been stabbed 18 times by her former common-law spouse, and Karen Vanscoy of St Catharines, who had a daughter murdered by a young offender, ended up taking the Ontario government to court because they felt their rights were violated when the crown attorneys involved in the two cases neglected to provide them with important information regarding the assailants’ court cases and the convictions. You see, these two women thought that when the government passed its Victims’ Bill of Rights it actually gave them some statutory rights, and they discovered, because of what the crown attorneys did, which led them to court, which led to a ruling by Chief Justice Gerald Day, that in fact they had no rights as victims. They had no rights, and any other person who thought they might be protected by this government’s Victims’ Bill of Rights didn’t have any either. Why was that?

I think the ruling that was made by Superior Court Justice Gerald Day in this particular case is very telling. It’s worth repeating in the House tonight as we’re dealing with a bill that supposedly—allegedly—is going to give some more rights to victims. Justice Gerald Day said the following in May 1999 in his ruling on the Ontario Victims’ Bill of Rights:

“I conclude that the Legislature did not intend for ... the Victims’ Bill of Rights to provide rights to the victims of crime. The act is a statement of principle and social policy, beguilingly clothed in the language of legislation. It does not establish any”—any—“statutory rights for the victims of crime.”

So much for all the pronouncements of the then Attorney General, Mr Charles Harnick. So much for all

the government’s rhetoric about how this bill was going to protect victims from being victimized twice. The Premier, when he was called to task about this by the media on the day the judgment was rendered by Gerald Day, said the government would fix its bill, would enshrine in legislation statutory rights, would make sure victims couldn’t be victimized yet again. Then the Premier repeated that promise during the election campaign of 1999, that at the earliest opportunity his government was going to bring in a bill that would protect victims, that would ensure that their rights would not be trampled on in court or anywhere else.

When this Attorney General introduced Bill 114 earlier this fall, some of us thought that this was the long-promised, long-awaited piece of legislation that was going to finally guarantee rights to victims, and oh, how wrong we have been shown to be, because this three-page bill, outside of permanently establishing the Office for Victims of Crime, which is a good thing, does absolutely nothing else to deal with victims of crime. It’s billed as an amendment to a victims of crime act that was allegedly passed in the first place to provide victims with some rights. That billing is such a failure. Anyone who listened to the Attorney General tonight who thought they might be getting some more statutory protection with this bill had better think again because there is nothing in this legislation to protect that. There is nothing in this legislation that remedies the terrible court ruling this government faced when the justice said this legislation has no meaning, it is toothless, it provides no rights, it’s a statement of policy. There’s nothing here that changes what has been in place since that ruling was made. That, despite the fact that on the day the judgment was made, the Premier promised he would amend the act and bring in rights and despite the fact that the Premier again during the 1999 election campaign promised the same thing.

2000

I say to the Attorney General, this bill tonight is more than a missed opportunity. It is a betrayal of victims like the two who brought the government to court in the first place and victims elsewhere in this province who trusted the Premier when he said, not once but twice, that he would fix this bill and bring in rights and who are still waiting for that to happen. The government should have lived up to the commitment the Premier made on not one but two occasions in 1999 and used this fall session to bring in a bill that provided statutory rights for victims of crime, and the government has refused to do that.

That surely speaks to a lack of credibility on the part of this government when it comes to protecting victims. The government is full of a lot of rhetoric about protecting victims, but a piece of legislation that’s supposed to enshrine those rights still doesn’t exist in this province, and it should.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Flaherty has moved third reading of Bill 114. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

Orders of the day.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Pursuant to standing order 72(c), I'm now asking for unanimous consent to move to third reading of Bill 101.

The Acting Speaker: Is there consent? Agreed? It is agreed.

MOTORIZED SNOW VEHICLES
AMENDMENT ACT, 2000
LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LES MOTONEIGES

Mr Sterling, on behalf of Mr Jackson, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 101, An Act to promote snowmobile trail sustainability and enhance safety and enforcement / Projet de loi 101, Loi visant à favoriser la durabilité des pistes de motoneige et à accroître la sécurité et les mesures d'exécution.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I would like to share my time with the former parliamentary assistant of tourism, Mr Joe Spina from Brampton, who is, in my view, Mr Snowmobile of Ontario. Joe Spina has done more in terms of going across this province talking to snowmobile users, people who are involved in blazing the trails for the snowmobile crowd. I've got to tell you, Mr Speaker, this guy has worked very hard on this bill and if anybody deserves credit for this, it's Joe Spina.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Order. It's five after 8. It's Wednesday night. Just try to control yourselves and we'll get along fine.

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre): I thank the minister and our House leader for the compliments. I just want to say "Happy trails" to everyone this winter because Ontario's snowmobile season has begun. Once again, over 200,000 snowmobilers are going to be heading out to enjoy some of the finest trails in the world, and about one in five of those snowmobilers will be tourists from outside of Ontario. Tourist operators are gearing up for what we think will be not only another great winter season but perhaps the greatest one in a long time. An early start with the weather this year has given a real good boost to the snowmobiling industry.

This government has committed an unprecedented \$170 million over four years to market Ontario as a four-season destination. The Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership Corp and the Northern Tourism Marketing Corp are working in partnership with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs to showcase Ontario as a great winter getaway destination.

Snowmobile trails have become an important part of Ontario's tourism infrastructure. Sustaining the trails means more visitors and more winter tourism jobs for Ontario families. In fact, the economic impact of this winter sport has been evaluated at about \$970 million to this province, clearly the largest, single most important winter recreation sport.

Unfortunately, the snowmobile season also brings with it tragic and preventable accidents. I'm sad to report that we have already recorded seven snowmobile fatalities this season. We need to do everything we can to make this family activity as safe as possible. The tremendous success of the industry has sparked the need for legislative changes. We have an outdated act that hasn't been touched since 1972. This government is committed to working with the Ontario snowmobile community to ensure we have a safer, stronger and sustainable system that provides for the needs of both tourists and recreational users alike.

For the past year, staff at the Ministries of Tourism, Transportation, Natural Resources, the Solicitor General, Northern Development and Mines, Health and Community and Social Services all contributed to the snowmobile task force, which is chaired by myself. With the teamwork that I received from these various ministries, hopefully we were able to find the right approach.

Bill 101 proposes changes to the Motorized Snow Vehicles Act and the Trespass to Property Act. It will enforce the current user-pay system, which requires snowmobilers who access the OFSC-sanctioned trails to have a permit. It will improve the safety of snowmobiling and support the reduction of fatalities through legislative and regulatory changes; through enhanced safety and enforcement measures, with penalties for non-compliance; with vehicle feature improvements; with enhanced trail design, maintenance and signage; and stronger enforcement on the trails to act as a deterrent to risk-taking behaviour. Bill 101 also amends insurance regulations to provide full coverage of snowmobiles under a motor vehicle liability policy, thereby enhancing the coverage of snowmobilers and, finally, provides consideration of special exemptions for traditional and business users of the trails.

I want to emphasize that the user-pay approach will ensure that people who will benefit most directly from Ontario's snowmobile trail system will contribute to its sustainability. Quite simply, if you use trails maintained by the OFSC, you need to buy a permit. If you do not use trails maintained by the OFSC, you do not need to buy a permit.

We also want to emphasize that the request for these changes in legislation came from the snowmobile community itself. The OFSC and the Ontario Snowmobile Safety Committee, which is a public sector and private sector partnership, made the request to our government's snowmobile task force earlier this year. The approach contained in Bill 101 was also broadly supported during public hearings in Kenora, Thunder Bay, Timmins, Bala and Peterborough. During these hearings, tourism oper-

ators and traditional users raised some concerns. We listened to them and we tried to revise the bill to meet their needs. In summary, the snowmobile community supports these changes and the public supports these changes.

2010

I want to take this opportunity to thank the executive and the negotiating team from the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs. The government liaison person from the federation is here in the gallery today, Tim West. Tim has worked tirelessly representing the federation in helping us go through the process these past 12 months, along with past president Bert Grant, former treasurer Bill Smith, current president Dennis Burns, not to mention the executive director and general manager, Ron Purchase. This crew of people has been very important and critical in working with us to try to shape a system and make revisions so that everyone would benefit.

I want to take this moment to also thank the opposition members for their support and for their co-operation at committee: Mr Levac; Mr Gravelle, for his input; Mike Brown from Algoma-Manitoulin; and last but not least, Mr Gerretsen. From the NDP caucus, I want to particularly recognize Shelley Martel and Frances Lankin, both snowmobilers and people who contributed with their input to this process. We urge the members of the Legislature to support this bill.

We also want to recognize, finally, the members of our own caucus, who were also in committee, people like Garfield Dunlop, Toby Barrett, Raminder Gill—my goodness, hey—Brad Clark and a number—

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): You can't remember their names.

Mr Spina: There were a number of people in and out of the different committee hearings, but people who also were affected by snowmobiling in eastern Ontario—Joe Tascona, who has the home of the OFSC head office in Barrie, and particularly Minister Norm Sterling, who comes from the real heartbelt of snow and ice in the Ottawa Valley.

In conclusion, we want to ensure the growth of a stronger, safer, more sustainable snowmobile trail network in this province because it is a great winter family sport. We just want to encourage everyone to practise smart sledding. Happy trails.

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): I just want to take a few moments. Before I get into the details of Bill 101, I want to make sure that I extend to all my colleagues in the House a merry Christmas, happy season and a great new year for you all. I want to also take the time to recognize the people who work in this building. To them I say thank you for the diligence, the hard work and the overtime you've put in time and time again. To Hansard recorders, to the Clerk's office, to the security guards, to all the people who make this place work, I want to say thank you and I also want to say merry Christmas and happy new year to you all.

I want to compliment the member from Brampton Centre. He and I have spoken at length about the bill. As

he knows, there are some concerns that were brought up, and to the credit of the government, they made an effort to try to take care of those problems. The one that I do want to point out, though, is one that I got an answer for that I found rather interesting, and that was the amendment we offered for the municipalities that had concerns about unopened road allowances being used as snowmobile trails. In that problem, it was pointed out that there is a very large liability concern by the municipalities and they basically put that forward. It was mentioned three times in the hearings when we went across northern Ontario.

This is a 30-year standing problem. The fact is, the liability has not been answered. The government's response in terms of whether or not they could support the amendment—it actually had to be stood down because we didn't have the answers—was, "We believe it's already covered in the Occupiers' Liability Act and the Municipal Act. Therefore, because we believe it's already covered off, we're not going to support the amendment."

The municipal employee who brought that to our attention, Mr Robert List, wrote me back after he had heard the response from the government side and said—and this was somewhat of his line and I don't necessarily agree with it—"If you get two lawyers in a room, you might get three opinions." The problem was—

Interjection: Maybe more.

Mr Levac: Quite possibly more.

The problem that he brought to my attention was that because it is up to interpretation that way, they would have liked to have been able to have that in the bill to say that the liability would not be covered off by the municipalities. It's not that I didn't want that to be in the bill because it was an amendment. It was because there was a concern that the municipalities—and I did support the member's bill and do support the member's bill because of the importance it holds for the snowmobile industry and the snowmobilers themselves—may now start pulling the plug on using those unused road allowances. They may say, "Sorry, you can't have access to this because we're not convinced that the liability is covered off yet, and until we get that response we may be pulling the plug on that."

That being said, I still want to challenge the government to go back and make sure, make darned sure, that the municipalities have an understanding of that. To that end we asked at the committee level, and they accepted my motion, to make sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs was notified by us, at the committee level, to please notify the municipalities of the interpretation that was being held. I'm getting the signal that that's being done and accepted. I want to thank the member for that, because that was an important part of that presentation, I felt, and it struck home: 30 years. So I want to thank the minister for doing that.

Finally, I want to make the comment that what we did here across the province in the consultation was really valuable input. To the member, as he said several times,

it was a wonderful opportunity for the people to come together and have input at the grassroots level.

I want to end with maybe a question that we need to ask the government: Why, then, time allocation for the important, ever-changing labour bills? We really need to know that the public gave input. If we use that as an example—and a good one—I would hope we would make better legislation because there were changes made. When the bill was introduced, it was pointed out that there were some problems in it, and when it came to committee we made those corrections. The system works when you let it.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): I too would like to add my few brief comments to this bill. Of course, the first thing we have to recognize is the tremendous tourism potential that snowmobiling has in this province; not only that, but the effect that it has right now on the economies of much of our province. Snowmobiling is a sport that has taken off tremendously over the last 10 or 15 years, and it was high time that we had a regulatory system in place so that everybody knows what the rules are.

I find it kind of interesting. This bill went out to public consultation during the summer, and at that time we were advised by the illustrious former parliamentary assistant that this bill would be the first bill back when the House came back in September and we would deal with it so that the snowmobile clubs and the snowmobilers would know what the rules of the game were going to be as soon as the winter season arrived this year. Well, here we are on the very last day of the session, after we really haven't heard anything about this bill over the last two or three months, other than the fact that it was in committee for two days, and we're finally dealing with this bill in a very rapid fashion.

I'm just wondering whether or not the fact that the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs had some very serious concerns about this bill has affected the government's action on this bill. Let me just read to you some of the concerns they have which have not been addressed in the bill. In the brief that they presented to the committee—and they have an excellent brief, by the way—they made four very salient points. The first thing they said was that the final authority on all matters and processes relating to the administering of legislative permits must remain with the OFSC, especially use of permit revenues. "Bill 101 as currently written is at odds with this basic principle." That's the position of the snowmobile federation. "It transfers the authority for virtually every aspect of the OFSC trail permit to the Minister of Transportation while leaving all of the responsibility but not authority with the club volunteers." That, Speaker, is still a major concern.

2020

It goes on to say in the second point they raise that a legislative permit must be an absolute and easily enforceable requirement on any snowmobile trails operated and maintained by a club. They state that it's their belief that all OFSC trails must be included, without exception, and

that Bill 101 allows the Minister of Transportation to exempt classes of trails from the mandatory permit requirement.

The point is that so much in this bill has been left to regulation that I don't think the average snowmobiler really has any understanding as to—they in effect will have to deal with the ministry to make sure that the proper regulations are passed. You and I know that once we're talking about regulations those regulations will not be dealt with in the House. So the average snowmobiler may not in fact get to know what those regulations are until the deed in effect has been done. So there are some major concerns about this piece of legislation, not the least of which is the matter dealing with the unopened road allowances.

I see that the members opposite there are having a tremendous discussion. Undoubtedly, it's about the significance of this snowmobile legislation from which they will benefit as well as they enjoy the winter season. But the municipalities in this province have a real concern that there isn't an outright statement in the bill that basically states that the municipalities will not be held responsible for any snowmobile accident that may occur on unopened road allowances. That's a concern. We were told by the parliamentary assistant that there were all sorts of legal opinions that it really wasn't necessary to put that in the bill. But I think for the municipalities' sake, and we all know the number of responsibilities that have already been downloaded on municipalities, it would have been a lot clearer, a lot better if the act had simply included the statement that a municipality cannot be held responsible for any snowmobile accidents or any snowmobile liability on unopened road allowance. For the life of me I cannot understand why the ministry was reluctant to put that in there.

Having said all that, I hope this bill works. I hope the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs is happy with the legislation. At least now there's a regulatory framework in place, which is better than the situation the way it currently exists.

With that, Speaker, I wish you and every member in this House and everyone in Ontario a very merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): Well, there's nowhere else I'd rather be at 8:30 this evening, than dealing with bill number four.

Let me begin by saying that as a result of the changes that have occurred during the clause-by-clause we will be supporting this bill. I want to make that clear to the folks who are here from OFSC tonight, and we have certainly indicated that to the former parliamentary assistant who has had the privilege of carrying this bill through this whole fall session.

I think it's worth noting, because the ex-parliamentary assistant made note of the amount of money that the government has spent on tourism to support trails, and it was quite an impressive amount of money, that were it not for the investment that had been made by our government in the Sno-TRAC program, we wouldn't

have trails to boast about today. That was a \$14-million investment to develop the trail system in this province to a first-class trail system that we could be proud of and that we could use to promote tourism in this province and that we could use to increase economic development, especially in my part of the world, where so many lodges and restaurants now benefit from this winter activity.

It was also our government that brought in the STOP officers, who act as trail wardens now to police what is happening on the trails. So I say to the ex-parliamentary assistant and the other government members who are here tonight, who are obviously very supportive of this bill and supportive of snowmobiling in general in this province, next time you want to yip and yap about the 10 lost years, remember where this all started. Were it not for that initial, important, significant \$14-million investment in the Sno-TRAC program, we wouldn't be here today with respect to snowmobiling in the province.

It's worth noting as well that OFSC, throughout that whole period of time when we made that investment, were incredibly good to work with and to deal with. I know the parliamentary assistant has benefited by their co-operation and expertise as well.

A couple of things with respect to the bill: the concern we have had from the beginning that I hope has been addressed is a concern that traditional users of trails would be forced to purchase a trail permit. We objected to that because we know, especially in my riding—and I think the other northern members who are here tonight can express the same—that we have many people who are not recreational users of the trail but use a small portion of the trail, for example, to access their camp or cottage so that in the winter they can ice fish on the lake in front of their camp or cottage. We also have a number of trappers who access small portions of the groomed trails in order to get to their traplines.

The concern that was raised during the consultations, and the concern that has been raised to many northern members in our constituency offices, is that it would not be fair to force those traditional users to pay for a permit, because they were not using those trails for recreational purposes; they were using them from time to time on weekends, if they wanted to go to their cottage, or from time to time to access their traplines, but they were not the hard-core recreational users of the groomed trail, who should indeed be paying for a permit and who should indeed be enforced in terms of making sure they are paying for the permits, to maintain that important trail system.

We raised those concerns with the parliamentary assistant and asked the government to look for a way to guarantee that traditional users would not be forced to pay a fee, would not have to buy a trail permit only for the purposes of accessing their camp or their trapline or some of the other uses that they would access those groomed trails for.

I hope the government has found a solution that's going to work. The government certainly told the committee during the clause-by-clause that it intended, by

regulation, to list all of those traditional users who would be exempt from having to buy a trail permit. That is a change from the government's first position during the committee hearings, because the first position was that those traditional users would have to buy a special trail permit which identified them as non-recreational users of those groomed trails. But it would still have meant that those individuals would have to pay some form of a fee to obtain those special permits. We objected to that, because we didn't think it was fair and we didn't think it made any sense that those who are not using the groomed trails for recreational purposes should have to pay a fee at all, just to be clearly designated as being exempt.

When the committee sat again in clause-by-clause, the parliamentary assistant announced that he had an agreement from the government that those traditional users who were going to be exempt would not have to purchase a special permit but would just be exempt and would not have to purchase a permit at all. We commend the government for making that change, because we didn't think it would be fair to have these people purchase a permit, and the government has committed to us, has guaranteed, has promised us that indeed those users will not have to buy a permit.

The second issue is the list of users who will be exempt. During the committee stage, the parliamentary assistant presented a four-page list to the committee members—I gather he had help on this—that would outline clearly who would be exempt from having to have a permit for using the groomed trails.

There are a number of users: trappers, cottage owners—who we were concerned with—First Nations, emergency workers etc. I would encourage the government to actually make that list public so that presenters who came to the committee hearings who were concerned about this particular issue will know they're going to be exempt, and also to make that list available to MPPs like myself who would like to assure our constituents who were particularly concerned about this section that they will be exempt. At present the document shows as being confidential for the purposes of the committee, and I would encourage the parliamentary assistant, in the new year, to provide all of us with a clear indication of who will be exempt so we can reassure our constituents that they will not be caught and have to buy a permit.

2030

Secondly, I know the parliamentary assistant has had some conversations with both the Minister of Transportation and the Solicitor General with respect to designation of trail wardens. He has assured me there will be ongoing discussions in the hope that we will reach a position whereby the Ministry of Transportation will be able to designate trail wardens for the purposes of this bill, and I hope that will happen. It was on that basis that I withdrew an amendment that would have done the same. I have done that on the basis that the parliamentary assistant has assured me that these discussions will go on and there should probably be a positive resolution to this. So I'm going to hold him to his word.

Thirdly, the purpose of the bill in the first place, as I understand it, was to secure an ongoing, substantial form of revenue for the OFSC so that it could continue to maintain the groomed trails in this province. I say to the government that I hope the changes that are coming in Bill 101 will provide the revenue that is needed to do that, but I would encourage the government to continue looking at an effective mechanism to pay for the grooming of the trails in the province.

The parliamentary assistant has clearly said—and frankly we all know, particularly those of us from the north—that the groomed trails provide an excellent vehicle for tourism in our province and generate incredible economic wealth. We do not want that put at risk. While we all hope the bill, by ensuring that recreational users have to buy permits and by having trail wardens who will enforce that, will generate the revenue the clubs need, if it doesn't, the government has to continue to look for a more effective mechanism to ensure the revenue is there to allow the clubs the ability to do the job they need to do to ensure we have a first-class trail system in this province. I say to the parliamentary assistant, I know you've looked at other jurisdictions, particularly in the States. I would encourage you to keep looking so that we have another mechanism to support this very important industry.

Finally, I want to very much thank the parliamentary assistant, Mr Joe Spina, who is here this evening. It is true that he and I, he and Ms Lankin, and he and Mr Bisson have had many discussions with respect to this bill, and I believe he worked very hard to try to meet those concerns. I hope we will have a bill before us that has met all the concerns and will continue to make sure the trail system is very economically viable in this province.

Mr Spina: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The danger when you mention names is that you forget, so I want to thank the Minister of Transportation, the Honourable David Turnbull; co-Chairs Julia Munro and Gary Stewart; and Chair Steve Gilchrist for their help.

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr Sterling has moved third reading of Bill 101. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (HISTORIC VEHICLES), 2000

LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE (VÉHICULES ANCIENS)

Mr O'Toole moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 99, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act with respect to number plates for historic vehicles / Projet de loi 99, Loi modifiant le Code de la route en ce qui

concerne les plaques d'immatriculation pour les véhicules anciens.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): With the indulgence of the House, I would like to recognize Gord Hazlett, a member of the East York Historical Society; Wayne Plunkett, one of the outstanding collectors in Ontario; John Parker; and my assistant, Greg MacNeil, for their hard work. With that, this will satisfy many of the antique enthusiasts in Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Further debate?

Mr O'Toole has moved third reading of Bill 99. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

STATUS OF BILL 107

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to move to discharge Bill 107 from committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is there consent? It is agreed.

Mr O'Toole: I move that Bill 107 be discharged from the standing committee on justice and social policy and that it be ordered for third reading.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed.

FIREFIGHTERS' MEMORIAL DAY ACT, 2000

LOI DE 2000 SUR LE JOUR DE COMMÉMORATION DES POMPIERS

Mr Levac moved third reading of the following bill:

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

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): In the short time I have, I just want to take a moment to say thank you to the people who have put this bill forward. I want to take a moment to say thank you to the firefighters for the job they do, day in and day out. I also want to thank the staff who have worked so diligently and very hard on this bill. It's an important thing for us to say to the firefighters of Ontario that we appreciate the work you do. You are very dedicated, and we are in debt to you. Also, to their families we say, thank you very much and God bless you for the work you do.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Levac has moved third reading of Bill 107. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

STATUS OF BILL 125

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to move the discharge of Bill 125 from committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it agreed? It is agreed.

Hon Mr Sterling: I move that Bill 125 be discharged from committee of the whole House and that it now be ordered for third reading.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

DEAF-BLIND AWARENESS
MONTH ACT, 2000LOI DE 2000 SUR LE MOIS
DE SENSIBILISATION
À LA SURDI-CÉCITÉ

Mr Young moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 125, An Act to proclaim the month of June as deaf-blind awareness month / Projet de loi 125, Loi proclamant le mois de juin Mois de sensibilisation à la surdi-cécité.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Young has moved third reading of Bill 125. Debate?

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to consider second reading of Bill 131.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed.

2040

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT
(IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE), 2000LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT
LE CODE DE LA ROUTE
(DISPOSITIFS DE VERROUILLAGE
DU SYSTÈME DE DÉMARRAGE)

Mr Dunlop moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 131, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to establish an ignition interlock device program / Projet de loi 131, Loi modifiant le Code de la route afin d'établir un programme d'utilisation de dispositifs de verrouillage du système de démarrage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Debate?

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? It is agreed.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, pursuant to standing order 72(c), I am now asking for unanimous consent to allow for third reading of Bill 131.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT
(IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE), 2000LOI DE 2000 MODIFIANT
LE CODE DE LA ROUTE
(DISPOSITIFS DE VERROUILLAGE
DU SYSTÈME DE DÉMARRAGE)

Mr Dunlop moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 131, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to establish an ignition interlock device program / Projet de loi 131, Loi modifiant le Code de la route afin d'établir un programme d'utilisation de dispositifs de verrouillage du système de démarrage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): On a point of order, Speaker: I think we had one of the most remarkable speeches in the time that I've ever been here when the government House leader very generously talked about the opposition bringing forward ideas, positive and constructive suggestions, to make Ontario a better place. I want to acknowledge that and say how much it was appreciated on this side of the House.

In the spirit of goodwill that we have here today, I would like to seek unanimous consent—

Interjections.

Mr Caplan: You haven't even heard it. We have goodwill.

In the spirit of goodwill and co-operation we've had here tonight, I seek unanimous consent for second and third reading of a bill standing in the name of my leader, Mr McGuinty, Bill 165, An Act to restore goodwill and positive learning conditions in Ontario's schools.

The Acting Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I heard a no.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): I know it's Christmas, but we can't let the goodwill go too far.

I seek unanimous consent to allow second and third readings to be called on Bill Pr2, Bill Pr17, Bill Pr25, Bill Pr26, Bill Pr28, Bill Pr31, Bill Pr32, Bill Pr33 and Bill Pr34.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT
(TRAFFIC CALMING), 2000

Mrs Mushinski moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Mrs Mushinski moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

MUNICIPALITY OF
WEST PERTH ACT, 2000

Mr Gilchrist, on behalf of Mr Johnson, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr17, An Act to change the name of The Corporation of the Township of West Perth to The Corporation of the Municipality of West Perth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? It is agreed.

Mr Gilchrist, on behalf of Mr Johnson, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr17, An Act to change the name of The Corporation of the Township of West Perth to The Corporation of the Municipality of West Perth.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

My thanks to Mr Gilchrist.

1274187 ONTARIO LIMITED ACT, 2000

Mr Young moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr25, An Act to revive 1274187 Ontario Limited.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? It is agreed.

Mr Young moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr25, An Act to revive 1274187 Ontario Limited.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA
TRUST COMPANY ACT, 2000

Mr Mazzilli moved second reading of the following bill:

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? It is agreed.

Mr Mazzilli moved third reading of the following bill:

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

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

KMFC HOLDINGS INC. ACT, 2000

Mr Ouellette moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr28, An Act to revive KMFC Holdings Inc.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? It is agreed.

Mr Ouellette moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr28, An Act to revive KMFC Holdings Inc.

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

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

2050

MUNICIPALITY OF
SIOUX LOOKOUT ACT, 2000

Ms Martel, on behalf of Mr Hampton, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr31, An Act to change the name of The Corporation of the Town of Sioux Lookout to The Corporation of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout.

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

Ms Martel, on behalf of Mr Hampton, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr31, An Act to change the name of The Corporation of the Town of Sioux Lookout to The Corporation of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout.

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

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

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION
ASSOCIATION ACT, 2000

Mr Young, on behalf of Mr Kells, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

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

Mr Young, on behalf of Mr Kells, moved third reading of following bill:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition Association.

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

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

IDLEWYLD MANOR ACT, 2000

Ms Martel, on behalf of Mr Christopherson, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting Idlewyld Manor.

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

Ms Martel, on behalf of Mr Christopherson, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting Idlewyld Manor.

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

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

ST JEROME'S UNIVERSITY ACT, 2000

Mr Wettlaufer moved second reading of the following bill:

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

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

Mr Wettlaufer moved third reading of the following bill:

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

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

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

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I would seek unanimous consent to move a motion without notice regarding the chief election officer.

The Acting Speaker: Is it agreed? It is agreed. The Chair recognizes the minister—the House leader, the minister of corrections and something else—Intergovernmental Affairs, of course. You thought I didn't know it.

APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF ELECTION OFFICER

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): I move that an humble address be presented to the Lieutenant Governor in Council as follows:

“To the Honourable Lieutenant Governor in Council:

“We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now

assembled, request the appointment of John Hollins as chief election officer for the province of Ontario, as provided in section 3 of the Election Act, RSO 1990, chapter E.6, and that the address be engrossed and presented to the Lieutenant Governor in Council by the Speaker.”

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The Chair recognizes the government House leader, Minister of Correctional Services—

Hon Mr Sterling: No, no, that's fine.

The Acting Speaker: —and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Hon Mr Sterling: I believe David Young and a member from each party have a few words to say about Mr Hollins.

The Acting Speaker: I think we agree.

Mr David Young (Willowdale): I am cognizant of the time and I will be brief, but I do want to take a few moments, and I anticipate some of my colleagues will as well, to talk a little bit about the process that has just been completed.

Some months ago a number of members of this Legislative Assembly, including Mr Duncan, the member for Windsor-St Clair, and Mr Marchese, the member for Trinity-Spadina, together with Gary Carr, the Speaker, began quite an extensive and comprehensive process to search for a new chief election officer, with the pending retirement of Mr Bailie. After conducting a rather extensive investigation, considering literally dozens of applications and conducting many interviews, we have found a candidate who we believe will do an exemplary job in his new position.

His name is Mr John Hollins. He's an individual I had some dealings with, although I do not remember dealing with him directly, when he was the chief election officer in North York. He not only ran elections that appeared—from the outside looking in, in any event—to be flawless, but the results came in a timely fashion. More recently he has been the chief election officer in the city of Toronto and once again has distinguished himself as an individual who took his job very seriously.

Interjection.

Mr Young: No, actually he is not a lawyer. He is an individual who has distinguished himself by doing the job efficiently and reaching out to groups, including the homeless and transients, who have not traditionally voted in large numbers.

I am confident that Mr Hollins will do a very fine job as chief election officer of this province. I congratulate the successful candidate. I thank my colleagues for what was a very time-consuming but rewarding endeavour, and I look forward to working with Mr Hollins over the coming years.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): The official opposition is pleased to endorse the appointment of Mr Hollins. I would say in a very serious manner that this is probably one of the most important appointments this Legislature can make. I say to the government that it was done well, it was done in a non-partisan fashion and I think it shows what we can accomplish in a relatively

short time when we work together—Mr Marchese did an outstanding job representing his party, and Mr Young and the Speaker—and when we take the opportunity to listen to one another and try to reason things out.

The official opposition welcomes the appointment of Mr Hollins and congratulates the government on this process and for allowing it to truly be a non-partisan process which yielded what we believe to be a very good result for Ontario.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): It has already been mentioned that it was my colleague from Trinity-Spadina, Mr Marchese, who was part of the selection process committee for our caucus. I know the government members are very disappointed that Mr Marchese is not here tonight to comment on this appointment, but let me pass on these remarks on his behalf.

He did want me to say that in fact there were many highly qualified and very capable individuals who put their names forward for this position. The two who were short-listed, Mr Hollins included among the two, were very capable, very excellent candidates. He is very pleased by this appointment. We in the New Democratic Party would like to congratulate Mr Hollins and say we look forward to working with him in the future.

2100

Hon Mr Sterling: I think it would be remiss of the Legislature not to thank the outgoing chief election officer, Warren Bailie, who served the province of Ontario for over a quarter of a century, who has taken us through I don't know how many elections and a number of redistributions, changes and those kind of things and has been known around the world, quite frankly, and has gone to a number of countries outside of Canada to supervise elections as well. I think the Legislature owes a great deal of thanks for his dedication, his hard work on behalf of all the politicians and the people of Ontario in running a whole number of elections in a fair and equitable and even-handed manner.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Sterling has moved a motion without notice. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): I move government notice of motion 92.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): I recognize the minister from Lanark-Carleton.

Hon Mr Sterling: The minister from Lanark-Carleton?

The Acting Speaker: There's only one and that's you.

Hon Mr Sterling: I move that notwithstanding the order of the House dated December 13, 2000, that we shall not sit on Thursday, December 21, 2000.

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

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. It is carried.

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): I recognize the minister from Lanark-Carleton.

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister of Correctional Services, Government House Leader): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and proud I am to be the minister of Lanark-Carleton.

I move that the following standing committees be authorized to meet during the winter recess in accordance with the schedule of meeting dates agreed to by the three party whips and tabled with the Clerk of the Assembly, to consider the following:

The standing committee on justice and social policy, up to 6 days to consider government business and up to 2 days to consider Bill 118;

The standing committee on general government, up to 11 days to consider Bill 159;

The standing committee on finance and economic affairs, up to 8 days for pre-budget consultations;

The standing committee on the Legislative Assembly, up to 3 days to consider Bill 135; and

The standing committee on public accounts, up to 8 days to consider the Auditor's Report and that the committee be authorized to release its reports during the winter recess by depositing a copy of any report with the Clerk of the Assembly.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Sterling moves that the following—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Dispense? We dispense.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? It is carried.

Hon Mr Sterling: Mr Speaker, I am going to call an adjournment of the motion shortly but before I do, I just want to say that the Clerk of the House, Claude DesRosiers, said to me tonight, as we were going through the process, "It's been a good night. I wish all the meetings of the Legislature could be as good as this night." Perhaps it's an element of the goodwill we still have with each and every one of us on this side of the floor and on the opposite side of the floor. I am sure I express the best wishes of everyone here to each other in saying let's look for a happy holiday season with our families and with our constituents and let's look toward a much more co-operative year in 2001.

I move adjournment of the House.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Sterling moves adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. There won't be a 30-minute bell. The motion is carried.

The House adjourned at 2106.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

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

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

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

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Martel, Shelley (ND)	Nickel Belt	
Martin, Tony (ND)	Sault Ste Marie	
Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Cambridge	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General and minister responsible for native affairs / adjoint parlementaire au procureur général et ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Maves, Bart (PC)	Niagara Falls	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Mazzilli, Frank (PC)	London-Fanshawe	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General / adjoint parlementaire au solliciteur général
McGuinty, Dalton (L)	Ottawa South / -Sud	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLeod, Lyn (L)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	
McMeekin, Ted (L)	Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot	
Molinari, Tina R. (PC)	Thornhill	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Munro, Julia (PC)	York North / -Nord	assistant deputy government whip / whip adjointe suppléante du gouvernement
Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	
Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	
Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan (PC)	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Durham	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al (PC)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Parsons, Ernie (L)	Prince Edward-Hastings	
Patten, Richard (L)	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	
Peters, Steve (L)	Elgin-Middlesex-London	
Phillips, Gerry (L)	Scarborough-Agincourt	
Pupatello, Sandra (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	
Ramsay, David (L)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	
Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Davenport	
Sampson, Rob (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	
Sergio, Mario (L)	York West / -Ouest	deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Smitherman, George (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	
Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John (PC)	Mississauga West / -Ouest	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Spina, Joseph (PC)	Brampton Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Tourisme
Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC)	Lanark-Carleton	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister of Correctional Services, government House leader / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, leader parlementaire du gouvernement, ministre des Services correctionnels
Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Peterborough	
Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de l'Éducation
Tilson, David (PC)	Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée

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

**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.
Tascona, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Public accounts / Comptes publics

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

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

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

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 20 décembre 2000

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur le don de tissus humains (Réseau Trillium pour le don de vie), projet de loi 142, M^{me} Witmer Adoptée.....	6679
Loi de 2000 sur la réglementation des fausses armes à feu, projet de loi 133, M. Tsubouchi Adoptée.....	6679
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Charte des droits des victimes d'actes criminels, projet de loi 114, M. Flaherty Adoptée.....	6679
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur les motoneiges, projet de loi 101, M. Jackson Adoptée.....	6679
Loi de 2000 sur la cité de Kawartha Lakes, projet de loi 170, M. Clement Adoptée.....	6679
Loi de 2000 sur la Commission des parcs de la Sainte-Claire, projet de loi 177, M. Jackson Adoptée.....	6680
Loi de 2000 modifiant le Code de la route (dispositifs de verrouillage du système de démarrage), projet de loi 131, M. Dunlop Adoptée.....	6698

COMITÉ PLÉNIER DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

Loi de 2000 sur la réglementation des fausses armes à feu, projet de loi 133, M. Tsubouchi Rapport adopté	6684
---	------

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2000 sur la Commission des parcs de la Sainte-Claire, projet de loi 177, M. Jackson Adoptée	6680
Loi de 2000 sur la cité de Kawartha Lakes, projet de loi 170, M. Clement Adoptée	6680
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur le don de tissus humains (Réseau Trillium pour le don de vie), projet de loi 142, M^{me} Witmer Adoptée	6684
Loi de 2000 sur la réglementation des fausses armes à feu, projet de loi 133, M. Tsubouchi Adoptée	6689
Loi de 2000 modifiant la Charte des droits des victimes d'actes criminels, projet de loi 114, M. Flaherty Adoptée	6693

Loi de 2000 modifiant la Loi sur les motoneiges, projet de loi 101, M. Jackson Adoptée.....	6697
Loi de 2000 modifiant le Code de la route (véhicules anciens), projet de loi 99, M. O'Toole Adoptée.....	6697
Loi de 2000 sur le Jour de commémoration des pompiers, projet de loi 107, M. Levac Adoptée.....	6697
Loi de 2000 sur le Mois de sensibilisation à la surdi-cécité, projet de loi 125, M. Young Adoptée.....	6698
Loi de 2000 modifiant le Code de la route (dispositifs de verrouillage du système de démarrage), projet de loi 131, M. Dunlop Adoptée.....	6698

CONTENTS

Wednesday 20 December 2000

SECOND READINGS

Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act (Trillium Gift of Life Network), 2000, Bill 142, Mrs Witmer	
Agreed to	6679
Imitation Firearms Regulation Act, 2000, Bill 133, Mr Tsubouchi	
Agreed to	6679
Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 114, Mr Flaherty	
Agreed to	6679
Motorized Snow Vehicles Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 101, Mr Jackson	
Agreed to	6679
City of Kawartha Lakes Act, 2000, Bill 170, Mr Clement	
Agreed to	6679
St. Clair Parks Commission Act, 2000, Bill 177, Mr Jackson	
Agreed to	6680
Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Ignition Interlock Device), 2000, Bill 131, Mr Dunlop	
Agreed to	6698

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Imitation Firearms Regulation Act, 2000, Bill 133, Mr Tsubouchi	
Mr Tsubouchi	6684
Report adopted.....	6684

THIRD READINGS

St. Clair Parks Commission Act, 2000, Bill 177, Mr Jackson	
Agreed to	6680
City of Kawartha Lakes Act, 2000, Bill 170, Mr Clement	
Agreed to	6680
Human Tissue Gift Amendment Act (Trillium Gift of Life Network), 2000, Bill 142, Mrs Witmer	
Mr Clark	6680
Mrs Dombrowsky	6682
Mr Bradley.....	6682
Ms Martel	6683
Agreed to	6684

Imitation Firearms Regulation Act, 2000, Bill 133, Mr Tsubouchi	
Mr Tsubouchi	6684
Mr Bryant.....	6685
Ms Martel.....	6687
Mr Sterling	6688
Agreed to	6689
Victims' Bill of Rights Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 114, Mr Flaherty	
Mr Flaherty	6689
Mr Bryant.....	6690
Mr Duncan	6691
Ms Martel.....	6691
Agreed to	6692
Motorized Snow Vehicles Amendment Act, 2000, Bill 101, Mr Jackson	
Mr Sterling	6693
Mr Spina.....	6693
Mr Levac	6694
Mr Gerretsen	6695
Ms Martel.....	6695
Agreed to	6697

Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Historic Vehicles), 2000, Bill 99, Mr O'Toole	
Mr O'Toole	6697
Agreed to	6697
Firefighters' Memorial Day Act, 2000, Bill 107, Mr Levac	
Mr Levac	6697
Agreed to	6697
Deaf-Blind Awareness Month Act, 2000, Bill 125, Mr Young	
Agreed to	6698
Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Ignition Interlock Device), 2000, Bill 131, Mr Dunlop	
Agreed to	6698

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

City of Toronto Act (Traffic Calming), 2000, Bill Pr2, Ms Mushinski	
Agreed to	6699
Municipality of West Perth Act, 2000, Bill Pr17, Mr Johnson	
Agreed to	6699

1274187 Ontario Limited Act, 2000, Bill Pr25, Mr Young	
Agreed to	6699
Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company Act, 2000, Bill Pr26, Mr Mazzilli	
Agreed to	6699
KMFC Holdings Inc. Act, 2000, Bill Pr28, Mr Ouellette	
Agreed to	6699
Municipality of Sioux Lookout Act, 2000, Bill Pr31, Mr Hampton	
Agreed to	6699
Canadian National Exhibition Association Act, 2000, Bill Pr32, Mr Kells	
Agreed to	6699
Idlewyld Manor Act, 2000, Bill Pr33, Mr Christopherson	
Agreed to	6700
St Jerome's University Act, 2000, Bill Pr34, Mr Wettlaufer	
Agreed to	6700

OTHER BUSINESS

Status of Bill 197	
Mr O'Toole.....	6697
Agreed to	6697
Status of Bill 125	
Mr Sterling.....	6698
Agreed to	6698
Appointment of chief election officer	
Mr Sterling.....	6700, 6701
Mr Young	6700
Mr Duncan	6701
Ms Martel	6701
Agreed to	6701
House sittings	
Mr Sterling.....	6701
Agreed to	6701
Committee schedule	
Mr Sterling.....	6701
Agreed to	6701

continued overleaf