



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

Third Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 19 June 2002

Mercredi 19 juin 2002

Speaker
Honourable Gary Carr

Président
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Copies of Hansard

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

Exemplaires du Journal

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



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 19 June 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 19 juin 2002

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell):

Today I am asking this government to come forward with the regulations for the Nutrient Management Act. Let me be clear: Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberal Party are in favour of a strong Nutrient Management Act but with regulations attached. We need these regulations now.

The farmers in my riding are worried. They are worried because they don't know what the regulations will be. They are also worried because every day the mega-hog farm operators from Quebec have their real estate agents offering big money for prime land to establish their mega-operations in Ontario as we have no regulations in place. Last week the Quebec government put a two-year freeze on all new construction and expansion of hog farms in their province because of their environmental problems.

I also learned this week that Quebec farmers are now trucking manure into eastern Ontario to spread on farmlands in my riding because the Quebec government has regulations and are not allowing them to spread manure on their farmlands due to the quantity of phosphorus that is generated by these mega-operations.

I say to the Minister of Agriculture: time is wasting. Where are the regulations? We need the regulations for the Nutrient Management Act before your government is forced to put a freeze on farming activities due to the polluted aquifers caused by the mega-farm industry.

AUTISM SERVICES

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Children with autism and their families have been abandoned, but beyond abandoned, they now find themselves literally under attack by this government.

Cameron Walsh is six years old. At the age of three he was diagnosed with autism. Two years ago his parents put him on a waiting list down in Niagara for this government's much-touted, much-ballyhooed autism treatment program. Two years later, Cameron is nowhere near receiving treatment. His parents can't wait any longer and now, at a cost of \$2,800 a month, they've had

to retain private rehabilitative services for their son because this government failed them.

Curtis Moore was assessed with and fit the eligibility requirements for the early autism initiative in June 2001. He, along with 38 other kids, was placed on a waiting list in Niagara, where they languish while this government dithers over who will be served and who is more needy or deserving.

What is this government waiting for? These kids need treatment. They need it now. Autism is not something that can't be treated. It can be. Like any other medical condition, these children deserve and have a right to that treatment. This government has chosen to abandon those kids—Curtis, Cameron and so many others down in Niagara and thousands more across this province—while it balances its budget on the backs of the poorest and the sick.

UNITED EMPIRE LOYALISTS' DAY

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): Five years ago this government passed a bill proclaiming United Empire Loyalists' Day. Today, June 19, Loyalists' Day, we are once again given the chance to recognize the sacrifice and the contributions made by thousands of United Empire Loyalists who fled persecution south of the border to make their home in Canada.

Today my colleague from Simcoe North, Garfield Dunlop, hosted a flag-raising ceremony outside the Legislature to mark this occasion. To Loyalist descendants who have travelled to Queen's Park, I want to say welcome and thank you for being here on this very special day.

I recently welcomed close to 100 proud descendants of United Empire Loyalists to Norfolk county during their national conference. Not only did the occasion give me a chance to recognize the legacy that patriotic Loyalists have left behind, but also an opportunity to reflect on my Loyalist heritage. Officially, I am UE through the Bowlby family on my mom's side, and, I might mention, my middle name is Butler.

To look across the Legislature today, we all benefit from the Loyalist vision that founded our province and our Dominion. The very motto of this province, "Loyal in the beginning, so remaining," is inscribed on our coat of arms and remains a constant reminder of Loyalist values. God save the Queen.

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): I, too, rise in recognition of

Loyalists' Day in the province of Ontario. This is an important day to all Ontarians. However, I happen to feel a special connection as I represent an area of eastern Ontario that owes much of its development to the Loyalist landing in Adolphustown, which is in my riding, that happened in 1784.

It is on this day that we recognize the contributions of the Loyalist settlers. The lives they lived and the beliefs they pursued were key to the founding principles of this province. They embraced ideas of courage, perseverance, freedom and loyalty. The theme of loyalty that is reflected in our provincial motto, "Loyal she began, loyal she remains," is a tribute to these Loyalist settlers. Their way of life greatly influenced the social climate and political structures of what was to become this great province as we know it today. Canada's proud tradition of a multicultural mosaic has its roots with the Loyalist settlers. The Loyalist spirit and beliefs are still alive and well in the people of this province.

Also, I am proud to claim that I am of Loyalist ancestry, as my forefathers and foremothers came to Lennox and Addington county from Connecticut. They were people with a spirit of perseverance, courage, commitment to freedom and dreams to create better lives for their families. Today we pay tribute to their faith and work ethic that contributed so significantly to the building of this great province.

1340

CANADA DAY IN CAMBRIDGE

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): More good news from Cambridge. Families in the riding of Cambridge celebrate our heritage with an outstanding display of national pride each Canada Day. The highlight of the festivities is the annual Canada Day parade, one of the largest in Canada. This year's event features marching bands from across Ontario and Cambridge's own Scout House Band. There are also many innovative floats contributed by the Shriners and Canadian Legion branches 121, 126 and 272, among others. This parade is a hallmark of our community and is enjoyed by thousands of children and adults.

I wish to acknowledge and congratulate the volunteer organizers, especially chairperson Kim Elvin and her dedicated committee, for their hard work. I would also like to thank the many volunteers and corporate sponsors such as Rockwell Automation. Ridgehill Ford and Ford Canada will be sponsoring an exciting Harvard airplane flyover.

This year's parade grand marshal is the Anne Dunne world champion women's senior curling team.

The Cambridge Canada Day parade will take place in the historic community of Hespeler along the heritage Speed River just north of the 401 on Highway 24.

I'd like to invite everyone in Ontario to join with us in Cambridge to celebrate Canada's birthday. The parade starts at 2 pm on Monday, July 1, and it promises to be a great day.

SCHOOL SAFETY

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): I rise today to tell the House about some real concerns that have been expressed by both parents and professional educators in my riding. They've raised some very valid issues with concern to school safety and the ability of our schools in Toronto to have effective safety measures.

In April, I circulated a survey in conjunction with our school trustee to all the principals and parent councils in Don Valley East. I asked them about the security measures that were in place in their school and what changes and improvements needed to be made. The results were quite clear. Schools are doing the best they can with the resources they've been given. They do their best to communicate safety plans to parents and students alike, but by no means are their plans or staffing abilities adequate, and they know who has to assist them.

Parents at Broadlands, Cassandra and Milne Valley want video surveillance cameras in their schools. Staff from Seneca Hill, Senator O'Connor, Lescon, Brian and Donview schools know that they don't have enough teachers, lunchroom supervisors, educational assistants and custodial staff to provide adequate supervision in their schools. Even simple requests for additional lighting in schools are not being fulfilled because of the same reason: the inadequate Ernie Eves school funding formula that is draining our schools' ability to respond to safety and security needs.

They also have real concerns about bullying in the schools. Reductions in the number of youth workers available to deal with students, the diminution of after-school clubs for youth and funding-formula-related cuts to ESL programming and vice-principals means a lessened ability of our schools to cope with student problems.

I have no idea why the Minister of Education will not immediately commit to implementing Dalton McGuinty's safe school plan. If the schools in Don Valley East are any indication, there is a clear desire by both parents and educators to take immediate steps. Teachers, students and parents alike can't be focused on learning if they don't feel safe. Minister, I will be sending you the results of this survey, and I know that the parents and educators are waiting for your answer. They—

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

GEORGE MARCELLO

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I rise in the House today to recognize the tireless efforts of a very special individual, George Marcello. Seven years ago, George received a liver transplant that saved his life. George was grateful for the second chance at life, so grateful that he became a man on a mission to promote the importance of organ and tissue donations.

His mission began in 1997, when he walked from Toronto to Ottawa. The following year, he helped create the Step by Step Organ Transplant Association. In 1999,

George walked for awareness again, this time completing a 2,500-kilometre, liver-shaped route in Ontario in only 96 days.

This particular journey caught the attention of former Premier Mike Harris. In the throne speech of October 21, 1999, inspired by George Marcello, Harris pledged to double the organ donation rate in Ontario by 2005. A new Premier's Advisory Board on Organ Donation was also created. This board is headed by hockey's most colourful personality, Don Cherry.

In spite of the enormous amount of publicity he had already generated for his cause, George Marcello didn't stop walking. This time, he raised the bar to cover the entire country. In June 2000, George began a 769-day walk across Canada, starting in Toronto.

Earlier this month, on day 715 of the journey, George stopped in Orillia to visit with students in my riding. George was carrying the Olympic-style torch that became the symbol of hope, harmony and spirit for his important mission.

George will finish his cross-country trek on July 27 right here at Queen's Park, and I hope many people can join us. But his mission will no doubt continue.

On behalf of my caucus colleagues and the citizens of the province of Ontario, I congratulate and commend George for his unwavering dedication to educating Canadians about how organ and tissue donations can save our lives.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): I was there. I was there the other day when, in a desperate attempt to cling to power just for the sake of having it, Ernie say-anything Eves eviscerated seven years' worth of message track in one fell swoop. No more "Just doing what we said we'd do," and the nauseatingly familiar "Tax cuts increase revenue" relegated to the dustbin of Ontario history.

Oh, what will Marilyn Mushinski say now? The retooling effort to reprogram the message tracks of the seal brigade is underway. Luckily, the BS-ometers of Ontario's voters are in better working condition than Ernie Eves's radar, which has him jumping all around like a Mexican jumping bean, trying to convince Ontarians that after years of initiating deadly, rapacious attacks on their beloved public services, he actually cares—that he actually cares about anything but a desperate attempt to cling to the perks of power, like golfing with the Tiger.

Don't take my word for it. In a rare moment of candour from these pathological politicians, they sent their lawyer to court this morning to argue before a judge that the courts should ignore the statements of Conservative ministers—ignore them because they will say anything. Exactly.

"The minister's statements are not indicative of legislative intent and should be given no weight." Exactly, like our first minister. Even their own lawyers know it: you can't trust Ernie Eves. He'll say anything.

DURHAM CENTRAL FAIR

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): It's on occasions like this, with students in the audience, that I'm often embarrassed by the performance on the other side.

I rise in the House to pay tribute to the Durham Central Agricultural Society on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Durham Central Fair. It's also known locally as the Orono Fair. This is one of the most successful fairs in all of Ontario because it's about agriculture and activities the whole family can enjoy. That is why attendance has continued to climb to well over 15,000 last year. Attractions include parades, livestock shows, commercial exhibitions, music, a demolition derby and performances by the Hell Drivers.

The Orono Fair belongs to the entire community. There are literally hundreds of volunteers I'd like to mention who contribute to its success each year. Many more participate as exhibitors and sponsors. The board of directors includes: president, Charlie Harris—no relation to Michael Harris—first vice-president, Larry Luxton; second vice-president, Donna Scott; past president, Brian Cascagnette; fair manager, Gord Robinson, who's also a local councillor; secretary-treasurer, Eileen Kennedy; and promotions and marketing manager, Darlene Brown, who does an excellent job. They are capably assisted by 25 directors.

In keeping with the 150th anniversary, there will be a historic display of photographs taken throughout the years of the fair, with memorabilia items such as ribbons, trophies and school projects. A commemorative painting by a well-known local artist, Eric Bowman, depicting the Durham Central Fair in the past and present will be a souvenir commissioned by the board on this occasion.

The Orono Fair is a long-standing tradition not only in heritage and agriculture but also in building strong communities.

This will happen September 5 to 8. I cordially invite all members of the House on both sides to attend the fair in September. I welcome the students to attend Durham Central Fair in Orono.

1350

VISITORS

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know you and this chamber would want to be introduced to page Lindsey O'Brien's parents, Paul and Lori O'Brien, and her grandparents, Ross and Audrey Dodridge, sitting in our members' gallery.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to our Legislature a busload of 50 Kingstonians who have come all the way from Kingston to be with us in the Ontario Legislature. They are in the public gallery and the members' gallery.

On a further point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like this chamber to recognize the presence today of Joan

Fawcett, former member for Northumberland, in our gallery.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am sure you and all members of the assembly would like to know that we have with us today Chief Leo Friday from the community of Kasheshewan, along with Nabil Batrouny, one of the consultants working on their SuperBuild project. We look forward to meeting with the minister later on this afternoon.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want to welcome young Martin from Dewson public school, and Christine from Palmerston, who have come here with their parents to visit and to learn from the proceedings to this Legislature. I welcome them.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

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

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

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): Pursuant to standing orders 59(a) and 60(a), I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on estimates on the estimates selected and not selected by the standing committee for consideration.

I am glad to inform the House that that important work begins next Tuesday.

Clerk at the Table (Mr Todd Decker): Your committee begs to present its report as follows:

Pursuant to standing order 59, your committee has selected the estimates, 2002-03, of the following ministries and offices for consideration:

The Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care—

Interjection: Dispense.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Dispensed.

Pursuant to standing order 60(b), the report of the committee is deemed to be received, and the estimates of the ministries and offices named therein as not being selected for consideration by the committee are deemed to be concurred in.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on regulations and private bills and move its adoption.

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

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting Groves Memorial Community Hospital.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ELLIOTT ACT, 2002

Mr Arnott moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting The Elliott.

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

Pursuant to standing order 86(a), this bill stands referred to the Commissioners of Estate Bills.

MEGA-HOG FARM CONTROL ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LE CONTRÔLE DES GROSSES EXPLOITATIONS PORCINES

Mr Lalonde moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 110, An Act to control mega-hog farms / Projet de Loi 110, Loi visant à contrôler les grosses exploitations porcines.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): This bill deems mega-hog farms to be identified as industrial for purposes of the official plan of the municipality where the farm is located. The operation of a mega-hog farm is not a normal farm practice under the Farming and Food Production Protection Act.

These hog farms at the present time have created environmental problems, especially in Quebec. They have put a freeze on for two years until regulations are put in place, and this is what we have to do down here too.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (HELMETS), 2002

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE (CASQUES)

Mr Levac moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 111, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act / Projet de loi 111, Loi modifiant le Code de la route.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): The bill amends the Highway Traffic Act to make it an offence for any person to

use a skateboard, scooter, Rollerblades or roller skates on a highway without wearing a helmet. Parents and guardians of a person under the age of 16 are also guilty of an offence if they authorize and knowingly permit that person to contravene the restrictions. A police officer may require the person to identify themselves if the police officer finds that person contravening that restriction. The authority to make regulations to exempt persons from the requirement of wearing helmets is now repealed.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe we have unanimous consent on the motion I will be presenting, and I understand that Minister Runciman wishes to speak for five minutes following me and that the NDP will speak for five minutes following the minister.

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

Mr Bartolucci: First of all, before I start, I want to thank the three House leaders for entering into negotiations and coming to the conclusion that this JOEMAC resolution was important enough to be brought forward in the House. So I want to thank Mr Stockwell, Mr Duncan and Mr Kormos.

I'd also like to thank Minister Runciman for his ongoing support of the MacDonald family, the Fragomeni family, for understanding the hurt of the community of Sudbury. I want to thank the third party as well for the expertise and the advice that they've offered over the last several months. And I want to thank Dalton McGuinty, who passed the first resolution dealing with the placement of Suzack and Pennett, and also my fellow caucus members for the amount of time and duty they do for me while I'm working on the JOEMAC committee.

The JOEMAC committee, as you know, was established in November 2001 to try to bring together all the groups who were outraged that the killers of Joe MacDonald—Peter Pennett and Clinton Suzack—would be moved from maximum security to medium security. There was an outrage in our community, an outrage that in fact spread quickly across this province and this country with regard to the policies used by Correctional Service of Canada. There was a need for a grassroots group to initiate a concerted lobby effort. We need and needed the help of a lot of people and a lot of groups. I immediately went to the Office for Victims of Crime. There I was met by Sharon Rosenfeldt, Scott Newark and Jim Stephenson, who are in the Speaker's gallery today. Sharon immediately said, "We are here to help the MacDonald family. We are here to help the JOEMAC committee." They assigned Detective Sergeant John Muise to the committee. John has been invaluable to us with his expertise and his knowledge.

1400

We needed support from other people as well, so we went to the Police Association of Ontario. They are represented in the Speaker's gallery today by Bruce

Miller, their administrator. Immediately Bob Baltin and Bruce Miller said that, yes, it was important we form a partnership, so the Police Association of Ontario is an equal partner on the JOEMAC committee. Every time we go around and speak to various groups in this province, we wear our Club Fed badges. We support the resolution of the Canadian Police Association and the Police Association of Ontario, their nationwide petition to make changes by the federal government. We want to thank them for their ongoing commitment to this cause.

A committee is only as good as the dedicated members who make it up, and today I am proud and pleased to have with me in this House Nancy MacDonald, Joe's wife, and Franco Fragomeni, Joe's brother-in-law, two key components of the JOEMAC committee because they bring with them the emotion and the expertise and the knowledge one can only get from suffering such a tragedy.

We met as a committee for the first time in November 2001. We mapped out a strategy. The short-term goal was to get a meeting with the Solicitor General of this country, Lawrence MacAulay, so that we could put our point of view forward. Our long-term goal was to effect systemic change in Canada so that the safety of the public would be paramount in the minds of those people who are elected federally when they make policy.

The JOEMAC committee decided we would first start with municipalities, so we went to the city of Greater Sudbury and asked them to pass the resolution that hopefully this House will pass today. From our city it went to the city of Sault Ste Marie, and then other cities in northern Ontario, finally ending up at the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities, where it was passed. It will be presented to AMO, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, hopefully be adopted there, and then next year at the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, where we hope it will be adopted.

Secondly, JOEMAC felt it important that we bring our police services on board, so we went to the police services board of Sudbury and asked it to pass the resolution. It did, and then Sault Ste Marie did, Espanola did, and several other police services boards, and finally at the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards, they adopted the resolution supporting JOEMAC in its goals for change.

Then, with our partner the Police Association of Ontario, we went to the police forces across Ontario, seeking their support, and indeed we were met with only open arms and the determination and the dedication to support and to make change.

Today we launch what JOEMAC calls the JOEMAC National Drive for Justice. We will be presenting this motion to every Legislature in every province and territory in Canada over the next while. We want to ensure that across this country people understand the importance of having laws that protect public safety and the need to have a concerted voice speaking on behalf of ordinary Ontarians and Canadians.

So our intent is to have this motion passed today. We in Ontario will be the first province in Canada, hopefully,

to pass this. I am proud to be part of a Legislature that believes in the importance of public safety.

If federal solicitor Lawrence MacAulay won't listen to the voice of JOEMAC, if it won't listen to the voice of the Canadian Police Association, if it won't listen to the voices of the Police Association of Ontario and the Office for Victims of Crime, hopefully the federal Solicitor General will listen to the united voices of every province and territory in this country when we suggest, and move, that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario call upon the Solicitor General to undertake the following three directives as demanded by the JOEMAC committee during its February 18, 2002, meeting with Mr MacAulay:

“(1) Ensure the immediate return of Clinton Suzack and Peter Pennett to maximum security to serve the duration of their 25-year sentence for the first-degree murder of Constable Joe MacDonald.

“(2) Order an external review of Correctional Services of Canada in light of the compelling and irrefutable evidence that CSC continues to pursue a dangerous and illegal policy whereby prisoners are cascaded to lower security settings and ultimately freedom, based not on individual risk assessments but on meeting numerical targets or quotas.

“(3) Follow through with a commitment made in April 2000 before a federal justice committee whereby he denied the existence of the aforementioned policy and offered to confirm this in writing to the CSC commissioner, wardens and staff that the prisoners must not be cascaded to lower security settings and ultimately, freedom based on numerical quotas.”

I thank this House for its support of this motion.

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Public Safety and Security): I want to thank the member for Sudbury for proposing this opportunity to speak about the work of the JOEMAC committee and thank him as well for his work on the committee.

Our government strongly supports the resolution put forward by the JOEMAC committee. Corrections Canada's decision to allow Joe's killers to serve their sentences in anything less than a maximum security prison, let alone a Club Fed setting, is a disservice to the memory of Joe MacDonald, his family and friends and thousands of other Canadians who are victims of violent crime. I especially appreciate this opportunity to speak today because in 1993 I was sitting over there. I was our party's critic for the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Ministry of Correctional Services, and Joe MacDonald's murder became a significant issue in this Legislature. During that time I got to know Joe's widow, Nancy, quite well, and I became a close friend of her brother, Franco Fragomeni. I'm grateful that both have joined us here today.

Perhaps because of my relationship with the family, Joe's death became very much a personal matter for me and a driving force behind many of the initiatives I was able to bring forward when I became Solicitor General. I don't want to rehash all the circumstances leading up to

and surrounding Joe's murder, but I do want to say that if any good flowed from this tragedy, it was a series of changes that have markedly improved police officer and public safety in Ontario.

In August 1995, we authorized the use of hollow point ammunition by Ontario's police officers and we followed that with a complete revamping of the Ontario Board of Parole, making community safety a primary factor in a release decision. I have the great pleasure of appointing Joe's brother-in-law, Franco, as one of the first new members of the parole board. Today, Franco continues to serve the people of Ontario by helping the Office for Victims of Crime in its important work, helping crime victims throughout Ontario, and he's done an outstanding job.

1410

In an initiative that I am most proud of, an initiative that was motivated by a murder that left a young woman without her best friend and husband and two children without their dad, we established the public safety officer survivors' tuition fund, a fund that pays for post-secondary education for survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty.

In closing, in the presence of a very strong and courageous lady, a lady who has led the fight for victims' rights right across this country, as well as with her friends and family here today, I would like to announce that this morning the government of Ontario officially renamed the survivors' scholarship fund in honour of the man whose death was the catalyst for its creation. From this day forward, the fund will be known as the Constable Joe MacDonald scholarship fund.

God bless you, Nancy.

Applause.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): New Democrats, this caucus, are pleased to have been able to help ensure that this resolution came to the floor of this House today. First-degree murder is the most serious offence in our Criminal Code, in our criminal justice system. The Criminal Code dictates mandatory sentencing ranges—in this case, a minimum of 25 years before parole eligibility.

The reason that mandatory minimum is there is because there is a point at which, let's say, the interest in mere rehabilitation has to give way to the broader interest of public safety. New Democrats join others in this assembly in calling for as strong an assurance of public safety as our justice institutions are capable of providing. So I say to you that just as we joined in resolutions in the fall and winter of last year that called for the return of these offenders to maximum security facilities, we join with the members of this assembly in that same call again today.

We don't do it in the interest of obtaining vengeance; we do it in the interest of justice and the safety of the community. There is a point when the conduct of our fellow citizens—yes, it's our fellow citizens—becomes so indifferent to the safety of others, in this instance resulting in the tragic loss of a husband and a father and a community member and a good police officer, that the

perpetrators of those types of crime have to be isolated in the interest of protecting other people from what they might do yet to others.

The tragic thing is that this is not an isolated instance. In this case we're dealing with two offenders and no, not just one victim, Constable Joe Macdonald, but his family and his colleagues in the police force and his community. All of them are victims. It's not isolated, and that makes it even more tragic.

I recently read Michael Harris's book *Con Game: The Truth about Canada's Prisons*. I commend it to you. It's consistent with everything I've ever read about the complete state of chaos in our federal prison system, and not just the lack of management by the federal government but an indifference by the federal Liberals to corrections and rehabilitation. It's a federal corrections system that no longer has corrections and rehabilitation, neither of those elements, as a part of it.

New Democrats understand, because when hard-working folks, whether they are from my communities or any of your communities, who struggle on a daily basis raising kids, trying to send kids to university and college and getting second mortgages while they are in their fifties, read the litany of press reports about the largesse and generosity of our federal corrections system to some of its most notorious and dangerous offenders, I say to you that people are outraged, and understandably so.

This is clearly federal jurisdiction. There may be many who criticize this Legislature for entering the field of federal jurisdiction, but it's clear that the federal government has no interest in addressing these issues and has been dragging its feet, notwithstanding the strong, aggressive and pressing efforts of the JOEMAC committee.

So we share the interest of the other members of this assembly in protecting people in our community and ensuring that justice is done and that offenders in the federal correctional system have placements that reflect their level of dangerousness, the severity of their crimes and the length of their sentences, and that those placements should not be altered or changed in any significant way until there has been a thorough and justifiable change in their assessment and in their status that would warrant their re-placement in another facet of the system.

As well, we call for restoration of corrections and rehabilitation into the federal corrections system. Similarly, we call upon the federal government to come to, if you will, and understand that there is a crisis in our prisons. It has been reported that it's the inmates running the corrections system federally. Every single bit of evidence points to that. We say that has to come to an end. We say there has to be a meaningful reform at the federal level by the federal Liberals of our federal corrections system to ensure safety and to ensure effective rehabilitation and correction of inmates.

The Speaker: Mr Bartolucci moves that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario call upon the Solicitor General to undertake the following three directives as demanded by the JOEMAC committee during its February 18, 2002, meeting with Mr MacAulay:

“(1) Ensure the immediate return of Clinton Suzack and Peter Pennett to maximum security to serve the duration of their 25-year sentence for the first-degree murder of Constable Joe MacDonald.

“(2) Order an external review of Correctional Services of Canada in light of the compelling and irrefutable evidence that CSC continues to pursue a dangerous and illegal policy whereby prisoners are cascaded to lower security settings and ultimately freedom, based not on individual risk assessment but on meeting numerical targets or quotas.

(3) Follow through with the commitment made in April 2000 before a federal justice committee whereby he denied the existence of the aforementioned policy and offered to confirm this in writing to the CSC commissioner, wardens and staff that the prisoners must not be cascaded to lower security settings and ultimately, freedom based on numerical quotas.”

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

ESTIMATES

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Mr Speaker, I rise today on a point of order with regard to standing order 58 that relates to the estimates that are supposed to be presented before the estimates committee. Standing order 58 requires that the government table its estimates on the next available sitting day following Victoria Day.

As you know, this year, because of the legislative calendar and because of the government bringing its budget in late, there was a motion passed in this House to deal with the budget at a later date. This year the House, by way of the motion, extended the deadline for tabling the estimates to June 17, 2002. According to standing orders 59 and 61, it's now incumbent upon the standing committee on estimates to consider the estimates of between six and 12 ministries and to report back to the House no later than the third Thursday in November.

Yesterday, the committee was informed by the government members that the complete package—and I repeat, the complete package—of supplementary information was not ready for the committee's consideration. In fact, they moved a motion and in discussion have said they would not be ready until July 2.

As my colleague from Niagara Centre would say, too bad, so sad. If you haven't got them ready, no excuse. You guys are the government. You're supposed to have them ready. The committee has a right to begin its consideration of estimates next week, and the ministries' unpreparedness in no way should prevent the committee from probing into the financial management of this government through the estimates committee. Otherwise, ministers could avoid the entire estimates process simply by instructing their staff not to be ready. Clearly this was not the intent of the financial procedures as outlined in our standing orders.

1420

Speaker, I would ask you to rule on the motion rammed through by government members of this committee yesterday at estimates. It states, in the way they did it, that the committee will begin its inquiries into the estimates of the Ministry of Health subject to the ministry's readiness. I put to you, Speaker, that such a motion infringes on my rights as a member of the estimates committee to fulfill my obligations under standing orders 58 and 61. I look for your guidance on that matter.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, this is not a new practice. It's a practice that's been long held, a tradition established—

Interjection.

Hon Mr Stockwell: No, it's established, a tradition that has been practised for many years. The argument is, were the estimates tabled on time? The answer is, yes, the estimates were tabled on time. The briefing books often come after the estimates. Every government produces their estimates and then briefing books afterward.

I understand the member's concern. His concern is that since we postponed the tabling of the estimates, there would be some concern with respect to starting early. The fact is, that's why the agreement was made that provided up to 70 hours of estimates time to be heard. That was a unanimous consent, agreement, among this House: that there will be up to 70 hours of hearings before estimates.

Furthermore, it was this House that agreed that seven and a half hours would be provided per ministry. My only suggestion to the member opposite is, if you don't like what was agreed to, then you either should have said no at the time or you should have consulted with your House leader, the member for Niagara Centre. I can only assume he consulted with his caucus, as I'm sure the House leader for the Liberals consulted with his caucus and I consulted with my caucus. By unanimous consent, we passed that motion. There is nothing out of order. If, after the fact, you have a great deal of frustration with the decision, then I think you should take that up with your House leader rather than the Speaker.

Mr Bisson: I don't want to get into a debate, but the point is this: when that motion was brought to the House, it was with the understanding that the information would be ready to do estimates at the date we had provided. Now what we've got is a government that basically says, "It ain't ready. Oops. Too bad. Therefore, we're not going to deal with our estimates until July." Surprise, the House is not in session. We probably won't get any hearings during the summer and the government is able to get away with at least half of the time killed off of the 70 hours, which means many of the ministries will not have an opportunity to be scrutinized by the estimates committee. That's why, Mr Speaker, I'm asking for your help on this particular matter.

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): On the same point of order, Mr Speaker: just briefly, as the appointed Chair of estimates committee, I want to point out for the information of the government that our usual

practice is to receive detailed estimates within a week. A courtesy period is provided. Just to be clear, for the information of the House, that is a separate issue quite distinct from—I think there were some problems arising with the consent resolution in that we were advised at the committee that the ministries would not be able to provide us with the supplementary briefing notes, which standing order 64 instructs ministries to have available.

I just want to make sure there is a clear understanding. That is the issue the Management Board information put to us at committee yesterday and which is being brought forward to the House today.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I thank the members for their comments. Standing order 64 does say that the committee on estimates shall be provided "with advanced briefing material which shall include" some information. That's standing order 64. I have no way of enforcing that.

I would hope it's through some circumstances, inadvertently, that this may not have happened this year. I will say this, though: what I have noticed in the past is that when it happens one year, it becomes historical and continues on. If this is an inadvertent circumstance, if there were some surrounding circumstances—ministers taking over late in the process—it may not have been done.

There isn't a point of order now, but I will be checking to make sure, if in fact it has been inadvertent, the government adheres to standing order 64 which does say that advanced briefing material will be provided to the committee. Hopefully this is a case this year where there were some unforeseen circumstances. I say very clearly to the government, I hope this will not become a precedent for that committee.

Mr Bisson: Mr Speaker, I just want to thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Hon Mr Stockwell: On a point of order, Speaker: I appreciate the fact that you read standing order 64, but may I add that if in history it had ever been done that way, where the briefing books were provided at the same time the estimates were tabled, I would say OK, that we would be breaking tradition. But quite candidly, and I say to the member opposite, the Chair of the estimates committee, there's usually a grace period between filing the estimates and providing the books. We haven't even exceeded that week yet.

If there is an argument to be made, I'm sure Management Board is working very feverishly to meet the one week or eight days, but surely today there can be nothing out of order, is what I'm suggesting.

Mr Kennedy: On a point of order, Speaker: For the information of the House, all the members of the committee agreed with a letter that has gone to the Minister of Health asking for the co-operation exactly as articulated by the House leader, and we would look forward to that. We hope to hear by Friday, and to have that information, if it's possible, by Monday. We could proceed as scheduled on Tuesday.

The Speaker: The committee has done the right thing and we wish them well. The committee has forwarded that and has done the correct procedure.

DEFERRED VOTES

BUILDING CODE STATUTE
LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2002LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT DES LOIS
EN CE QUI CONCERNE
LE CODE DU BÂTIMENT

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 124, An Act to improve public safety and to increase efficiency in building code enforcement / Projet de loi 124, Loi visant à améliorer la sécurité publique et à accroître l'efficacité dans l'exécution du code du bâtiment.

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

The division bells rang from 1426 to 1431.

The Speaker: Mr Hodgson has moved third reading of Bill 124. All those in favour, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

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

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Bartolucci, Rick	Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David
Bisson, Gilles	Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario
Bountrogianni, Marie	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Boyer, Claudette	Dombrowsky, Leona	McGuinty, Dalton
Bradley, James J.	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Brown, Michael A.	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Gravelle, Michael	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Ramsay, David
Churley, Marilyn	Kennedy, Gerard	Ruprecht, Tony
Cleary, John C.	Kormos, Peter	Smitherman, George

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 53; the nays are 33.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Yesterday, the Premier presented me with a hat to eat. I just wanted to say I appreciate it. I deserved it. I want to acknowledge that I made a mistake. I've learned my lesson, and it won't happen again.

On Focus Ontario, I was asked, "Will they delay the tax cuts?" and I said, "No way. If they do, I'll eat my hat." The reason I said that was they said they wouldn't delay them. They passed legislation on it. There's actually a law that says they can't delay it. But I was wrong, and I deserved it yesterday, and I did eat my hat.

Just to let everybody know, I won't make the same mistake again. I'd urge all members on both sides of the Legislature to never say publicly that if the government doesn't do what it promises to do, you'll eat your hat, because you may find that Premier Eves will deliver a hat to you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

ONTARIO BUDGET

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. In your budget—a budget which is becoming affectionately known as the "I'll say anything to hang on to power" budget—you walked away from your fundamental commitments that you'd made, in particular, tax cuts and your Taxpayer Protection Act. In so doing, you walked away from your principles.

Your budget represents a dramatic departure from your six previous budgets. I think that makes it especially important that the Ontario public have an opportunity to comment on your budget. Will you agree to hold public hearings to give Ontarians an opportunity to comment on your budget?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The leader of the official opposition has obviously not been in the same place that the rest of the world has been since September 11. The events of September 11 have had a profound impact upon revenues in every jurisdiction in North America and indeed, most jurisdictions in the western world. Every jurisdiction has taken their own steps to deal with those problems.

The state of Michigan, for example, has gone from a surplus of about \$1 billion to \$3 billion to a deficit of \$1 billion to \$3 billion. I guess we could have run a deficit of \$1 billion to \$3 billion in the province of Ontario and responded the way they did, but we decided to defer our tax cuts for one year.

By the way, we did proceed with five tax cuts in the budget, as we had indicated, which cover 88% of the businesses in the province of Ontario, being the small business community. I assume the leader of the official opposition is at least in favour of that.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, use whatever convenient excuse you may settle on, but the fact is you have broken

your promises and you have decided to break your own law.

I asked you about public hearings. Let me quote you, sir, in 1991, when you were standing on this side of the House. You said, "Why is the opinion of the public of Ontario, which could be very easily heard on this budget through reference to a committee, with open public hearings, not important to the Premier of Ontario?" That was a question you yourself asked when you sat on this side of the House.

More recently in your throne speech, you said that listening was the hallmark of courage. I ask you the same question that you asked of Premier Bob Rae back in 1991: why is the opinion of the public of Ontario, which could be very easily heard on this budget through reference to committee, with open public hearings, not important to the Premier of Ontario?

Hon Mr Eves: Life must indeed be boring over there. They're digging up all kinds of quotes and reading them in their spare time.

I would say to the leader of the official opposition that the member for Scarborough-Agincourt just stood up on a point of order at the beginning of question period and good-naturedly, of course, talked about the Focus Ontario issue. He forgot to include, though, in his point of order another quote that he had in that interview, that "We"—meaning the Liberal Party I presume—"would like to see them defer the tax cuts." That is exactly what we did. He didn't say "cancel," he said "defer" the tax cuts. That is exactly what we did to meet the exigencies of the fiscal year resulting from the September 11 fallout.

1440

Now, the leader of the official opposition can pretend, if he wants, that September 11 didn't happen, that it didn't have an impact on the economy of Canada, that it didn't have an impact on the province of Ontario, on Manitoba, on Quebec, on all the other provinces, but the reality is that it did, and we made the best decisions we could to deal with—

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

Mr McGuinty: Now, Premier, to remind you one more time, before we come back to the question I keep asking you, your government said shortly after September 11 that it was important that we accelerate tax cuts, that we bring them forward. Now you're saying that September 11 means we have to delay them. You're going to have trouble reconciling that.

You told us back in 1991 that it was important that the government listen to you and hold public hearings on the matter of a budget. At least Minister Flaherty, during his last budget, held public hearings. At least we can say that much for this man, a man we greatly miss.

Premier, I ask you, if you said when you sat in opposition that we should hold public hearings, if you maintained through your throne speech that listening was the hallmark of courage, if at the time of your last budget you held public hearings, and given that this budget represents such a dramatic departure from your six

previous budgets, do you not agree that the best thing to do in the circumstances is to allow the Ontario public to have public hearings?

Hon Mr Eves: We did listen to the people of the province of Ontario. That's why we're spending \$1.7 billion more on health care this year than last, that's why we're spending \$557 million more on education than last and that's why we're spending \$500 million more on environment than last, because we listened to the people of the province of Ontario, who wanted us to do all those things and balance the books of the province at the same time. That's how we got to where we are today.

It's easy to snip from that side of the House. On this side of the House, you actually have responsibility and you actually have to be able to do something with that responsibility.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Education. The school boards have now come to understand fully the impact of your abandonment of public education. Here are some of the comments that have been coming in.

The director of education in Ottawa says the board is in critical condition and your budget simply won't help. In London, where they are facing an \$11-million shortfall, the education director says, "There's nothing"—in the budget—"that will allow us to go to the community and say, 'Hallelujah.'"

In Welland, the superintendent of financial services said, "Provincial funding for school boards doesn't realistically reflect the true costs of delivering quality elementary and secondary ... programs."

Tom Kilpatrick, chair of the Greater Essex County District School Board, says, "It's not anywhere near what we need."

Your budget continues to starve public education, but you remain very much committed, Madam Minister, to putting half a billion dollars into private schools. I ask you on behalf of Ontario students, why have you abandoned them?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): The level of funding for public school boards this year is the highest ever in the history of this province. We are committing \$14.2 billion. We have increased funding this year, as the Premier has just said, by \$557 million. That is a 2.9% increase at a time when enrolment is only growing by 0.4% and at a time when the economic growth was just 1%.

I would also encourage the Leader of the Opposition to take a look through the newspaper clippings today at the number of boards that have taken the time and made some very difficult decisions. But I'm pleased to say they have been able to balance their budgets.

Mr McGuinty: Your budget, Minister, abandons our children, especially kids who need special help.

Theresa MacNeil, the mother of a child with special needs, said, "The budget won't even touch our kids." Dr

Sandra Fisman, head of Western's psychiatry program, said, "More and more children will continue to fall through the cracks. These problems won't go away, and the prevalence of high school dropouts will become overwhelming."

I believe that our children need help now. That's why I put forward a plan. My plan calls for helping special-needs children now. It calls for ensuring that we're helping students who are struggling now. It calls for stopping school closures now.

I ask you again, Madam Minister, why have you abandoned our children, and why will you not adopt my plan, which will help our kids now?

Hon Mrs Witmer: Our government has responded very quickly to the concerns of people in Ontario. In the last few weeks, the last couple of months, in response to the concerns we heard, we have provided, as I said before, an immediate injection of an additional \$557 million. This is a very significant amount of money at a time when in our province and throughout Canada and throughout the United States we have not seen economic growth. It is a very significant announcement.

As far as special education funding is concerned, we are presently spending about \$1.37 billion. That is a 17% increase since 1989 and that again is a very considerable amount of money. We have also set up the task force to take a look at the funding formula.

I don't think any other government has responded as quickly to the concerns that have been heard. We have listened, we are responding, and we have put more than half a billion dollars—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Final supplementary.

Mr McGuinty: Madam Minister, you yourself don't even believe what you're saying. That is some tripe that you're trotting out there. When was the last time you visited any Ontario schools? They are in trouble. They are struggling. They are on their knees. They've got 39,000 kids waiting on a list for their first special education assessment. Our schools are short of textbooks. We've got deficits popping up around this province like mushrooms in the spring. I suggest that you get out of your limousine and begin to assume your responsibility, which is to take charge of public education.

I ask you, why is it that in this budget you did not stand up for public education? Why did you not say, "I will not tolerate putting half a billion dollars into private schools"?

Hon Mrs Witmer: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't even know what he's talking about. I haven't seen half a billion dollars invested in private schools. But I can tell you what David Peterson did with the school closures. You know what? David Peterson closed 37 schools between 1985 and 1990, and you're trying to pretend that school closures are a new issue? Give me a break.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Take a seat. I'm afraid it's too noisy. The minister had some time left, if she wishes. No? New question.

1450

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): My question is for the Premier. How many more women and children in this province have to die before your government takes significant action to combat domestic violence? Since Gillian Hadley's estranged husband gunned her down two years ago tomorrow, women's advocates have been urging your government to act. Now a juror and a neighbour who tried to save Gillian Hadley's life are telling you that your time is up. They want you to act on the jury's first recommendation: to create a community-based committee to implement the 57 remaining recommendations to help prevent more tragic deaths like Gillian Hadley's. So will you rise today and tell us that you're creating an implementation committee immediately?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I believe the Attorney General has a response to this question.

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): Let me be very clear. This government will not tolerate violence against women or children in this province. We want to help victims break free of domestic violence and we will do everything within our power to do so. We have a track record that demonstrates that we are serious. They are not mere words.

Over the last number of years we have implemented 145 programs over various ministries, spending in excess of \$40 million a year. In terms of the recommendations that the member opposite referenced, indeed we have already begun to implement those recommendations. I would remind her that the recommendation dealing with crown training is well advanced. The recommendation dealing with local domestic violence coordinating committees is well advanced. We take this very seriously and we will have more to say in the next short while.

Ms Churley: Minister, first you had the recommendations from the Arlene May inquest almost four years ago. Then you had the recommendations from the Hadley inquest. A committee without the mandate to implement all of the recommendations is useless. Furthermore, propping up initiatives in the criminal justice system is a narrow approach which is not reaching about 75% of the women who are in this situation. We need a community-based committee, as recommended in the very first recommendation, to get all those other recommendations up and running.

I am asking you again: will you, as a first step, announce today that you are setting up this community-based committee so that all of those recommendations can be implemented immediately?

Hon Mr Young: We are well advanced in the sense of the member opposite talking about first steps. Indeed, we're well beyond first steps. The member referenced the May-Iles inquest and the jury's recommendations that emanated from that proceeding. We've implemented in

excess of 90% of those recommendations, recommendations that include 24 domestic violence courts, the largest number as compared to any province in this country, the most comprehensive system in place. We have moved a considerable distance in relation to shelter beds, which was another recommendation. Indeed, there are 300 new shelter beds across this province, including the Durham area, which was the subject of the most recent coroner's inquest.

I would remind the member opposite that we had an announcement a number of months ago in which we put forward a program that is unlike any in this country that will provide a 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week, 365-days-a-year assaulted women's help line that will provide immediate assistance to women in excess of 140 languages. We are very proud of those programs.

Ms Churley: Minister, in the public gallery today sitting right here are John Wallace, the man who tried to save Gillian Hadley's life; Lorna Ruder, a member of the inquest jury; Eileen Morrow of OAITH; and Denise Brown from the Cross-Sectoral Violence Against Women Strategy Group. They say that you have not implemented most of the major recommendations before you. They say that murder of women and children by violent partners is both predictable and preventable. They say that the focus on propping up those initiatives in the criminal justice system isn't working. You have to do something about affordable housing, bring back second-stage housing, employment initiatives, child care and on and on. Those are the things that you are missing. These people, the experts, are here to tell you and you are still not listening. I will ask you again: will you announce today that you will set up this community-based committee so that those very important initiatives can be taken immediately to save women's lives?

Hon Mr Young: This government's hearts, minds and thoughts are with those individuals who find themselves in situations that may well result in domestic violence. I say to you that we must all resolve to do everything we can and, to the extent possible, leave aside the political rhetoric and leave aside the temptation the member opposite seems to have to try to make this a political football to be punted back and forth.

Indeed, we have done more than simply yell across the legislative floor. We have implemented dozens and dozens of programs and we are appreciative of the hard work that has come from the two juries she referenced earlier; as I indicated, in excess of 40 programs—\$145 million each and every year is being spent by this government and we are committed to doing more because there is always more to do.

Ms Churley: I'd say to the Attorney General that I'll be coming back at him again on that question. That was totally unsatisfactory.

HYDRO ONE

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): My question is for the Premier. We were shocked to read media reports today that say you will sell Hydro One to a single

buyer this summer. It's obvious you're just waiting for the House to rise so you can sneak through your dirty deal while no one is looking. That means no debate in the Legislature and no way for the seven out of 10 Ontarians who oppose your foolish plan to voice an opinion before it is a done deal. So I'm asking you, will you confirm that you absolutely will not sell off a major chunk of Hydro One this summer?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I don't know if the honourable member was in question period yesterday, but both her leader and the leader of the official opposition asked questions about this issue. We indicated that we were not parting with control of Hydro One. We are not selling Hydro One. We did indicate that we will be seeking a private sector discipline to Hydro One, whether it's through strategic partnership or an income trust or an IPO or a NavCan model. We will not part with ultimate control, which will remain in the hands of the people of Ontario.

Ms Churley: Only giving off—what is it?—49%. You know I wasn't at question period yesterday, but I understood what you said yesterday better than you seem to understand it yourself. Premier, we were even more shocked to learn that you will let the private sector partner run Hydro One. In other words, you may have control on paper, but the private sector is still going to wag the dog. That means high executive salaries and perks and it means a strategy that puts power exports with more pollution and more smog ahead of the needs of Ontarians. Premier, will you confirm that you absolutely will not, under any circumstances, turn over management to the private sector?

Hon Mr Eves: We are going to do what is best for the people of the province of Ontario in terms of providing a future supply of electricity for many generations to come. We're going to do it in the most competitive, cost-effective manner possible without parting with control of the assets of Hydro One.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Health. The Lake of the Woods hospital in Kenora desperately wants to offer CT services to their patients. Right now, people in north-western Ontario are forced to travel to Winnipeg or Thunder Bay to get a CT scan and the wait is now approaching 10 weeks and growing.

The hospital has raised the necessary capital dollars to make the purchase. They just need you to authorize the operating dollars to keep it running. Their proposal has been sitting on your desk for 16 months, with no response. We now hear, Minister, that you are looking to the private sector to improve access to MRIs and CTs for Ontario families. Do you not think, sir, that before you do that, you should be ensuring that our public hospitals are operating at full capacity? And why is it that you will not provide the operating dollars to the CT machine in Kenora?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): As the honourable member may know, we review the operating funding for each and every hospital in the province every year. They are required to submit an operating plan, which is in essence a business plan for each hospital.

That is the case for the Lake of the Woods District Hospital, and certainly from our perspective we are trying to make sure the Lake of the Woods District Hospital, like other hospitals in Ontario, operates in a fiscally responsible manner, because that is the way they can deliver excellent patient care. If the honourable member has any more information that could help us reach a satisfactory conclusion on this issue, then that would be helpful as well.

1500

Mr McGuinty: Do you know what I think, Minister? I think you have a private sector bias.

Let me give you some of the numbers we have received from the hospital. Your ministry is now spending \$470,000 to send patients to Manitoba for CT scans. Lake of the Woods District Hospital in Kenora is asking for only 250,000 operating dollars annually. So you would be saving considerable money by operating within the public system and providing the operating dollars to Lake of the Woods District Hospital in Kenora if you were to fund their CT scans.

I ask you again, why are you jumping so suddenly to the private sector when it comes to the delivery of better access to MRIs and CT scans if you have not first ensured that the public hospital system is operating at full capacity?

Hon Mr Clement: If I have any bias at all, it's a bias against having ideological blinkers, which means you're automatically against the private sector.

On this side of the House we're not automatically against—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order.

Hon Mr Clement: On this side of the House we don't condemn the private sector and we don't try to automatically reject private sector alternatives. We try to work with the private sector to deliver more accountability and more accessibility for the citizens in Ontario. If the honourable member has a problem with that, he should state it in front of this House rather than using the words that he uses.

This is what the Ontario Hospital Association has been saying about the Ernie Eves budget: "The OHA is very pleased that Premier Eves has delivered on his government's commitment to protect patient care services. Today's budget announcement of about \$700 million in additional hospital operating funding, representing a 7.7% increase ... is a significant step forward in meeting patient care needs across Ontario."

That's the response of the hospital sector. We are working with the hospital sector; we are working with the private sector. We'll work with anyone who can deliver better health care for Ontarians, and we are proud of that on this side of the House.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): My question is for the Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation. As the member for Cambridge, I understand the importance of automobile manufacturing, not only to Ontario's economy, but also, as a whole, to Cambridge's economy.

Cambridge is the home of Toyota Motor Manufacturing Corp, which employs over 3,000 Ontarians. Not only are the Solara, Matrix and Corolla made in Cambridge; Toyota recently announced that their new Lexus SUV will be made in Cambridge. This is great news not only for Cambridge but for Ontario, as it marks the very first time a Lexus has ever been made outside Japan.

Minister, I know you are aware of how important the auto industry is to our province, which is why you hosted an automobile round table with industry experts in May. I would like to know what you have done since the round table to help ensure this industry remains a strong part of Ontario's economy.

Hon Jim Flaherty (Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation): What a great question from the member for Cambridge, a terrific question. Just over two weeks ago I had the pleasure of meeting with the North American president of Toyota, Mr Tag Taguchi. He expressed to me how Toyota was proud to have chosen Ontario and Cambridge as the home for the first ever Lexus to be built outside of Japan.

The auto sector is vitally important to the economy of Ontario. It employs more than 130,000 people in the province. There are challenges globally. It is a globally competitive industry. There is some overcapacity in terms of production. For those reasons, we are developing an automotive strategy for Ontario in co-operation with my federal colleague.

Interjection: Who?

Hon Mr Flaherty: It's Allan Rock, actually.

We had a round table on May 22 in Toronto, to be followed by another round table hosted by the federal government next week in either Hamilton or Toronto. I have also met with the CEOs of the large assemblers and some of the parts companies as well and, of course, with Buzz Hargrove—

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

Mr Martiniuk: Thank you for that response, Minister. I'm pleased to hear about your meetings with these industry leaders, particularly Toyota. The importance of Toyota's continued investment in Ontario and in Cambridge cannot be overstated.

I would like to know what steps our government is taking to help ensure the strength of the automobile industry.

Hon Mr Flaherty: We're taking steps to develop our automotive strategy. The report is being released with respect to the round table. We're developing an Ontario automotive innovation group to report back on the innovation challenges the industry faces and to recommend

ways to address those challenges. We're also establishing an Ontario automotive skills working group to identify training and skills challenges that Ontario faces and to present proposals in that regard.

As I say, I'm working with my federal colleague. All of the science, technology and innovation ministers from across Canada will be meeting in the next two days in Vancouver. I'll be bringing to their attention our developments and the steps we're taking in Ontario as we move forward to the federal round table next week in Ontario.

PRIMARY CARE REFORM

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Health. While nearly one million Ontarians are without a family doctor, we hear that you continue to drag your feet on primary health care reform. I just want to go over the history of this matter and your government.

In 1996, then-Minister of Health Jim Wilson announced, "1996 will be the year we move ahead on primary care reform." In 1998, Minister Liz Witmer announced primary care pilot sites. In 2001, Minister Tony Clement said, "You're going to see this thing come out of the starting gate like a coiled spring." The commitment was that we were going to have 80% of family doctors signed up on to a health network by 2004. Now we hear that you have abandoned that target and that goal entirely.

Can you tell us now—we've had three statements from past ministers, including yourself—what is the new goal, and how much longer must Ontario families wait until they can join primary care reform?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I'd be happy to report to this House that Ontario leads the country in primary care reform. We are proud of that. We are proud of the fact that we are opening family health networks. We opened one in Oakville. We're opening one in Guelph. There is a lot of interest. There have been 600 interviews and discussions with 600 different family practitioners by Dr Ruth Wilson, who is the head of the Ontario Family Health Network. We are on track. We are excited by the prospect of a new beginning for family practice in Ontario.

We are leading Canada, incidentally, without a single penny of federal health care dollars. So if the honourable member wants to be productive, phone Anne McLellan, phone Jean Chrétien. Get some action from the feds, and maybe we can work together for a change.

1510

Mr McGuinty: Minister, the only thing you forgot to mention is that this thing is going to come out of the gate like a coiled spring. You got everything else out, but you forgot that part.

Your model that you have chosen for primary care reform is not working. Only 2% of Ontario's family doctors have signed on. I have proposed an alternative. It is driven by communities; it is not bound by ideology. I

say to you, Minister, why don't you keep your model, continue to work with that, but add to it my model? It is community-driven. There are more than 50 communities that have said they would embrace that kind of a model. It's the kind of a model where communities go out and set up the operations, essentially for doctors to join. Doctors are too busy to sign on to your model. So I'm asking you, given that your model is not working, with a success rate of only 2%, given that you've had to abandon your target once again, why will you not at least consider our model that we put forward?

Hon Mr Clement: Your model is about funding community health centres, which we do. Your model, and I quote the Liberal Party on this, is that "Family health teams including doctors, nurses and other professionals will work together to provide care, support, advice to patients and their families around the clock." Sound familiar? That's what we're doing. That's exactly what we're doing. Congratulations, Dalton; you caught up to where we've been for the last few years. Work with us, work with the federal counterparts, get us the money that we are owed from the federal government. Then you'll be doing something constructive. Until then, it's just a bunch of hot air.

LONG-TERM CARE

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): Today, my question is for the Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, for 10 lost years, between 1985 and 1995, when the Liberals and the NDP governments terrorized Ontario taxpayers, not one long-term-care bed was built in this province. I know that our government is committed to invest in the development of 20,000 new long-term-care beds, and I know that many of my constituents are particularly interested in an update on the progress of these beds. Minister, for the benefit of those constituents in Scarborough Centre, could the Associate Minister of Health please provide this House with an update on the development of the 20,000 beds?

Hon Dan Newman (Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I thank the very hard-working member from Scarborough Centre for her question.

In fact, since 1995, long-term-care facility funding has increased by more than \$770 million. Our multi-year, \$1.2-billion plan to improve and to expand long-term-care services includes 20,000 new long-term-care beds being added to the system. More than 5,000 of these beds have been built and more than 7,500 beds are currently being tendered or are under construction.

Our commitment to invest in the development of 20,000 new long-term-care beds is in stark contrast to the records of both the provincial NDP and provincial Liberal governments. Indeed, our investment in these new beds will ensure that the health and well-being of Ontarians is not compromised by the inaction of the years between 1988 and 1995, when both the Liberals and NDP failed to build even one single new long-term-care bed in the province.

We've been working very hard to improve access in a sustainable way for the people of Ontario, no matter where they live, no matter where they call home.

Ms Mushinski: Thank you for that response, Minister. I know that you've been very busy ensuring that the commitment is met, and I'd certainly be interested in telling him about some of the recent health announcements that my constituents are interested in. We've come a long way, and I'm very proud to be a part of an Ernie Eves government that responds to the needs of Ontarians. This year's budget marks another unprecedented year for investments in health care.

Minister, on Monday, the Honourable Janet Ecker announced that we are increasing health care spending by \$1.7 billion. This represents a 7.3% increase over last year. I know that the Liberals don't like to hear that. We are increasing hospital funding by 7.7% to \$9.4 billion, something else the Liberals don't like to hear. That allows for expansion of priority programs such as cardiac services, dialysis, and MRI scans. We're increasing funding for building and renovations to health facilities by approximately 70%.

Minister, amid all of these—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I'm afraid the member's time is up. Minister?

Hon Mr Newman: I thank the member for Scarborough Centre for the question. I note too that the member for Scarborough East is also supportive of the recent health care investments within the region. Scarborough is a wonderful place to live, work and raise a family.

On Thursday, June 13, I was pleased to announce a capital grant of \$2.3 million for Providence Centre on St Clair Avenue East that will assist with the hospital's renovation and equipment costs.

Further, on June 6, I was joined by the member for Scarborough East and had the privilege of announcing that the Ernie Eves government is providing more than \$10.3 million in funding to Rouge Valley Centenary. The money will assist Centenary in upgrading its neonatal intensive care unit, as well as in the redevelopment of the hospital's maternal newborn unit.

On May 30, I had the pleasure of taking part in the grand opening of the West Park Health Centre in northwestern Toronto, which is a new 200-bed, long-term-care facility.

We've been working hard to improve access in a sustainable way for the people of Ontario no matter where they live, no matter where they call home.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): My question is to the Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, the member from Don Valley West. Minister, you've been complaining lately that in your 12 years here you've suffered two pay cuts that haven't been reinstated and that you've had your pension plan taken away. You

and some of your colleagues are calling for a return of the gold-plated, or rather sterling-plated, pension plan.

My question is—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. I'll let the member continue. Let's see what the question is.

Mr Kormos: My question is, since you obviously have such a highly developed sense of justice, will you, as Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, also be calling for an increase to the minimum wage to help those people whose wages have been frozen at the bottom of the pay scale for the last seven years?

Hon David Turnbull (Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation): I'll refer this to the Minister of Finance.

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Finance): In 1995 all of my colleagues, as candidates, stood on a platform with Mike Harris and said that the gold-plated pension plan for MPPs should be scrapped. We have scrapped it. It is staying scrapped.

Mr Kormos: Minister, I'm sure that came as a shocking surprise to you this morning during the cabinet meeting.

You're also quoted—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Let's come to order, please. The member for Niagara Centre has the floor.

Mr Kormos: Minister, you're also quoted in the paper as having whined and moaned—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Will the member take his seat. The member for Windsor-St Clair, come to order, please. Otherwise you'll get a warning. Sorry again, to the member for Niagara Centre.

Mr Kormos: Associate Minister, you're also referred to in the paper as whining and moaning about the wage reduction that you took to become an elected member and the vagaries of political life. It's clear to all of us you fear for your future financial stability. That's ironic, given your portfolio of enterprise, opportunity and innovation.

Look, since we're still trying to figure out what enterprise, opportunity and innovation really means, perhaps I can make a suggestion. I suggest you try to figure out how to support the most vulnerable workers in this province and stop worrying about how you're going to get by when you retire.

Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, will you promise today to recommend to your cabinet colleagues that the opportunities of our lowest-paid workers would be improved by increasing the now-seven-year-frozen minimum wage in Ontario?

The Speaker: Minister of Finance?

Hon Mrs Ecker: First of all, I'd like to say that Minister Turnbull is worth every cent and more that he is paid by the taxpayers. He gives them service in his riding that they deserve, an excellent member.

Second, the honourable member is talking about the minimum wage. Well, 600,000 modest-income Ontarians

have received a pay increase in their take-home pay because of this government's tax cuts—tax cuts for modest-income Ontarians that are in this budget. That is how we believe modest-income Ontarians—they get the money to keep. They don't need the government in their pocket. We have delivered on that commitment.

1520

HOME CARE

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): My question is to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Your government, through your health care restructuring program, closed hospitals and reduced a lot of beds. You made a solemn promise and commitment to the people of Ontario at that time that you would take the money that was saved from these closures and put it into community care. We all know that didn't happen.

In this year's budget and estimates there's absolutely no additional new funding for community care, for the nursing services and the home care services that many of our elderly and vulnerable need so badly in this province. As a matter of fact, over the years many individuals have been cut off: 3,500 people in Hamilton alone; hundreds in eastern Ontario and in my community of Kingston.

Why are you continuing to break the promise that you solemnly gave when health care restructuring took place and you closed all of those hospital beds by not putting the money you saved from that into home care and nursing care so that the frail and elderly could be looked after in their own home environments, which is the best possible way for them?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): The honourable member is mistaken. We have made a commitment through two governments now, the Mike Harris government and the Ernie Eves government, to increase community care funding, to increase home care funding. Home care funding as of last year had increased by over 70%. The funding for long-term care and community care services is increased in this budget.

In the meantime, through Minister Johns's efforts last year and earlier this year, we ensured that we had a structure in place for community care access that was accountable, that made sure the money was focused in on the individual recipients rather than on governance or administration.

So that's the commitment on this side of the House. Of course, community care is an integral part of our health care system. Of course, we understand that it is important to have as much care as close to home as possible rather than in an institutionalized setting. The honourable member is mistaken. We are fully committed to that.

Mr Gerretsen: I'm talking about new additional funding. What you have committed to is a 1.6% increase, a total of \$22 million in a budget of \$1.4 billion. This is absolutely not enough, and it goes back to a commitment that you made in 1998, on which you still owe \$275

million to the community care access centres in this province.

We all know that seniors who live at home, in their own home environments, are saving not only their own health but also the health care system. It would cost a lot more money if they were involved in a hospital or lived in a long-term-care facility. Will you not at least commit today that you will increase the funding of community care by the same percentage that you're giving to the hospitals in this province, namely 7%?

Hon Mr Clement: In the first part of the question the honourable member says we've cut back and in the second part of the question he admits that we have actually increased the budget. That's Liberal math for you. But the fact of the matter is that we have increased the budget. We have increased our commitment to home care. We have increased our commitment to long-term care. We've increased our commitment to hospital care. That is the commitment of the Ernie Eves government.

If the honourable member really wants to be helpful, I will inform the honourable member that despite the promises of the federal Liberal government, there has been zero cents for community care. If community care is so important to Liberals, why are they spending zero cents on the dollar when it comes to community care? That's the true tragedy. That's the true crime.

If the honourable member wants to be helpful, phone Peter Milliken up and get a straight answer from him.

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE FUNDING

Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex): My question is for the hard-working minister from London, the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. On Monday, the finance minister delivered our government's fourth consecutive balanced budget. This budget is good news for Ontario. It demonstrates our government is keeping its promise of growth and prosperity for Ontarians. In the face of real challenges, the Ernie Eves government has made fiscally responsible decisions for Ontario. We have invested in the priority programs that matter most to Ontario families: health care, education and a clean and safe environment.

Following Monday's budget, Minister, can you stand in your place and give us an update on our government's support for Ontario's colleges and universities?

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues): Thank you, to my friend from Perth-Middlesex. The great news is that there will be a place for every qualified and motivated student in our post-secondary system. We have had a plan, and I will tell you that we're in the third year of a five-year plan. I hope that next September we will have completed it a year in advance. I'm talking about the buildings and the operating dollars: a \$75-million commitment to colleges and universities, going up to \$368 million by 2003-04. Our colleges in fact do benefit not only from a \$5-million increase in operating, but from a \$50-million fund to

renew and update equipment in the colleges needed for the kinds of learning resources our young people are demanding and that they deserve. So this is \$10 million more next year. Another \$16 million—very important, as we listen to our colleges and universities in rural Ontario and northern Ontario. We have \$10 million going to our colleges and \$6 million to our universities.

Mr Johnson: Thank you, Minister. My next question concerns skills training. Skills development in this province drives the economy and helps keep Ontario the best place to live, work and raise a family in Canada. Indeed, you'll remember not so long ago the meeting you had with two very effective and dedicated teachers at Stratford Northwestern Secondary School, Rob Collins and Mark Roth. The 2002 budget was clearly good news for Ontario's colleges and universities, but I was wondering if you could tell me of our government's support for apprenticeship and skills training following Monday's announcement.

Hon Mrs Cunningham: If anyone here in this Legislative Assembly has had a chance to go to Stratford Northwestern Secondary School, they would have seen teachers and a community dedicated to the skills training of their students and apprenticeship training. It's something I know the member for Perth-Middlesex is very proud of, and so are we.

In the budget, I will say that we again have committed money for upgrading the equipment and learning resources at our publicly funded colleges of applied arts and technology by \$50 million over the next five years. This is very good news for people who are interested in having a skilled workforce so that we can remain competitive in Canada and in the world.

The budget also committed \$25 million, just beginning over the next three years, in the base of our colleges—most of it, I would say about 90% of it—to increase the annual support to expand our apprenticeship training. Our commitment is to double the number of apprentices in Ontario.

CABINET OFFICE FUNDING

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): My question is to the Premier. According to the government's own numbers, Cabinet Office costs are still on the rise. For the record, Cabinet Office is the central agency that supports the Premier and the cabinet. The Premier prides himself on the drastic cuts that he made in his former capacity as finance minister. It was under his watch that thousands of nurses were fired and hundreds of schools were shut down. People on disability have not had an increase for years. The mantra is that everyone must do more with less. I've tracked the cost of Cabinet Offices from 1995 and they have increased by about 119%. How does the Premier justify this drastic increase of Cabinet Office from \$7,800,000 to today at \$17,200,000?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I refer the question to the Chair of Management Board.

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture): According to the estimates filed—I look at the 2001-02 estimates—they indicate \$17,565,700; the 2002-03 estimates indicate \$17,252,000, which indicates a negative change of \$313,700. That's my answer.

Ms Di Cocco: The increase is still 119% since 1995. This dramatic increase shows the double standard here. There's less money for people with disabilities, there are inadequate funds for long-term care, programs being cut, schools closed, but not for the Premier and his cabinet.

What should be an embarrassment to this government is that although the number of members in the Legislature has been reduced in 1999, the cost of cabinet offices has increased substantially. I still don't have an explanation of why we have a 119% increase since this government came into office.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: Again, my answer will be arithmetical. In my world, \$17,252,000 is less than \$17,565,700. In fact, to reduce that to a percentage, it is a 1.79% decrease.

1530

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Despite all the protestations from the special interest groups out there, the closet industry that profits from the doom and gloom message about housing in this city, particularly many city of Toronto councillors, media reports recently confirmed there has been a dramatic increase in vacancy rates in Toronto, from 0.9% to 2%. This is up from a low of 0.6% last year.

Can you tell the Legislature what programs your ministry has put in effect to help encourage the development of rental housing?

Hon Chris Hodgson (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I know this is an issue the member from Scarborough cares deeply about; it's an issue that affects his residents. I'm pleased to see the numbers are getting better. According to his statistics and those of the Fair Rental Policy Organization, when it surveyed its members, the vacancy rate has climbed from a low of 0.6% to 2%. This recent data shows the policies implemented by this government are working. More vacancies on the market will lead to more competition and more families and people finding homes.

Mr Gilchrist: I appreciate the answer from the minister.

Interjections.

Mr Gilchrist: I heard some heckling from the other side asking, "Which councillors?" We don't want to go down that road, because we know many of the members opposite and many of the city councillors are actively standing in the way of our development of more housing, particularly hostel housing, in certain parts of the city not too far from this building.

I think we can all agree that an improved business and tax climate for the rental housing industry will encourage further construction of new rental housing.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The member for Hamilton East, come to order.

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): What do you do, Stockwell? Dick.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock. The member for Toronto Centre-Rosedale will please withdraw that.

Mr Smitherman: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Settle down. I don't need any help from the minister sitting there. I will handle this. You're not very helpful when you do that. I would ask you to please refrain from doing it.

The member will stand and withdraw it.

Mr Smitherman: I do, Mr Speaker. I apologize for that.

The Speaker: We were halfway through your wrap-up, with about 10 seconds left.

Mr Gilchrist: My question to the minister specifically is, what has this government done to improve the business and tax climate for affordable housing, and what can other levels of government do to assist as well?

Interjections.

Hon Mr Hodgson: I know there's a lot of noise in here, and I hope I got the whole question. It seems to me the Liberals are disappointed that there are more vacancies available. Vacancies mean there's more choice and that landlords have to be competitive.

There are a couple of reasons for that. First, interest rates are lower. Second, there have been a lot of initiatives taken by this government to remove barriers to home ownership—I know the Liberals are against home ownership. We've increased home ownership by 100% since we've taken power with the housing starts that have started. In 1995 there were 35,800 new homes under construction. Last year there were 73,282. This means the private sector is building homes and people are buying those homes, which is good news for the province.

The member from Scarborough was asking about what this government has done. There have been a number of initiatives. I just want to tell you: \$6 million in government lands, \$123 million—

The Speaker: The minister's time is up. New question. The member for—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Thank you very much. The people at the desk keep track of it. I appreciate that you all have your own little clocks. I gave him some time to go on. His time is up. Stop the clock. I thank all the members. The people at the table keep the clock, not me. They're the ones who do it. That's why they're correct. Quite frankly, I trust the people at the table rather than the cabinet minister sitting there when it comes to the clock.

PRIVATE CLINICS

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Minister of Health. The budget opens the door for for-profit expansion of health care services. As I said yesterday, New Democrats are opposed to that because we believe that does come at the expense of patient care.

Today we learned that Wellbeing Inc, the largest for-profit MRI body scan chain, is opening up a shop in Toronto next year. The chain expects to cater to the healthy and wealthy from Europe, the US and Canada, anyone who is prepared to pay US\$1,000 for a scan. As the president said, and I'm quoting, "We're looking for you to swipe your AMEX card and take preventive, proactive control of your personal health."

Minister, is Wellbeing Inc in line to operate a for-profit MRI screening clinic as part of your government's private sector solution to deal with waiting lists?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I read the same news article you did, and all I can tell you is that they may think they're opening up a clinic. They have, to my knowledge, not applied for that. They would have to go through an application process. Frankly, the budget was quite clear that the emphasis for the new public-private partnerships to increase accessibility for diagnostic services is going to be in the underserved areas to start with and not to the over-served areas. So unless University and College is automatically an underserved area that I'm not aware of, I suppose there would have to be some reconsideration by that company. But I can tell the honourable member that I certainly have not heard from them, nor have they got approval to do so.

PETITIONS

CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): I'm very pleased today to present yet another petition from the upper Ottawa Valley. I particularly want to pay tribute to Marilyn Hagen of Deep River and Alice Clark of Cobden for gathering this petition of over 1,000 names. The petition reads in part:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ontario government is shutting down the heart surgery unit at the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario; and

"Whereas the closure of this program will restrict the accessibility to life-saving surgery for children in eastern Ontario; and

"Whereas every year CHEO treats 140 cases of seriously ill children close to home; and

"Whereas centralizing children's heart surgery services in Toronto will force patients and their families to travel 400 to 600 kilometres away from home at a traumatic time; and

“Whereas there is a waiting list for cardiac surgery in Toronto but not at CHEO; and

“Whereas the people of eastern Ontario demand accessible, quality health care for their children;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately override the Ontario government’s decision to close this life-saving program and ensure that top-quality accessible health care remains available to every child in eastern Ontario.”

I’m very pleased to sign and endorse this petition as I present it to you.

PUBLIC SECTOR COMPENSATION

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): I have a petition on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham.

“Whereas the citizens of Ontario are alarmed and disappointed with the ‘golden parachute’ severance packages available to senior executives at Hydro One; and

“Whereas the top five executives at Hydro One are not only making large salaries”—it should really be “were”—“but also have been given packages that would provide more than \$12 million if they leave, even of their own accord; and

“Whereas the citizens of Ontario consider this compensation to be clearly excessive;

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

“That the Parliament of Ontario instruct the board and senior management of Hydro One to roll back the salaries and severance packages, with the goal of ensuring remuneration is in keeping with expectations of the citizens of Ontario, and

“Further, that the Parliament of Ontario take” the necessary “action to dismiss members of the board and/or senior management if they refuse to reduce the pay and severance packages for Hydro’s top executives.”

I’m pleased to sign, endorse, and to support the Minister of Energy. I’m asking the opposition to do the same, because there’s already legislation to achieve this.

1540

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the auto industry accounts for approximately 50% of Ontario exports to the United States, supports another three or more jobs elsewhere in the economy and contributes billions of dollars in tax revenues to governments; and

“Whereas the auto industry is the economic lifeblood of communities, such as St Catharines, Oshawa, St Thomas, Alliston, Windsor, Oakville, Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo; and

“Whereas the auto industry has experienced job losses and seen challenges due to competition from industries in Mexico, the recent recession in the United States and delivery problems at Ontario’s borders; and

“Whereas the prosperity of the province of Ontario is dependent in large part on an auto industry that is competitive and dynamic; and

“Whereas select committees of the Legislature tend to be task-oriented and non-partisan in their deliberations;

“Be it resolved that the Ernie Eves government convene a select committee on the auto industry that consults with labour, business and the public in a timely fashion to address the challenges and opportunities that the engine of Ontario’s economy will be facing in the future.”

I affix my signature. I am in complete agreement with the establishment of a select committee on the auto industry.

HOME CARE

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): I am receiving a lot of petitions, and I appreciate that, from my constituents in the riding of Durham.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas we, the undersigned, support the philosophy of caring for the elderly, the handicapped and the infirm within their homes and communities wherever possible; and

“Whereas caregiving by paid professionals in the home is not always the preferred choice of family members; and

“Whereas we believe in some circumstances it is more reasonable and compassionate for the government to use the money assigned to professional caregivers to support those family members who would prefer to remain at home to care for their relatives and family members; and

“Whereas caregivers who work outside the home often carry an extra burden of guilt and anxiety when they leave their loved ones in the care of strangers while they go out to work;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to provide financial support to those residents of Ontario who choose to remain with their loved ones and care for them at home. And we respectfully ask that the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care and other relevant ministries give full consideration to developing legislation and policies to provide caregivers who care for their relatives in their homes full support.”

I am in full support of this petition and I call on other members of this Legislature to sign and support this petition.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Progressive Conservative government promised in 1995 not to cut classroom spending, but has already cut at least \$1 billion from our schools and is now closing many classrooms completely; and

“Whereas international language weekend classes are a needed part of learning for many students in our neighbourhood; and

“Whereas the Education Act, specifically regulation 285(5), mandates provision of these programs where demand exists; and

“Whereas the Conservative government funding formula is forcing the Toronto District School Board to cancel these Saturday classes for groups who want this programming;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to instruct the Minister of Education to restore meaningful and flexible funding to the Toronto District School Board, to ensure that they are able to continue to accommodate these Saturday international languages classes.”

I have affixed my signature to this petition because I agree with it.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the residents of Centre Hastings are facing an immediate and critical situation in accessing physician services; and

“Whereas a retiring family physician has been unsuccessful in procuring a replacement physician, potentially leaving 5,000 patients without a doctor; and

“Whereas accessibility to already overcrowded hospital emergency departments and walk-in clinics is limited because of distance and availability to transportation; and

“Whereas Centre Hastings has been designated as an underserved area in need of five physicians;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act immediately to establish a community health centre in Centre Hastings.”

I will affix my signature to this petition.

ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the federal government has given a yearly increase in disability pensions geared to inflation, and the Ontario government, through the disability support program, has clawed this amount back;

“Therefore, we, the undersigned people of Ontario, petition the Ontario Legislature to remove the cap on the disability support program.”

This is signed by a significant number of my constituents and I affix my signature in agreement with their concerns.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): It appears that we must continue to read petitions to stop the sale of Hydro One, in that the province now plans to sell off just half of it.

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One and Ontario’s electricity transmission grid—the central nervous system of Ontario’s economy;

“Whereas the government never campaigned on selling off this vital \$5-billion public asset and never consulted the people of Ontario on this plan;

“Whereas Ontario families want affordable, reliable electricity—they know that the sale of the grid that carries electricity to their homes is a disaster for consumers;

“Whereas selling the grid will not benefit consumers—the only Ontarians who will benefit are Bay Street brokers and Hydro One executives;

“Whereas selling Hydro One and the grid is like selling every 400-series highway in the province to private interests—selling the grid means the public sector will no longer be responsible for its security and protection;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

“To demand the Conservative government halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario.”

I’ll pass it off to Sean.

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): My colleague David Caplan and I have many petitions coming through, and I’ll read it as it says here, “Stop the Sale of Hydro One.

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One and Ontario’s electricity transmission grid—the central nervous system of Ontario’s economy;

“Whereas the government never campaigned on selling off this vital \$5-billion public asset and never consulted the people of Ontario on this plan;

“Whereas Ontario families want affordable, reliable electricity—they know that the sale of the grid that carries electricity to their homes is a disaster for consumers;

“Whereas selling the grid will not benefit consumers—the only Ontarians who will benefit are Bay Street brokers and Hydro One executives;

“Whereas selling Hydro One and the grid is like selling every 400-series highway in the province to private interests—selling the grid means the public sector will no longer be responsible for its security and protection;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

“To demand the Conservative government halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear

mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario.”

I affix my signature to this and I will give it to Lindsey to give it to the desk.

COMMUNITY CARE ACCESS CENTRES

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): I have another petition to the provincial Legislature of Ontario.

“Whereas the Conservative government promised to institute patient-based budgeting for health care services in the 1995 Common Sense Revolution; and

“Whereas community care access centres now face a collective shortfall of \$175 million due to a funding freeze by the provincial government; and

“Whereas due to this funding shortfall, community care access centres have cut back on home care services affecting many sick and elderly Ontarians; and

“Whereas these cuts in services are mostly in home-making services, forcing Ontarians into more expensive long-term-care facilities or back into hospital;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately institute real patient-based budgeting for health care services, including home care, so as to ensure that working families in Ontario can access the care services they need.”

This letter is signed by a number of my constituents from the smaller community of Atikokan, who share the concern we all do about home care funding. I affix my signature in agreement with their concerns.

HYDRO ONE

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): These petitions keep flying in here. This one says, “Stop the Sale of Hydro One.

“To the Legislature of the province of Ontario:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One and Ontario’s electricity transmission grid—the central nervous system of Ontario’s economy;

“Whereas the government never campaigned on selling off this vital \$5-billion public asset and never consulted the people of Ontario on this plan;

“Whereas Ontario families want affordable, reliable electricity—they know that the sale of the grid that carries electricity to their homes is a disaster for consumers;

“Whereas selling the grid will not benefit consumers—the only Ontarians who will benefit are Bay Street brokers and Hydro One executives;

“Whereas selling Hydro One and the grid is like selling every 400-series highway in the province to private interests—selling the grid means the public sector will no longer be responsible for its security and protection;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

“To demand the Conservative government halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear

mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario.”

I have affixed my signature to this excellent petition.

1550

ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights was intended to give the citizens of Ontario a way of getting involved in environmental decision-making; and

“Whereas the Environmental Bill of Rights requires Ontario government ministries to develop a statement of values to ‘guide the minister and the ministry staff when making decisions that affect the environment’; and

“Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Education has been exempted from the requirements of the Environmental Bill of Rights despite the importance of environmental education; and

“Whereas the Ministry of Education has eliminated environmental science as a stand-alone set of courses that focuses entirely on the science of the environment from the secondary school curriculum; and

“Whereas the Ministry of Education is responsible for developing educational policies that directly affect the ecological literacy of future citizens and is, thus, partly responsible for the health of our environment; and

“Whereas the citizens of Ontario are being denied their right to shape the decisions being made about environmental education by the Ministry of Education’s exclusion from the Environmental Bill of Rights;

“Therefore we, the undersigned citizens of Ontario, petition the Ontario Legislature to prescribe the Ministry of Education to the Environmental Bill of Rights without further delay.”

This is brought to me by Dr Tom Puk, who is fighting this battle very vigorously up in Thunder Bay at Lakehead University. I’m very happy to sign my name.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): This is like a news flash. I have some more petitions here. It says, “Stop the Sale of Hydro One,” and it goes on to say:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One and Ontario’s electricity transmission grid—the central nervous system of Ontario’s economy;

“Whereas the government never campaigned on selling off this vital \$5-billion public asset and never consulted the people of Ontario on this plan;

“Whereas Ontario families want affordable, reliable electricity—they know that the sale of the grid that carries electricity to their homes is a disaster for consumers;

“Whereas selling the grid will not benefit consumers—the only Ontarians who will benefit are Bay Street brokers and Hydro One executives;

“Whereas selling Hydro One and the grid is like selling every 400-series highway in the province to private interests—selling the grid means the public sector will no longer be responsible for its security and protection;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

“To demand the Conservative government halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario.”

I affix my signature to this. Jordan, I want you to give it to the desk.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs): I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 80, An Act respecting directors and officers of Hydro One Inc. and its subsidiaries, when Bill 80 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill, without further debate or amendment, and

That the vote on second reading may, pursuant to standing order 28(h), be deferred until the next sessional day during the routine proceeding “deferred votes”; and

That on the same day that the bill receives second reading, it may be called for third reading; and

When the order for third reading is called, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That no deferral of the third reading vote pursuant to standing order 28(h) 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 Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson): Mr Baird moves that, pursuant to standing order—dispense? Dispense.

The Chair recognizes the chief government whip.

Hon Mr Baird: I think it’s time that we vote on this important piece of legislation. The objectives of this bill formally remove the directors of Hydro One from the board of Hydro One and its subsidiaries. They authorize the appointment of board members as necessary until the next annual meeting of Hydro One. They impose restrictions on Hydro One compensation for termination and resignation for designated officers. They require negotiation of new compensation packages for designated officers of Hydro One and nullify existing—

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Would you check whether or not there’s a quorum, please?

The Acting Speaker: Would you check and see if there’s a quorum, please?

Clerk Assistant (Ms Deborah Deller): A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is now present, Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The Chair recognizes the chief government whip.

Hon Mr Baird: I can’t believe it. There’s only one Liberal in the House, and there’s a quorum. It’s my friend Joe Cordiano, a very hard-working guy. But the Tories are here to do the business of the day.

As I said, this bill requires the negotiation of new compensation packages for designated officers of Hydro One and nullifies existing contract provisions that are in excess of the act. It puts in place means to cover any excess amounts paid and prevents proceedings against the crown or others related to this act.

The people of Ontario feel very strongly about this, that something was not working on the side of taxpayers at Hydro One. They wanted their government and their elected representatives to act.

Frankly, I find it absolutely amazing that this bill wouldn’t have gone through on a wink and a nod so that we could be debating the more important public policy issues here at Queen’s Park. I would have thought that the Liberal and New Democratic parties would have said, “Let’s pass this bill right away so we can debate the Hydro bill and more important pieces of legislation.” I was shocked that the Liberals and New Democrats held this bill up for so long. That’s why we’re proposing to move to the next stage of debate, which is a decision, a vote, so that we can get on and deal with other important issues of the day. I think it’s incredibly important.

Despite the resignation of most of the members of the Hydro One board, this legislation is necessary to allow for the appointment of new directors and to protect the people of Ontario against excessive provisions in some current contracts of Hydro One executives.

The reason this bill is needed and the reason changes and private sector discipline are needed at Hydro One is because the reality of a market economy isn’t working at Hydro One, because it is a broken-up part of the old Hydro One monopoly. None of us in this House are happy about it. None of us are satisfied. None of us want to see this continue. The people of Ontario want this bill passed.

The proposed legislation we’re dealing with puts the people of Ontario first, through the government, who are the shareholders of Hydro One. This isn’t the government’s company. This isn’t a government asset. This is the people’s asset. I know people in St Marys and Stratford were equally as amazed as people in Greely, Osgoode, West Carleton, Richmond, Burritts Rapids, Barrhaven and Bells Corners with what they saw going on at Hydro One. They wanted a government to stand up and act. They wanted the government to intervene.

Chris Stockwell, the Minister of Energy, and our Premier, Ernie Eves, intervened, and intervened early, to

protect taxpayers. Everyone on this side of the House wants to protect taxpayers. It's the opposition who are holding this up. They'll be able to say, "Oh, well, we've got one more time allocation motion" and "Isn't the government draconian?" on what is probably the most reasonable piece of legislation introduced in this session that I can think of.

I don't want to be debating this. I want to be debating health care, education, environmental controls and the importance of clean water in Ontario. I'd like to be debating the budget today. We could talk about the important investments made in health care, where the health care budget, for the first time in Ontario, is going over \$25 billion. I'd like to be debating education. I'd like to be debating the substantial increase the Minister of Finance gave toward clean drinking water in the budget. I'd like to be debating that this is the fourth balanced budget in a row. When I worked for the federal government in Ottawa, for the nine years I was there, we didn't bring in one balanced budget. So four balanced budgets in a row is really unprecedented and is something that all Ontarians, particularly Conservatives and neo-conservatives, can take great pride in. We're fulfilling the campaign commitments we made to balance the budget. It really is unprecedented and I'm very proud of that accomplishment. The Minister of Finance did a good job.

I find the comments we've heard about the budget amusing. Despite the 190-odd tax cuts we've already had and the four new tax cuts in this bill, the people who were against the tax cuts in the first place now want the tax cuts faster. The people who voted against tax cuts that were to go into effect in six months are now mad that they're going to 18 months. But they didn't want them at all. I voted for all the tax cuts. I support them. Who wouldn't want to see them sooner? But it's a balanced plan with balanced leadership to ensure we balance the budget and meet the important priorities in health care. I think of the Queensway-Carleton Hospital and the Ottawa Hospital, where the supervisor, Dennis Timbrell, and the new president, Jack Kitts, have done a phenomenal job, and the difference this budget will make for that institution. I think of the important priorities in education, where the school boards in my riding will be able to get an increase in support for classroom education.

I wish we could debate that, instead of this resolution. It would be better. I would think this legislation should go in a wink and a nod and we could get on to debating the more important public policy issues of the day, but we're not, because we're debating a bill like this that should have gone through on a wink and a nod.

Frankly, I don't think we should be debating it. I think we should adjourn debate on this issue, and I would move adjournment of the debate.

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

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1602 to 1632.

The Acting Speaker: All those in favour will please rise and remain standing until counted.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing until counted.

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 22; the nays are 47.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Further debate?

Hon Mr Baird: I feel badly that we changed our minds on that one—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Baird: I'm not for turning. I recall that great speech by a British Prime Minister when she said, "The lady is not for turning." Margaret Thatcher was a very wise Prime Minister.

This time allocation motion we're dealing with shouldn't be debated. We should vote on this bill and talk about other important things like the budget brought in by the finance minister. That's the type of thing we should be debating. We should be debating the important needs of our environment. We should be debating quality education. We should be talking about the need for new schools.

In my riding, in Stittsville, we need a new school for the public board. The schools are overcrowded there. They are busing children out of the community to the hamlet of Munster. That is an incredible priority for me. We needed two when I ran for office in 1999. We got the public elementary school built in Davidson Heights in south Nepean. They just opened it recently—the Adrienne Clarkson Elementary School—a lovely facility made possible by a change in the Education Act which allowed local development charges to be used both to buy the land and to construct the school. I was pleased to be there, and the Governor General was there to help open the school. That was a great occasion.

We should be debating education. That's something important. But we're not debating education. We're debating this time allocation motion, which is something that naturally concerns me. Accordingly, I move adjournment of the House.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Baird has moved adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1636 to 1706.

The Acting Speaker: All those in favour will please rise and remain standing until counted by the Clerk.

You may take your seats.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing until counted by the Clerk.

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 24; the nays are 47.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

Further debate?

Hon Mr Baird: I was talking to the Minister of Education about the importance of a new school in Stittsville. That's what I'd rather be debating here today instead of this time allocation motion. I do believe, though, that the motion we're debating on the bill for Hydro One and the board of directors and those issues are important. It shouldn't consume this much debate but it is important.

I was impressed with the way our Minister of Energy, the Honourable Chris Stockwell, stepped in to deliver a really amazing act of courage on behalf of taxpayers in this province. I want to congratulate him while he's here on this important issue.

I was reviewing the motion in one of our 30-minute bells. It made me think about the resolution and I would like to amend it.

I would move that government notice of motion number 32 be amended by deleting the second paragraph and substituting the following therefor:

"That the vote on second reading may not be deferred, and".

The Acting Speaker: Mr Baird has moved that government notice of motion number 32 be amended by deleting the second paragraph and substituting the following therefor:

"That the vote on second reading may not be deferred, and".

Hon Mr Baird: Speaking to my amendment now, not the main motion, I don't think the motion should be deferred. I think we should vote on it right away. I think it would be an important opportunity for all members of the Legislative Assembly, including the member for Etobicoke Centre, to vote on this, and the Minister of Labour, who is here. He was also the Minister of Transportation, a good Minister of Transportation. He helped with a lot of projects in eastern Ontario. I know he doesn't want to defer the vote either. He would like the motion amended not to defer it.

I regret that we're here debating this. I think this bill should have just gone through right away so we could be debating the hydro reorganization, so we could be debating health care and health care reform. I was pleased to see in the budget that the Minister of Finance brought forward in this place this week the proposals on MRIs. I thought that was a welcome addition and I wish we could debate that. Maybe we could debate that if I moved adjournment of the debate.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Baird has moved adjournment of debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1711 to 1741.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Baird has moved adjournment of the debate.

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing until counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed will please rise and remain standing until counted by the Clerk.

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 0; the nays are 48.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion lost. The Chair recognizes the chief government whip.

Hon Mr Baird: Mr Speaker, in debating this amendment to the motion, I was wondering if I might withdraw my amendment to the motion.

The Acting Speaker: Yes, you may.

Hon Mr Baird: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker; I do.

This Hydro bill is one which I'd hoped we could have passed more quickly so we could debate more substantive issues. I am pleased, though, that when the Minister of Energy, the Premier, the government, this caucus, this team, saw taxpayers' money being wasted, they stepped in to try to address the situation.

I would rather be debating important issues like tax cuts, and the four tax cuts contained in Janet Ecker's budget: the tax cut for small business that's going forward; the tax cut in the mining industry, which I know is so important in northern Ontario. I would like to be debating those. I would like to be talking about the 190-plus tax cuts we've already had that have been so important in helping create jobs and encourage investment in Ontario. I would like to be talking about the budget, where we saw a significant increase once again this year to help people with developmental disabilities. The budget provided \$49 million of new operating support to associations for community living right across the province of Ontario, plus more than \$10 million in capital support for places to live for people with developmental disabilities. I know that will make a huge difference in the lives of a lot of very vulnerable people in the province of Ontario. I wish we could be debating that this afternoon because that's an incredibly important issue. It's one which I worked tremendously hard on over the last three or four years both as a member and as a minister and one which I continue to hold very close to my heart.

I am very optimistic and excited that tomorrow is Community Living Day here at the Ontario Legislature, where representatives from the Ontario Association for Community Living are coming from right across the province to Queen's Park. Each party will be giving a speech on that tomorrow. They'll also have the opportunity to meet with members from all sides of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. I think that's good news, because we can do more to help people who are vulnerable.

The plan contained in the budget created a number of very important initiatives: places to live for people with developmental disabilities—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. There will be no yelling back and forth. If one member has the floor, until somebody else gets it, you wait your turn.

Hon Mr Baird: We can do more to help people with developmental disabilities, and that's an important issue that doesn't get enough debate in this House. We can do

it through programs like home sharing, we can do it through supported independent living, we can do it through conventional group homes, we can do it through organizations like Reena. I attended a function for Reena. It's a developmental disability organization up in the north end of Toronto, in York region. They opened an elder home in recent years and are proposing to open another one. They had a fundraising function the other evening to help raise funds for this important project to help people with developmental disabilities who are aging. For the first time, we're seeing people with developmental disabilities age and reach their 60s, 70s and 80s. This is something we simply didn't see in years gone by. They're facing the same challenges that we all face in our retiring years. The initiatives contained in the budget will be able to help address those important challenges. I'm very pleased that the government did that.

The more than \$60 million in support for people with developmental disabilities in this year's budget builds on the \$55 million in last year's budget, it builds on the \$50 million in the budget before and it builds on the \$35 million announced in 1998. This is a group that doesn't get a lot of focus, doesn't get a lot of attention in the media or in political circles, but one which is incredibly important.

We've got to be mindful, in my judgment, to ensure that it's not necessarily those with the loudest voices who get heard but those who have the most important interests and that we, as elected representatives, have to compensate for that voice. Associations for community living may not have the voice of a chamber of commerce or a teachers' union, but they're every bit as important in the province of Ontario, and I'm very pleased that the minister, Janet Ecker, followed through on the commitment of Jim Flaherty, the former Minister of Finance, and Ernie Eves, the Minister of Finance before that, to create a substantial number of new initiatives and supports to help people with developmental disabilities.

I was also pleased in the budget presented by the Minister of Finance that she followed through on the commitments made by Jim Flaherty on violence against women, to build more beds and more shelters for domestic violence around the province of Ontario. That's something that's important. The plan that was announced last year will see more than 300 new beds, and more than 136 beds will be refurbished, because we can do more to address the challenge of domestic violence in the province of Ontario. But that money would be meaningless unless there were substantial operating supports. There's \$3 million, growing to \$9 million, starting last year, to provide operating supports in that area. I think that's something that's important.

We can do more. That's why I was pleased to work with the former member for Beaches-East York, Frances Lankin, when she came forward with a proposal for a domestic violence help line, to take the one that's in Toronto and make it province-wide. I was very pleased to attend the launch of that new initiative this past April. It

was incredibly important. I was very proud to play a role in that. The Attorney General, David Young, was very supportive in helping fund those types of initiatives through the victims' justice fund, which is about \$4.5 million over five years and of which I think we can all be incredibly proud.

I would rather be debating those types of important initiatives here than a time allocation motion on a bill that should have gone through much more quickly, so we could debate these important public policy initiatives. That's why the motion before us here requires that part of debate is voting, and we have to make a decision on this important issue.

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

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1750 to 1800.

The Acting Speaker: Mr Baird has moved government notice of motion number 32. All those in favour will please rise one at a time and be counted by the Clerk.

Ayes

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

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

Nays

Bartolucci, Rick	Conway, Sean G.	Marchese, Rosario
Bisson, Gilles	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bountrogianni, Marie	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bradley, James J.	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Brown, Michael A.	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Gravelle, Michael	Ramsay, David
Caplan, David	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Churley, Marilyn	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sergio, Mario

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 50; the nays are 24.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being past 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 this evening.

The House adjourned at 1803.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 19 June 2002

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Nutrient management	
Mr Lalonde	1089
Autism services	
Mr Kormos	1089
United Empire Loyalists' Day	
Mr Barrett	1089
Mrs Dombrowsky	1089
Canada Day in Cambridge	
Mr Martiniuk	1090
School safety	
Mr Caplan	1090
George Marcello	
Mr Dunlop	1090
Government policy	
Mr Smitherman	1091
Durham Central Fair	
Mr O'Toole	1091

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on government agencies	
The Speaker	1092
Report deemed adopted	1092
Standing committee on estimates	
Mr Kennedy	1092
Report deemed received	1092
Standing committee on regulations and private bills	
Mr Marchese	1092
Report adopted	1092

FIRST READINGS

Elliott Act, 2002 , Bill Pr9, <i>Mr Arnott</i>	
Agreed to	1092
Mega-Hog Farm Control Act, 2002 , Bill 110, <i>Mr Lalonde</i>	
Agreed to	1092
Mr Lalonde	1092
Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Helmets), 2002 , Bill 111, <i>Mr Levac</i>	
Agreed to	1092
Mr Levac	1092

THIRD READINGS

Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002 , Bill 124, <i>Mr Hodgson</i>	
Agreed to	1097

ORAL QUESTIONS

Ontario budget	
Mr McGuinty	1097
Mr Eves	1097
Education funding	
Mr McGuinty	1098
Mrs Witmer	1098
Domestic violence	
Ms Churley	1099
Mr Young	1099
Hydro One	
Ms Churley	1100
Mr Eves	1100
Hospital funding	
Mr McGuinty	1100
Mr Clement	1101
Automotive industry	
Mr Martiniuk	1101
Mr Flaherty	1101
Primary care reform	
Mr McGuinty	1102
Mr Clement	1102
Long-term care	
Ms Mushinski	1102
Mr Newman	1102
Minimum wage	
Mr Kormos	1103
Mrs Ecker	1103
Home care	
Mr Gerretsen	1104
Mr Clement	1104
University and college funding	
Mr Johnson	1104
Mrs Cunningham	1104
Cabinet Office funding	
Ms Di Cocco	1105
Mr Tsubouchi	1105
Affordable housing	
Mr Gilchrist	1105
Mr Hodgson	1105
Private clinics	
Ms Martel	1106
Mr Clement	1106

PETITIONS

Children's health services	
Mr Conway	1106
Public sector compensation	
Mr O'Toole	1107
Automotive industry	
Mr Bradley	1107
Home care	
Mr O'Toole	1107
Education funding	
Mr Caplan	1107

Doctor shortage

Mrs Dombrowsky	1108
Ontario disability support program	
Mrs McLeod	1108
Hydro One	
Mr Gravelle	1108
Mr Curling	1108, 1109
Mr Caplan	1109
Community care access centres	
Mrs McLeod	1109
Environmental Bill of Rights	
Mr Gravelle	1109

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Time allocation , government notice of motion number 32, <i>Mr Stockwell</i>	
Mr Baird	1110
Agreed to	1113

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors

Mr Kormos	1091
Mr Gerretsen	1091
Mr Bisson	1092
Mr Marchese	1092

Federal correctional services

Mr Bartolucci	1093
Mr Runciman	1094
Mr Kormos	1094
Agreed to	1095

Estimates

Mr Bisson	1095
Mr Stockwell	1096
Mr Kennedy	1096
The Speaker	1096

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 19 juin 2002

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2002 sur le contrôle des grosses exploitations porcines , projet de loi 110, <i>M. Lalonde</i>	
Adoptée	1092
Loi de 2002 modifiant le Code de la route (casques) , projet de loi 111, <i>M. Levac</i>	
Adoptée	1092

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2002 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne le code du bâtiment , projet de loi 124, <i>M. Hodgson</i>	
Adoptée	1097