



Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario  
Second Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario  
Deuxième session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 27 June 2001**

**Mercredi 27 juin 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

Wednesday 27 June 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 27 juin 2001

*The House met at 1330.  
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HOME CARE

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** It is nothing less than heartbreaking to speak to constituents whose access to vitally needed home care is either being cut back or simply turned down as a result of this government's freeze in funding to the Thunder Bay Community Care Access Centre. How the Premier and the health minister can justify this cruel attack on people who are fighting to stay in their homes is absolutely beyond any of us who care for the well-being of our constituents.

Recently I spoke to a 75-year-old woman living on a fixed income who was struck down by an impaired driver this past January and has been able to stay in her apartment only because of three visits a day from her home care provider. But as a result of the cutbacks, she will now receive only one visit per day, which will make it difficult for her to stay in her home.

Also, a gentleman I spoke to who had serious back surgery and has since lost his sight has had his allotted time cut back to such a degree that he feels bereft of hope. He has in fact told me that he often thinks he'd be better off dead than alive.

Another constituent is a blind, diabetic, 84-year-old woman whose family is desperate for respite care but have been told that because of the funding freeze, new cases like hers cannot be accommodated.

These are but a few of the tragic cases I have heard over the past week. Clearly the horror stories will only get worse unless this government provides increased funding to our home care sector. As we prepare to rise for the summer, I want to make a last-gasp plea to the Minister of Health: Please, Minister, provide the needed funds so that people in my riding can count on the support and help they need to live their lives with dignity. People's lives are simply hanging in the balance.

CANADA DAY

**Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge):** Once again we are going to celebrate the birthday of our great country. In my riding of Cambridge, the Canada Day committee

has been busy organizing a spectacular lineup of activities in celebration of Canada's birthday.

The fun will start early in the morning on July 1 with a children's fishing derby followed by games and races, a midway running all day and night, a seniors' bingo, and entertainment by local bands and artists. The highlight of this day is the 21st annual Cambridge Canada Day parade, one of the largest parades in Canada on that day. Over 140 groups will be represented with an impressive lineup of marching bands, floats and much more. We finish the daylong birthday party with a huge fireworks display at Riverside Park in Cambridge-Preston at dusk.

I would like to thank the many volunteers who worked very hard all year to make this celebration a success, and in particular, parade chairman Lee Tiggelman, her daughter Laura, Millie Baker, Kathy Murphy and Kelly Killoran, to name but a few.

On behalf of Cambridge, I invite everyone in this great province to bring the family to Cambridge on July 1 to celebrate Canada's birthday.

SHARON REYNOLDS

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** On June 12, 1997, a young girl by the name of Sharon Reynolds was found dead in the basement of her house in Kingston. Her mother, Louise Reynolds, was subsequently charged with the murder of her seven-year-old daughter. On January 25 of this year, less than two months before the trial was scheduled to start, the crown attorney, on what I understand were instructions from the Attorney General's office, withdrew the murder charge.

A five-page feature article in Maclean's on May 14, 2001, raised serious questions about the involvement of Dr Charles Randall Smith, the government's chief pathologist, in the investigation of the death of this little girl and other murder cases in which he was involved in his professional capacity.

In a series of seven feature articles carried in the Whig-Standard this past week, investigative reporters Arthur Milnes and Rob Tripp also raise serious issues and concerns about the facts surrounding her death.

Letters to the editors and petitions signed by hundreds of people are demanding a full and open inquiry. Both the chief of police for Kingston, Bill Closs, and I have repeatedly requested that the Premier and the Attorney General authorize a full and impartial inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the death of Sharon Reynolds. Last week I was informed by the Attorney General that a

public inquiry would not be authorized by him because of a pending court action initiated by her mother, who has been in custody for over three years. How can a civil court action that may never come to court interfere with a full, impartial and open inquiry for this little girl lost?

I plead with the Premier and the Attorney General that pursuant to section 2 of the Public Inquiries Act, you authorize a full and independent inquiry into the death of Sharon Reynolds so that we can truly find out what happened in this horrific death. The people of Ontario and the life and memory of this seven-year-old girl demand nothing less.

#### OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** I am proud to stand here today with letters from hundreds of members of the United Steelworkers of America, and I join them in their condemnation of this government's assault, this government's attack, on workers' workplace health and safety rights by virtue of this government ramming Bill 57 through the Legislature.

These working women and men, members of the United Steelworkers, are adamant and make it very clear that this government's attack on the right to on-site inspections by Ministry of Labour inspectors when there is a lawful refusal of work as a result of an unsafe workplace, the denial of an on-site inspection, is going to lead to more injuries and more deaths.

As well, these members of the United Steelworkers know that the changes to the reporting of injuries, the abandonment of the requirement to report injuries, will indeed make workplaces more dangerous and increase the number of workplace accidents and deaths.

As well, the government's repeal of section 34, which no longer requires that there be a report to the minister prior to the introduction of new chemicals or biological agents, again increases the exposure of workers to accident, disease and death.

We join with the United Steelworkers of America, other working women and men in this province, other trade unions and their leaders in condemning this government and calling upon this government to use its opportunity in committee today to abandon Bill 57 and restore workplace health and safety.

#### YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

**Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex):** I rise today to highlight a project in my riding that is helping rural young people find good jobs close to home.

The Huron and Perth Youth Development Alliance is comprised of 27 businesses and organizations in Perth and Huron counties, and indeed the north part of Wellington as well, that contribute to various sectors of the local economy, including science and technology, agribusiness, manufacturing, distribution and service.

These companies were concerned with the number of youth in the area who were migrating to urban centres to

obtain job experience and skills training. With the help of a grant from OMAFRA's rural jobs strategy fund, this youth development alliance has designed a project that will invest about \$2.5 million in technical training, skills development and practical work experience for 152 youth in Perth and Huron counties interested in beginning and continuing their careers in local communities—about 25% from the ministry.

I want to commend Ben Cornell and Norm McLennan of Ward and Uptigrove Consulting in Listowel for their dedication and commitment to this project. I also want to applaud the 27 companies and organizations that make up the alliance who are doing their part for rural economic renewal and for youth in rural Ontario.

Highly skilled youth and more investment opportunities will result in stronger rural communities in Ontario for generations to come.

1340

#### SOINS HOSPITALIERS

**M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell) :** Hier matin, je recevais un appel suivi d'une lettre d'une de mes commettantes, M<sup>me</sup> Raymonde Lemay de Rockland. Jeudi dernier, le 21 juin, cette dame a été admise à l'hôpital générale d'Ottawa, après une longue période d'attente, pour une double intervention chirurgicale qui a eu lieu le jour même de son admission.

J'ai été stupéfié d'apprendre jusqu'à quel point les coupures du gouvernement Harris face aux centres d'accès aux soins communautaires sont menaçantes. Ce sont surtout nos personnes âgées qui vivent seules à la maison qui sont victimes de ces coupures malsaines.

Le vendredi 22 juin dernier, un jour après sa double intervention chirurgicale, le D<sup>r</sup> Brunet, son orthopédiste, lui annonçait que son congé de l'hôpital devrait avoir lieu le samedi 23 juin et qu'il était douteux qu'elle puisse recevoir des soins à domicile, dû au manque de financement du CASC.

Cette dame a reçu son congé de l'hôpital tel que prévu le samedi 23 juin et a été informée par la suite qu'il lui sera impossible de recevoir des soins à domicile avant le 26 juin, et ça pour seulement une heure par jour pour les huit prochains jours.

Ceci est inacceptable. Encore une fois, ce sont nos personnes âgées qui souffrent à cause des coupures du gouvernement Harris.

#### PHARMACARE

**Mr Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington):** On May 3, I raised a question with the Minister of Health regarding the federal Liberals' 1997 red book promise to introduce a national pharmacare program, or universal coverage for medically necessary drugs. There have been two federal elections since this promise was made and there has been no follow-up from the government of Canada, as was confirmed by the minister's response to my question.

I wrote to the Prime Minister on this subject about four months ago, and I have received no meaningful reply to my request for a status report, just an acknowledgement from an assistant that my letter had been received.

Meanwhile, the Ontario government has been busy making a wide range of prescription drugs available to meet the needs of patients in this province. Since 1995, the Ontario drug benefit program has been expanded to offer 1,216 more drug products, bringing the total to 3,100 products, helping seniors and people on social assistance obtain the medicine prescribed by their doctors. Spending on the Ontario drug benefit program has risen by almost 70% since 1995, up from \$1 billion to \$1.8 billion this year.

Ontario has managed to put these resources where they're needed, despite federal cutbacks to our health care funding. Federal support for health care has slipped from 18 cents on the dollar in 1994-95 to a mere 13 cents now. The need to reverse the federal cuts and introduce an escalator clause to increase federal support to keep pace with rising costs for health care was supported by members from all three parties in this House when my private member's resolution passed unanimously last year.

The Premier is continuing that call for an escalator clause by asking for an immediate commitment from the government of Canada to cover 50% of the increasing costs for health care. I hope all members will continue to support this initiative.

#### PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** I listened with great interest to the Premier's summary of the session that ends tomorrow. Interestingly enough, in my mail the day before, on a piece of letterhead called "Seizing Tomorrow's Opportunities," I received this:

"When did we choose incompetence? When did we decide to screw up like the NDP? The taxpayer federation criticizes our priorities. Seniors' groups, our core voters, attack Tony Clement for musing about taking away their free drug coverage. The Premier breaks our campaign promise on education funding. Janet Ecker says there's no plan for MPP pay raises and two days later she introduces a bill for it. The Premier tells seniors, our core voters, they should thank God they live in Ontario, with the best services in the world."

This one was interesting:

"We nominate an incompetent candidate for a key by-election. The Premier calls problems with seniors, our core voters, getting home care a shoddy ploy for more money."

Was this a Liberal who wrote this? No way. Was this a New Democrat? No. It was a Tory expressing her frustration at a government that's clearly under siege and a Premier who's showing no leadership and isn't capable any more of leading this province. I do agree with one thing it says here: "It's time to seize tomorrow's

opportunities." The real leadership's coming from Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberal Party in this province.

#### STAN DARLING

**Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** I rise in the House today to honour a remarkable gentleman from our riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka. He is an outstanding citizen, a wonderful family man and a great friend. I think I can speak for all members in bringing the warmest greetings and best wishes to Mr Stan Darling as he celebrates his 90th birthday on July 15, 2001.

It is pretty impressive when you reflect back on the number of lives Stan has touched. In such a short time I can't possibly mention all of the boards and organizations that Stan Darling served on. But to name a few, he served as reeve of Burk's Falls, president of the Georgian Bay development council and was a member of the Burk's Falls Lions Club, where he has had an exceptional attendance for 62 years.

Stan was the PC federal member for Parry Sound-Muskoka for 21 years, from 1972 to 1993, retiring at age 82. He is the best representative in and outside of politics we have ever seen. Stan made a point of attending every social function and taking care of as many people as he possibly could. He's still doing that today as he nears 90 years old.

One of the highlights of his political career was the signing of the treaty on acid rain in 1991. His leadership, involvement and devotion to environmental issues have proven invaluable to us today and for future generations.

It is a great honour for me to be a friend of Stan Darling. He will serve as a role model for me as I make my way in the world of politics.

Few will come close to Stan Darling's outstanding record of service to his constituents, his family, his friends and his riding. He's an inspiration to all of us in public office.

I would like to call on all members of the House to join me in congratulating Mr Stan Darling on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

#### MEMBERS' EXPENDITURES REPORT

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I beg to inform the House that I today have laid upon the table the individual members' expenditures for the fiscal year 2000-01.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** On Thursday, June 14, the chief government whip, Mr Klees, rose on a point of privilege concerning security incidents that occurred on June 12 at the constituency office of the Minister of Finance and on June 14 outside the Premier's office in the Legislative Building. The member for Windsor-St Clair, the member for Beaches-East York, the government House leader and the Minister of Labour also made submissions. I've had the opportunity to review the

Hansard of that day, the written submissions of the chief government whip and the relevant authorities and precedents.

Before dealing with the question of privilege, I want to reflect on—not reconsider—a point of order raised by the member for Beaches-East York and dealt with by the Acting Speaker. The member for Beaches-East York indicated that the submission of the chief government whip reflecting on the alleged silence of members of the third party about security incidents offended standing order 23(h) and standing order 23(i). These standing orders require the Speaker to call a member to order if he or she, and I quote, “makes allegations against another member” or “imputes false or unavowed motives to another member” in debate.

At the time the member for Beaches-East York raised her point of order, the chief government whip had not specifically identified which member or members were the subject of his remarks. Had that been done, it would have been open to the Chair to intervene and call the member to order. In any event, looking back on the incident I cannot emphasize enough that members should exercise restraint in making personal allegations against another member. Members should understand that such allegations can cause disorder, that the Chair takes seriously its responsibility to maintain order and decorum in the chamber and that the Chair will continue to be vigilant in this regard.

After the Chair’s ruling on the point of order raised by the member for Beaches-East York, the chief government whip resumed making oral submissions on his point of privilege. Toward the end of these submissions, he informed the House that the purpose of that part of his remarks reflecting on the alleged silence of members of the third party concerning the security incidents was, to quote him, “to get the third party publicly on record” on the issue. This was an unfortunate choice of words, because it detracted from the seriousness of the safety and security issue raised by the member and from the rationale for rising on a point of privilege. In other words, when members rise on a point of privilege, they should do so in order to vindicate the individual privileges of all members and the collective privileges of this House.

I also want the House to know that I take all security incidents very seriously, given the jurisdiction over security that has been given to the Speaker by virtue of section 103 of the Legislative Assembly Act. Therefore, I want to inform the House about the following measures being taken in light of the latest incidents. Firstly, I have taken steps to enhance security in the Legislative Building. Secondly, the Sergeant at Arms, whose security responsibilities are primarily focused on the legislative precinct, will continue visiting members’ constituency offices to advise on security issues. Finally, the Speaker’s all-party advisory committee on security will review the incidents with a view to assisting me to determine what else should be done to prevent or deal with future incidents. I ask for the co-operation of all members to

ensure that the working environment is safe and secure not only for members but for their staff, their clients and their constituents.

I will now speak directly to the point raised by the member for Etobicoke Centre, Mr Stockwell, regarding the demonstration that occurred on June 14 in the Legislative Building in front of the Premier’s office. The member recounted the difficulty he had that day in navigating the hallways of the Legislative Building and the precautions that were taken to ensure he was escorted safely to those places in the building he wished to go. In reviewing his comments, the member did not make it clear that he was in fact prevented from getting to and from a specific place in the Legislative Building or was prevented from carrying out his parliamentary duties.

#### 1350

It would appear that, to the contrary, with appropriate assistance, the minister was able to come and go safely. While I acknowledge that ideally members should not have to encounter even the inconvenience that the member experienced, the nature of a public building that is also the seat of Parliament sometimes works against this. I therefore find that he did not make out a prima facie case of privilege. In so finding, I nevertheless reiterate my determination to ensure that all members have confidence in the safety and the security of this building.

Returning now to the point of privilege raised by the chief government whip, I wish to advise the House that section 46(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act confers, and the Speaker claims, an absolute and unfettered right to deal with all questions of privilege, regardless of other circumstances. I have nevertheless in this case made the decision to defer my ruling until such time as charges against individuals in relation to the events at the constituency office of the Minister of Finance have been fully dealt with.

It is not typical for a matter of privilege to come before this House while either criminal or civil charges related to the very serious incident or incidents complained of in that matter of privilege are pending. For this reason, and to fully observe the principle that the Legislature and judicial branches of government ought to refrain from encroaching upon proper jurisdictions of each other, I feel prudence requires me to set this matter aside until the judicial system has disposed of it.

Therefore, and regardless of the outcome of the matter—and I want to make it very clear, regardless of the outcome in the court—at the appropriate time I will rule on the point of privilege of the member for Oak Ridges on its merit, and I thank the House for their patience in this regard.

#### VISITORS

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I’d like to welcome here a delegation from beautiful Victoria county, led by councillor Faye McGee: Lynne Boldt, Corky Swartman, and Grant Dewar. Welcome to the Legislature.

**Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain):** On a point of order, Speaker: I'd like to welcome to the House my son, who graduated from grade 8 last night, Alexander Tsanis.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** It's not a point of order, but my daughter graduated from grade 8 last night as well.

**Mrs Bountrogianni:** It's not a point of order, but I would also like to welcome Yani Alexopoulos from Runnymede Secondary.

**Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill):** On a point of order, Speaker: I would like to welcome members from the Canadian Jewish Congress; people from the Islamic Society of North America, Canadian chapter; Jewish Parents for Equality in Education; Ontario Parents for Equality in Education Funding; United Jewish Appeal; Canadian Association of Jewish Day Schools; and the Canadian Association of Islamic Relations who are in the gallery today.

**Mr Colle:** Mr Speaker, I'd like to welcome senior citizens from my riding who are fighting to save their homes from demolition of their apartments, and I'd like to welcome here the citizens from Cheritan Court and Rosewell Court.

**Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** Mr Speaker, I do have a point of order: We have the privilege today of having with us in the gallery the family of one of our pages who has worked so hard over the last short while. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce Becky Codd-Downey's mother, Judi Codd; Bob Downey, her father; Frank Codd, her grandfather; uncle Frank Codd; Doris Galloway, a great-aunt; and David Galloway, a great-uncle, who are here today.

**The Speaker:** All the parents can be very proud of the great job the pages are doing.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I beg to inform the House that today the Clerk received the ninth report of the standing committee on government agencies.

Pursuant to standing order 106(e), the report is deemed to be adopted by the House.

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

**Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on justice and social policy and move its adoption.

I also mention my daughter graduated from grade 8 last night.

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

Bill 82, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act to provide an arm's length process to determine members' compensation / *Projet de loi 82, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Assemblée législative pour établir un processus sans lien de dépendance permettant de fixer la rétribution des députés.*

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

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1355 to 1400.*

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

#### Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia
Arnott, Ted	Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Gerretsen, John	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Gilchrist, Steve	O'Toole, John
Bartolucci, Rick	Gill, Raminder	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Beaubien, Marcel	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bountrogianni, Marie	Guzzo, Garry J.	Phillips, Gerry
Boyer, Claudette	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Brown, Michael A.	Hastings, John	Ruprecht, Tony
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Sampson, Rob
Caplan, David	Hudak, Tim	Smitherman, George
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Snobelen, John
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Spina, Joseph
Cleary, John C.	Johnson, Bert	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Kells, Morley	Stockwell, Chris
Colle, Mike	Kennedy, Gerard	Tascona, Joseph N.
Conway, Sean G.	Kwinter, Monte	Tilson, David
Crozier, Bruce	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Tsubouchi, David H.
Cunningham, Dianne	Marland, Margaret	Turnbull, David
Curling, Alvin	Martiniuk, Gerry	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Di Cocco, Caroline	Maves, Bart	Wilson, Jim
Dombrowsky, Leona	Mazzilli, Frank	Witmer, Elizabeth
Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn	Wood, Bob
Dunlop, Garfield	McMeekin, Ted	Young, David
Ecker, Janet	Miller, Norm	
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	

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

#### Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Marchese, Rosario	Martin, Tony
Kormos, Peter	Martel, Shelley	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 76; the nays are 5.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 26, 2001, the bill is ordered for third reading.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

**Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on regulations and private bills and move its adoption.

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

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting Master's College and Seminary (formerly Eastern Pentecostal Bible College);

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting Conrad Grebel University College;

Bill Pr 20, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Your committee begs to report the following bill, as amended:

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting The Boys' Home.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

AUDIT AMENDMENT ACT  
(FAIRNESS IN MUNICIPAL  
FINANCES), 2001

LOI DE 2001 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LA VÉRIFICATION  
DES COMPTES PUBLICS  
(ÉQUITÉ DANS LES  
FINANCES MUNICIPALES)

Mr McMeekin moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 93, An Act to amend the Audit Act and to ensure that municipal restructuring and the reallocation of responsibilities between Ontario and its municipalities do not have an adverse effect on municipal finances / Projet de loi 93, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la vérification des comptes publics et visant à assurer que la restructuration municipale et la nouvelle répartition des responsabilités entre l'Ontario et ses municipalités n'ont pas des conséquences préjudiciables sur les finances municipales.

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

The member for a short statement.

**Mr Ted McMeekin (Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot):** This bill will give the auditor the power to investigate and report to the Legislature the financial effects of municipal restructuring and the reallocation of responsibilities between Ontario and its municipalities since 1995. It will also give the Provincial Auditor the ability to make the recommendations needed to ensure the financial resources of Ontario's municipalities are proportional to their responsibilities.

This is a bill that municipal leaders across the province have been asking for. We've contacted dozens of mayors across Ontario, and to date every single one of

them has been in support of this legislation, as is the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

NEIGHBOURHOODS  
AND AFFORDABLE RENTAL  
HOUSING PROTECTION  
AND PRESERVATION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LA PROTECTION  
ET LA CONSERVATION DES QUARTIERS  
ET DES LOGEMENTS LOCATIFS  
À PRIX ABORDABLES

Mr Colle moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 94, An Act to stop the demolition of affordable rental housing and the conversion of affordable rental housing into condominiums and to protect and preserve existing neighbourhoods / Projet de loi 94, Loi visant à empêcher la démolition des logements locatifs à prix abordables et leur reconversion en condominiums ainsi qu'à protéger et à conserver les quartiers existants.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

The member for a short statement.

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** The Neighbourhoods and Rental Housing Protection Act which I've introduced would prohibit the demolition of affordable rental housing and protect neighbourhoods by establishing neighbourhood preservation areas.

This act dramatically curtails the extraordinarily arbitrary powers of the province through its appointed Ontario Municipal Board and restores the democratic rights of citizens to enjoy their homes and neighbourhoods without the fear of being disenfranchised, ignored and overruled by a most undemocratic and arbitrary arm of this government, the Ontario Municipal Board.

1410

ETHICS AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN PUBLIC MATTERS ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR L'ÉTHIQUE  
ET LA TRANSPARENCE  
DES QUESTIONS  
D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC

Ms Di Cocco moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 95, An Act to require open meetings and more stringent conflict rules for provincial and municipal boards, commissions and other public bodies / Projet de loi 95, Loi exigeant des réunions publiques et des règles plus strictes de règlement de conflit pour les commissions et conseils provinciaux et municipaux ainsi que les autres organismes publics.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

The member for a short statement.

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** This bill would require specified provincial and municipal councils, boards, commissions and other public bodies, as listed in the schedule of the bill, to hold meetings which are open to the public. The public could only be excluded from meetings of the body if certain types of matters were going to be discussed by the body. Minutes of meetings open to the public would have to be made available to the public in a timely fashion and would have to contain sufficient details.

The body would also be required to set rules respecting public notice of its meetings and meetings of its committees, the availability of minutes to the public and the availability of the body rules. The body would be required to appoint a person responsible for compliance with the rules. Section 8 would impose a penalty for failure to comply with requirements for notice, minutes and rules.

This bill would also impose conflict-of-interest rules on members of the specific public body. Section 12 would impose a penalty for contravention of the conflict-of-interest provisions.

It is the open process through public scrutiny that ensures accountability.

## VISITORS

**Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to ask the House to welcome Annie Kidder, from People for Education; Phyllis Benedict, president of the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario; Liz Sandals, president of the Ontario Public School Boards Association; and a variety of other parent, school and education groups concerned about the future of publicly funded education.

## MOTIONS

### CONSIDERATION OF BILL 81

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** I have several routine motions, which I'd just like to go through.

I move that the order for second reading of Bill 81, An Act to provide standards with respect to the management of materials containing nutrients used on lands, to provide for the making of regulations with respect to farm animals and lands to which nutrients are applied, and to make related amendments to other acts, be dis-

charged and the bill be referred to the standing committee on justice and social policy.

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

### CONSIDERATION OF BILL 90

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** I move that the order for second reading of Bill 90, An Act to promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste, be discharged and the bill be referred to the standing committee on general government.

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

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** Hopefully these are the copies you're supposed to get.

There are a couple of committees that we talked about between House leaders: the legislative subcommittee on alternative fuel sources and also the Legislative Assembly committee, which will be looking into parliamentary reform. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to move motions relating to committee business on those. We'll take it one at a time.

There will also be some other committees—the ones we just said yes to—authorized to sit through the summer adjournment. We will do it a step at a time so that everyone can be very clear what is happening on them, if that is OK.

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

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It is my understanding, subject to the advice of the Clerk, that the routine motions we just put—there are some other routine motions on these committees that we have to put forward. I can double-check that if you like, but that was part of this motion as I understood it.

**The Speaker:** We'll take a moment to confer.  
Government House leader.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** This is another matter on which we've had discussions between the House leaders. We're just sharing wording on that. I understand it's coming to them. I'll read this slowly so we're all clear on what we're attempting to do here. If this proceeds, I should point out that this would mean we would not be sitting here this evening in the heat.

Notwithstanding standing order 59(e), I would like to seek unanimous consent to allow the estimates committee to meet to review the 2001-02 estimates of the Ministry of Education scheduled for today while we debate the motion on Bill 80; and

I seek unanimous consent to call second and third readings of Bill 19, An Act to amend the Training, Colleges and Universities Act, and Bill 85, An Act to minimize the use of restraints on patients in hospitals and on patients of facilities, and to have the question put immediately thereon without further debate or amendment.

**The Speaker:** Is there consent? Agreed.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** We'll be taking this one step at a time as I understand the process here.

ONTARIO STUDENT LOAN  
HARMONIZATION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR L'HARMONISATION  
DES PRÊTS D'ÉTUDES DE L'ONTARIO

Mrs Ecker, on behalf of Mrs Cunningham, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 19, An Act to amend the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Act / Projet de loi 19, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le ministère de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités.

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

ONTARIO STUDENT LOAN  
HARMONIZATION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR L'HARMONISATION  
DES PRÊTS D'ÉTUDES DE L'ONTARIO

Mrs Ecker, on behalf of Mrs Cunningham, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 19, An Act to amend the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Act / Projet de loi 19, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le ministère de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités.

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

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

1420

PATIENT RESTRAINTS  
MINIMIZATION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LA RÉDUCTION  
AU MINIMUM DE L'UTILISATION  
DE LA CONTENTION SUR LES MALADES

Mrs Ecker, on behalf of Ms Lankin, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 85, An Act to minimize the use of restraints on patients in hospitals and on patients of facilities / Projet de loi 85, Loi visant à réduire au minimum l'utilisation des moyens de contention sur les malades des hôpitaux et des établissements.

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

PATIENT RESTRAINTS  
MINIMIZATION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LA RÉDUCTION  
AU MINIMUM DE L'UTILISATION  
DE LA CONTENTION SUR LES MALADES

Mrs Ecker, on behalf of Ms Lankin, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 85, An Act to minimize the use of restraints on patients in hospitals and on patients of facilities / Projet de loi 85, Loi visant à réduire au minimum l'utilisation des moyens de contention sur les malades des hôpitaux et des établissements.

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

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

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** I would just like to thank the Speaker, the clerks and the members for their co-operation today in making this happen.

**The Speaker:** We should have breaks more often. Things seem to work very well when we do that. Back to reality.

DEFERRED VOTES

RESPONSIBLE CHOICES FOR GROWTH  
AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT  
(2001 BUDGET), 2001

LOI DE 2001  
SUR DES CHOIX RÉFLÉCHIS  
FAVORISANT LA CROISSANCE  
ET LA RESPONSABILISATION  
(BUDGET DE 2001)

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 45, An Act to implement measures contained in the 2001 Budget and to amend various statutes / Projet de loi 45, Loi mettant en oeuvre des mesures mentionnées dans le budget de 2001 et modifiant diverses lois.

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

*The division bells rang from 1422 to 1427.*

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

Ayes

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

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

**Nays**

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Brown, Michael A.	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Cleary, John C.	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce	Lankin, Frances	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 50; the nays are 35.

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

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

AMBULANCE SERVICES COLLECTIVE  
BARGAINING ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001

SUR LA NÉGOCIATION COLLECTIVE  
DANS LES SERVICES D'AMBULANCE

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 58, An Act to ensure the provision of essential ambulance services in the event of a strike or lock-out of ambulance workers / Projet de loi 58, Loi visant à assurer la fourniture des services d'ambulance essentiels dans l'éventualité d'une grève ou d'un lock-out de préposés aux services d'ambulance.

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

*The division bells rang from 1432 to 1437.*

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

**Ayes**

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

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

**Nays**

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley

Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Brown, Michael A.	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Cleary, John C.	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce	Lankin, Frances	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 49; the nays are 35.

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

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

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

WALKERTON TRAGEDY

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** My question is for the Acting Premier. Yesterday on the witness stand, former Minister of the Environment Brenda Elliott said "I don't recall" 41 times.

Today Norm Sterling picked up where she left off. The former Minister of the Environment, Norm Sterling, was asked about a letter he received from the Minister of Health citing major concerns around loopholes in drinking water notification. Norm Sterling said the letter was "no big deal." It's hard to believe it was no big deal.

The letter he received and responded to caused yet another letter to be received by him from the next Minister of Health.

I'm asking, how do we get to the bottom of this at the Walkerton inquiry when it's very difficult to be constantly hearing, "I don't recall," and "It's no big deal"? To the Deputy Premier: how are we going to get to the bottom of the Walkerton inquiry?

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance):** To the Minister of the Environment.

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of the Environment):** I think the member opposite can appreciate the fact that the inquiry and the investigation are still ongoing. Obviously all of the information that is being presented by individuals appearing will be very carefully considered. As a result of the information that is received by the inquiry, recommendations will be made, and it's those recommendations that we look forward to seeing and implementing.

**Mrs Pupatello:** Today, Norm Sterling talked about the loopholes on the witness stand, loopholes that were brought to his attention repeatedly. He said about those loopholes that his own ministry officials told him not to worry about the loopholes. He said he couldn't recall which officials said that. That's hard to believe.

I have in my hand, and we are now sending over, a confidential government document that shows very clearly that his own officials were very worried. In fact, they

said in writing the exact opposite of what Norm Sterling said on the stand today. Minister, given this evidence, how can we believe anything Norm Sterling says on the witness stand?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** Again, I would hasten to add to what I've just said in response to the statement and the question that has been asked by the member opposite that I would just remind her that this is an inquiry that is taking place at the present time. Obviously there are people who are very carefully considering all of the information and all of the testimony that's being provided. It's not our job to prejudge the investigation. It's not our job to prejudge what the recommendations may be. But again I would hasten to add that we do look forward to the recommendations.

**Mrs Pupatello:** Minister, it's your job to tell the truth. The inquiry is about the truth. Minister, it's about the truth. Today, Norm Sterling said that he was told not to worry by officials, officials he refused to name.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Please take your seat. Order.

The member can continue.

**Mrs Pupatello:** His own ministry officials reported to him documented concerns since 1997 raised by the operations division of the Ministry of the Environment dated August 21, 1997. It said, "The main points centre on non-reporting of drinking water quality." It said the main concerns were on the notification protocol being obsolete. Those are very powerful words and they are the words that led to the Walkerton tragedy.

Today you expect the world to believe, the public of Ontario to believe, Norm Sterling citing phantom ministry officials, when these officials said in writing the exact opposite to what he said on the stand today. Minister, how can we expect to believe anything he says on the stand today?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** We all agreed that a very comprehensive review would be undertaken by Justice O'Connor regarding the tragic events that occurred in Walkerton. It's up to the inquiry to come to conclusions. I don't believe we should be prejudging or making some statements that would not take into consideration their final recommendations. That is the job of the inquiry.

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a question for the Deputy Premier. So far at the Walkerton inquiry we've heard from a former highly respected medical officer of health for the province of Ontario and from two ministers who have amnesia, whose answers can best be described as extremely evasive. Dr Schabas, the former medical officer of health of Ontario, prodded then Health Minister Jim Wilson to fire a warning rocket at Norm Sterling about the dangers of the drinking water cuts in the Ministry of the Environment.

You have been a minister of several portfolios. Can you believe a minister could possibly feel that such a letter was not of the utmost importance and should not be followed up thoroughly by that minister?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** To the Minister of the Environment.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** In response to the information and the question that has been raised by the member opposite, again I would hasten to encourage all members in this House to remember that there has been a commission set up to thoroughly look at and examine all of the issues related to Walkerton. It would be inappropriate for us to prejudge the recommendations, to prejudge the outcome without all of the information being very, very carefully considered.

**Mr Bradley:** Minister, we know that the government kept two sets of books when it came to the situation of cutting the budget and the staff of the Ministry of the Environment, two different versions of the consequences of the mindless cuts to the budget of the ministry of which you are now minister, the Ministry of the Environment, one for the public and one for yourselves.

Norm Sterling says there was some phantom bureaucrat out there, some phantom official or officials in his ministry, who said, "There was no need to worry," yet I have a leaked document that says the following: "Concerns regarding the ODWOs"—Ontario drinking water objectives—"were raised by operations division, Ministry of the Environment in a memo sent to program development branch dated August 21, 1997. A number of issues were brought forward, with the main points centring on the non-reporting of drinking water quality by smaller" communities, "the cost to smaller" communities.

Who should I believe, Norm Sterling on the stand or the author of the document that says there's a real danger to drinking water in this province?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I would remind the member opposite that the inquiry is carefully reviewing millions of documents. There is a tremendous amount of information related to the tragedy that occurred in Walkerton. I would encourage him to allow the members of the commission to carefully consider all the documentation, to listen to all those people who have been asked to appear and to not prejudge the outcome or the recommendation.

**Mr Bradley:** We have a former Minister of the Environment on the stand who has been contradicted by information found in a government document, totally contradicted. We have the former Ontario medical officer of health, Dr Richard Schabas, who says that the Premier of this province turned his back on public health in this province. Isn't it true, Minister, that the whole bunch of you in the cabinet knew what was going on and that you decided to ignore the warnings of Dr Schabas and others and that as a result seven people died in Walkerton and 2,000 people were sick?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I would again remind the member opposite—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. We need to be able to hear. Sorry, Minister.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I would again remind the member opposite that it is very, very important that Justice

O'Connor hear all of the evidence. We also certainly are aware of the fact that there are millions of pieces of evidence. I would just encourage the member opposite to not prejudge the outcome but to allow Justice O'Connor to take a look at what has been said, what has been presented, and to come forward with recommendations. Those are recommendations that we on this side of the House look forward to seeing.

1450

**The Speaker:** New question.

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** I have a question to the Deputy Premier. Today has been another day of, quite frankly, stunning revelations at the Walkerton inquiry, yet another Conservative environment minister who stood by and did nothing while safe water was sacrificed on your altar of tax cuts. Your former environment minister Norm Sterling was asked about one of the many smoking guns in this affair. We're talking about the letter, you see, to Mr Sterling from the health minister, as he was then, James Wilson, saying that when the water testing labs were privatized, changes were needed to ensure health officials would be notified of any life-threatening results. This was the letter from the then Minister of Health to Minister of Environment Norm Sterling. Sterling admitted that he never read the letter, a letter that could have prevented the Walkerton tragedy if it had been acted on.

So tell us, please, sir, is this the legacy of the Harris government, a minister who doesn't read his mail and seven people die?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** To the Minister of the Environment.

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** It's very interesting that the member of the third party talks about a legacy, because we are very proud of the fact that we announced the drinking water protection regulation in August 2000. Certainly we're very pleased that we have taken measures to ensure the safety of the water. Unlike the NDP, which in their throne speech of November 1990 said, "We will act to protect our supply of clean water.... As a first step we will introduce a safe drinking water act to set standards for water treatment and protect our people's health and safety," we took that action.

**Mr Kormos:** Notwithstanding that Sterling didn't read the letter of warning from Health Minister James Wilson, he wrote a reply nonetheless. His letter responding to Wilson was one that said basically, "Don't worry, be happy." The letter said that the existing voluntary drinking water objectives were fine and there was no need to change the law. We all know that turned out to be tragically wrong. But, you see, somehow Sterling can't remember a thing about this crucial decision. Just like Brenda Elliott yesterday, there seems to be a collective cabinet amnesia around Walkerton.

A letter from a minister to another minister about a life-and-death matter, and it looks like the minister didn't even read it before signing it. Is this how your government does business? Is this how your government protects the public?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** If there was an act of omission, it was certainly something that obviously your government omitted, because again I come back to the fact that in your throne speech of 1990, you said that you were going to protect water, that you were going to introduce a safe drinking water act, and that never, ever happened.

We can all talk about acts of omission, and certainly I think all governments have omissions.

**Mr Kormos:** It was your Minister of Health who sent the letter of warning to Minister of Environment Sterling, and it was Minister of Environment Sterling who never read the letter, but then nonetheless replied, saying, "Don't worry, be happy."

In addition, you should know the evidence today revealed that although Sterling has no recollection of this, his letter to Health Minister Witmer said he would welcome a review of the drinking water objectives. Witmer wrote back and said she was gratified by his response.

What happened then? There was still time to take action and prevent the tragedy, but this is what Sterling told the inquiry: he doesn't recall reading Health Minister Witmer's letter. He never followed up on the drinking water objectives. In fact, and this is stunning, this is shocking, Sterling never even read the drinking water objectives until two weeks ago, when he was being prepared, woodshedded, for this inquiry.

My question is to the Acting Premier. Your minister in this government, Brenda Elliott, told the inquiry yesterday that you're all responsible for Walkerton. When you get letters from other ministers, when you send letters to other ministers, do any of you bother reading them?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** The member opposite needs to remember that all the evidence needs to be presented to the inquiry, to Justice O'Connor. There are currently presentations being made and there is information—thousands and thousands of documents—that is being considered. Again, I would encourage the member opposite not to prejudge and to ensure that we await the recommendations after they have been very carefully considered by the commission.

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** My question once again is to the Deputy Premier, and it's about young offenders. We've just learned that you're playing fast and loose with public safety in a cynical attempt to break the union at Kennedy House in Uxbridge, Ontario. Over the past few weeks your government, through its ministry, has either granted early release or transferred out to open custody about 60 young offenders from the secure Uxbridge facility. You're sending these young offenders from a secure facility to open custody facilities that are already overflowing with offenders and don't have the staff to handle them.

This is a high-stakes game you're playing with public safety. Many of these young offenders that you're moving into open custody are highly dangerous and very likely to reoffend. How can you justify giving dangerous young offenders a free pass to go out and reoffend?

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance):** I'm not familiar with the Kennedy House issue which the honourable raises. I'll undertake to look into it and get back to him about the particular questions he may have. If he has additional concerns about that issue, other questions he'd like to ask, he can put them and I'll look into it. I have not heard about the issue he has raised.

**Mr Kormos:** Deputy Premier, I suggest that you look to your Minister of Community and Social Services and, in view of your unfamiliarity with this issue, refer this matter to him.

You see, for a government that talks a big game about getting tough on crime—and, boy, you guys have—you're awfully quick to throw public safety out the window when it comes to serving your union-bashing agenda.

Your ministry is actively jeopardizing public safety by authorizing early releases and the transfer of these young offenders into less secure spaces. Many of these inmates would be serving up to five years in jail if they were adults. Some of them were in open custody before they went to Kennedy House, but they caused so much trouble that they were transferred back to Kennedy in Uxbridge, which is a secure facility. Between sending them into open custody and simply sending them back on to the streets—you're doing both—you're flirting with disaster. Is it worth putting public safety at risk just to beat down and beat up on a union?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** The member for Niagara chose to ask the question of me. I'm not familiar with the subject matter. He now suggests that another minister would be familiar with the subject matter. We'll look into it and get back to him to try to respond to the questions he has raised.

#### HOSPITAL FUNDING

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** My question is for the Minister of Health. You know that Ontario hospitals are underfunded. They need \$700 million this year if they're going to keep their doors and their beds open for patients. You've promised hospitals there will be more money, but you haven't said how much and you won't say when the money is coming.

On Monday you presided at the opening of a new wing of Toronto East General Hospital. Maybe for the first time ever, people who came to see you cut the ribbon were told this multimillion-dollar facility would never actually open unless you come up with some money to run it. On Monday you seemed to want to assure Toronto East General that money would indeed be coming. So we have a lot of promises, but so far we have no delivery.

My question today is, how are you going to keep these promises of more funding to hospitals when you are actually planning to spend \$250 million less on hospitals this year than you did last year?

**Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** To quote the honourable member's col-

league from Windsor West, it's your job to tell the truth. And the truth of the matter is we're not spending less this year; we're spending more this year on hospitals. That has been the case over the last three to four years. Indeed, spending for hospitals since the 1998 year has gone up. We are proud of that record. We are proud of the fact we're putting in more money for doctors' services, \$375 million a year for nursing services. Indeed that is our practice.

**1500**

Do the hospitals have to be accountable for the dollars they're spending? Of course they do. But are they places where citizens expect excellent health care from the deliverers of those services? Of course they are. We are reviewing the operating plans of all the hospitals, which is why we cannot make an announcement on Toronto East General, just as we cannot make an announcement for 164 other hospitals, until we have reviewed all the operating plans to ensure they can deliver the most excellent services at a cost that is acceptable.

**Mrs McLeod:** That's fine, Mr Speaker—something that is so far from the truth. It seems they've been having difficulties today establishing a standard for truth.

Minister, I claimed after the budget—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Quiet down over there right now. I let you guys go, and typically, you push and you push and you push. So now I'm going to have to crack down on you. The language gets worse and worse and worse. Then the minister gets up and repeats what's on this side. So now I'm going to crack down. Be very careful what you say or I'll throw you out.

Sorry. Proceed.

**Mrs McLeod:** I wasn't sure, Mr Speaker, whether that was directed at me in my attempt to establish a basis for understanding what is reality.

Minister, I claimed after you presented your budget that you were going to cut a million dollars from hospital budgets—not my figures but the Ontario Hospital Association's figures. It turns out I shortchanged your willingness to hack away at hospital budgets even more. What I have here today, Minister, is the only recourse I have for what is fact. It's your estimates book, tabled this week. Your estimates book says you spent \$8.7 billion on hospitals last year and says equally clearly that you plan to spend \$8.4 billion on hospitals this year.

Minister, I ask you again, when hospitals are facing deficits of \$700 million, when they're going to have to lay off nurses and close beds, how can you be planning to cut—

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

Minister of Health?

**Hon Mr Clement:** The answer to her question is that she's incorrect. Estimates are called estimates for a reason: they're estimates. Her assumptions are incorrect, her analysis is incorrect, her conclusions are incorrect—she's incorrect. We are going to be spending more money for hospitals this year than last year, which was more

money than the year before and more money than the year before that. That is our commitment.

Now, part of our job is to review all the operating plans to make sure the dollars that are spent on behalf of the taxpayers actually achieve better results for the patients of those hospitals. That is why we are reviewing the operating plans.

If the honourable member wants to be helpful, call your local MP so that they can be part of the solution as well, because the Liberal MPs from Ontario aren't doing their job to ensure we have better health care for the citizens of Ontario. That's the problem.

**The Speaker:** Point of order. Stop the clock.

**Mrs McLeod:** —Minister of Health to table the obviously second set of books which are being kept on health care—

*Interjections.*

#### MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. I believe the people of Ontario have a right to participate and be well informed about environmental decision-making. This is why there is an Environmental Bill of Rights registry, and why the government posts many such items on the Internet for all to see.

Last week the Environmental Commissioner brought to the attention of the House the issue of some remaining instruments at MNR that needed to be regulated. Minister, can you tell this House what action you have taken to respond to the concerns raised in last week's report?

**Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Natural Resources):** I thank the member from Peterborough for the question. I know it's one that's on the minds of many people in this chamber.

Last week the Environmental Commissioner did come out and talk about some instruments that were lacking. At the time, I expressed great regret in an apology to the Environmental Commissioner for not having those instruments in place. I made the statement that all the members of this chamber agree with the EBR and the EBR registry.

I also committed to report back this week on what steps have been taken to correct the situation. I am pleased to announce today that the EBR instrument regulation will be filed very shortly and will be posted for all to see before July 16 of this year.

**Mr Stewart:** Minister, thank you for taking quick action. As we all have the same intention in mind, it's a good thing this omission was brought to our attention and is now being rectified.

For people who don't know what we are talking about, and there are lots of them—God, there are lots of them in this House, especially the ones over there who don't pay any attention whatsoever—can you tell us a little bit about the EBR registry and the kinds of MNR items currently being posted there?

**Hon Mr Snobelen:** The vast majority of the items that come before the Ministry of Natural Resources are now posted on the EBR. They include matters that relate to forestry, water management, parks and new protected areas, fish and wildlife, fire and prescribed burns and of course Niagara Escarpment decisions. A vast majority of the policy issues that come before the ministry are posted on the registry because we invite the opinions of the public. It's particularly useful to know what the ramifications of various policy decisions and certifications might be. We have used the EBR extensively and we look forward to using it even more extensively in the future.

#### AIR QUALITY

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Stop the clock. I believe she is here. She should be here shortly. Oh, there she is coming the other way. The member for St Catharines.

**Mr Bradley:** Minister, this morning I attended a media conference held by the Ontario Medical Association, a highly credible, highly respected organization—not radical, not anti-government—that does its research very well. At the press conference they said you're making absolutely no progress in dealing with air quality problems in this province. They said in fact that sulphur dioxide emissions from former Ontario Hydro thermal plants have increased about 15% to 20% since 1997. While levels have decreased for some pollutants, they say that most of this decrease occurred in the early 1990s. Recently, most pollutants show no change or an increase in ambient concentrations.

In other words, they presented a very credible case today that you're making no progress in dealing with smog, and we have our sixth smog alert today. Minister, do you not agree with the Ontario Medical Association that in fact you have abandoned any attempts to significantly improve the quality of air in this province?

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of the Environment):** If the member had truly been listening to the presentation made by the OMA, as certainly we did—in fact, I want to just compliment the OMA for the efforts they're making to continue to focus on the adverse effects of smog, the adverse effects it has on the health of people in this province.

I have to tell the member opposite that I welcome their report card and I also continue to take their recommendations seriously. But I just want to quote from what the OMA said today, which was, "Together, we must all take action, and by 'we' I mean all levels of our community, whether it be as governments, corporations or individuals." That's exactly what we plan to do. We plan to be part of the solution to the problem along with other governments, corporations and individuals.

**Mr Bradley:** According to the medical association, the best they could give you was a C minus in dealing with air quality. I've got some suggestions for you on

some things you might do that could improve the environment in this province.

First of all we have Dr Schabas, a former medical officer of health of Ontario, saying that you've turned your back on public health in Ontario. You have the OMA saying that you're not doing sufficient to deal with air quality in this province. Minister, when are you going to bring in a comprehensive, mandatory—not voluntary—set of regulations and legislation to force polluting industries to significantly reduce the number of pollutants they're putting into the atmosphere? When are you going to invest in public transit, something your government completely abandoned? When are you going to convert the largest single source of pollution in this province, the Nanticoke generating station, which belches out coal, which belches out sulphur dioxide, NO<sub>x</sub> and 30 other contaminants, to natural gas?

1510

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** If we take a look at the OMA's 1998 recommendations coming out of their report, there were recommendations to this government, the United States, the federal Liberal government, the city of Toronto and physicians. I'm very pleased to say that they asked for more stringent caps on SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. We introduced those caps on March 26 of this year.

They asked for disclosure provisions to provide public reports showing emissions data. We did that. We finalized the regulation on May 2, 2001, that requires the mandatory tracking and public reporting of 358 air pollutants.

They asked Ontario to petition the US EPA to require sulphur dioxide and NO<sub>x</sub> emission reductions in the United States. I'm glad to say we did respond. We supported the United States' EPA in their defence and we successfully intervened.

They asked us—

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

## CARIBANA

**Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East):** My question is for Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation. Last week our government announced that this year's Caribana festival will receive \$353,000 in provincial funding. I was pleased to represent you at the media launch of the Caribana festival just earlier this week. I'm going to tell you that the organizers were very pleased and recognized that were it not for the provincial grant, there would have been no Caribana this year.

Torontonians look forward to the Caribana parade every year. As you know, it is not only a key tourist attraction for the city of Toronto; it is also a celebration of Toronto's and Ontario's rich cultural diversity.

I'm delighted that this funding has guaranteed that the organizers will be able to stage the Caribana parade this August. But I'm more concerned about the long-term future. Can you tell me if you have a long-term plan so

that Torontonians can count on a successful parade in years to come?

**Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation):** Thank you, member for Scarborough East, for the question. I want to thank him too for being at the launch of Caribana earlier this week. I want to thank the Toronto members for their advice on the Caribana festival, particularly Scarborough East, Scarborough Centre and Scarborough Southwest for their commitment to ensuring that Caribana is a success not only this year but for the next years. Yes, we do have a plan to work with Caribana to make sure this largest cultural celebration that attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors, bringing business to our hotels, our shops and our attractions and millions of dollars to businesses here in the city of Toronto, will not only continue but flourish in the long run. We want to engage in a long-term planning process. One example: we want to help Caribana access corporate donations to ensure that they are strong and flourish in the long run.

**Mr Gilchrist:** I know that the funding you've given is in stark contrast to what was done by the previous two governments. They were always very supportive in words, but their deeds did not exactly match their rhetoric. I couldn't agree with you more that the festival needs to attract strong corporate partnerships in order to become independent and to have a sustainable future. How does the government precisely plan to help the Caribana board develop those partnerships and achieve that goal?

**Hon Mr Hudak:** Again I want to thank the members for Scarborough East, Scarborough Southwest and Scarborough Centre for their advice on what is a three-point plan in particular. First of all, we want to work with Caribana's organizing committee to develop a marketing plan to promote the event not only this year but into the future. We also want to work with the committee to make sure we can access corporate donations to show business support on a sustainable basis. Also, I look forward to the province of Ontario having a seat, with the city of Toronto, on an advisory committee established by the city to help Caribana ensure it has efficient operations and manages the funding for this year's parade as well as into the future.

I'm pleased to say the committee has already had some progress and is proceeding with the restructuring plan to help them better manage resources, funds and volunteers. We look forward to working with them to ensure Caribana in 2001 is a success and builds for a long-term sustainable parade into the future.

## PRIMARY CARE REFORM

**Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-East York):** My question is to the Minister of Health. Your government has been in office for six years now and for six years we have been asking you to make progress on primary care reform. For six years you've been spinning a communications line about the pilot projects you have out

there and telling us that you have promised targets. In fact, specifically you have told us that 80% of family doctors are going to be enrolled in the Family Health Network by March 2004. Now we find out that of the seven pilot projects you have touted as being highly successful, two have been cancelled and the other five are in trouble.

Minister, primary care reform is an absolute centre-piece to health care reform. For six years you have not delivered. For six years you have promised us and that promise has gone unfulfilled. Are you really committed to doing this, and what are you going to do to make that promise come to a reality?

**Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** May I be the first to officially congratulate the honourable member for the passage of the patient restraint bill, which we on this side of the House think is an excellent bill as it has been reworked by the honourable member. She spent a lot of time on it and certainly I think it'll assist us in providing better health care for Ontarians.

I want to update this House because other people might have read the same article she did. There are some inaccuracies in the article. The Parry Sound pilot project is in fact ongoing; it has not been cancelled. The Thunder Bay project actually never was followed through on; it was not cancelled because it was never started.

I can tell the honourable member—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Clement:** That's an inaccuracy in the article. So from our perspective, I can assure the honourable member that from our side of the House—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Clement:** They're not serious on the opposition Liberal side. Clearly they've got to spend more time lobbying the federal MPs, but from our side of the House, family health networks, primary care reforms—

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

**Ms Lankin:** I'll have an opportunity to give my thanks on the record for the minister's support on the bill at another time.

I'm not sure what you're saying about these seven pilot projects, because for a number of years you and previous ministers of health have been standing in this House and telling us that there are seven successful pilot projects. Now we find out that one of them never got going. I guess it was an estimate of a pilot project, just like now you tell us you're going to spend more on hospitals than what you've tabled in your estimates, which of course you can't do without supplementary estimates being brought forward to this House.

Minister, it's very hard to pin your government down on real progress on health care reforms that are going to build a sustainable system of medicare. Without primary care reform, without community based primary care reform, it won't succeed. At times I am of the suspicion that you really don't want it to succeed. Do you believe in the sustainability of medicare? When will you deliver on primary care reform in this province?

**Hon Mr Clement:** We do believe in the sustainability of medicare and we are delivering on primary care reform. The honourable members laugh and think it's jolly on the other side of the House, on the Liberal side, but I can tell this House that we didn't have seven pilot projects, we had 14 pilot projects, so we can say that Thunder Bay was replaced by seven—in Hamilton, Chatham, Paris, rural Kingston, Ottawa, Parry Sound—175 physicians, 225,000 patients.

This is on track, it's ongoing and it's going to be a success. This side of the House, the NDP, have supported us all the way. All that side of the House can do, the Liberal side, is laugh. Laugh if you will, but we believe in primary care reform, we believe in medicare and we believe in a better standard of health care for the citizens of Ontario. Laugh if you will, because you can laugh on that side but you don't know how to govern.

#### STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

**Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park):** Would that there was some way we could laugh along with the minister. This minister, the Minister of Education, whom I have a question for, I hope will do better.

I want to ask the Minister of Education about her cuts and her funding figures, but what's happened isn't funny at all. Yesterday in the House there were nine parents and they came with me to the estimates committee. They listened to the Minister of Education not answer what she is going to do, this Minister of Education, for their children, who because of the cuts coming from this House are not going to be able to have their kids in school next year.

Their education assistants have been taken away from them, Minister. You've heard from boards that have been faced with two bad choices. Either they remove essential learning services or, as in Kawartha Pine Ridge and Ottawa, they don't pass budgets. This is a direct result of your inability to secure the funds we need in this province to educate our children.

I wonder if you will stand up in the House today and finally answer those parents of special-needs children, answer the people around the province who are finding out in their communities that education is being cut, and tell them you will do something to change that circumstance.

1520

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** As I answered the honourable member yesterday in committee, we recognize the need to continue to improve special education in this province. That's why we have continued to increase funding. There was a 12% increase alone last year for special-needs education.

Second, we are putting standards in place and clear accountability measures so that school boards are quite clear about the programming they should be providing and so that parents are quite clear about the programming

their students should be able to receive. Those steps are underway right now.

I met with several of those parents yesterday to talk about the individual circumstances of their particular children. I also should say that one of the parents the honourable member brought into the House yesterday called me over to talk about the improvement in services that her child had received.

I recognize there are improvements that need to be made. The parents who are taking care of special-needs children advocate very hard on their behalf. Any one of us would do the same in their place.

**Mr Kennedy:** These parents have said, clearly and in writing, that they hold this minister responsible. They accept none of that misdirection. They know, Minister, that independent figures have shown that you have cut funding to schools this year. They can see it in their communities and these families can see it in their households. They've got kids that they've struggled to try and get treated with decency and respect and you have said nothing so far about what you will do for the school boards across the province that are having to make these painful cuts. They have carried these programs for years and the minister knows that the funding has not been there.

There are textbooks missing, there are teachers missing, there are special education assistants gone missing. I want to know very simply, to the parents and soon to this province, will you be working right away to help put back what students need: for these to go to school and everyone else to get a decent education in this province?

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** There is nothing to put back because we are spending more on education, on the public education system—in this coming school year, \$13.8 billion. That is an increase above enrolment.

**Mr Kennedy:** Seventy-five million less.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** If the honourable critic would be quiet for a minute he might be able to listen to this. That is more.

Second, we also recognize that more needs to be done in special education. But again, I would like to point out to this House that one of the changes in rules we brought in was a law that said school boards were accountable for special-needs funding. They couldn't spend special-needs funding outside that envelope. We thought that was an appropriate accountability measure. The honourable members of the Liberal Party voted against that. They voted against an accountability measure that said school boards have to use special-ed money for special-needs children.

We know there need to be improvements. These parents need the continued support, they need more help, and that's why we are taking these steps to do—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** New question.

#### INVESTIGATION INTO CHILD ABUSE

**Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa West-Nepean):** I have a question for the Solicitor General. During its investigation at Cornwall, the Ontario Provincial Police entered

the home of an Ontario probation officer pursuant to a search warrant authorizing the seizure of arms and narcotics. None were found. But without a warrant for the next-door neighbour's home, they entered the home of the neighbour of the probation officer and again found no trace of arms or narcotics in that home. They did, however, seize a suitcase containing 24 or more pornographic movies. Some of these were commercially edited and sold and some were homemade, some from a camera mounted at the foot of the probation officer's bed. That suitcase and contents have been identified as the property of the probation officer, who committed suicide before his trial.

Mr Minister, this evidence, these films, have been in the hands of the OPP for over six years. The evidence has never been tendered in court proceedings and indeed many of the predators in these movies, both the commercial movies and the homemade movies, have never been charged. I'd like to ask you, sir, where those films are located at this time, and when will this evidence be returned to the estate of the probation officer, which it should be by law?

**Hon David Turnbull (Solicitor General):** Let's be very clear: our government does not tolerate the abuse of children in any manner. Our thoughts are certainly with the entire community of Cornwall.

The member knows that it is inappropriate for me to comment on specific investigations. As Solicitor General, I cannot and I will not direct the day-to-day operations of any police service.

As you are aware, the Harris government is committed to protecting children from abuse of all kinds, particularly sexual abuse. I was extremely proud to bring in Christoper's Law, the first sex offender registry in this country.

The OPP's child pornography section is the largest such unit in Canada and is looked upon by other police services as the lead agency for investigations of this type of crime.

**Mr Guzzo:** Mr Minister, I'm not asking you to comment on any investigation; there's no investigation going on.

I want to tell you this: on November 22 of last year, when I was debriefed by the OPP, visited by Detective Inspector Hall, the lead investigator for Project Truth, and one of his superiors from Orillia, I put that same question to Detective Inspector Hall. Here was his answer. He said, "Mr Guzzo, we don't have those tapes. We don't have those films any more. We destroyed them."

I said, "No, no, you can't destroy evidence in this province. That's against the law." He said, "The man was dead; he wasn't going to be charged."

I said, "What about the other people in the movies? What about the kingpins of this organization who were also seen in those movies?" He shrugged his shoulders, the same way he did when he couldn't explain the 115 charges that were missed three times.

But here's the good news: copies of some of those movies have been found. My question to you is, what should we do with those? The citizens' group has them. What should they do? The Premier has said, "Give them to the OPP," but the citizens' group says, "They may destroy these ones too." They've been very expensive. What would you recommend that these people do with the copies of these films that they found, sir?

**Hon Mr Turnbull:** Clearly, any evidence that is in the hands of citizens should be handed over to the OPP. It's very clear that the integrity of the justice system rests on our ability to proceed without interference.

I want to mention that since July 1997, when Project Truth was initiated, 115 charges have been laid against 15 people. I've mentioned in this House before that charges may still be pending, and the book has not been fully closed on whether further charges are to be laid. Any further comment by me would be inappropriate.

#### DOCTOR SHORTAGE

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** My question is for the Minister of Health and it concerns the press conference he held last week regarding foreign-trained physicians. Minister, I'd like to know how you continue to make announcement after announcement so that it appears as though you are actually doing something in very crisis situations like physician-underserved areas, when in fact after you make announcements, there is no information available to any of us to try to get foreign-trained physicians to access the system to become licensed to practise in Ontario.

Following your announcement last week, you now have the College of Physicians and Surgeons acting as a receptionist for thousands of people who are making calls of inquiry to enlist themselves to become licensed to practise in Ontario.

Why do you continue to make announcements outside of this House or in this House when you have no details, no plans and no information to actually process people who have been waiting and have pinned their hopes on the announcement that you made last week and to which there is no further information?

**Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I'm happy to inform this House, as I have done in response to a question from the member for Durham earlier last week, that in fact we are moving ahead with 140 physicians a year, 90 new positions a year for international medical graduates. That is up from 36 positions a year. We indicated it would start in the fall of this year, which is on track. We are moving toward additional details for the fall.

I can tell you that the College of Physicians and Surgeons by law is the place through which these international medical graduates would be processed and assessed. By law, that would be the place you would have the interaction between the potential graduate and our society. I have been informed that the CPSO is getting 50 calls a day, which is wonderful. It shows

there's a lot of interest for new medical graduates to go to underserved areas and practise their profession in underserved areas like the honourable member's.

1530

**Mrs Pupatello:** You have thousands of people who are waiting for information about your new six-month assessment program. That's what you announced last week. We ask the most basic of questions: can they continue to work? What does the assessment consist of? Is it of their medical training? Is it of the individuals themselves? Do they do it in Windsor or do they move to Toronto? What cost? There are all these very basic questions, which would change these people's lives, in order to become licensed to practise in Ontario, and those most basic questions could not be answered, not by you—you didn't know and you said so—not by the college itself—they haven't sorted it out yet. All you did was hold a press conference to make an announcement to say that now you might consider what you might do about the problem.

We are tired on this side of the House of your making announcement after announcement but nothing ever comes to fruition. You want to put on a big show, but you don't want to do the work that's involved to get these people practising in Ontario. We have a desperate situation in Windsor with a shortage of physicians and it's incumbent on you to do something about this. We don't expect just announcements; we expect the Minister of Health to do the work before he makes such announcements.

**Hon Mr Clement:** We were happy to announce that government policy has improved as a result of the George report recommendations. We not only accepted the George report recommendations, we improved on the George report recommendations, because we felt that international medical graduates are an immediate source of medical expertise that can be shared with underserved areas in Ontario, including the honourable member's constituency. The announcement was that government policy has improved, government policy has changed for the better and this is good for the people of Ontario.

The honourable member wants to know the answers. There are answers to all those questions, if not now then certainly in the weeks ahead as we move toward the September date at which this policy becomes operative. I'd be happy to send the honourable member more information if she's confused about or doesn't understand the government announcement. I want to educate her because her area is going to be one of the main beneficiaries, an underserved area that is going to have international medical graduates willing to practise, willing to serve the people of Ontario. Her area, as a result of this government, is going to be improved and we are very proud of that.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre):** My question is for the Minister of Education. Unlike the member from

Parkdale-High Park who has grandstanding parades of sympathizers, I usually base it on my gut instinct and look at the realities. In Peel I know of very few schools with swimming pools, but the Toronto District School Board has been engaging in a very public debate about its budget allocation for the next school year. Can you assure me and the House, Minister, that the government's student-focused funding policy is meeting students' educational needs in Toronto?

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** All the school boards are very familiar with the criteria they are eligible for. They recognize the unique needs of board circumstances. The Toronto board gets significant monies for their inner-city needs; for example, for their ESL needs. Toronto District School Board funding this year is projected to increase by \$43 million and that's a 2.3% increase over last year's spending. That's an increase when you look at their enrolment. Their enrolment is virtually stable at about 0.2%, so it has gone up.

Secondly, we recognized the challenges the Toronto board had in amalgamation and the steps they had to take. They've received over \$900 million specifically for the Toronto board. I know other boards see that as special treatment for Toronto, but we thought the over \$900 million was important, and \$248 million of that was a one-time disbursement last year, money that is to help them make the difficult decisions about living within their budget.

**Mr Spina:** Minister, it's clear from your answer that the government seems to have provided the appropriate amount of funding to the board, but it's apparent the board still needs help in controlling its spending. I wonder whether any of the half-dozen board offices from the previous boards are still around. They recently made some cuts to a variety of programs that would negatively affect students in board schools. Minister, as the board prepares to vote on its budget tonight, can you assure us that the taxpayers of Toronto and the parents of students have explored all the appropriate cost-saving options? Are some of those board offices still standing? I don't know.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** Many school boards have asked for assistance in preparing their budget. Staff certainly have attempted to give what advice and information they can to boards. The Toronto board has been no different. There have also been studies that have offered the board guidance on where they can find administrative savings. By their own estimates, they can find savings and still provide programs.

As a matter of fact, some of their own trustees have come up with other alternatives. If you look at some of their own figures over the past three years, they could have had \$190 million worth of savings in administration if they had made those decisions. We believe they must continue to focus on reducing administrative costs, so that we can keep the focus on classrooms, and recognize that living within a budget, whether it's for trustees or any level of government or someone's own household

budget—it's a challenge to set those priorities and do it, but it's something all school boards have been asked to do, as this government does and other governments and organizations do.

#### HOME CARE

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** My question is to the Minister of Health. I want to bring to your attention the case of a constituent in my riding, Judy Dubeau. Her mother, unfortunately, is terminally ill. With the care she was receiving at her chronic care facility, the family felt that because the minimal level of care she was getting was not enough to meet the needs of the mother, the daughter and the rest of the family decided to bring the mother home. The reason they did so was they felt they'd be able to provide the best level of care by caring for her themselves at home. As a result, Judy has had to quit her job in order to stay at her place. They're trying to get services from the CCAC. Unfortunately, they're not able to get the level of care they need. Why? Because your government refuses to give the money necessary to CCACs to provide the type of care these patients need.

Minister, I ask you, for the rest of the family and our community, are you prepared to provide the level of service needed to Judy Dubeau's mother so that she can stay at home with dignity in her final days?

**Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** Of course I don't know the details of the case or the individuals involved that the honourable member has mentioned. I can tell you that your local CCAC, when your government was in power, received \$7,683,367; this year they're receiving \$9,035,796. That's an increase of almost \$2 million, close to 20% by my calculation. There is some population growth presumably in your area, but a lot of that goes to greater care, greater home care, in your community. So if there's a particular problem of management or inability to deliver excellent services that are experienced by your CCAC, please share the details with me and I would be happy to get to the bottom of it.

**Mr Bisson:** Minister, the problem is not the management of the CCAC. Those people are working hard to provide the level of care they need to provide to citizens who need to stay at home. As they say, Minister, you stand in this House and you play with figures. You know, liars figure and figures lie. The reality is this woman needs—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Bisson:** It's a saying.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** You get into that stuff and then the other side does it. I've asked you to try and watch what you say. When you start to do that, you borderline on it. I would ask you to withdraw that, please.

**Mr Bisson:** I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The point I make is simply this: the woman wants to stay at home. The best level of care she can get, according to her choice, is to stay at home and be with her

family in her final days. I ask you to intervene on behalf of the Ministry of Health to make sure the CCAC gets the financial commitment it needs to provide the service necessary for this woman so she can stay at home in her final days with dignity.

**Hon Mr Clement:** Again, I'm unaware of the details. I certainly have a lot of sympathy for the family you mention. Of course we want excellent health care to be delivered either at the home or in providers of health care services. I apologize to the honourable member for citing the facts, but the facts are that there has been close to a 20% increase in the budget of the local CCAC. If there's a particular problem in their ability to make sure that money goes to the right people for the right resources, we'd be happy to work with the honourable member directly and with the CCAC to make sure that happens.

Perhaps the honourable member recalls that when he was in power it was the same as it is now: 100% of those dollars, 100 cents on every dollar we spend on home care, is spent by Ontario; zero dollars by the federal Liberal government, that proclaims it is the saviour of medicare. So maybe the honourable member and I can work together to convince the federal Liberal MPs and the MPPs in this House who are in the Liberal Party to do their bit to ensure that we have the resources necessary for people such as the person in your riding.

1540

### MOTIONS

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to seek unanimous consent to revert to motions for the purpose of moving a motion to adjourn this evening's sitting, and a motion respecting the committee schedule for the adjournment, which I had discussed with the House leaders previously.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The government House leader would like to do another unanimous consent.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** If they would be quiet for a minute, I will attempt to explain so that we can get this resolved. In order to not sit tonight—as you know, we had unanimous consent to not have Bill 19 this evening—we need to move a motion to that effect. I did discuss it with the House leaders and I can move that motion separately if it would assist in easing the transition here of getting through this.

**The Speaker:** On a further point of order, for some help in clarification.

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** Mr Speaker, did I understand that you seek unanimous consent for a motion that permits the House to not sit this evening?

**The Speaker:** Yes. Is there consent? Agreed.

### HOUSE SITTINGS

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** Mr Speaker, I move that notwithstanding the order of the House dated Monday, June 25, 2001, the House shall not sit this evening.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Agreed? Agreed.

### COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader):** I will ask for the consideration of the House: earlier today we passed motions to send Bill 90 to the general government committee and to send Bill 81 to the justice committee. If there is consent, I would like to move that motion as well.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** Mr Speaker, I move that the following committees be authorized to meet during the summer adjournment to examine and inquire into the following matters:

Standing committee on general government, for up to two weeks, to consider Bill 90, An Act to promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste; and

Standing committee on justice and social policy, for up to three weeks, to consider Bill 81, An Act to provide standards with respect to the management of materials containing nutrients used on lands, to provide for the making of regulations with respect to farm animals and lands to which nutrients are applied, and to make related amendments to other Acts.

**The Speaker:** Mrs Ecker moves—dispense? No. You'd like me to read it.

Mrs Ecker moves that the following committees be authorized to meet during the summer—

**Interjection:** Dispense.

**The Speaker:** We tried to dispense. The member would like to hear it—adjournment to examine and inquire into the following matters:

Standing committee on general government, for up to two weeks, to consider Bill 90, An Act to promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste; and

Standing committee on justice and social policy, for up to three weeks, to consider Bill 81, An Act to provide standards with respect to the management of materials containing nutrients used on lands, to provide for the making of regulations with respect to farm animals and lands to which nutrients are applied, and to make related amendments to other Acts.

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

### PETITIONS

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park):** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas we believe that all education resources should be directed to our public schools, not private schools;

“Whereas Mike Harris has been attacking public education for six years, chopping \$1.8 billion from the classroom and now wants to pay parents to leave public education for private schools;

“Whereas we believe that a voucher plan for private schools is wrong, unfair and steals money from public education;

“Whereas we believe that these funds being invested in private schools would be better spent on rebuilding public education through such measures as bringing class sizes down to 20 students per class in the early years;

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

“Do not turn your back on Ontario’s working families. Fight Mike Harris’s voucher system for private schools; fight for smaller class sizes; fight for public education.”

I have here variants on this petition in the number of some 6,000 and I ask them to be submitted.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** I’ve got thousands of names here on these petitions of people concerned about the tax credit that you’ve just passed for private schools.

“Whereas the announced tax credit for private school tuition will lead to government funds being directed to private education rather than the underfunded public school system that is mandated to educate all children, regardless of cultural, religious or socio-economic status;

“Whereas the education tax credit of up to \$3,500 per child, when fully implemented, will lead to an increase of students being enrolled in private schools to the detriment of the public schools;

“Whereas there will be no accountability for the use of public funds allocated through the education tuition tax credit; and

“Whereas the advocates for religious schools have indicated they will continue to seek full funding for religious education with the potential result of more public funding being diverted to private schools;

“We, the undersigned, call on the Ontario Legislature to vote to remove the education tuition tax credit from Bill 45, the Ontario 2001 budget legislation.”

This has my full support.

#### DOCTOR SHORTAGE

**Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas on September 27, 1997, Cambridge was legally designated underserved, having an insufficient number of family doctors for its citizens; and

“Whereas thousands of men, women and children in Cambridge are not cared for by their own family physician and this unfortunate situation exists in other Ontario communities;

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

“That the Ontario government substantially increase the number of family doctors in Cambridge and other underserved areas by:

“1. Permitting substantial numbers of qualified and highly competent foreign-trained family doctors the right to practise in Cambridge and other underserved areas in Ontario; and

“2. Substantially increase the number of available student spaces in Ontario medical schools and require new graduates to serve in Cambridge and other underserved areas in Ontario.”

This petition is signed by over 1,500 good citizens of Cambridge and I affix my name thereto.

#### HOME CARE

**Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury):** I have a petition from the community care access centre people who need home care services in Timiskaming, Cochrane and Sudbury, and it says:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the need for home care services is rapidly growing in Ontario due to the aging of the population and hospital restructuring; and

“Whereas the prices paid by community care access centres to purchase home care services for their clients are rising due to factors beyond the control...; and

“Whereas the funding provided by the Ontario government through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care is inadequate to meet the growing need for home care services; and

“Whereas the funding shortfall, coupled with the implications of Bill 46, the Public Sector Accountability Act, currently before the Legislature are forcing CCACs to make deep cuts in home care services without any policy direction from the provincial government;

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

“(1) That the Legislative Assembly direct the provincial government to take control of policy-setting for home care services through rational, population-based health care planning rather than simply by underfunding the system; and

“(2) That the Legislative Assembly direct the provincial government to provide sufficient funding to CCACs to support the home care services that are the mandate of community care access centres in the volumes needed to meet their communities’ rapidly growing needs; and

“(3) That the Legislative Assembly make it necessary for the provincial government to notify its agencies about the amount of funding they will be given by the government in a fiscal year at least three months” in advance of that commitment.

I proudly give this petition to Anthony Gras from Sudbury to present to the table.

#### PROTECTION OF MINORS

**Mr Bob Wood (London West):** I have a petition signed by 4,834 people.

"Whereas children are being exposed to sexually explicit materials in many commercial establishments;

"Whereas many municipalities do not have bylaws in place to protect minors and those that do vary from place to place and have failed to protect minors from unwanted exposure to sexually explicit materials;

"Whereas uniform standards are needed in Ontario that would make it illegal to sell, rent, loan or display sexually explicit materials to minors;

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

"To pass Bill 95, Protection of Minors from Sexually Explicit Goods and Services Act, 2000, as soon as possible."

1550

#### HOME CARE

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario community care access centres deliver vital home care services to seniors, the disabled and those discharged from hospital so they can remain in their own homes; and

"Whereas Ontario community care access centres need an additional \$175 million from the Ministry of Health this fiscal year just to deliver their current level of health care services; and

"Whereas the Ministry of Health has refused to fund this necessary increase and has further failed to provide the CCACs with equity funding last year and this year, despite a 1998 promise by the former Minister of Long-Term Care, Cam Jackson, to do so; and

"Whereas this deliberate underfunding by the government of CCACs has forced the CCAC boards to adopt a deficit-reduction plan which severely reduces the home care services they provide; and

"Whereas this reduction has a drastic impact on clients who cannot afford to pay for these services and will be forced to go without necessary home care;

"Therefore, be it resolved that the Conservative government immediately fund the additional \$175 million requested by the Ontario CCACs this year and, further, provide the equity funding that was promised in 1998."

I sign my signature to this petition.

#### SHARON REYNOLDS

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it relates to a statement I made earlier in the House today.

"Whereas Sharon Reynolds, a seven-year-old young girl, died tragically; and

"Whereas the crown's case against Louise Reynolds was not proceeded with; and

"Whereas there are many unanswered questions relating to the circumstances surrounding the death of Sharon Reynolds;

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

"That the Premier of Ontario and his cabinet colleagues call upon the Lieutenant Governor in Council, pursuant to section 2 of the Public Inquiries Act, to order a full and independent inquiry into the death of Sharon Reynolds."

I agree with the petition and have signed it accordingly.

#### HOME CARE

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the need for home care services is rapidly growing in Ontario due to the aging of the population and hospital restructuring; and

"Whereas the prices paid by community care access centres to purchase home care services for their clients are rising due to factors beyond the control of community care access centres; and

"Whereas the funding provided by the Ontario government through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care is inadequate to meet the growing need for home care services; and

"Whereas the funding shortfall, coupled with the implications of Bill 46, the Public Sector Accountability Act, currently before the Legislature are forcing CCACs to make deep cuts in home care services without any policy direction from the provincial government;

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

"(1) That the Legislative Assembly direct the provincial government to take control of policy-setting for home care services through rational, population-based health care planning rather than simply by underfunding the system; and

"(2) That the Legislative Assembly direct the provincial government to provide sufficient funding to CCACs to support the home care services that are the mandate of CCACs in the volumes needed to meet their communities' rapidly growing needs; and

"(3) That the Legislative Assembly make it necessary for the provincial government to notify the agencies it funds of the amount of funding they will be given by the government in a fiscal year at least three (3) months before the commencement of this fiscal year."

This is signed by 45 members of my riding, and I have signed my signature to it.

#### PROTECTION OF MINORS

**Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas children are being exposed to sexually explicit materials in many commercial establishments; and

“Whereas many municipalities do not have bylaws in place to protect minors and those that do vary from place to place and have failed to protect minors from unwanted exposure to sexually explicit materials; and

“Whereas uniform standards are needed in Ontario that would make it illegal to sell, rent, loan or display sexually explicit materials to minors;

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

“To pass Bill 95, Protection of Minors from Sexually Explicit Goods and Services Act, 2000, as soon as possible.”

#### EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** I have a petition here from the Chatham Christian School parents in support of the tax voucher. Though I’m in complete disagreement with the sentiments of this petition, as the elected representative for Chatham-Kent who represents all the good citizens of that riding, I’ve committed to the parents to read it. It reads, in part:

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

“To pass the budget bill giving tax credits to parents of children who attend independent schools as soon as possible.”

Again, I support public education and oppose the tax credit.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas tax credits for private schools will create two-tier education;

“Whereas the government’s plan is to give parents a \$3,500 enticement to pull their kids out of public schools;

“Whereas tax credits for private schools will encourage the growth of a segregated society of narrowly focused interests;

“Whereas tax credits for private schools will steal money from an already cash-starved public system and deliver public money to special interests who do not have to account for its use;

“Whereas tax credits for private schools effectively create a voucher system in Ontario;

“Whereas the Harris government has no mandate to introduce such a measure,

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

“We call on the government of Ontario to withdraw its plan for two-tiered education and properly fund public education in Ontario.”

I’ve attached my signature to the petition.

**Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey):** I have a petition from Orangeville, Shelburne, Palgrave and Grand Valley. It is addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas wide parental and student choice are essential to the best possible education for all students; and

“Whereas many people believe that an education with a strong faith component, be it Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Hindu or another religion, is best for their children; and

“Whereas many people believe that special education methodologies such as those practised in the Montessori and Waldorf schools are best for their children; and

“Whereas over 100,000 students are currently enrolled in the independent schools of Ontario; and

“Whereas the parents of these students continue to support the public education system through their tax dollars; and

“Whereas an effective way to enhance the education of those students is to allow an education tax credit for a portion of the tuition fees paid for that education;

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

“To pass the budget bill giving tax credits to parents of children who attend independent schools as soon as possible.”

I’ve signed this petition.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas we believe that all education resources should be directed to our public schools, not private schools;

“Whereas Mike Harris has been attacking public education for six years, chopping \$1.8 billion from the classroom and now wants to pay parents to leave public education for private schools;

“Whereas we believe that a voucher plan for private schools is wrong, unfair and steals money from public education;

“Whereas we believe that these funds being invested in private schools would be better spent on rebuilding public education through such measures as bringing class sizes down to 20 students per class in the early years;

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

“Do not turn your back on Ontario’s working families. Fight Mike Harris’s voucher system for private schools; fight for smaller class sizes and fight for public education.”

I affix my signature to this petition.

#### EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** “Whereas the Harris government is planning to take funds that our public schools desperately need and funnel them to private schools through tax credits; and

“Whereas the government’s plan is to give parents a \$3,500 enticement to pull their kids out of public schools;

“Whereas this initiative is, in effect, a voucher system and is the beginning of the end of quality public education in Ontario;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, call on all members of the Legislature to fight and defeat this attack on the choice parents most want: stability, co-operation and respect in clean, safe public schools.”

I sign my signature.

#### PROPOSED INDUSTRY SITE

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

**Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre):** Thank you, Speaker, I didn't think this was ever going to happen.

To the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario:

“Regarding the applications by General Environmental Group Inc;

“Whereas the proposed site is in the middle of several long-standing residential neighbourhoods;

“Whereas the proposed site is within 600 metres of a major hospital, and the largest public park in Kitchener-Waterloo, as well as numerous schools and churches, and is within 100 metres of a public outdoor swimming pool and the TransCanada Trail;

“Whereas the high volume of heavy truck traffic associated with this industry would worsen the already seriously poor air quality in the city core;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and the Ministry of the Environment for the province of Ontario as follows:

“We call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and the Ministry of the Environment for the province of Ontario to immediately suspend consideration of this proposal;

“Further, we call upon the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to initiate a full environmental assessment and open public hearings before any further consideration is given to the proposal.”

This petition is signed by almost 1,700 people and I also affix my signature.

**The Acting Speaker:** The time for petitions has ended. For those of you who didn't get yours in, stay tuned tomorrow, same time, same place.

I just wanted to set the stage: we are now on Wednesday afternoon, about 4 o'clock; it's about 85 degrees. I will ask for your indulgence. I just wanted to say that anybody growing corn in the province of Ontario just loves this. The heat units are just beautiful.

1600

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon Dan Newman (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or

special order of the House relating to Bill 80, An Act to promote a stable learning environment and support teacher excellence, when Bill 80 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment, and at such time, the bill shall be ordered for third reading;

That the order for third reading may then immediately be called;

That when the order for third reading is called, 90 minutes of debate shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, and that the time shall be divided equally among all recognized parties. That at the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment;

That no deferral of the second or third reading votes pursuant to standing order 28(h) shall be permitted; and

That, in the case of any division relating to any proceeding on the bill, the division bells shall be limited to five minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson):** Debate?

**Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North):** Mr Speaker, I'd like to say that I will be sharing the time today with the member for Northumberland and Mr Wood from the London area.

First of all, I agree with you on the temperature in here. I think it's more than 85 degrees this afternoon. I've never seen it as hot in this building before as it is today. I don't know if the air conditioning is just not working or whatever is happening, but it's very warm in here.

I'm pleased to rise this afternoon and say a few words on the time allocation of the Stability and Excellence in Education Act. As parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education, I'm pleased to make a few comments on it.

When our government launched its education reform six years ago, our primary goal was to offer Ontario students the best-quality education possible. A key part of our quality education agenda is to assure parents that their children are receiving an enriching and rewarding education in safe, stable school environments.

Parents want and expect to see their children succeed. Parents want their children to be taught by teachers who have the skills and knowledge to help them achieve the higher standards that have been set. Our goal is to make that happen, and our goal is also to educate and train a workforce that can compete in the 21st century in the world economy.

In 1999, our government's election platform for its second term described how we intended to move forward with our plans to make Ontario's public education system among the best in the world. We have been listening carefully to what parents, students and our education partners say needs to be done. We continue to consider their advice and we are making progress in that direction.

Student-focused funding, new elementary and secondary curriculum with higher standards, province-wide student tests, a greater voice for parents and safe school environments have all been aimed at creating an

education system where excellence, accountability and improved student achievement are the highest priorities.

Students deserve to get the best education possible. Bill 80, the proposed Stability and Excellence in Education Act, if approved by this Legislature, is another step in our plan to provide the best education system possible for the students of the province of Ontario.

The initiatives under this legislation and our other quality education reforms demonstrate our government's ongoing commitment to higher standards for our schools, with an emphasis on performance-based accountability. There are three key areas in Bill 80, which if approved, will amend the Education Act and the Ontario College of Teachers Act to enable our government to do three things.

First of all, we will implement a mandatory professional learning program for teachers, a key component of Ontario's teacher testing program. Second, we will respond to parents' and students' concerns about the frequent labour disruptions involving school boards and teachers' and school staff unions in Ontario. Third, we will act on our commitment to ensure that co-instructional activities are available to all students in our province.

I'd like to take this opportunity to detail some of the specifics of each of these components. First of all, we'll talk for a few moments on teacher testing. Parents want to see their children succeed. Research clearly demonstrates the difference a good teacher makes. Excellent teachers can motivate, inspire and challenge students to accomplish things they never thought possible. I'm sure that all of us in this Legislature have met many teachers like that over the years, both when we were in school and as we visit schools today.

The teacher testing program that our ministry announced last year recognizes that dedicated and excellent teachers are the backbone of a quality education. That is why our teacher testing program is being developed as a series of initiatives to ensure that both new and experienced teachers have the most up-to-date training, knowledge and skills to help students succeed.

Language proficiency testing is already in place for new applicants to the teaching profession who took their teacher training outside of Ontario in a language other than French or English.

Coming into effect next spring, subject to the approval of legislation, all new applicants for Ontario teaching certificates will take a qualifying test to ensure that they know their curriculum subjects. This fall we will be bringing in legislation for new province-wide performance appraisal standards to ensure all teachers are evaluated regularly and consistently in their classrooms.

Our teacher testing initiatives to be introduced over the next year include an internship program for new teachers to help them acquire strong teaching and classroom management skills, a system to recognize teaching excellence, and a role for parents, educators and experts in a quality assurance process for schools.

Bill 80 proposes another step in our program: mandatory recertification. Mandatory teacher recertification

was a key election promise our government made in 1999 and was also recommended by the Royal Commission on Learning in its 1995 report, which received all-party support in this House. Ongoing professional learning is not something new to the teaching profession, neither in this province nor to teachers in many other jurisdictions across the world.

Meeting ongoing learning requirements is common in many professions. In Ontario, professional associations and self-regulated professions approach professional development and upgrading in a variety of ways. Their objective is to assure their clients that all members have the up-to-date knowledge and skills needed to provide high-quality service.

Students in this province deserve nothing less of their teachers. If approved, this legislation would require all members of the Ontario College of Teachers to complete five-year cycles of professional development to stay up to date and maintain their certification. The bill would amend the Ontario College of Teachers Act to give the college statutory authority to implement and enforce mandatory professional learning requirements.

Under the program all members of the Ontario College of Teachers would be required to successfully complete seven core courses and seven elective courses during each five-year cycle, regardless of the type of school in which they actually teach. Core courses would focus on curriculum knowledge, student assessment, special education, teaching strategies, classroom management and leadership, use of technology and communicating with our parents and students. Approved courses would include professional development activities and programs to improve their skills or teach a new subject.

#### 1610

Most teachers currently engage in a wide variety of professional development activities. What this requirement would do is formally recognize the professional development activities that many teachers are already involved in and it would help focus these activities so they support our government's priorities of improved student achievement and learning.

That brings me to say a few words on labour stability in our schools. This is the second initiative of this legislation. This has to do with the concerns expressed by parents and students about labour disputes in our schools today. Finding better ways to resolve collective agreement issues is in everyone's best interests. If approved, the legislation would require future collective agreements between school boards and teachers' unions to run for three-year terms. As current contracts expire, school boards and teachers' unions would be required to negotiate contracts that expire on August 31, 2004. All subsequent collective agreements would have a term of three years. Our government believes that energies can be better focused on the delivery of quality education to students when both the school boards and the unions have longer periods free from collective bargaining. We continue to believe that local agreements are the best solution, and we have provided resources for boards to

achieve a reasonable settlement with the teachers' unions.

As we have seen in a number of communities this year, labour disputes involving support staff can also have a direct impact on the delivery of education to our students. The Education Relations Commission, an arm's-length independent body, currently advises the government when the continuation of a strike or lockout involving teachers is putting students' education at risk. This legislation would expand the commission's current authority to include any school board employee group, including support staff.

The third component of the legislation is the co-instructional activities that I'd like to say a few words about. Co-instructional activities are an important part of a quality education experience. These activities enrich the participation of students and parents in the school community, and participation in these activities builds positive relationships within a school community. Our government shares the concerns of parents, students and teachers about schools where a full range of co-instructional activities has not been available. The advisory group on co-instructional activities and our education partners have given us their advice. Their recommendations have made it clear that all parties have a role in fulfilling their responsibilities to our students.

Bill 80 would first of all maintain the current requirement that high-school teachers teach an average of 6.67 eligible courses a year—the course-load equivalent of an average of four hours and 10 minutes a day—but provide greater flexibility in the regulations that would, if approved, define instructional time to include, first of all, time spent giving remedial help to students so they can meet the challenges of our rigorous curriculum; and time spent on duties such as supervising students and filling in for absent teachers. It would allow a school board to pass a resolution to vary the maximum average class size in its high schools by up to one student, therefore providing boards with more flexibility to access resources to meet students' needs; repeal unproclaimed subsections of the Education Accountability Act, 2000, that would have required teachers to participate in co-instructional activities; and it would allow the government to proclaim the sections of the Education Accountability Act that require school boards to develop and implement plans for the provision of co-instructional activities for high schools.

This significant package of initiatives clearly demonstrates the government's commitment to an improved education environment. The legislation is part of our comprehensive plan to ensure that Ontario's public education system can achieve excellence. With this legislation, we are acting to assure parents and students across Ontario that teachers have the up-to-date knowledge and skills needed to help students reach their full potential. That is why we are implementing a comprehensive teacher testing program. We are taking steps to provide the stability parents want and students need in a positive school environment.

This legislation, as it stands before the House, is another step toward increased quality, more accountability and improved student achievement. I call on all members to join me in the speedy passage of this bill for the benefit of all of our students.

Mr Speaker, in spite of the fact that it's so warm in here this afternoon, I appreciate the opportunity to say these words to you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** I wish we could be speaking to this bill longer than the time I have allocated to me, but that's because here we are yet again having debate shrunk on a bill affecting the students, parents and families of the riding of St Paul's.

Let me just say at the outset that instead of a closure motion on education, the real issue this government should be addressing is classroom funding, the funding formula. There is no one writing to me in St Paul's, there is no one calling me or e-mailing me in St Paul's saying, "I think all teachers' contracts should expire in 2004." Nobody is saying that. They're not writing and saying, "We need to come up with some more tests for teachers to stick it to them." No one is writing me saying that. I'm getting a lot of phone calls, letters and e-mails, though, and people who come in to visit me in the office, talking about the problems with the funding formula and the serious problems with respect to classroom funding.

I have visited every single school in the riding of St Paul's, at least all the schools where they let me come in. During that time, I heard the same thing time and time again: "The classes are too big. We're having educational assistants taken away from us. We don't have enough money for textbooks so we're going to have to engage in a fundraising campaign at the local level in order to pay for the basics." I'll speak to the issue of extracurricular activities in a moment, but that's what the people of St Paul's are talking to me about when it comes to education. It's not about the contracts issue and it's not about the tests for teachers issue; it's simply about how we ought to run our educational system in a way that makes sense.

The current funding formula makes no sense and it's nothing less than an absurdity for the schools in St Paul's. If you look at the structure of the schools, the size of the schools, when the schools were built, the funding formula doesn't work for these schools. It doesn't work. The fact that there is a big boiler room in a school has nothing to do with how much money ought to be going to that school. That's why the educational reforms, the educational proposals put forward by Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals, are the better way.

What parents are saying to me is that their child will be in a class of 31 four-year-old kids next year, that they're losing the educational assistant in their child's classroom of 31 four-year-old kids and that the lack of funding has put extracurricular activities like swimming at risk. One school in St Paul's riding, Brown Public School, will have junior kindergarten classes of 31 students in both the morning and the afternoon next

year—31 students packed in like sardines. The French immersion senior kindergarten at Brown Public School will have two classes of 28 kids.

Farther west in the riding, Humewood public school, where I was last night for their graduation—it was a great night, it was a fun night; the parents were there and the kids were there—is no longer going to have a full-time library. That's what's going to happen to Humewood. They've gone from a full-time ESL teacher to a part-time ESL teacher at a school where 21% of the students do not speak English as their first language. Their grade 2s will be in classes of 30 in the afternoons next year. I received so many letters from parents from Humewood and so many calls from parents at Brown Public School who said we ought to be spending our time in the Legislature not debating time allocation motions that are going to kill debate; we ought to be debating what the future of public education is—the future of public education not being about simply giving our kids an economic advantage without more.

**1620**

We all know that public education has a broader purpose, that our kids, our families, go through a public education system to participate in these days of our years, to address the solution to the problems that pour upon us, and it requires the best judgment from our kids, the best education we can possibly give them so they can make those judgments. I would hope we are trying to build a public education system here in Ontario that produces excellence for all kids, that makes ours the best education system. We'll have families who move into Ontario and businesses will come to Ontario—we'll get people coming here because this is the best place to do business; it has the highest-quality health care but also high-quality education.

The broader public outside St Paul's and, I can tell you, the people of St Paul's, are concerned. This isn't just an issue in midtown Toronto, I can assure you. There were 700 people at the Toronto District School Board's budget meeting on Wednesday—700 people for a budget meeting. An earlier emergency meeting of parents attracted 180 people from 36 schools, and that's just in the city of Toronto. We have, across this province, crises in school boards and in schools because of the failure of this government to provide an appropriate funding formula and because of the cuts to education undertaken by the Harris government.

With respect to extracurricular activities, I remind everybody that Dalton McGuinty came forward with a peace plan to try to address the crisis over extracurricular activities. It was endorsed by commentators of all political stripes. Maybe not everybody liked every piece of it. It was a compromise; it was a balanced, fair approach. It was a peace plan. Yet here the government goes again, trying to undermine the credibility of teachers and increase fear among parents with respect to the future of our public education system. Of course, there's no indication in this bill of who's going to absorb the cost of the courses set forth in this bill's mandatory recerti-

fication of teachers. We're not going to be able to debate that any further, because the government is putting closure on further debate of this bill.

With respect to extracurricular activities, this is another move by this government to centralize control over teachers, a one-size-fits-all approach directed from Queen's Park when we know very well that the needs of students and schools are different and vary from region to region. What's good for North Bay is not necessarily good for north Toronto.

I want to say, on behalf of the students who are wrapping up their school year in St Paul's, parents who have grave concerns about the future of public education, who are seeing their classroom sizes bloat, who are seeing the number of educational assistants and ESL teachers decrease, that you should raise your voices loud and clear. Please let me know what's going on in your schools so that I have an opportunity to hold this government to account. If you're living outside the riding of St Paul's, and particularly if you're living in the riding of a government MPP, I urge you to contact that MPP and let him know what's really going on. We can't control public education from an office in Queen's Park. We have to have the flexibility to respond to the local needs.

I look forward to the opportunity to take Dalton McGuinty's and the Ontario Liberals' education plan to the people, I hope, in the very near future. I know it is before the voters of Vaughan-King-Aurora in the by-election tomorrow.

I will be sharing my time, if it has not been said already, with the member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke and also with the member for Sarnia-Lambton.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** It's good to have the opportunity to speak to the Stability and Excellence in Education Act. Right now it's 4:27 in this Legislature and it's quite hot in here. But that's OK; we can manage it. We can manage heat and cold in this place. When it's cold, we perform better, and if it's hot, we still perform. I will be dividing my time with two other members: the member for Sault Ste Marie and the member for Timmins-James Bay.

Speaker, just to remind you and remind the citizens: when government says "stability" in a bill, it means instability; and when they say "excellence," it means lack of it. Why else would they speak of a bill called "stability and excellence"? Why else would they say that, except it must mean the contrary? It has nothing to do with stability and excellence. Why else, except to hide the instability they have caused in the educational system in the last six years?

They have taken \$2.3 billion out of the educational system. Citizens, does that sound like stability? You take \$2.3 billion out, and you, as a government, dare to introduce a bill that says "stability and excellence in education"? It doesn't make any sense. You understand that. I know the majority of you have caught on to the game, at least those of you who were paying attention.

Those of you who were paying attention know that because of the Conservative cuts, Ontario ranked 55th in

North America in 1998. Who knows where we are now? We ranked 55th in North America. That's really at the bottom. You can't get much lower than that. Do you citizens call that stability and excellence in education? I don't.

The Ontario alternative budget calculated that in order to restore Ontario to its 1994-95 ranking, per pupil funding would have to be increased by \$1,000. Can you imagine what that means? Can you imagine not putting money in education when the economy is good? Can you think what will happen when the economy goes bad and money isn't coming into provincial coffers? If they cut \$2.3 billion now, what will happen when the economy dips down? Wait and see.

With Bill 45, the desire of this government to all of a sudden give choice to parents implies—not implies; means, because the Premier stated very clearly, as did the Minister of Education—that \$300 million will come out of public education, as a minimum. The Premier has said \$500 million. So we're working in that range, anywhere from \$300 million to \$700 million. More will come out of our public system with the desire of this government to say, "We want to give parents the choice to take their kids out of our public system by giving them a tax credit."

The tax credit of a maximum, up to five years, of \$3,500 is more, when you calculate it in the income tax system, than an actual \$3,500. It means more than that. We're telling people they can take our money and take their kids out of our public system and it's OK by the government. The Conservatives say that it's not a problem to test teachers in the regular system. In fact Mr Dunlop, the member from Simcoe North, who spoke, was proud of the mandatory testing of teachers.

**1630**

Good citizens, you know that with Bill 45, which gives private individuals money to send their kids to private schools, they won't have to test the teachers. Mr Dunlop was so proud of saying, "We're testing teachers now and it's going to be mandatory." But what about the other teachers in the private schools? Mr Dunlop doesn't speak to that. He says, "Don't worry about that. They're private." Well, Mr Dunlop, why are you giving money to people who will send their children to private schools and you will not apply to them the same standards you apply to our public system? We don't get it.

Do you understand? You're playing politics with teachers. Here are teachers who, at the elementary panel, undergo regular professional development, meaning many of them take courses on a regular basis. Sixty-seven per cent of the teaching profession is already taking courses at the moment, voluntarily. But that's not good enough for the government. They don't want voluntary teacher credit professional development. They're saying, "No, we want 100% because it's not good enough; that 67% of the elementary panel is already doing it voluntarily—not good enough." What kind of a government is this?

If I had that kind of a buy-in from a profession, where almost 70% of the people are doing it because they want

to—they're taking courses of their own free will and it's not good enough for this government, but it is good enough not to test those teachers in the private system. It's good enough for those people not to have a teaching certificate, because a majority of those people teaching in private schools are not teacher certified. They don't need a teacher's certificate. That's OK there in the private system. We don't need the same standards to apply to them, but in the public system, these people play politics with our teachers in beating them up as often and as regularly as they can.

Where do you people get off doing stuff like that? I'm surprised. I am genuinely surprised the public hasn't asked for your heads sooner.

**Interjection:** On a platter.

**Mr Marchese:** And placed it on a platter, indeed. I'm surprised that they have taken so much from this government. Everything you've done is all about politics and has nothing to do with education. The tax credit is a financial issue. It has nothing to do with education. In fact, the Minister of Education wasn't even consulted. It has profound implications for the educational system, but Madam Ecker was not consulted. In fact, she defends it, poor woman, because she's a part of the government, she's a cabinet member. But she wasn't even told that they were going to bring in this measure. It has profound social implications and the Minister of Education or the other members were not involved. It was just a financial transaction because the government wanted to give some money back to those poor folks who made a different choice. The majority of those poor folks who send their kids to private schools, the non-denominational ones, pay anywhere from \$5,000 to \$15,000 per child.

You had a number of members saying yesterday, "The opposition criticizes us because they say the people who send their kids to private schools are all rich." Well, in fact, 60% are. If you can afford to send your child to a non-denominational school, where the rates are \$5,000 to \$15,000—at Upper Canada, it's 15,000 bucks, and if your son or daughter sleeps there it's 28,000 big ones. And they want my money? Member from Simcoe North, you've got to please engage me. How can you smile at stuff like that? These people, rich people—\$28,000 if you bunk your kid there, and you want to give them 3,500 bucks of a tax credit? Something is nutty up there, right?

I did admit that the people who send their children to religious schools are not rich people. I did say that. I want to acknowledge that a lot of them make tremendous sacrifices, the same sacrifices many of our parents make, who are low-income people and send their kids to a public school system. They volunteer a lot of their time in our public system, similar to those people who send their kids to private schools, religious or otherwise. Everybody makes sacrifices, but the majority of students are in the public system and are well served. Ninety-five per cent of our multicultural communities in Ontario are well served by our public system, and this government is saying, "It's not good enough. If people want a choice to

send them somewhere else, we want to give our public money so they can make a different choice.” I say, “Sorry, no go. No way.” If they make a different choice, God bless, you make a different choice. Yes, it implies sacrifice, but not my problem. Not my problem.

But this government has found itself fit to give public money to people who make a different choice. I’ve got to tell you it’s nuts, and the public agrees with me. It agrees with New Democrats who have been unequivocal and not vacillating in our position with respect to private schools. We support public schools only, now and tomorrow. That’s the position we’ve taken.

With respect to this bill, I’ve already dealt with teacher testing. It’s a political move. I suggest MPPs should be tested.

Mr Dunlop is putting up his hand, “I’m in.” God bless. I’d love to see you people tested. I’d love to be part of that teacher test, too. If it’s good enough for teachers, it ought to be good enough for you to undergo the same kind of testing. It’s not good enough to say we undergo our test every four years through an election process—not good enough, sorry.

Then they say labour stability brings non-teaching education workers under the Education Relations Commission. What have we said with respect to that? We’ve said that Bill 160 gutted the Education Relations Commission. It’s almost a body that serves political interests only because, you see, in the past it was the Education Relations Commission that mediated and monitored contract negotiations. They don’t do that any more. That role of the Education Relations Commission is gone. They don’t have that role any more. It was the Education Relations Commission that trained arbitrators. That’s gone too. They don’t do that any more. The only function left to it by the government is to advise on jeopardy during a strike. That’s the extent of that power.

Now they want to bring in non-teaching under the jeopardy rule as well. We know that it’s designed to punish the lowest-paid workers in our schools. It’s designed to attack their right to strike for a fair contract. That’s what it’s about. But remember, the Education Relations Commission is only here to serve their need. You remember the threshold? Before you could actually rule on jeopardy, in our days, it was 45 days—our days and before. Now jeopardy comes in around more or less 15 days. That’s all these politically nominated people do. That’s their only function. But they’re proud: “We want to bring back stability to the education system.” I’ve told you what it does. It does nothing of the sort.

With respect to the workload and extracurricular activities, this government finally, after stalling, delaying, not wanting to confront the issue of the teaching workload, after so much delay, they came up with a position that said, “You boards will now be forced to provide extracurricular activities, and your choice is you’ve got to increase school size to do that.” The government didn’t throw in some money to reduce the workload of the teacher; they said, “You’ve got to increase class size if you want to reduce the workload.” What kind of a choice is that?

You see, good citizens, it’s not going to help students or teachers. The class size will go up in order to reduce the teaching load, but boards are left to deal with that responsibility. The government is not helping at all. They’re not putting any money in. They’re saying, “You, board, have to do it, because you’re in charge.” And the government liberates itself from that responsibility by not doing anything. There’s no extra support except to tell the board, “You’ve got to increase class size to reduce the teaching load.” That’s not what they wanted. It’s not what teachers asked for. It’s not the kind of compromise Ontarians were looking for. You get dumped again—downloads again the responsibility to the board. There aren’t too many solutions with respect to how you solve those issues.

**1640**

So is this stability? Are we getting the kind of stability that the system, teachers and parents are looking for? No, and I’ve got to tell you that parents are sick and tired of this government, sick and tired of the cuts, the \$2.3 billion cuts we have witnessed in the system, where you have fewer English-as-a-second-language teachers, fewer music teachers, fewer librarians, fewer caretakers. I said the other day that there are more mice than teachers these days because we don’t have enough caretakers to deal with the problem. These people are proud. We’ve got fewer social workers, fewer psychologists, 37,000 people waiting for assistance to be able to get into a special education program—waiting, but there’s no place for them and there’s no one to test them, and these people are proud to bring in a bill saying this is a bill called stability and excellence in education. Come on. You can’t fool us any more. You don’t fool me and I hope, good citizens of Ontario, that they don’t fool you either.

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** I was interested in the comments from the last speaker as he talked about standards and requirements and certification of teachers whether they be in independent schools or in the public system. I think he’s really missing a point in the fact that the public system is a monopoly, that if you live in concession 4, lot 22, you have no choice as to which school your children go to. They go to the local school where the bus takes them, and which teacher do they get? They get the teacher who happens to be in grade 4 or grade 8 or grade 7, whichever level they happen to be in. If they make a choice to pay the extra money and go to an independent school, the parents can have a choice of various independent schools. But when it comes to a public system, it is indeed a monopoly, and I think he’s really missing that point.

I want to talk a bit about teacher testing in the next 10 minutes.

Few people would disagree that physicians, lawyers, architects, veterinarians and other trusted professionals should have to stay up to date in their skills and knowledge to continue to provide high-quality service. In Ontario, professional associations and self-regulated professionals approach professional development and upgrading in a variety of ways. Some have provisions in

place. We've set specific requirements for the renewal or maintenance of a professional certificate. Generally, these requirements must be met over a certain period of time, often three to five years.

For some professions, the failure to meet ongoing learning requirements could mean losing the right to use a professional designation. Let me provide you with a few examples.

The Ontario Association of Architects has a mandatory continuing education requirement for all licensed members. Over a period of two years, members must complete a minimum of some 15 points, half of which must be taken from core professional renewal options and the other half from self-directed options.

The Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario also requires its members to complete a mandatory program of professional development over a specific time period. All members are required to obtain 90 points every three years through a range of educational experiences. Dental specialists must obtain at least half of these credits from programs linked to their area of specialization. A typical full-day program of professional development would be the equivalent of six credit points.

The Law Society of Upper Canada requires its members to provide information on their continuing legal education activities.

The Ontario Institute of Agrologists requires that its members complete a minimum of some 60 hours of professional development over a five-year period.

The point I'm trying to make is that the demand for quality assurance and for establishing ongoing professional learning requirements for their members exists in many professions.

The professions I've just named, as well as many others, are responding to public expectations for quality and for excellence. Their objective is to provide their clients with the assurance that all of their members have the up-to-date knowledge and skills needed to provide high-quality service. That is what our government is trying to achieve with the mandatory teacher recertification program proposed in Bill 80. Over the past six years our government has been building a more rigorous, more accountable high-quality education system, one that will ensure our children's success well into the future.

We will only be able to fully achieve this goal with the confidence that all the members of the Ontario College of Teachers are up to date in their skills and in their knowledge. Ongoing professional learning is not something new to the teaching profession in this province or for teachers in many other jurisdictions. Teachers in other countries and provinces are also required to update their skills and knowledge.

For example, in Nova Scotia teachers must complete at least 100 hours of professional development every five years. Many US states have entry requirements for new teachers and mandatory professional development requirements for practising teachers within specified time frames. In many US states, professional development required to maintain and renew a teaching licence

involves a minimum standard of professional activity. In countries such as the United Kingdom, Germany, England, Sweden, Switzerland and Japan, ongoing professional training has become an important part of reforms to make their education system more effective. In the United Kingdom, for example, the Teacher Training Agency established in 1995 is responsible for the review, improvement and provision of continuing professional development of all teachers.

In Ontario we have many excellent teachers who regularly update their skills and are indeed committed to excellence. But parents want to know that all teachers, not just a large majority, have the skills and knowledge to help their children achieve the high standards we have set for them. That is why our government last year introduced our comprehensive Ontario teacher testing program. The program builds on support and systems already in place to ensure that both new and experienced teachers have the up-to-date training, knowledge and skills to help students succeed and achieve high standards. Mandatory teacher recertification, as we're proposing in this bill, is an important element of our teacher testing program. It was a key election promise that our government made in 1999 and was also recommended by the Royal Commission on Learning in its 1995 report, which received all-party support.

Building a system that ensures our children's success means preparing them for a world that is continuously changing and will be even more technologically driven and competitive than today's. All parents want to see their children succeed, and most would agree that the quality of their child's teacher can affect how well their child performs, whether a student has a difficult year in school or a rewarding and enriching one. Parents want their children taught by teachers they know are well trained, knowledgeable and committed to continuous improvement, teachers they know will prepare their kids to compete and win in the world of today and tomorrow.

Parents know that excellent teachers foster a passion for learning that students can carry with them throughout their lives. A good teacher can also motivate and inspire their students to achieve things they never thought possible. That is why, in designing and developing the details of our teacher testing program, we have consulted and continue to consult with parents and students, as well as teachers and all our education partners, including the Ontario College of Teachers. We have also drawn from experiences in other jurisdictions and extensive research on best practices in other professions.

In addition to mandatory recertification, which I will explain in more detail shortly, our teacher testing program includes a number of other initiatives.

Already in place is a language proficiency test, in effect since last fall, for new applicants to the teaching profession who took their teacher training outside of Ontario in a language other than English or French.

To be introduced over the coming months, pending approval of the legislation, where necessary, is a requirement that all new applicants for Ontario teaching cer-

tificates take a qualifying test similar to lawyers' bar exams starting next spring, and new province-wide performance appraisal standards to ensure that all teachers are indeed evaluated regularly and consistently in their classrooms.

#### 1650

The ministry is also developing an internship program for new teachers to help them acquire strong teaching and classroom management skills. It will also be introducing a system to recognize teaching excellence. It will establish a role for parents, educators and experts in a quality assurance process for schools.

Bill 80, if approved, would require all members of the Ontario College of Teachers to complete five-year cycles of professional development to stay up to date and maintain their certification.

The bill would amend the Ontario College of Teachers Act to give the college clear statutory authority to implement and enforce mandatory professional learning requirements. In addition, it would confirm mandatory professional learning as one of the objectives of the college; determine the overall requirement for mandatory recertification; establish a statutory committee of the college to approve courses and providers; outline notice, appeal, suspension and cancellation provisions for teachers who do not complete the professional learning requirements; and determine transitional requirements for mandatory recertification.

Approximately 40,000 practising classroom teachers and some 6,500 new teachers would be the first to participate in the mandatory recertification program starting this fall. All other members of the Ontario College of Teachers, including principals, vice-principals and other certified teachers, would begin in the fall of 2002.

Under the program, all members of the Ontario College of Teachers would be required to successfully complete seven core courses and seven elective courses during each five-year cycle, regardless of the type of school in which they teach.

Core courses would focus on curriculum knowledge, student assessment, special education, teacher strategies, classroom management and leadership, use of technology and communicating with parents and students. Course lengths will vary according to learning requirements. Our priority is high-quality upgrading in core knowledge and skills.

The courses and their providers would be approved by a professional learning committee of the Ontario College of Teachers, a key partner in this initiative. The professional learning committee would be established as a committee with statutory authority to approve the courses and providers.

The committee would be made up of up to five minister's appointees and six governing council appointees. The six council appointees would be two elected council members, two council members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and two college members at large.

The committee would approve providers and courses to meet the professional development needs of both new and experienced teachers.

Regulations would set out the minimum criteria for the courses. It is anticipated that the regulations would require the courses to be related to student achievement, be linked to the core competency statements developed by the ministry in consultation with education partners, and include tests or other assessments.

Approved courses would include professional development activities and programs in which many teachers already participate to improve their skills or to teach a new subject.

There's a lot more I would like to say about teacher training, but time is running short and I want to leave some time for Bob Wood, so I'll conclude my remarks at that point.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):**

Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm going to take some time this afternoon to speak to Bill 80.

Before I do, I really want to congratulate the nincompoops who look after this building, because I'll tell you, as I said to you privately, it's quite unacceptable that we're left in this situation. I know accidents happen, but staff and members and others are left working in an environment—if I didn't know better, I'd think the ghost of Harold Ballard was running this place. There's a press report someplace that in his heyday, when he ran the Gardens, Ballard used to make sure that for the big concerts the air conditioning was caused not to work so that the business at the concessions was just that much more robust.

I don't want to be as cranky as I'm getting these days, but I'll tell you, we sit here for two or three months in the spring. We're gone all summer. We'll be back sometime in mid-October. I expect the well-paid technical staff who are supposed to support this place to have this place in better running order than it is this week.

I'll just say that and move on to Bill 80, another piece of legislation that has an interesting title: the Stability and Excellence in Education Act. The nomenclature of this Harris government reminds me of those sort of third-tier Communist governments of Eastern Europe in the mid-1960s and the 1970s, the Ceausescu crowd that would offer themselves up as some kind of pale and almost laughable imitation of Western democratic norms and language. I said here the other day, and I'll repeat now, that I suspect that 15, 20 or 30 years from now people are going to be embarrassed by the ridiculous language that's been assigned to the bills passed in this Parliament and the one immediately preceding.

Who do we think we're kidding? If there's one thing that most honourable members, besides the zealots on both sides of the current divide, would know from their experience, it's that if there is one thing we don't have in public education today, it's stability. I'm going to be perhaps a little more ecumenical and a little less partisan in some ways than maybe even some of my own

colleagues, because I'm not here to say that everything the government has tried to do is bad and that everything that was done prior to 1995 was good. I will say as a former Minister of Education that there were issues that were developing and percolating through the 1970s and 1980s that were bound to erupt and have erupted in the 1990s. But to come here in the spring of 2001 and say we've got stability in education is to insult the intelligence of the Legislature, and quite frankly is to insult the intelligence of a very large number of Ontario's citizens, particularly Ontarians with children in the elementary and secondary schools.

I hear from my constituents with school-age children that they are increasingly worn out, beaten down, depressed by what appears to be a war between the government and the school system that does not seem to be capable of some kind of peace.

I happened to say to a retired school principal in my constituency a few months ago—I want to tell you he's someone who's had a long and close association with the Progressive Conservative Party—"I think we're actually maybe getting to a peace treaty." We were talking particularly about a part of this bill, the extracurricular activity. And so we did. We got movement from Minister Ecker and her colleagues in the Harris government on that subject. But within hours we got the Harris government totally reversing itself on funding private schools.

Now we are left with a situation where we've made one step forward with the issue of extracurricular activities. I want to say that on the basis of what I'm hearing from teachers and school administrators in Renfrew county, some of them not ideologically opposed to the Harris government, the Ecker plan on extracurricular is still short of what we need to make the extracurricular possibilities available in the schools of the Ottawa Valley.

**1700**

But we are now faced with this new opening as to private schools. I was struck the other day, reading the Ottawa Citizen—I didn't bring the article with me, but there's a school in rural Lanark county that began a couple of years ago with very few students. It's a Christian academy. This year I think it's going to register something like 61 kids, in fall 2001, and the projections are for something like 90 to 100 students at that school in a couple of years' time. I'll tell the House what the House would probably know, and those of you who come from rural and northern Ontario will know it: those students are going to be coming from rural schools in the main. So there's no doubt we're going to be opening a spanking new Christian school and it is only a matter of months, maybe a couple of years, before I fully expect to be reading in the Smiths Falls or Perth or Ottawa papers how a number of rural schools in Lanark are almost certainly going to be in distress, unless all of the kids are coming from home-schooling environments, and I doubt that that's true. This will be a zero-sum game, and there will be public schools in rural Ontario, in my part of

eastern Ontario, that will be under a great deal of stress and likely going to close.

I can tell you as a former Minister of Education, these are the issues that make the current minister's or any minister's job very difficult. We've got a couple of million kids going to 5,000 schools in cities as large as Toronto and in communities as small as Brights Grove and Calabogie.

**Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** Don't forget Petrolia.

**Mr Conway:** I won't forget Petrolia.

It will be very interesting to see where this takes us. I said before, and I repeat now, if any of us, individually or collectively, feels very strongly about providing these kinds of incentives for private schools, I think we are duty bound to say to our local and general electorates before an election that such is our position. But that's not what we've done here.

I am one who is going to observe the obvious: under the Harris government's funding model, I see no way to avoid province-wide bargaining. That's where we're headed, and this bill takes us one step closer to that reality.

I remember 15 years ago, my friend Claude Ryan, the then Minister of Education for the province of Quebec, telling me more than once, "Conway, let me tell you what you don't want: you don't want what we've got in Quebec. You don't want province-wide bargaining across the public sector because, I'll tell you, once you get that you've really got yourself a very difficult situation," and that's where we're headed. I hope I've fairly represented my friend Ryan; I think I have. I'm quite sure that Bill 80, in that provision which provides for all contracts to terminate simultaneously, at a fixed point in 2004, is a clear indication that that outcome is inevitable.

We have, of course, the whole question of the mandatory certification of teachers. I want to say a couple of things about that. I personally believe that it ought to be an objective of the province generally, and school boards locally, to ensure that, to the very best of our ability, if I'm a science teacher or I'm a history teacher or I'm an English teacher I have credentials for the subject areas that I am going to be teaching. In fact, there is some very good evidence in other jurisdictions—I can think of one report done in the United States not that many years ago which makes plain that one of the things that really has a very positive effect on improving the educational outcomes of schools is in fact having teachers who are well motivated and well qualified to do the tasks that are before them.

I must say that when I think back to my conversations both as a private member and as a Minister of Education, not as much time was spent on that subject as I feel there ought to have been. If I were giving advice to school boards—and I do think they are doing a better job of this today than might have been the case a few years ago—one of the questions I would have is, what is your plan to make sure that you've got well-qualified, well-motivated teachers in your schools, particularly as you move into a

period of time when there are going to be, according to the College of Teachers, tens of thousands of new hires?

My teacher friends would want me to say tonight, and I will say on their behalf, how attractive are we making the job of teaching today? There was a very interesting article by Margaret Wentz in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*—I don't know how many of you saw it—talking about some relative or in-law of hers who had taught in the rural schools of, I think, the eastern townships. Ms Wentz made the point that's been made by others: how attractive is teaching to bright young people today? I can tell you, I would be very reluctant myself, if I were graduating from a faculty of education in 2001, to embrace the teaching profession. I'll tell you why: I think the expectations are perhaps a bit unrealistic. But maybe more central to my diffidence might be that there just seems to be this culture war that's so pronounced and deep-seated. I would be afraid that if I went to my local elementary or secondary school, I would be caught in the crossfire between parents, on the one hand, who expect and understandably want the best for their kids, and politicians, local and provincial, who seem to be more willing than ever to turn the whole educational debate into just a big, endless political battle. I'd be really not very anxious to be caught up in that, particularly at a time when I have a lot of other options—and there are other options.

I will say here tonight what I said the other day in a speech at Napanee. I'll say this for the Premier: he's a former teacher, he's a former school board trustee and chair; he knows this file better than many of us here. The premeditated campaign that he has launched against teachers in this province is, in my view, now a very serious impediment to resolving some of these important issues to which Bill 80 directs our attention. You simply can't go around as the leader of the government saying the kinds of things Mr Harris seems to want to say routinely about teachers and not have that kind of rhetoric take a toll.

I'm the first to admit that, with 120,000 or 130,000 teachers, there are undoubtedly excellent teachers, there are some mediocre teachers and, yes, there are some poor teachers. I think we've all had that experience. But do you know what? There are 103 members of this Legislature, and I think independent analysts would say there are people like Frances Lankin—who, unfortunately, is leaving us—who is a real ornament to this place. My friend Arnott working over there is the acme of duty and responsibility. There may be others around, whom I shall not name, perhaps myself included, who do not bring the same degree of prestige and reputation to the profession.

I read the business pages of the national newspaper every day. Almost without fail there's some scoundrel being talked of, who has absconded with funds, who is charged with God knows what. I sit here day after day and I'm waiting for Mike Harris to say, "You know some of those scoundrels on Bay Street? They should be dealt with."

I never, ever hear the slightest complaint about the stockbroker who has stolen money from the unsuspecting 80-year-old client.

**1710**

I read about chiefs of police. I read about police officers, a noble and very important profession with some bad actors. I read almost on a weekly basis cases where the police have within their midst the odd bad actor. There is not a peep out of the Harris government about failing on that side.

We have a new morality play here. Bay Street business men and women are, a priori, good, virtuous and very important. Teachers, nurses, public servants are, a priori, slackers and malingerers. Oh, yes, we will go to our own local ridings and we will nod that we've had a good teacher and we know a good nurse, but let me tell you, the comments that have been made by the Premier, directly and indirectly, about the public service generally and about teachers are absolutely unhelpful and they are beneath someone who, like Mike Harris, has been both a teacher and a school board trustee.

I know people who have talked with the Premier in North Bay. They say to me, "I don't know what got into Mike. When I taught with him, when I worked with him, he certainly seemed to have a different point of view, a different orientation."

I just want to say today that if we think, if the government thinks that, going forward, when we need something like 35,000 to 40,000 new teachers over the next five to seven years, that we are going to attract bright young men and women to the teaching profession on the basis of the campaign that's been directed against the teaching profession, then I think Mr Harris better think again. It strikes me as passing strange that people in the government don't seem to know that it is now a seller's market.

I would myself like to assign a couple of good reporters someday: go to Guelph, go to Nepean, go to Stratford and certainly go to Metropolitan Toronto, pick a day, walk into those principals' offices and ask this question: "How many teachers are here today with letters of permission?" because I'm going to tell you, the *Beacon Herald*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, the *Toronto Star*, the *Kitchener Record* would have quite a story. I think people would be quite astonished to find out just how many people are now teaching in the public schools of Ontario without any credentials related to the teaching profession. And that's only going to get worse as we look at the deficit in the profession caused by significant on-going retirements and clear signals sent out, many by governments but others from other quarters, that are suggesting to young people, "Think twice before you consider a career in teaching." As I say, not too many weeks ago I read a report from the Ontario College of Teachers which suggested that we're going to require something like 35,000 to 40,000 new teachers over a very short period of time.

I want to conclude my remarks today by recommending to the House an article that you may not have

seen but I'm going to recommend that you read. A couple of weeks ago in Saturday Night magazine, which is an insert to the National Post on Saturday, there was an article—and this is from June 2, 2001—by J. Teitel. It was an interesting article entitled “The Con in Neo-Con,” and the sub-title of the article is, “If neo-Conservatives really are fighting for old-fashioned family values, why are they tearing down so much of what their parents stood for? And why?”—the article goes on to ask—“are we as a general society so happy to let it happen?”

What Mr Teitel does in the article is, he takes Algonquin composite high school, 1961, and shows you the world of Mike Harris's secondary school experience. He compares that world with the world of the late 1990s, 2000, 2001. Saturday Night magazine and the National Post are not viewed as fire-breathing, radical, big-L Liberals, and I could argue that in some respects the article is perhaps a little unfair, but it's a very compelling argument he advances.

I've said before that I have no kids, but my parents, the parents of the Great Depression and the second war, what did they give to me? They gave to me in the 1960s and 1970s a level of opportunity that was unprecedented, vastly more than they ever experienced. I think that generation, Tom Brokaw's The Greatest Generation, did so because they were reared in such deprivation.

What does my generation offer in return? University tuition as high as we can make it. We, who got it almost for nothing, say to our kids, “The sky is the limit.” Teitel's argument about the panoply of extracurricular opportunities at Algonquin in North Bay in 1961 as compared to, what, young people in North Bay? Think about being a youngster, and you went to high school in Mount Forest or in Pembroke or in Petrolia starting about 1997. What kind of menu have you had in terms of extracurricular activity?

The language I want to use is such lumberyard vernacular that I will not, Mr Speaker, use it, but I have so much sympathy for those kids graduating this week. They have been put through an endless confrontation and fight after fight after battle. I'm telling you, if I were one of them I would be mad as hell because, by the time I got to be 15 or 16, I was in a high school that, had it not been for the extracurricular sports and other activities, I would not have been a very easily managed kid. There are tens of thousands of young people who have come through a five-year war, a war that does not seem to want to end. The government is not entirely responsible, and there are days when I have more than a bit of sympathy for their position. But this battle, this fight, must end because our social and economic well-being cannot stand much more of it. To offer legislation that says “excellence and stability in education” without a true and genuine commitment to meet your partners at least on the middle of this battlefield to sign a peace treaty in the interest of these kids ought to be this government's and this Legislature's first concern.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** It's a pleasure to have an opportunity to put a few comments

on the record when it comes to this particular bill. If I have to say anything in the nine or 10 minutes I have, it is the following. It is really regrettable that the government over the last number of years, some six years now—opportunity after opportunity—has found a way of picking a fight with educators across this province. I think it's a disservice. Like in every profession out there you have excellent teachers, you've got good teachers and you've got some mediocre teachers. You have good politicians, excellent politicians, mediocre politicians—no difference whatever profession we come from.

What I object to is that it almost seems as if—and I know it doesn't only almost seem, but it's been the case over the past number of years that this government has decided they're going to take a fight with a number of people across Ontario by determining what it is these people do for a living. At first, when the government ran in the election of 1995, they went out to demonize people who were on social assistance. They tried to make people believe that everybody who is on social assistance somehow is a lazy bum and doesn't deserve what they get from the state and, as such, should be penalized by kicking them off their behinds, getting them out there looking for work and reducing their benefits to boot.

**1720**

It was vastly popular with the public. A lot of people believe in those sorts of things. I don't. I think it's the wrong way of doing things. As a result, the government picked that political fight, got some political capital out of it, and I would argue won the 1995 election big time based on their picking a fight with welfare recipients.

They continued that fight after the election and then decided they had to change the target somewhat, and that's what they did. In 1995, soon after being elected, John Snobelen, the then Minister of Education, said to his staff in the Ministry of Education that they needed to create a crisis in education, and that by creating a crisis they would have an opportunity and the backdrop to be able to make the changes that ideologically his government wanted to make. They did so. They created the crisis in education by underfunding it, by taking some \$2 billion out of the education budget, by turning the system around, inside out, on its ear, and then picking a fight with teachers. We've had nothing but attempts on the part of this government to pick a fight, not only with teachers but all education workers, and in the case of this bill, even custodial staff and support staff in the schools.

I know, I understand, that the government thinks this is politically popular. I understand that the government says, “If we go out and bash education workers and teachers, somehow or other it's a popular thing,” because some people in society figure, “Those people have it pretty well off. I work hard for a living. Why is it those people are getting their summers off?” This is the sort of talk in some of the mainstream out there. The government wants to get on that side and picks a fight with teachers.

I think in the end it's a huge disservice. What we've managed to do is to create not only a fight with teachers,

but quite frankly an atmosphere in the education system that I don't think is conducive to good education. To educate children and young adults properly, you have to create an atmosphere of learning. You don't create, in my estimation, an atmosphere of learning when a government is out there stirring the pot by underfunding it and picking a fight with education workers and teachers in the education system. I think that is very counter-productive.

It's interesting that when we look at what's been happening in the teachers' colleges over the last couple of years, as a result of the fight this government has had with teachers, we now see there is a decline in enrolment in teachers' colleges and a bigger difficulty trying to attract students to go into that profession. Initially, that's not a problem because there is a sufficient number of teachers in the system to deal with the number of students we have in the system. But as time goes on and we retire many of those people who went into the education system some 25 and 30 years ago, who are now coming out on retirement, it's becoming increasingly more difficult to replace those teachers with new qualified teachers coming out of teachers' colleges. Why? Because the government has demeaned the value of teachers and what they do in their field.

Young people who are now going to college and university and who are deciding they may want to go into the educational field are saying, "Why should I choose a career that somehow is not valued by society," because that's what they're hearing out there when the government is out bashing teachers, "and why should I go into a profession that is always constantly under attack by a provincial government?"

As a result, we now have a shortage of teachers in the education system that is starting to be apparent. This exemplifies again what this government is all about: create a crisis, create a problem, and therefore you have the opportunity to make the ideological changes you want. Why are we creating private schools? I think the government to a certain extent has created a demand for funding private schools by underfunding the system and doing what they've done.

I'll just say what I said at the very beginning, which is that I would much rather see my provincial government and we, as members of the Legislature, trying to find positive ways of being able to deal with what is in the education system, what works, what doesn't work, and how we strengthen it. I don't think anybody in the education system who is currently employed—students, parents, trustees, education workers, politicians or whatever—will argue that everything in our public school system is hunky-dory and it doesn't need adjustment. I think most people would like to see some changes.

But I think that change has to happen in a backdrop that has a certain mutual respect and understanding of the willingness to make things happen in a positive way. I think it's rather unfortunate that this government has decided to pick that fight.

On the issue of the private schools, I just want to say again—because as most members of the assembly would

have gotten, I have gotten a number of e-mails on this particular issue; not a record number but certainly a lot of e-mails. Most were in support of my position, probably because I've been seen as being a supporter of our public system and opposed to the private system—the tax credit voucher that the government creates. Most of the e-mail that I got was in support of my position and says we shouldn't be using tax dollars to fund a private system. Some of the comments that people have made to me I think are very valid ones and are questions such as, if we're going to give public dollars to a private system, are we going to have some control over curriculum? How do we ensure that our tax dollars are being utilized in a way that ensures that those kids are being taught according to a standard called a curriculum as set out by the Ministry of Education? Are we going to have some sort of standards when it comes to teachers?

In our public system of education, we demand teacher testing, we demand evaluation of our teachers. Right or wrong, that system is there in place. When it comes to those teachers in the private system, are we going to have the same kind of demand that we ensure that those teachers are properly qualified to be teaching? Are we going to make sure that the students inside those private schools are not taught in an atmosphere that only teaches one particular way of thinking?

I'll give you an example. I forget the name of the school, but it's one of the private schools. I was sent an e-mail along with a URL that was pointing to their Web site. When you read the Web site of the school, their curriculum basically says they will not accept any teachings of liberalism, socialism, communism or unionism. The only thing they want to teach is capitalism. I say if that's what you want to do as a private school, go out and do it yourself but don't use my public dollars to teach one particular ideology. I believe it's important that students are given choices when it comes to what are the various political systems out there and what the different economic theories are. It's up to those students to decide what they want to believe in by way of their own conviction, their own learning and their own reading. But for public dollars to say, "We're not going to accept any speaking in the school about other economic or political theories," I think is, quite frankly, very dangerous and, I would argue, something they tried in the Communist bloc and it didn't work very well. I would hope in Ontario, in this modern society, that we wouldn't have a sort of Stalinist approach to education when it comes to what kids are supposed to learn in the education system.

That's just one example of what happens in the private schools. I don't say they all do that. I'm sure they all have different policies. My point is we need to make sure that if we're going to use public dollars, there is some public accountability. I don't see that happening within the system that the government's purporting.

That's all the time I have and I want to thank the members of the assembly for paying attention to what I have to say and look forward to comments of other members on this very important issue.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate.

**Mr Bob Wood (London West):** I rise to support both this motion and the bill, not because I think it's a perfect bill but because I think it is, on balance, a bill worth supporting. I'd like to take a few minutes to go through some of the specific provisions of the bill and identify those which I think are steps forward and those which I hope may see some revision in the future.

We note that the bill would extend the role of the Education Relations Commission to giving advice respecting when pupils' successful completion of courses of study is in jeopardy as a result of a strike or lockout of any board employees. I think that's a step forward. I think it's a very logical and positive thing to do.

We also would note that the bill permits boards to pass a resolution specifying that the average size of secondary school classes in the aggregate may exceed 21 pupils by an amount that is equal to or less than one pupil. That, of course, is legalese for saying they have a little more flexibility in respect to the pupil-teacher ratio. I see that as a step forward, but I should explain my view of the regime I think we should move toward with respect to boards of education. That regime is in essence this: I think that we should give greater flexibility to the boards in terms of how they operate themselves. I think we micromanage them now in a way that is not particularly helpful. I hope that in the future we will look at ways of giving them greater flexibility to do their management but hold them accountable for their methodology through a type of body like the Education Improvement Commission, which would monitor the sort of methods they are using in order to achieve the goals that are set out for them.

1730

I would also suggest that we should monitor them by results. In other words, let's take a look at the standard tests and see whether or not the levels of achievement that are expected are in fact being produced. As we move in that direction, I think we would find we could give considerably more flexibility to the boards and give them the opportunity to try some innovative ideas and some ways that may be a little different from a one-size, province-wide type of plan.

I also note in the regulations under one of the sections that there is going to be more flexibility regarding the kinds of courses and programs that may be counted as instructional time for the purposes of that section. I think that is also a step toward giving the boards more flexibility in how they conduct their business, and I think that's positive.

Section 7 of schedule A is going to repeal those sections of the act that currently make it a duty of a teacher to participate in co-instructional activities as directed by the principal. That idea was put forward and, I think, was not found to be a very good idea. I think it's a good idea to take it out of the law of this province.

Section 8 removes the duty of the principal to assign duties related to co-instructional activities to teachers.

My remarks on that section would be basically the same as the remarks I just made on section 7.

Section 9 prescribes three-year terms for collective agreements between boards and the designated bargaining agents for teachers' bargaining units. I am a strong believer in free collective bargaining. I think it should only be interfered with where the public interest requires that. It is thought that this proposal will provide more stability. Time will tell whether it actually achieves that end. I am hopeful we can get out of that kind of prescription in the fairly near future. However, I would be a reluctant supporter of that particular aspect of the bill.

The second part of the bill is schedule B, the amendments to the Ontario College of Teachers Act relating to teachers' professional learning requirements. I would have to declare my view of what I think effective teacher testing is. I'm a big believer in teacher testing, but I think effective teacher testing is to take a look at the level of student achievement at the beginning of the year, test that again at the end of the year and see whether the particular teacher has achieved the goals that might reasonably be expected during that year. That, to me, is effective teacher testing.

Speaking of what's in this bill—and members of the House and those watching on TV may find my enthusiasm for the bill diminishing somewhat as we move to schedule B—section 2 of the schedule adds “professional learning required to maintain certificates of qualification and registration” to the objects of the college.

I, of course, am not a teacher. I am a lawyer by profession, and basically we have found, among lawyers, that they are fairly good about maintaining their professional knowledge. Where we have claims of negligence against lawyers, it is practically never as a result of a lack of knowledge of the law. So lawyers seem to figure it out themselves and make sure they get the updating they need, and our profession, like all professions, has changed quite rapidly.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Wood:** I'm here to defend those parts of the legal profession that should be defended, and I'm here to be quite critical of those parts that need to be changed.

Getting back to this bill, section 3 of schedule B amends the act “to clarify that the register kept by the college containing information on each member that is available to the public would not include information concerning the professional learning courses completed by the member, unless that information forms part of a term, condition or limitation on the member's certificate of qualification and registration.”

I think that's a sensible administrative section. But to get back for a moment to the general concept, in the legal profession we have found that the lawyers will update themselves. I would like to go on record as saying I'm not convinced that what this act is doing, which is basically prescribing how the teachers ought to update themselves and keep themselves current, is the best way of making certain our teaching profession in our public school system is totally up to date. I think we could leave

a lot more to them. However, I do defend section 3. If we're going to do it, section 3 makes some sense.

Section 4 of the schedule sets out "the new professional learning requirements and how the new requirements would be implemented." My comments on that of course are similar to my comments of a couple of minutes ago.

"The new section 24.6 would provide that every five years, every member of the Ontario College of Teachers shall successfully complete an approved professional learning course from one of each of seven course categories set out in the regulations ... and seven other approved professional learning courses ... in order for the member to maintain his or her certificate of qualification and registration."

Unfortunately, I think, this gets us into a bit of a one-size-fits-all situation, although I acknowledge there is flexibility within 24.6. There may be some teachers who need a lot of updating over a five-year period; there may be others who basically don't need a lot, yet we're going to say to everyone, "Every five years you've got to take these various courses as set out."

I would like to go on record as saying I am hopeful that over time we will go to more effective means of teacher testing. Teacher testing rightly done, I think, can be very helpful to the teachers, the students and the parents. But I think we should take a close look at the model we have before us with a view to significant revision over a period of time. As we take a look at experiences in that profession, take a look at experiences in other professions—how do they make certain there is competency and how do they make certain people are kept up to date?—I'm not sure we'll find in that many cases that they use the model set out in this bill.

I am hopeful that some of these reforms are going to be looked at as they proceed. I'm hopeful that some of them will be revised, but I would commend to the House this bill as, all in all, a step forward rather than a step behind.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to put a few thoughts on the record with regard to this subject, but in another way, to put some thoughts on the record with regard to this whole session of the Legislature we've just come through, actually going back to just before Christmas for me, to put what we're doing here this afternoon somehow into that context. We're beginning to see more and more, as things start to come into better focus, the intention of this government and ultimately the result of the intention of this government where services for people are concerned, where quality of life is concerned, where the issue of the common good is concerned in this province. I have to say that it presents to me as a disturbing trend, and no more so than as we look at this piece of legislation we're debating here this afternoon under the aegis of a time allocation motion.

I want to start by saying, as my colleague from Nickel Belt has said on many occasions as we've sat here together on Wednesday afternoon, doing duty on behalf of

our caucus, with other colleagues, but the two of us, "It's Wednesday afternoon, so it must be another time allocation motion." That's the pattern in this place. Or the juxtaposition: "A time allocation motion, so it must be Wednesday afternoon."

**1740**

That might be funny, except it's sad because it reflects so very clearly the attitude of this government where public process is concerned, where public debate and dialogue are concerned, where full and due process within the political system is concerned. More and more of these pieces of legislation that affect so directly and in so many meaningful ways the services we all count on and depend on to live our lives in communities across this wonderful province that we have all had a major hand in creating are being affected in a very negative way.

I think we should all be concerned about that. As we see this government grasping at that which will get them re-elected come the next election, as we move toward the middle of their second term and the realization that's coming upon them that what got them elected in the first place was a very hard-hitting, right-wing, anti-government, anti-organized labour, anti-public service, pro-tax cuts, pro-private sector agenda, and that they were losing their grip on the controls as people began to realize the effect of that kind of approach to this province, they have now made a sharp right turn and we now have delivered to us here on a regular basis more and more legislation that takes us down that road.

This government is wont to say it's not the government, that it in fact is here to fix government. By saying that, they move themselves away from any responsibility that might be there by way of the services government offers in this province and the negative impact of the changes that are being made by government. By saying you're not government, you can ultimately get off the hook and say, "It's not me." Government now is more and more municipalities' as Queen's Park downloads responsibility for so many of the things that we all together, collectively, decided over the years Queen's Park would be responsible for.

Public health, for example: here in the last couple of days, as we've watched the hearings on the terrible disaster of Walkerton unfold, we've come to realize that the Premier, because he is the lead in the province where government is concerned, turned his back very directly and clearly on issues of public health. It was somebody else's responsibility, I guess municipalities', because the responsibility for testing drinking water was turned over to them, and with that I guess responsibility for everything else environmental that might affect the lives of people in very real and problematic ways. This government has turned its back on that.

It has also targeted very effectively people in this province who have worked very hard over a number of years to build up the kind of public offering we have for each other in this province, whether it was in the delivery of health care services, whether it was looking after our

highways, whether it was protecting our environment or, in this instance, where it came to building up our wonderful public education system. You've heard it said here by my colleagues and others that this bill that we're debating here today is nothing more than a smokescreen, a shell game, and the real initiative they're pushing through is the tax credits for private schools. I'd suggest to you it's much more than a smokescreen. There are some very real and problematic things contained in this bill, spoken of by others—the member from Renfrew a few minutes ago—as to the devastating impact, the difficulty it will create for those who have been the backbone of the education system, an education system that puts us out there on the forefront of developments in education on a worldwide scale. That we would, in such a methodical, systematic way continue to tear down that which we've built up, continue to demean and target those who have participated in that exercise so effectively and so positively over so many years, has to give all of us cause to wonder and to think and to ultimately challenge the direction that this government is going in.

You know, the bent to turn everything over to the private sector and contract things out eventually comes home to roost, because there is no accountability, there is no effort, when you privatize public services, to improve those services. There's simply a drive to make it ever more profitable. For example, the heat in this place this afternoon: the member from Renfrew-Nipissing talked about the people in this place who are responsible for that. It's not them. I'm told that the air conditioning and heating in this place is now contracted out to some company and that in fact they're responsible. They're not able to cope with or provide the kind of service that we need in here. But that shouldn't be a surprise to anybody: first, that the government is doing that, and second, that it's not working out and that we're all of us here this afternoon sitting sweltering in heat as we try to do the public work of this province.

The most problematic example, though, of the agenda of this government that I've been looking at over the last six months has been the attack by this government on those who are poor, the most vulnerable, the most at risk of our citizens out there, and for no other purpose, it seems to me as I look at it, but to gain political points. They know it's popular to welfare-bash. They know it's popular to take money away from poor people because, "You know, they're lazy anyway and it's not their money to begin with." There's no real thought-out program of

improvement to the lives of those people with this government, nor is there in this bill as it will affect the education system that all of our children will have to count on over the next years in this province.

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr Newman has moved government notice of motion 44. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members; this will be a 10-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1749 to 1759.*

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

#### Ayes

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

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

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Kormos, Peter
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	Marchese, Rosario
Brown, Michael A.	Duncan, Dwight	Martel, Shelley
Caplan, David	Gerretsen, John	Martin, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Crozier, Bruce	Kennedy, Gerard	Pupatello, Sandra

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 48; the nays are 21.

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

It being two minutes and 18 seconds past 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 am tomorrow.

*The House adjourned at 1802.*

**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	Bountrogianni, 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	<b>Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio (Health and Long-Term Care) / ministre sans portefeuille (Santé et Soins de longue durée)
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	<b>Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony</b> (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	Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Burlington	<b>Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron</b> (PC) Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées	Kitchener-Waterloo	<b>Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth</b> (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	<b>Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.</b> (PC) Minister of Consumer and Business Services / ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Leeds-Grenville	<b>Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.</b> (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	<b>Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne</b> (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	<b>Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David</b> (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	<b>Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.</b> (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement
Eglinton-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	<b>Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob</b> (PC) Minister of Correctional Services / ministre des Services correctionnels
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Steve (L)	Mississauga East / -Est	DeFaria, Carl (PC)
Erie-Lincoln	<b>Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim</b> (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	<b>Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John</b> (PC) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	<b>Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail		
Etobicoke North / -Nord	Hastings, John (PC)		
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Kells, Morley (PC)		
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)		
Guelph-Wellington	<b>Elliott, Hon / L'hon Brenda</b> (PC) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales		
Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)		
Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	<b>Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (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	<b>Baird, Hon / L'hon John R.</b> (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) <b>Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan</b> (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	<b>Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.</b> (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif	Simcoe-Grey	<b>Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Minister of Energy, Science and Technology / ministre de l'Énergie, des Sciences et de la Technologie
Northumberland	Galt, Doug (PC)	St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)
Oak Ridges	<b>Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank</b> (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	<b>Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary</b> (PC) Speaker / Président	Stoney Creek	<b>Clark, Hon / L'hon Brad</b> (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	<b>Coburn, Hon / L'hon Brian</b> (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	<b>Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet</b> (PC) Minister of Education, government House leader / ministre de l'Éducation, leader parlementaire du gouvernement	Whitby-Ajax	<b>Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Willowdale	<b>Young, Hon / L'hon David</b> (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,  
Tony Martin, Frank Mazzilli,  
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, Claudette Boyer, Garfield Dunlop,  
Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy, Morley Kells, Frances Lankin,  
Ted McMeekin, Bill Murdoch, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Members' expenditures report

The Speaker..... 1953

### Speaker's ruling

The Speaker..... 1953

### Visitors

Mr Colle .....1954, 1955

Mrs Bountrogianni ..... 1955

The Speaker..... 1955

Mrs Molinari ..... 1955

Mr Young ..... 1955

Mr Kennedy ..... 1957

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 27 juin 2001

### DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

#### Soins hospitaliers

M. Lalonde..... 1952

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

**Loi de 2001 modifiant la Loi sur la vérification des comptes publics (équité dans les finances municipales), projet de loi 93, M. McMeekin**

Adoptée..... 1956

**Loi de 2001 sur la protection et la conservation des quartiers et des logements locatifs à prix abordables, projet de loi 94, M. Colle**

Adoptée..... 1956

**Loi de 2001 sur l'éthique et la transparence des questions d'intérêt public, projet de loi 95, M<sup>me</sup> Di Cocco**

Adoptée..... 1957

### DEUXIÈME LECTURE

**Loi de 2001 sur l'harmonisation des prêts d'études de l'Ontario, projet de loi 19, M<sup>me</sup> Cunningham**

Adoptée..... 1958

**Loi de 2001 sur la réduction au minimum de l'utilisation de la contention sur les malades, projet de loi 85, M<sup>me</sup> Lankin**

Adoptée ..... 1958

### TROISIÈME LECTURE

**Loi de 2001 sur l'harmonisation des prêts d'études de l'Ontario, projet de loi 19, M<sup>me</sup> Cunningham**

Adoptée ..... 1958

**Loi de 2001 sur la réduction au minimum de l'utilisation de la contention sur les malades, projet de loi 85, M<sup>me</sup> Lankin**

Adoptée ..... 1958

**Loi de 2001 sur des choix réfléchis favorisant la croissance et la responsabilisation (budget de 2001), projet de loi 45, M. Flaherty**

Adoptée ..... 1958

**Loi de 2001 sur la négociation collective dans les services d'ambulance, projet de loi 58, M. Stockwell**

Adoptée ..... 1959

# CONTENTS

Wednesday 27 June 2001

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Home care</b>	
Mr Gravelle.....	1951
<b>Canada Day</b>	
Mr Martiniuk .....	1951
<b>Sharon Reynolds</b>	
Mr Gerretsen.....	1951
<b>Occupational health and safety</b>	
Mr Kormos .....	1952
<b>Youth employment</b>	
Mr Johnson .....	1952
<b>Pharmacare</b>	
Mr Arnott.....	1952
<b>Progressive Conservative Party</b>	
Mr Duncan .....	1953
<b>Stan Darling</b>	
Mr Miller .....	1953

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

<b>Standing committee on government agencies</b>	
The Speaker .....	1955
Report deemed adopted .....	1955
<b>Standing committee on justice and social policy</b>	
Mr Barrett .....	1955
Report adopted.....	1955
<b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills</b>	
Mr Dunlop .....	1956
Report adopted.....	1956

## FIRST READINGS

<b>Audit Amendment Act (Fairness in Municipal Finances), 2001,</b> Bill 93, <i>Mr McMeekin</i>	
Agreed to .....	1956
Mr McMeekin.....	1956
<b>Neighbourhoods and Affordable Rental Housing Protection and Preservation Act, 2001,</b> Bill 94, <i>Mr Colle</i>	
Agreed to .....	1956
Mr Colle.....	1956
<b>Ethics and Transparency in Public Matters Act, 2001,</b> Bill 95, <i>Ms Di Cocco</i>	
Agreed to .....	1957
Ms Di Cocco.....	1957

## MOTIONS

<b>Consideration of Bill 81</b>	
Mrs Ecker .....	1957
Agreed to .....	1957
<b>Consideration of Bill 90</b>	
Mrs Ecker .....	1957
Agreed to .....	1957

## House sittings

Mrs Ecker.....	1969
Agreed to .....	1969

## Committee schedule

Mrs Ecker.....	1969
Agreed to .....	1969

## SECOND READINGS

<b>Ontario Student Loan Harmonization Act, 2001,</b> Bill 19, <i>Mrs Cunningham</i>	
Agreed to .....	1958
<b>Patient Restraints Minimization Act, 2001,</b> Bill 85, <i>Ms Lankin</i>	
Agreed to .....	1958

## THIRD READINGS

<b>Ontario Student Loan Harmonization Act, 2001,</b> Bill 19, <i>Mrs Cunningham</i>	
Agreed to .....	1958
<b>Patient Restraints Minimization Act, 2001,</b> Bill 85, <i>Ms Lankin</i>	
Agreed to .....	1958
<b>Responsible Choices for Growth and Accountability Act (2001 Budget), 2001,</b> Bill 45, <i>Mr Flaherty</i>	
Agreed to .....	1958
<b>Ambulance Services Collective Bargaining Act, 2001,</b> Bill 58, <i>Mr Stockwell</i>	
Agreed to .....	1959

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Walkerton tragedy</b>	
Mrs Pupatello .....	1959
Mrs Witmer .....	1959, 1960, 1961
Mr Bradley .....	1960
Mr Kormos.....	1961
<b>Young offenders</b>	
Mr Kormos.....	1961
Mr Flaherty .....	1962
<b>Hospital funding</b>	
Mrs McLeod.....	1962
Mr Clement .....	1962
<b>Ministry of Natural Resources</b>	
Mr Stewart.....	1963
Mr Snobelen.....	1963
<b>Air quality</b>	
Mr Bradley .....	1963
Mrs Witmer .....	1963
<b>Caribana</b>	
Mr Gilchrist.....	1964
Mr Hudak .....	1964
<b>Primary care reform</b>	
Ms Lankin .....	1964
Mr Clement .....	1965

## Students with special needs

Mr Kennedy.....	1965
Mrs Ecker .....	1965

## Investigation into child abuse

Mr Guzzo .....	1966
Mr Turnbull .....	1966

## Doctor shortage

Mrs Pupatello.....	1967
Mr Clement.....	1967

## Education funding

Mr Spina .....	1968
Mrs Ecker .....	1968

## Home care

Mr Bisson .....	1968
Mr Clement.....	1968

## PETITIONS

### Education funding

Mr Kennedy.....	1970
Mr Marchese.....	1970
Ms Di Cocco.....	1972

### Doctor shortage

Mr Martiniuk .....	1970
--------------------	------

### Home care

Mr Bartolucci.....	1970
Mr Martin .....	1971
Ms Martel .....	1971

### Protection of minors

Mr Wood.....	1971
Mr Beaubien .....	1972

### Sharon Reynolds

Mr Gerretsen.....	1971
-------------------	------

### Education tax credit

Mr Hoy .....	1972
Mr Martin .....	1972
Mr Tilson .....	1972
Mr Martin .....	1973

### Proposed industry site

Mr Wettlaufer .....	1973
---------------------	------

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

<b>Time allocation, government notice of motion number 44,</b> <i>Mrs Ecker</i>	
Mr Newman .....	1973
Mr Dunlop .....	1973
Mr Bryant .....	1975
Mr Marchese.....	1976
Mr Galt .....	1978
Mr Conway .....	1980
Mr Bisson .....	1983
Mr Wood.....	1985
Mr Martin .....	1986
Agreed to .....	1987

Continued overleaf