



No. 78A

N° 78A

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 37th Parliament

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

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Monday 10 December 2001

Lundi 10 décembre 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

Monday 10 December 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 10 décembre 2001

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31 March 2002 and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

MUNICIPAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): In 1995, Mike Harris wrote a letter to the president of Vaughan CARES to explain the Tory party's view on waste management in Ontario. He concluded the letter with this promise: "Please be assured that no municipality will be forced against its will by a Harris government to accept another municipality's garbage."

I have written an open letter to the five Tory leadership candidates to reaffirm this Tory promise. In my riding, Canadian Waste Services has proposed to increase the Richmond landfill site by six times its present size. I agree with the many residents who have written letters, phoned my office and signed petitions that this expansion is not in the better interests of this community.

The town of greater Napanee has passed a resolution that it is against the Richmond landfill proposal. Just last week, the municipality of Tweed rejected a proposal to create a 5,000-acre megadump within its boundaries.

The people of Ontario deserve to know if the five would-be leaders will respect the wishes of their communities when they say no to landfills. We also need to know what commitment these would-be leaders will make to our environment or if it will be more of the same tax-cut-at-all-cost agenda that has taken its toll on the landscape of Ontario.

HEART AND SOUL:
THE STORY OF BETHESDA-REACH

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I'm pleased to rise in the House to acknowledge the publication of a volume of local history about the former village of Bethesda. This book of 225 pages is entitled Heart and Soul: The Story of Bethesda-Reach. It will be officially launched December 15 at Utica Hall.

The Bethesda-Reach Women's Institute has worked tirelessly on this project for the past 18 months. The authors chiefly responsible for the book are Mildred Evans, Barb Evans, Corinne Croxall and Mary Jean Till. I would like to congratulate them on their efforts and also extend congratulations to all those who helped out in any way. The compilation of local history such as this is always a true community effort. I understand some of the research was originally conducted by the late Hilda Bailey, commemorating the centennial year, 1967. This book includes maps, photos and fascinating stories about local residents.

Many things have changed in Durham riding over the past 100 years, but one of the things that hasn't changed is a respect for the people and places of our past. This book shows that by remembering the past, we can better understand the present and face the future with pride and confidence.

As you are no doubt aware, the women's institute organization has helped to ensure that Ontario's rural communities continue to be vibrant and caring places to live, work and raise our families. Through the Tweeds-muir histories, they have documented the life and times of rural communities across Ontario.

I'd like to extend my thanks and best wishes to the Bethesda-Reach Women's Institute on their latest project. I am confident that their book will be a bestseller in Durham riding and indeed Durham region. In fact, it would be a great Christmas gift for any of the members to consider purchasing.

SOUND BERMS

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): Minister of the Environment, I rise to bring forth an issue that demands your immediate attention. The Chief Firearms Office has been visiting gun clubs, enforcing the requirement to build sound berms by 2003. Made out of clean fill and dirt, they generally cost \$80,000 to \$90,000.

However, Atlantic Packaging and Ontario Disposal are offering free berms composed of pulp and paper mill

sludge. The problem is, there may be other forms of sludge in this composition. The berm in Oshawa has been tested positive for E coli. Another in Madoc has been ordered removed. A berm is to be built in my own riding at the East Elgin Sportsman's Association any day, on a sand plain where the water table is less than 10 feet deep. This will go ahead, despite the fact that no one knows how safe these mountains of sludge are.

By mixing the sludge with sand, Ontario Disposal gets around the loophole in regulation 347 of the Environmental Protection Act; they call it a product. Your ministry refuses to regulate products. Minister, you've been painfully silent on the issue, and you're more than aware of it. You quietly visited the Oshawa club; you know that there may be septage in these berms. Your silence and refusal to regulate mountains of sludge are leaving these gun clubs hung out to dry. Under the EPA, they will be liable for any adverse effect, yet you and your ministry continue to refuse to warn them.

Minister, you must speak up today and show that leadership that you aspire to and tell us how you plan to stop these mountains of sludge across this province.

SANTA CLAUS

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): It is the season to be merry. Today I would like to speak about that merry, jolly man, Santa Claus, easily one of the world's most popular and mysterious characters.

We know he lives in the North Pole with Mrs Claus, and we know he and his elves load the sleigh each Christmas Eve for a marathon trip around the world. But little is known about his past.

Some historians believe the legend started in the fourth century when Nicholas, the first bishop of Myra in Asia Minor—today modern Turkey—became known for his kindness to children and for helping the needy. Santa has been depicted as everything from a pixie, a leprechaun, even a gnome. But credit must go in part to the Coca-Cola Co that the jolly fellow has an image that is well-known and enduring around the world as a plump man in a red suit and white beard.

Popularly known as the Sundblom Santas after the artist, the series of Santa Claus oil paintings were used for a number of special Christmas advertisements for Coca-Cola beginning in 1931 and carrying through the next six decades. The Sundblom Santa is remarkable for several reasons, most notably because of the way he captured the essence of St Nicholas. Sundblom created an enduring symbol, the spirit of kindness and giving that is Christmas.

NORTHERN MEDICAL SCHOOL

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): As the northwestern Ontario campaign to seek equal status for Thunder Bay for the northern medical school heats up, it seems to me that a few things need to be said about how unfairly this process has so far played

out. This strikes me as particularly timely, as it is my understanding that Health Minister Clement will be in Thunder Bay sometime this week and Sudbury Mayor Jim Gordon will be gracing us with his presence early next week.

As far as Mayor Gordon is concerned, there are a few questions I believe he must answer. First of all, Mayor Gordon, at what point did you decide to stab Thunder Bay in the back? After a period of working co-operatively with Thunder Bay on the original dual-campus model, when exactly did you learn that Sudbury was to be given the full medical school? When that happened, why did you not inform Thunder Bay Mayor Boshcoff that the original proposal was no longer being considered, or to put an even more sinister edge on this, were you working all along in opposition to the original proposal?

If my remarks sound a tad bitter, I will freely acknowledge that they are. Many people in northwestern Ontario have worked very hard to make this project a reality, and quite frankly they felt at the end of the day that they had been duped. Clearly the finger should be pointed at Mayor Gordon.

For those who view this medical school as only having long-term benefits, let's look at the fact that 19 physicians have agreed to come to Sudbury to work since the April announcement. Clearly the fact that a medical school is to be located in one's community has short-term benefits as well in terms of physician recruitment.

I say to Health Minister Clement, if you are remotely sincere about your stated goal of attracting more physicians to the north, you will see how vital it is that Thunder Bay become an equal partner in this new medical school.

1340

ONTARIANS WITH DISABILITIES LEGISLATION

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): I stand today to thank all those people across Ontario who participated in the hearings, however limited, that took place in Ottawa, Windsor, Toronto, Thunder Bay and Sudbury with regard to Bill 125, the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, and the shadow hearings in London on Saturday. My apologies to all those who couldn't attend because we didn't come to your community.

It needs to be known that we in this caucus encouraged the government to take their time, to wait until January, February or March, when they could go out and visit more smaller and larger communities in different places across this province. It's a huge province and transportation is a huge challenge, particularly at this time of year. Many people did not have their voices heard. Many of you have been working on this effort to remove barriers for those living with disabilities for a long time now, some since the early 1970s, working to have an effective Ontarians with Disabilities Act enacted

in Ontario. I heard you and our caucus heard you as you called for major amendments to Bill 125.

Ladies and gentlemen, today's the day. Today is a very important day in the very young life of this bill. We'll find out today if the government actually heard those submissions so ably delivered and if the government is serious about giving this bill some effectiveness and some teeth, because today they will table their amendments, or they won't, and we'll be watching.

NORTHERN ONTARIO WELDING SCHOOL

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I'm pleased to rise this afternoon to speak about the official opening of the Northern Ontario Welding School that I had the pleasure of attending in Barrie last Friday.

The Northern Ontario Welding School's approach to training is to provide students with the skills and work ethic required in today's workforce. With the school emulating a work environment with proper safety procedures, scheduling, reading of blueprints and instilling a good work ethic, students are prepared to meet the demands of the workforce.

Students work eight hours per day, either day or afternoon shifts, five days a week. Attendance is mandatory and progress is closely monitored. By course completion, students have a good idea of what to expect from the industry and how their own strengths and skills will meet the demands from potential employers.

Northern Ontario Welding School's training program is based on knowing the needs of industry and developing training programs to meet these needs. The school employs specialized instructors with many years of welding experience in industry and as teachers. Students benefit from the low student-teacher ratio, giving each student adequate individual attention and additional training as required to pass a test and become a certified welder.

I congratulate president Bill Mandris and his staff for this important investment in Simcoe county and for the use of our province.

HOME CARE

Mrs Sandra Papatello (Windsor West): I want to talk about Bill 130, the home care bill, a bill that should be withdrawn, a bill that we should not debate in this House, a bill that should be thrown right out the big window behind the Speaker's chair.

Because of this bill, which is a hostile takeover, a gag order of home care agencies across Ontario, people like Cathy Chisholm in Niagara will not be able to tell us, after this bill is passed, that there's a \$9.2-million shortfall in home care requirements in the Niagara region. There will not be a Cathy Chisholm to tell us that the brunt of these cuts are being faced by children; that waiting lists for speech, physiotherapy and occupational therapy have quintupled since last year; that just under 2,000

school-aged children were waiting for therapy, compared to just 400 in previous years.

This information will not be available to us because of your hostile takeover. What we know is, this is this government's attempt not to properly fund home care, to take beds away from hospitals and force people into home care, and to give no monies to properly service these individuals.

Let me say again, Bill 130, this home care bill, should be thrown right out the window behind the Speaker's chair. This bill should die today.

CHRISTMAS

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill): As Christmas fast approaches, many of the Thornhill residents I represent will not only celebrate the joy of a holiday, but will celebrate the importance of a very special holy day.

While Christmas has become associated with Santa Claus, Christmas trees, the traditions of giving presents, reuniting with family and sitting down to a bountiful meal, we must not forget that Christmas is a celebration by people of the Christian faith honouring the birth of Jesus.

Now in the second full week of Advent, Thornhill Christians are busy making preparations for the commemoration of the birth of Jesus. Each of the four weeks of Advent symbolizes a different way in which believers perceive Christ: through the flesh, the Holy Spirit, death and Christ's judgment of the dead. Special masses will be held in many parishes throughout Thornhill and across the province commemorating and celebrating the birth of Jesus.

I will have the pleasure of participating in the readings at St Paschal Baylon church on Christmas Day. The story of Christmas will be retold and passed on to generations of believers so that they will understand and appreciate the significance of this very special celebration.

While most of us take comfort knowing we will be able to spend time with our family and loved ones, I ask that we remember the less fortunate and extend our hands with friendship, love and faith during this special season.

Not only would I like to wish the residents of Thornhill a very merry Christmas, but I would like to extend my greetings to the over 1.8 billion Christians throughout the world who celebrate this special event. I would also like to extend a merry Christmas and happy holidays to all the members of the Legislature.

VISITORS

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am very pleased to welcome Mr Tony Gulotta, president of the Scarborough Centre Chamber of Commerce, who is in the east gallery this afternoon.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): While we are welcoming honoured guests, I would like to inform the members that we have with us today in the Speaker's

gallery a delegation from the House of Peoples' Representatives of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Please join me in welcoming our special guests.

COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received a favourable report from the Commissioners of Estate Bills with respect to Pr2, An Act respecting Wycliffe College. Accordingly, pursuant to standing order 86(e), the bill and the report stand referred to the standing committee on regulations and private bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SUPPLY ACT, 2001

LOI DE CRÉDITS DE 2001

Mr Tsubouchi, on behalf of Mr Flaherty, moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 149, An Act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for the public service for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 2002 / Projet de loi 149, Loi autorisant le paiement de certaines sommes destinées à la fonction publique pour l'exercice se terminant le 31 mars 2002.

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

The Chair of Management Board?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): This is commonly referred to as the Supply Act. It is the formal approval by the Legislative Assembly of all the money that is spent by the government of Ontario over the year.

This follows the process, first, of the budget, a committee hearing estimates and, finally, the concurrence by this assembly in the estimates process that was done by committee.

This bill gives the government the authority to spend money in accordance with those estimates.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): We have one motion today. I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to midnight on Monday, December 10, and Tuesday, December 11, for the purpose of considering government business.

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.

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

The division bells rang from 1350 to 1355.

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	Gill, Raminder	Munro, Julia
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	Mushinski, Marilyn
Beaubien, Marcel	Hodgson, Chris	Newman, Dan
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Coburn, Brian	Johns, Helen	Runciman, Robert W.
Cunningham, Dianne	Johnson, Bert	Sampson, Rob
DeFaria, Carl	Kells, Morley	Stewart, R. Gary
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.
Ecker, Janet	Maves, Bart	Tilson, David
Elliott, Brenda	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Galt, Doug	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Gilchrist, Steve	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Di Cocco, Caroline	McLeod, Lyn
Bartolucci, Rick	Dombrowsky, Leona	McMeekin, Ted
Bisson, Gilles	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Bountrogianni, Marie	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Boyer, Claudette	Hampton, Howard	Peters, Steve
Brown, Michael A.	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Caplan, David	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Levac, David	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Marchese, Rosario	Sergio, Mario
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	Smitherman, George
Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony	Sorbara, Greg

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 39; the nays are 36.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors): I ask for a unanimous consent to do a five-minute statement to celebrate International Human Rights Day.

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

Hon Mr Jackson: It is an honour today to invite all Ontarians to join in celebrating International Human Rights Day. Today marks the 53rd anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a landmark document recognizing the dignity and inherent rights of all people.

Ontario is significantly proud of its efforts to ensure the human rights of every individual in this province. In fact, Ontario has played a defining role in the history of human rights in our nation. In 1962, it became the first province to establish a Human Rights Commission and the first to legislate a Human Rights Code. That code, backed up by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, has set standards of human rights and entitlement

that are the envy of the world, rights that have strengthened and will continue to strengthen.

On May 1, 2001, as Minister of Citizenship, I announced that the Human Rights Code would be amended and improved after almost 40 years. This will be done in the new year, following public consultations.

1400

As a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, it is especially important this year for us to adhere to our fundamental commitment to safeguard the rights of all our citizens. Those attacks in the US were an assault on human rights, the like of which we have never suffered before in North America. The savage murder of thousands of innocent people, using passenger aircraft as missiles of destruction, is beyond our comprehension. And yet, while those attacks have caused us all to re-examine our lives, the people of Ontario have stood strong and united in their condemnation, no matter what their birthplace, background or faith. When a few misguided individuals directed hate toward Muslim, Hindu and Arab communities in our province, Ontarians quickly rallied to their neighbours' and citizens' support.

The government, led by Premier Mike Harris, was equally fast to reaffirm our fundamental commitment to protecting the rights of all our citizens. Our commitment to human rights advancement is greater today than ever before, and I believe that as a result of the events of September 11 we have become even stronger in our relentless fight against racism, bigotry and discrimination.

Ontarians have taken up arms against attacks to eliminate human rights, using weapons Canadians are renowned for: the weapons of peace, justice and tolerance. When action is required, rest assured that our province will take it. There will be no negotiations when it comes to maintaining human rights; they will be vigorously protected and jealously guarded.

This provincial Parliament's record demonstrates its continuing commitment to ensuring that all our citizens are treated equally. The record is apparent in our province's readiness to welcome immigrants from around the world, to embrace different cultures and to celebrate them. Here in Ontario, we receive 100,000 newcomers every year, more than any other province. To assist those newcomers in becoming full citizens as soon as possible, this government spends about \$45 million annually on resettlement programs. Immigrants built this nation and this province, and they continue to bolster its economic stability and success.

A further demonstration of this government's intent to allow all Ontarians the right to the benefits of full citizenship and full participation was demonstrated with the tabling of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, Bill 125, the most far-reaching legislation of its kind ever introduced in Canada. It is appropriate that this week an all-party legislative committee of this House will consider clause-by-clause amendments, after consultations with the broader disabilities community, to strengthen this important benchmark legislation.

Ontario's record of advancing the cause of human rights and fostering a climate of improved understanding and mutual respect between people is unparalleled. It is a record of which we are proud. It is a record on which we will continue to build.

This government has an outstanding record in supporting the rights of women, children and seniors. Across Ontario, the government will spend about \$145 million this year, in a number of ministries, on programs and services to prevent violence against women and their children. The government also has a number of initiatives to safeguard the future of our growing and aging seniors population, including a \$68-million initiative to combat Alzheimer's disease, the first such comprehensive plan in Canada.

Now more than ever, we must all be determined to take further steps to make this new century a true age of equal opportunity for all of our citizens, one in which each individual is treated with generosity, compassion, dignity and respect. To deny the human rights of one person simply denies the rights of us all.

Mr Gregory S. Sorbara (Vaughan-King-Aurora):

As my party's critic for human rights legislation, I am pleased and honoured to be able to rise today to say a few words on this, the 53rd anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Before I do so, I might just express a little bit of shock that in the context of unanimous consent to speak about Human Rights Day around the world, my friend from Burlington would take the opportunity to do a five-minute commercial for his government, but he'll have to live with that.

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): That's fine. You'll take five minutes to slag the government.

Mr Sorbara: No, I am not going to take five minutes to slag the government, I tell my friend.

The preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights includes the following: "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world"—I repeat, "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." The foundation of that is the inherent dignity, equality and inalienable rights of every member of the human family.

That declaration was passed by the United Nations on December 10, 1948; 53 years ago the world gathered together to make a profound commitment to the equality of every human being in the world. This is a living document and is the first pillar of the 20th-century human rights laws and the cornerstone of the universal human rights movement.

I think it is appropriate for us on this day to reflect on where we have been and where we yet need to go. Of course, that universal declaration came after the horrendous conflict of the Second World War, characterized in such large measure by the genocide of the Jewish people across Europe, and so fitting it is that that declaration came in the light of those atrocities. Yet since then, over

the course of the past 53 years, our challenge as legislators, whether in Ontario, Canada or around the world, becomes increasingly important.

Today, as I speak here, there is a brutal conflict going on on the other side of the globe, in Afghanistan, and the issue of human rights confronts us there. My friend Rick Patten, just moments ago, tabled a resolution in this Legislature about the severe violation of human rights in Burma. But I think today that we need not go across the globe, that we need to look at what we are doing right here in our own province and in our own country.

We have recently, in Ottawa, passed legislation that has the capacity to severely restrict human rights that we as a people have fought for for a long time. We need to be very vigilant that, in the wake of September 11 and the enhanced importance of security, we do not allow ourselves in this great nation to once again trample on basic human rights.

Now to respond, just for a moment, to my friend from Burlington who celebrates the record in Ontario, I agree with him that he has made, and we have made and successive governments have made important steps, but let me remind him, if he needs to do political battle on this subject at this time, that the human rights commission in Ontario is, unfortunately, an embarrassment. Individuals who go before that tribunal are asked to wait literally for years and years for justice.

Let us not think that the battle to protect and enhance human rights in Ontario is over. We have much to do for communities that historically have been on the margin and have suffered the tyranny of the majority in this province.

I invite all my friends in this Legislature to celebrate our undying commitment to human rights for all Ontarians and for all Canadians.

1410

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I'm pleased, on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus, to speak to this first International Day for Human Rights of the 21st century, and I will be joined by our leader, Howard Hampton.

It's an important day because it presents us with an opportunity, in this instance here, as legislators, to lend our voices in support of Amnesty International's call for a global coalition for human rights. The struggle for human rights is a global pursuit. It's been a passionate interest of many of us of my generation ever since our first awareness and vicarious sharing of the pains and the victories of the civil rights movement of the 1950s in the United States. Certainly for many of that same generation, the war in Vietnam and the struggle to end that war raised our consciousness of human rights and the need to engage in the struggle for international human rights.

We've continued our involvement with a wide range of human rights movements because we believe that justice and human dignity are fundamental rights that ought to be enjoyed by every person of every nation, every colour, every creed, every ethnicity and religion. Justice and human dignity are fundamental rights that

must be enjoyed by people of every gender and every sexual orientation.

I'm proud to say that just this morning I participated in a press conference here at Queen's Park calling upon all three parties in this assembly to support a resolution to condemn human rights violations in Burma. In 1990, Nobel laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, leader of the National League for Democracy, won 82% of the votes in Burma's national election. The military regime running that country, the SPDC, has refused to heed the will of the people and has confined Aung San Suu Kyi to house arrest for over 10 long years. She has called upon nations internationally to join in economic sanctions in condemnation of that military dictatorship in Burma, yet our own federal government continues to indirectly support Burma's dictatorship by facilitating and indeed allowing Canadian companies to trade and invest in Burma.

Listening to what other people in the world have to say is the first step toward advancing a global human rights agenda. In August, Rosario Marchese and I joined a delegation of elected leaders, labour representatives and community activists on a mission to Colombia known as the Minga campaign for peace and against violence. There, we listened to the stories of hundreds upon hundreds of people, many of them aboriginal people, women and members of displaced communities, who have suffered at the hands of right-wing paramilitary groups and drug cartels. Human Rights Watch reported that military thugs and drug lords in Colombia account for 85% of that country's political violence and human rights violations. In Colombia, like everywhere else in the world, it's the voiceless who suffer the most. In Colombia this last year alone, there have been an estimated 1,655 terrorist attacks. That makes for seven each day. People live in chaos. We met those people in Colombia. Four presidential candidates, one Minister of Justice, hundreds of police, Supreme Court judges, priests, journalists, teachers and labour leaders have been assassinated indiscriminately. Between 1995 and the year 2000, 3,656 innocent civilians were slaughtered, 7,300 people were kidnapped, and hundreds of towns and villages have been ransacked and burned, torched in a campaign of terror.

Given the extensive abuse of human rights in nations around the world, it is unfair to pick one nation and yet not another. That's where we, as Canadians, have to be very conscious of the fundamental rights and freedoms that people in this country acquire, not by birth here, not even by citizenship here, but by virtue of setting foot on Canadian soil—those fundamental rights and freedoms currently under attack by way of Bill C-36. That attack is as serious as any attack on human rights. We must stand vigilant in opposition to it.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): I want to join in the recognition of the United Nations' International Human Rights Day to point out to all members that while we are here, literally hundreds of thousands of people in Afghanistan are in danger of starving to death over the next few weeks.

I'm asking all members to join with organizations such as Oxfam Canada, Toronto's Faith Action Network, the Steelworkers Humanity Fund and UNICEF in engaging in a day of fasting and at the same time contributing financially to organizations like UNICEF so that they may provide and distribute food to the hundreds of thousands of people in Afghanistan, including tens of thousands of children, who are in danger of starving. If we cannot feed ourselves, we cannot observe human rights.

MEMBER'S BIRTHDAY

The Speaker: The member for Hamilton East on a point of order?

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): Actually, on a point of interest to the House, Mr Speaker, I'm sure all of us would join in extending best wishes for a happy birthday to my colleague Marie Bountrogianni from Hamilton Mountain.

VISITORS

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want to point out to all members that Cindy Haney, Doris Mengellberg and Pam Constable from the OSSTF are here. They are here to point out that there is a six-week strike in place by special education assistants against the Keewatin-Patricia school board, and they are asking for our support to find a resolution.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): My question is for the associate minister of health. Minister, the relationship between patient and doctor is sacred. People tell their doctors things they would not tell to anyone else. Their relationship depends on trust. But your government is threatening that relationship with your mishandling of patient files and information technology.

Today we learned that the privacy commissioner is investigating allegations that the privacy of patient files has been compromised. This comes, incredibly, just one month after doctors in Chatham started using your brand new record-keeping technology.

Minister, how could you have failed to make absolutely sure that the privacy of patient files would be maintained in your new system?

Hon Helen Johns (Minister without Portfolio [Health and Long-Term Care]): As the member opposite knows, the government is absolutely committed to ensuring privacy and confidentiality of patient records. The member also knows, because she's had an opportunity to talk to the Information and Privacy Commissioner today, as has the Ministry of Health—the Ministry of Health

tells me that they have heard from the Information and Privacy Commissioner and they have been informed by the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, that there is no investigation going forward. I know that she knows that, so I'm kind of in a quandary about the question.

This government has moved forward with smart systems for a health program. They are designed to enhance patient safety. They are enhanced to make sure that the personal health information of the client is secure, and we have been in contact with the Information and Privacy Commissioner through all of our discussions, because we're committed to ensuring that records are safe.

Mrs McLeod: I hope we're not going to play word games with something as serious as personal health information and its confidentiality. The privacy commissioner is conducting what she has termed "fact-finding" into the allegations that have been made against the violation of the privacy of patients' medical records. The allegations are serious, Minister. They are allegations that private companies have been given access to patient information, that patients were not fully informed about what happens to their health information, that raw data are given to technicians for tracking. There is even an allegation that a technician took home tapes with thousands of medical records and that some of those tapes were lost or misplaced.

There is nothing more sensitive than your medical record, and physicians who hold those records in trust were promised a technology that would be absolutely secure. I suggest to you that that is not what you have given to them, and your failure has shattered confidence in the privacy of medical records. Minister, what steps will you take now to ensure that that confidence can be restored and that patients' medical records will be kept completely confidential?

Hon Mrs Johns: The only person in this Legislature who's shattering confidence is the member opposite. As we were moving forward to bring the Ontario Family Health Network into place, we talked to the Information and Privacy Commissioner. I have a letter from the Information and Privacy Commissioner. The ministry tells me they have worked with the Information and Privacy Commissioner through every step of the process. They inform me that they have talked to the Information and Privacy Commissioner all the way through the process, and again today.

Let me say that this government is committed to providing quality health care. We're committed to ensuring that patient records are kept safe and sound. We have worked with the doctors in the Chatham-Kent area and the Ontario Medical Association to make sure that we provide the Ontario Family Health Network in that area. It's a pilot project—

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

1420

Mrs McLeod: Yes, indeed, the Ministry of Health did work with the privacy commissioner before the system

was set up. One month after the system is in operation, it becomes apparent that a hacker on the Internet system can access a patient's personal medical information. That is not good enough; a simple denial is not going to restore confidence in the privacy of records being maintained.

Minister, you knew how difficult it was going to be to make sure that computerized medical files would be secure. It is the single greatest issue that was raised in the privacy hearings when your government tabled health privacy legislation. But instead of dealing with the challenges, what you did was pull the bill and forge ahead with your new technology. We know that at the same time this is happening, you're forging ahead with new smart card technology.

Minister, I stress again the sensitivity of personal medical files. Will you assure us today that you will stop experimenting with patients' medical files and their records until you bring in health privacy legislation that ensures that patients have true protection?

Hon Mrs Johns: Let me say that we were very careful as we moved forward with the Ontario Family Health Network. As you know, someone can break into a doctor's office, open a file cabinet and get health records, and that can't be stopped. But when it comes to putting records on the computer, we had an organization, a recognized company, come in and look at the records. They told us that they tried for two days to hack into the records and were unable to do that. We have a written report from the company saying so. We also fully informed the patients. The patients have to enter into an agreement with the family health network to ensure that they understand what is happening.

So let me tell you that we have done a great deal to try and ensure that all records in the province of Ontario are safe. Personal health information is the most important piece of information a person has, and we are acting to ensure that those records are as safe as is humanly possible.

HÔPITAL MONTFORT MONTFORT HOSPITAL

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell) : Ma question s'adresse au ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones. Vendredi dernier, la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario a rendu sa décision au sujet de l'hôpital Montfort d'Ottawa. La cour rejette donc l'appel de votre gouvernement et confirme l'ordonnance de la Cour divisionnaire, qui annulait les directives de la Commission de restructuration des services de santé. La balle est dans votre camp, monsieur le ministre, ainsi que celle de votre collègue le ministre de la Santé.

La Cour d'appel reconnaît que l'hôpital Montfort est le seul hôpital en Ontario à fournir un vaste éventail de soins de santé et de la formation médicale dans un milieu francophone.

Monsieur le ministre, n'eût été le comité SOS Montfort, présidé par M^{me} Gisèle Lalonde, et la communauté francophone qui s'est mobilisée, la communauté francophone de l'Ontario aurait perdu une institution essentielle.

Il faut dire que ceux et celles qui connaissent l'hôpital Montfort savent très bien que la décision de la commission ne correspond absolument pas à la réalité. Monsieur le ministre, ma question : allez-vous enfin reconnaître l'importance fondamentale de Montfort ? Est-ce qu'on lui accordera le financement qui lui revient ? Aussi, est-ce que le gouvernement est prêt à faire des excuses publiques pour les dépenses inutiles encourues et aussi pour le stress et l'inquiétude causés à la communauté francophone ?

L'hon John R. Baird (ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones) : La provision de bons services de qualité en français pour les citoyens de la province est quelque chose qui est vraiment une priorité pour notre gouvernement. C'est quelque chose pour lequel on continuera de travailler très fort.

Vendredi matin, il y a eu la décision de la Cour suprême de la province de l'Ontario. Les juges ont pris six, sept, huit, neuf mois pour penser à leur décision et pour en créer une. Selon nous, il est très important de prendre le temps de lire une décision de plus de 60 pages. On va prendre quelques jours, quelques semaines pour avoir une bonne connaissance de la décision avant de prendre une décision.

Je vais dire à mon collègue, le porte-parole pour le Parti libéral dans le domaine des services en français, que la provision de bons services en français est quelque chose qui est vraiment important pour nous, et on va continuer de travailler très fort.

M^{me} Sandra Pupatello (Windsor Ouest) : Monsieur le ministre, vous avez dépensé des milliers de dollars pour tenter de réduire les droits linguistiques de la minorité dans cette province. Vous avez tenté de fermer cet hôpital, qui est à la base des services médicaux en langue française dans la province. Sans la Loi sur les services en français des Libéraux, vous auriez pu réussir.

Cinq années d'incertitude à Montfort ont eu des effets négatifs sur le moral du petit nombre de médecins et d'infirmières francophones que nous avons. Certains ont été forcés de partir. Un autre appel ferait encore plus de tort aux services de santé.

Monsieur le ministre, allez-vous mettre fin à votre guerre pour fermer Montfort ? Pouvez-vous promettre ici et maintenant que vous ne ferez pas appel de cette décision ?

L'hon M. Baird : C'est bien sûr quelque chose qui est très important. On a travaillé très fort comme gouvernement pour améliorer les services en français. La question de la provision de services en français, ce n'est pas la question devant nous. C'est la question de la provision de bons services de qualité en français, pas seulement dans la région d'Ottawa-Carleton et dans l'est de la province

mais partout dans la province. On va continuer de travailler très fort.

On a reçu une décision de la cour vendredi. C'est une décision de plus de 60 pages. Je sais qu'il y a des gens qui voudraient avoir une réponse cinq minutes après que la cour a rendu sa décision. Selon nous, il y a des choses qui sont près de la constitution, qui sont près d'autres choses légales, et il est important de prendre quelques jours au moins d'avoir la chance de lire la décision de la cour et aussi d'avoir une connaissance de comment on va suivre la décision.

Bien sûr, on va continuer de travailler très fort pour être sûr que l'on continuera d'offrir non seulement des services en français mais de bons services de qualité en français.

Mrs Pupatello: Minister, you were asked a simple question: will you be appealing this? We are telling you that, on behalf of the francophones of Ontario, we expect that you will not. You have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars fighting the francophone community over this hospital and you owe it to them not to appeal the decision.

We in this party celebrate the Monfort Hospital and we celebrated those bilingual services being available. You have fought them every step of the way. We are asking you, Minister, today to stand on your feet and say, "We will not fight Montfort. We will fight to maintain these services." After five years, Montfort today was celebrating and we on this side of the House celebrated with them. Minister responsible for francophone affairs, will you stand in the House today and say you will not appeal this decision?

L'hon M. Baird : Selon moi et selon tous les députés de mon côté de la Chambre, il est très important d'avoir une connaissance des ramifications du jugement. On va prendre quelques jours pour entendre les résultats du jugement.

Il est aussi très important d'avoir un dialogue entre nous et les gens à l'hôpital Montfort pour être certains que les bons services de qualité sont disponibles non seulement dans la communauté d'Ottawa-Carleton mais aussi dans l'est de l'Ontario, avec la formation et les besoins de tous les francophones de la province.

Il est très important pour nous de prendre ces quelques jours et aussi d'avoir l'opportunité de parler avec nos partenaires dans le domaine de la provision des services en français et avec les gens qui ont appuyé fortement l'hôpital Montfort dans le passé.

ALGOMA STEEL CORP

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is to the acting Premier and it concerns what is happening on this very day in Sault Ste Marie.

People in Sault Ste Marie are very concerned that the core of their economy, Algoma Steel, which provides tens of thousands of full-time jobs in Ontario, may be allowed to go under. For months the steel workers have been at the table trying to put together a reorganization

package. The question is, where has your government been and where has the federal government been? Why haven't you been at the table, demanding that the note holders and the banks come together and put together a package to reposition Algoma Steel and the tens of thousands of full-time jobs that it represents? Why aren't you at the table? Why haven't you demanded that the Liberals in Ottawa join you at the table? Are you prepared to allow tens of thousands of full-time jobs to fail?

Hon Chris Hodgson (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): The Minister of Economic Development and Trade wants to answer this question.

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Economic Development and Trade): Contrary to what the leader of the third party is suggesting, the Ontario government has been very much at the table with respect to ongoing discussions with Algoma Steel, the bondholders, and others who are participating in this decision. In fact, as I understand it, there will be an appearance in court later today, this afternoon, with respect to some changes in the agreement that was rejected by the bondholders last week. So it's clear we are participating. We've been playing a very active role in trying to save Algoma.

1430

Mr Hampton: We're now at H-hour, D-Day in this process, and your government's response thus far is only to be concerned about the pension fund. That's important, but you've got a much broader, much bigger leadership role. What we've needed from your government is to say clearly and publicly that you are not prepared to allow Algoma Steel to go under, and to say clearly and publicly that the Liberals from Ottawa should join you at the table and should say to the noteholders and the mortgage holders that there must be a restructuring of the debt, that there must be a repositioning of the company, because Ontario cannot afford to lose another 10,000 jobs on top of the 28,000 full-time jobs that were already lost in November.

Are you prepared to say that clearly and forcefully today, so that the noteholders, the mortgage holders and the banks cannot back away from this, that they must be at the table, that they must commit to a repositioning package today? Say it now, loud and clear.

Hon Mr Runciman: What I will say is what we've been saying for some time. We've had Mr Bill Farlinger, current chairman of the board at Ontario Power Generation, representing the government in the restructuring discussions, in an effort to protect the interests of the pensioners covered by the pension benefits guarantee fund. We've done that. We're playing that role. That's a role we feel is critical to the pensioners at Algoma. We will continue to play that role. We have no intention to go beyond that commitment. We feel there are efforts being made, in a very strenuous way, to find accommodation with all the stakeholders, Ontario being one of them. We remain hopeful that there will be an accommodation.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Final supplementary, the member for Sault Ste Marie.

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): Minister, that's just not acceptable. The future of my community is in jeopardy. The Steelworkers have slogged away for six months trying to save Algoma Steel. We're five minutes to midnight on this deal. You could breathe real life into Algoma's restructuring plan by coming to the table and playing a strong role, instead of letting the noteholders dictate the future of my community. Will you at least get the Premier to co-sign an all-party letter, on behalf of your government, demanding joint federal-provincial action that will save Algoma and the future of Sault Ste Marie?

Hon Mr Runciman: We are certainly concerned about the impact any negative decision could have on the community. We want to work with the community to assist them. We've been doing a number of things over the past few years to help diversify the Soo economy. We will continue to work with them to try and address those broader concerns.

With respect to Algoma, we are playing a role; we are at the table; we feel we're filling an appropriate role there. The federal government, as the member opposite indicates, has not been to the table. I would encourage him to address his concerns in that direction.

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is to the Minister of Health. People across Ontario today learned that the confidentiality of their health records once again may be at stake under this government. This time it's your electronic patient information database. You indicated earlier that there is not a problem. But we spoke to the Information and Privacy Commissioner, who told us this morning that she is going to demand a meeting to seek clarity as to what is happening, that the meeting will take place on Wednesday of this week, that so far there has been no full program review of what is happening and that she wants to understand how confidential information could possibly have gone home with someone.

Can you tell us why an investigation, a meeting with the privacy commissioner, is now required by the privacy commissioner when you're trying to tell everyone everything is fine?

Hon Helen Johns (Minister without Portfolio [Health and Long-Term Care]): As I said earlier, we've been working with the Information and Privacy Commissioner over the last number of months to ensure that this goes forward. We've also not entered into the Ontario Family Health Network until we had the OK from the Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Let me say that I'm always happy to meet with the Information and Privacy Commissioner. I believe that the Information and Privacy Commissioner provides valuable service to the Legislature. I'm always open for a

meeting with the Information and Privacy Commissioner. We're happy to do that.

Up until this point, we have kept her informed, we have let her know about the things that we are doing with the Ontario Family Health Network, and she has written a letter to explain some of her happiness with that. If she wants to meet with me, I'm sure that she will be calling, and I of course will openly welcome her to my office.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Supplementary?

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): Minister, we'd appreciate if you'd table the letter that you have been swinging around so we can see what the date of that is.

You also don't clearly understand that Ms Cavoukian is meeting on Wednesday with the smart systems people to find out what has happened specifically with respect to the allegations raised this morning. Not just some simple meeting to come and say hello, she is coming to meet with you to discuss the serious allegations which are now a matter of public record.

It's very clear, Minister, that your system for storing personal medical files was not designed with privacy protection as the priority, but it's also very clear that implementation of such a system demands that level of the highest security of people's medical information. It certainly doesn't mean that a technician can take home tapes for several nights, tapes that include thousands of medical records.

We want to know from you specifically today, what concrete steps are you taking to deal with these very serious allegations, and what are you going to do to reassure the public that the security of their medical records is guaranteed?

Hon Mrs Johns: Mr Speaker, I have to tell you that it's difficult to take constructive criticism from the party opposite. When their government was in power in 1992, the provincial audit report said that the ministry at that time "had not defined access rules and ensured that existing controls ... were adequate to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the information....We determined that over 12,000 computer users could potentially access and change registration information without authorization."

We have not gone there. What we have is a small project with 7,000 people rostered in the Chatham-Kent area. We have those patients talking to their doctors. They understand what the system is. We have a system that was discussed with the Information and Privacy Commissioner. We have worked all the way along with companies to ensure that we could maintain records in a safe way—

The Speaker: The minister's time is up.

HIGHWAY 407 TOLLS

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Somebody's not telling the truth about the tolls on the 407.

Just before the last election, your government very clearly said that you had an agreement that would protect

the users. You said that this agreement would mean that tolls could increase by about 3 cents per kilometre after 15 years—after 15 years, up 3 cents a kilometre.

In a document that the 407 corporation has released, they've said something quite different. They've said that, provided certain traffic flows are met, tolls may be raised "without limit."

After a two-year fight with the Privacy Commissioner, you would be aware that on January 14, the public will finally see this deal that has been kept secret.

My question to you is this: who was accurate? Was it you, the government, that, when you sold the 407, said tolls could increase by only 3 cents a kilometre after 15 years? Or is the 407 corporation telling the truth that tolls may be raised without limit provided certain traffic flows are met?

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Transportation): First off, I'd like to respond to the member's question from the standpoint of his implication that the government didn't want the contract released. The government has always stated from day one that we would release the contract to the public pending the decision of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. The rules have always been there. The legislation is stated in such a way. The company itself took the position that under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act they would apply for a third-party exemption, so the company had concerns about certain things in the contract being released. We said to the Privacy Commissioner, "It's your decision." At no time, honourable member, has this government refused to release that document. We said it was up to Information and Privacy Commissioner.

1440

Mr Phillips: I never even asked that question. You've got the wrong briefing note, for heaven's sake. My question is about ripping off the users of the 407. It's not about the privacy commissioner and whatnot. Let's get with the program here.

I had a phone call today from a very large corporation that tries to use the 407, and when they decided they'd use it they took your advice about the controls. They were paying \$200,000 a year. They scheduled their work so they would be on off-peak hours. In May of last year, 18 months ago, their fee went up to \$250,000. In January of this year, it went to \$300,000, and with the new announcement, it will go to almost \$600,000. It will have almost tripled in the space of 27 months—less than that actually.

My question to you is the same one that I asked just a moment ago when you answered a completely different question. Who was telling the truth? Was it you, when you announced the sale of this and said that tolls could only go up three cents a kilometre, or the 407 corporation, when they said tolls can go up without limits? Who is right in this case, Minister?

Interjection.

Hon Mr Clark: It's nice to see that the member for Vaughan-King-Aurora is actually in the House today.

When the—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): When you get into that, you just end up getting yelled at. I encourage the member not to refer to that. They'll refer to the people who aren't—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Clark: When the honourable member asks a number of questions within a question, I do the best to answer. According to the toll threshold formula, the ETR cannot increase peak rates over 1.5% for 2000 and 2% for each 2001 and 2002, excluding inflation. It's as clear as that.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Over the last couple of weeks I've heard Liberal members across the floor criticize you and our government for the perceived lack of action we've taken on the made-in-Ontario safety net program. Minister, could you please set the record straight? What has actually taken place with this very important program? Constituents in my riding are well aware of the program, and they would like to hear the details of what our government is doing to help them in the long term. I ask you, Minister, to stand in your place and clear up the foggy minds from across the floor.

Hon Brian Coburn (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs): When I was at the Ontario Federation of Agriculture annual convention last week, I announced the support that I had from our government—my caucus and cabinet members—on the made-in-Ontario strategy that had resulted from the input I had from all the commodity groups. I had received their support to move forward into negotiations with the federal government, and as part of those negotiations, I was asked to highlight five key elements: crop insurance is available in 53 commodities; income support program for producers of grain and oil seeds; self-directed risk management which is offered to fruit, vegetable and maple syrup producers; both governments work toward enhancing the net income stabilization program; a disaster assistance program to be used as required when faced with circumstances well beyond our control.

These five elements are part of the negotiations, and we're waiting on the federal government to respond to our request.

Mr Johnson: Minister, thank you for that response. I appreciate your informing this House and my constituents that our government has worked hard in helping farmers across the province.

There is still one thing I don't understand. If we've already developed a package that all commodity groups can work with, what is the holdup in implementing it?

Hon Mr Coburn: As you know, to make this agreement work you need agreement from the three parties: certainly the producers, our government and the federal government. Right now, our proposed safety net program

is with the federal government, and we're waiting on their response. Hopefully today Finance Minister Martin will make reference to the needs that we have in the agricultural community here in Ontario.

When we announced the \$90-million one-time payment, we went \$20 million beyond what we needed to do in order to meet the federal-provincial agreement. Our commitment is very much in favour of the needs of the agricultural community, and I hope, after the budget speech in Ottawa today, that they will be as well.

MFP FINANCIAL SERVICES

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex): My question is to the Chair of Management Board. Minister, MFP Financial Services Ltd and MFP Technologies Ltd have extensive contracts for financing equipment and for providing services with your government. In fact, you paid approximately \$88 million to them in this past fiscal year.

I first raised this issue with you in a letter on September 4. Further, in reply to my question on October 3, you said, "certainly all the contracts we have are on contract and certainly appear to be aboveboard." Now the city of Toronto is the latest municipality to line up and sue MFP.

Can you assure this Legislature and, more importantly, can you assure the taxpayers of Ontario, that all of your contracts with MFP Financial Services Ltd and MFP Technologies Ltd are above reproach?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): I do reference the response back on October 3 as well, at which time the member asked me this particular question. At that time, I said, "As a result of seeing your letter, I've asked our ministry, Management Board, to investigate all the contracts dealing with this particular company. They have advised me already that in fact we have no legal disputes between them and any of our government ministries at this point in time." Also, they have assured me there is compliance with their contractual liabilities, their obligations with the government of Ontario.

I believe that the civil servants at Management Board, who act basically as auditors for this government internally, are doing a good job. They have investigated this, as I have asked them to do, and they're satisfied at this point in time that there is contractual compliance with this particular company.

Mr Crozier: Minister, considering that Brock University had its contracts with MFP revised, and considering that the region of Waterloo is suing MFP over contract discrepancies, and considering that the city of Windsor yanked a \$2-million leasing agreement from MFP and is conducting a forensic audit of all its contracts, and considering that the Essex-Windsor Solid Waste Authority is conducting a forensic audit of its contracts, and considering that the Union Water System is conducting a forensic audit of its contract with MFP, I would suggest to you, as I did in September and again in October, that you call for the Provincial Auditor to conduct a special forensic audit

on all past and present contracts with MFP Financial Ltd and MFP Technologies. Would you agree?

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: The member has absolutely no information whatsoever to ask for this type of an action. When this was brought up to me through the letter from the particular member, and also in the House again, I asked the civil service, the Management Board—by the way, I don't understand why you haven't got confidence in the employees who work for the Management Board of this government.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: I hear some chirping back there. I have indicated in the past that we have good civil servants who work for us in this government, certainly in Management Board of Cabinet. I have all the confidence in them and their abilities when we've asked them to review the contracts. When they say back to us that they find compliance with those contracts, I have to believe them. I believe and have confidence in them.

This member has absolutely no information on which to say that this government does not have total compliance with our contracts.

1450

NORTHERN COMMUNITIES CAPITAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka): My question is for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. The new capital assistance program that you unveiled last week in the Legislature in response to consultations with northerners means that constituents from Parry Sound-Muskoka and right across the north will benefit from investments in priority projects in the region.

Minister, could you clarify for all members of this House what the rationale and restrictions are on this new program?

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of Northern Development and Mines): The northern communities capital assistance program provides funding for the construction, acquisition or renovation of facilities and essential services that create, renew or enhance the infrastructure of northern communities. Northern Ontario lower-tier municipalities, First Nations, local services boards, and not-for-profit corporations providing community services in areas without municipal structure are eligible to apply.

The northern communities capital assistance program application form is available on the northern Ontario heritage fund Web site or may be obtained from government information centres. Applications must be received by the heritage fund by December 31, 2002. I would encourage northerners to work with the Mike Harris government by submitting their proposals to the heritage fund so that together we can continue to build strong northern communities.

Mr Miller: Thank you very much, Minister. You're certainly doing a great job representing the constituents of the north.

This new capital assistance program sounds great. I know my constituents and northerners will be preparing their proposals for review. In fact, I just got a letter from the reeve of South River looking for funding and wondering if there's any funding for an underground water distribution system for the village of South River. Perhaps he'll be able to participate in this program and get that new water distribution system.

Eighty-two million dollars is indeed a significant amount, and the north is very happy about it. What does the announcement actually mean for the individual communities? For the benefit of all members of this House, can you translate that into some real dollars for the individual communities of the north?

Hon Mr Newman: In communities like Magnetawan, with a population of 184, and south Algonquin, with a population of 1,237, they would each be eligible for funding of up to \$200,000. For communities like Hilton Beach, with a population of 196, and Gogama, with a population of 625, they each would be eligible for up to \$100,000 in funding.

Some other examples of funding levels for various communities across the north would include Dryden, which has a population of 7,587 people. Dryden is eligible for up to \$1.13 million. Neebing, with a population of 2,044, would be eligible for up to \$300,000 in funding. I would encourage communities across the north to bring forward their applications to the heritage fund so that together we can build even stronger northern communities.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of Energy. The wheels keep falling off your dirty deal to privatize and deregulate Ontario's electricity. Today it's John Mayberry, president of Dofasco, employer of over 7,000 people, who says very clearly that because of what you're doing, privatization and deregulation—electricity prices will increase by between 20% and 40%—there will be more risk and more unpredictability and volatility. Then he says it will cost jobs in Ontario.

Are you listening to the John Mayberrys? If you are, it seems to me you either have to guarantee Dofasco and the other companies that rates are not going to go up or you have to cancel your stupid idea of privatizing and deregulating Ontario's electricity system. Which is it?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): I just remind the honourable member that the only two countries in the industrialized world that haven't undertaken to introduce competition in the electricity sector are Canada and France. I guess there's a lot of stupidity in the world.

The honourable member will know that we cannot continue, as Mr Mayberry suggests in his op-ed piece in the *Globe and Mail*, to have average consumers subsidize the large companies in this province. Some companies in this province receive a portion of their electricity that is

below cost. It contributed to the debt over the years. We are opening up a competitive market. Those companies will buy electricity on the competitive market, but to ensure that we transition these companies in a sensible way, the honourable member will know we've already filed a regulation for a four-year transition for companies that need help in adjusting to the competitive market.

Mr Hampton: This is a friend of your government. This is Dofasco, a company that contributes thousands of dollars to the Conservative Party every year. This is what Mr Mayberry says: "Dofasco has gone to all potential suppliers for electricity pricing and crunched the real numbers. Our data show prices will go up and consumers will have little ability to protect themselves." Whether they're big companies or little companies, what he points out, over and over again, is that your strategy to privatize electricity will simply mean that those who buy up Ontario Power Generation will want to sell their power in the United States, where they can get double the price. He, at Dofasco, now recognizes that.

Why are you so intent on killing more jobs, doing more damage to Ontario's economy, when it's already very fragile? Why won't you listen to one of your friends who's simply saying, "This is a bad idea. You don't have it right. Don't do it."

Hon Mr Wilson: The Minister of Economic Development and Trade and I met with Mr Mayberry last Wednesday. He made the same points as he did in the *Globe* article, but he also makes one point in the *Globe* article where he is in error. He says that competition will be bad for the average household. The average household is today subsidizing large companies in this province. That was the policy of the two parties across the way. We are transitioning those companies over four years. Over four years Mrs Jones will continue to subsidize those companies, as I will on my monthly bill. I'm willing to do that over four years until there is some competition so they can buy at competitive market prices. Nobody else in the province is getting that deal.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): My question is for the Minister of Education. Right now there are school boards around the province talking to parents, to local schools, about school closings that you want to arrange. You're trying to close Epsom school in Durham region. You're trying to close St Bernadette school in Toronto, and St Veronica. You're also trying to close schools in Hamilton and Windsor—St Bernard's in Hamilton. Minister, all around the province, it's your school closing policy forcing boards into conflict with parents and so on. You've been closing schools at triple the rate of other governments.

We've learned that in Durham region you've given them an extension. You said that their forced policy to close schools will get special treatment. It doesn't have to report until the middle of February. It'll still be eligible for next year. Minister, I have a question for you: with

your incredibly senseless school closing policy, will you at least give all the other boards in Ontario the save privilege you gave your home board?

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): The honourable member doesn't know what he's talking about. First of all, the responsibility for deciding school allocation is as it always has been. I understand the honourable member keeps not understanding this, obviously deliberately. The allocation decisions are part of what a school board and school board trustees are responsible for. That is always the way it has been.

Secondly, the policy is also very clear that school boards must consult with the community. I have yet to see a school board allocation proposal that has not benefited from consultation with the community. Many times the school board might well adjust it, but at the end of the day, it is up to the school boards to decide how best to allocate their resources. That policy has been very clear. There has been no change.

1500

Mr Kennedy: The chair of the Durham board and Ismail Patel, the planner there, tell us they've got an exemption to that, that they don't have a December 30 deadline, they've got a different deadline. They know where to go when they want something changed to do with a school closing. They come to you, because it's your provincial school closing policy, and they're going to close Epsom school in your riding because they have to build new schools someplace else. It's senseless. It's closing schools in St Catharines, in Windsor, in Essex county; it's closing them in Toronto and Ottawa. Minister, what those people want to know is, do they at least get fair treatment from you? Will you extend the deadline for every other school board, the way you did it for your home board in Durham?

Hon Mrs Ecker: The allegations of the honourable member I find quite offensive. No board in this province is getting special treatment. Every board in this province frequently sits down and works out with the ministry flexibility arrangements on a whole range of rules. We've done it for the Toronto school board—obviously the honourable member didn't think that was special treatment—and we've done it for other school boards on a whole range of things, because at the end of the day we continue to work with school boards to make sure they are making the best decisions on behalf of their students and their parents.

PATHS TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY WEB SITE

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): My question is to the Minister for Citizenship. This year has been a truly significant one for persons with disabilities in this province, culminating with the tabling on November 5 of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, Bill 125. This bill, which builds on the nearly \$6 billion spent annually by this government on programs and services to assist people

with disabilities, was subject to public hearings that took place across the province, ending last Friday.

Last week, this government also unveiled Paths to Equal Opportunity, a new Web site designed to help business and service providers make their buildings, products and services accessible to customers and employees with disabilities. I am sure persons with disabilities in my riding and those throughout the province will be able to take advantage of this innovative Web site. Could you provide us with more details on what this site provides?

Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors): First of all, I'd like to state that employers across Ontario are learning that persons with disabilities are a very valuable source of new employment in our province, and as such, they're also learning that these people have incredibly good records for loyalty and ability in the services they perform for their employer. The Paths to Equal Opportunity Web site is a practical information tool for those employers and the disabilities community on how to remove barriers and to open doors for employment for persons with disabilities. This is a unique Web site in Canada, given that it has special features that change the font size and the colour formatting for persons with visual impairments and has keyboard shortcuts for persons who can't manipulate a mouse. It's the most technically advanced Web site of its kind in all of Canada.

Its call letters are www.equalopportunity.on.ca, and I encourage all employers in Ontario to look into this innovative site.

Mr Hardeman: Bill Wilkerson, co-founder and CEO of the Global Business and Economic Roundtable on Addiction and Mental Health and the author of *The Business Case for Accessibility*, is a passionate supporter of the argument that persons with disabilities represent a huge business and economic opportunity for Ontario and Canada. Mr Wilkerson, I understand, was with you when the Web site was launched at the fully accessible Granite Brewery restaurant in Toronto, where he spoke of the economic opportunities that will open up when business removes barriers for customers and employees with disabilities.

Minister, will you tell us more about the advantages to be gained by opening doors for customers in the business sector and by the employers creating job opportunities that nurture the skills of persons with disabilities?

Hon Mr Jackson: This government has made a significant commitment in its funding programs with respect to enabling change, which involves opening opportunities on a wide range of opportunities, whether it's volunteerism or access to employment. We're very pleased that this Paths to Equal Opportunity Web site demonstrates about 17 examples of specific businesses like Loblaws, Laidlaw Transport, Coca-Cola, the Granite Brewery and others that have done innovative ways in which they've worked with the disabilities community to modify their workplace—the guidelines that employers have been looking for as to how they can improve access.

The Greater Toronto Hotel Association, in partnership with our ministry on a \$63,000 enabling-change program, developed one of Canada's leading programs to train the hospitality industry in the city of Toronto. I'm pleased to report the successes that we're enjoying in this city. The Marriott Hotel, for example, has TTY machines available to their guests; visual fire alarms are available for the deaf; the modified—

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

COMMUNAL WATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS

Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin): I have a question for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. I want to bring to your attention and the attention of all members the plight of many of my constituents connected to private communal water systems. These residents are facing an impossible situation. Their water systems clearly do not meet provincial standards. The cost of testing the water has also already placed a huge financial burden on the owner and/or residents. These systems need significant capital outlays to ensure safe, clean drinking water.

In Algoma-Manitoulin, there are hundreds of people in this situation. For example, the Peace Tree subdivision in Heyden will be in need of significant capital improvements to meet the standards.

Minister, what steps have you taken to provide the necessary assistance to ensure that the residents relying on communal private water systems will have safe, clean drinking water?

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of Northern Development and Mines): That question is best answered by the Minister of the Environment. Chris?

Interjection: The acting minister.

Hon Chris Hodgson (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Thanks to my colleague the Minister of Northern Development for referring this question to me.

I think I understand the question. You're concerned about some of the communal water systems in northern Ontario that have to come into compliance with the new Ministry of the Environment regulation on small waterworks, and they are having a hard time figuring out how they are going to be able to afford to bring that up to the new standard.

It's something the Minister of the Environment has been working on, consulting with small communities. It's something that our caucus is very concerned about, and I'm sure all members in the House are concerned that small systems should be safe. We should make sure that they are funded to be safe. It's getting those two things to work together, to make sure it's practical, because you don't want to be paying too much money when it could be cheaper to drill a well, yet we have these systems in place and we want to make sure they are brought up to the right standard.

Mr Brown: Minister, the subdivision I cited was in an unorganized township, so there is no municipal government to deal with this.

I want to bring to your attention also that the OSTAR program is to fund one third of the capital funding of municipal water systems. One third is not enough to make it work. I recently was at the opening of one water system that was just opened in the township of Sable-Spanish Rivers, and they tell me that they received 90% provincial support to open that water system. How in the world do you believe that the town of Bruce Mines, for example, which has been sentenced to 18 months of boiling water already and has no way of funding a new communal water treatment plant—how do you expect that on one third funding they can possibly provide water for the residents of Bruce Mines in the near future?

Hon Mr Hodgson: This isn't a new problem. This has been a problem we have faced in small communities for a long time.

The northern heritage fund has a category, if the member wants to hear this, where the governments, under the Canada-Ontario infrastructure, fund one third, one third and one third. That was asked for, and it's something that's easily understood. The municipalities know how to deal with that.

Unorganized areas would fit into the same criteria, except that their one third is very difficult to raise on the users of the system, so we have a category where in emergency situations, when it goes above the one third ratio, the northern Ontario heritage fund kicks in, like it has for a long time in the past, and we will take a look at that.

Those are some of the considerations that the Minister of the Environment and this government are seized with right now. We've been consulting with people across Ontario. The minister has held 28 consultation sessions. Almost 1,000 people have attended. I think the public want to make sure that the systems are safe, but they also want to make sure that we're practical and that these solutions are affordable. If there is extra assistance needed in some of the small communities in rural and northern Ontario, we will be looking at that as well, and how we address that.

1510

NUMBER PLATES FOR HISTORIC VEHICLES

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): My question is for the Minister of Transportation. Although he's sitting right in front of me, I prefer to put it on the record here.

The minister will no doubt recall that my private member's Bill 99 was passed in the House last year, and I thank you for that. This legislation allows owners of antique vehicles to display the year-of-manufacture licence plate.

This summer the ministry introduced the regulations that allow owners of these vehicles to apply for approval to use year-of-manufacture plates. Ontario has a very

large community of men and women who restore and maintain classic and antique vehicles. The option of displaying year-of-manufacture plates is appreciated because it ensures that the vehicle is restored in absolutely every detail, from bumper to bumper.

I understand, however that there a few finer points in the legislative process that may want your follow-up. For example, I understand that some historic licence plates have the same number as trailers or snowmobile plates, and since these plates match those of licence plates already in the system, they may not be registered for use on historic vehicles.

Minister, I'm asking you to review this situation in order to fine-tune it to accommodate the many historic vehicles in Ontario.

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Transportation): Perhaps I should just look backwards here. My colleague is correct; some year-of-manufacture licence plates have been assigned to other vehicles or trailers. This is because prior to 1971, every car in Ontario got a new plate every year. Since then, Ontario has moved to a system whereby there's a plate with a sticker attached to it, so as a result there are some expired plate numbers before 1971 that would have been issued to other vehicles. The vehicle registration system is designed to never have duplicate numbers so that plates could not be issued to two separate vehicles. Licence plates assist enforcement officers in determining both the proper vehicle class and verification of registered ownership. Both my ministry and the law enforcement authorities have expressed reservations about altering registration data that potentially could duplicate plate numbers. So at the present time, we are looking at the system to see how we can help those with the year-of-manufacture plates.

Mr O'Toole: Thank you, Minister. It's clear that you're the person to clear this up.

My supplementary question revolves around fees for the year-of-manufacture plates. My understanding is that donors of historic vehicles can pay, as they have always, \$18 for a generic historic vehicle plate. However, if you want to register your year-of-manufacture plate, the cost of processing the registration is \$74, the same as a regular plate. Could you please explain why the fee is set at \$74 a year? Is it because there is added cost? Minister, what's the excuse for the \$74 instead of \$36?

Hon Mr Clark: Vehicle owners will continue to have the option of registering their historic vehicles using the existing historic vehicle plate provided by the ministry or with a year-of-manufacture plate. If the owner chooses to use a historical plate on the vehicle, there are some restrictions. Vehicles with these plates can only be used for parades, exhibitions, demonstrations, for sale and for travelling to repair depots.

However, during the preparation of the legislation, we heard from historic vehicle owners who wanted to drive their vehicles with year-of-manufacture plates without these restrictions. This was agreed to by the ministry and included in the legislation. Therefore, vehicles with year-of-manufacture plates are allowed to operate on the

highways without restriction, the same as other vehicles. If they choose to do that, the annual validation fee is \$74, the same as for other vehicles.

HÔPITAL MONTFORT MONTFORT HOSPITAL

M. Gilles Bisson (Timmins-Baie James): Ma question s'adresse au procureur général. Monsieur, comme vous le savez, la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario vient juste vendredi de renforcer encore, sur la bataille de Montfort, la question, est-ce que votre gouvernement a l'autorité de fermer cette institution ?

La cour a été claire. La Cour d'appel de l'Ontario a dit carrément que vous n'avez pas le droit. Nous voulons vous poser une question qui est très simple : est-ce que vous êtes préparé à ce point-ci aujourd'hui de dire que vous n'allez pas à la Cour suprême avec un appel pour essayer de renverser cette décision ?

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): It is true that we did seek some further direction from the court of appeal and we received that direction Friday morning. We are in the process of reviewing the decision and the reasons provided by the court of appeal, as I am sure the member opposite would have expected us to do out of respect for the court and out of respect for the issue. Indeed, it is a very important issue. In due course, we will be announcing our decision as to what further steps, if any, are to be taken.

M. Bisson : Très carrément au procureur général, la décision est de 60 pages. Il n'est pas très compliqué de vous figurer ce que vous allez avoir. Ce que nous demandons, c'est que vous respectiez la population franco-ontarienne et que vous fassiez ce que vous êtes supposé de faire : supporter et promouvoir les services en français pour la population franco-ontarienne. Il est très clair que vous avez perdu à deux reprises devant les cours l'habileté de votre gouvernement de fermer cette institution, l'hôpital Montfort.

On vous demande une autre fois : dites aujourd'hui que vous n'allez pas aller à la Cour suprême du Canada pour être capable d'aller en appel de cette décision. Allez-vous carrément vous mettre avec la communauté francophone, ou allez-vous retourner encore une fois pour essayer de nous taper sur la tête à la Cour suprême elle-même ?

Hon Mr Young: As the member is aware, the decision is a complex one, dealing with a very important matter. I know that he feels comfortable summarizing it in a few words or less and then trying to score some political points in the process. I, for one, think that a 60-page decision is worthy of more than an hour or two or a day or two of consideration. We are in the process of reviewing it. We are respectful of the importance of the issue, we are respectful of the court from which this decision emanates, and in due course we will have more to say about this very important issue.

PETITIONS

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It says:

“Because we, the undersigned, believe in our responsibility as teachers to maintain a high degree of professionalism; and

“Because such professionalism is best served when professional learning is self-directed and based on teacher need, improves professional skills, improves student learning, is based on best-practice accountability and is funded by the appropriate educational authority; and

“Because we oppose the government’s teacher testing program and the College of Teachers’ professional learning program because they do not meet the objectives of effective professional learning,

“We, the undersigned—“ from St Charles College, St Benedict Catholic Secondary school, Marymount academy, St Theresa’s school, St Albert learning centre and St Mark school—“respectfully request that you repeal all clauses and references to professional learning from the Stability and Excellence in Education Act, 2001.”

I affix my signature and give it to Andrew to bring to the table.

OPTOMETRISTS

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I have a petition addressed to the Ontario Legislature.

“Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario will be considering a private member’s bill that aims to amend the Optometry Act to give optometrists the authority to prescribe therapeutic pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of certain eye diseases; and

“Whereas optometrists are highly trained and equipped with the knowledge and specialized instrumentation needed to effectively diagnose and treat certain eye problems; and

“Whereas extending the authority to prescribe TPAs to optometrists will help relieve the demands on ophthalmologists and physicians who currently have the exclusive domain for prescribing TPAs to optometry patients; and

“Whereas the bill introduced by New Democrat Peter Kormos (MPP—Niagara Centre) will ensure that patients receive prompt, timely, one-stop care where appropriate;

“Therefore I do support the bill proposing an amendment to the Optometry Act to give optometrists the authority to prescribe therapeutic pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of certain eye diseases and I urge the government of Ontario to ensure speedy passage of the bill.”

I have signed that as well.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): It’s my pleasure to introduce a petition here on behalf of the member from Scarborough Southwest who, as you would know as members of the crown, is the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. It’s my pleasure to read the petition on behalf of the minister and on behalf of his constituents of Scarborough Southwest.

To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Criminal Code of Canada considers animal cruelty to be a property offence; and

“Whereas those who commit crimes against animals currently face light sentences upon conviction; and

“Whereas those who operate puppy mills should, upon conviction, face sentences that are appropriate for the torture and inhumane treatment they have inflicted on puppies under their so-called care;

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

“That the Ontario provincial government petition the federal government to move forward with amendments to the cruelty of animal provisions in the Criminal Code as soon as possible.”

I know the minister would sign this. I’m going to sign this on behalf of my constituents in Durham.

1520

EDUCATION FUNDING

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

“Whereas the Harris government’s rigid education funding formula is forcing neighbourhood school closures and has centralized control for education spending and decision-making at Queen’s Park, and will not allow communities the flexibility to respond to local needs;

“Whereas chronic underfunding and an inflexible funding formula are strangling the system and students are suffering the consequences;

“Whereas there is evidence that large schools do not automatically translate into cost-effectiveness;

“Whereas smaller, neighbourhood schools have lower incidences of negative social behaviour, much greater and more varied student participation in extracurricular activities, higher attendance rates and lower dropout rates, and foster strong interpersonal relationships; and

“Whereas small neighbourhood schools in local communities, both rural and urban, serve as important meeting areas for neighbourhood organizations which help bring individuals together and strengthen neighbourhood ties and the current funding formula does not recognize community use of these schools,

“Be it resolved that the Harris government immediately reconfigure their unyielding funding formula to restore flexibility to local school boards and their communities which will allow neighbourhood schools in our province to remain open.”

I affix my signature as I am in complete agreement.

CHILD CARE

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have petitions that have been signed and sent to me by E. Rosewell of Caledonia, the Ryerson School of Early Childhood Education, the Church of St Thomas, and the children's daycare centre in St Catharines. These petitions read as follows:

"Whereas an internal government document states the Conservative government is considering cutting the regulated child care budget by at least 40%;

"Whereas the same internal document states the government is also considering completely cutting all funding for regulated child care and family resource programs in Ontario;

"Whereas the Conservative government has already cut funding for regulated child care by 15% between 1995 and 1998 and downloaded 20% of the child care and family resource program budget on to municipalities;

"Whereas Fraser Mustard and Margaret McCain identified regulated child care and family resource programs as integral to early childhood development;

"Whereas the Conservative government will receive \$844 million from the federal government over five years for early childhood development;

"Whereas Ontario is the only province which didn't spend a cent of this year's federal money on regulated child care;

"Whereas other provinces are implementing innovative, affordable, and accessible child care programs such as Quebec's \$5-a-day child care program;

"Whereas the need for affordable, accessible, regulated child care and family resources continues to grow;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We demand the Conservative government protect the current regulated child care and family resource program budgets and invest significant federal Early Years funding in regulated child care and family resource programs. We demand future federal Early Years funding be invested in an expansion of affordable, regulated child care and in continued funding for family resource programs."

I agree with the petitioners, and I have signed my name to this petition.

PARKING FEE REGULATION

Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"Whereas many senior citizens are living on fixed incomes and being forced to pay an additional \$400 per annum for parking alone; and

"Whereas many senior citizens will be forced to sell their vehicles as a direct result of high parking fees, thereby affecting their standard of living; and

"Whereas most of the parking spots are located outside and unprotected from inclement weather and vandalism; and

"Whereas in a subsidized building, tenants are forced to pay the market rate for parking;

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

"That the government of Ontario regulate the cost of parking, ensuring that subsidized buildings maintain affordable fees."

This petition is signed by over 550 people in my riding, and I am pleased to affix my signature to it.

LONDON HEALTH SCIENCES CENTRE

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the London Health Sciences Centre is a world-class academic health sciences centre serving people throughout southwestern Ontario; and

"Whereas the Ministry of Health has forced the London Health Sciences Centre to find \$17 million in annual savings by 2005; and

"Whereas the London Health Sciences Centre has agreed to cut 18 programs in order to satisfy directions from the provincial Ministry of Health; and

"Whereas these cuts will put the health of the people of southwestern Ontario, and particularly the children of southwestern Ontario, at risk; and

"Whereas these cuts will diminish the London Health Sciences Centre's standing as a regional health care resource; and

"Whereas these cuts will worsen the continuing physician shortages in the region;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned"—the citizens of such places as Kippen, Clinton, Grand Bend, Exeter, Bayfield, Goderich—"petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government take immediate action to ensure these important health services are maintained so that the health and safety of people throughout southwestern Ontario are not put at risk."

We, the undersigned 1,900 individuals, ask the government to put this decision on hold.

I'm in full agreement and have affixed my signature.

OHIP SERVICES

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): "Whereas the Harris government's decision to delist hearing aid evaluation and re-evaluation from OHIP coverage will lead to untreated hearing loss; and

"Whereas these restrictions will cut off access to diagnostic hearing tests, especially in geographic regions of the province already experiencing difficulties due to shortages of specialty physicians; and

"Whereas OHIP will no longer cover the cost of miscellaneous therapeutic procedures, including physical therapy and therapeutic exercise; and

"Whereas services no longer covered by OHIP may include thermal therapy, ultrasound therapy, hydrotherapy, massage therapy, electrotherapy, magneto-

therapy, transcutaneous nerve therapy stimulation and biofeedback; and

“Whereas one of the few publicly covered alternatives includes hospital outpatient clinics where waiting lists for such services are up to six months long; and

“Whereas delisting these services will have a detrimental effect on the health of all Ontarians, especially seniors, children, hearing-impaired people and industrial workers; and

“Whereas the government has already delisted \$100 million worth of OHIP services,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately restore OHIP coverage for these delisted services.”

I add my name to these as well.

LORD'S PRAYER

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, which reads as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

I affix my signature.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): Mr Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

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 nays have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1528 to 1602.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing until they've been counted by the Clerk. You may take your seats.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 41; the nays are 45.

The Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Pursuant to standing order 30(b), I am now required to call orders of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Hon Helen Johns (Minister without Portfolio [Health and Long-Term Care]): I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 130, An Act respecting community care access corporations, when Bill 130 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 referred for third reading; and

That, notwithstanding standing order 28(h), no deferral of the second reading vote shall be permitted; and

That the order for third reading may be called on the same day.

That, when the order for third reading is called, 60 minutes shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, to be divided equally among all recognized parties, and at the end of that 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; and

That, notwithstanding standing order 28(h), no deferral of the third reading vote shall be permitted; and

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

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Mrs Johns has moved government notice of motion 109.

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to allow the standing committee on finance and economic affairs to sit tomorrow from 9 am to 12 pm and from 4 pm, and that the committee be authorized to sit beyond the hour of adjournment to debate and vote upon all clauses and all amendments to Bill 125, the Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

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

Hon Mrs Johns: It's my pleasure today to speak to Bill 130, the bill respecting community care access centres in the province of Ontario. As everyone will recognize, the government, through consultation with many people on the outside, is moving to change the governance of CCACs within this bill and bring accountability to community care access centres.

The third thing we're doing, which is important, is we are legislating that we have a community advisory

council which will bring together the community care access centre, the hospital and long-term-care facilities. Each of those organizations will be there to ensure that when a person comes through the system, there is an ability to make sure they get the care they need and, in one way or another, get the services they need.

Before I go any further, I should say I'm sharing my time with Mr Klees and Mr Wettlaufer; I wanted to just say that.

Also, it's very important, as you would know, that the government moved to create community care access centres in 1997. At that time, we put forward proposals to ensure that we provided strong services to the community. Since that time, there have been a number of concerns raised by the public within each of the areas and we have done a number of reports and looked at different community care access centres. We had a global report done by PricewaterhouseCoopers. We also had an operational review done of the Hamilton Community Care Access Centre, for which the Speaker is one of the members.

At that time, we recognized there was work that needed to be done on community care access centres so that we could continue to provide strong services within the community. We found a number of things. We found, although the services within the community care access centre and in the community were strong and had grown at a very fast rate, that there needed to be changes to be able to meet the ever-changing needs.

The community sector in the health care budget has grown at the fastest rate of any sector in health care over the last five years. We have quoted in the House for the last number of weeks that, on average, the budgets in community care access centres have grown by 72%. For maybe a layperson watching the TV today, it's hard to recognize how much money that really is, but let me say that in 1995 the budget in community care access centres was about \$600 million. Now, in 2001, the budget in community care access centres is some \$1.2 billion, so it has grown substantially. Some community care access centres are growing faster than others as a result of changing demographics and those kinds of things, but on average it is 72% across the province.

We need to make sure that community services stay in the community. We have taken an active role in looking at community care access centres over the last six to eight months by doing the two reports. Putting a government appointee into Hamilton was to try to ascertain how we might best ensure the community services stay sustainable within our health care network. From that standpoint, that's what we're doing today.

In the bill we have moved toward ensuring that we change the governance. We want to ensure that community care access centres across the province will be providing many of the same services in one area as in other areas. We also want to ensure that we do proper training across the whole province so that the boards understand the role of people on the board, but more importantly, that they understand how the request for proposals sys-

tem that was implemented some four years ago by this government works.

If this legislation is passed, we are going to ensure that the CEOs are appointed by the board. What we're doing there is trying to ensure that there is consistency across the province. We are trying to ensure that we have the qualifications that make all the boards strong and sustainable in the future. We're also trying to ensure that we do the proper training and that we're able to do the training that will allow these CEOs to ensure that they can provide the services. We're working toward that.

Also in the bill we talk about the community advisory council. We're trying to ensure that all the health providers work together. We need to have health providers working together so that when someone comes out of the hospital, they get the services they need in the community. When they get the services in the community and they feel they need to go to a long-term-care facility, they are able to do that.

One of the things I've heard recently is that this government's goal is to try to push people into long-term-care facilities. Although this government has made a substantial investment in long-term-care facilities, that is not the goal. The goal is to ensure that people get the right services at the time that they need them. For example, I have aging parents, as many know, who watch this program on a daily basis. In that particular case, when they need small-community services, they should get those in the community. When at some time one of them is alone and isn't getting an interaction with the community, I may well say to them that they should look at a long-term-care facility so that they can have an interaction with other people, they don't have to drive to places, and they can get the proper health care they need.

So there's a continuum. There's a place for every aspect of health care in the health care system. Our goal with this legislation is to ensure that we have sustainable hospitals, we have sustainable community services, we have sustainable long-term-care facilities and we have supports in the community that can be sustainable too.

1610

There's been a lot of talk over the last while about why the need for this legislation. We needed to do those changes, but there are many other changes that the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care and myself will be working on over the next few months.

We're going to ensure that we have strong case managers who are evaluating patients and making sure they get the services they need.

We have a number of community care access centres in the province right now which have a very strong case management tool which should be used in all community care access centres, so we're going to implement that before the new year comes around for community care access centres. We're looking to ensure that we have the right numbers of people in the community care access centre and that they are providing services to the people of the community.

So we're working on those things. We're also working on education and training programs, which of course I didn't need to put in the legislation. So from that perspective, we have a plan to make sure that community care access centres are stronger in our communities when we're finished.

I've also heard some comment that the boards will no longer have community representatives on them. Let me say that that is just fundamentally not true. It's my intention to take a number of people from the community who are involved in many different aspects of the community so that we have the best boards we can have in the province. In fact, it's my intention in a number of areas to reappoint boards that are already in existence because of the wonderful job they're doing in providing services to the community.

Mr Speaker, there have been a few concerns raised by different organizations over the period of time, and as you would be cognizant, we wanted to go to committee to be able to make a few amendments, but that didn't prove possible with negotiations in the last week. So from that perspective, I have done a fair amount of work to ensure that we can deal with the concerns that people have raised.

The first concern we heard was that Bill 130 doesn't tie in to the freedom-of-information and privacy concerns. I want to say quite clearly that that is not the case today. There are no services provided under Bill 130, this act. The services that a community care access centre would provide are all outlined in the Long-Term Care Act of 1994. The Long-Term Care Act of 1994 provides for the collection, but only in certain limited cases, of people's information. It is bound by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, which allows the minister to collect personal information only in specific circumstances, and they are all reflected in the Long-Term Care Act. So we know that we are covered with respect to that. If I could have got to committee, I certainly would have put an amendment in to ensure that people knew that was the case. I have had quite a bit of discussion with lawyers across the government, and I have been guaranteed that that is the case. I have written to the Ontario Association of Community Care Access Centres and let them know.

The second issue was that Bill 130 does not ensure access centres will be able to conduct their day-to-day business during the transition period. The transition period is the time from when the bill is approved by this House—if it is approved by this House—and it receives royal assent until such time as we get the boards and the CEOs set up within the organizations.

Let me tell you that if this bill passes, I will be moving very quickly to try and move forward to address this issue. I want to ensure that we get these boards up and running as quickly as we can after the legislation is passed. Obviously, this only relates to the issues in Bill 130. The question is clearly addressed in section 4 of Bill 130. It states that the corporation continues and there is no interruption in the functioning of the corporation's

affairs during the transition. This obviously includes service providers' contracts. If an agency needs to enter into a service provider contract because the old one has expired, they are able to do that to carry on day-to-day business. We also will be able to put some policy out to ensure that they can enter into small-dollar contracts for that time frame, so that the normal day-to-day business of the community care access centre does not stop. It's our goal to ensure that people continue to be served with high-quality care during this period.

The third issue was that Bill 130 has no liability clause to protect board members and employees of the statutory corporation. This is simply untrue. Concerns about good faith protection can, and will, be addressed through the normal process that CCACs currently employ. These include an indemnity from the corporation, and the purchase of director and officer liability insurance for board members and the executive directors. As an example of how this is done now, I refer you to the public hospitals, of course, because that's how they provide their insurance and freedom from liability.

The fourth issue that was raised is that Bill 130 doesn't make clear the accountability of the executive director to the board. Actually, it does. To quote from the legislation, "The executive director ... is responsible for the management and administration of its" CCAC "affairs, subject to the supervision and direction of its board of directors." To put it another way, the government sets the terms of employment; the board provides direction. The point is that the executive director must be responsive to ministry programs and ministry direction, as well as to board priorities.

The fifth issue we've heard is that Bill 130 lacks clarity as to the status of CCACs as local community operations, as opposed to government agencies. The phrase "local community operations" is usually applied to organizations created locally, and financially supported locally to pursue local objectives. In fact, community care access centres, as I said earlier, were created by the Mike Harris government to implement provincial policies that would support rationalized and enhanced home care for the people in the province of Ontario. That's why we've increased spending in home care by some 72% over the last five years. That's why more than \$1 billion flows every year to community care access centres alone. That's why we're changing the governance of the community care access centres. To put it in another way, CCACs were created by the province, which funds them 100% with provincial taxpayer dollars, to pursue provincial objectives aimed at bringing better home care to Ontarians. Local input comes from the appointments of local people. So we are assuring the people of Ontario that we will be involved with the local boards. We will be getting local input. But we also want to assure the people who are using the services that we have every intention of making sure that services are provided across the province, in their communities.

The last concern we have heard is that the OIC board will no longer have local ties. I think I've addressed this

a couple of times. I am on record as saying that we're going to have local people on the boards. It's my intention, if this bill is passed, to advertise to fill board vacancies that may exist. In fact, the ministry is on record as saying that we want to look at the majority of board members who are around right now and see if we can reappoint them. In addition, the advisory councils will be chaired by the community care access centre board members, and there will be input coming from the whole community when we look at these advisory councils. So I feel comfortable that the community support agencies will have more of a say in how community services are provided. They will work hand in hand with the community care access centres, the hospitals and the long-term-care facilities in the area.

1620

Because this is legislated, it will no longer be an ad hoc committee that exists in some places. They will now exist in all communities across the province, and they will bring to community services a stronger and a better system of community care in the province.

I have written a letter to the Ontario Association of Community Care Access Centres. I know they will be passing that around to the access centres. But let me say, because I have two colleagues who want to speak here, that it's very important for us to have a sustainable community system. The people of Ontario rely on that system. We have to have every aspect of our communities strong when it comes to health care. Hence the bill is happening today. I believe that in the long run, if and when we get approval of this bill, after we implement the changes that we need, after we work with the communities, that the people of Ontario will be happier with the health services they're receiving in the community.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Further debate is in rotation, so the floor will go to the member for Toronto Centre-Rosedale.

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): I will be sharing my time with the members from St Catharines, Sudbury, Prince Edward-Hastings and Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington.

In response to that awful speech from the minister opposite, I say but one word: yikes. For anyone who was at home and listening and subjected to that, here, in less than seven minutes, is the straight goods on a bad bill, one more bill from a command-and-control government that seeks to gag the voice of the local communities. This is a shameful attempt by that minister to attempt, in her 20-minute ramble, to create an impression other than what this bill really is.

Let's be clear. The word "respecting" may be in the title of the bill, but respect, as it relates to local communities and as it relates to the patients in this province, ends right there. The meaningful decision-making capacity at the community level in this bill becomes advisory. Advisory—in brackets gagged, choked to death. The local views of local residents in this bill are choked to death. The notion here is that this sort of Tory government, state-sanctioned paternalism means that we draw

back to all of this repository of wisdom in the Ministry of Health.

You know, the Ministry of Health is located in my riding of Toronto Centre-Rosedale, close to the corner of Bay and Wellesley. I'm proud of my riding, but I don't think that government, in a province as large and diverse as ours, is one where all of the wisdom is to be found in the offices of the Ontario government. Yet that's what this bill says: "Momma knows best." This is the Momma-knows-best bill. Wisdom is the domain of downtown Toronto. That's what the minister ought to be standing up and saying.

Let's look at this government's record with respect to decisions in our health care system. This minister speaks, but she does not yet understand the extent to which these home care services are crucial in creating a flow in the continuum of care—words that people like to use. The problem they are creating is that people, unable to get the required assistance at home, are forced to look for long-term-care solutions quicker. We went through this awfully painful health care restructuring process that said, "We will not continue to house people in hospitals." So hospitals are forcing people out the door sicker and quicker.

We know that 70%, versus just 30% from a few years ago, of the patients requiring care from our community care access centres are hospital discharges—70% now, only 30% a few years ago.

This minister talks about the growth in CCAC budgets, and she demonstrates, in focusing on that very point, that the silo mentality that has caused so many problems for this government in dealing with our health care system is alive and well and living in the mind of that minister. She assures us that after seven long, painful years with respect to our cherished system of health care in this province—she doesn't get it, and when she doesn't get it, they don't try to fix it. They don't listen to experts. They don't pretend to understand that there is wisdom in communities, that the people of Simcoe county and elsewhere might be able to come up with some suggestions about how to make that work. No, they impose a gag order on the people of the province of Ontario.

What's the price that will be paid? It will be paid in the stripping of further confidence from our already frail medicare system, and that I think is their hidden agenda. That's really what they want. By taking out of context the growth in this budget, by not reflecting on the fact that there are 800,000 more Ontarians than when they came to office, and by discounting the savings that have resulted in hospital budgets, the hospital element of the overall health care budget, they do an extraordinary disservice to their constituents and they put at even further risk the quality of our medical system here in this province.

It seems like it ought to be reasonably simple, and even the minister spoke about this sort of continuum of care. But I beg members who have not yet had those painful and disheartening conversations with people who have been discharged from hospitals requiring a very high threshold of care, who have been out of hospitals

and then back in—I had a meeting today with a woman whose sister was released from hospital, while fighting cancer and with pneumonia, to have care provided by the community care access centre. We know that there has been this extraordinary transfer of treatment dollars to those discharges at the expense of our frail and elderly. What will be the impact on the frail and elderly? The people who are home, some of whom will be elderly, will very clearly, because they are way smarter than this minister and this government, be able to answer this question for themselves. If you're at home and your community care access centre is not able to assist you with keeping your independence, staying at home and going about your life, then the answer is clear: you will seek out a long-term-care option even sooner than you might have otherwise intended.

In a nutshell, that is the effect of this government's bill. Instead of dealing with the problems that are in the system, they seek to impose this made-in-Toronto gag, a gag to the throat of communities across the breadth of this province and to the people who have toiled away and sought to create for their citizens a system that worked for them.

I will be voting with such intensity against this lousy bill, and I urge government members to see the light, listen to their constituents and stay away from the vote.

Mr Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): I am pleased to participate in this debate. I want to first of all again commend my colleague the Honourable Helen Johns for her leadership on this issue, which is so important. Community care access centres have been top of mind certainly in my riding. I know throughout York region and in many areas of the province over the last number of months our health care system has evolved to the point where home care is particularly important in the continuum of care, and when in fact there is a failure in this area of home care, then it has its repercussions throughout the community. So to see the kind of leadership that Minister Johns has taken on this is particularly encouraging to me and it's encouraging to my constituents.

We have had a great deal of discussion in this House about what some of the areas are that need to be addressed to resolve some of the concerns.

1630

I have repeatedly stated that I believe this is a two-pronged issue. On the one hand, particularly coming from a high-growth area—York region; and there are other regions around the Toronto area—where there is particular pressure as a result of an influx of people and an aging population, there is an issue of, “Do we have enough money in the system to actually deal with that population-growth pressure?”

I'm not one who would say that we should close our eyes to the issue of reviewing the funding formula and ensuring that we do in fact have the resources available to deliver the services. So I will continue to advocate to ensure that the Minister of Health, the associate minister of health, our cabinet and our government look at

whether or not we need to infuse additional resources, additional money into this system.

Having said that, it has also become very clear to me over the last number of months, as I've had input from constituents, caregivers, caseworkers and nurses who are involved in this very important service of delivering home care, that another aspect, the second prong of this problem, is the structure and the governance of the CCACs and precisely getting down to how efficiently we can deliver services.

In previous readings on this bill, I read into the record actual communications from constituents who have pointed to inefficiencies that they pick up, just as a result of being subject to some of the inefficiencies within the system.

I received an e-mail this morning from the CEO of the York region CCAC, who advised me and other colleagues that over the last number of months the waiting list for CCAC service has been eliminated in the York region CCAC, with the exception of speech-language therapy where there is still a 45% waiting list. However, Mr Bill Innes, who wrote that e-mail, went on to say that he is not sure as to why they were able to eliminate that list. There seems to be less demand on the system. He surmises that perhaps one of the reasons is that some of the referral agencies—the hospitals, the long-term-care facilities—are not referring as many cases to the CCAC because they feel from past experience that they're not capable of dealing with the issue, that they're not able to deal with the cases.

I have to say, that was not comforting to me. First of all, if the CCAC is now capable of dealing with these issues and taking on more cases, why would that not have been communicated to the hospitals and the long-term-care facilities, to say, “We're now in a position of being able to take on the cases you have to refer to us”? So I'm concerned about that lack of communication.

I'm also concerned that the reason for the elimination of the waiting list isn't that we simply have said, “We're going to eliminate certain services.” If that's the case, I want to know about that as well. I expect much more detail in terms of what is in fact taking place.

Where I am encouraged is that I believe the bill before us is going to take a very important step, and that is to give the government an opportunity to appoint through order in council the members of the board of directors who ultimately have the responsibility to hold accountable the chief executive officer of the CCAC and the entire organization. This will allow us to ensure that people are sitting around that board who actually have the experience and the ability to deal with what effectively is a multi-million dollar service delivery corporation. With all respect, we want to give credit to the people who have been there to this point, who have had the responsibility, and who have done it on a volunteer basis, I should add. We acknowledge the work they've done and we thank them for it, but in some cases it is time for us to replace some of those board positions with people who have more experience and more expertise in terms of manag-

ing an organization of this size. I believe that in itself will take us a good distance toward dealing with these issues.

Our objective as a government is to ensure that the people who need the service, who deserve the service and who qualify for the service will in fact have it. No one in this province who needs home care should be without it. That's why I take this bill very seriously. That's why I support it: because I believe that, in the final analysis, that objective will be achieved. Some difficult decisions will have to be made over the next number of months and weeks in terms of implementing some of these changes, but I'm convinced that once those decisions are taken, the people in this province will benefit from it.

In closing, because I know my colleague wants to add his comments to this as well, once again I want to say that we're privileged in this province to have a comprehensive home care system. I also believe we have a responsibility to make whatever changes are necessary to make that very good system even better, to make sure that no one falls through the cracks, and to ensure that, on a governance basis, we have the efficiencies and the accountability in place. As I've said before, if in fact we have to shore up the resources that are available, then let's do that as well and make sure that the people who are dependent on us to make those decisions on their behalf are looked after in this province.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): The speech I just heard reminded me of somebody putting brown sugar on porridge, because indeed what is underneath that brown sugar is an awful lot of rather ill-tasting porridge, which is the responsibility of members of the cabinet. Now I perhaps understand why you would want to depart from that particular group of people, their having made those kinds of decisions.

I want to say to the member and to members of the House what this bill is all about. The government has seen that for home care to be effective, it's going to require a major investment of funds—no question about it. The government was supposed to have saved all this money by closing local hospitals or forcing them to merge or bring about what they called the restructuring of health care services in many areas. But like so many areas, the government simply took that money—some of it, at least—and put it in its pocket to pay for its very expensive tax cuts.

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: As a result, I say to my friend from Kitchener, we see that the community care access centres are in trouble.

The minister would like to say there has not been a cut in the amount of money provided to community care access centres this year. That is not correct when one looks at the fact that last year there was a requirement all over Ontario for an infusion of funding mid-year to make up for the needs of those community care access centres. The government simply went back to the old figure at the beginning of last year. So that represents, in effect, a cut at a time when there is an increased demand for those services.

1640

I can tell you that I get calls almost daily at my constituency office from people who are perturbed at the cutback in services. These are often frail, elderly people who are reduced to one bath a week or a small service here or there. They often do not even have family within easy driving distance to where they happen to reside. They often come out of hospital much quicker and sicker than they used to because there's a new policy imposed by the Harris government which says we're to get people out of the hospital much more quickly, meaning that when they go back into the community, they require more intensive care than would have been the case in years gone by. It is a fact that now 70% of the people using community care access centres and home care services are hospital discharges. I remember a few years ago, approximately 25% to 30% of these people were hospital discharges, so we're seeing a radical change as you force people to leave earlier.

What is this about? This is about closing off debate at the local level—in other words, forcing people to be compliant with government policy. My office called the Niagara office today and asked for the executive director. Do you know what the answer was? "She no longer works for the community care access centre." That means she was fired out the door by this government. This is a person who was not prepared to be silent about the needs of the patients in the area of Niagara. She was prepared to speak out. What she got for that was her walking papers. You can be sure that the people who replace the people fired out the door, and the present boards, are going to be much more compliant, much more silent. The fact is that we're going to have to rustle up even more Tories, if that's possible, even more Conservatives from the executives in the local areas, to be on the boards, because they are the people who will simply nod and say, "Yes, Minister," like the dog in the back of the car that sits there, that little artificial dog that nods up and down. "Yes, Minister. You're correct, Minister." So we're not going to have the kind of advocacy we will need for local people, and indeed there is that kind of advocacy needed.

I saw a letter to the editor in the St Catharines Standard by Hilda Pelissero, who was talking about the need for health care services in this province. There is a situation in many, many families where people require home care services and they cannot get those home care services, and they're struggling along. The people who have fallen on ill health for no reason that they can be blamed for are now forced to struggle along because this government is more interested in tax cuts than it is in health care.

Of course, today we will hear the weeping and gnashing of teeth of the Minister of Finance. At about 5 o'clock, he will have a press conference and say, "Woe is me. I have to cut all these things because I'm not going to get enough federal money." I looked at the books, and they say the government is going to forgo some \$3.7 billion in revenue from an income tax cut and—

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): Not this year.

Mr Bradley: —from a \$2.2-billion corporation tax cut—

Mr Wettlaufer: Tell the whole truth.

Mr Bradley: —and from what the member from Kitchener likes most, the new tax credit for people who want to put their kids in private schools.

There's also government advertising. I say to the Solicitor General, who is here today, I open up the newspaper and now they're advertising SuperBuild. They haven't even started to flow the dollars and they're already advertising SuperBuild. So this government's got lots of money for self-serving, self-congratulatory advertising, they've got lots of money for tax cuts, but they don't have money for community care access centres.

They're going to close the mouths, shut off debate, as they do in this House with this motion. They're going to stop any of the criticism at the local level, hoping that they can muzzle the people and that therefore people will not know the problems that are arising in home care. There are many problems; this bill does not address those problems. A forgoing of the tax cuts and the withdrawal of this legislation would go a long way to encouraging the kind of support we need in our communities for community care access centres.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): Well, here we are. Here's the government trying to ram through Bill 130, and we now have before us a draconian time allocation, which none of us should be surprised with because, of course, two of these motions were placed on the order paper last Thursday. Needless to say, we opposed both of those motions because they have nothing to do with getting at the heart of the matter, which is this government's blatant attempt to take over community care access centres because some of them, like my own, Manitoulin-Sudbury CCAC, actually had the guts to come forward in a public way and say that the government's current underfunding of health care was causing serious harm to seniors, to the disabled and to those being discharged from hospital.

The government doesn't like that kind of public criticism, which has gone on by a number of CCACs, including my own, and very many seniors' organizations for the last number of months, so the government is going to do what it wants to do today, and that is to take control of the CCACs, muzzle them, silence them, make sure there's not going to be any more public criticism of this government's underfunding of health care by these organizations.

The minister said in her opening remarks that she might have preferred to bring forward amendments, but that this proved not to be possible through negotiation. I want to comment on that as a first point. You are absolutely right: my House leader told the government House leader last Thursday that we were not going to be party to a sham, a façade, a joke, which was both of the motions with respect to how to complete Bill 130.

The government has called motion number 109 today. This means that at the end of this debate today there will be a vote, and then we will proceed immediately, when it's next called, to third reading. The debate on that will occur for one hour, the time allocated to all three parties. When that's done, then there will be a vote, and that's the beginning and the end of this bill and it will be passed. That is unacceptable to us.

The other government motion, 108, wasn't much better. Under that motion the government was going to have a façade of public hearings this Wednesday morning, three hours in total, for groups that care about home care to try to come and have their say. Then on Thursday morning, from 9:30 to 11, the government was going to move into clause-by-clause. But what's interesting is that under the motion, at 9:30 in the morning, all of the clauses, all of the amendments would be put. So all we were going to do was to vote on the amendments. There wasn't even going to be an opportunity for people to have their say about those amendments.

You know what, Speaker? We weren't going to be party to that process either, because it is undemocratic. It is a clear indication that the only thing this government wants to do is to get this rammed through so they can get control and silence those CCACs, like my own, that actually had the audacity to come forward and tell it like it was for seniors in our community.

It's with some interest that I note the letter from the Ontario Association of Community Care Access Centres, which says, "The very fact that the government has indicated that it is prepared to proceed with the amending process is very encouraging to us. The OACCAC believes that with appropriate amendments, Bill 130 can be workable and better enable us to continue to serve those requiring in-home medical and social services."

I don't know where the association was on the night of Wednesday, November 29, when the minister sat in her place, and in response to the very amendments that had been given to her by the association, said clearly that the government wasn't going to accept any, not a single one. They had representatives sitting in the gallery. I don't know if they didn't hear that that night, or maybe they were hoping she wasn't serious. But they had already indicated very publicly they had no intention of accepting any amendments to this piece of very draconian legislation—none at all. So the association shouldn't be surprised today that the ministry has no intention of going down that road.

Frankly, even if the minister would have accepted the amendments from the association, New Democrats would have opposed this bill because the amendments, frankly, were ineffective. They didn't get at the heart of the problem with this bill, and the heart of the problem is that this government, through legislation, is taking over control of the day-to-day operations of community care access centres. That's what the government is doing.

The amendments from the association didn't deal with that at all. They were completely ineffective, from my point of view. That is also why we told the government

House leader that New Democrats were not going to be party to some kind of meaningless process that may perhaps move some amendments that didn't change the heart of the bill, the guts of the bill, which is this government using its legislative power to take over CCACs to silence them.

1650

We are not going to be part of that. We are standing for those many seniors' organizations, which I will talk about later in my remarks, which have called on this government to withdraw this bill and have a meaningful consultation about long-term-care reform that includes continuing with local, elected boards of directors and executive directors who are hired by those local boards of directors, where there isn't an attempt by the government to control information that's distributed by the same CCACs. We agree with those organizations of seniors who have called on this government to get rid of this bill, who have said very clearly that it cannot be fixed; it is beyond repair; it is beyond reproach; get rid of it. If you're serious about doing something for home care, then have a meaningful consultation where seniors and their representatives can actually participate in that process. We know that wasn't done with this bill.

The final point I want to make about this motion is that frankly none of them had to come forward. If the government truly wanted to have a discussion with seniors about reform of the long-term-care system, the government could have carried this bill over into the intersession and the government could have had a committee of this Legislature have full, extensive, province-wide hearings on this bill or a new bill with respect to home care. The government could have easily done that because last Wednesday, in this very House, we debated and the government passed a motion which carries all bills—government bills and private members' bills—over into the next session, even if the House prorogues.

So this bill was not going to be lost by the time we finished sitting this week. On the contrary: a number of other bills, at least 23 as of today, are going to carry over. I suspect there will be some hearings on other bills in the session. They're all going to be carried over. If this government had been serious about consulting with the people who are most affected by the work of CCACs—that is, seniors, the disabled and those being discharged from long-term-care facilities—the government would have made the decision that they would carry this bill over and they would have full, extensive public hearings on home care.

The fact that the government chooses to bring in a draconian time allocation motion today which essentially says, "After this debate, we move to third reading for 60 minutes, have a vote and it's all over," reinforces, in my mind and everyone else's who has been watching this, that the government is only interested in ramming this through and getting control over CCACs by the new year so that they don't have to hear any more public criticism from these organizations about this government's current underfunding of home care.

The fact of the matter is that this bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to enhance home care in the province of Ontario. The bill is all about a hostile takeover by this government of CCACs, many who, like my own, came forward and have been very critical of the government's underfunding of home care since last May, when the government decided that it would freeze funding for home care, which for many CCACs actually meant a cut in their budget for this year. That is true in my own association, because this association had a deficit last year. It was covered by the government. Instead of getting that full amount, the CCAC is back to the very amount last year that was insufficient, inadequate, to deliver home care in my community. The government's decision in May represents a cut in the Manitoulin-Sudbury CCAC; a deficit of about \$1.8 million, \$1.6 million of which is due entirely to increases in the contracts it has with other service providers to deliver home care.

This government has made much of the fact that funding has increased for CCACs. The minister and then the Premier in June of this year tried to say that it was the incompetence of the boards and their mismanagement of funds that was leading to the crisis in home care. Speaker, do you know that the Manitoulin-Sudbury CCAC, over the last three years, has seen an increase of \$487,000 in its budget? Over the last three years, that's the only increase it has seen—\$487,000. It represents one fifth of 1% of the total increase that all CCACs received in the last three years—one fifth of 1%. I can tell you that the volumes for nursing, the volumes for homemaking services, the rapid discharges from hospitals, all of those needs have dramatically increased way past one fifth of 1% in my community. But that's the sum total of the increase our CCAC has been given to deal with the increased need for home care in our community.

Let me be clear. The government's move has nothing to do with trying to take control of incompetent boards that are needlessly, wastefully spending government money for home care services or on other things. That's not what's happening. It's not what's happening in my CCAC, and I suspect it's not what's happening in the overwhelming majority of CCACs that deal with all of us as members. As I said earlier, the fact is that the bill is really about the government getting control over CCACs. If you look at Bill 130, the government does that in a number of ways. I talked about this in the debate on second reading, and I want to reinforce these points today so that people who are watching clearly understand that it has nothing to do with improving home care and everything to do with assuming control.

First, the bill exempts community care access centres from the Corporations Act. Under the current Corporations Act, it is mandatory for your CCAC board to sell memberships. You have to do that under the Corporations Act. It is mandatory for you to hold an annual general meeting. It is mandatory for you, at that meeting, to hold an election for your board of directors so that they are duly elected from the community they are supposed

to represent. It's also part and parcel of that annual meeting for the objectives of the corporation, for their plan for the next year, for their budget, for their audited statement from the CA firm that did it etc, for all of that information to be public and available.

What normally happens is that that same evening, once the board has been duly elected from members of the corporation, ie members of the public who are there, then the same board itself elects a chair and a vice-chair. That's mandatory under the Corporations Act right now.

I listened with interest to Mr Klees, who said, "It's time we have some different people on those boards. We have to get rid of some of those people who have been appointed." I don't know what's going on in his CCAC, but there haven't been appointments by this government at our CCAC since the first annual meeting they had when they were duly constituted after 1996. After the government did its OICs to create the first board, at the very first general meeting after, which occurred about 10 months after in our case, those people were duly elected by the community. That was the end of the government appointments.

That is the process that should continue. I'm not interested in having the government appoint its lackeys to the CCAC board, the five or seven of them who will run all the affairs of the corporation, who because they are exempt from the Corporations Act don't even have to have an annual meeting to tell the public what they're doing, don't have to elect people from the board. No, the government's going to take care of that themselves. I'm interested in the local representation elected from the community that has been part and parcel of our CCAC since at least 1997.

If you look under subsection 7(1), the Lieutenant Governor now appoints the board members. Gone are the public elections by members of the corporations. No, the government has seen to that. Now what we've got is this government deciding who's going to be appointed.

The government couldn't even take the step of what appears in the Ministry of Health Act right now, to at least ensure diversity so that the board members reflect the population that is getting service in terms of ethnicity, linguistics, geography, interests, their own special skills etc. At least under the Ministry of Health Act, for DHCs it's right in the legislation that the board members have to reflect that diversity. The government didn't even take that step, because they're not interested in diversity; they're interested in getting people on there who are going to be their friends, who are going to muzzle any further opposition or criticism that might come out with respect to the current government's underfunding. That's why we're seeing such a dramatic change.

1700

If you look at subsections 10(1), 10(2) and 10(4), those subsections refer to the appointment of the executive directors. Again, it's no longer the duly elected local board that goes out and does a posting and hires an executive director, who is responsible for his or her employment back to the board; no, the government is

now going to take over control and appoint the executive directors, a move that is, frankly, unprecedented in terms of health care corporations that provide service. And why? Because the government wants to be sure that they pull the strings, that they have control over the person who is running the daily operations, so that they can be sure that what is done is in the government's interest—not the local community's interest but government's interest—and that the executive director, for example, can't be a pipeline to the media or MPPs, to talk about underfunding or waiting lists or people who can't get service. God forbid that that might happen. So the government is going to make sure it doesn't happen, and the government, not the local duly elected board, now has control over the appointment, the remuneration, the benefit package, the severance and everything else of the executive director.

You know what, Speaker? It even goes further than the executive director. If you look under subsection 15(1), there is a list of things that CCACs cannot do before they are designated under this act. One of those things is that they have to go to the Ministry of Health for approval of a particular individual for a managerial position. So not only do they control who is on the board, who is the executive director, but under the section I just referenced, they also have control over who is chosen to be in a management position—a case manager, for example. Tell me what Queen's Park knows about someone who is good for case management in Sudbury, Ontario. They don't. Again, it shows you the extreme to which the government is prepared to go to ensure they have control over the day-to-day activities of what goes on in CCACs.

Under section 11, the Regulations Act does not apply to Bill 130. The importance of that is as follows: the government, the minister, will give direction to CCAC boards under this legislation. By exempting this from the Regulations Act, it means those directions don't become public. They don't appear in the Ontario Gazette like other regulations and directions normally would.

You ask yourself, what does the government have to hide that it has to go to that extreme? The government will now make sure that the directions the minister issues to CCACs that are supposed to be delivering health care to people in our community—something our community should know something about in a public way—the government will ensure that even those directions that are given to CCACs about how to operate and who will get service won't even become public matters.

The final section, section 18, says that the minister will make available an annual report. Most CCACs were already doing that as a requirement of their annual general meeting under the Corporations Act. There is nothing new. But what is new about that section is that the minister will distribute or will allow to be distributed only that other information that the minister feels is in the public interest. Well, I can guarantee that the Minister of Health will not think it in the public interest to release publicly the deficit in the CCAC in my community or any other. I can guarantee that the Minister of Health will

not believe it to be in the public interest to provide information to the public about how many people have had their services cut off or reduced as a result of that deficit. I can guarantee you, as I stand here today, that the minister will not deem it to be in the public interest to have the Manitoulin-Sudbury CCAC release its waiting list for services to people who want to know and who should be able to know in my community. I can guarantee that anything that smacks one little bit of criticism of this government or of a deterioration of home care in my community won't be in the public interest and won't be released.

Again, it demonstrates to me, and it should to everyone who is watching, the length this government is prepared to go, to ensure that it controls who is on the board, who is running CCACs on a day-to-day basis and what information is given to the public about the operation of the CCACs. It is completely draconian and completely shameful that the government will go to that extreme to ensure information can't be leaked out that might imply criticism of this government's underfunding of home care.

The minister in her comments today again would have people believe that it was a review that was done by PricewaterhouseCoopers last December and finally released in June this year that is the natural end result of where the bill came from, that as a result of the recommendations and what was in that revue, this is how we got Bill 130. Nothing could be further from the truth. PricewaterhouseCoopers makes it clear in their executive directory that their review had nothing to do with the governance of CCACs. They qualified that explicitly in the executive summary of this report. It had nothing to do with governance, yet almost all of the sections I just referred to which showed the government clamping down on CCACs have to do with this government changing the governance structure of CCACs. That did not come from this report.

Second, there's nothing in the report that encourages the government, tells them, directs them, recommends to them to take over CCACs in the manner I have previously described: ie, the Lieutenant Governor appointing the board, the government appointing the executive director, the government having to approve people in managerial positions, the government having control over what information is disseminated to the public; nothing in the recommendations of this report tells the government to do any of that in terms of the findings that came from PricewaterhouseCoopers, nothing at all. That is clearly a direction that this cabinet wants to take to muzzle people. It doesn't come from the PricewaterhouseCoopers report.

Third, the report does contain many recommendations on what the government should do to improve home care in Ontario. The sad reality is that the recommendations that tell the government to do something don't appear in Bill 130. Oh, no, none of that appears in Bill 130. In my debate on second reading I listed at least 10 areas where the review calls on the Ministry of Health to do something to improve home care, and I can tell you that those recommendations don't appear in Bill 130.

Finally, the review is very specific. It says categorically, without a doubt, that this government has to increase its investment in home care if the system is going to work. It says that particularly in recommendation number 4 and it also says that in the executive summary at the front of the report. I want to quote it and put it into the record. It says the following: "Given that a strong home care sector is critical to the future sustainability of the health system, it is recommended that strategies be implemented to strengthen the role of CCACs and position them to meet growing future demands."

This is consistent with the ministry's business plan for 2000-01, which states, "To provide better care for patients and improve access to services, we will expand and enhance our community-based health care, home care and psychiatric services." This is what the Ministry of Health business plan says. Did the Ministry of Health expand the budget for home care this year? No, the Ministry of Health froze the budget for home care which, in the case of my CCAC, was a cut in funding. That was the same scenario that faced many other CCACs across the province beginning in May.

You see, what's interesting is recommendation number 4, which the minister has never talked about. Isn't that strange? Neither has any single government member talked about this particular recommendation. PricewaterhouseCoopers said the following: "The ministry should continue to move forward with its commitment to invest in CCACs as indicated in the ministry's 2000-01 business plan and ensure consistent funding approaches across the province."

The business plan says, "Invest more," not "Freeze," not "Cut." How come I've never heard Minister Johns mention that recommendation? How come I've never heard any government member mention that recommendation? How come I'm not going to hear any of them mention that today in their remarks? Because it is clear that if the system is going to work, the government has to invest, and the government does not want to do that. The government is more interested in bashing local boards of directors who had the audacity to come forward and be critical. Then they recognize what is a fundamental recommendation in this report: "The government needs to invest more."

PricewaterhouseCoopers concluded: "The aging population, growing consumer demand and continued efforts on the part of hospitals to expand outpatient services and reduce length of stay indicate that current resource alignment will be inappropriate in the future," ie, the current amount that the government has in home care will be inappropriate, and this bill does nothing, not a single thing, to deal with that important recommendation from this independent consultant's study.

1710

There are a number of groups, a number of individuals who have let us know they are opposed to the bill. What's interesting is that while the minister has tried to say repeatedly that the bill responds to concerns that they have received from seniors, that the bill responds to con-

cerns about access that have been received from organizations etc, do you know that the groups that represent seniors have been writing in and faxing and calling and saying, "We oppose Bill 130"? They're not calling to say they support it; they're not endorsing what the minister has tried to say in this House. They are sending letters that say, "We oppose Bill 130." The minister has no support for this bill from the very people who are dependent on home care, the very people she says this bill is trying to help. She has no support from them and their organizations.

The council of Kingston sent in a recommendation on December 4 opposing this bill. The Association of Jewish Seniors, which represents 5,000 seniors in the greater Toronto area, sent in a letter on November 29: "We oppose Bill 130. Have some real hearings if you're interested in doing something." The Ontario Coalition of Senior Citizens' Organizations, which represents about 350,000 seniors in this province, has written to us, and the minister has these letters, to say, "We oppose Bill 130. It does nothing for home care. It has everything to do with silencing people who have come forward and have been critical about the current underfunding. Withdraw this bill. If you're interested in doing something, hold some public hearings and let's talk about real long-term-care reform."

The Alliance of Seniors represents over 300,000 people as well, seniors. What did they say? "We urge you in the strongest possible terms to withdraw Bill 130 and your plans to take control over the governance and management of CCACs. Scapegoating CCACs is not the answer to the issues in home care."

The ONA, the Ontario Nurses' Association, many of whose members provide services in CCACs: "Withdraw the bill. It does nothing to improve home care." This is from Community Care Peterborough, who wrote to us and said, "Get rid of this bill. It's completely dictatorial."

Here's the CCAC board of Waterloo region. The chair, Norma Marossi, says, "I am truly offended by the message that the proposed legislation sends." The vice-chair, John Enns, says, "The implications of the proposed legislation is a slap in the face the week after the Waterloo CCAC was praised for its accountability and effectiveness in a glowing report from the Canadian Council on Health Services Accreditation." The chair also said—and I just want to give you one final quote from her—"The news about this legislation was a shock, because up till now the province has been complimentary of the service that we have provided. Our board no doubt will soon be replaced, as we understand that this legislation is on the proverbial fast track." I suspect that Norma is right.

Finally, the chair of my own CCAC, Sudbury-Manitoulin—who resigned on November 8 and then our board would not accept his resignation because he has done such a fine job to support people in our community—Bob Fera, said the following: "I feel I must resign as I consider this government's planned takeover of the CCACs in this province as a hostile one and a slap

in the face to all volunteers in the province of Ontario, and to my opinion their planned legislation is nothing more than smoke and mirrors to cover this government's lack of adequate funding and commitment for proper home care of our seniors."

There's a lot more that I could say, but I know my colleague from Timmins-James Bay wants to speak. I just want to say the following in conclusion: Bill 130 does nothing, zero, nada, absolutely nothing, to enhance home care in the province of Ontario.

Interjection.

Ms Martel: My colleague is going to give me the last five minutes. I'm going to go for it.

That's a real shame, because the fact of the matter is that the current underfunding of home care that is occurring right now in the province of Ontario is having a very dramatic and a very negative impact on seniors, on the disabled and on people being discharged from hospital in our province.

The effects of the freeze, which in too many cases, like the case in Manitoulin-Sudbury CCAC, was a cut in funding this year, are the following: seniors, the frail and the elderly are having to go without the home care services they need, whether that's homemaking services, whether that's home care services, whether that's physiotherapy, whether that's speech pathology, whether that's rental of equipment that they need to remain in their own home. Those people who can't afford it are having to go without, and that will have a greater cost on the health care system as a result. That's because those people who can't get home care services have to go to their family doctor because they need care, because they're deteriorating, or they have to go to the walk-in clinic because, as in my community, we have a shortage of doctors, so that's where you end up when you can't see your own family physician. They're at the walk-in clinic or they're also in the emergency ward because they can't get the services they require.

We note, and the Waterloo CCAC pointed this out in information that we all received about two weeks ago, that there has been an increase in the number of people going into long-term-care institutions. The Waterloo CCAC pointed that out and juxtaposed that with their statistics from last year. They have seen an increase in people who have now had no choice, because they can't get the care that they need in their own home, but to now go into long-term-care facilities. That makes no sense.

I know the government is really anxious to try to fill the nursing home beds that have been built in the province by so many of their wealthy corporate friends. I know the government's really interested in making sure they can fill those beds on behalf of their friends. But you know what, Speaker? It's a bloody shame that the government is more interested in making sure that those beds are filled so their wealthy friends can benefit than they are about trying to ensure that people who can remain in their own homes are allowed to do that for as long as possible, because at the end of the day there is a

dramatic and a very negative impact on those people who would prefer to live in dignity in their own homes.

Sadly, there's also a cost to the health care system, because at the end of the day it costs the whole health care system and all of us as taxpayers far more to be caring for people in long-term-care facilities than it does for us to support them in their own homes and make sure they get the home care, the nursing services, that they need, to make sure they get the homemaking services they need, to make sure they get the physiotherapy and speech therapy services they need, to make sure that the medical equipment that they need to be sustained in their home is available to be rented from the CCAC at minimal cost. It makes sense to ensure that we are providing them with the medical supplies that they need and that are very expensive to buy otherwise, which is an expense which is also forcing people out of their homes and into long-term-care facilities.

It makes no sense to go down the road that we are going down. The only thing I can assume is that the government is trying to keep its friends in the private long-term-care sector happy by making sure there will be people to fill those beds. That comes at the expense of seniors who would rather not be in the beds, and it comes at the expense of the whole health care system because it costs more to do that.

In conclusion, let me say that the minister is quite right: our party refused to be part of the charade. The charade was to accept a motion that would have given us three hours of public hearings and then had us move directly to clause-by-clause to clearly demonstrate that the government wasn't interested at all in hearing from the public and certainly wasn't interested in amendments being put by the opposition. So we told the government House leader last Thursday, "No way. Stick it in your ear. We're not going to negotiate a settlement. We're not going to agree. You bring forward whatever motion you want, but we will not be party to a farce or a charade or a hoax or anything else."

What the government should be doing today is withdrawing Bill 130 and having meaningful public consultations about reform of home care across this province in the break.

1720

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): I would have expected perhaps a greater defence of the closure motion. I see the Minister of Energy is here, and well he should be, because in a sense we are laying waste one of his projects as the first Minister of Health in the Harris government. I want to simply say that I think any self-respecting member who would give this bill any kind of positive attention—

Interjection.

Mr Conway: You laugh. We are here today, apparently, to put paid to a concept and a design that you proudly brought here five years ago.

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): It still stays intact.

Mr Conway: Bark if you want; get into the debate. You just passed an opportunity to stand in your place and explain how it is that you feel this closure motion is a good thing. Let the record show that the former Minister of Health now takes his leave.

We've got the member from Huron in here today ramming this Bill 130 in our face and sitting smugly, as she does, saying that it's all in the public interest. Well, to hell with her, I say. The previous speaker rightly observed—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I think we crossed the line there. I'd ask you to withdraw that.

Mr Conway: I will withdraw, Mr Speaker. I would not want to offend the Victorian sensibilities of this very self-respecting Parliament, which seems to want to take any amount of abuse offered up to it. I'm not in a very good mood today, for a variety of reasons which I won't get into in my very limited time. I should, after all, be really pleased that I've got a few minutes to contribute to the debate.

I represent a big slice of rural and eastern Ontario, and let me tell you, my constituents are not very happy about this home care business. The previous speaker spoke, I think, for a lot of people when she said that no self-respecting member of this Legislature would want to truck with the kind of parliamentary procedure that the associate minister of health has in mind for dealing with amending Bill 130. I wouldn't touch it with a barge pole. This bill is an affront to the frail elderly and it's an abuse of this Legislature. I think the closure motion should be treated in exactly that fashion.

Of course, nobody is paying much attention here today, and why would they? Why would they? Because what we are here to do today is essentially acknowledge that Jim Wilson's master plan of five or six years ago has come unglued and unstuck.

My constituents clearly understand that the community care access centres, those local agencies which are designated the responsibility of supervising the delivery of home care, have had dumped on them a very big, new and costly responsibility, namely dealing with a vastly increased number of complex and acute patients who have been discharged from active treatment hospitals quicker and sicker than ever before. I am told by knowledgeable people that whereas five years ago 20% to 30% of the budget for the home care program was given over to acute care patients, that figure today has risen to something like 60% to 70%. So when I hear the prattle from the treasury bench about, "We're spending more money," I don't doubt it's true. But you're now asking home care to look after a very large part of the acute care patient load that until recently had been provided for, in the main, in an institutional setting. Is it any wonder that \$1.2 billion is not adequate to carry that load? Of course it isn't.

I want to say to the government, I can understand how there may be a situation in Hamilton or some other place where you've got behaviour that you consider unacceptable. But then to bring in this kind of legislation

to say that all the other community care access centres should be treated with the same hammer, the same kind of takeover? What does that say to good people, whether they're in Pembroke or Petrolia or Goderich or Toronto or Timmins? The whole concept of home care and community care is that there is going to be good, local neighbourhood, community, family involvement, direction and integration.

What have we got in Bill 130? We have got government legislation that represents, as my colleague from Windsor West says, not only a hostile takeover by the province but a dramatic centralization of the home care program here in the heart of downtown Toronto. If you think you're going to be able to effectively deliver home care programs in communities like Madawaska, Whitney, Stonecliffe, Calabogie, Beachburg, Barry's Bay and hundreds of communities like that from the Hepburn Block, you are intoxicated with a sense of your own power and importance beyond all my comprehension.

It will be a screw-up of dramatic proportions. And who will be affected and who will be disadvantaged? Tens of thousands of frail elderly, people who understand that there have to be some design changes, for sure. Minister Wilson came here a few years ago and I had some sympathy for his problem. What did he tell us was one of the reasons for the new design? He felt that organizations like the Red Cross and the VON and others, mostly in the not-for-profit health and social service sector, many of them in business for decades, over a century in at least one or two cases, had developed over time too much of an administrative overhead and therefore we had to create a new paradigm, had to allow a more competitive marketplace to work in this home care, community care part of the health and social services sector.

What do I hear now? Guess what's happened. The market's been working all right. More and more of the not-for-profits have been pushed out and the for-profits are in there doing a land office business. The per unit price of most things has gone up, and now the insurer, Her Majesty's provincial government, is saying, "My goodness, one of the"—I see heads shaking underneath the gallery. Perhaps I'm wrong. It's too bad we don't have a legitimate, bona fide parliamentary environment where smart, knowledgeable people could come and talk to us. We have this stupid show trial around here that more and more members, unfortunately too many of them too young and too new to know they're being had, allow to continue.

This is an important bill, like a number of other important bills. And what are you going to get? You're going to get another dose of the plebicitarian nonsense that makes this place so patently irrelevant: have an election once every four years and then let the devil take the hindmost.

Most of us haven't a clue of what's really going on here. How could we in this kind of parliamentary environment? All we know is what we hear.

I'm out in my constituency, as are most other members, and I'm hearing from the very people whom we intend to benefit from these services. We are promising the moon and delivering a thin slice of rancid cheese. Yes, there are problems. Is this takeover going to solve the problem? I doubt it. The notion that we are going to have better home care delivery with a centralized Queen's Park takeover is madness on stilts.

I can understand the frustration of a cabinet and of a minister faced with intractable non-compliance in certain areas. I don't know the Hamilton story. Maybe it's bad enough to justify a trusteeship. But I can tell you one thing: it is not acceptable justification for Bill 130 and the companion closure motion we've got here today—time allocation motion, I should more properly call it. Stuff it down our throats like a bunch of stupid turkeys before Christmas is, I guess—and the Queen of Huron county smiles benignly. I hope you can smile in the face of all these older people.

I went to a meeting of retired teachers on the weekend. One of their number one concerns is what's happening with home care, and they're not very pleased. They look at Bill 130 and they say to themselves, "How is this going to work?"

I can tell you that one of the problems with modern government is the place is full of people very strong on policy development. Fewer and fewer people know anything about program implementation. Even in a perfect world it is going to be one hell of a challenge to effectively deliver the kind of programs we intend, even from a community base like mine in the city of Pembroke, out across an area of almost 7,000 kilometres. Is that not the right phrase? Hectares, I guess. What is it? It used to be 3,000 square miles.

1730

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Consumer and Business Services): Hectares.

Mr Conway: Is it hectares? Thank you, Norm. It's a very significant challenge, but we just think, "Oh, well, it's got to happen." Why? Because some bureaucrat, some politician, said it has to happen.

We are here today to now say, in a very short period of time, the Wilson plan—Jim, when was that, 1996? He's not going to answer. I guess I made him mad. Too bad. It's about five or six years ago that we had the Wilson plan, and for those of us who paid any attention—

Hon Mr Wilson: And the board was appointed by government.

Mr Conway: And the board was appointed by government. Well, all I know is what I've got in front of me. I'm not saying you don't have some problems, but what have we got here? You've got this plan now to take it all over.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Stop the clock. Take your seat. There is absolutely no excuse for that kind of cross-talk

at the other end of the House that has nothing to do with what's going on here. When I asked you to come to order, you continued. That's unacceptable behaviour, and both of you know it. So please, not again.

Sorry for the interruption. Please continue.

Mr Conway: Everybody should be annoyed, because here we sit, the whole lot of us, government and opposition, and really important legislation is going to go flying through because somebody is mad over at health or treasury. We're all going to put our yea or nay to it and then hope and pray that God or some other intervention saves us from probably being made to look the fools that we're going to be made to look like in—enough time probably will pass before the next election.

I guess I've just been around here long enough to say that I feel a certain residual responsibility. This legislation is an admission that the last plan was fundamentally or seriously flawed. I don't know exactly how, although I've got some ideas based on my own experience.

I repeat: roughly 70% of the business for these home care delivery agencies now is acute care. The Minister of Energy shakes his head in the negative. I am sorry, Jim, but people closer to the scene than either one of us say that's so. I was talking to a nurse the other day and she told me that the combination of what's going on in home care and in some of the hospital sector is making her life just an increasingly chaotic and unsatisfying situation, dealing with a lot of these cases.

The cases that are brought to my attention are clearly ones where people are being discharged quicker and sicker from the local hospital, they're going home, and the resources are simply not there for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is that more of these complex or chronic cases are now being expected to be looked after at home. That is a very major and very expensive undertaking. So when people say to me, "We're spending more money," of course you're spending more money if that is the new mandate. That is not the mandate we advertised five and 10 years ago for home care. I don't care who is running the system; you're going to have this kind of pressure if it's not addressed elsewhere.

I am angry because my constituents particularly—I was out the other day talking to an 81-year-old who lives in the south Nipissing part of my constituency. He is 45 kilometres from the nearest health and hospital centre.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Hey, Sean, come to my place.

Mr Conway: I know.

These are the people we're trying to do something about. When he heard, because he heard it on the radio, he said, "Do I hear that now the plan is to essentially take control and centralize it in Toronto? Is that a fair representation?" I said, "Well, on the basis of a certain reading of the legislation, I don't think it's an unfair representation."

It's tough enough in my area to deliver the program out of Pembroke and into some of the hinterland. This circumstance that we've now got, to say nothing of the kind of volunteers you depend on—how does good home

care work in rural Ontario? You better hope the families, the local municipal office, the doctor's office, the local churches, the United Church Women, the Catholic Women's League—a whole series of informal networks—are in place, with some community leadership committed to making it work. If that's not there, you can spend billions of dollars trying to replicate that structure and never get close.

I look at the new legislation and I just shudder. I say again, I know there's a frustration in government, because I gather there have been some bad actors. Deal with the bad actors. Province, clarify your mandate. If it's going to be much more about acute care delivered in home settings, then fess up to that reality and pay the bill. But this time allocation motion to support Bill 130 is, in my view, a real insult, not only to this Legislature but to the tens of thousands of frail elderly out there who are expecting that we are going to improve, not worsen, their situation.

I simply say in conclusion, what meaningful dialogue have we had with anybody? The minister stood up here on November 7, just before we adjourned for constituency break—that's less than five weeks ago—and announced a dramatic takeover in Bill 130. I haven't been privy to the machinations around committee time, but let's be realistic. A month after the bill is introduced to the Legislature and the public, we have government notice 109 basically saying that it's all going to be over within a very few days of this moment. And we think that is some kind of meaningful consultation with anybody about a complex and sensitive matter of public policy?

As I look at my friend from Orléans, I'm sure he, like most members, understands the sensitivity around home care, because it really is a front-line service. I repeat, I have been getting a very large number of oral and written inquiries, concerns, complaints, about what's been going on. When they find out the reality of this, I don't expect the volume to decrease in that respect, but can we be serious? Can we be serious as community leaders and can we be serious as legislators that we have given this subject the kind of consideration and public consultation that it deserves?

I just resume my seat, asking myself the question: why would anybody take us seriously if this is the way we're going to discharge our responsibilities on a matter of this kind of urgency and public sensitivity?

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate? Prince Edward-Hastings—the member now has the floor.

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): Dr Richard Potter, a real gentleman, who resides in my riding and was Minister of Health under the Bill Davis government, when asked what was his greatest accomplishment as minister, said it was the development of the home care system. Then he added that his greatest disappointment has been this government's dismantling of that system.

This is a political move, pure and simple. It does not improve the quality of service to a single resident of Ontario. It is a power grab, pure and simple. It is ironic

that they're using time allocation to limit debate when the entire purpose of the bill is to limit any reaction from the real people in the community who know what is going on. The calls that come to my office are not about the governance of CCACs; they are about the lack of funding that produces a lack of services.

Within my riding, this government committed in writing to provide equity funding so that every resident in Ontario would have the same home care dollars. They reneged on the promise—another promise made, another promise broken. They have talked about flatlining the budget when in fact, because of increased contracts that they have required with the suppliers, there has been an 18% cut, an 18% cut that is driving senior citizens into nursing homes and backing up individuals in hospitals, unable to leave hospital.

When they talk about putting more money into home care than they ever have, we need to put it in perspective that over the life of this government they have cut the number of available hospital beds by 9,000. Services that used to be delivered in hospitals now must be delivered at home, or in fact are not being delivered at home with these cuts.

With the concept of appointed boards, are we going to get experts? Well, I would suggest the phrase, "I'm from the government and I'm here to help you," applies here. The local people on these boards now are people who know their communities. If you have a concern, you can stop, you can see them in the grocery store, you can pull in their driveway and you can ask them a question. With the appointments, we're seeing a concentration of power in Toronto.

1740

I challenge anyone in Ontario to try to phone the minister, to try to phone the Premier. You get a 1-800 number that rings to no answer or rings to voice mail. This government that preaches accountability in fact is removing accountability from the local access centres. People in their local communities know what is best. The concept of a cookie-cutter approach that what works in one CCAC will work in every other simply does not.

This in fact is a creation that the government's made. They're wanting to kill the approach they've taken to it, because they think it doesn't work. It in fact has worked, and worked only too well, where we now have boards and we have executive directors speaking up and saying, "It is not working. You cannot give us less effective money. You cannot cut services. You cannot take and starve the system and expect the people of Ontario to accept it." So they are being penalized for being an advocate and a voice for it.

The whole approach of this government has been the attacks on the elderly and on the sick. This does no one a service whatsoever, other than an ego trip. Does it save money? Obviously, it does not. Is money the issue? We spent a quarter of a billion dollars in ads in this province that are clearly more important to this government than looking after the sick and the elderly of this province.

This bill is a shame and a sham.

Mr Wettlaufer: I've listened very attentively to the arguments of the members opposite. I, of course, have listened to our own members speak. I think it's painfully clear that some of the members opposite don't realize that it was our government that brought in community care access centres. I think it's important to note that the community care access centre initiative was important enough to our government and it was important enough to the people of Ontario that we initiated the CCAC to support the accessibility of a whole range of services under one roof.

Now, why was it? It was necessary to support the elderly, medically fragile students, people with disabilities and those who are chronically ill. We also wanted to enable them to remain in the comfort of their homes as long as possible.

Mr Bisson: That's a good thing, Wayne.

Mr Wettlaufer: Yes, it's a good thing, I say to the member from Temagami. It is a good thing.

Mr Bisson: Temagami?

Mr Wettlaufer: Or Timmins-James Bay; sorry.

The community care access centre model offers access to community-based services, home care, long-term facilities and hospital discharge programs, all under a single umbrella.

I'd like to talk about the home care initiative as an example. The funding for home care is up by 70% in six years. Now, it has increased to approximately \$1.1 billion in this fiscal year. Now, let's think about home care for a moment. This is not provided for under the Canada Health Act. Last year, in a federal election, the federal government campaigned on providing funding for home care. Guess what? They won the election and now they haven't come forward with any money for home care. Home care is a problem right across this country. I say to the people who are watching on television here today that the federal government has provided no funding for home care. In some provinces, home care isn't covered in the medicare programs.

I look at Waterloo region, where I come from; Kitchener is in Waterloo region. Annualized home care funding in the Waterloo area has increased—and I would say this is a rather dramatic increase—from over \$32.3 million in 1998-99, so we're only talking two fiscal years ago, to an estimated \$39.5 million, an increase of \$7.2 million, or 22%.

I say to the member for Timmins-James Bay, with increases like that, how much is enough? We can keep on increasing, right? Health spending in this province is up already. It was \$17.4 billion when this government came to power in 1995. I recall the Liberals campaigning in 1995, saying how they would keep funding at \$17.4 billion. Well, the funding for this year in health care in Ontario is \$23.7 billion. That's an increase of \$6.3 billion in this province alone, by this provincial government alone. I say to you, Speaker, and I say to the members of the opposition through you, and to the people watching, at this same period of time, the federal government's

contribution to Ontario's health care funding has actually gone down by \$100 million.

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Transportation): Say it isn't so.

Mr Wettlaufer: No, I'm afraid it is so. The federal contribution to the funding problems in this province has decreased by \$100 million.

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): Shame.

Mr Wettlaufer: Yes, it is a shame.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): Funny how they've got a balanced budget.

Mr Wettlaufer: The member for Windsor-St Clair says, "Funny, the feds have a balanced budget." Of course they have a balanced budget. They get it by reducing health care funding to the provinces. Of course they were able to balance their budget.

Mr Duncan: Scrap your tax cuts.

Mr Wettlaufer: The member for Windsor-St Clair says, "Scrap tax cuts." That's the Liberals' panacea: scrap tax cuts. The people of Ontario want the tax cuts. But you, the Liberals, say to scrap the tax cuts. You don't want any tax cuts. The tax cuts are responsible for an increase in the revenue in this province, and as a result of the increase in the revenue to the province, we have actually increased the share of health care funding. The percentage of health care funding in relation to the total funding envelope is actually higher today than it was in 1995.

The Leader of the Opposition, I noticed recently, has been saying, "Health spending by the federal government is adequate." I want to say that over and over again. The Leader of the Opposition says, over and over again, that health care funding by the federal government is adequate, in spite of the fact that they have reduced funding for this province to the tune of \$100 million. In addition, he has been trying to convince the public for months, for years, that health care funding has actually gone down in this province. That's funny. The Ontario auditor believes that it has gone up by \$6.3 billion.

But I understand. The Liberals are in opposition. The member for Hamilton East said last week, "Of course you get upset with us, because we oppose everything. That's our role. We're in opposition. It's our role to oppose." That's what you said. All they ever do is oppose. It doesn't matter whether a bill is good or bad; they oppose it.

As a government, we have demonstrated our continued support of the CCAC initiative. We have increased funding. But this year we asked for some accountability on the part of the CCACs. We have asked them to try to carry out government initiatives. I guess we could have said, "We would like you to carry out the Liberal initiatives." If we had done that, then we'd have said, "Spend all you want. Create deficits." Of course, if you carry out the Liberal Party initiatives, they're dedicated to defeating a government. It would be rather foolish if we said, "Don't carry out the government initiatives." Of course, the NDP are going to oppose as well, and they've

got their own reasons. We've asked the CCACs for some accountability. Do the Liberals not want accountability? The Liberals don't want accountability.

Interjection.

Mr Wettlaufer: I hear the member from Windsor-St Clair right now. You're opposing the issue of accountability. You don't think that anybody should be accountable, right?

Interjection.

Mr Wettlaufer: Thank you. I'm glad to hear that.

Mr Duncan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to send this bill back to hearings for proper public scrutiny and proper accountability of the government.

The Deputy Speaker: I hear a no.

The member will please continue.

Mr Duncan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I need your direction. Will the record reflect that the government said no to those hearings and that accountability?

The Deputy Speaker: The record will just show that I heard a no, not where it came from.

Mr Duncan: But it won't say that you heard the no from the government side, refusing to have committee hearings?

The Deputy Speaker: The record will show as I've stated. Please take your seat.

Hon David Turnbull (Solicitor General): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would seek that the member from Windsor-St Clair take back his unparliamentary language, if he thinks it's appropriate.

The Deputy Speaker: I didn't hear it, but that doesn't mean it didn't happen. I'll give the member an opportunity to withdraw, if he feels that he said something.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: No? All right. Order.

We're down to the last 30 seconds. Let's give the member for Kitchener Centre the respect he's due to finish his speech.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

The member for Kitchener Centre may continue.

Mr Wettlaufer: Thank you, Speaker. I presume that you obviously didn't hear the "no" come from the other side as well.

We've encouraged these CCACs to employ good case management practices to ensure that their clients get the services they need. We feel that through this bill, we're well on the way to having a stronger CCAC system. We've looked at the PricewaterhouseCoopers program review report and we agree with it.

Mr Duncan: Can we expect you to vote against the motion now?

The Deputy Speaker: If the House leader for the official opposition would contain himself, we'll move forward with those votes.

Mrs Johns has moved government notice of motion number 109. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please indicate by saying "aye."

All those opposed will please 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 1753 to 1803.

The Deputy Speaker: Those members in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

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

The Deputy Speaker: Those members opposed to the motion will rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted
Bisson, Gilles	Gravelle, Michael	Parsons, Ernie
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hampton, Howard	Peters, Steve
Boyer, Claudette	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Brown, Michael A.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Pupatello, Sandra
Bryant, Michael	Levac, David	Ramsay, David
Caplan, David	Marchese, Rosario	Ruprecht, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Martel, Shelley	Sergio, Mario
Crozier, Bruce	Martin, Tony	Smitherman, George
Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 47; the nays are 35.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

The House adjourned at 1807.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
76B	4270	2	54	forward by The Elliott which needs a change in its

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

Monday 10 December 2001

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Municipal waste disposal	
Mrs Dombrowsky	4343
Heart and Soul: The Story of Bethesda Reach	
Mr O'Toole	4343
Sound berms	
Mr Peters	4343
Santa Claus	
Mrs Munro	4344
Northern medical school	
Mr Gravelle	4344
Ontarians with disabilities legislation	
Mr Martin	4344
Northern Ontario Welding School	
Mr Dunlop	4345
Home care	
Mrs Pupatello	4345
Christmas	
Mrs Molinari	4345

FIRST READINGS

Supply Act, 2001, Bill 149, Mr Flaherty	
Agreed to	4346
Mr Tsubouchi	4346

MOTIONS

House sittings	
Mrs Ecker	4346
Agreed to	4346

ORAL QUESTIONS

Protection of privacy	
Mrs McLeod	4349
Mrs Johns	4349, 4352
Mr Hampton	4352
Ms Martel	4352
Montfort Hospital	
Mr Lalonde	4350
Mr Baird	4350
Mrs Pupatello	4350
Mr Bisson	4358
Mr Young	4358
Algoma Steel Corp	
Mr Hampton	4351
Mr Runciman	4351
Mr Martin	4352
Highway 407 tolls	
Mr Phillips	4352
Mr Clark	4353
Assistance to farmers	
Mr Johnson	4353
Mr Coburn	4353

MFP Financial Services

Mr Crozier	4354
Mr Tsubouchi	4354
Northern communities capital assistance program	
Mr Miller	4354
Mr Newman	4354
Competitive electricity market	
Mr Hampton	4355
Mr Wilson	4355
School closures	
Mr Kennedy	4355
Mrs Ecker	4356
Paths to Equal Opportunity Web site	
Mr Hardeman	4356
Mr Jackson	4356
Communal water treatment systems	
Mr Brown	4357
Mr Hodgson	4357
Number plates for historic vehicles	
Mr O'Toole	4357
Mr Clark	4358

PETITIONS

Professional learning	
Mr Bartolucci	4359
Optometrists	
Mr Kormos	4359
Cruelty to animals	
Mr O'Toole	4359
Education funding	
Mr Bradley	4359
Child care	
Ms Martel	4360
Parking fee regulation	
Mr DeFaria	4360
London Health Sciences Centre	
Mr Peters	4360
OHIP services	
Mr Martin	4360
Lord's Prayer	
Mr Tascona	4361

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Time allocation, government notice of motion number 109, Mrs Ecker	
Mrs Johns	4361
Mr Smitherman	4364
Mr Klees	4365
Mr Bradley	4366
Ms Martel	4367
Mr Conway	4372
Mr Parsons	4374
Mr Wettlaufer	4375
Agreed to	4377

OTHER BUSINESS

Estimates	
The Speaker	4343
Visitors	
Ms Mushinski	4345
The Speaker	4345
Mr Hampton	4349
Commissioners of Estate Bills	
The Speaker	4346
International Human Rights Day	
Mr Jackson	4346
Mr Sorbara	4347
Mr Kormos	4348
Mr Hampton	4348
Member's birthday	
Mr Agostino	4349
Adjournment motion	
Mr Duncan	4361
Negatived	4361
Erratum	4377

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 10 décembre 2001

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de crédits de 2001,	
projet de loi 149, <i>M. Flaherty</i>	
Adoptée	4346

QUESTIONS ORALES

Hôpital Montfort	
M. Lalonde	4350
M. Baird	4350
M ^{me} Pupatello	4350
M. Bisson	4358
M. Young	4358