



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 15 May 2001

Mardi 15 mai 2001

Speaker
Honourable Gary Carr

Président
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Copies of Hansard

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

Exemplaires du Journal

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



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 15 May 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 15 mai 2001

The House met at 1845.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PUBLIC SERVICE STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 2001
LOI DE 2001 MODIFIANT DES LOIS
EN CE QUI A TRAIT
À LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 14, 2001, on the motion for second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1993 / Projet de loi 25, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la fonction publique et la Loi de 1993 sur la négociation collective des employés de la Couronne.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): The Chair recognizes the member for Niagara Centre.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): As you know, Speaker, I had to start last night and I've got to finish up. I've only got 27 minutes left, so I'm going to try to be fast and get this compressed as much as I can. I want to thank you in advance for keeping me on a tight leash last night because from time to time I tended to digress and get into the bigger picture. But you want me to stay on the micro, and I shall with respect to Bill 25.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Exactly, Speaker, and I'm grateful to you. I am still reeling a little bit from this afternoon, though, when I asked the Attorney General to intervene on the plea bargaining being undertaken by the provincial prosecutor down in Burlington. The young Fleeton boy, as you know, 17 years old, was struck down and killed by an illegally loaded truck from a lumber company. An oversized load knocked him down and killed the 17-year-old boy doing a summer job. He'd just graduated from grade 12, June 14 last year. The trucking company was charged and we're advised today that tomorrow the dirty, evil deed is going to be done. Plea bargaining. The provincial prosecutor is going to withdraw the charge. A 17-year-old boy's life doesn't mean much. I asked the Attorney General to intervene and he didn't want to.

I guess I'd better move on to Bill 25, hadn't I? But I'm still very much shocked.

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Point of order, Mr

Speaker: With respect, perhaps it's a point of privilege, more accurately. With the greatest of respect to my friend opposite, his recollection of the events of this afternoon are considerably different than those of the Hansard and mine. I said no such thing as he suggested I did, and I would ask him to withdraw that.

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order. The Chair recognizes the member for Niagara Centre.

Mr Kormos: Thank you, Speaker. I'm trying to regain my composure. Bill 25—

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: I am. I'm extremely upset, and I say this in all seriousness, about what's going to happen in the Burlington provincial offences court tomorrow when the crown's going to pull the charge and let this trucking company make a \$2,000 contribution. They're going to get a tax receipt for killing a kid.

OK, Bill 25, because that's what we do have to address this evening in the balance of my time. If you recall last night, I was referring to those rather neat, clever, somewhat unprecedented sections that create this incredible window of opportunity for the Ontario Provincial Police Association to take over up to—what?—2,500 OPSEU members working in provincial police stations across the province. I questioned the motive of the government in wanting those OPSEU members to become members of OPPA—which isn't a trade union; it's an association—because Bill 25 also, in this window of opportunity, gives OPPA artificial status for the briefest of times for the purpose of taking over these workers. It gives it the status of a trade union, which it isn't.

1850

Again, no quarrel with the OPPA. I put this to the OPSEU members who are the subject matter of this bill, those OPSEU members working at Ontario Provincial Police stations, to consider why it is this government wants them to belong to the OPPA rather than to OPSEU. Think about it for a minute, friends. Why would this government, your boss, want you, 2,500 of you and your AMAPCEO colleagues, a very small number and an even smaller number of professional engineers of Ontario, to belong to the OPPA rather than to OPSEU?

Here it is. OPSEU is at the forefront of the struggle, the fight with this government over privatization and this government's attack on the civil service, on the public sector here in Ontario. Leah Casselman and OPSEU have been there in the fight, have been right at the front, have been the vanguard in the fight against the privatization of corrections here in Ontario. Why does this government

want you OPSEU members in provincial police stations to belong to the Ontario Provincial Police Association rather than OPSEU?

I suggest to you, sisters and brothers, members of that sector of the public service—I have no qualms about calling working women and men “sisters and brothers”—that you should reflect hard, please, on the motives behind the government wanting you to become members of the OPPA rather than members of OPSEU with your thousands of other sisters and brothers and the power you have as a united group of working women and men, the power you’ve had and the power you’ve demonstrated in the fight against this government and its privatization agenda, because that’s what Bill 25 is really all about. It’s all about facilitating privatization.

We talked a whole lot about that last night and it’s inevitable that we talk about it more again today, you see, because approximately 20% of all public sector workers are unclassified, some 10,000 unclassified workers already, with almost another 50,000—not exactly 50,000, just shy of 50,000. Ten thousand are already unclassified.

I know what that means because I’ve met the workers, women and men in correctional institute after detention centre after jail after reformatory in this province, who are members of that unclassified workforce, kept out there hanging, lower rates of pay, no job security, far lesser entitlement to any benefits. I’ve watched those 10,000 workers in their workplaces and the insecurity they face on a daily basis, and now this government wants to change that term from a one-year term to a three-year term, plus it wants to create yet another whole group of what are really unclassified workers, but this bill calls them term classified. These term classified are going to be in a whole other group of workers in the public service who have no job security and who could be gone like that, with a snap of the fingers.

Another opposition member last night gave a pretty lengthy and skilful presentation on the fascinating history of the public service here in Ontario. One of the reasons why the public service has to have the job security that union membership provides for it, has to have what is the equivalent, I suppose, of what some might call tenure, is so that they can perform their jobs, ranging from the front-line service jobs at public offices all across the province to right in the ministries, policy people giving ministers advice and counsel, is so that they can perform those jobs without fear or retribution. It’s a very important concept to a professional public service.

You heard last night about the significant history of that public service here in Ontario, the pivotal point being—what?—around 1918, when governments of the day recognized the propensity for corruption in a public service that was patronage-based, in a public service that didn’t have the job security and the ability to be independent and the ability to give a minister or a deputy minister not only positive advice but negative and critical advice as well.

The term classified are going to be the elite of the unclassified workers, because the term classified are

going to have better benefits packages. They’re called “classified” because it appears they get most of the benefits of the classified but they’re term classified, which means they can be gone like that. They’re on contract. It’s all about contracting out, which is all about privatization. As the guy on the cooking show says, “It’s not rocket science.” It’s pretty obvious to anyone who takes a look at the legislation. These term classified positions are new.

This has been raised. This one stands out like a sore thumb in this bill. Do you remember I went back to Bill 26? Do you remember big Bill 26, omnibus Bill 26? It was the cornerstone of the privatization agenda, the privatization course here in the province of Ontario. It’s a long time ago now—Bill 26, the omnibus bill, the cornerstone. Since Bill 26 we’ve seen recurrent in bill after bill that deals with traditional public services the entry of the capacity to delegate significant power to the private sector, to people right outside the civil service, right outside the government bureaucracy, delegating that power so that private sector operators of prisons, of correctional institutions, of jails, of detention centres, of our social services system—witness Andersen Consulting with their new name. Tony Martin knows what it is. I, for the life of me, couldn’t remember it if you paid me. But Andersen Consulting, the multimillion-dollar beneficiary corporate friend, American-based—it’s a pattern.

This government is a big siphon of public monies out of Ontario into the United States to line the pockets of corporate, private, for-profit operators. They won’t even let those profits stay in the province of Ontario. Is it any surprise to anyone that the successful bidder on the Penetanguishene mega-jail ended up being American? The minister didn’t exactly take me into his confidence, but I’ll bet you dollars to doughnuts that the design of that jail was such that they knew—the government knew, the minister knew—from day one, from the get-go that it was only an American that was going to have in any way, shape or form the qualifications to operate that. They knew it was going to go to the American sector. They knew, darn it. They knew it, they knew it, they knew it. Sure as God made little apples, they knew it.

Those mega-jails like Penetanguishene and Lindsey and Maplehurst, the one down in Milton—custom built for the American corporate world with taxpayers’ dollars. We understand what happened; we dealt with this in estimates. The auditors highlighted—big yellow highlights in the auditor’s report. The government used taxpayers’ dollars to build these mega-jails when they could have, had they done things right—that’s what the auditor said, not me. I’m relying on what the auditor said. I trust the auditor. I’ve known the auditor for a long time now.

Heck, if you’re going to let the private sector make these huge profits off of our jails, why don’t you let them take the risk and make them build the jails to begin with? Why are you using taxpayers’ dollars to build the jails so the private sector can make the profits? It’s not very smart, is it? It’s not very clever. It’s not very fiscally responsible, is it? You know darn well it isn’t.

There's an interesting little twist in Bill 25. Again, this has been referred to a couple of times already by other speakers. It's a slick little thing in there that says that in the course of a grievance hearing, a criminal conviction will be conclusive proof that the person who was convicted did the things that he or she was convicted of. Now that in itself—I mean there's an argument to be made for that position. It certainly isn't clear in the law in this province, but what people should be very tuned into is that's a matter that's being dealt with by our courts right now. It's before the Court of Appeal currently. Look, and I'm not going to—no, I will. For a minute I thought I wouldn't but, darn it, I will. The scenario as it's described to me is where the griever, who had been convicted, attempted to argue, and successfully, before the grievance settlement board, that the conviction that he endured was in fact a wrongful conviction.

1900

Now before I get people jumping up all over the place saying how dare I suggest there are wrongful convictions, please, take a look at some recent history here in this country, in this province. Ask Mr Morin about wrongful conviction.

The grievance settlement board held that the griever, an employee, could argue that the conviction was wrong. Again, this didn't just come down from the sky out of nowhere. It has long been unsettled law, as I'm told it by lawyers, that a criminal conviction in and of itself has not clearly been conclusive proof of the acts that would have given rise purportedly to the conviction. So the grievance settlement board adopted that argument in law.

The government undertook a judicial review—government as boss, as employer. Think about this, you folks who are being called upon—oh, this window of opportunity—to be a part of OPPA. It's up to you to decide and it's up to the OPPA to argue their case, although let's understand that at the end of the day that process itself is going to be a far cry from the fair and democratic thing that this government says it will be. But the Divisional Court and the judicial review reversed the decision of the grievance settlement board, fair enough, and the union, of course, acting on behalf of their employee, as unions do—that's their job and they do it well and OPSEU does it as well as anybody, if not better than most—then appealed that. That's before the Court of Appeal. The hearing was held back only on April 24, 2001.

Why does this government show such disdain for Ontario's appellate court? Why does this government persist in showing such disregard for the rule of law? I have no idea how the Court of Appeal is going to rule on that. I'm looking forward to their judgment, and I'm prepared to live with their ruling on it, as to whether or not a criminal conviction constitutes conclusive evidence of the behaviour that would have given rise to that conviction, the axe—I think lawyers call it the delict.

Incredible arrogance: this bill should be opposed on that basis alone. This government doesn't like workers. It mocks them, boots them around every chance it gets. It likes unionized workers even less and it likes low-income

workers even less. It doesn't like the Court of Appeal either. This government hasn't got a very impressive track record in the courts, has it? Spent a whole lot taxpayers' money—a whole lot, man, and still spending it.

I'm told the lawyers for the Premier, who's not here—he's in Lausanne, Switzerland, by the way. I've never been to Lausanne. I understand it's a high-priced town. You're talking about bucks.

Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain): It has a nice casino.

Mr Kormos: Casino in Lausanne? See, I've never been to Lausanne, never mind a casino.

OK, he's in Lausanne, and I'm not sure, but didn't fly tourist.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): On a point of order, Speaker: It is quite inappropriate for the member from Niagara Centre to be commenting on the location of the Premier right now, especially when he's in Lausanne to lend support to Toronto's Olympic bid.

The Acting Speaker: That is a point order. I'm listening carefully to the member's context and what he's saying, and I would like to hear him out. The Chair recognizes the member for Niagara Centre.

Mr Kormos: Thank you kindly, Speaker. I appreciate your direction, your guidance.

Look, the fact that the Premier's in Lausanne is really of no relevance, I suppose, to Bill 25, but it was something I felt compelled to note because I've never been to Lausanne. Most of my folks down in Niagara Centre have never been to Lausanne either.

Interjection: Neither have I.

Mr Kormos: I know.

The Acting Speaker: I fail to see how that particular city in the world is brought into the context of Bill 25. So I would like to get to Bill 25.

Mr Kormos: Thank you, Speaker, very much.

I'm really concerned about the disdain that this government shows for the Court of Appeal. They want to politicize judges. Is this the message to the Court of Appeal: "It doesn't matter what you rule because we're not concerned that the Court of Appeal in Ontario says what the law is in Ontario; we're just going to ram it through by legislation, even though it's before the Court of Appeal and a judgment is due any day"?

We should be opposing Bill 25 for that section alone because (1) it ignores the reality, yes, of wrongful convictions; (2) it ignores the fact that people plead guilty for any number of reasons. They do; that's the reality of it. People plead guilty for any number of reasons. Dare I say that the vast majority of people who plead guilty of course are guilty, the vast majority, but there are a whole number of reasons why people plead guilty. I think it's an incredible affront and some real heavy-handedness on the part of this government to want to circumvent the Ontario Court of Appeal and to tell those honourable justices there, lords, that they are irrelevant to this government. This government doesn't care that the Court of Appeal is

in the midst of a process determining the legality of that issue. It simply doesn't care. It could care less.

I should mention that you're going to hear later this evening from the member for Trinity-Spadina and the member from Hamilton. The member for Trinity-Spadina is appearing on CKLN radio from 7:30 to 8, talking about public education. That's Rosario Marchese on CKLN radio from 7:30 to 8 this evening and people, I'm sure, will be tuning in to listen to what the member from Trinity-Spadina has to say. I encourage people, because by the time 7:30 comes it's going to be in rotation to a Tory speaker, and I'm sorry, if you were here yesterday—there ought to be a standing order against boring speeches, against tedious speeches. There isn't. I looked through the standing orders. I've been looking through the standing orders a lot lately for all sorts of little things. I just thought I'd spend more time reading the standing orders. I had to interrupt my study of the standing orders to take a look at Bill 25, of course, and the assistance I got from OPSEU. But I've been reading the standing orders a whole lot. There's nothing in there about boring speeches. In five minutes, when the rotation goes on, people will surely wish there was.

New Democrats are not supporting this legislation. New Democrats are voting against this legislation. New Democrats are standing with sisters and brothers who are members of OPSEU, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, just as we stood with them on the fight against the privatization of jails, stood with them across the province, in every city of this province where this government has decided to turn yet another publicly built jail over to the private sector so that the private sector, inevitably American, can make money off their operation. New Democrats have been there with OPSEU members and with members of those communities fighting that.

1910

I'm concerned that the government figures that they can ram this through because it's just a hodgepodge of little amendments here and there. The government speakers refer to this as change that's long overdue after 120 years. Come on, let's be honest about this. There's but a handful of government members who have been here for 120 years. The vast majority of them would have no idea what transpired over the course of the last 20 years, never mind the course of the last 10. The vast majority would have no idea of what transpired over the course of the last 10 years. So I'm fearful for what's happening to the public service with this legislation. I'm fearful for what's happening to public institutions that people have built with their hard labour and with their investment by way of tax dollars.

Let's understand that this government thinks that tax dollars should be used to support private, more often than not for-profit schools. Yes, this government has a real unique spin. I guess it's change, right? It's change that this government should be spending public tax dollars to support private and in oh so many cases for-profit schools. Nuts, isn't it? Wacko. This government thinks

that it should give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this province while it downloads more and more on to municipalities, where the folks where I come from, senior citizens, hard-working people, women and men doing their best, struggling on a day-to-day basis, trying to keep their homes—I'm talking about people who have paid for their homes trying to keep them, senior citizens who are risking homelessness because of the down-loading on to municipalities—5% and 10% property tax increases across the board. There are municipalities that are going to be higher, aren't there? We know it. We know that for a fact and we know who's responsible for it. This government is responsible for it, and fewer and fewer services available too.

We're at the cusp: the imminent, real danger of broad-scale privatization of those things that were built and owned by the people of this province being pilfered from them so that this government can hand them over to their corporate friends, corporations that I tell you are no friends of the folks like the folks where I come from down in Welland or Thorold or Pelham or South St Catharines; corporations that have bought into the agenda of globalization and that have called upon this government, and this government does their bidding.

It's like the little RCA mascot, the little dog that sat beside the Victrola; you know, "his master's voice." Do you remember that? I remember that, heck, and I'm not as old as you are. I remember that, the little dog that sat beside the Victrola, RCA, "his master's voice." This government is the lapdog of those corporations. Those corporations say, "Reduce wages, lower the minimum wage." That's what this government has done by virtue of not raising it for the last six years—\$6.85 an hour. You know, reduce government so that government doesn't stand in the way of corporations bulldozing their way through and generating more and more profits, inevitably not to stay in the jurisdictions where those profits are made. That's what they say to this government, and this government says, "Oh, your wish is our command."

And consult? This government did not consult with the very workers that it's attacking, nor should we naïvely expect it to. This government daren't say that it consulted with the public service that it's placing under direct attack with this Bill 25.

We're voting against it. Full committee hearings and at the end of the day, vote it away.

The Acting Speaker: Comments and questions.

Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey): I'd like to respond to one area that the member spoke on and that is with respect to his insisting that he stand with his brothers and sisters with OPSEU, as opposed to what the intent of the legislation is. It's called democracy in the workplace. It's called being able to choose between unions. Certainly what this act is trying to do is to permit civilian employees of the Ontario Provincial Police to join the Ontario Provincial Police Association or vote, indeed, with respect to OPSEU. My friend, of course, the speaker over here, says, "Oh, you only have one choice."

You only have one union to choose from.” That’s not what the bill is saying. We’re saying you have a secret ballot to vote.

In fact, this party, the New Democratic Party, doesn’t believe in the secret ballot. They don’t believe in that. They believe in the days where the union leaders would stand around and make notes as to who was voting for what. That’s what they did. You were pressured into voting how the union leaders were recommending. That was their style, and certainly when this party was in office, that was their position. “Don’t have a secret ballot. We can’t have that. We can’t have democracy in the union movement. We can only have dictatorship. We can only have”—

Interjection.

Mr Tilson: Exactly. The man says, “Oh.” The member from Hamilton says, “Oh.”

But that’s what you do. You were one of the ones to push it. You still push it. You still push for open ballots, where the union leaders can say, “Oh, that guy over there is going to vote for this and that guy is going to vote for that.” Then you say, “Look what happened.” That’s not democracy. This bill is all about democracy in the workplace.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): Of course the last speaker takes a very isolated little portion of the bill as if it’s the entire bill, when we all know that what the bill really deals with is the privatization of the civil service. That’s what it deals with—giving you the outright power to privatize the civil service.

It’s rather startling that almost 25% of the people who work for us right now are on some sort of contract. At one time the people who worked in our civil service were proud of the fact that they worked for the province of Ontario. The morale was high. I can tell you that among the many civil servants I deal with in the Kingston area, and there are quite a few of them in the various ministries etc, I don’t think the morale has ever been lower. I think that people are fearful for their jobs on an ongoing basis. There’s more demanded from them, there are fewer of them, and it’s getting tougher for them. What this bill in effect does is it allows individuals such as deputy ministers to privatize the civil service even further.

It’s very interesting, the wording that is used by the minister in his own press release. It says, “It allows the ministry to recruit specialist contract workers for time-limited, project-specific work for up to three years, with possibility of renewal.” The terminology that’s used here almost makes it sound as if these people want to be on contract, that perhaps they don’t want to work there on a permanent basis: “with the possibility of renewal.” If we want to be proud of our civil servants, if we want to boost the morale, build up the morale which is needed in order to implement the policies that the government of the day brings forward, the worst thing we could do is privatize the civil service.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my colleague from Niagara Centre. Let me say that he

did spend a great deal of time, and with great passion, talking about democracy.

To hear the comments from the government side attacking unions for a lack of democracy and then stereotyping some caricature of a union leader is pretty sad, as opposed to the member from Niagara Centre, who was talking about real democracy. The government member across the way who commented on this is the same member who participated in a government that changed the election laws of the province for the first time ever without the agreement of all the parties in the House—never been done before, unilaterally brought in by a minister sitting in the House today and supported by the very member who wants to talk about democracy.

At the same they changed the election laws, they changed the way you finance elections so that corporations—guess what; stand back for the shock—can contribute more money than they used to be able to. And this member of the government wants to talk about democracy? The fact of the matter is that this member sat here through all the years that your government has eliminated rights of opposition members one after another, taken away. The member for Niagara Centre talked about Bill 26. That was the beginning of taking away the rights of democracy in this place, because so much now is decided by regulation. Regulations are not decided—

1920

Interjection.

Mr Christopherson: I hear a former cabinet minister talking. She will know that regulations are passed in cabinet without the media. Here in the House, you’ve got to take your actions in front of the cameras and give us an opportunity to express an opposing point of view. All those undemocratic actions were perpetrated by this government. You ought to listen to the member for Niagara Centre more often rather than condemning him. All those regulations—

The Acting Speaker: The member’s time has expired.

Mr Wettlaufer: As I listen to the members of the opposition and the member of that other party, the third party, it’s amazing that for the last six years, everything we have done as a government has been apocalyptic, to listen to them. The sun was not going to rise the next day.

Let’s understand here: term classified workers. We’re making a change from one year to three years before renewal, because term classified workers want some level of security. These are people who are in the external world, the private sector. We need them because of their high skills, their technological and professional expertise. We need them, but we don’t need them as part of the public service for 10, 15, 20 or 30 years. Why would we want to bring them on for 10, 20 or 30 years and build up a cost to the taxpayer when we only need them for three years, with the option of renewing? They want some security. That’s why we want to bring them in for a possibility of up to three years.

They talk about 10,000 unclassified employees in the civil service. We have 60,000 classified employees. We cannot set out to destroy the civil service. What I don’t

understand is that the critic in the Liberal Party and the NDP critic from Niagara Centre who spoke were fully briefed by our ministry, and they are trying to paint things in this bill that aren't there.

What about the OPP? What about the civilian employees in the OPP? Hundreds of them have written to us, have asked us to give consideration to this. Is this not democracy? Are we not permitted to extend that to them?

The Acting Speaker: The member for Niagara Centre has two minutes to respond.

Mr Kormos: As a matter of fact, my fear is that it isn't democracy.

I read Eric Kierans newest book just the other day, a biography, written with the help of a ghost writer. Eric Kierans was talking about the phenomenon of global corporatism, this new, enhanced level of capitalism. How do you like it so far? He wrote it before the Quebec City summit. New Democrats were there. This caucus was there with its leader and with its federal leadership and its colleagues in the federal caucus and other provincial leaders.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Listen, be very careful, because Eric Kierans, who is no New Democrat, who is no socialist, is a capitalist's capitalist. His background is in the corporate world. He was head of the Montreal Stock Exchange. He made considerable amounts of money developing corporations.

Eric Kierans speaks very specifically in his book, Remembering, about the very phenomenon that tens of thousands of young people, workers and friends were protesting in Quebec City. Eric Kierans says this—and we had better pay close attention because it isn't Buzz Hargrove saying it, it isn't Howard Hampton saying it, it isn't Judy Rebick saying it. This is Eric Kierans. He says that if this movement of global corporatism, this development in capitalism is allowed to go forward, the inevitable result—Eric Kierans said this—is “fascism or chaos.”

When Sinclair Stevens, Tory of all Tories, no left winger, says, after being in Quebec City, “I never thought I would see this kind of police-state tactic in Canada.... The police action in Quebec City, under orders from our government...was an assault on all our freedoms,” my friends, we had better start being very careful. This government is engaged in the very agenda that was being promoted in Quebec City. We know what it is. People had better oppose it.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): I'm very pleased to join in the debate on the bill before us, which is Bill 25, An Act to amend the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1993. I want to repeat that and make that clear, because that's what we're debating here tonight: the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1993.

Accountability is the first area I want to talk about. Accountability is what good government is all about.

Reviewing the Public Service Act, an act that is more than 120 years old and does not support the demands of today's evolving business needs, is part of our government's commitment to be more accountable to the needs of taxpayers. No substantive changes have been made to the Public Service Act in 40 years. Our government is taking action to correct this situation and make sure that our workforce is in a position to deliver the quality services the public expects and deserves.

This is only part of a broader series of measures that the government has taken and will continue to take to bring accountability to the taxpayers' dollars that are spent on public programs every day.

Changes in the Public Service Act will help make government programs more accountable to the people of Ontario by giving government the flexibility required to reduce the waste and inefficiency involved with administering government programs. It would allow for more flexible and dynamic working arrangements to address the needs of taxpayers which are not adequately addressed through single ministries.

By the delegation of some deputy ministerial authority, it will help the civil service streamline its operations while keeping all parties involved accountable to the government and the people of Ontario. It is important to note that there is a difference between delegation of authority and delegation of responsibility. All people who are affected by this will still be accountable to the deputy minister, the government and the people of Ontario.

This act, if passed, would allow deputy ministers to delegate authority, providing more flexibility in reporting lines. For example, the Deputy Minister of Health and Long-Term Care would be able to delegate supervision authority of some employees to a manager in the Ministry of Colleges, Training and Universities when working collaboratively on a project to increase the number of medical school graduates.

Under the current legislation, this would not be possible. Deputy ministers can delegate authority to managers within their own ministry, but not externally. With challenges that require solutions involving more than one ministry, the current act makes it necessary to have several reporting lines where only one is necessary. This creates an unnecessary level of bureaucracy and more unneeded expenses without any value added to the taxpayer. This is not good value for the money, and with scarce resources we know that it is necessary to do more with less, just as families have been doing for years. This is being accountable for the precious resources we deal with. After all, government does not have any money of its own; it all belongs to the taxpayers.

The value added in this portion of the legislation provides for a more efficient and effective public service that is more responsive to the needs of the community. It will allow the government and public service to approach challenges in the innovative and creative fashion that taxpayers want. Taxpayers don't care about bureaucratic hurdles; they want results and value for their money, and we are going to provide just that.

These changes are only part of a wider approach by this government to bring more accountability to the taxpayers' dollars being spent on public programs every day. It is being accountable by delivering programs that adapt to the changing needs of Ontarians and taking innovative approaches to the challenges and pressures of delivering top-notch services in the light of increasing fiscal pressures.

The focus is not just on accountability; there are also issues of efficiency. Efficiency, effectiveness and reliability are the cornerstones of an excellent public service. Proposed amendments to the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act focus on how to help the Ontario public service deliver services the taxpayers of this province expect and deserve.

1930

Real people and families all across this province are facing pressure on their own finances. They look for ways to get more for less. If they can spend less and get more, they do it. Government should be no different. In fact, it must be exactly the same, because government does not have its own money to spend. It only spends the money of taxpayers, and we must always strive to be more efficient and deliver valuable services which give taxpayers the greatest value for the dollar.

One challenge to achieving greater efficiency is attracting and retaining people in the public sector who can deliver high-quality programs. These people often need to have specialized expertise, which is in scarce supply and obviously in high demand. If we are to deliver on taxpayer expectations, we need to be able to attract and retain top talent that can make things happen.

The current Public Service Act makes it difficult for the public service to attract this talent, especially at executive levels and in high-tech areas. These legislative changes will allow us to make more attractive job offers to new workers with specialized skills the public service needs.

Updates to the Public Service Act include increasing initial appointments to the unclassified service up to a maximum of three years before they need to renew.

The bill also creates a category of "term classified" employees. This will help ministries recruit workers with highly specialized skills for time-limited project work. This adds an element of flexibility and adaptability which is needed to do business in today's fast-paced work world. It also allows the government to take the greatest advantage of specialized talent which is needed for specific projects but not necessarily on a permanent basis. These employees may have an opportunity to renew their contracts after three years, where appropriate. They will be entitled to many of the benefits currently available only to full-time classified employees. This will make the Ontario public service more attractive to today's highly specialized and mobile workforce who are looking for new challenges and stimulating opportunities. Nothing in this bill overrides any existing provisions in any collective agreements; nor does it propose to change any of the classified positions in the public service.

As I stated earlier, it has been more than 40 years since the Public Service Act's last substantial update. The legislation dates back more than 122 years, and parts of it no longer meet current and future business challenges.

As the main legislative framework for human resource management in the Ontario public service, the Public Service Act sets out the authority for activities in areas such as recruitment, conditions of employment and rules of conduct. It governs the employment of all civil servants, unclassified public servants and crown employees designated under this act.

We are taking action to substantially update the act and to make sure this legislation supports what taxpayers expect from their government: greater accountability and better services. The legislative changes we're looking at will help the public service deliver the top-notch services the people of Ontario demand. The changes will provide more efficiency and flexibility and ensure we have a workforce that can respond to changing business needs.

Accountability, which I've spoken about, efficiency, which I have spoken about, and democracy are the cornerstones of these legislative amendments. We cannot meet the needs of the people of Ontario if we're not flexible enough to adapt to their changing needs. We cannot be efficient if we do not modernize employment and recruitment practices. We cannot be democratic if we do not give people a choice.

As you know, the Ontario public service is experiencing challenges attracting and recruiting the talented and skilled people we need for time-limited, project-based work. This issue is particularly acute in executive recruitment in specialized areas, such as information technology. We have an obligation to recruit and retain the best employees possible to deliver our programs and services. At the same time, we need to have a flexible workforce to support time-limited initiatives. New provisions in the bill will help us do that. They include increasing initial appointments to the unclassified public service of up to a maximum of three years before renewal is required. Current provisions limit initial appointments to the unclassified public service of up to only one year.

Increasing the initial term of appointment will make the public service a more attractive workplace to external workers and help us retain the skills necessary to deliver the services the public needs and deserves.

New provisions also include creating a category of term classified employees. Ministries will be able to hire these employees in exceptional circumstances where highly specialized skills are needed for time-limited project work. Term classified employees may be appointed for up to three years, with the opportunity to renew for an additional period of time. This will allow ministries to recruit individuals with the required skills and make offers for temporary positions more attractive.

Hiring employees for specific terms is an example of how we can remain committed to meeting the needs of taxpayers. By removing unnecessary layers of bureaucracy, we can focus on delivering our services to the public. Part of the legislative updates to make the Ontario

public service more efficient includes providing greater flexibility to civil servants' reporting relationships while remaining accountable to the taxpayers who foot the bills.

This includes situations in which deputy ministers will be allowed, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, to delegate their authority under the Public Service Act to non-public servants. Currently, a deputy minister may only delegate his or her authority to a public servant in his or her ministry. This limitation was identified as a barrier for cross-ministry initiatives and partnerships with other governments and the private sector.

Let me be clear. Allowing greater delegation of a deputy minister's authority does not mean we are renegeing on our commitment to be accountable to taxpayers. We may be delegating authority, but our government is still ultimately responsible for the quality of services it delivers. In fact, the new provisions in this bill will allow public servants to be managed more effectively when working in these partnership arrangements.

As you know, our government has been exploring, and continues to explore, partnerships with the broader public service or the private sector to provide better service to the people of Ontario and make sure we are using tax dollars appropriately.

With the creation of SuperBuild, Ontario signalled its intention to increase its use of public-private partnerships and to provide the best value for Ontario's taxpayers. But the government can only review its services and assets and allow for public-private partnerships if it has the flexibility to delegate authority.

At the same time, we need to establish open, fair and transparent processes to ensure that the public's interest is protected, and that is exactly what changes in the Public Service Act allow us to do. These changes also include providing workplace democracy for Ontario Provincial Police civilian employees. By amending the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act and the Public Service Act, civilian employees of the Ontario Provincial Police will be able to choose, on a one-time-only basis, whether to continue to be represented by their current bargaining agent or by the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

Hundreds of these employees have expressed their wish to join the OPPA, which would allow them to be in the same situation as their municipal police sector counterparts. Under the Police Services Act, civilian employees at municipal forces are represented by their respective municipal police associations. Legislative amendments to the Public Service Act will provide OPP civilian employees with a democratic choice. It is a matter of fairness and openness in the workplace that employees have the right to be able to choose the bargaining agent that best meets their needs.

1940

As it is currently structured under the act, the purpose—and I'll focus on the amendments—is to allow the Ontario Provincial Police Association, which currently

acts as the bargaining agent for collective bargaining purposes for police officers in the Ontario Provincial Police, an opportunity to become certified as the exclusive bargaining agent for civilian employees working within the Ontario Provincial Police. These civilian employees are currently part of three different bargaining units: one group is represented by the Association of Management, Administrative and Professional Crown Employees of Ontario; another group by the Ontario Public Service Employees Union; and the final group by a trade union known as the Professional Engineers in the Government of Ontario. These amendments give the Ontario Provincial Police Association an opportunity to make three separate applications to the Ontario Labour Relations Board in order to have civilian employees excluded from their existing bargaining units and included in a newly established bargaining unit and to have itself certified as the exclusive bargaining agent for the new bargaining unit.

The opportunity to make these applications is time limited. Each application must be made within the last three months of the collective agreement, applicable to employees in their respective bargaining units and specified in the bill. The procedure relating to the application for certification and the representation vote are set out in sections 28.0.1 and 28.0.8 of the act. What we see here is a procedure for an application for certification to the Labour Relations Board and a representation vote for these civilians in terms of who they want to be represented by. In essence, instead of being represented by three separate bargaining units, they can be represented by one bargaining unit involved through the OPPA.

What we're talking about here is a community of interest with the group that they would be represented by and consistent with how the municipal sector works with respect to police forces. If the civilian employees vote in favour of joining the OPPA, they will be placed in a separate bargaining unit under the Public Service Act and will be represented by the OPPA.

This is an updating of the Public Service Act, not a complete overhaul of the legislation. The Management Board Secretariat consulted with ministries and bargaining agents last year, I understand, on a number of items that were identified as needing an update.

Updating the Public Service Act removes the barriers that hinder the government in adopting the dynamic needs of the people of Ontario. It enables the government to move with the times in established practices and reflect those commonly used in the modern workplaces.

There's one other area I want to focus on under the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, and it deals with some practices that are there. These amendments also apply to the Public Service Act, specifically the Public Service Grievance Board which deals with the Public Service Act and the Grievance Settlement Board which deals with grievances obviously under the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act. These changes that are being proposed deal with the following.

It says that the Grievance Settlement Board would be prevented "from requiring the employment of an em-

ployee in a position involving direct responsibility for or an opportunity for contact with a wider range of persons than previously where the employee has been found to have used more than minimum force against or to have sexually molested a person.”

Another amendment states that, “unless an appeal is still available, a conviction for a Criminal Code offence constitutes conclusive proof in a grievance proceeding before the Grievance Settlement Board”—or the Public Service Grievance Board—“that the convicted person committed the act or omission that gave rise to the conviction.” That’s substantially a procedural change.

I’m pleased to speak on the bill and those are my comments.

The Acting Speaker: Further comments and questions? The Chair recognizes the member for Timiskaming-Cochrane, New Liskeard, Cobalt, Haileybury.

Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming-Cochrane): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for that detailed description of my riding. I appreciate that.

It’s very interesting, this act that the government is bringing forward, because it really takes a shotgun approach at all the public sector institutions across Ontario, ignoring some of the very good work that many of the institutions across the province have done.

I’ll give an example of the Ontario Hospital Association, of all the hospitals across the province. They were the first institution in Ontario to produce report cards, and they have already produced report cards in 1998 and 1999. Ontario hospitals conducted the largest patient satisfaction survey in North America. Ontario hospitals continue to expand their report cards. Their report cards in 2001 will be released in a series of reports as follows to the public: acute care services this summer; emergency department in November 2001; complex continuing care, November 2001; and some feasibility studies on mental health, rehabilitation, women’s health, nursing and population health in December of this year. They are putting forward a very comprehensive accountability schedule for the people of Ontario. Working in partnership with the University of Toronto and other research partners, the hospitals of Ontario have prepared comprehensive public report cards on hospital performance in four key areas: patient satisfaction, clinical utilization of outcomes, financial performance and condition, and system change and integration.

That’s all to say that the imposition of this act on top of what the Ontario Hospital Association is doing is really going to create a lot of red tape, something I thought this government was quite allergic to and wanted to rid themselves of. This is going to duplicate many of the operating plan processes that the Ontario Hospital Association has put into place and it’s going to create a confusing parallel structure. I would say to the government that they should be aware of what some of the Ontario institutions are doing in their way of accountability.

Mr Christopherson: I’m pleased to respond to the speech by the member from Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford.

He said during the course of his speech—and I’m paraphrasing, but this is pretty close—that the government finds they are having difficulty attracting and recruiting employees. Quelle surprise. Given the way you treat public sector workers in this province, I’m not the least bit surprised you’ve got problems attracting anybody to work here. Do you know what the word is out on the street in terms of being a nurse in Ontario, because of you, directly making that connection? Being a teacher, being anybody anywhere in the public sector now is seen to be the last place in the world that you’d want to be. You shouldn’t be the least bit surprised, nor should you try to offer up your need to recruit people and your inability to attract people as a reason for bringing in this legislation, when you’re the one who set the tone that has sent out the message, “This is not a good employer.”

You also talked about the fact that there are times when you need to bring in experts on contract, and that’s why you’ve brought up this new category. By the way, it’s interesting to take note that during the negotiations with OPSEU last time, you, the government, the employer, had a demand on the table that you could hire new employees who would be immune from any bumping for three years. That sounds an awful lot like something we have here in front of us. Maybe you’re just trying to achieve the same thing without having to negotiate it.

But at the end of the day, everybody’s facing the issue of hiring people on contract. When are you going to get caught up with the idea that people who work on contract need more benefit coverage and need more rights protected in law? There’s an answer to the problem that you’ve spent no time on.

1950

Mr Wettlaufer: I’d like to say that the member from Simcoe-Barrie-Bradford has exhibited a very good understanding of this bill and I’d like to compliment him for it, contrary to the critic from the Liberal Party, who last night suggested that such things as personal information and an integrated human resources sector could be shared outside of ministries, when it was quite specific in the act that it can only be shared inside and between ministries; it cannot be shared outside of the ministry.

The member from Timiskaming-Cochrane talked about the hospitals and the universities and all the red tape. Hospitals and universities are not run by this government; hospitals and universities have their own boards of directors. They are not even affected by this piece of legislation.

This piece of legislation addresses job-specific, project-based, time-limited jobs or appointments in exceptional circumstances only. It will not affect collective agreements between union and employer. I don’t know what the problem is. I don’t know why we can’t seem to get through to these people over here, who have been totally briefed by ministry staff and don’t seem to get the message.

We talk about the term “limited employee” as well. It expands benefit coverage. We’re not trying to eliminate

benefits to these people, but the government, like private employers, from time to time needs to hire highly skilled expertise. That could only be for a one-year or a two-year or a three-year period; we're saying up to a three-year period. What is the problem with that? The taxpayer appreciates it. I don't know why the people on that side of the House don't appreciate that.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): What I'm worried about, when you talk about, "Who are they going to hire outside?"—the first name that comes to mind is Tom Long. The last time I remember Tom Long getting a contract—maybe the energy critic for the Liberal Party can help me—was it not a quarter of a million dollars? It was a contract of that kind that Tom Long, who is the president of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario—

Interjection: Leslie Noble.

Mr Bradley: Leslie Noble was another who was in the hierarchy of the Conservative campaign. She had a huge contract from the government of Ontario. This wasn't paid for by the Conservative Party; this was paid for, as is the \$235 million in government advertising, out of the pockets of taxpayers in this province.

I know that if Walter Robinson of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation is listening, he'll be concerned about those contracts, first of all, and the \$235 million that has been spent on self-serving, blatantly partisan government advertising.

I'm concerned when I see this privatization. There are people lining up now; let me tell you, there are people from the LCBO worried about this bill, because there are a lot of Tories out there rubbing their hands, saying, "We would love to get our hands on those stores that the LCBO has at the present time." We know there's an example of a public agency which has made a genuine effort to be as consumer-friendly as possible, to do as good a job as possible. Unfortunately, with this legislation, with the general thrust of the government, private is good; public is bad. That's most unfortunate.

This bill is going to be used, in my view, to assist the government in doing in the workers of this province.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford has two minutes to respond.

Mr Tascona: I want to thank all the members for commenting on this piece of legislation, in particular the member from Hamilton West and the member from Kitchener Centre. They actually did comment on the bill.

Interjection.

Mr Tascona: I want to take that back, yes. The other ones didn't comment on it.

The member from Timiskaming-Cochrane talks about a shotgun approach and he focuses on anything but what I'm talking about, which is the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act.

About setting the tone, the member from Hamilton West is right; everything else he said I don't think was even relevant to what I'm speaking about tonight. We set the tone with respect to recruiting and attracting employees, providing for flexibility with respect to the

public service, flexibility to do project work, flexibility to attract high information technology employees, flexibility to do cross-ministerial work.

I'm glad the member from St Catharines joined us. Too bad he didn't join me when I was speaking. I will say this: what I was speaking about was that we are dealing with a piece of legislation, the Public Service Act, which has not been amended for over 40 years, longer than the member from St Catharines has been here, I think. If I'm wrong, let me know, because I will stand to be corrected.

I will say that the changes being put in place deal with flexibility; they deal with accountability; they deal with democracy in terms of what will be done with the civilians who will have an opportunity, through the Ontario Provincial Police Association, to deal with their bargaining rights. Obviously it is a splintered unit at the moment, but I will say this: it will reflect what is the practice out in the municipal police services.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): I will be sharing my time on debate on Bill 25 with the member for Kingston and the Islands.

I would like to open with the comment that I am very curious that the government would be presenting the idea of continuing to privatize services for the people of Ontario and that they would not have paid attention to what I have to believe they are hearing from people in their ridings. I am certainly hearing from the people in Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington with regard to those government services that have been downsized and privatized that they are not getting better service—far from it.

I talk to farmers in my riding who used to be able to go to the next town to the Ministry of Ag and Food office with their crop or a sample of grain when there was a problem with it and they don't know what the blight was—

Mr Bradley: What happened to that office?

Mrs Dombrowsky: It's closed. It's gone. They have nowhere to get direction, advice or support. There is no private service in my community that is offering that service to the farmers in my area. That's what I'm hearing from them. Have you not listened to the people in the province of Ontario? Do you not understand that there are important services they need that they're not receiving?

I'm also reminded by the people I speak to throughout my riding about the fact that Ministry of Transportation services are not what they once were. People tell me that in the wintertime now during storms, "We wait hours before major highways are cleared of snow, before salt and sand get put on major highways." In some locations, county and municipal roads are plowed long before the provincial highways are. That's a service that is no longer looked after by people who are employees of the province. A private company is looking after those services.

The member from Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford talked about the difficulty in attracting and recruiting people to the public service, and little wonder. The best you can offer these people is a three-year contract. If you live in a community and you want to buy a house and you go to the bank for a mortgage and they say, "Where do you work?" and you say, "I have a contract with the government for three years," chances are that you're probably not going to be very favourably considered for a mortgage, or even a car payment. These people are looking for some stability, some guarantee that if they loan an individual money, there is going to be a source of income there for a fixed period of time, more than three years. Car loans now go beyond a three-year period; they are usually four- or five-year loans; certainly mortgages are.

I live in a community where a very valuable government service was located the Ministry of Natural Resources. The ministry in my community of Tweed employed some 48 employees. That office was closed, and many of the services that those people provided are either no longer provided by the government or are provided on a contract basis by the same people who worked for the ministry but whose roles became redundant and they lost their jobs. Now they are contracted by the government to do the same service, but they don't receive the benefits. That has an impact on their family and that has an impact on the economy of my community. My community is dying because those committed, dedicated professionals are no longer there, or if they are there, they're not compensated fairly, as they once were for the quality of work they did.

2000

I would be very interested to understand from the members of this government who give us sermons all the time about accountability to the taxpayer, this same government that has doubled the size of its cabinet staff—you've done that. You've doubled the size. That's a fact. The minister of—what are you minister of now? I forget. On the other side of the House there are wincing about, "Can this be true?" It is true. It is a fact. It's a matter of the public record that you have doubled the size of your staff. I would be very interested to know how many of the people that you have added to your employment you have added on a three-year basis, on a term contract.

Mr Bradley: A big pay increase too for the political staff.

Mrs Dombrowsky: My colleague from St Catharines has reminded me as well—a very important point—that not only have they increased staff, they've increased the salaries of staff. We hear all about accountability to the taxpayer, and yet you don't walk your own talk.

This is about service to the people of Ontario. I'm hearing from people in my riding that the example they see from the government is not the reality they're experiencing in our communities. People in my riding don't believe they are getting better services when they are contracted out or done on a term basis. They know the people who worked for the various ministries, the

commitment they had, the contribution they made at their place of work and the contribution they made within their towns and villages in Ontario. Instead of the government stepping back and assessing the damage that's taken place, the reduction in service, the reduction in quality of service the people now encounter—and I'm sure you're getting the same calls I'm getting in my constituency office about calling a ministry office and they can never get a warm body at the end of the phone. It's all voice mail. They complain about the fact they used to be able to go to the Ministry of Transportation office in their town and get their licence, and now they've got to drive 30 miles.

Mr Bradley: Family support office.

Mrs Dombrowsky: The family support office is another excellent example of a change the government has made that has not been for the better. The people of Ontario are not better served.

I hear this time and time again, and yet what do we have here this evening before us? Bill 25, where the government will further push to engage people on a short-term contract basis. There's not the same commitment. It's not like before, when people were employed by the Ministry of Transportation. They were proud to be employees of the crown and of the work they did. They were proud within their communities: "If you have a need and we can help you, we will do that." But on a contract basis you don't get that same commitment. With a contract they might be working in this community for a period of time and then they might shift to another community, wherever the need might be. When they leave one area to go to another, who's looking after the area they left?

Mr Bradley: That happened when they inspected water plants.

Mrs Dombrowsky: My colleague from St Catharines reminds me as well about people who were employed in—I'm really glad the member from St Catharines is here because he's reminding me of a lot of things I hear about in my constituency, and I'm sure you hear about them on the other side of the House.

All I'm asking you this evening, as part of this debate, is to please pay attention to what the people are saying. They're saying, "We are not better served. When we consider where we were in 1995"—what they say to me is, if they had a choice between the little bit of money they may have here from the tax cut you've given them or being sure that when they need to go out on a winter night, they will know the road is plowed. If they have to take their sick child to the hospital, they know the road is plowed. That is not the case right now in Ontario. There is a myriad of services we took for granted for many years that are no longer there.

I say to the members of the government, please, consider what the impact of what we are debating here this evening will mean. It will mean a further erosion of services within our communities, and I don't believe that's what the people of Ontario want.

You would suggest that it allows us to be very selective and we can just place people here for a short term, but the needs of the people are constant. I think it's very short-sighted to suggest that we just throw money at a problem here and throw money here and put someone there for three years and after three years we'll put them over here. It's not good planning. It's not sustainable.

I'm very happy that I've had this opportunity to talk about an issue that's very important not only to myself but to the people I represent, people who come and talk to me every day. I just want to take this time as well to pay some tribute to the people who have dedicated their lives in their communities as public servants, who have been very proud of what they've done and who feel very badly that ministries they were formerly attached to are really only a shell of what they once were.

Mr Gerretsen: I would like to start at the point where my colleague left off, and that is that we don't pay tribute to our civil servants often enough. Many of these people at the higher levels, or at the entry level, are extremely hard-working and dedicated individuals who serve in our offices here at Queen's Park through the various ministry offices and the many offices that we have in our own communities. I know it's always easy to criticize them, as we all do from time to time as we sometimes hear from the general public, but most of the individuals who work for us in one capacity or another are extremely hard-working and dedicated to the public whom they serve. I think that should be stated, and it isn't stated often enough.

To listen to the government's propaganda you would think—and I think I'm using their exact wording—it's to modernize employment and recruitment practices and to give the civil service and the deputy ministers and the other people involved greater flexibility. It always astounds me about this government how they set about doing one thing but then they don't own up to it, they don't admit that they're doing it. Why don't you just admit the truth? You want as great a flexibility as possible. You want to be able to hire and fire people on relatively short notice, if and when you need them.

As far as I'm concerned this is taking us back—what?—40, 50, 60, 70 years, when people were basically hired on the basis of day labour or for a week or for a month or for two months. That's what's being suggested here. The suggestion was made by a government member that some of these people would prefer to work under contract for a year or two years or three years. I'll grant you there may be the odd one who would prefer that, but if you gave a person the choice between working for a ministry, particularly a ministry that they would be involved with in revamping its procedures, in the way it does business with the general public etc, if you gave the average person who has the qualifications to work within that ministry the choice between working for that ministry for a year or becoming a permanent employee, I know darned well that most of them would choose to be a permanent employee.

The argument goes, "What if some of these people want to get on to something else later on in their life?" and certainly in today's modern work world many people have more than one career, and it may very well be that some people, after working for a particular minister or in a particular job for two, three, five years, may want to go on to something different. But that should be their choice. That shouldn't be left up to some bureaucrat or some deputy minister.

We have some statistics here that indicate that right now 24.7% of the people who work for us in the various ministries are contract employees. That is one out of every four individuals. I don't know what it was like 10, 15, 20 years ago, but I'm sure the statistics were nowhere close to that.

I think that if we want to build up morale within the civil service, then the way to do that is by giving people a sense of stability, by also giving the individuals who deal with that particular ministry and with those individuals, in other words the citizens of the province who deal with that particular ministry or department, some sense of continuity. We want to make sure that the morale of the people who work for us is as high as possible.

2010

So don't give me all these code words, that you want "greater flexibility" and to "modernize employment and recruitment practices." It's got nothing to do with that. It's got everything to do with the fact that you want the right to basically hire and fire people on a moment's notice without their having any sense of security that they would get through the normal collective bargaining procedures through the various unions or federations that they may work under. That's what this is all about.

There are some particular aspects of this bill that really disturb me, and one of them is section 34. One of the government members mentioned that. It deals with the whole aspect of disclosure of private information. I would invite the government members to do two things: (1) read that section very carefully, and (2) get an opinion from the Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ann Cavoukian.

I know there will be plenty of opportunity between now and 9:30 for a government member to get up on a two-minute response, and perhaps during that period of time they could indicate to me whether or not this section—section 34, that deals with personal information about public servants and who it can be shared with etc—has in effect been referred to the Information and Privacy Commissioner. Or are we going to find out three or six months from now, as we have so often in the past in so many other pieces of legislation that we've dealt with in this House over the last three to four years, that as far as the Information and Privacy Commissioner is concerned, this is totally against the law or does not meet the standards that are required under the information and privacy legislation?

I'll just read this section very quickly. It says, "Personal information about a public servant may be disclosed, collected and used under this section only to

the extent necessary for the proper administration of an integrated human resources program.” I don’t know what an integrated human resources program is or who decides what it is in particular circumstances, but I’d certainly like to have some answers on that. It says, “A public servant shall disclose personal information about a public servant to a person engaged in providing an integrated human resources program.” In other words, a public servant may have to give this information not to another public servant but to a person engaged in providing an integrated human resources program who may or may not be a public servant.

We all know how this government got into deep trouble with POSO, the Province of Ontario Savings Office, when information went to the private sector there, and it was the private sector in that case that basically said, “Hey, you gave us information about 50,000 individuals, and we don’t want it.” It was a major scandal here a year or so ago. So we all know what can happen when the privacy rules and regulations and laws of this province are not followed and how information can be misused if it ends up in the wrong hands.

I would like somebody on the government side to give a clear-cut explanation of section 34 as to why it is necessary to take this information and give it to people who are not public servants. What is the reason for that, and has this section been vetted through the Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ann Cavoukian?

We know what this government is all about. This government is about providing as few public services as possible. We’ve seen the results of that. We’ve seen what happened within the Ministry of the Environment and in Walkerton when, in effect, the environment budget was cut by some 50% and basically an awful lot of the inspectors—I forgot the exact number—were let go. The jury is still out as to who exactly is to blame for that. Obviously the public inquiry is getting to the bottom of that right now. But we know the dangers to our own public safety that can be involved in not having the qualified people who are so badly needed within the workforce of a particular ministry.

This bill is just about more of that, about basically giving the government and, through the government, its deputy ministers as free a hand as possible to hire and fire whatever employees are needed from time to time. That, as far as I’m concerned, does not lead to the kind of morale that you want within the public service, the kind of public service that we’ve always admired in the province of Ontario. That is seriously at risk if this legislation gets passed.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Questions or comments?

Mr Christopherson: I wish to comment on the remarks of the member from Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington and the member from Kingston and the Islands, specifically comments made by the member from Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington. She talked about the new classification of temporary contract

employees and the concerns that she has about that. I’d just like to underscore that message.

In fairness, I can recall when we were in government that the number of unclassified versus classified was a problem, and we had a number of plans in place that were at least heading in the right direction. I won’t stand here and say it would have solved the problem overnight, but at least it was taking us in the right direction. What this government is doing with Bill 25 is taking us in exactly the wrong direction. The problem was, not enough people were full-time, not enough people had the benefits and the job security they were entitled to. A lot of individuals who were unclassified had been connected with the Ontario government as an employer for years, longer than some people spend what they would consider to be a whole career chapter in a job. They were locked into this unclassified twilight zone: you’ve been there five or six years, you’ve got some rights but not in law, and at the end of the day you’re working beside somebody who has all kinds of rights. That was a problem that needed to be addressed.

Your solution is to create another classification, term classified. So we’re now going to pile on top of all those people who were on the one-year contracts people on three-year contracts, and as I mentioned in earlier remarks, you still haven’t done anything about giving people on contract some rights. You’ve been so busy taking away everyone else’s, you haven’t focused where you should be.

Mr Wettlaufer: I’d like to draw your attention to the remarks by the member from Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington as well as the member from Kingston and the Islands. The member from Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington suggested that this would curtail services. I’d like to know how this could possibly curtail services when we have said specifically it was to enhance the delivery of public services.

What we are trying to do here is hire external expertise on a job-specific, project-based, term-limited appointment, and that is specific to exceptional circumstances. It is not for all of the public service; it is not for a broad area of the public service. It is exceptional circumstances only. A good example of this would be in the IT area where we are trying to develop an IT program. We want to be able to hire the best possible expertise. We would like to be able to go to a corporation like—let’s use examples—Research in Motion or Descartes, or whatever, to bring in that expertise that we do not possess in the public service so that it would free up our public service to do what they do best. This will not be expanding the size of the civil service; it will be job-specific only.

The member from Kingston and the Islands said he would like to know what the Information and Privacy Commissioner said. He may find this hard to believe because he wasn’t in on the briefing, but certainly his critic was: we did consult with the Information and Privacy Commissioner and nothing in section 34 allows us to divulge—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments?

2020

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex): I was watching the debate on TV and the member from Kitchener Centre referred to some of my remarks last night where we talk about the disclosure of personal information. As the member from Kingston said, under the explanatory notes it says, "Section 34 would permit personal information about public servants to be disclosed, collected and used but only to the extent necessary for the proper management of an integrated human resources program." We go to section 34 and it talks about—

Interjection.

Mr Crozier: Well, yes. But what it does say throughout the bill is that a deputy minister may take his authority and delegate it to any other deputy minister; any other deputy minister may delegate his or her authority to any person or persons. Now, that throws the door wide open. Any person—

Interjection.

Mr Crozier: It doesn't say that; it says "any person or persons." I want the government to explain to me, then, where in this legislation there's a definition about "person or persons." To me, that can be the private sector. If that's not the case, then let's amend the bill so that it says it cannot be used by the private sector, because any time you talk about delegating authority, delegating responsibility, to "a person or persons," to me that simply means you can delegate it to the private sector and then just like the provincial savings office, it can be right out there in the private domain. I don't want anybody's private information being out there.

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre): I think the fundamental objective here that we've been trying to achieve is that it gives the public service the flexibility that many industries in the private sector have. It allows you that opportunity, as a deputy minister or a delegate thereof, to bring employees in. There are other categories that currently allow them to do that. This simply gives them another classification to be able to bring in, as we've said, some experts, perhaps some employees on a particular trial basis, and it's an opportunity, because if they prove themselves, like in other sectors, it's a perfect opportunity for them to be fully employed.

This is a flexibility that many in the private sector have. Why shouldn't the public service have the opportunity to really be able to comb through and try people out if we want the highest-quality public servants? It gives management the opportunity to ensure that if someone works well and proves they have the skill sets to deliver, we have a highly qualified, well-skilled person who can complement the rest of the workforce.

I just wanted to draw attention—it appears as if no one has been drawing comments to sections 7 and 12 of the bill, which really have come about as a result of the request of the workers. These are the civilian workers who work with the OPP. We just want to make it known, because it seems to have been ignored by the opposition, that this is a very important element of the bill that allows these civilians to be able to work with the OPPA.

The Deputy Speaker: Response?

Mrs Dombrowsky: Just in response to the comments made by the government members, you obviously didn't meet before and get your stories straight. I mean, what is the purpose? What is your goal in bringing this legislation to the House for debate tonight?

The member for Kitchener Centre would say, "There are projects in the civil service that are short-term in nature, and we would like to be able to, in the area of information technology, for example, go out and hire the best of the best." Personally, I believe that as a government we will have a need for experts in information technology for more than a short-term period of time. But that's what the member from Kitchener Centre said.

Then the member for Brampton Centre got up and said, "The reason we're establishing a three-year-term is so we can try these people out; we can find out if we like them or if they like us or there's some chemistry here." It's a very different message and I think a very dangerous practice to get into, that, "We'll try people out. Instead of leading them along for maybe a year, we're going to do it for three years now," and somehow that's going to be good for the people they're serving. I really question the kind and the quality of service you're going to get from someone you have a contract with who's constantly wondering, "Am I in their favour or am I not?" You don't get the best commitment or the best job when people are put in those kinds of work environments.

The two speakers for the government really tell the story here. They're presenting it as one rationale, but really I think the member from Brampton Centre uncovered the truth.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate?

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): I certainly appreciate the opportunity to take a few minutes to talk about Bill 25.

On April 30, 2001, Minister Tsubouchi introduced amendments to the Public Service Act. It's interesting to note that it has been more than 40 years since the act's last substantial update. The legislation dates back more than 122 years and parts of it no longer meet current and future business challenges.

As the main legislative framework for human resource management in the Ontario Public Service, the act sets out the authority for activities in areas such as recruitment, conditions of employment and rules of conduct. It governs the employment of all civil servants, unclassified public servants and crown employees designated under this act.

We are taking action to substantially update the act and make sure that this legislation supports what taxpayers expect from their government: greater accountability and better services.

The legislative changes we're looking at will help the public sector deliver the top-notch services the people of Ontario demand. The changes will provide more efficiency and flexibility and ensure that we have a workforce that can respond to changing business needs.

I want to go back to this question of efficiency, because obviously efficiency, effectiveness and reliability are the cornerstones of excellent public service. The proposed amendments to the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act focus on how to help the Ontario public sector deliver services the taxpayers of this province expect and deserve. Real people and families all across the province are facing pressures on their finances. They look for ways to get more for less, and if they can spend less and get more, they do it. Government should be no different. In fact, it must be exactly the same, because government does not have its own money to spend. It only spends the money of taxpayers, and we must always strive to be more efficient and deliver valuable services which give taxpayers the greatest value for the dollar.

One challenge to creating greater efficiency is attracting and retaining people in the public sector who can deliver high-quality programs. These people often need to have specialized expertise, expertise which may be in short supply and in high demand. If we are to deliver on taxpayer expectations, we need to be able to attract and retain top talent that can ensure things happen.

2030

The current Public Service Act makes it difficult for the public service to attract this talent, especially at executive levels and in high-tech areas. If you look at the changes that have come about in the last five years within many of the ministries, it demonstrates how important this particular talent is to the ability of government to embark on greater e-commerce and e-government in being able to have the expertise there. These legislative changes would allow us to make more attractive job offers to new workers with the specialized skills that are necessary.

Updates to the act include increasing initial appointments to the unclassified service up to a maximum of three years before they need to renew. Again, I go back to some of those ministries which have been working for some time on special initiatives which do require the specialized services of individuals. It is in those areas that we need to be able to have this flexibility.

This bill creates a category of term classified employees. This will help the ministries recruit workers with the highly specialized skills for time-limited projects. This adds an element of flexibility and adaptability which is needed to do business in today's fast-paced work world. It allows the government to take greatest advantage of specialized talent which is needed for specific projects, but not necessarily on a permanent basis. These employees may have an opportunity to renew their contract after three years, where appropriate. They will be entitled to many of benefits currently available only to full-time, classified employees.

This will make the Ontario Public Service more attractive to today's highly specialized and mobile workforce, who are looking for new challenges and stimulating opportunities. Nothing in the bill overrides any existing provisions in any collective agreements, nor

does it propose to change any of the classified positions in the public service.

But I must emphasize that we cannot meet the needs of the people of Ontario if we are not flexible enough to adapt to their changing needs. Again, you don't have to look far before you can find many examples of the way in which our government does business and the way in which we have changed the way in which government does business. We can only do this if we modernize our employment and recruitment practices.

We cannot be democratic if we do not give people a choice. We have an obligation, therefore, to recruit and retain the best employees possible to deliver our programs and, at the same time, we need to have a flexible workforce to support time-limited initiatives.

The new provisions in this bill will help us do that. They include increasing initial appointments to the unclassified service up to a maximum of three years before renewal is complete. Current provisions limit initial appointments to the unclassified service up to one year.

New provisions also include creating a category of term classified employees. Ministries will be able to hire these employees in exceptional circumstances where highly specialized skills are needed for time-limited project work. All of this will allow the ministries to recruit individuals with the required skills and make offers for temporary positions more attractive. Hiring employees for specific terms is an example of how we can remain committed to meeting the needs of taxpayers. By removing unnecessary layers of bureaucracy, we can focus on delivering our services to the public.

Part of the legislative updates to make the Ontario public service more efficient includes providing greater flexibility to civil servants' reporting relationships while remaining accountable to the taxpayers, who foot the bills. This includes situations in which deputy ministers will be allowed, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, to delegate their authority under the Public Service Act to non-public servants. Currently, a deputy minister may only delegate his or her authority to a public servant in his or her ministry. This limitation was identified as a barrier to cross-ministry initiatives and partnerships with other governments and the private sector.

I think this is a point that needs to be emphasized, because one of the criticisms of the traditional delivery of services by ministries was the fact that there was the problem, the barrier, of dealing with only one ministry whose focus, then, was that particular ministry. It really lends credibility to the notion that the left hand needed to talk to the right hand. It is this kind of legislative initiative that will further allow that kind of inter-ministerial initiative to continue and in fact to be able to provide better service.

If you think about the many small communities in this province where being able to access ministry services is extremely important, sometimes it's a real barrier for those individuals in those small communities to be able to access those services in a timely, convenient and

efficient manner. So it's the opportunity this legislation affords that allows us to be looking at that kind of delegation.

But let me be clear. Allowing greater delegation of a deputy minister's authority does not mean we are renegeing on our commitment to be accountable. In fact, one of the most important issues is, of course, the need to be accountable. This piece of legislation is only part of a broader series of measures that the government has taken, and will continue to take, to bring accountability to the taxpayer dollars that are spent on public programs every day.

Changes in the Public Service Act will make government programs more accountable to the people of Ontario by giving it the flexibility required to reduce the waste and inefficiency involved with administering government programs. It will allow for more flexible and dynamic working arrangements to address the needs of taxpayers which are not adequately addressed through single ministries, as I mentioned. By delegating this authority of some deputy ministerial authority, it will help the civil service streamline its operations, while keeping all parties involved accountable to the government and the people of Ontario.

It is important to note that there is a difference between delegation of authority and delegation of responsibility. All people who are affected by this will still be accountable to the deputy minister, the government and the people of Ontario. This act would, if passed, allow deputy ministers to delegate authority, providing for more flexibility in reporting lines. For example, the Deputy Minister of Health and Long-Term Care would be able to delegate supervision authority of some employees to a manager in the Ministry of Colleges, Training and Universities, which is working collaboratively on a project to increase the number of medical school graduates. Under the current legislation, this would not be possible. Deputy ministers can delegate authority to managers within their own ministry, but not externally.

With challenges that require solutions involving more than one ministry, the current act makes it necessary to have several reporting lines where only one is necessary. I think that if you look at the example I gave a moment ago with the opportunities it provides for people particularly in smaller communities, I'm sure you will understand how effective this kind of change can be.

2040

What we have now creates an unnecessary level of bureaucracy, which is obviously responsible for unneeded expenses without any value. This is not good value for the money, and with scarce resources, we know that it is necessary to do more with less, just as families have been doing for years.

This is being accountable to the precious resources we deal with. After all, government does not have any money of its own; it all belongs to the taxpayers.

The value added in this portion of the legislation provides for a more efficient and effective public service that

is more responsive to the needs of the community. It will allow the government and public service to approach challenges in the innovative and creative fashion that people want. Taxpayers don't care about bureaucratic hurdles; they want results and value for their money. We are going to provide just that.

These changes are only part of a wider approach by this government to bring more accountability to the taxpayers' dollars being spent on public programs every day. It is being accountable by delivering programs that adapt to the changing needs of Ontarians and taking innovative approaches to the challenges and pressures of delivering top-notch services in the light of increasing fiscal pressures.

As you know, our government has been exploring and continues to explore partnerships with the broader public service or the private sector to provide better service to the people of Ontario. With the creation of SuperBuild, Ontario signalled its intention to increase its use of private-public partnerships and to provide the best value for Ontario's taxpayers.

But the government can only review its services and assets and allow for public-private partnerships if it has the ability to delegate authority. At the same time, we need to establish open, fair and transparent processes to ensure that the public's interest is protected. That's exactly what changes in the Public Service Act allow us to do.

These changes also include providing workplace democracy for Ontario Provincial Police civilian employees. By amending the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act and the Public Service Act, civilian employees of the Ontario Provincial Police will be able to choose, on a one-time-only basis, whether to continue to be represented by their current bargaining agent or by the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

Under the current Public Service Act, 2,500 people are prevented from their democratic right to choose the bargaining unit which they feel best represents their interests. Civilian employees of the Ontario Provincial Police, who perform duties such as administration, forensic sciences and other important roles in police business, are barred currently from joining the Ontario Provincial Police Association. This situation is out of sync with municipal police forces in the province, whose civilian employees are represented by the local police association.

We believe that democratic choice is imperative. Many, many letters have been received from civilian employees who want the choice to decide on the bargaining unit that represents them. As it stands, the legislation does not allow for these employees to be part of the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

This amendment will allow these employees to have the democratic choice of which bargaining unit represents them. This choice rests with the employees. This is not a government decision. Each member is free to vote according to his conscience. Should they feel that their current union does not properly represent their interests, they may choose to join another.

The process will be fair, transparent and democratic. Each union will vote separately. Members of one union will not have a say about the fate of another.

Just as in the Labour Relations Act, certification will only take place when more than 50% of votes cast are in favour of joining the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

From this you can see how important Bill 25 is in ensuring the fairness and the opportunities in this province.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): People who are watching this debate may wonder what is the focus of, what's this, our second evening of debate on what may seem to be a somewhat minor bill. The fact is that the government has already brought in all of its major legislation opening the door to privatization in virtually every area of what has formerly been public service, either delivered by government or indeed by the broader public sector.

I am surprised that they have left any housekeeping details that are yet needed in order to carry out any further privatization. In fact when it comes to government's directly provided services, I'm surprised that there's much left that they need to do, that there's much more that they could possibly privatize.

We've watched the systematic dismantling of the Ontario public service under this government. You would think that the government would be prepared to step back and understand, have accountability for, the consequences of the kind of privatization which has already been done.

Because time is limited, let me take the Ministry of the Environment water testing labs as one very salient example. I could go back to about five years ago, now, when those labs were being privatized and we raised questions about what would be the water safety, what would be the standard of protection of the public when these labs were privatized and it was carried out by a private sector company. There were no answers then. We actually raised the cost-effectiveness, because we had evidence that we presented in this House that showed that the water testing laboratories under the public sector were actually offering a less expensive service than those labs operated by the private sector. It didn't matter. This government's goal was to privatize. It didn't care about the consequences.

I would suggest that, in any of its privatization, it has no interest in accountability. It talks about accountability for the public sector, but when it comes to private sector contracting out, we get the kind of answer that the Minister of Health has given on the cancer care private clinic, where he says, "It's a private sector arrangement. I can't be held accountable for it." There is no business plan. We can't even get it under freedom of information. No accountability; just more privatization for ideology.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): I want to say to the member from York North, please don't share that speech with the others, because I've memorized it already. If you do that, I'm going to say, "Oh, my God."

By rote it's right here. I don't know how many times I've heard the word "flexibility"—12, 15, 20 times.

Mrs Munro: But have you learned it?

Mr Marchese: No. I learned how to remember your speech. It's "more with less," right? Right on number one. "We'll help to streamline," "ability to recruit the best," "flexible workforce," "removing layers of bureaucracy." The word "choice"—I don't know how many times I heard that one. It's a beautiful speech. It has no content. I'm not saying it's your fault, member from York North, because there are a lot of staff people who help with these things in terms of sending out the messages. It's messaging; I understand.

What you people are doing is hoping that the poor working guy out there will say, "Yeah, right on. There's just too many of these civil servants, and they have such a cushy job that whatever we can do to get rid of these people is good." So we create the term "term classified"—I'll get to that when I have some time.

2050

But this speech and the speeches of most of the other members demonstrate the abhorrence this government has for the union movement, for union members, for unions generally, and the mistrust and distrust of the general workforce that works for you people. I just don't understand it. How can you expect to have the kind of morale we expect of our workers when you're telling them, "We're just about to get rid of you" through this new "term classified"? "Government has no money of its own," she says, but they collect it and give it out to the private sector and privatize more and more.

Mr Tilson: I'd like to comment on one of the areas that was raised by the member from York North, and this is something that has been going on in private enterprise for years. This is not new stuff. In fact, we're trying to bring the civil service into an area that private enterprise has been doing for years. There are many jobs today in corporations and in industries and, indeed, in government, which require a specialized service. Information technology is one example which requires someone to work for short periods of time. Current provisions limit initial appointments of up to one year for these unclassified services. That's all it is.

What we're trying to do is encourage good, qualified people to come into the civil service for longer than that period of time. We believe that increasing this initial term of employment will make the public service a more attractive workplace to external workers and help us retain the skills necessary to deliver the services the public needs and deserves.

That's one of the purposes that was raised by the member from York North as to what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation: to encourage good, qualified people to come into the civil service for these specialized areas.

Mr Crozier: There are a number of things this bill does that are of concern to me. One in particular is that it de-professionalizes civil servants. Last night I gave some

history of the civil service and why we have the civil service. The member from York Centre—

Mr Marchese: York North.

Mr Crozier: I'm sorry, York North—described, or at least said, what the bill does. But what hasn't been forthcoming from the government is why they're doing it. We can see—

Interjection.

Mr Crozier: Well, the mere fact that nothing has been done for 40 years or 140 years still doesn't mean that a reason shouldn't be given for doing it. The whole reason the public service was established was to professionalize and de-politicize it. I pointed out last night how outside workers, those out in the field, used to have jobs at the whim of their political masters. The public service has performed a very professional role over these 100 years or more. What we haven't heard yet from the government is why they want to de-professionalize the civil service, why they seem to want to take it back and politicize it. I think one of the things that is hidden in this bill is the fact that much more political influence may come to bear when it comes to offering work and jobs in the public service. That's our concern.

The Deputy Speaker: Response?

Mrs Munro: Thank you to the members from Thunder Bay-Atikokan, Trinity-Spadina, Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey and Essex. I want to concentrate my comments in the brief time I have. First of all, to the member from Trinity-Spadina, who obviously has listened very carefully and has certainly picked up on the important parts of this bill—I'm not sure he understands them—and also in response to the members from Essex as well as Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey, I would just point out that the whole purpose of this bill is, in fact, to be able to deliver services. It requires some expertise. That expertise is in our community at large. We, in this government, have made a commitment to move to streamlining services for the people of Ontario. Doing that requires the infusion of the kind of expertise that will come in and make those contributions, potentially on a short-term basis.

It also is really important to recognize that in the last few years you see the ways by which we have streamlined services, making those things available to people, whether it's kiosks, e-mail or the Internet. That requires the kind of expertise this legislation will allow for. And yes, that is flexibility.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Bradley: It's always interesting to look at the content of these pieces of legislation to see what hostage is in them, what message is found in the legislation. What it's all about is this obsession the right wing has on the other side of the House—not the old Davis Tories, who were kind of practical in their approach, but the right-wing ideologues who now dominate not only the Conservative benches but of course the inner echelons of the Premier's office and the minister's office.

This obsession with privatization permeates so much of the legislation and the regulatory regime of this gov-

ernment. You can see where there is payback. One need only look at the television shots of the Tory fundraiser, the big one in Toronto—perhaps one of the government members can help me with how much money you cleared in one evening.

Mr Wettlaufer: Two million dollars.

Mr Bradley: Two million dollars, the member for Kitchener says. This means that the captains of the corporate world have shown up at the Tory fundraiser to thank the Tories for turning over to them this wonderful opportunity to make money at the taxpayers' expense.

In the past, many of these services were provided by the public service at a reasonable cost, with efficiency. But this government, because it's obsessed with wanting to get rid of government, says in effect, "Well, we had better hive this off, and where better to hive it off than to our friends in the corporate sector?"

So they line up at the fundraiser to say thank you. I think—and somebody on the government side will help me out—they must have at least \$16 million in the pot now, in the campaign chest.

Mr Wettlaufer: Two million.

Mr Bradley: No, \$2 million was one night. You made \$2 million in one night. I have read \$16 million, and that was the last figure. That was before the member for Niagara Falls hosted the major fundraiser in St Catharines, which no doubt brought in hundreds of thousands of dollars because of his hard work in gathering the people, and also the hard work of Cam Leach, who was recently appointed to the police commission in Niagara. He was the chair of the dinner. I know that was a pure coincidence; it was not a reward. I don't want anybody on the other side suggesting that was a reward for chairing the fundraiser.

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): That was a punishment.

Mr Bradley: A punishment, says the member for Niagara Falls.

The point I want to make that is troubling to me, when I look at the democratic process—and this isn't the only jurisdiction where it has happened—is that, more and more, money plays a role in the political process. Where we saw that was before the last election—

Interjection.

2100

Mr Bradley: I know the member for Perth would certainly be concerned about this: more and more, our politics in Ontario is being dominated by the ability to spend a lot of money. Remember, before the last campaign—the Minister of Health was in the cabinet then, I think, or he may have just been a whiz kid—they decided they would raise the limit on the amount of money a corporation or an individual could contribute to a political party. That of course helped the party that was catering to the richest and most powerful people in the province, that being the Conservative Party.

Second, they raised the limit on how much a party or a candidate could spend in an election campaign. Again that benefits those who have the financial wherewithal—

Mr Wettlaufer: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: As we seem to be debating fundraisers instead of Bill 25, I wonder if it would be in order to point out that the Liberals raised \$1 million on their latest fundraiser.

The Deputy Speaker: That isn't a point of order, but I would remind the member for St Catharines that we are debating Bill 25.

Mr Bradley: I don't see the microphone on. Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, I can say it now. I won't say that whoever operates the microphone was asleep at the switch, because I know he never is; he's always doing his job appropriately.

If that is the news, it must be good news. The point I make is that you have raised the amount that people and corporations can contribute and you've raised the amount that can be spent on an election campaign. The reason it ties in—I'm glad the member for Kitchener brought Bill 25 to my attention. It's all about privatization, and who benefits most from privatization? Those who are lining up at the government trough for profit-making purposes on public services. They are the friends of the Tories, the corporate captains, the people who have greased the skids for the Conservative Party when it comes election time. The member for Grey-Wellington—is that the new one?

Mrs Dombrowsky: Dufferin-Peel.

Mr Bradley: It always changes. The member for Dufferin-Peel would be concerned about this because he's a parliamentarian.

The Deputy Speaker: Through the Speaker, please.

Mr Bradley: Through the Speaker, he has been a parliamentarian who I think has observed the process with some interest. I think in his heart of hearts, if he were allowed to speak out, he would agree with me that it is unhealthy to have money play such an important role in the political process. It should be secondary. I think that's unhealthy in any jurisdiction. We see the consequences south of the border, where privatization is moving ahead very quickly.

I know that some of the members of the cabinet who are of the right wing—and I see a member sitting across from me, the Minister of Health. I'm not sure whether he walked out of the Alliance caucus today or not, because I was watching television a bit about people walking out.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I was never in.

Mr Bradley: He says he was never in.

You're wondering, Mr Speaker, what this has to do with Bill 25. Let me look at a few areas where I see some privatization taking place that I think is unhealthy.

Make no mistake about it: Premier Harris is bound and determined that he's going to privatize our health care system. Privatization will eventually involve two-tier health care; that is, one tier for the rich, who are able to buy their way to the front of the line, and one for the rest of the province. I'm looking at an example where I see privatized for-profit health care take over where there was a public service. We have Cancer Care Ontario, which over the years has done a credible job, a good job in terms of dealing with cancer care in the province. At

Sunnybrook hospital, Dr McGowan, I believe it was, who was with Cancer Care Ontario, left it to set up a private firm that will now provide that service that the public sector, the hospital, should be providing at Sunnybrook. That's for-profit. There isn't anybody in this province who can tell me that Sunnybrook hospital, given that additional funding and that additional staff, couldn't do the job and do it at less cost, because there's not that for-profit motive there.

We'd like to get a copy of that particular privatization contract. The Minister of Health says it's a secret. We have been trying to get it. I asked the health critic for the Liberal Party. We've been trying to get the information on it. We can't get the kind of information we need, just as we can't get information on privatization in the field of electricity. There's a contract up at Bruce nuclear and we're trying to get that contract. It's, "Oh, you can't have that." What's the word they use for the information?

Mr Marchese: Classified.

Mr Bradley: Classified. No, there's another word the corporate sector uses that you people could tell me.

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): Privileged.

Mr Bradley: Privileged information or something of that nature. It's a big secret. You cannot tell us what the terms of that contract are, yet the people of Ontario will have to accept the consequences of that contract. Again it's the secrecy, it's the behind-the-closed-door nature of this government, while their friends in the private sector are benefiting.

We had an example given of the privatization of the Ministry of the Environment labs. We have one former minister here today. In fact there is a long line of people who are former Ministers of the Environment in this government. But there is one this evening at least who is here. We're not allowed to say who is absent. I can say who is present, however. There is one who is here. Nothing epitomizes the problems that arise more than with this obsession with, shall we say, privatization. They closed the regional laboratories of the Ministry of the Environment. I believe today that, had the Ministry of the Environment labs received the samples from Walkerton, they would have sent out the red flag immediately.

Remember what the private sector lab said. The person representing that lab said, "My responsibility is to my client." That was the local water commission and the person who looked after the plant. "That's my responsibility." But I can tell you that the Ministry of the Environment, when it was running that laboratory, would have informed the local medical officer of health and all concerned that there was a problem with the water in Walkerton at the very time the people from that public lab, the Ministry of the Environment lab, would have received it. Unfortunately that lab was closed down. The municipalities were virtually left on their own in that instance. They had a turnover time that was extremely short. It was totally disorganized, and across the province we were left vulnerable.

I'm a person who wants to give credit to the commission, which we asked for and forced the government into

a public inquiry on this matter in Walkerton. I'm fair enough to say, let me hear the final results from that. I'm not a person who would rush to judgment on all aspects of it. I simply say that with the privatization of those labs there's a problem.

I was listening to Godfrey Jenkins, who is a highly courageous and very knowledgeable person in the Ministry of the Environment, talking about privatization and the implications in this bill. He was testifying very recently before the commission. Here's the question to him:

"Let me deal ... with the layoff situation. I take it, Mr Jenkins, you're aware of the substantial layoffs in the ministry over the past five or six years or redeployment and those sorts of things?"

"Mr ... Jenkins: Yes.

"Q: And would you agree with me that the layoffs resulted in a substantial loss of expertise to the Ministry of Environment on drinking water issues specifically?"

"Mr ... Jenkins: Absolutely.

"Q: And would you also agree with me that the layoffs resulted in a substantial loss of what we might call institutional memory?"

"Mr ... Jenkins: Very much so."

I think that's important to look at, because one of my colleagues mentioned earlier what happens when you lose that institutional memory. That's what happens when you bring people on only on contract.

I want to look at a Hansard. This was postponed, by the way, when the Premier decided the House wasn't coming back until April 19. You will remember the House sat, I think, December 20, and then most of the public actually thought the House was back in January because they saw the federal House in session.

Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex): I was working in January.

Mr Bradley: The member for Perth was working.

But we have a House that is supposed to be in session, was not in session. The Premier did not allow it to come into session.

One problem we had was that the Provincial Auditor's report on the Ministry of the Environment couldn't proceed before a committee because the very day before, the government said, "Guess what? We're going to prorogue," and it's all wiped out. The only committee that could continue is the government agencies committee which processes the appointments—the Conservative appointments of the Conservative government—through the committee.

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of Northern Development and Mines): Who's the Chair?

2110

Mr Bradley: Now, I have to be impartial. Somebody once said, "Well, you can't criticize what the committee does if you're the Chair." So I will step aside from the chairmanship for a second and I will tell you—and this is an MPP's observation—there is an inordinate number of people who, when asked the question, "Are you now or

have you ever been a member of the Progressive Conservative Party?" answer, "Yes." They answer yes to that.

Mr Bartolucci: I remember when Ray Poratto couldn't—

Mr Bradley: I don't want to get into that. But here's what happened before the public accounts committee. Ms Richardson of the Ministry of the Environment—and the former minister will like to hear this; he will know about this, maybe—was asked about new staff, because we expect that.

Mr Spina: Bill 25.

Mr Bradley: Well, this is Bill 25. This is contract staff. For once I'm on target. This has something to do with the bill. I know you think a lot of the things I say don't have; this has. The question is asked of Ms Richardson. She says, "I actually have a chart with some of that information that Mr Griffith" of the ministry "doesn't have. In our efforts this year to get increased resources and staffing, we did obtain approval for 68 new staff in what we're calling Operation Clean Water."

So I'm about to say, "Hurray!" I want to compliment the government; I'm trying to get the microphone so I can compliment the government. Well, unfortunately, Ms Richardson goes on to say the following: "Fifty-four of those staff were for inspection and enforcement activities, six for certificates of approval, three for certification and licensing, and five for project management coordination." The question is asked, "So are they permanent now?" I'm leaning over my chair to hear whether they're permanent or not, and Ms Richardson says, "No, these are not permanent staff. We have about 18 months' worth of funding for this project."

So as soon as the heat's off, these people are going to be fired out the door. The member for Niagara Falls was there. He will confirm this when he gets a chance to speak later on. He will confirm what I heard. And it's just another example. You want contract staff.

What happens? There's no institutional memory there. What you wanted to—and I have now two former Ministers of the Environment who are here today. I'm seeing double. As I say, I could probably see seven if they were all here, but at least two former Ministers of the Environment are here. I almost forgot what I was going to say.

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: And myself. That's three, yes.

What was I going to say on this one? This was—

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: Exactly. It was extremely important. It was about temporary staff.

I remember when we were going to have the blitz. Remember when we found out there were a lot of problems with the water treatment plants in the province because the government decided it wasn't going to inspect them on the schedule that it used to? Well, then they had to have a blitz, because they had to show something was going on. So they took people from other parts of the ministry and left those parts vulnerable. What else did they do? Well, remember the people they fired

out the door, over 900 people? Some people have said as many as 1,400; I erred on the conservative side. At least 900 people were out the door of the Ministry of the Environment.

Well, they hired some of them back. They had to go scrambling around the province and around the country to find these people to hire them back to inspect the water plants on contract. These are similar to the forest fire-fighters, what you've had to do there. So there's an example in the Ministry of the Environment of how this bill will apply.

Well, what else do we have? You wonder about the pay of these people. Will the pay be the same as the people in the Premier's office and in the offices of the ministers? They all got a 30% increase. I saw in the newspaper where it said up to a 30% increase in ministers' staff and the Premier's staff." Not even the cabinet ministers themselves got a raise, but their staff all got a raise. That must tell you people something about where the Premier places you in priority compared to his personal staff and the political staff of the ministers. I thought you should know that because some people in the province may not be aware of that yet.

We have POSO, the Province of Ontario Savings Office. I'm now getting telephone calls and letters from people who lament the closing of this office. It provided a nice service for people. You know what the banks are doing now: they're consolidating, gobbling up the trust companies, closing offices left and right around the province, shrinking the hours, and here's the Province of Ontario Savings Office of which Bill Davis was proud, I think Premier Robarts was proud of it and subsequent governments. Now the ideologues say we've got to shut that down, a good service for the people of Ontario.

We also have the privatization of health care that we see incrementally happening. More and more services now must be obtained from private sources because the government is underfunding those sources.

So the whole plan of the right wing—and I'm not talking about the moderate Conservatives who used to occupy those benches; I'm talking about the new right-wing ideologues—is to discredit public services and public institutions, "Create a crisis," as John Snobelen, the former Minister of Education said, so that people will accept in desperation a solution they would never accept, and that is privatization.

The Premier is setting us up for privatization of the health care system, we see privatization creeping into the education system as we see American universities coming in here and it all has to do with the contents of this particular Bill 25.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments?

Mr Marchese: I've got to say from the outset that I support 90% of what the member for St Catharines said. It's the other 10% I want to talk about.

You've got to stop talking about those special-interest groups and those fundraisers, OK? You guys have the same problem. My history of how I remember this is that Tories have fundraisers of \$700 a pop and you guys have

fundraisers of \$600 a pop. More or less you're there, \$100 less. When you surpass \$500, it's a whole lot of money, right?

I want to make reference to another event that Monte Kwinter—they're honouring Monte, and God bless, I think that's a good honour, but it's for the Ontario Liberal fund.

Mr Bradley: I used to go to your fundraisers.

Mr Marchese: I understand that. But with our fundraisers we're lucky if we can raise \$25 a pop, right? With all due modesty, I want to say it.

At the event of Monte the special guests were Peterson and McKenna and His Worship Mel Lastman. There are about 60 people on this tribute committee. I think a whole lot of people on this list swing both ways, if you know what I mean; not a whole lot, but a lot of these special types swing both ways. Jim, I hope I'm not hurting you too much with this but I always get a bit sensitive about these areas.

When we talk about special interests, please be careful. But on the whole matter of what this government is doing in terms of undermining the public service, I'm with you. On the whole matter of wilfully weakening the public sector, I am with you. It's an attack on the unions; it's an attack on the civil servants. With that, you and I are on the same side.

Mr Wettlaufer: Speaker, if you ever doubt that you're losing your sense of humour, and I say the same to the television audience, then just tune in to this channel, because we heard it all tonight: the wildest accusations from members like the member for St Catharines, who only spoke, out of his total 20-minute time allotment for Bill 25, for one and half minutes on Bill 25.

Mr Tilson: That's a record.

2120

Mr Wettlaufer: That is a record. But what they've done is taken a very boring piece of legislation, something that is non-controversial, and tried to spice it up with these wild accusations.

The member for St Catharines even decided to talk about 30% pay increases for members of staff. I just wonder what his reaction is going to be next month when the federal Liberals in Ottawa slide through that 30% to 40% increase for MPs that they're talking about. I wonder how he's going to react. I realize that I'm also not talking on Bill 25, but I know I'm expected to address my comments to what he was talking about.

I understand part of the problem of why they are not addressing Bill 25, because I spoke to the member from Kingston and the Islands outside of the House a little bit earlier and he explained to me that he would appreciate a briefing from the minister. I think we can arrange that. We did arrange a briefing for the member for Essex, the Liberal critic, but I think at his advanced age he is perhaps not remembering everything properly and he is not passing on that information to the members of his caucus. I'm convinced that's what it is. Understand, Mr Speaker, this is the first change in 40 years.

Mr Crozier: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think his subversive attack on my age might be an attack on all older people in this province. He would do well to listen to age and respect it.

Mr Bartolucci: I agree with everything the member from St Catharines said. He outlined the shortcomings and the reasons that we must be concerned about Bill 25. It is not an innocuous bill. It has major ramifications for the people of Ontario. Let me tell the people of Ontario what the bill contains in just one small segment. It will allow a deputy minister to delegate his or her powers to hire, fire, promote, transfer or discipline to any deputy minister in any other ministry or to any designated private sector person.

What the member for St Catharines was saying is that this government's bent on privatization is not in the best interests of Ontarians. Imagine for a second that a deputy minister can delegate authority for jails, environmental protection or public safety issues to a private company whose only interest is profit.

For 20 minutes I heard the member for St Catharines outline scenarios, real-life situations, where this government has failed the people of Ontario because we didn't put the necessary safeguards in place. Listen to what the member for St Catharines is saying. Listen to what our critic the member of Essex said last night. This is a major piece of legislation that must be reworked, that must go to committee, that must have its major shortcomings addressed in committee, and hopefully the amendments that will come forward will make this bill acceptable to the people of Ontario. We cannot accept Bill 25 the way it is.

Mrs Munro: It gives me pleasure to be able to comment on the earlier remarks of the member from St Catharines. I think that people forget the fact that governments must move on in the same way as the community around us to be able to provide the kinds of efficient services that people have come to expect. This government has made those kinds of commitments.

Bill 25 acts in the same vein as those earlier commitments. There have been so many examples of changes we have introduced that allow members of our communities to interact with government and government services on a much timelier basis than had traditionally been done. Bill 25 simply continues that commitment by making sure that we are able to have the flexibility and at the same time maintain the accountability that will allow us to make sure that those services are conducted in a transparent manner, that will make sure the people in this province continue to have the best services available to them.

Much has been made of the opportunity to allow the deputy ministers to delegate authority. Very clearly, when you look at the way that interministerial activity goes on today, that is precisely what is necessary. Interministerial activity allows for the community at large to understand the big picture of government, that we are no longer locked in those silo mentalities.

The Deputy Speaker: Response, the member for St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: I appreciate the remarks of all members.

The member for Trinity-Spadina: the only thing I would mention is, I had one of the Waffle group of the NDP say to me the other day—

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: They're resurrected—"I was very concerned when the NDP changed its constitution to allow donations from companies." That person was disappointed.

Mr Marchese: I was against it.

Mr Bradley: I knew the member was against it.

The member from Kitchener talks about an impending federal raise. Well, again, they're following your lead. You said they followed your lead when they were cutting taxes for the corporations, and now they're following your lead because people in your cabinet were floating a 42% increase for members of the Legislature. We in the opposition said, "No way is that going to happen."

Obviously the federal government heard what you were saying and may wish to implement it, because their opposition won't fight it—a divided opposition. How many parties are there today in the House? I don't know if there is a new party with 12 people in it.

I could tell from his remarks that the member for Sudbury understands the danger of delegating the deputy minister's power to some hotshot in the private sector to start firing people or demoting people in the public service.

The Conservative member for York North said, "Governments must move on." I couldn't agree with her more. This government should in fact move on. I agree entirely with her on that.

I want to say, one of the nasty things that was done was there was a chance to allow people who had worked for the government all of their lives, with perhaps three years left, to bridge themselves to retirement, and your government denied them the opportunity. However, for MPPs, the bridge to retirement is an appointment.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 9:30 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 2128.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston

Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr

Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant / Greffière adjointe: Deborah Deller

Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

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

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

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

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

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

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Alvin Curling
Gilles Bisson, Alvin Curling,
Gerard Kennedy, Frank Mazzilli,
Norm Miller, John R. O'Toole,
Steve Peters, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

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

Chair / Président: Marcel Beaubien
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Doug Galt
Marcel Beaubien, David Christopherson,
Doug Galt, Ernie Hardeman, Monte Kwinter,
John O'Toole, Gerry Phillips, Joseph Spina
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Norm Miller
Marie Bountrogianni, Ted Chudleigh,
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,
Rosario Marchese, Norm Miller, Marilyn Mushinski
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,
Jerry J. Ouellette, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Carl DeFaria
Toby Barrett, Marcel Beaubien,
Michael Bryant, Carl DeFaria,
Garry J. Guzzo, Peter Kormos,
Lyn McLeod, Tina R. Molinari
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: R. Gary Stewart
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Vacant
Ted Arnott, Marilyn Churley,
Caroline Di Cocco, Jean-Marc Lalonde,
Margaret Marland, Jerry J. Ouellette,
R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N. Tascona,
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John C. Cleary
John C. Cleary, John Gerretsen, Raminder Gill,
John Hastings, Shelley Martel, Bart Maves,
Julia Munro, Richard Patten
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et des projets de loi d'internet privé**

Chair / Présidente: Frances Lankin
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop
Gilles Bisson, Garfield Dunlop,
Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy, Frances Lankin,
Frank Mazzilli, Ted McMeekin, Bill Murdoch
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

CONTENTS

Tuesday 15 May 2001

SECOND READINGS

Public Service Statute Law

Amendment Act, 2001, Bill 25,

Mr Tsubouchi

Mr Kormos	711, 716
Mr Tilson	714, 727
Mr Gerretsen	715, 722
Mr Christopherson	715, 719, 723
Mr Wettlaufer	715, 719, 723, 731
Mr Tascona	716, 720
Mr Ramsay	719
Mr Bradley	720, 728, 732
Mrs Dombrowsky	720, 724
Mr Crozier	724, 727
Mr Spina	724
Mrs Munro	724, 728, 732
Mrs McLeod	727
Mr Marchese	727, 731
Mr Bartolucci	732
Debate deemed adjourned	732

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 15 mai 2001

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

**Loi de 2001 modifiant des lois
en ce qui a trait à la fonction
publique, projet de loi 25,**

M. Tsubouchi

Débat présumé ajourné	732
-----------------------------	-----