



No. 28A

N° 28A

ISSN 1180-2987

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)**

Thursday 27 June 2002

Jeudi 27 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

Thursday 27 June 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 27 juin 2002

*The House met at 1000.
Prayers.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS'
PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Before you start the proceedings today, I see that Mr Duncan's bill is listed as first on the order paper, rather than my bill, my resolution. I think there was a general impression that something happened there. Perhaps we could ask permission to deal with ballot item 54 first, then, if that's possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Mr Bradley has asked that unanimous consent be given to consider ballot item number 54 and then ballot item number 53. Agreed?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: No?

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Franco-phone Affairs): Could I maybe ask for an up-to-five-minute recess?

The Acting Speaker: We will take a five-minute recess.

The House recessed from 1003 to 1008.

APPOINTMENT OF
SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): I move that, in the opinion of this House, a select committee should be appointed pursuant to standing order 110. The select committee will be charged with examining the relationship between the environment and health. The committee be given up to seven months to study and report back to the Legislature with recommendations respecting improved health outcomes resulting from a cleaner environment. The Legislative Assembly directs the House leaders of the three recognized parties to negotiate the terms of reference for the committee. The assembly recommends that the committee begin its deliberations no later than September 2002 and report back to the House no later than March 2003.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): The member for Windsor-St Clair has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Duncan: Mr Speaker, let me begin by apologizing to you. There was a bit of misunderstanding. We thought this was the second item today and express gratitude to

the government and the third party for allowing this to proceed.

All of us in this House I think share a concern about our environment and about our health. We have all experienced smog days, we have all experienced a number of environmental conditions and situations that we recognize could possibly, and likely do, affect our health. I think every member of the House has a desire to look at a range of possible alternatives and solutions that we might be able to find, as a province, to begin to address what is a very complicated issue.

In December 2001, the journal *Environmental Health Perspectives* published a report entitled *Community Health Profile of Windsor, Ontario, Canada: Anatomy of a Great Lakes Area of Concern*. The report concluded that the Windsor area and nearby municipalities have death rates significantly higher than the Ontario and Canadian averages. That's what has given rise to this. In January of this year a local coalition of union activists, environmentalists, local members of provincial Parliament and local members of federal Parliament in our area met to discuss this report and to begin to determine what we, as a community, should do to respond to what is obviously a situation of some concern.

All of us have struggled since that time to begin to come to terms with (a) the magnitude of the issue and (b) what it is we, as a people, not just as governments but as a society, can do. I have rapidly come to the conclusion that while there are certain things that are obvious and simple, the problem does not lend itself to an immediate and simple solution.

I believe all members of this House have an interest in looking at this area. I believe a select committee of this nature can advise the government and can advise the ministers affected, particularly health and environment, with respect to what it is we, as members of the Legislature, believe as a society we can begin to do to address this situation.

I put this resolution today in a non-partisan fashion. I think everybody in this House agrees. I think everybody in this House wants to find the types of solutions or to begin to address the problem in ways that will help, over time, to improve our environment and, eventually, health outcomes.

I was encouraged to recommend a select committee because we've done two since last year. We did the select committee on alternative fuels, chaired by Mr Galt from Northumberland, and the Legislative Assembly committee is now looking at parliamentary reform. I've

spoken to members from both committees and all parties, and we've all agreed that those were very useful exercises. I believe the government established those committees in good faith, and I believe this government and possibly future governments will look at the recommendations contained in those reports and attempt to incorporate them into meaningful public policy alternatives.

I have identified roughly 15 select committees that have been appointed by this House over the years since 1985, all of which have given us reports, some of which have been outstanding, many of which have had some or all of their recommendations eventually incorporated into government policy.

The two issues of environment and health are, I think, top of mind, not only for our electors in all parts of the province, but for all members of this House. I think having the opportunity to get a group of members together with the resources, with the support from the Legislative Assembly, will give us an opportunity for the first time to address the very serious issues that confront all of us as citizens of this province.

One of the other complicated factors about this is that there are obvious federal overlaps, municipal overlaps, international overlaps. Obviously we can't do anything to clean things up in the Ohio Valley. But let's work together as an assembly and as a society. I often think of this chamber as sort of like the kitchen table of the province. This is where we come together to discuss issues of significance. Quite appropriately, it is a partisan chamber because there are differences of opinion, but on an issue of this nature you will find a deep bibliography of research into this area that's largely scientific that doesn't go to the next level, which is to determine how we can take these findings and address the serious public policy concerns.

All three of the most recent governments have taken steps in one direction or another to address certain aspects of it. This, I believe, will afford us the opportunity if we decide as a Legislature and the government follows up on the recommendation to appoint a select committee to do a meaningful look at all of this.

I don't need to remind members of the serious smog problems we have here in Toronto. We have those same problems in my home community of Windsor. They're prevalent in Hamilton and other areas. There are many environmental concerns and we know those environmental concerns have public health implications. I urge members to look at this seriously as a method of allowing us meaningful input into the discussion, allowing us the opportunity, hopefully in a non-partisan fashion, to provide advice not only to the current government but if should there be different governments in the future.

If one looks at the recommendations of various select committees and royal commissions in the past, often-times it takes many years for recommendations to be implemented. This will be a very modest first step, but it is a step. It's something, in my view, that can lead eventually to a better quality of life, a better and healthier environment for us and our children.

I believe there's a place for all parties to work together and, by the way, to define our differences in meaningful ways that go beyond what I would call the normal routine of this place, to define those differences in clear public policy terms and, where we differ, to debate and take our differences to the people. As we found in the alternative fuels committee, as I believe we're going to find in the Legislative Assembly committee's work on parliamentary reform, we will find areas of mutual agreement, areas that we can agree we must and should move forward on.

This issue is so important. It especially affects children. I don't need to remind the House about elevated incidences of asthma in our young people, in our young children, and how those cases have grown over time, about elevated incidences of various cancers that have been well documented and well defined, and about scientific evidence that suggests clearly there is a link between the environment and those health outcomes. It's the sort of thing that should be taken seriously. It's the sort of issue that none of us has a magic bullet to solve. It has economic and public policy consequences. But I believe this Legislature and this House, members of goodwill on all sides, can find areas we can agree on and find potential solutions to the problems that will confront the current government and future governments, problems that, while not intractable, are difficult. If we, as a society, can set our minds to this, focus on it and bring to bear our collective wisdom and imagination, I'm convinced that we can make a difference and can begin to address these serious problems.

I say, as I conclude my opening remarks, that governments of all stripes have wrestled with these problems. Some policies have worked and had some positive effects and some frankly haven't, but let's take a first modest step toward addressing this in a systematic fashion that will hopefully yield better health outcomes for all our children and our families.

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):

I'm very pleased to join in the debate on the resolution put forth by the member for Windsor-St Clair. The issues he's raising here are important, let's be honest. I serve with the member on the committee dealing with private members. I know he's a very sincere and hard-working member with respect to trying to come up with solutions in this area. Having lived in Windsor, I can certainly appreciate his comments with respect to—

1020

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): Did you go to Windsor law school?

Mr Tascona: No, I didn't go to Windsor law school, but my sister-in-law and brother-in-law did. It's a good law school. But I would say it's a serious issue when you're dealing with the environment, the heat and certainly the pressures of the economic forces you face in areas that really do get hot.

Because we're dealing with terms of reference for the committee, when he goes to deal with the terms of reference—and he'll be there, because he's the House

leader for the Liberal Party—I want to put to him, don't restrict a cleaner environment to the outside. I think it also has to be looked at inside in terms of buildings and smoking. I want to stress that in terms of smoking, I know there's provincial legislation that deals with smoking in the workplace. It has been in effect since 1989. But there are exceptions to the government's ban with respect to smoking in the workplace, where there's public service in restaurants and bars, and the responsibility has been given to municipalities to establish bylaws in those areas.

Quite frankly, it's been an area of a lot of controversy with respect to how you balance those areas in terms of the fairest way to regulate this. Exclusive responsibility with respect to smoking is with the federal government. If they didn't want smoking, they could stop it tomorrow, but they have not made that decision to stop smoking. They've decided it's going to be regulated. It's allowed. It's regulated by the province and the municipalities.

I want the member to know my thoughts about this. I want him to look at the inside environment, where people work or where children are with respect to daycare and areas where they can be affected by their environment. It doesn't mean just the outside environment, so I hope he doesn't take a look at a narrow focus. Certainly there are issues with respect to smog in terms of people being able to breathe, but there are also issues with respect to their breathing inside. There are controversies out there that have to be addressed with respect to not necessarily the workplace, because I think the province has taken a position on that, but I think municipalities are struggling with respect to how to deal with that.

I know in my own riding of Simcoe county the health unit says they would like a 100% stamp-out of smoking, and that's being grappled with by the municipalities. Some municipalities are in favour of that and have gone ahead. Other municipalities—in particular in my riding, Innisfil is dealing with that issue. They haven't made any decision. Bradford-West Gwillimbury is the same. The city of Barrie has been dealing with it and they've decided not to have a 100% smoking ban.

I think the bottom line is that the province has to show some leadership on this, because you're seeing some really interesting—I'll put it as “interesting”—and different standards set out between municipalities with respect to how they deal with smoking. That has to be addressed. Certainly I think we have a role to play. I'd like to see the terms of reference show some strong leadership, because let's face it, when you look at smoking and the impact secondary smoke has on the environment where people work and on people who actually do smoke, it's a tremendous impact. Even smoking outside, whether it's controlled or not, affects people who are just in the general vicinity.

I want this committee to take a strong look with respect to the inside environment and not only with respect to air ventilation, because having worked in some large office buildings on Bay Street when I used to practise law here in Toronto, when you work inside these

large buildings and you depend on your air ventilation and you don't have a window you can open, it's different. You have to make sure that what you're breathing and the work environment you have are safe and aren't detrimental to your health.

You have your challenges with respect to inside and outside the workplace, so let's not be too narrow with respect to what you define the environment as. I think you should take a very close look at smoking and maybe revisit that issue in terms of health impact. Because I think that would be a major step forward in terms of dealing with a healthier and safe environment. I indicate to the member opposite that when they look at the terms of reference, don't narrow them to the outside environment, because there are some significant issues inside the workplace that have to be addressed.

I certainly believe that a select committee would be of assistance in dealing with this issue. I know our throne speech reaffirmed our commitment to the Nutrient Management Act and spelled out the centrality of the environment to Smart Growth.

I think the initiatives we've taken—and I'll just refer to my riding, Lake Simcoe—have been significant in terms of trying to ensure that it's a cold-water lake and is beneficial to the fish in that particular lake. We have seen tremendous strides with respect to control of what goes into that lake. I think all the communities around that lake have joined together to make sure, through provincial money and initiatives with the Lake Simcoe conservation authority, to protect our environment.

It's not just what you breathe; it's also what you drink, as we know, and the environment and the recreation we have in this province. So let's take a hard look at all the aspects of this issue, health and environment, and I think we'll come up with some positive initiatives in terms of showing some leadership on some issues. In particular, the province should be showing some leadership with respect to smoking in our environment.

That's all I have to say. I would support the resolution.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): I'm very happy to support the resolution of my colleague from Windsor-St Clair today and hope that we look for all-party support on a select committee to study the links between the environment and our health.

I think what we wish we had more time for in this hour to debate this resolution was the time to go through the detail of the profile that was done and released in Windsor just a few short months ago.

The data that resulted in this profile was nothing short of stunning for the province. I thought the people in Windsor reacted in a very funny way when this became public. Most people in Windsor know there is a link between where we live in our environment and our health condition. Most people, in fact, responded by saying, “You know, we knew that.” It's quite good to see it actually documented and to know that all the anecdotal evidence, the stories we hear, how many neighbours on our street have cancer of a similar type—those things anecdotally were always there, and we've lived with that.

But note that two gentlemen, James Brophy and another individual who is listed here as the writer, went to the length of collecting data from Stats Canada to actually do a review. What they found, in not just some cases but in many in this study, were several diseases occurring at elevated rates in Windsor, including lung cancer, cancers of the digestive system, the reproductive system, lymphoma, leukemia, diabetes, asthma, infertility and degenerative nerve diseases. It was striking to hear and to see in writing things that we always knew from our neighbours.

Those of us who grew up in Windsor, as Dwight and I did, have relatives and friends whose parents or grandparents worked at the Bendix plant, which was probably made most famous after its closing, when we all realized and grew up with the notion that these people were working in asbestos for decades and that the people in that plant have since come down with innumerable diseases because of work at that plant, and then after the fact realizing that many plants in this automotive capital of Canada, the foundries in our area—I know that the people who come from the Hamilton area have similar concerns with the steel industry there, as in Windsor with the chrome-plating plants and all those heavy industrial environments that cause pollution unimaginable in the days when the plants opened. Today we look at that and wonder how our fathers—they were mostly men—worked in that environment, even up to the mid-1980s. When the Kelsey-Hayes plant closed, we realized there were people, hundreds of them, who worked in this environment for years and years, and anecdotally we would hear of the number of people in these plants who had become very ill, often with similar types of cancers. It's unfortunate that's our history where health is concerned.

1030

I've often been up in the House talking about how we can combat these health issues and how we need a health system to fight the diseases, once people are ill. It is time that we spend as much energy determining where we got that as we are currently fighting to get the system to respond to illness. It is also our responsibility to deal with how we can prevent it. The member from St Clair and I both hope that is ultimately going to be the result of such a select committee study, that we are going to be able to look at resolutions that come forward from the committee to say, "This is the kind of environment we have to strive for."

It's striking to note that it isn't just ill health, as we come to know it, but things like mental health. We have talked about the lack of mental health services, but we often don't talk about the incredible demand in our community and why that is. We currently have 700 kids on a waiting list for mental health services. Why, in an area like Windsor and Essex county, is that so elevated? If you speak with teachers in our elementary schools, they will often say that we have an incredibly high number of kids with attention deficit disorder. The doctors, psychologists and psychiatrists are all saying now that they

believe there may well be a link between our environment and these kids' behaviour, that those mental health illnesses may well be triggered by allergies.

If you have an environment like ours, where we don't know for certain but can suspect, it then becomes our duty and we are duty-bound to find if there is indeed a link. Then the greater issues lie after that: to determine how we collectively, across all levels of government, can work with our community partners to make a difference in that environment.

While Windsor has been identified in this study by the individuals who wrote this paper, it's of concern to every industrial city and it's of concern to the province as a whole. I hope the entire House will support the resolution and we can look forward to an excellent report coming out of a select committee to determine what—and if—are those links between the environment and our health.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): I would like to commend Mr Duncan for bringing forward this important private member's resolution this morning and say how pleased I am to see his quick response to the report, which came out some time ago in Windsor, a very alarming report that suggests the illness and death rate for people in Windsor is significantly higher than the Ontario and Canadian averages. This was published in a report entitled *Community Health Profile of Windsor, Ontario, Canada: Anatomy of a Great Lakes Area of Concern*.

Since this report came out, I'm sure there's been a lot of discussion in Windsor about it, but we haven't heard much discussion here in this chamber, as we have been preoccupied with many other issues. I want to remind the House that there are many individuals and groups, doctors, organizations, that have been toiling away over the years on the prevention of cancer. I want to remind members of the House that in 1994 Ruth Grier, when she was Minister of Health—she had been Minister of the Environment—put in the public sphere a report called *Recommendations for the Primary Prevention of Cancer*. It is true that this report is focused more on cancer than on any of the other diseases. We well know by now that there is a whole litany of ways the environment can affect our health.

What we hear most about in this Legislature these days, for obvious reasons, is water. The water we drink can kill us or make us ill. We know the air we breathe can cause up to 1,900 people to die premature deaths in Ontario due to smog. Soil contamination from carcinogens, heavy metals and other toxic substances that endanger our kids can work their way into our water. Water quality has clear links to human health and is under threat from so many areas, including contamination from toxic dumping, nutrients, and the list goes on.

I believe it's a very good idea to bring a select committee together so that we can attempt to work, in a non-partisan way, to bring in all those experts out there who have been working in this area for so long. Hopefully now the entire Legislature is ready to work together for that common goal.

I want to remind people that on April 18, 1996, I brought forward a resolution in this Legislature that

talked about cancer being one of the leading causes of premature death in Ontario, "claiming more than 20,000 lives annually," and noted that Ontario "currently spends in excess of \$1 billion a year on cancer treatment."

The previous, New Democratic Party government recognized this dire threat and commissioned a task force to advise on ways to effectively stem the rising incidence of this disease. Unfortunately, our government was defeated shortly after that report came out. I asked specifically in my resolution—and surprisingly I got the support of all three parties—to set up not a select committee but something very similar to that, with all three parties being represented. That would be a committee "consisting of environmental, health, labour, industry, women's, aboriginal and other interested groups," and the government of Ontario should "work with that committee to establish realistic and measurable timetables for sunsetting persistent bioaccumulative toxic chemicals that are known or suspected carcinogens as outlined in this report of the task force."

I'm glad to see that the resolution before us today goes further than that and talks about the direct link between all aspects of our health and the environment.

I don't know if you're aware but there are over 70,000—just try to imagine that—artificial chemicals that we've allowed into our environment. Of course we have no idea how these chemicals interact and, once they do interact, how they react to each other. In October 1993 the Ontario Minister of Environment and Energy released primary and secondary lists of candidate substances for bans, phase-out or reductions and other lists by other bodies that had been submitted to the public in this same area.

Obviously it's not possible, once that chemical, that persistent toxic substance is out there, to remove it. So the focus has got to be on prevention of the use and production and generation of these substances in the first place. As that report pointed out, certain classes of persistent toxic chemicals are of particular concern. One of these classes that we're hearing a lot about today is organo-chlorines, which includes such chemicals as DDT, PCBs and dioxins. Organo-chlorines have been found to act as tumour promoters and there is growing evidence that some of those substances can mimic the effects of estrogens on cells and are likely causing birth defects and reproductive problems, such that they can have very serious long-term effects on the reproductive abilities of future generations.

Those are some examples of the things we need to be looking at—all of the links. Bring in all of the experts who have been working on these issues for years and try to find common ground and begin the process of phasing out and getting rid of some of those persistent toxic chemicals that are going into our food chain and are having a direct effect on and a direct link to the reproductive systems of women who are giving birth to children, to breast milk.

We know that the incidence of breast cancer and prostate cancer and testicular cancer, particularly in

young men, is growing at an alarming rate. Studies have shown that in a very large percentage of those, the causes are not known.

Direct genetic links cannot be found. That is why it's so important that we find ways to get together and try to come to some conclusions and some ways, in a non-partisan fashion, that we can start the work of eliminating some of these toxic chemicals from our environment.

1040

Pesticides are an issue that we hear a lot about these days. There is enough evidence out there to show that some of these pesticides can have very bad health effects on our children, yet we have a government that is doing nothing about those pesticides. Perhaps there is a feeling that we need more evidence, more proof, that those pesticides are having a negative effect on our health, particularly on our children's health.

A large number of man-made chemicals have been released into our environment, and there are a few natural ones, but they are having the impact and the effect of making our children sick. We see more and more instances of cancer.

I do want to commend the member for bringing this resolution before us today. I recently sat on a task force, a special select committee on alternative fuels, and I'm pleased to say it was a very effective and well-run committee where, at the end of the day, we released a report. Yes, there were some compromises made, but actually it was a very good report with far-reaching recommendations for the government of the day and other governments to follow.

What remains to be seen is what the government does with that report. I'm disappointed that this report that came out shortly before we lost government in 1995 was never acted on. I'm disappointed that on several occasions in this Legislature I asked the Minister of Health of the day and the Minister of the Environment to work together with me to form this committee and it never happened. I have letters in my file. I have a big file here of correspondence to show my attempts to bring the Legislature together with experts in the field, but it never happened.

I do hope, and I believe from what I've heard today, that attitudes have changed, that there is no longer such a fear of bringing together all members of the Legislature and that we can work together and come up with common recommendations. That, after all, is the reason we're here: to work together as legislators to try to do the best we can for our constituents across the province.

Congratulations to Mr Duncan for bringing this forward today. I certainly will be very pleased to serve on this committee.

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I appreciate the chance to respond to the motion being put forward by the member for Windsor-St Clair. I empathize very much with him. I'll be supporting his resolution and I thank him for bringing it.

I think what an ideal time—I don't know if this was planned or accidental—to be debating this in late June. I

think it's a perfect day to bring it to our attention and have a close look at it.

I have a quote from Mikhail Gorbachev: "The 21st century will be the century of the environment." I think he's absolutely right. That was stated some time ago, probably a decade ago, but certainly those are prophetic words that are going to be true in Ontario and probably true worldwide.

On his suggestion of a select committee, I was just having a chat with my good friend Jim Bradley about this select committee. I've been fortunate to be on both of the select committees we've had since I came to office in 1995. The select committee on nuclear affairs was a very satisfying experience for me. It was struck back in 1997. Then, to be able to chair the most recent select committee on alternate fuel sources—I was just chatting there a second ago about the fact there was a total consensus. I think it puts us in good stead with what select committees can in fact do for this Legislature and for, particularly, the people of Ontario. During the writing of the report the door was closed, the party hats were left at the door and we just sat down and worked for the good of the people of Ontario. If select committees can do that into the future, I think we can accomplish an awful lot for the Legislature and for the present government.

That particular report on alternate fuel sources can certainly put Ontario out in front as leaders in looking after our air and looking after our water, particularly some of the thoughts on the production of electricity. There is a tremendous amount of interest in the province looking at wind turbines. They felt our report was very positive, the fact that we're promoting the idea of run-of-the-river hydraulic plants. I think it has been overlooked because of the power, if you'll excuse the pun, of the nuclear plants. I'm disappointed that with all that power that's available at night they haven't been producing hydrogen over the last three or four decades and powering some of our urban buses and reducing the pollution that is present in our urban centres.

Just a gentle challenge to the opposition parties: when you're on the right, you tend to think that's the party that's all about economics, and when you're on the left, that's the party that's all about the environment. But a tremendous number of changes have occurred and a tremendous amount of legislation has been brought in by our government since we took office in 1995 for the good of the environment. I challenge the opposition parties with what they brought in when they were in office. I know they did bring in some things, but I think our party while in government has been exceptional with the number of changes that we've made. I know that we must indeed protect our air, water and land to ensure a healthy, vibrant community. Ontario is no exception to this rule and that is why Ontario has taken numerous actions during the more than seven years we have been in office.

Air quality is perhaps one of the most important environmental issues that concerns Ontarians, especially those of our citizens who are elderly or who are suffering from asthma or other difficulties. Last week we proposed

to add fine particulate matter to Ontario's air quality index. Although medical and environmental groups recognize Ontario as having one of Canada's best air quality monitoring systems, improving the system will better protect the health of the people of Ontario, especially those who are vulnerable to poor air quality, like children, people with asthma and the elderly. Our youngest daughter has asthma and of course we're quite concerned about it. She's a delightful young lady who, by the way, just got married last Saturday.

Also in June of this year, Ontario's new emissions reporting registry on air went on-line, making polluters more accountable to the public by providing regular information about what emissions are being put into the air and by whom. This will of course allow consumers to make informed decisions about whom they want to do business with, to know which companies are doing the best job of minimizing their environmental impact and to motivate poor performing companies to do a better job, either by voting with their feet or by actively lobbying those companies to improve their performance.

Talking about the air quality index, I should also mention that our government has already spent \$5 million to upgrade Ontario's air monitoring network. As well, the air quality index reporting system was expanded into the rural areas and high-growth areas for the GTA. These two initiatives in June are in addition to many other government initiatives to improve the province's air quality.

Our government's anti-smog action plan is a commitment to reduce the nitrogen oxide and volatile organic compound emissions in Ontario. The goal is to reduce these two emissions by 45% by 2015 when compared to the base year of 1990. In October 2001, the government proposed to tighten this deadline, moving it from 2015 to 2010.

Also, in October 2001, the government set strict emission caps on the six fossil fuel electric plants currently owned by Ontario Power Generation. When fully implemented in 2007, the caps would cut emission limits of smog-causing nitrogen oxide by some 53%, and sulphur oxide by some 25%.

Again, I come back to our member from Windsor-St Clair, and compliment him on bringing forth this particular resolution. I look forward to voting on it and expect that this particular resolution will pass.

1050

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): I am pleased to join the debate this morning to support my colleague's resolution to strike a select committee for an examination of the relationship between health and the environment.

The member from Windsor-St Clair makes the point that the select committee on alternative fuels brought forward an excellent report, with recommendations supported by all three parties, and I hope at the end of this debate we will have the same kind of consensus that we did on the alternative fuels committee.

Mr Speaker, I know that you and many of my colleagues are aware that I have a special interest in causes

related to cancer. The information on causes and effects is overwhelming. We probably could fill this House with all the materials that are available. This speaks to the need for this select committee to do a thorough job to review the literature and findings and make recommendations to this House to ensure that the people of Ontario receive a coordinated approach to research and development. This committee has the potential of advancing research and, ultimately, the health of our citizens.

Let me give you a few facts. Women in Canada are a thousand times more likely to be diagnosed with breast cancer than women in China—I repeat, a thousand times. There are reasons for this. It's not because it's purely one thing or another but rather a multiplicity of things. It relates to the environment. It relates primarily in this case, though, to diet.

Dr Norman Boyd, head of epidemiology and statistics at the Ontario cancer centre, believes that differences in diet and exercise may explain much of the high rates for Canadian women. Some experts believe that hormone replacement therapy, bleaches, lipsticks and dishwasher fluids play a role in breast cancer. Estimates for women in Canada diagnosed with breast cancer are 20,500 this year, an increase of 1,500 this year alone. Environment is another, the external environment. The member earlier talked about the internal environment; it is correct that that is also a factor. But experts in the field believe we need to know what role the various environments play, and I agree. How do we tackle the problems if we don't know the causes and the effects?

This week in Hamilton the federal environment minister told participants attending a global conference on water that water will be the overwhelming issue of the 21st century, of 100 years we are entering. The president of the Great Lakes Commission said, "Developing countries face desperate problems." He went on to add that there is a crisis in the developing world, specifically the Great Lakes-St Lawrence region. This is where the majority of our population here in Ontario live. Water is essential to our existence. We learned from Walkerton how essential water is and, where there are problems, just how life-threatening tainted water can be. Justice O'Connor told us the causes of this failed system.

I'm not sure the government listened. Bill 81, the Nutrient Management Act, was forced through this House. This bill is the very essence of why we need this select committee. If we as legislators are forced to push a flawed bill like that through the House, without knowing the full details of the regulations, how can we ensure the safety of Ontarians? This bill leaves more questions than answers, in my opinion. I don't know how the government could expect us to pass a bill when they can't even tell us what constitutes a nutrient.

What is it that we are flooding on our fields and what will be going into our water systems? We don't know. What we do know is that untreated human waste is still being spread on farmers' fields, the very fields from which we get our food, and this government is going to

privatize oversight of nutrient inspection, administration and training services. So we will have one set of rules applied across the province, administered by private firms.

In brief, I would like to point out one matter of extreme importance. The World Health Organization has called an emergency meeting to review evidence that basic foods contain carcinogens. These are foods we all eat, but when fried, baked or grilled at high heats, dangerous levels of carcinogens have been found. These foods are potatoes, rice, bread products. These are foods we all eat. If even the simplest foods can be detrimental to our health, if the water we drink, cook and bathe in can be detrimental to our health, if the air we breathe contains contaminants, if we are spreading human waste on our fields, there is no doubt that it is time we finally review this matter in depth. That's why I'm happy to be here today to support the proposition and the resolution to create a select committee.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I wish to speak briefly to this particular resolution, which I think is important: the establishment of a select committee. I think all of us, in each one of our constituencies and in each of our political experiences, recognize that the question continues to be asked, what is the relationship between our general environment out there and health?

The Minister of Labour is here this morning. He would know, from his briefings and from his own knowledge, that there are contentious issues that exist within the workplace. There is evidence that exists that within the confines of a workplace, certain contaminants, certain chemicals, certain toxic substances may well have an effect on individuals. It's probably even easier to quantify in that case than it is in the general environment.

If you ask people why we have relatively widespread breast cancer, for instance, it doesn't seem to lend itself to any easy answer. Many people out there have asked the question, is it something in our environment? Is there something out there in our environment that impacts upon our health? That's why I think a select committee of this kind is very useful.

Mr Galt, when he was speaking earlier as the Chair of the select committee on alternative fuels, pointed out the value of a select committee. Frankly, I'm a great fan of select committees. One reason is that it focuses attention on a fairly specific area. The second is that people tend to be far less partisan in their consideration of the issues at hand in a select committee setting than they will be in one of the standing committees of the Legislature, which by their nature—and I don't say this in a critical way—are an avenue for partisan exchange.

I was very impressed, and somewhat surprised, I must say, because there haven't been that many select committees around to make a judgment on this, at the consensus that was reached. If you read the report of the alternative fuels committee, there are some pretty radical recommendations, pretty sweeping recommendations in it. Yet there was a strong discussion in the committee. When we were doing the report writing—first of all, we

gathered excellent information from people who made presentations to us. We had certain visitations where we were able to glean some information. Then the real work came along when we had to write the report. I watched people with pretty divergent views and philosophies, all of us on that committee, work together to develop a consensus and come up with a report that I think is an excellent blueprint for not only any government in Ontario but any government in any other jurisdiction on how we can move away from our dependency on fossil fuels, for instance, to renewables, alternative fuels which are much more benign environmentally and do not consume valuable fossil fuels which could be used for other purposes.

I think this committee, which grows out of an experience in the city of Windsor, which has been impacted by environmental problems, without a doubt is a good idea. I think there are members of this Legislature who have a specific interest and would want to be part of this committee and would want to develop a report.

One of the important parts, it seems to me, in this committee is going to be the gathering of information. That's going to be extremely important—credible information, because there's a lot of conjecture out there. If you go to almost any city in a jurisdiction, if you're the Minister of Health or Minister of the Environment or Minister of Labour, they will say, "We have the highest cancer rate in Ontario," for instance, because we see an incidence which is somewhat concerning to all of us, and understandably so. So we want to determine whether there is indeed a direct impact from the environment on our health. I think ministers would be interested. I think members of this Legislature would be interested.

Once again, it's not only for our own purposes in Ontario, though that's our primary purpose as legislators in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Also, I think what we find through the select committee could well be of value to people in so many other jurisdictions.

1100

The Acting Speaker: Further debate? The member for Windsor West—Hamilton West. I'm sorry.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): Thank you, Speaker. That's actually not a bad opening, because it gives me a nice segue into my opening remark, which is that there are a lot of similarities between the environmental issues in Windsor and those in Hamilton.

With that, the first thing I want to do is commend my friend and colleague from Windsor-St Clair, Mr Duncan, who I think has done a real service to this issue by virtue of bringing this here. I don't know at this point—I haven't gone around and asked—whether this is going to pass. I hope it does; I sense that there's a good chance it might. It would definitely be one of the most progressive things to come out of this Legislature, and I mean that in the sense of all of us as elected members of our communities as opposed to being broken down into three separate camps.

Just this week, in fact on Monday, in the Hamilton Spectator, in a regular column by Lynda Lukasik. Lynda

is an environmental activist who lives in the east end; I believe she lives in Dominic Agostino's riding. She's the founder of Environment Hamilton, a citizens' organization. She just recently received her PhD in planning. This is what she said in Monday's article: "It's time to speak out. We've become guinea pigs in a very large, very uncontrolled scientific experiment, the outcome of which remains unknown. The reality, though, is that we are inextricably linked to the environment around us."

That, in a nutshell, is why I think all of us should support this. There's nothing partisan about it. There's no sense of "gotcha." There's no sense of trying to set anybody up. There are so many issues contained in here. For instance, it was reported in May, just last month, that in the area from Oakville to Brantford, Milton to Niagara Falls, in 1997, 350 tonnes—350 tonnes—of toxic chemicals and carcinogens went up the smokestacks of our industrial facilities. Three years later, it's up 72%, and in that same area of our province, which of course encompasses my home town of Hamilton, it's now at 600 tonnes of toxic emissions going into all those communities.

We really don't have a touchstone we can refer to to say, "Here's the damage that's done," and therefore it either justifies or doesn't justify the expenditure on whatever issue might be in front of either a local city council or this provincial government, or in fact the feds. We don't have that starting point.

How many of us who served on municipal councils have dealt with the issue of pesticides? It continues to be an issue in Hamilton. I suspect it's an issue in Windsor, Sault Ste Marie, right across the province. Most councillors really don't know where to go. Obviously, none of them wants to poison their own citizens, but they don't want to overreact. It's a big issue locally. It may not seem like it in the context of headlines these days, but it's a big issue when you're dealing with local politics. This would give us a chance to deal with that.

In Hamilton, this issue resonates so strongly. First of all, the Red Hill valley expressway: there are studies that can show how many children are going to die and how many elderly people will die and how many children and other citizens will contract asthma and other respiratory diseases because of that expressway. Anything we can do to show that plans where we spend money from the provincial government are going to kill people is information we ought to know.

In Hamilton we also experienced Plastimet. We are so lucky that no one died there; that could easily have been an environmental massacre. SWARU in the east end of Hamilton continues to be one of the major polluters in Canada. Yet we don't show the leadership in this place to do something about that. There are literally tens of thousands of new chemicals coming into our environment and we have no idea what the impact is on the human body. It has become far too acceptable to think about someone who has died of cancer as having had some kind of normal death. There's nothing normal about dying of cancer.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. The member for Windsor West has two minutes to sum up.

Mr Duncan: Windsor-St Clair.

I want to thank the member for Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, Mr Tascona; the member for Toronto-Danforth, Ms Churley; the member for Northumberland, Mr Galt; the member for Ottawa Centre, Mr Patten; the member for St Catharines, Mr Bradley; and the member for Hamilton West, Mr Christopherson. I want to respond briefly to what has been raised by them.

Mr Tascona talked about the terms of reference. I've set the resolution so that the government and the opposition can negotiate that. This is a broad topic. It's something we want to have a meaningful, effective report from, and I'm sincere when I say it's important that we can agree to the terms of reference.

Ms Churley spoke with some experience and passion about bringing people together on complex issues that involve chemical interactions, cancers, the human body and so on.

Mr Galt and Mr Bradley spoke with some knowledge about how effective a select committee can be. Candidly, it was watching that committee and our Legislative Assembly committee that led me to believe this is the right step to take, a small but meaningful step.

Mr Patten of course brought the passion of his own battle with cancer to bear on this debate, and what he has learned about the linkages between our environment and cancer.

Of course, Mr Christopherson has always spoken passionately about his own community's experiences as well as the issues around cancer.

To the people in my own community, we live in some fear of our environment and what effect it's having, particularly on our children. I believe all of us in the Legislature share those concerns. Of 103 members, I would say 103 are unquestionably concerned and would like to have the opportunity to do something. The government members indicated their willingness to support this. I hope that happens at noon. I think this will be a small but important step we can take to begin to address a very complex and challenging issue.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, with apologies to the member from Windsor-St Clair.

TENDER FRUIT LANDS

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I move that in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario be urged to establish an agricultural preserve in the Niagara Peninsula similar to that in the Napa Valley in California, in order to protect tender fruit lands from further development.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): The member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Bradley: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and 10 minutes would not be enough to easily deal with all the issues related to this issue, but as I indicated in a little note I sent to members of the Legislature, the purpose of

bringing this issue forward is to get a discussion going on how best to preserve agricultural land.

To put a little bit of focus on an actual preserve itself, this kind of preserve exists in many other jurisdictions, both in Canada and the United States. What it is designed to do is to retain good agricultural land for agricultural purposes. Governments across North America are talking about smart growth now. How do we best use the land we have for the benefit of the population as a whole? In my view, that is a good discussion, and that kind of debate is very helpful and very public at this time.

I focus on the Niagara Peninsula because I am very familiar with the Niagara Peninsula and the fruit lands there. I am alarmed at how quickly it's being lost to development. I think it's a genuine asset to the whole province.

We're lucky in the Niagara Peninsula that we've got, first of all, good soils for the growing of grapes and other tender fruit. The second thing we have, besides good soils, and perhaps even more important, is a microclimate that is conducive to growing tender fruit. It is said that the difference between the growing season on top of the Niagara Escarpment, that is, south of the northern portion of the Niagara Peninsula, and the area down in the little pocket near Lake Ontario is about 27 days' growing, and those are frost-free days. We have as well some of the best farmers you're going to find probably anywhere in North America in terms of tender fruit, people who have had long experience, people who have handed down farms from generation to generation.

1110

With those three particular assets, it seems to me we would want to preserve as much agricultural land as possible. I wish I could say it could be done through local zoning laws, but it can't. It's very difficult for municipal politicians to resist the temptation of development, because development is instant money. It is often looked upon as success. Indeed, we want to see development in certain places that are not on agricultural land. One of the initiatives we've seen in this Legislature has been that of a focus on brownfield development. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was very excited about being able to move forward with that, and a significant step has been taken. I think that helps very much in terms of getting people to redevelop parts of their municipalities and to intensify their development.

One of the things we all know is that if you want to save the farmland, you have to save the farmer. That's something very basic. It seems to me, and somebody will correct me if I'm wrong, that one of the steps the government took in this budget was to treat farmland in a different way for taxation purposes. That's positive, in my view. It's difficult sometimes for those of us in opposition to look at budgets. They always say, "What is good about the budget?" You can always find some things, and that's one step that I think is important in preserving this land.

From the legislative library and other sources, I have a number of things that are being done around North

America, not only in the Napa Valley of California, which is highly successful agriculturally and tourist-wise—it brings in well over \$1 billion per year in just the revenues from the selling of wine—but many other areas and states in the United States that have found ways to assist farmers, while keeping the farmland for the purposes of agriculture. I'd like to see us look at these. I mentioned in my note to members of the Legislature that I wanted to get a discussion going. I want to get that discussion focused, however, on some kind of agricultural preserve.

I'm not going to be specific today. We've mentioned select committees. Frankly, I think it's a great topic for a select committee. We have some members here who have direct experience in agriculture, in the marketing of our products and so on. I think it would be valuable to have them in to tell us how we can best preserve this land. I don't think any one of the plans I see in the various states in the United States and other jurisdictions in and of itself is necessarily the solution; perhaps a combination is. A combination would be very helpful.

I look at that land and some people would almost cry when they see that good agricultural land being lost. I was reading in my own local newspaper about the member for Stoney Creek, the Minister of Labour, and his commitment to the preservation of agricultural land. He sees it in his constituency and in his general areas—areas that were once really top-notch areas for agriculture being lost to development. Again, in some cases we want to see development take place. This is not something designed to block development, but it is something designed to make sure we can retain good agricultural land for good purposes.

The Minister of Consumer and Business Services is here. He has certain responsibilities for wine, and as Minister of Tourism he had certain responsibilities. People come from other parts of the province to the Niagara Peninsula not to see more shopping centres, as they might see adjacent to Toronto—Mississauga has some great shopping centres. So have we; we want to say that. But generally speaking, you find people from the Metropolitan Toronto area come to our area to enjoy the rural experience, to enjoy what are now top-notch wines and to get tender fruit they can get right at a fruit stand. It's top-notch, fresh and of the highest quality. That's why I think it's going to be important for us to try to look for ways to implement smart growth as it relates to agriculture.

I know that it's nice to have your own food supply. We know we keep our prices reasonable for Canadians when we have some competition here in Canada. If we don't have the competition from our own local growers, we will be gouged by people outside. But we still have to make sure our local growers have programs in place that ensure they're not penalized by being compelled to retain their own land for agricultural purposes.

I see urban development taking place. I have statistics from the Niagara region which show how much we've already lost of that agricultural land and how important it is to preserve that which is left. We also have a situation

where you'll see developers buy up land and then don't farm it. They go to the local council and say, "See, it's not being farmed anyway, so we might as well develop it." That does two things: it militates in favour of development of good agricultural land, but it also drives up prices so farmers themselves who may want to expand their operations, if they are able to do so, have to pay a huge price for that land. It artificially drives up the price of that land for farmers who may need it for expansion purposes.

I also know there's the issue of severances. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture has expressed its concern from time to time about severances because that's death by a thousand cuts. If you are not careful in giving severances—and I'm not saying there isn't a case from time to time for severances, but if you allow them to be given willy-nilly, if you allow them to be traded one municipality to another municipality—and that's what happens, now that it's not under regional control, it's back under local control—ultimately the region probably has to agree to these severances. People start bargaining: "You give me my severance in my community and I'll give you your severance in your community." That's death by a thousand cuts.

What happens as well is, it starts to urbanize rural areas and then you get people complaining about natural farm practices. Farmers in this House would know that. You have urban people move out to enjoy the countryside, only then to want to impose upon the countryside the urban conditions they came from in some circumstances. You get complaints about noise, odours, dust and dirt from people who have moved from an urban setting to a rural setting.

I think it would be a national tragedy to lose this farmland. I think we have a chance to preserve it for future generations. I don't want to pretend it's an easy thing to do, but I do want to say this: if you don't preserve the farmers, if you don't assist the farmers in ensuring that they get a reasonable return, whether it's through programs from the government or the prices that are paid for the products, then you won't save the land. I want to save the farmers as well as the land, but it's going to take a bold step from a provincial level of government to do this. I think our Legislature has a chance to do that today by, in general terms, approving this resolution.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I speak on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus with enthusiasm for this resolution. I'm rather fortunate because I get to go to the Niagara South Federation of Agriculture dinners because part of my riding is Niagara South. The member from Erie-Lincoln gets invited to those too. I also get to go to the Niagara North Federation of Agriculture dinners, where Mr Bradley is inevitably in attendance as well. Mr Bradley doesn't have the blessing I have of being invited as frequently to Niagara South, although I suspect if he asked them to, they would.

But why I make a point of this is that there's a remarkable contrast in agriculture in Niagara region.

When we're down at the Niagara South Federation of Agriculture dinner and the annual meeting—and the member for Erie-Lincoln will confirm this, I'm sure—we're talking about some diverse types of farming and agriculture: chicken, cattle, among others, some crop farming. But when we go up to Niagara North and sit down with those farmers at their annual meeting dinner, we meet second, third and fourth generations of tender fruit farmers. We also meet newcomers.

I was grateful for being given a copy of Doug Draper's article in *Vines* magazine. Doug Draper is a very bright and very capable journalist down in Niagara region, who has written a very succinct and powerful argument for the need to preserve agricultural lands in Niagara. Although this isn't unique to Niagara, Niagara is unique in terms of the types of agricultural lands that warrant our prompt attention.

1120

As I say, in terms of families where three, four and even five generations have been farming the land in Niagara north and Niagara south—in Niagara north there are tender fruit farmers operating vineyards. Mr Draper in his article in *Vines* magazine writes of Michael Kacaba, for instance, a newcomer to Niagara, investing substantially, not only money but also his family's future, their lifestyle in developing a small vineyard to a company to provide grape product for a small boutique winery. I've got to tell you: travel along Highway 8 from, oh, Grimsby down through Niagara region east and you're confronted by—you can travel down that road in May and think you've seen all the wineries that are there, but go again in June or July and you discover yet more, and all of them not only with delightful product but some of them, in increasing numbers, award-winning, and on an international level in an unprecedented way.

So we indeed are the trustees of an incredibly unique and, yes, valuable—invaluable—heritage. Once you pave it over, there ain't any more—ever. And you can never build it; it's not like building a new one. Nothing short of God and millions of years of history can create the microclimate we find north of the escarpment, down there along the shores of Lake Ontario, not only the microclimate but the incredibly rich soil, the two combined creating—if the west is the wheat bowl—the fruit bowl, not only of Ontario but also of Canada, especially when it comes to tender fruit.

I was also especially grateful and especially proud not only of my association but also of my predecessor Mel Swart's association and his strong support, like mine, for PALS, the acronym for Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society. This is a group of committed people who over decades now—hasn't it been, Mr Bradley?—have been fighting to preserve agricultural land in Niagara region. Their first president was Dr Bob Hoover, a professor at Brock University—still very active, mind you, very much a senior citizen but you wouldn't know it in terms of how active he is in the community and how active he remains in the fight to preserve agricultural land, along with so many others. PALS itself has nur-

tered leadership that's matured through the years. Our own Dr John Bacher from St Catharines, along with others, has developed some incredible expertise around (1) the need to preserve this agricultural land and (2) methods by which it can be meaningfully preserved.

At the end of the day, the fundamental battle is between developers—look, far be it for me to tell developers they shouldn't want to develop what is very expensive housing on this very unique land in this very unique microclimate situation. Of course they want to. That's a tribute to the uniqueness and high quality of it. I acknowledge that if they're unfettered—you see, this government wants to let the market prevail. This government has been disinclined to understand the role of government in terms of its need to be interventionist and, yes, to protect people and our most valuable assets and our future from the incredible pressures of the free market. If developers have their way—and since, what is it, 1997, they have—that tender fruit land is going to be gone; it'll be eliminated and it'll never be returned. It'll take millions and millions more years and yet more historical accidents globally for another similar climate and chunk of soil to be created, and it could be a hundred miles from here or it could be 1,000 or 10,000 miles from here.

Now, back in the early part of the 1990s, Bill 163 provided part of the solution. One also has some significant sympathy for farmers, who have seen their fruit prices under attack by virtue of free trade and the huge growth of the importation of mega-farm fruit from the southern United States, particularly California. Farmers have been under attack. Farmers have not seen the subsidies and support in this province and in this country that farmers in other western countries have enjoyed—quite frankly not “enjoy” in terms of receiving it with such great pleasure, but acknowledgment by the governments of those other countries that an intrinsic agricultural industry is in and of itself an extremely valuable and important thing to preserve. If you forfeit production of your own food and become reliant on another jurisdiction, then you are enslaved forever. While you can tear down a building and build a new one, you can't pave over land and then hope some time down the road to re-soil it and restore its agricultural potential.

So we have a historic and national interest in preserving this agricultural land. And I've got to tell you that I am incredibly persuaded by the years, the decades of work PALS has done research on the issue. Indeed Gracia Janes provided me with a copy of her address made in Guelph in April this year on behalf of PALS, the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society, where she talks about PALS's history, its process of canvassing various approaches and techniques. Its final conclusion: the free market is the antithesis of preservation of agricultural land. The pressures are so strong, so profound—again, farmers under attack with their diminished fruit prices because of the competition that was permitted as a result of the free trade agreement and the absence of meaningful governmental support, unlike farmers in

other jurisdictions in so many other countries—that farmers find themselves, after lifetimes of farming the land and being good trustees of it, with no option but to sell it if they're to have any sort of retirement with any decency or dignity.

One has to understand and be sympathetic to the pressures those specific farmers have, especially when generation after generation of the land has been farmed but younger generations don't find the farm life, with its incredibly long days and heavy workload and modest income, to be attractive in contrast or comparison to the careers that are available to them. So we understand, and I'm sure the author of this resolution understands, the interests of farmers. But those same farmers also understand the interest in preserving the land, and that's why the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society, after a thorough and complete a course of research as could ever be conducted, has been an advocate of, and the New Democratic Party government of the early 1990s in fact enacted, the concept of creating agricultural land reserves by virtue of easements.

We know that we can't rely upon mere zoning, because subsequent governments can alter that zoning, governments like this one, that are the little puppets of the corporate developers—and for reason: corporate developers have invested a lot in this government, and this is the best government the corporate developers could buy, or rent. When you take a look at campaign contributions and you see who has supported this government and its candidates financially, you see to whom this government is beholden, and it is those same corporate developers. So mere legislation and mere land zoning in and of itself isn't sufficient, because subsequent governments can alter it, change it, flip it, what have you.

The most concrete, meaningful and historic way of preserving agricultural land is through the easement system proposed in Bill 163 in the early 1990s—a policy reform that was underway in a meaningful and effective way, because it also compensates the farmer for reducing the value of his land to mere agricultural usage as compared to the value it would have for development purposes—for residential and commercial purposes.

1130

So the farmers' interests are met in terms of its being compensatory. Does it cost money? Yes, but as PALS points out and as Doug Draper would point out, in contrast to the incredible investment we have made, as a succession of governments, in the wine industry, for instance, in Niagara, it's but a pittance, and we have a strong interest in maintaining that wine industry. One of the observations that has been made is that with the growth of wineries and the expectation and promotion of Niagara wines, the access to land adequate to grow the grapes to make those wines is rapidly becoming so restrictive as to constitute a restraint or constraint on the growth of the wine industry in and of itself.

This government could have taken this bold step, though it didn't, but we all advocate, I hope, that Ontario wines should be 100% Ontario grape, bar none. If there is

even one grape from elsewhere in a bottle of so-called Ontario wine, then sorry, it's not Ontario wine. Why should we as Ontarians be taking any other position? We've got farmers and wine makers down in Niagara working hard, making major investments and bringing kudos to Niagara and Ontario, and darn it, they need the support of government. At the very least, government could make it quite clear that Ontario wine means 100% Ontario grapes.

New Democrats endorse this resolution. New Democrats indeed continue to advocate for the easement system that was put into place by Bill 163, the policy endeavour that was crushed rapidly by the Conservative government shortly after they attained power. New Democrats condemn this government for its indifference to the preservation of agricultural land in Niagara and, quite frankly, in other parts of Ontario as well. But the focus today, of course, is Niagara.

New Democrats continue to stand with PALS, the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society, its leadership and its membership. New Democrats continue to support the initiative of PALS, and New Democrats call once again for the establishment of a land easement system that will preserve this agricultural land, not only in the short term but quite frankly forever, and that will do so in a fair way, that will do so in a way that financially compensates the farmers who deserve financial compensation, a land easement system that will ensure the preservation of agricultural land in Niagara for generations—not just decades but centuries to come.

Anything less is mere tinkering. Anything less is less than a sincere commitment to the preservation of this unique, scarce and valuable asset of Ontario and indeed all Canadians.

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): I am pleased to speak to this resolution this morning, put forward by the member for St Catharines, a resolution proposing that the Ontario government establish an agricultural preserve in the Niagara Peninsula to protect the tender fruit lands from further development.

As parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I can assure the member for St Catharines that our ministry and our government is absolutely committed to working with our agri-food and rural communities to strengthen, to sustain and safeguard our rural environment and our food production systems.

This government fully recognizes the important contribution that agriculture and the food sector make to this province. Clearly, the economic benefits are enormous, and we're committed to the tender fruit and grape growing industries. I will mention, for example, that we're funding a five-year, \$10-million OSTAR development grant to promote and increase the domestic and international market share of grape wines grown in Ontario.

On May 10 of last year, Ontario's profile as a world competitor in wine making got a big boost with an investment of more than \$2 million under the Healthy Futures program. Together with our industry partners,

we're building the wines of Ontario as a word-class brand which will increase investment and economic activity and certainly create jobs. The ministry also provides a great deal of technical expertise and advice to tender fruit and grape growers to help them improve and protect their crops.

With respect to land use planning in the peninsula, we certainly recognize the importance of the Niagara Escarpment Commission and, more recently, the Smart Growth initiative of this government. I'll make mention as well of the mid-Niagara corridor planning process. This is a process, in part, to relieve pressure on the area below the escarpment from the QEW, which presently, and regrettably, runs through Niagara fruit lands.

I also personally would like to make mention of a Manitoba program I've been looking at, the ALUS program. This stands for alternate land use services. It's piqued the interest of farmers in my riding. It's a conservation program that encourages farmers to set aside marginal land, wetlands perhaps, for natural wildlife habitat. It's a voluntary program. I recognize that it goes beyond what this bill is proposing. Mr Bradley may wish to take a look at the ALUS program.

I could expand further on some of these initiatives, but I will be splitting my time with some of my colleagues. I'll close by saying that with respect to the initiative taken by the member for St Catharines, I cannot support this resolution simply because establishing an agricultural preserve in the Niagara Peninsula is not the responsibility of the province of Ontario; it's a decision to be made by local municipal government. Both the province of Ontario and the state of California have very similar approaches to land use planning. We believe that the province's role is to provide strong land use planning policy directions to municipalities, as does the state of California, and to allow municipalities the flexibility to develop within these directions according to local needs, as Napa county has done in establishing the preserve in the west.

I support the protection of agriculture—I own a farm—but, in light of my preceding comments, not this resolution, not that the Ontario government be the one to establish an agricultural preserve.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): I'm pleased to be joining the debate in support of my colleague from St Catharines. I'm disappointed that I gather the official government position will be against this resolution. I think if we reflect on one of our key roles here in the Legislature, it is to look ahead at how things are going to unfold, and where we have enormous public assets in significant danger of being eroded, the Legislature has a responsibility to act.

I just reflect back. Algonquin park was a decision by the Legislature of Ontario, where it was seen that logging was going to run the risk of destroying an enormous asset for the province and we stepped in. The Niagara Escarpment is another example where, among other things, as the province looked ahead and saw that piece by piece the Niagara Escarpment, I think heavily because of

aggregate producers—people were going to mine the rock and the stone there. The province felt a responsibility to step in and preserve it. Thank goodness we did.

I've been most directly involved in two things. With the Rouge park, contrary to what the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture said, the province did step in and established, among other things, an agricultural preserve. I might add that my colleague Mr Bradley was deeply involved in that decision. That decision was made as a result of the community launching a very, very effective effort to persuade the government of the day—it happened to be a Liberal government—to take action to preserve the Rouge treasure. Governments of all three political stripes—the Liberals, the NDP and now the Conservatives—have embraced that and have actually expanded it.

The most recent one—and my colleague Mr Colle was deeply involved in this, and I personally think the one in the Legislature primarily responsible for making it happen—was the preservation of the Oak Ridges moraine.

All four of those examples are treasures for the province of Ontario, for the people of Ontario, who have said, through their elected officials, "We need action taken to preserve it."

1140

Now we've got another example. My colleague from St Catharines, Mr Bradley—his thrust, I might add, for the 15 years I've known him here in the Legislature, has been the environment, protecting our environment for the future. For me, and I think for most people in Ontario, if you look at that Niagara area it is a jewel. There are few, if any, people in the area of southwestern Ontario, maybe all of Ontario, who have not visited that area at least once. For most of us it's two or three times a year that we travel there, whether it be for May 24, when the blossoms are all out, or whether it be a trip through the wineries. It is a jewel. There are at least two articles here from presidents of wineries expressing their very significant concern that, day by day, there is an encroachment on that jewel.

This, in my mind, is not unlike decisions the Legislature made—I just quoted four of them: Algonquin park, the Niagara Escarpment, the Rouge park, and, just within the last few months, the Oak Ridges moraine. This has the same significance. An issue like this creeps up on you. Day by day it's an encroachment, unless you have a vision that says that, "10, 15, 20 years from now, we do not want to see this continued incursion into the farmland in that area."

My colleague Mr Bradley also acknowledges that there are people with a huge vested interest in not proceeding with this. That's understandable. Many of them, unless there's a proper plan for dealing with them, would lose financially. I do think we need to make sure that we treat those people fairly. But we have to have the vision here in the Legislature to look ahead and say, "We need to take a step now."

I commend my colleague Mr Bradley for his foresight in doing this, and I would hope that in spite of what I

gather will be the official government position, many members of the Conservative back bench will support this resolution.

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Labour): It is indeed a pleasure to speak to this particular issue, because it's an important issue that has been near and dear to my heart. I want to commend the member for St Catharines for bringing forth the resolution, and also thank him for recognizing that it is something that has been important to me.

We have an opportunity here. Realistically, it is rare in the political world that all the stars start to line up and it becomes a win-win for everybody. The Minister of Consumer and Business Services will speak later on, and he may point out that our wine industry is burgeoning. We now have access to the European market, which means there is more and more interest in Ontario wines. Ontario wines for the most part are grown in the Niagara Escarpment area, down in the Niagara tender fruit lands. There's a reason for it. That area is a microclimate. It is a protected area, from the lake—it's buffered by the lake—and it's protected by the escarpment. The member from St Catharines talked about the Napa Valley. The Napa Valley is a phenomenal experience. This is again a microclimate, but we have an even better microclimate here in Ontario for the growing of wines. People don't realize this, but in the Napa Valley the vintners, the people who are actually growing the grapes, will hire helicopters to come in on hot days to hover over the vineyards to stir up the air so it doesn't cause a drying-out factor on the grapes. It gives them a much better hybrid grape. They go to that extreme to improve the quality. In Ontario we have a prevailing wind that blows over the Niagara Escarpment which automatically stirs it up. We have this incredible microclimate, and we must recognize that to continue to expand our wine market we have to preserve the tender fruit lands.

We have to recognize that development naturally occurs, and it has been occurring. If you look at Hamilton, it is slowly sprawling outwards. We see it happening. I'm from the Stoney Creek riding. We have Stoney Creek and Grimsby in my riding, and you can see the development slowly moving out. What happens historically with development is that the people who move into the community have come from an urban community. They've moved to Grimsby, a wonderful town. It's a quaint town. It's like Mayberry. I mean, everybody knows everybody. It's a wonderful community. So people move from the urban centre to this community and it's a developed area, and naturally when the next development begins the people who are living there say, "I moved here, so why not have more development?" But what I have experienced in my riding is a resurgence of the recognition that they want to preserve what's there. I've had 28 round tables since I've been elected. I've had a number of them on agricultural issues. They want to preserve the tender fruit lands.

The member for St Catharines is absolutely correct. We say, "The municipalities make these decisions."

You'll find this fascinating. I was visited—it was divine intervention, if you will—by a constituent just last week. He came in to speak to me about an issue. He didn't know this topic was coming up from the member for St Catharines. He brought in to me that there is a situation in Grimsby right now where a planning consultant has come in and done a study, and—this boggles my mind—they're saying that the soil below the escarpment in the tender fruit land area is of a lower grade than the soil above the escarpment. A planning consultant has come in and is saying, "You can farm above the hill—we'll put peaches up on the hill—but below the escarpment, where the tender fruit lands are, it's low-grade agricultural land, so we have to develop it." It's the opposite. The low-grade land is on top of the escarpment. Ask the farmers up there. They can't get grapes to grow. You can't grow peaches up there. For anyone to suggest that they can is absurd.

We have to preserve the tender fruit lands below, and that's why, when I was Minister of Transportation, I was so keen on developing the mid-peninsula corridor. I saw it as an opportunity—again, stars lining up. We can push development above the hill and begin to preserve what is really a remarkable piece of property.

So not only do I support the resolution, but I also believe we need either a select committee or a task force where we can do like we did on the Oak Ridges moraine: bring the parties together to start dealing with this matter and proceed in a more prudent way to preserve the Niagara tender fruit lands.

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): I commend the Minister of Transportation for his position on supporting the member for St Catharines on this issue. The member for St Catharines should be commended, because he always is a pioneer. In this instance he has shown that we have to think ahead and we can't think back.

Hopefully we can get other ministers, as did Mr Clark, to jump onside. This is a no-brainer. It has to be done. It's shocking. In Ontario, there were 7,792 fewer farms in 2001 compared to 1996, about 8,000 fewer farms in Ontario since this government came to power, an 11.5% decline. The Niagara fruit belt, one of the world's premier tender fruit areas, is basically being victimized by this government's smart sprawl policies, which are just paving the place, which are just putting cookie-cutter homes everywhere, and we are losing these incredibly valuable jewels.

Don Ziraldo is the pioneer, along with Mr Bradley, in protecting this gorgeous area. This article says, "In the more than 30 years since this ordinance was passed"—comparing to the one in Napa Valley—"not an acre of prime grape land has been removed from the preserve, and thousands of acres have been added." This is in California, Napa Valley. Then Mr Ziraldo says that by contrast, here in Niagara it "has become critical. We need a moratorium declared on development on all rural lands on and below the Niagara Escarpment, and it has to be

done by the province—like yesterday.” The province has to be dragged kicking and screaming.

Look at what the Ontario Municipal Board has been doing and what the province has allowed to be done all through this tender fruit belt: application after application—the famous one in Fonthill—allowing, again, cookie-cutter homes over prime fruit land, and the government twiddles its thumbs. Shame on them.

1150

We talk about the wine industry, how important it is. Just the other day we had an amazing feat by a Torontonian who is a vintner, in the wine industry. These people should be praised and honoured; instead, they won't mention them in this House. But I will mention their names: Charlene and Joseph DeMaria. They won five awards internationally. Joseph DeMaria's Vineland-based Royal DeMaria winery won for its icewines at a competition in Bordeaux, France.

“It is the first time in the history of the award ... that any winery has won five gold medals.” This guy, who is a hairdresser in Bloor West Village, started growing grapes for icewine in Vineland and won five gold medals. It's like winning the World Cup or the Stanley Cup. This government won't support or praise guys like DeMaria, won't mention his name in the House, and he has put us on the map.

“Linda Watts, the export and special projects manager at the Wine Council of Ontario, says Royal DeMaria's wines winning five gold medals is a coup for the winery and the country.

“Winning one of these medals is a marketing tool for wineries, particularly in the domestic market....

“To have one winery win five golds is quite a significant achievement.”

“There were 547 wines ... entered from 20 countries,” and Mr DeMaria, who has to be a hairdresser to make a living on the other end, won five gold medals. These are the pioneers, the heroes who will create jobs, put us on the world map and bring in export dollars.

What this government is doing is allowing homes—Home Depot and Canadian Tire—to pave all this precious fruit land. Support Mr Bradley's far-reaching, far-sighted initiative and you will preserve this gold mine, literally, for generations. We have some of the best wines in the world and some of the best fruit in the world. As the minister's assistant has said, they don't want to do anything to protect it. That's shameful. How stupid can you be when you've got this resource under your nose in the Niagara region? Listen to Mr Bradley and do the right thing for Niagara region.

Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Consumer and Business Services): I'm pleased to rise to speak to the resolution before the House today and commend my colleague from St Catharines for bringing this important motion here for debate, one that I feel quite strongly about as the MPP who has the pleasure of representing the Lincoln area, one of the most beautiful areas in the peninsula, and in the province, I would argue.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Hudak: Fort Erie, Port Colborne and Wainfleet are not on the escarpment but are beautiful areas in themselves, and I'm quite proud to represent Erie-Lincoln as a whole.

I appreciate the member's comments and those of my colleague from Welland-Thorold and my colleague from the Stoney Creek riding as well. The member from Eglinton—I think there was a little bit of silliness in terms of accuracy, but I appreciate the tone of the member from St Catharines, I'll put it that way, because the issue is complex. I think the government has done a lot to support this and we can always do more.

I've had the pleasure as well of serving as Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, and now as Minister of Consumer and Business Services, and being able to make an impact, as well being a local MPP, in keeping Niagara green. For a local resident, there's nothing quite like sitting out in the vineyard on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon or at our annual summer picnic at Moyers' cherry orchards in Vineland or hiking along the Bruce Trail.

Part of this agricultural land, for sure an important part of this debate—Marcy's Woods, a topic also very near and dear to my heart, keeping that in public hands. I really want to thank Minister Snobelen and Minister Ouellette for their support. The province put forward \$900,000 with the Nature Conservancy of Canada to help purchase that. There was some help from the town of Fort Erie, and I would like to see some help from other areas because they're not making any more of it. This is the last vestige of Carolinian forest and some of the best tender fruit land in Ontario. That's why I'm speaking in support of this resolution today, to keep Niagara green and to support the notion of an agricultural preserve in the peninsula.

The reference to Napa Valley is a good reference. As the member said, you don't want to duplicate everything. It's a unique area. But Napa serves as a good example because of the tourism element as well, being relatively close to San Francisco and enjoying the benefits of that from a tourism standpoint, which then also fuels the agricultural economy. Certainly with the populations of Toronto and the greater Buffalo area, within an even shorter drive than to Napa from San Francisco, that poses outstanding opportunities if we keep it as the gem it is, as a green area. But at the same time, with those populations expanding—as my colleague from Stoney Creek says, we've seen Hamilton heading east into Stoney Creek, into Grimsby—that also puts pressures on developing that land and there's a risk of losing some of this tender fruit land that is not being made any more.

First and foremost, it is most important I think to make sure it's economical for the farmers to continue to farm, to make sure they have an incentive to keep that property in production. So ideally the value of the land in fruit production would exceed the value of the land in development. The work we're doing on the wine and culinary tourism strategy—I was proud as the Minister of Tourism to bring that forward as part of our wine strategy. The

goal here to bring Americans, Germans, Japanese and folks from across Ontario into Niagara to enjoy the vineyards, cherry orchards and such and, again, to give that economic incentive to keep it in production.

Now, as Minister of Consumer and Business Services, there is a great opportunity to build on that, to sell more of that wine and associated product to Ontarians, increasing sales to the LCBO as well as abroad into European markets, breaking down those borders.

Of course, it's not just the grape and wine industry. We've made efforts as well on the tender fruit side—peaches, sour cherries and such—and do what we can to make it economical for the farmers to keep in production. So while Napa serves as a good example, I think, on the tourism side, we have to be careful, as my colleagues have said, to avoid a cookie-cutter approach—to look at Napa, to look at Okanagan and other examples, but to find a solution unique to Niagara.

Yes, I do believe the province can play a very important role in preserving this, because Niagara is simply not for Niagarans but for the province as a whole to enjoy. In that debate, in that discussion, I think it's important for us to make sure that the serious concerns of farmers are taken into consideration. When I had my discussions in the past with Dave Elliott from the Niagara South Federation of Agriculture; Len Troup from the tender fruit growers; Wayne Lockey from the grape growers—I just had a good conversation with him last night; and Linda Franklin from the Wine Council, among others—concerns to make sure that we don't do an outright ban on agricultural land, that we achieve that proper balance between incentives to keep it green, to make sure we preserve the most important types of land, but at the same time not to bind farmers' hands from doing what they can do to make sure their farms are profitable. So I'm very pleased to speak to the resolution and congratulate the member from St Catharines for bringing this forward.

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): I appreciate the opportunity to support and speak in favour of the member from St Catharines, who provides us with a guideline not just for his riding and the people around him but a concept that should be embraced—and I think it's been alluded to by the member opposite and some members here—that this is an opportunity for us to go beyond that and look at preservation of lands as we use them in a symbiotic relationship between us and the land. I think we should also point out what this should not be about. This shouldn't be about urban versus rural, this shouldn't be about developers versus environmentalists, this shouldn't be about profit versus a way of life—it should be a combination of all of those that basically says we should be smart and measured to grab an understanding of the symbiotic relationship that we do have between the land and the people.

This is a start, this is a step in the right direction that makes us all become quite aware of what our relationship is with the land and our environment, because the two go together. It should be about understanding for the future,

because we are not in, as I think we should be—we should be talking about, and could be and must be talking about, the competition of foreign interests. We are probably looking at an opportunity to prevent self-destruction because the competition is going to come in if we don't do something about this particular situation. Right now, China pretty well owns the market in apples, in pears, in all of the other fruits and vegetables that are starting to be taken over by other people who have that relationship already understood.

I also want to make a comment about brownfields. It was mentioned once before. Councillor Marguerite Ceschi-Smith in my riding is spearheading—she's the chair of the brownfields committee in our city, but further to that she's on FCM, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. She's the chair of a brownfields committee and is talking about national strategies of brownfields. So inside of that comes the use of greenhouses that the member referred to earlier. There's an opportunity for us to start these businesses and put them on brownfields within municipalities, inside, in terms of development that stops the sprawl we're talking about and also preserves the growing lands we're talking about in terms of looking forward.

1200

The member opposite speaking on behalf of the government disappointed me somewhat in terms of his reference to the municipalities, that they can work it out. Quite frankly, the government extracted themselves from water for the longest time as to our environment, and we got Walkerton, because we had a mishmash of opportunity. The very same member sponsored a bill and did some public hearings on Bill 81, province-wide concepts of how we do nutrient management. Why didn't you leave it to the municipalities? This is the same thing. It's the use of our lands. There should be standards across the province that we develop.

It's quite odd that in one breath he talks about municipalities having to take care of business and yet he's the one who introduces and brings us Bill 81, which gives us province-wide standards in the use of nutrient management. That's got something to do with the land. It's unbelievable the government would take that position. We have some very smart people on the other side who understand that relationship, and they're starting to talk to us about understanding that nutrient management should be province-wide. The member opposite, who introduces the very same bill, turns around and says, "No, now we want to push it back to the municipalities."

We've got Bill 81 and we've got Walkerton, where we're still cleaning up and we're taking it back to the province. We come up with a great resolution that says the province should involve itself in a non-partisan way in taking a good, hard look at how we're going to take care of our lands in the future, and the member opposite tells us, "No, we don't want to get our fingers into this pie." Well, it's time to, because you have to look forward.

Again I bring to the House the concept of seven generations. They were so smart when they told us about that. What we do today has to be looking forward seven generations to ensure that seven generations from now, things will be right. We have a stepping stone and the member from St Catharines is bang on when he says we have to start taking a look at this holistically.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk to this bill. I ask the member from Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant to get on the bus, because it's the right way to go.

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): I'm very pleased to conclude the debate on this resolution. I think it's a worthy resolution. Coming from the riding of Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, we have the Holland Marsh, which is something that is very important to the province in terms of agricultural land. The principle the member from St Catharines is putting forward would apply equally to the Holland Marsh and what it means to this province. I would say that the government's provincial policy statement clearly states the importance of protecting prime agricultural land.

The Acting Speaker: The member for St Catharines has two minutes to sum up.

Mr Bradley: I want to thank all the members who have contributed to this very non-partisan debate that we've had in the Legislature today. In my view, it would be sheer madness to convert this prime agricultural land we've all talked about for development purposes when there is other land that is available around the province for those purposes.

I want to thank Dr Bob Hoover of the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society, along with Gracia Janes, who have provided information over the years and who have engendered a lot of discussion about this topic. I want to thank David Pond from the legislative library, who produced some very good information that I'd be happy to share with any member of the House about programs south of the border and in other jurisdictions that are designed to help both the farmer and society as a whole by keeping the farmer on the farm and making it a viable operation and protecting agricultural land.

The article by Doug Draper, which has been made reference to here today, talks specifically about grapes. We all know in this House how successful our wine industry is, because we have some outstanding growers who produce the grapes and excellent vintners who produce the wine. We also have other products such as peaches, pears, cherries, apricots and apples—a variety of fruit that is produced in the Niagara Peninsula. It's of great benefit. This is a tourist gem for those of us in Ontario, something we will want to preserve.

I agree with the consensus out there that some kind of task force or select committee should look at the specifics of trying to create such a preserve, because each area is unique and different and we need that kind of input to see what's best for Niagara in preserving Niagara's land. We have an opportunity in this House to protect a genuine asset for future generations, and I certainly hope this

Legislature will agree with the resolution this morning and do so.

VISITORS

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to introduce to the House my father, Michael Martin from Sault Ste Marie, and his sister and my aunt, Ellen Scougal from Scarborough, Mary Malone from Newcastle, Sister Moyra Martin from Ireland and Anne Doyle from Victoria.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Welcome to the Legislature.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): We will now deal with ballot item number 53.

Mr Duncan has moved private member's notice of motion number 7. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

TENDER FRUIT LANDS

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Now we will deal with ballot item number 54.

Mr Bradley has moved private member's notice of motion number 8. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. The motion is carried.

It being after 12 of the clock and all business related to private members' public business having been taken care of, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock.

The House recessed from 1208 to 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): It is regrettable that thousands of children in the city of Toronto are casualties of the labour dispute between service workers and the city of Toronto.

All permits for parks, tennis courts, outdoor sports fields and civic squares are cancelled, a majority of which provided activities for children. All city-operated swimming pools and arenas are closed, including pools at the board of education facilities. All recreational programming, such as camps, drop-ins, clubs, swimming lessons and walking tours are cancelled. Community centres, fitness centres and community schools are closed and their programming cancelled.

This means children in the city will not be able to go to their local library, take swimming lessons, visit their local museum, play with their local sports team, or keep cool in the wading pool or splash pad.

The city of Toronto finds itself in a most untenable position because this government has downloaded so many services to the municipal tax base. We hope that the city and the union can come to an agreement quickly so that children in the city of Toronto will not be deprived of the important services that they need and deserve for a healthy, happy summer.

JUST THE TICKET

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): I want to speak today about York region's summer theatre companies, including the Red Barn Theatre in Jackson's Point. They have together formed an alliance with the Stratford and Shaw festivals and Ontario's tourism ministry to offer a unique entertainment package called Just the Ticket.

This initiative is a partnership between a group of theatres and Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership. The promotion also involves Newmarket's Resurgence Theatre, Aurora's Howard Johnson Hotel, the Eaton Hall Inn and Conference Centre in King, Pheasant Run golf course in East Gwillimbury, and Wildflower Farm in King.

In this all-inclusive package, people are offered theatre tickets, overnight accommodations and tickets to entertainment venues at a single price. The Red Barn package covers admission to any of this summer's five productions, an overnight stay including breakfast at a bed and breakfast or hotel, and admission to area venues including Georgina Pioneer Village and Sibbald Point Provincial Park.

This is a unique promotion that will attract tourists to York region. All you have to do is look through a brochure and pick any Just the Ticket theatre package. For tickets, call the box office at 905-722-5157.

MEDICAL IMAGING TECHNOLOGIES

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): I find it somewhat galling that while this government talks about opening up privately run MRI facilities in the province they're not yet prepared to maximize the use of the publicly run facilities in our hospitals.

In Thunder Bay, our MRI and CT scans are simply not being used to their full capacity. As the only diagnostic tools in the Thunder Bay district, the demand is great yet it still seems startling that the waiting time to get an MRI has stretched to seven months while people have to wait three months to get a CT scan.

This is absolutely unacceptable, particularly as these delays add enormous stress to people waiting for diagnosis. But what is more upsetting is that these long delays are absolutely unnecessary and could be reduced, if not eliminated, with increased financial support to the hospital.

Thunder Bay Regional Hospital currently has five radiologists on staff, with a sixth scheduled to arrive in August. This full complement means that TBRH is ready, willing and able to expand its hours of operation immediately if the province simply comes forward with an immediate increase in operational funding directed at the diagnostic wing.

Premier Eves and Minister Clement have said repeatedly and publicly that their goal is to increase accessibility to these vital diagnostic tools. If that is truly the case, I would hope that Minister Clement will listen to my plea today for increased funding to properly utilize the MRI and CT scans at Thunder Bay Regional Hospital. I would hope that this government's drive to privatize our cherished public health care system will not blind him to the fact that our publicly run MRIs and CT scans can deliver quicker and less costly service to people who are increasingly and justifiably frustrated by the waiting times that presently exist.

CANADA DAY CELEBRATIONS

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): This coming weekend will mark the 135th anniversary of Canadian nationhood, and I'm pleased to report to this House that the residents of Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale are going to celebrate it properly in Chinguacousy Park.

The city of Brampton is hosting a proper party on Monday from 10 in the morning until a fireworks display caps the festivities at 10 at night. I'm sure the fireworks display will be up to Brampton's usual spectacular standards.

As well, Chinguacousy Park will have live music, dance and martial arts demonstrations. The beer tent is serving Brampton's own Cool brand beer, perfect for days like July 1, which is forecast to be warm and dry.

A petting zoo, amusement park, climbing wall and magicians will also help entertain kids of all ages. There will also be a giant cake, which is fitting for Canada's 135th birthday party. The cake will be cut at 5 pm, but there's no word at this time as to who will blow out the 135 candles.

Mr Rob Sampson (Mississauga Centre): Someone with a lot of hot air.

Mr Gill: Yes.

On behalf of the people of Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale, I want to congratulate the city for putting together this event and wish all Canadians everywhere a very happy Dominion Day.

HIGHWAY 69

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): I take this opportunity to remind the people who will be driving on Highway 69 south this weekend to please drive carefully, to follow all the safe driving rules, because that is a very dangerous stretch of highway.

A couple of weeks ago I told the government that I would be launching a petition campaign with regard to the four-laning of Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound. These are the results of that three-week petition. There they are—everybody wanting to ensure that Highway 69 is four-laned from Sudbury.

What's even more shocking is that you've got the member from Durham going like this, saying it's not important.

Let me quote some of the statistics from the Ministry of Transportation and the Ontario Provincial Police when they say that between 1996 and 2000, 32 people have died on Highway 69 between Sudbury and Parry Sound. In that same time period, only five people have died from Parry Sound to Barrie on the 400 series. That's five too many, mind you. At the same point in time, there have been 1,622 accidents on Highway 69 south between Sudbury and Parry Sound. Highway 400 between Parry Sound and Barrie saw 607 accidents.

Clearly, multi-lane highways save lives. Clearly, multi-lane highways cause fewer accidents. I challenge this government to commit real money to do real four-laning between Sudbury and Parry Sound, and I challenge them to do it immediately.

JESSIE BANNERMAN

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre): On behalf of my colleague the member for Brampton West-Mississauga, it's my honour to speak today about Jessie Bannerman, who announced her retirement from a very busy political and social life, effective the end of this month. Jessie was honoured by the community last night in Brampton by her many friends and her family.

Jessie came to Canada from England through pier 21 in Halifax over 50 years ago, and has never looked back. She has been a resident of Brampton since the early 1960s, and immediately immersed herself in many volunteer groups and community activities, among them the Flower Festival and the Pine and Rose Festival. She is a past president of the Brampton Curling Club and has served on the Brampton Millennium Committee. She is a long-time member of the Zonta Club and, effective tomorrow, will be the zone 4 service chair, encompassing southern Ontario, western New York and northern Pennsylvania. Jessie is also active in the Salvation Army and the Canadian Cancer Society and is currently a member of the Brampton Community Foundation.

1340

Jessie is a very caring individual, known for her hard work and ability to multitask her volunteer work and office career, and for her wealth of knowledge of Brampton and of government. It's these traits that made her the outstanding asset to the constituency offices of the Honourable John McDerimid, MP from 1980 to 1993, and currently of my good friend and colleague the Honourable Tony Clement.

Please join me in congratulating Jessie on an auspicious career and her well-deserved retirement with her

husband, Bill. I'm sure they'll enjoy their summers on the golf course, winters in the curling club and definitely—God bless you, Jessie—time with their children and grandchildren.

GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): As we wrap up the 20-some-day session, I want to reflect a bit. The government introduced four new bills this session. The first one was the Hydro One blank-cheque bill, which of course they had to time-allocate. That's the bill that leaves the government open to do whatever it wants with Hydro One this summer. They of course wouldn't announce their decision here in the House. One can't be too surprised by that. They've changed their position five times since the Legislature resumed.

They brought forward the Hydro One directors act; I'm sure they planned and anticipated that. That's the one where they had to fire all the directors of Hydro because of the mismanagement and because of these outrageous salaries. Yet they want to proceed with the privatization, or at least the partial sell-off, of Hydro One. We're still not sure what they're going to do, because they certainly don't want to talk about it in this House. They want to wait till the summer, when the Legislature is done.

There's the budget bill, which was time-allocated last night—a time-allocated budget bill. That's the bill, you'll recall, that wipes out the Taxpayer Protection Act they were all so proud of just some short years ago.

What an interesting session. What a change. It's a change that speaks to trust. It speaks to the trust of people in their government, what governments will say and not say, what they say one day and do the next. This government does not deserve the trust of the people. The people ought to have an opportunity for an election sooner rather than later.

ADOPTION DISCLOSURE

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): I'm appealing to the Premier of Ontario and the leader of the official opposition today to allow Bill 77, the adoption disclosure reform bill, to be called for a vote. We all know that a vast majority of members on all sides in this Legislature want this bill to pass. This bill, or a similar bill, has been before this House for many years. We've come very close to having it pass. But time after time after time a few members in this Legislature—and we know it is a very few members—hold the bill up. Is this democracy? No, it isn't.

You're breaking my heart again today. You're breaking the hearts of thousands of people who have been working on this issue since the 1970s to bring justice and fairness to the thousands of adoptees out there who cannot make contact with each other and who cannot find out about their health and birth information. It is against human rights—it violates human rights. Jurisdictions across the world have changed the law.

I have spoken with many of you on many occasions, and you know I have fixed my bill to deal with your concerns about those few who still want privacy. There is a contact veto in the bill which gives people more privacy than they have now under the existing act.

I appeal to you today to let this bill go forward for a vote—no more delays.

MISSISSAUGA FIREFIGHTERS OF THE YEAR

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): Mississauga recently honoured its 2002 Firefighters of the Year in an awards ceremony held at city hall.

Captain Allan Thompson and Acting Captain John Hill, along with Firefighters Larry Jackson, Gerald Lacasse, David Middleton, Edward Nelson, Peter Perrone and John Watts, received this prestigious award for their quick-thinking action during a house fire in my constituency on September 9 of last year.

When the crew arrived at the burning house on Exbury Crescent, they were faced with a basement fire with zero visibility as a result of heavy smoke. To make matters worse, the female resident of the home could not be found.

Firefighters Watts and Middleton went searching for the missing resident under dangerous conditions, having to pass through extreme heat and smoke. They located the unconscious woman in a small washroom in the basement and, with the help of the other firefighters, passed through the fire area and carried her to safety.

As Mississauga Fire Chief Garry Morden said of his crew, "If this wasn't done properly and professionally, it would have been a failed rescue. Their quick, professional response ... resulted in the saving of a life."

On behalf of all residents in the city of Mississauga, I'm privileged to congratulate and thank these outstanding firefighters. We are fortunate and grateful to have you safeguarding our community. You are a tribute to your profession, and we are very proud of you.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On a point of order, Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to give second and third reading to Bill 77, Ms Churley's adoption bill.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): It's already had second reading.

Mr Duncan: I seek unanimous consent to give third reading to Ms Churley's adoption bill, Bill 77.

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

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister of Tourism and Recreation): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: This is the last day for our pages. Although it is the custom of the Speaker to acknowledge their contribution to this House and how much all members of the House have

enjoyed them, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to thank them on behalf of all members.

In particular, as the father of Lauren Jackson from Burlington, who was a page here for the last three weeks, I must tell the members opposite that Lauren's route was through the Liberal caucus. She started every morning with Mr Cleary and ended up at the end of the day with, I think, Mr Bartolucci. In between, she met some very wonderful people. The reports are that all the staff in your offices are just wonderful. So thank you for treating my daughter and all the other pages so well.

I'm joined in the House today by my wife, Elaine, and my youngest daughter, Michelle. We had lunch with our daughter, and we've had a great day.

If I might just echo the sentiments that were reported in the media by the leader of the official opposition, I fully support his comments that we would all be better MPPs if we could find more time with our families. I think it anchors us and makes us better MPPs.

So thank you to all members of the House. Everyone have a great summer.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): While we're on that, I'm sure all members would like to join me in thanking our wonderful group of pages. We wish them well in their endeavours, and we thank them for the fine work they've done over this past short while.

With the indulgence of the minister, Lauren's grandmother also makes the best egg salad sandwiches during election campaigns. I can assure you of that.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On the same point of order, Speaker: I want to add our voice to the congratulatory praise given these pages. They are a particularly impressive, skilled, bright, articulate group of young people. They bring skills to this Legislature that indeed surpass many of the skills demonstrated by so many elected members.

We were pleased to have been able to work with these pages. We're going to miss them far more than they will miss us.

Special congratulations to Lindsey O'Brien. I want her family to know that she has been an outstanding young page here at the Legislature. Her family, school, friends and community should be very proud of her, as should the families, classmates and communities of each and every one of these pages.

I expect, over the course of the next 20 years as we're reading papers and covering Queen's Park, we'll see some of these pages' names pop up in the Queen's Park coverage of this chamber as representatives in their own right of their own constituencies in their own communities. May they be as outgoing, courageous, rebellious, independent and free-thinking as they've been during their terms here as pages.

1350

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

COLLISION REPAIR STANDARDS ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LES NORMES DE RÉPARATION EN CAS DE COLLISION

Mr Klees moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 165, An Act to further highway safety and establish consumer protection through the regulation of the collision repair industry, and to make a complementary amendment to the Insurance Act / Projet de loi 165, Loi visant à améliorer la sécurité sur les voies publiques et à protéger les consommateurs en réglementant le secteur de la réparation en cas de collision et à apporter une modification complémentaire à la Loi sur les assurances.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): It gives me great pleasure to introduce the Collision Repair Standards Act, 2002, for consideration by this Legislature. I do so today in honour of a pioneer of the collision repair industry, Mr Heinz Fuhrman, whose wife, Kris, is with us today in the members' gallery. She's joined by a number of Heinz's colleagues from the repair industry.

Mrs Fuhrman is here today because she was very much aware of her husband's vision for his industry: a fair and ethical business environment in which consumers could rely on quality workmanship, and a fair marketplace in which collision repair shops could carry on their business on a level playing field and expect return on investment.

This bill, the Collision Repair Standards Act, 2002, proposes to establish the regulatory framework through which those goals can be achieved. The bill is about improving highway safety by making sure that vehicles that have been damaged in collisions are properly repaired. It is about protecting the right of consumers to choose who works on their cars, and it is about protecting them from dishonest practices. This bill will provide for the implementation of a regulatory framework for the collision repair industry which will provide for the certification of collision repair shops based on province-wide industry standards and will provide for the de-certification of those collision repair shops that fail to meet those standards.

It is about ensuring safety, it is about consumer protection and it is about fair and ethical business practices.

INSURANCE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE), 2002 LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE LES ASSURANCES (ASSURANCE-AUTOMOBILE)

Mr Sampson moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 166, An Act to further stabilize automobile insurance rates / Projet de loi 166, Loi visant à stabiliser davantage les taux d'assurance-automobile.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Rob Sampson (Mississauga Centre): This bill contains a number of amendments to the Insurance Act, the insurance statutes of Ontario. The intent was to draw from a number of consultations that have occurred since Bill 56 was introduced and passed in 1996, because that's what we said we would do in 1996.

It also, I hope, will encourage some discussion and comment around some specifics about legislative and regulatory reform of auto insurance, so that we can do our job to help make sure rates in this province are affordable and provide consumers the protection they deserve in Ontario.

ANAPHYLACTIC STUDENTS PROTECTION ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LA PROTECTION DES ÉLÈVES ANAPHYLACTIQUES

Mr Levac moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 167, An Act to protect anaphylactic students / Projet de loi 167, Loi visant à protéger les élèves anaphylactiques.

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): In 23 years of education, 12 as a principal, I had to deal with five cases of students who went into anaphylactic shock. This shock is death-defying. Quite frankly, you have five minutes to respond in a life-and-death situation. We need to have a standard in our province that deals with this. The Education Act only covers principals to cover the health and safety of students. There's no specific comment on anaphylactic shock in our school system across the province. I want to thank Mrs Dwyer, whose two sons both have allergies. One has bee-sting allergies and one has peanut butter allergies and both of them have gone into shock. We need to do this.

Mr Bill Chopp, the superintendent of education in Brant-Haldimand-Norfolk Catholic District School Board, was very helpful in drafting this legislation. Policies do exist, but they're not standardized and there

are no minimum standards. I would suggest that the bill require that every school principal establish a school anaphylactic plan. The plan would, among other things, develop and maintain strategies to reduce the risk that exposure could result in anaphylactic shock in a school; communicate information about life-threatening allergies; arrange for training; develop emergency procedure plans for each anaphylactic student; and maintain current information on file.

With consent, school staff could administer or supervise the administration of medication required to be taken during the school day to save a life. In the event of an emergency involving an anaphylactic student, school staff would be permitted to administer their medication without consent to save a life. No action for damages resulting from the administering of medication would be permitted unless the damages were a result of gross negligence.

We want to give principals permission to ban peanut and any other allergy materials in schools.

WELLAND HYDRO
ELECTIONS ACT, 2002
LOI DE 2002
SUR LES ÉLECTIONS
AU SEIN DE WELLAND HYDRO

Mr Kormos moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 168, An Act to provide for the election of members of the board of Welland Hydro / Projet de loi 168, Loi prévoyant l'élection des membres du conseil de Welland Hydro.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): This government forced the city of Welland, as it did so many other communities, to dissolve its hydroelectric commission, which it operated for decades as one of the most efficient hydroelectric commissions in the province, with an elected board of four members elected at large in the municipality, along with the mayor. In the course of forcing municipalities to incorporate their hydroelectric commissions, it also denied municipalities and members of those municipalities the right to directly elect representation on those boards. This bill provides that the members of the board of directors of Welland Hydro are the mayor of the city of Welland and four elected directors.

MPPs PENSION PLAN
STUDY ACT, 2002
LOI DE 2002 SUR L'ÉTUDE
DU RÉGIME DE RETRAITE
DES DÉPUTÉS

Mrs Marland, on behalf of Mr Murdoch, moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 169, An Act to provide for studying the establishment of a pension plan for members of the Legislative Assembly / Projet de loi 169, Loi prévoyant l'étude de l'institution d'un régime de retraite pour les députés de l'Assemblée législative.

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

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

The member for a short statement?

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): I think the title of the bill is explanatory, according to my colleague, the member on whose behalf I'm tabling it.

1400

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT
(SCHOOL BUSES), 2002
LOI DE 2002
MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE
(AUTOBUS SCOLAIRES)

Mr Parsons moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 170, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to require that school buses be equipped with flashing orange caution lights / Projet de loi 170, Loi modifiant le Code de la route pour exiger que les autobus scolaires soient équipés de feux d'avertissement orange clignotants.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): In rural Ontario it is very difficult for car drivers to guess whether the bus coming either ahead of them or behind them is about to stop, particularly if they are approaching a bus where they're doing 80 kilometres an hour, or perhaps slightly over, on occasion. This bill will provide for orange lights to come on to advise the motorist that the bus is about to stop. Once the bus is stopped, of course, the red lights would come on. I believe this bill will considerably reduce the incidence of drivers accidentally going past a stopped school bus. It will give them warning and thus will provide greater safety for our students.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT
(TURN SAFETY), 2002

LOI DE 2002
MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE
(SÉCURITÉ DANS LES VIRAGES)

Mr Kormos moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 171, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act respecting turn safety / Projet de loi 171, Loi modifiant le Code de la route à l'égard de la sécurité dans les virages.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): The bill increases the responsibility on the driver or operator of the vehicle to ensure that he or she does not interfere with pedestrians, motorcycles, bicycles, motor-assisted bicycles or wheelchairs when making a turn. This bill was prompted by the Bikers' Rights Organization of Ontario, and I am pleased to present it for first reading on behalf of all motorcyclists, bicyclists, persons in wheelchairs and pedestrians, as well as persons riding motor-assisted bicycles and bicycles.

FLAGS AT HALF-MAST ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002

SUR LES DRAPEAUX EN BERNE

Mr Chudleigh moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 172, An Act to require that flags be flown at half-mast at provincial government buildings to honour Ontario police officers, correctional services officers, firefighters and ambulance workers who lose their lives in the line of duty / *Projet de loi 172, Loi exigeant la mise en berne des drapeaux qu'arborent les édifices du gouvernement provincial en l'honneur des agents de police, des agents de services correctionnels, des pompiers et des préposés aux services d'ambulance de l'Ontario qui perdent la vie dans l'exercice de leurs fonctions.*

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton): I was surprised when I learned that it is not now the requirement of government buildings to fly their flags at half mast when these types of men and women give the ultimate sacrifice for us. People who protect us from chaos in our society, people who protect our homes, people who protect us in our time of medical need and people who guard those people who are incarcerated in provincial institutions deserve this kind of respect when they do give the ultimate sacrifice.

ST. JAMES' CATHEDRAL SIGHTLINES PROTECTION ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002

SUR LA PROTECTION DE LA VUE
DE LA CATHÉDRALE ST. JAMES

Mr Smitherman moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 173, An Act to preserve and protect the sightlines of St. James' Cathedral / *Projet de loi 173, Loi visant à préserver et protéger la vue de la cathédrale St. James.*

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): The intention of this bill is to ensure that St James'

Cathedral, which is one of the more significant landmarks in the city of Toronto, continues to enjoy what it now has, which is the ability for people to see it. This would ensure that buildings built in the St James' Cathedral precinct are not built to such a scale that they would dwarf it.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): I move for unanimous consent for third reading and a vote on Bill 77.

The Speaker: We already asked for it. We can't ask again.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I can recall some notorious precedents wherein there was—

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Name one.

Mr Kormos: Well, April 26, 2001, where there were repeated requests on the same matter for unanimous consent—time after time denials and then finally it was granted.

The Speaker: The reason that is done is if there is some occasion when it's unclear. This was very clear, and there were definitely some noes. We can't keep asking the same question. There were definitely some noes.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to midnight on Thursday, June 27, 2002, for the purpose of considering government business.

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

All in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1409 to 1414.

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

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic
Arnott, Ted
Baird, John R.
Barrett, Toby
Bartolucci, Rick
Beaubien, Marcel
Bountrogianni, Marie
Boyer, Claudette
Bradley, James J.
Bryant, Michael
Caplan, David
Christopherson, David
Chudleigh, Ted
Clark, Brad

Elliott, Brenda
Eves, Ernie
Galt, Doug
Gilchrist, Steve
Gill, Raminder
Gravelle, Michael
Guzzo, Garry J.
Hardeman, Ernie
Hastings, John
Hodgson, Chris
Hudak, Tim
Jackson, Cameron
Kennedy, Gerard
Klees, Frank

Murdoch, Bill
Mushinski, Marilyn
Newman, Dan
O'Toole, John
Ouellette, Jerry J.
Parsons, Ernie
Phillips, Gerry
Pupatello, Sandra
Ramsay, David
Runciman, Robert W.
Ruprecht, Tony
Sampson, Rob
Sergio, Mario
Smitherman, George

Cleary, John C.	Kwinter, Monte	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Levac, David	Stewart, R. Gary
Conway, Sean G.	Marland, Margaret	Stockwell, Chris
Cordiano, Joseph	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Curling, Alvin	McDonald, AL	Turnbull, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn	Wilson, Jim
Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted	Witmer, Elizabeth
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Ecker, Janet	Munro, Julia	Young, David

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Hampton, Howard	Martel, Shelley	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 78; the nays are 5.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the record of the vote count today will indeed confirm my suspicion that it was Mr Christopherson who yesterday voted for a similar motion, and not me.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I move that, through a lot of hard negotiations and complete capitulation on my part, the standing committee on estimates be authorized to meet for seven and a half hours during the summer adjournment, in accordance with a date agreed to by the three party whips and tabled with the Clerk of the assembly, to consider certain estimates.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Mr Stockwell moves that the standing committee on estimates—dispense? No? Somebody wants to hear it—be authorized to meet for 7.5 hours during the summer adjournment, in accordance with a date agreed to by the three party whips and tabled with the Clerk of the assembly, to consider certain estimates.

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

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

Further motions? The government House leader.

1420

HYDRO DAM SAFETY

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): It’s not an actual motion, Mr Speaker, but an undertaking I gave the opposition in questioning by Mr Conway yesterday, asking me to table the program the OPG has put in place

since the horrific accident on the weekend. I undertook to provide him with a letter from OPG and table with the House the public water safety campaign from OPG as well. Through much good work I think by the OPG, they have provided me with this information. I have one for the table and I also have one for the member for Renfrew.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: On June 10 the government House leader said something I actually agreed with—I know that’s hard to believe. He referred to Mr Kormos as the House leader from hell, and no truer words were ever spoken.

To ensure that the government House leader never forgets what he said about Mr Kormos, we have a little something for Mr Kormos to wear to future House leaders’ meetings to reinforce the point. Perhaps you’d like to sign this later on today.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On that same point of order, Mr Speaker: Having had the opportunity to serve with the House leader from hell, upon learning that Mr Stockwell was appointed government House leader I did request a padded room for those meetings, and you have yet to reply.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I’m just glad I don’t have to go to them.

The government House leader on a serious point of order?

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Yes, Mr Speaker. I will also note that the letter I sent over from OPG, tabled today, has also been sent to all constituency offices of all members of the House.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I’d like to obtain unanimous consent for third reading without debate of Bill 140.

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

The member for Sudbury on a point of order?

VISITORS

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): It isn’t a point of order, Mr Speaker, but I do want to recognize two very talented people in the members’ gallery today: Maria Dombrowsky and her very good friend Kaitlyn. Welcome to the assembly.

ORAL QUESTIONS

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Premier. The Independent Market Operator, the body you created through your legislation, has now informed you in no uncertain terms that it has every intention of going ahead with something it calls locational pricing. In essence that is going to mean that

families and businesses in northern Ontario and rural Ontario are going to be forced to pay still more for their electricity than the rest of Ontarians.

My question to you is: are you going to allow your Independent Market Operator to go ahead with its plan for locational pricing?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I refer the question to the Minister of Energy, who I believe answered it yesterday.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I did answer it yesterday. It's a variable rate that's allowed and that is being studied for one year. It has not been approved at the OPG; it has not been approved anywhere. All they've decided to do is study the plan for a year. It's that simple.

Mr McGuinty: I want to be very clear where I'm coming from: I'm against this. I'm against a discriminatory pricing policy that's going to hurt people living in northern Ontario and rural Ontario.

I understand that the market operator is considering this. What I want to know is whether you're going to allow them to proceed with a discriminatory pricing policy. People in northern Ontario and rural Ontario are already up against it. They are struggling to find growth.

The question I have for you on their behalf is: are you going to stand up for them and say no to the IMO?

Hon Mr Stockwell: To be clear on this file, you may be suggesting right now that you're against it—right now. That doesn't mean you'll be against it forever, because we'll come up with another December 12. On that fateful day you may have misspoken yourself or told us you thought too quickly. So right now you're suggesting you're against it.

All I'm suggesting to the member opposite is, they've decided to study the program for a year. I think any reasonable government would say, "If you're going to study a program for a year, bring us the results and we'll determine if it's acceptable or not."

There's nothing on the books that says they're going ahead. It's on the books that they're going to study it for a year. So your standing in this place and telling me you're against it holds no value to me or to taxpayers, because today you may be against it and then we'll have December 12 and you'll be for it.

Mr McGuinty: The question is very simple, Minister. I can appreciate the bluster, but we really would like to get the answer. The question remains the same. The IMO, a body which your government created, tells us it has every intention to proceed with something they call locational pricing; what that means is a discriminatory pricing policy that's going to harm people living in northern Ontario and rural Ontario. What ratepayers in those two parts of the province are looking to you to do now is to turn to the IMO and say no.

I'm asking you again on behalf of northern Ontarians and people living in rural Ontario: are you going to allow locational pricing to happen in the province of Ontario?

Hon Mr Stockwell: Let me just read this story into the record—I think it's interesting because it's another snap decision you just made today, I guess:

"However, he was soon crusading against the sale of Hydro One, all the while denying that he'd ever held a different position—until he was confronted with a tape of his initial comments late last week.

"I honestly believed I'd never said that (I was in favour)," McGuinty said. "I didn't recall at the outset that I'd said what I'd said."

"However, the opposition leader said he'd learned a valuable lesson." What was that valuable lesson?

"You've got to be careful about coming to a quick conclusion about a very complicated matter," he said.

"When this story broke, and it broke very quickly, the subject to that point in time had been the privatization... I was called upon to make a very quick decision ... upon reflection I made the wrong decision."

Now you've made another quick decision. Did you think too quickly this time? Or are you thinking slowly? I don't know. I can't tell.

We're going to study it for a year, and maybe on December 12, you're going to come back to us and say once again, "When I think too quickly, I make mistakes."

HYDRO ONE

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Premier, in a few minutes you're going to use your majority to ram through your Hydro bill, which is going to give you every ability to do whatever you please with Hydro One, and you have apparently no intention whatsoever of telling us what you plan to do with Hydro One.

The question I have for you today is: have you yet made up your mind on what exactly you plan to do with Hydro One?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition has been. We've said very definitively that we are going to bring private sector discipline to Hydro One, that we are going to entertain bringing in a private sector partner. We will not part with control. We will retain more than 50% ownership in Hydro One.

Mr McGuinty: Let's just take a moment, Premier, and go over the record to show how definitive and unequivocal you have been throughout.

On April 26, one of the newspapers reads: "Hydro One Sale to go Ahead: Eves." Thursday, May 2: "Eves: Hydro Sale 'Off the Table.'" Thursday, May 30: "Eves Defends Hydro Bill: Legislation Would Allow Sale of \$5.5-billion Electricity Grid." June 13: "Hydro Sale is Now Off." Now we're back to June 20: "Hydro Sale has Tories' Support." The last one—and this is a beauty of course, because it's particularly telling—says, "No Decision Yet on Hydro One Sale: Eves."

You're now going to give yourself full legislative authority to do as you please with Hydro One. I ask you again: have you made up your mind yet in terms of

exactly what you're going to do with Hydro One this summer?

Hon Mr Eves: First of all, the legislation before the House today does exactly what we said it did when we introduced it, in fact, before we introduced it. It gives the province of Ontario the power of ownership it always thought it had with respect to assets it owns on behalf of the people of the province of Ontario.

We are going to entertain proposals from the private sector to part with up to 49% of the entity and bring private sector discipline to the entity. Surely you who stood in this House and asked questions day after day about compensation and severance packages at Hydro One, criticizing the then board and chief executive officers of Hydro One, would not now want to say there doesn't need to be some private sector discipline brought to that entity.

1430

Mr McGuinty: Do you know what I think, Premier? I think you in fact do have a plan for Hydro One now. You simply lack the courage of conviction to share that plan with the people of Ontario.

You have been meandering aimlessly. If the Minister of Finance wants to know what my plan is, keep it. It's as simple as that. Keep it. It's not a big deal.

I ask you again, Premier, on behalf of Ontarians, now that your meandering, aimless, directionless journey has come to an end and you have in fact made up your mind, would you like to extend the courtesy to Ontario families of sharing exactly what your plans are for Hydro One?

Hon Mr Eves: Speaking of knowing exactly what you're doing, Dalton McGuinty, on May 29: "I have been very consistent with respect to Hydro One. I think it should be kept in public hands. I've been very consistent."

Dalton McGuinty, December 12, 2001: "I would bring in legislative oversight. I think it's important to move ahead with competition in terms of both generation and transmission. There are good public-private partnerships."

You're very consistent, all right, Dalton. You're all over the map.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. We've had our fun.

ENRON CORP

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. Premier, in February I asked your government what role the infamous Enron Corp had in your government's hydro policy. The then Minister of Energy, Jim Wilson, said that the government never had any private meetings with Enron. He said that Enron Canada had nothing to do with Enron Corp in the United States. Mr Wilson said that, even though Enron had given thousands of dollars to the Conservative Party and to Mr Wilson's electoral campaign itself, they never received special treatment from the government.

Premier, these are briefing notes from June 19, 2001, pertaining to a meeting between Jim Wilson, Minister of Energy, senior officials in the Ministry of Energy and Kenneth Lay, the chairman of Enron Corp.

Premier, you would know Kenneth Lay. He is quite an infamous person now, having salted away millions of dollars in off-shore bank accounts, having been behind a billion-dollar swindle of energy markets in the United States.

Can you explain how Mr Wilson would have forgotten about such a meeting with such an infamous person?

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

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): The member opposite makes the allegation that somehow there's some connection between OPG, the government and Enron. There isn't. The simple fact is, there isn't. If you're saying, OK, a meeting took place, a meeting may have taken place but there is no evidence whatsoever that there is any correlation between our government and Enron.

Furthermore, if you want to suggest that in some way there's some taint or smell about OPG, about Hydro One, about the IMO and the OEB with respect to the Enron debacle that took place in the United States, you may in fact make that allegation and suggestion. But I'm saying to you that there's no connection whatsoever. It's a wild goose chase that you're on, trying to chase this down.

Mr Hampton: I guess my question would be, why did the then Minister of Energy deny having such a meeting with such an infamous person, with a corporation that then went on to become the largest single bankruptcy ever in the world, a corporation that's under investigation in state after state in the United States?

But the briefing notes are interesting. According to this note, the minister wanted Enron's advice, Ken Lay's advice, on when to open the electricity market, on how to educate the public about the for-profit market. He wanted the advice of this corporate swindler on how to do it.

Right at the top of this document it says, "Desired outcome"—

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Northern Development and Mines): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think if the honourable member did his homework, he would find those are briefing notes prepared for a meeting that never took—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Take your seat. The minister can answer the question and repeal that.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Take your seat, Minister, right now.

The leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: It says, "Desired outcome: the minister and Enron Chairman Ken Lay develop an ongoing relationship." We know that three out of four people in this province don't want your privatized, deregulated electricity market, but you never want to talk to them. But your government wanted an ongoing relationship

with the largest corporate swindlers ever in the history of the world.

Premier, this is a corporation that's under investigation in the US Senate. It's the subject of multi-million dollar lawsuits. Tell us, why did your government want a comfortable, ongoing relationship with this corporate swindler?

Hon Mr Stockwell: It's like The X-Files. This guy lives in a fantasyland and it's hard for us to try and wrap our hands around his ankles and pull him down to earth. You may have a briefing note that suggests there was this meeting that was going to take place. The minister has already told you that he never met with Enron. Now, don't you think it's kind of important when you start allegations that we met with the biggest swindler in the world that's ever been around, yadda yadda, that maybe the meeting should have taken place? Well, the meeting didn't take place, so all your allegations go up in smoke. The meeting didn't take place.

You never sent the letter. Your caucus has dreams you're not the leader. Those things happen. The letter wasn't sent. The meeting didn't take place. X-Files is on tonight. I know where you'll be.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr Hampton: Maybe the Premier and maybe the Minister of Energy would like to explain another meeting which took place in 1999 between the Minister of Energy and the same corporation, for which there are briefing notes available. But what is interesting here is, it's very clear that your government appointed Enron representatives to the independent market operator design, to the technical design committee, that Enron contributed significant sums of money to your government, that you wanted an ongoing relationship with this corporate swindler.

In the United States you now have investigations before the Congress, you now have legislative committees looking at how Enron shaped failed US energy policy. So I'm going to ask you, since your government wanted this ongoing, cozy relationship with Enron, since you wanted them on every one of the market design committees, I ask the Premier, will you do what is now being done in the United States and have a legislative committee look at how this corporate swindler influenced your government's design of hydro deregulation and hydro privatization? If it's good enough for the—

The Speaker: Just before the minister gets up, the third party, I would say we tried to do it quietly so we didn't waste time in question period; we've asked you to remove those boxes. They are a demonstration. The Sergeant at Arms has asked you. All you're doing is moving them around, so now we are going to take time out of question period. If you don't get your question, it's because of the antics that we're doing this. The boxes have wording on there about Hydro. They are a demonstration. I'm now going to ask the Sergeant at Arms to remove them. In the future, if they come up to you, they are doing it on my behalf, and when they request something, they do it because I want it to happen.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: Just for the record, and we have no intention of disregarding your request, I think there was a communications problem. The wording we got was that the camera was picking it up, would we "move" it. The word wasn't "remove." Otherwise we would have immediately.

The Speaker: The problem is having the wording on there, and that could have been taken off. We've been here since the beginning of question period with it. I didn't want to take time to do that because I know you like to get to your question, but if I have to do it and waste time in question period, I will do it. When the members of the Sergeant at Arms request something, they do it because they're speaking on my behalf. I would ask all members to co-operate with the Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms has a very difficult job to do. He respects all members, but when he's asking on my request, he's doing that because I've asked him to do it.

The Minister of Energy.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The industry nominates the—I'm sorry. They're all caught up. I guess they didn't realize they had boxes there.

The industry nominates the people with respect to the appointments, I say to the leader of the third party, and I think you knew that as well. You're right: they have a representative on the IMO. Beyond that, I don't know. You're off on a—

Hon Mr Wilson: It's Enron Canada too. It's a different company.

1440

Hon Mr Stockwell: I understand. There's no point in explaining it to him, because he doesn't want to know what the facts are. He just wants to get up in a big rant, in a big rave, and go on and on about his conspiracy theories and all these ideas that keep coming to the fore.

The fact of the matter is this: Mr Hampton, you have travelled the province making these outrageous comments. You have made these allegations in the House about our dealing with some swindlers and slanderous sorts. You know this not to be the case, yet you stand up every day. It's beneath you as a member to make these kinds of unsubstantiated allegations that smear not only my name, the government's name, but directly smear the minister, Mr Wilson. I find it reprehensible that you continue to do this when you know the facts. These questions are nothing more than cheap publicity stunts designed to muddy and sully our names. Frankly, I'm sick of it.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): I have a question to the Premier. It's evident that your government does intend to allow a discriminatory system of hydro rates to take hold in Ontario. The IMO has in fact spent a great deal of time studying this. This latest scheme has people in northern and rural Ontario worried

that they would in effect have to pay higher transmission rates for their electricity. They're worried with good reason, because it could leave them paying much higher prices. What other people don't realize is that someone living in a large urban area could also pay much higher prices—for example, the greater Toronto area.

Premier, will you give us a commitment today to call off this scheme of so-called marginal locational pricing so that people aren't forced to pay higher and higher hydro rates?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I'm sure the Minister of Energy can answer the question for the honourable member, as he did yesterday.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): It's the same answer as yesterday. The fact of the matter is that the IMO is simply gathering data. They're just gathering data. There has been no mechanism put in place. This is not a done deal. It hasn't been agreed to by anybody. They're simply gathering data. I don't know why you're opposed to a company going out to gather data. If it's not a good plan, if it's not a good deal for the taxpayers, if it's not a good deal for the ratepayers in Ontario, they have one party they can count on to represent them, and luckily we're in power.

Mr Hampton: Premier, you have received these petitions; you have received these e-mails. We've received tens of thousands of them from people across this province, three out of four people saying, "Don't sell off our hydro system; don't deregulate the market; don't privatize." Yet what's clear is that you've got all kinds of time, in 1999 and again in 2001, to sit down with companies like Enron, companies that authorized the Death Star scamming strategy, the Fat Boy scamming strategy in California, the Ricochet scamming strategy, a company that just last week, in the New York Times, was under investigation for hiding \$1.5 billion in profits while people in California were being gouged.

Why is it, Premier, that your government won't listen to the people but you're so interested in listening to the very scam artists who are under investigation, not just in Canada but all across the United States? Who counts with you? The people certainly don't. Why do companies like Enron count so much?

Hon Mr Stockwell: Leader of the third party, you should be careful when you start about polling data. As I understand polling data today about you and your party, more people believe Elvis is alive than would vote for you. According to polling data, more people believe the earth is flat than would vote for you. I'm not really certain that you should be ranting on about polling data and talking to the government about polling data. If you want to talk about polling data, then maybe you should worry a little bit more about getting your polling data up rather than being concerned about us and how we work this government.

Last, we have made this decision, and we've made this decision to examine all the options. The status quo

wasn't on the table. We're getting private market discipline and we will retain public ownership. From all the people I've talked to in Ontario, they think it's a good idea. What they're asking me about is how come it took you and the Liberals so long to get Bill 80 passed to protect the taxpayers from the deals the board made with the senior executive of Hydro One. They don't understand why you and your bedfellows, the Liberals, coerced this House into four and five days of hearings when everybody knows that's—

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

OTTAWA-CARLETON DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Education. Families in Ottawa are concerned about the objectivity and independence you're going to accord the investigator who is coming to examine the Ottawa-Carleton board of education. You can allay those fears today by assuring us that this investigator will have a free hand in making recommendations to you, including a recommendation for greater funding. The question I have for you is, will your investigator have complete freedom to make any recommendation, including a recommendation for more funding?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): It's an interesting question, but let me refer to the terms of reference regarding the investigator who has been asked to review the finances of the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board.

I might also mention at this point in time that the commission in July 1999 already indicated there were problems with the Ottawa-Carleton board in not moving forward to achieve the efficiencies and reductions that had been requested, so we are now taking the action that the board did not undertake.

The investigator will assess the board's financial position, review the financial management and program decisions already taken by the board, review the recommendations of board staff, assess whether implementation of the recommendations would result in a balanced budget and provide a recommended course of action. The investigator has the absolute freedom to recommend the course of action he or she would deem appropriate.

Mr McGuinty: The reason I ask is that when you were asked about this, you told the media there was no more money coming. It is one thing to say your investigator will have a complete and free hand with respect to coming up with recommendations for you, but that would be a purely academic exercise if you're not prepared to give any more money.

To be more specific, now that you've concluded and agreed your investigator will, in fact, have a free hand and is open to making a recommendation for more money, the question I have for you is, if that investigator

comes up with a recommendation for more money, will you then provide more money in keeping with the recommendation?

Hon Mrs Witmer: It would be inappropriate for me to determine before the fact what the investigator at the Ottawa-Carleton board may or may not decide. However, I would just remind the Leader of the Opposition that since 1999 the EIC, the commission that was set up to take a look at what boards were doing as they moved forward to achieve efficiencies and reduce the amount of money that was being spent, has been recommending that this board take action. We're now at a point where we're going to do the financial assessment.

NURSES

Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex): My question is for the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. I want to talk to you about nurses today. We keep hearing report after report that we're going to face a shortage of nurses 10 to 15 years from now. Recently, Eva Ryten, from the Canadian Nurses Association, found there will be a shortage of 113,000 nurses by the year 2016. I must admit that by the year 2016 I'm probably going to need some nursing help, and I'm sure many members in this House are going to need some. Furthermore, as of January 2005, Ontario will no longer provide the diploma nursing program in this province. Can you tell me how, by eliminating this particular program, we're going to deal with the possible nurse shortage we're going to face 10 or 15 years from now?

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues): This is a challenge for all of us, but we're very confident that with our university programs, our college programs and our bridge training programs for foreign-trained nurses, we will meet the estimated number the member speaks of.

I want to emphasize that we do understand the need for more nurses. We have put over \$120 million toward increasing the number of graduate RNs by a projected 25% this year and another 25% next year. In the next three years, we expect to graduate over 8,000 new nurses. This is the largest number—of course we have more to do. I want to emphasize that the number of graduates from both our colleges and our universities—not just the programs the member has spoken about—is increasing substantially.

1450

Mr Beaubien: Thank you for your reply, but I have done a little bit more research on this subject. As you are very well aware, it's a subject I'm not going to let go. I am very concerned about this, because if we look at what happened in this province 10 or 12 years ago when the Liberals and the NDP decided to reduce the number of applicants to medical schools, we face a shortage today. I have some statistics in front of me that tell me the final intake nursing diploma enrolment for new entrants in the year 2001-02—

Interjections.

Mr Beaubien: Why don't listen for a minute? You might learn something.

There were 2,650 new diploma nursing entrants. On the compressed degree enrolment, the new entrants for the year 2001-02 were 241. The university stand-alone degree enrolment for the year 2001-02 was 66. Minister, the numbers just don't seem to add up. I'm very concerned. I think we need to look after that. I think your ministry needs to reintroduce the diploma nursing program in this province.

Hon Mrs Cunningham: I'm happy to respond to my colleague. He is quite right that the last intake for the college diploma leading to a certified four-year registered nurse is in 2004-05, but we also have nursing programs for RNAs, and I think that is what's missing in the question my colleague is asking. It should be noted that we are not only increasing the number of university-educated nurses; we are also increasing the number of college-educated RPNs as well. In fact, we lifted the quota on the number of registered practical nurses training in Ontario.

So there are two charts to look at. One is for the RNs, and the other is for the registered practical nurses, who are doing a fabulous job, and we're expecting enrolment increases over 26% by 2004-05. All these nurses are well qualified to deal with the technology and the care of patients in our hospitals and in home care.

GOVERNMENT POLLING

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): I have a question for the Premier. I want to ask you about actions you took in 1998 that show some of the parents and children who are watching your priorities when it comes to education. You were finance minister and Deputy Premier then, and parents were protesting—in fact, you were taking control of the funding of education. You were fighting with the school boards.

We've just learned through a freedom-of-information request what you were also up to. What you were up to was hundreds of pages of polling, campaign-style, every night, polling of public opinion being done, paid for by taxpayers. These are political and partisan questions. They cost the taxpayers half a million dollars, and the half a million dollars was paid to Bradgate Research, owned by John Mykytyshyn, who is your Conservative Party pollster.

When the schools were in chaos then, why was the first priority of your government to spend over half a million dollars on partisan polling?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I'm not aware of the information he's talking about. I'd be happy to take a look at it and respond.

Mr Kennedy: For half a million dollars, I hope he looked at it when he had it commissioned in the first place. Just like back in 1998, we now see the results of your taking control of education. There is turmoil; there

is chaos. Your solution back then was partisan polling. You asked questions like, “Does the public feel that the Mike Harris government is going in the right direction?” and, “What is your impression of the Mike Harris government?”

When you were finance minister, you authorized one of the most blatant abuses of government funds. This money, this half a million dollars, came from the education budget. It was paid for by the Ministry of Education. Minister, you were the finance minister and you were Deputy Premier. This came out of the operating budget of the Ministry of Education, not the ministry budget. Premier, will you admit that you were aware that this half a million dollars was being wasted on partisan polling and, more importantly, frankly, Premier—because children and parents want to know what your priorities are—can you guarantee us today that nothing similar is going on, that you’re not spending taxpayer money on partisan polling on education or, for that matter, on health care and—

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

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The honourable member knows very well I have never been the Minister of Education in the province of Ontario. He knows that—

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): You were finance minister.

Hon Mr Eves: The Minister of Finance now runs every single ministry in the government? Jimmy, how long have you been around here? How long has the member for St Catharines sat in this House?

The reality is—
Interjections.

The Speaker: It’s a little too noisy. Order.

Hon Mr Eves: The reality is, with respect to education, the honourable member very well knows that the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Finance, for that matter, in her most recent budget last Monday, earmarked 557 million new dollars for education in the province of Ontario—half a billion dollars in new money going to public school boards across the province, in-year. That is where our priorities lie with respect to education. We will continue to make improvements to the education system in Ontario, and we will continue to do so on behalf of the young people across the province, so everybody has an equal opportunity in education in this province.

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Business Services. Minister, there’s been a lot of discussion recently about the draft privacy legislation that you and your ministry are developing. I understand that the proposed legislation will govern the way businesses, hospitals and charities collect, use and disclose personal information. It will affect everything from the way my medical records are handled,

right down to how a telemarketing company can use my information.

I’m very excited about the strong consumer protection angle of the bill. However, I’ve heard some concerns from both the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors about how this bill will affect their fundraising ability. What are you doing, Minister, to address their concerns in this very important piece of legislation?

Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Consumer and Business Services): I appreciate the question from the member for Oxford and for the letter he has written to me representing his constituents back home, from June 3.

To answer the question directly, we’re working very hard to make sure we get this legislation right. People want to be assured that their personal information and their personal health information is used for proper purposes, that it is protected. At the same time, we have to ensure that there is a balance in place for companies who depend on this information for their businesses, for jobs, particularly charities, for the use of information to further their good purposes.

We’ve received to date about 400 different submissions on the draft privacy bill, ably begun by my predecessor, Minister Sterling. We’ve held workshops with groups from charities to hospitals to the privacy commissioner, among others. I’m pleased to say that a lot of progress has been made. I’d like to introduce to the members somebody who has been instrumental in making sure we get the language right. Joining us in the gallery today is Susan Mullin from the Association of Fundraising Professionals, who has played a critical role in these consultations. Thank you, Susan.

Mr Hardeman: Thank you very much, Minister. I’m pleased to hear that we have representatives from the non-profit charities here today also expressing their concerns about the legislation.

I’ve heard from many of my constituents, who write me and talk about the difficulty they will have in fundraising for organizations such as the United Way of Oxford. They think that this bill will dramatically decrease their ability to fundraise. They’re worried that they will have to obtain consent from every previous and potential donor before contacting them to solicit a donation. This would create a much greater administrative burden and far less money going to the cause for which they are collecting.

I know that they brought these concerns on the implications of this legislation to your attention. Can you please tell the House what changes you will be making to this draft legislation to address this very large issue?

1500

Hon Mr Hudak: The member makes a very important point. We appreciate hearing from groups like the United Way of Oxford, among the 400 different submissions we have received to the draft legislation. It has been beneficial to hear from both sides of the debate.

Obviously, we want to ensure that charities continue to prosper and move forward on their important initiatives on health care, education and other issues like

them. Clearly defining the rights of a consumer or individual to opt out of future mailings, for example, would be important. But the fear the member brings forward I believe has been addressed, and subsequent changes will be coming forward thanks to folks like Susan Mullin and those in that sector. We want to make sure personal information is protected, but at the same time we want to enable charities to continue to do their good work.

MENINGITIS C

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Premier. Today there is a three-and-a-half-year-old girl from Mount Elgin who is in critical condition in a London hospital after contracting meningitis C. This did not have to happen. This is a preventable disease.

For almost a year now, New Democrats have urged your government to implement a province-wide immunization program. There are boards of health across this province, including Oxford county, which have passed resolutions supporting this call.

Two weeks ago, I introduced the Michael Maxwell bill in memory of a 17-year-old from Ingersoll who died of meningitis on March 14. His family was in the gallery that day. His father, Gregg, e-mailed many of us this morning, asking us to pass his son's bill today, especially in light of the serious situation facing yet another Ontario family.

Premier, the question is simple: will you do the right thing? Will your government support the Michael Maxwell bill today?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I believe the Minister of Health can respond to this.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I can tell this House that of course public health protection is a top priority for our government. We are working very closely with the regional medical officer of health in this case to investigate the case and of course want to offer our sympathy to the family involved.

I can tell this House that the patient is still hospitalized but is responding well to treatment. We remain very hopeful in her case. We are of course working with the local health authorities to make vaccines available to the close contacts. The honourable member may want to know that we contribute 50% of all costs associated with an outbreak investigation and administration. But if it is determined that vaccinations are needed, we pay 100% of the costs out of the provincial budget.

Ms Martel: Minister, the question was, would the government support the Michael Maxwell bill today? We have a three-and-a-half-year-old girl in a London hospital who is in serious condition after contracting meningitis C. This is a disease that is preventable. We have a vaccine that works. Quebec and Alberta determined that meningitis was a serious public health issue and moved on their own to implement a province-wide immunization

campaign against meningitis C. You should follow their lead.

I ask you again, in all seriousness, Minister, will you do the right thing today and implement a province-wide immunization program and public education campaign against meningitis C so no Ontario family ever has to face this again?

Hon Mr Clement: I want to assure this House that we continue to follow long-standing national guidelines when it comes to the control of meningitis. This is also an issue of national importance. We continue to seek to work with the federal government on a strategy to provide improvements to this program. Last year I wrote to the Minister of Health on this very issue. I have not yet received a response, but I did have the opportunity to meet with my federal counterpart, Anne McLellan, recently and raise the issue again, because we feel it is a matter of common interest and of national interest, and we will continue to advocate on behalf of the people of Ontario.

ANGIOPLASTY SERVICES

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): My question is for the Minister of Health. Here is the current status for heart patients in the Windsor area who need angioplasty and are on a waiting list for London. We have four patients sitting in a Windsor hospital waiting for a transfer to London. In London, all eight angioplasty beds are full. In our catchment area, 40 people considered semi-urgent are waiting for their call to travel to London. Two years ago, these people waited six to eight weeks. Today, they wait four to six months. Today, they're being rerouted to St Mike's in Toronto and Trillium in Mississauga whenever our cardiac coordinator can get them in. London can't fit everyone; there's no room, and people wait.

Last May you met with me and Dr Chetty in Windsor. You said it was a good idea. You had a fundraiser for your leadership campaign, hosted by a cardiologist. You told them that night it was a great idea and to expect the announcement by January. You told them that months ago; that was six months ago.

Minister, you've announced the Scarborough site already. The people in Windsor want to know when we are getting our angioplasty in Windsor.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I do want to inform this House that there are 17 approved cardiac catheterization centres throughout Ontario. Last year the ministry, on behalf of the people of Ontario, funded 45,898 cardiac cath procedures. Of course, as the honourable member knows, we have five new cardiac cath centres thus far. Certainly, with the announcement in last week's budget that Ontario hospitals are receiving \$9.4 billion worth of funding from the taxpayers of Ontario, which is a record amount, we believe we are providing better services closer to home, and that includes cardiac services as well.

The honourable member is correct: I have not closed the door to a local catheterization procedure centre. I certainly would like to work with the local hospitals in that regard.

Mrs Pupatello: Our Windsor hospital has now formalized its relationship with Beaumont Hospitals in Michigan. Our cardiologist won't let the urgent cases wait on London lists because they're not a top priority in the scope of all southwestern Ontario. Your announcements, or whatever you just said, have made not a bit of difference for southwestern Ontario.

Listen to this carefully: three patients per month whom we are sending to Beaumont in Michigan cost us \$1.3 million. Our proposal is that \$1.25 million would pay for 357 people to be done in Windsor. It's just crazy to pay this money to a US hospital when we can do it in Windsor for 10 times the number of people.

Minister, it's crazy not to make this announcement immediately. If you don't do it because you care for our people getting in on a timely basis, do it for the money you'll save. It just makes sense to make this announcement. The figures don't include the wait these people have in a thousand-dollar-a-day bed in a cardiac care unit. It makes absolutely no sense. You came to us. You said you liked the idea. You've already made this announcement in Scarborough. You promised the people in Windsor that you would do this. Why are you breaking your promise?

Hon Mr Clement: We're not breaking any promise. The honourable member has some interesting statistics and figures. You'll forgive me if I'd like to review them, given events in this Legislature earlier this session. Certainly I welcome any statistics you have; I welcome any facts you have. I've said in Windsor on numerous occasions that I'd like to work with the local community to work out a proposal we can review. Of course I want the best health care for the citizens in the Windsor-Essex area, and I'd be happy to work with honourable members on this side of the House and opposite in order to carry that out.

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): My question is for the Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation. Biotechnology is one of the driving forces of today's global economy. It provides unprecedented knowledge and scientific advances of high commercial value that save lives and improve the quality of life for the people of Ontario and around the world. Furthermore, encouraging Ontario to be at the cutting edge of research and development will lead to thousands of new jobs in Ontario and billions of dollars in economic activity. What is our government doing to support the growth of a biotechnology industry in Ontario?

1510

Hon David Turnbull (Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation): I want to thank

the excellent, hard-working member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale. Certainly our government recognizes the importance of encouraging innovation. Innovation and research are essential to creating a strong economy, and thus a higher quality of life. This means we can have better schools, better hospitals, more jobs and better health care.

Currently, Ontario's pharmaceutical and biotechnology cluster ranks number seven among North American states and provinces. Toronto is the fourth at the regional level, just behind Los Angeles. Ontario has set a very ambitious goal, and that is to be one of the three top biotech jurisdictions in North America.

Two weeks ago our government announced a \$51-million biotechnology strategy which is anticipated to bring new research and commercialization interests in excess of \$10 billion within 10 years. The cornerstone of this strategy is to—

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

Supplementary?

Mr Gill: Thank you, Minister, for working very hard in elaborating on our government's biotechnology strategy. The International Biotechnology Convention and Exhibition, the BIO 2002 conference, which I was pleased to attend, was held in downtown Toronto approximately two weeks ago—of course the member from Durham, Mr John O'Toole, was there with me—where more than 14,000 participants from around the world attended. I know that our province participated and raised awareness among delegates, potential investors and researchers about the benefits of investing and undertaking research in Ontario. Minister, can you tell us why Ontario is indeed a great place to invest and undertake biotechnology research?

Hon Mr Turnbull: Ontario has built a very strong economic foundation. Over the last seven years, Ontario has earned a reputation as a very good place to do business. We've cut taxes close to 200 times, and this has resulted in almost 900,000 net new jobs. By 2006 we will have the lowest combined corporate income tax rate of any US state or Canadian province.

In a recent KPMG study, Ontario's major cities, Ottawa and Toronto, were shown to have the lowest cost to do business as compared with major cities in the US. Ontario, we know, is the home to some of the world's most respected researchers and at the forefront of major developments. We will continue to make Ontario an ideal place to live, to work, to raise a family and to grow a business.

NEW VISIONS

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale): Mr Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. It concerns the future of eight residents at New Visions. Today in the Speaker's gallery we are joined by six of the eight residents whose very future is threatened: Mark Ciccotelli, Ava Clewes, Jason Bromfield, Dale Hunter,

Michael Millard and Cale Baird are here to indicate to you, along with friends and caregivers, the extent to which they feel threatened.

Last night, Cale Baird had the opportunity to graduate from Monarch Park high school, a success that he attributes to the quality of life—

Applause.

Mr Smitherman: I'm sure he appreciates the applause, but I think he'll be waiting in anticipation for your answer, Mr Minister. He attributes his success to the stabilization that has occurred at New Visions. Now, within 90 days, he's threatened, along with seven others, with eviction and likely reinstitutionalization.

Minister, will you tell these six people, their caregivers and their families what steps you're undertaking to make sure that the circumstances they presently are engaged in, which are positive, continue.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I thank the honourable member for the question and for any work he's doing in this regard. It looks like he is well apprised of certain aspects of the situation. I think I can speak for all members of the House when I say that our first concern is for the clients of this particular agency, and we want to make sure they have continual access to health care and other community services that are required for them.

We've been involved in a series of meetings with the officials involved in New Visions Toronto. There has been an unfortunate circumstance in which New Visions withdrew themselves from funding that we had offered them. I'm hoping, if I can have the honourable member's assistance if he wishes to provide it, to reinstate their acceptance of our funding because I have \$500,000 which I would like to spend on that particular agency as quickly as possible for its residents. So perhaps, if we can work together, we can solve this together.

Mr Smitherman: Minister, as far as it goes that's a terrific answer, but let's be clear about something: they said that they could not accept the funding because their fiduciary responsibilities require them not to run a deficit. They cannot, within the funding envelope that you propose, care for these eight individuals. Comsoc has been picking up the tab for that, and this year they have said no. They want to continue to offer care. The executive director of New Visions is in the members' gallery. She wants to continue to offer care, but for the sake of \$100,000 a year, eight individuals will be reinstitutionalized at a cost of God knows how many hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

So, Mr Minister, the power is in your hands to decide which silo in your ministry will foot the bill: one at the reasonable rate of \$100,000, or one at some rate so exaggerated that we will all look like fools. The power is in your hands, Minister. Yes, in answer to your question, I will work with you, but when you leave the east lobby doors today, these folks—and Cale Baird among them—will be there to talk to you.

I want to work toward a settlement that works for these people. Let's be clear here: they didn't say they

didn't want to offer the services; they are not able to run a deficit. The issue is \$100,000 a year. Let's solve that. Let's settle that. What will you do around that today?

Hon Mr Clement: Let me say a couple of things. First of all, for each Ministry of Health-funded space in this particular agency, the agency receives roughly \$56,000, which is, I believe, an important amount of money. But I'm certainly willing to continue the discussions. My understanding is that my officials had discussions with their officials yesterday. I took the liberty, when I realized that we might have a few visitors in the gallery, to secure a room in this Legislature for my officials and myself, as necessary, to work with whichever person is designated for that approach. You're certainly welcome to be part of that discussion too.

CANCER CARE

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): My question is also to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Several of my constituents are interested in the initiative this government is taking to improve cancer care here in the province.

In May's throne speech, this government made several commitments to improve cancer care in Ontario. Minister, can you please tell me how the 2002 budget addresses the government's throne speech commitments and what initiatives this government is taking to try to eradicate this horrible disease?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I don't think there's a person in this House who has not had a family member or a friend touched by this terrible disease.

In May's throne speech, this government promised to actively pursue a strategy to eliminate the two leading forms of cancer, breast cancer and prostate cancer, and we committed to immediately expand the scope of our cancer research network so that research on all forms of cancer be eligible for funding. We are committed to the eradication of cancer, and we will continue to fight this devastating disease which affects, as I say, so many families across Ontario.

The budget, without a doubt, reinforces this commitment. As stated in that budget, we will invest an additional \$40 million for new treatments for individuals with cancer; increase funding of \$50 million over three years to enhance the Ontario Cancer Research Network, doubling the number of patients who can benefit from this research; and provide \$30 million to modernize and upgrade cancer radiation equipment. Of course, in a bid to eradicate one of the worst forms of cancer, we did increase the cost of cigarettes, which experts indicate will help deter young Ontarians from smoking. Our record is clear.

Mr Dunlop: Minister, I'm very delighted to hear what this year's budget is doing to improve cancer treatment and research here in Ontario.

Minister, these new funding commitments are without a doubt good news for those suffering from cancer. I'm

sure my constituents are delighted to see how cancer care-related facilities and programs are a priority for this government. Can you please tell me what others are saying about these initiatives as we go on?

Hon Mr Clement: I just happen to have transcripts of particular quotes from across the province as a result of the budget initiatives. Northwestern Ontario Regional Cancer Centre spokesman Michael Power stated, "This is outstanding for Cancer Care Ontario, it's outstanding for cancer patients and it's outstanding for the Northwestern Ontario Regional Cancer Centre." In the Windsor Star, Rob Cunningham of the Canadian Cancer Society applauded the tobacco tax increase. Terry Sullivan, vice-president of preventive oncology at Cancer Care Ontario, said the tax increase may be the single most important step in cancer prevention in this province.

While experts in the cancer field are cheering the initiatives, we would like to hear from Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals to come out and also show their full support for what this government is doing to help fight this terrible disease.

1520

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): My question is to the Premier. Yesterday, city of Toronto outside workers, hard-working women and men of CUPE Local 416, were forced on to picket lines, not around the issue of wages but around the issue of job security, which really means privatization. I want you to know that the NDP strongly supports CUPE Local 416 in their struggle to maintain healthy public services. Premier, will you support their right to freely collectively bargain and to lawfully strike?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): This is a dispute between the city of Toronto and their employees. The province of Ontario has no intention of intervening unless health or safety become an issue.

Mr Kormos: Premier, the motivation of the city of Toronto and other cities across this province during the course of similar bargaining sessions is to terminate job security, and similarly to open the door to privatization in an effort to reduce costs.

You've authored this scenario by virtue of downloading on to communities, by imposing new costs on them and by merely providing them these so-called tools in your tool boxes. You're part of the problem, Premier. You're the one who's rolled out the red carpet and set the standards for privatization. Why aren't you part of the solution?

Hon Mr Eves: One day the honourable member wants us to intervene, the next day he doesn't. In fact, from one minute to the next he wants us to intervene then doesn't want us to intervene.

This is a matter between the city and its employees. He correctly points out that the city employees have the right to bargain, and we have no intention of interfering.

PUBLIC SECTOR COMPENSATION

Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain): My question is for the Premier. This morning Bill 53, the Public Sector Employees Severance Pay Disclosure Act, was supposed to go through clause-by-clause in the public accounts committee. It is a bill that I modelled after your very own sunshine law. Basically—it's very uncomplicated—public CEO severance packages that are over \$100,000 should be made public.

The bill received unanimous consent at second reading in November, including support from your caucus and ministers. Public hearings were held in March, and the privacy commissioner supported the bill.

This morning, government members used procedural tactics to avoid clause-by-clause review of Bill 53. The member for York North read from a script for 20 minutes to avoid this. This is the kind of circus that is abhorrent to the public and makes them laugh at us as politicians.

Premier, instead of paying lip service, will you direct your government members to seriously look at this bill, which will bring openness and accountability to public sector severances?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Committees in the Legislature have the right to order their own business, and that is exactly what they are doing.

PETITIONS

HIGHWAY 69

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): I have a petition signed by literally thousands of people from all across Canada and the United States. It's with regard to four-laning Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas modern highways are economic lifelines for the north; and

"Whereas the stretch of Highway 69 from Sudbury south to Parry Sound is a treacherous road with a trail of death and destruction; and

"Whereas the carnage on Highway 69 has been staggering; and

"Whereas the Harris-Eves government has shown gross irresponsibility in not four-laning the stretch of Highway 69 between Sudbury and Parry Sound; and

"Whereas immediate action is needed now to prevent more needless loss of life; and

"Whereas it is the responsibility of a government to provide safe roads for its citizens, and the Eves government has failed to do so;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the" several thousand "undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to urge the Eves government to begin construction immediately and four-lane Highway 69 between Sudbury and Parry Sound so that the carnage on death road north will cease."

Of course I affix my signature to this petition and give it to Jordan to bring to the table.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): We have literally thousands of petitions from people across Ontario wanting to stop this dirty deal on Hydro. It reads as follows:

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Harris government’s plan to privatize and deregulate Ontario’s electricity system will lead to higher rates because private owners will sell more power to US customers whose rates are typically 50% higher than Ontario’s; and

“Whereas selling coal plants like Nanticoke to the private sector will lead to more pollution because the private owners will run the plants at full capacity to earn a profit; and

“Whereas electricity deregulation in California has led to sky-high rates and blackouts; and

“Whereas Ontario needs a system of public power that will ensure rate stability, environmental protection and secure access to power;

“Therefore, be it resolved that the undersigned”—literally tens of thousands—“call on the government to scrap electricity deregulation and privatization and bring in a system of accountable public power. The first priority for such a public power system must be incentives for energy conservation and green power. Electricity rates and major energy projects must be subject to full public hearings and binding rulings by a public regulator instead of leaving energy rates to private profit.”

I sign that petition.

CONSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton): I have a petition that deals with the Constitution of 1792 that was brought to the House of Assembly of Ontario. After a lot of whereases, the meat of the petition comes to:

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

“That the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, sitting as a whole, cause the government of Ontario to promptly refer the following questions to the Court of Appeal for Ontario for its determination under section 8 of the Courts of Justice Act.

“Question 1. What are the valid ... provisions of the Constitution of Ontario of October 15, 1792, and of the Ontario Great Charter of 1897?”

“Question 2. What are the requirements for revising and updating the Constitution of Ontario of October 15, 1792, and the Ontario Great Charter of 1897?”

It’s signed by a number of my constituents, and I affix my name to the bottom of it.

HYDRO ONE

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): “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’m in complete agreement with this petition, and I affix my signature to it.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): I have petitions here signed by approximately 70 people. It reads as follows:

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Harris government’s plan to privatize and deregulate Ontario’s electricity system will lead to higher rates because private owners will sell more power to US customers whose rates are typically 50% higher than Ontario’s; and

“Whereas selling coal plants like Nanticoke to the private sector will lead to more pollution because the private owners will run the plants at full capacity to earn a profit; and

“Whereas electricity deregulation in California has led to sky-high rates and blackouts; and

“Whereas Ontario needs a system of public power that will ensure rate stability, environmental protection and secure access to power;

“Therefore, be it resolved that the undersigned call on the government to scrap electricity deregulation and privatization and bring in a system of accountable public power. The first priority for such a public power system must be incentives for energy conservation and green power. Electricity rates and major energy projects must be subject to full public hearings and binding rulings by a

public regulator instead of leaving energy rates to private profit.”

I agree with that and will affix my signature thereto.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It reads as follows:

“Whereas Sarnia-Point Edward and area is experiencing a crisis in a shortage of health care professionals, specifically doctors; and

“Whereas community health care centres are a proven primary health care system that can attract professionals and deliver primary health care in a cost-effective, efficient manner;

“Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario approve a community health care centre for Sarnia-Point Edward and area as soon as possible.”

I’ll sign my name to this petition.

1530

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): My petition reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ontario Conservative government hastily amalgamated Niagara’s ambulance dispatch service into the Hamilton’s Central Ambulance Communication Centre;

“Whereas an independent review of Hamilton’s Central Ambulance Communication Centre found several major shortcomings, including inexperienced dispatchers, high call volume and out-of-date equipment, hindering the dispatch of ambulances in Niagara and in other parts of the province;

“Whereas poor training of Central Ambulance Communication Centre dispatchers by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care has led to improper emergency coding, resource misallocation and waste and increased wait times for those requiring ambulance services;

“Whereas the Central Ambulance Communication Centre dispatchers are handling 1,300 more calls a year than recommended by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care;

“Whereas these shortcomings in ambulance service restructuring are putting lives at risk in Niagara, Hamilton and throughout the province;

“Whereas the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care has been in possession of the independent review since October 31, 2001, which provides recommendations to greatly improve ambulance dispatch services in Niagara and Hamilton;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately act upon recommendations presented in the independent review of the Central Ambulance Communication Centre and eliminate the

grievous imperfections which are placing our citizens at risk.”

I affix my signature. I am in full agreement.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): I have another petition that reads as follows:

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Harris government’s plan to privatize and deregulate Ontario’s electricity system will lead to higher rates because private owners will sell more power to US customers whose rates are typically 50% higher than Ontario’s; and

“Whereas selling coal plants like Nanticoke to the private sector will lead to more pollution because the private owners will run the plants at full capacity to earn a profit; and

“Whereas electricity deregulation in California has led to sky-high rates and blackouts; and

“Whereas Ontario needs a system of public power that will ensure rate stability, environmental protection and secure access to power;

“Therefore, be it resolved that the undersigned call on the government to scrap electricity deregulation and privatization and bring in a system of accountable public power. The first priority for such a public power system must be incentives for energy conservation and green power. Electricity rates and major energy projects must be subject to full public hearings and binding rulings by a public regulator instead of leaving energy rates to private profit.”

There are approximately 219 signatures for this petition. I affix my signature to it.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke North): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario dealing with the Saving for Our Children’s Future Act, 2001. It reads as follows:

“Whereas post-secondary education is very important in the development of young adults, to the betterment of society and the economic future of our province; and

“Whereas the continuing challenge and cost of education facing families in Ontario in the 21st century is ever increasing; and

“Whereas the cost of post-secondary education in Ontario requires a combination of government and individual financial support; and

“Whereas the tax credit proposed in Bill 4, Saving for Our Children’s Future, 2001, will effectively and beneficially encourage families to save for their children’s education; and

“Whereas the large majority of children and families with a registered education savings plan do not apply for OSAP, thereby freeing millions of dollars for other OSAP students;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, hereby respectfully petition the Legislature of Ontario to act quickly to pass Bill 4, Saving for Our Children's Future, 2001, and thereby extend the opportunity of post-secondary education to thousands of" young people in Ontario.

This is signed by over 2,000 people and I affix my signature.

HYDRO ONE

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

I have a petition for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ernie Eves is planning to ram through the sale of Hydro One without a mandate from the people of Ontario; and

"Whereas an Ontario Court judge has ruled that the sale of Hydro One is illegal; and

"Whereas Ernie Eves's Bay Street friends will benefit from the sale of Hydro One at the expense of Ontario's working families;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to encourage Ernie Eves to take Dalton McGuinty's advice to put working families ahead of his Bay Street friends by immediately stopping the sale of Hydro One."

I affix my signature.

HEALTH CARE

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre): I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. The undersigned wish to express their concern about the current debate on health care:

"... medicare has saved a generation of Canadians from fear of financial ruin due to illness; ...

"... we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to work co-operatively to uphold the five principles of the Canada Health Act which are in need of reinforcement and new commitment. These principles are: accessible, universally available, publicly administered, portable and comprehensive."

These petitioners "further ask that Canadians be provided with a properly funded and sustainable not-for-profit health system ... and ask that Canada take back its role as a leader in national health care, insured by a public health system fully supported by the federal and provincial governments."

I'm happy to submit this to the Chair.

SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the people of Windsor-Essex county, continually see the number of students requiring special education increase; and

"Whereas we support the government's efforts to provide school boards with proportional special education funding based upon need;

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

"To provide special education funding reflecting real needs and ministry approved claims without delay based on immediate current levels of such needs identified within Windsor and Essex county, commencing September 2002 and henceforth."

I might add that though this comes from Windsor-Essex, this applies to every parent of every school board in Ontario and I am pleased to sign this.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Again, I have literally thousands of signatures on petitions here that read as follows. They say, "Stop the dirty deal." To the Ontario Legislature:

"Whereas the Harris government's plan to privatize"—that should have been "Eves government," I guess—"and deregulate Ontario's electricity system will lead to higher rates because private owners will sell more power to US customers whose rates are typically 50% higher than Ontario's; and

"Whereas selling coal plants like Nanticoke to the private sector will lead to more pollution because the private owners will run the plants at full capacity to earn a profit; and

"Whereas electricity deregulation in California has led to sky-high rates and blackouts; and

"Whereas Ontario needs a system of public power that will ensure rate stability, environmental protection and secure access to power;

"Therefore, be it resolved that the undersigned call on the government to scrap electricity deregulation and privatization and bring in a system of accountable public power. The first priority for such a public power system must be incentives for energy conservation and green power. Electricity rates and major energy projects must be subject to full public hearings and binding rulings by a public regulator instead of leaving energy rates to private profit."

I sign that petition.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: To the government whip and to yourself, a number of members still have petitions left to present. Normally we only have 15 minutes, but seeing that this is the last day of the session, would it be in order to possibly get unanimous consent to add a few more minutes to allow those petitions to be presented?

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Let me test the House on unanimous consent for an extension on the presentation of petitions for up to five minutes.

All those in favour? Any opposed? Hearing none, that is ordered. Petitions may continue for another five minutes.

1540

MARIA K.

Mr Monte Kwinter (York Centre): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Maria K. is a 77-year-old Holocaust survivor who is in a Toronto hospital. She has Parkinson’s symptoms caused from bad medicine and she has late-onset asthma, nothing that would end her life now as long as she receives care.

“Maria K. is a ward of the province of Ontario, the public guardian and trustee. For the past year, Maria K. has not been permitted to leave her room. She’s sedated much of the time. Friends and neighbours are not permitted to visit, all due to a dispute with her daughter, who has demanded better care for her mother. At one point during the past year she received no food for six weeks.

“Last year, Maria K.’s daughter tried to save some hospital beds. The hospital responded by vilifying her daughter and taking away the daughter’s right to make decisions for her mother. Maria K. is currently able to see her daughter only two hours per week under supervision, and her daughter has no say in her mother’s care.

“This is bad for Maria K. because the care plan does not respect her previously stated wishes and because, as a Holocaust survivor, Maria K. has special social and emotional needs that are not being met.

“Maria K.’s stated wishes previous to her illness were that she wanted to live as long as possible. Maria K. went to the hospital because her daughter was working abroad. Her daughter is permanently living at home now. Her community doctor says that Maria K. needs tender, loving care. She’s not getting that now. The friends of Maria K. asked for an end to the year-long dispute and isolation of Maria K., to move her out of the hospital as soon as possible and to restore her daughter’s ability to make substitute decisions for her. As a Holocaust survivor, Maria K. has experienced enough isolation. It is time to honour Maria’s life.”

This petition is signed by a number of her friends.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): I have here another couple of thousand signatures on a different petition on privatization. It reads as follows:

“To the Provincial Legislature of Ontario:

“Whereas the Conservatives’ plan to privatize Ontario’s electricity system will lead to higher rates for consumers, industry, schools and hospitals;

“Whereas power privatization will lead to unsafe nuclear plants, increased air pollution and dangerous drinking water;

“Whereas Ontario needs a system of public power that will ensure rate stability, environmental protection and secure access to power;

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

“Stop the privatization of Ontario power. Provide incentives for energy conservation and green power. Call for accountable public power, with all proposed rate increases or new power plants to be approved by an arm’s-length regulator after full public hearings.”

I’ve signed these petitions from various parts of the province.

FARM IMPLEMENT SECTOR

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): I have a petition in support of Bill 76. This is the bill to foster competition and innovation in the farm implement sector.

“Whereas some large farm equipment manufacturers have been requiring farm implement dealers to sell only products exclusive to that manufacturer; and

“Whereas these security policies and exclusivity clauses create an unfair marketing advantage for large manufacturers; and

“Whereas these policies hinder competition and farmer choice; and

“Whereas these policies discourage innovation; and

“Whereas these policies threaten the economic survival of dealers, short line manufacturers and the rural communities in which they are located;

“We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

“To eliminate exclusionary policies and restore fairness and competition to the farm implement marketplace by supporting Bill 76.”

I’m in favour of this piece of legislation and hereby affix my signature.

SERVICES DE SANTÉ POUR ENFANTS

CHILDREN’S HEALTH SERVICES

M^{me} Claudette Boyer (Ottawa-Vanier): « Attendu que le gouvernement planifie la fermeture du service de chirurgie cardiaque à l’hôpital pour enfants de l’est de l’Ontario ;

“Whereas the government plans to centralize all cardiac services for children in Ontario;

« Attendu que la chirurgie cardiaque à l’hôpital pour enfants est un service essentiel pour les enfants de l’est de l’Ontario et pour les enfants francophones de toute la province ;

“Whereas the lives of children may be at risk if forced to travel to Toronto for cardiac care;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand that the government halt immediately its decision to close cardiac surgery services at the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario in Ottawa.”

J’y appose ma signature.

EDUCATION FUNDING

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

“Whereas Ernie Eves and the Progressive Conservative government promised in 1995 not to cut classroom spending, but has already cut at least \$2 billion from our schools and is now closing many classrooms entirely; and

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

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

“Whereas the Conservative government and Ernie Eves funding formula is forcing the Toronto District School Board to cancel these Saturday classes for groups who want to participate in them;

“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 they are able to continue to accommodate these Saturday international languages classes.”

I have affixed my signature to this petition.

VISITORS

Hon Tina R. Molinari (Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I have some very important guests here today I'd like to introduce. They are students who have won the ABC Aventis Biotechnology competition and they are from St Elizabeth, which is in my beautiful riding of Thornhill: first place, intermediate division, Kory Benvenuto-Whitham, Rohit Barreto, Priscilla Mendonca; fifth place, senior division, Steven Chuang. With them are the supervising teacher, Mr Sydney Smith, and Aventis biotech scientific coordinator Dr William Mak. I'd like you to please welcome them.

Mr Monte Kwinter (York Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Today is a great day in the history of the Ontario College of Art and Design. When Bill 109 is passed, it will give degree-granting status to that institution. As a graduate of that institution, as a former vice-president of that institution, and having a daughter who graduated from that institution, I am delighted to be able to participate. I also want to take this opportunity to introduce in the members' gallery the president of the Ontario College of Art and Design, Ron Shuebrook, the executive vice-president, Peter Caldwell, and Catherine Redmond.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HYDRO ONE INC. DIRECTORS
AND OFFICERS ACT, 2002LOI DE 2002 SUR LES ADMINISTRATEURS
ET LES DIRIGEANTS DE HYDRO ONE INC.

Mr Stockwell moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 80, An Act respecting directors and officers of Hydro One Inc and its subsidiaries / Projet de loi 80, Loi concernant les administrateurs et les dirigeants de Hydro One Inc. et de ses filiales.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 19, 2002, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Stockwell has moved third reading of Bill 80. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion, please indicate.

All those opposed, please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1548 to 1553.

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

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Eves, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Arnott, Ted	Galt, Doug	Parsons, Ernie
Baird, John R.	Gilchrist, Steve	Peters, Steve
Barrett, Toby	Gill, Raminder	Phillips, Gerry
Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	Pupatello, Sandra
Beaubien, Marcel	Guzzo, Garry J.	Ramsay, David
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Boyer, Claudette	Hastings, John	Ruprecht, Tony
Bradley, James J.	Hodgson, Chris	Sampson, Rob
Bryant, Michael	Jackson, Cameron	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Smitherman, George
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Sorbara, Greg
Clark, Brad	Kwinter, Monte	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Marland, Margaret	Stewart, R. Gary
Colle, Mike	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stockwell, Chris
Conway, Sean G.	Mazzilli, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	McDonald, AL	Tsubouchi, David H.
Curling, Alvin	McGuinty, Dalton	Turnbull, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	Miller, Norm	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Dombrowsky, Leona	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Duncan, Dwight	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Dunlop, Garfield	Murdoch, Bill	Wood, Bob
Ecker, Janet	Mushinski, Marilyn	Young, David
Elliott, Brenda	O'Toole, John	

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Marchese, Rosario	Prue, Michael
Hampton, Howard	Martel, Shelley	
Kormos, Peter	Martin, Tony	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 74; the nays are 7.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

KEEPING THE PROMISE
FOR GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT
(2002 BUDGET), 2002
LOI DE 2002 SUR LE RESPECT
DE L'ENGAGEMENT D'ASSURER
LA CROISSANCE ET LA PROSPÉRITÉ
(BUDGET DE 2002)

Resuming the debate adjourned on June 25, 2002, on the motion for second reading of Bill 109, An Act to implement the measures contained in the 2002 Ontario Budget and to implement other initiatives of the Government of Ontario / Projet de loi 109, Loi mettant en oeuvre certaines mesures énoncées dans le budget de l'Ontario de 2002 ainsi que d'autres initiatives du gouvernement de l'Ontario.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 27, 2002, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Chudleigh has moved second reading of Bill 109, An Act to implement the measures contained in the 2002 Ontario budget and to implement other initiatives of the Government of Ontario.

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

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1557 to 1602.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, members for Oak Ridges and Hamilton East. It's the last day. We could wait a long time.

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

Ayes

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

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We're in the middle of a vote. This House will come to order.

All those members opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bisson, Gilles	Gravelle, Michael	Phillips, Gerry
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hampton, Howard	Prue, Michael
Boyer, Claudette	Kennedy, Gerard	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Kormos, Peter	Ramsay, David
Bryant, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Caplan, David	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Marchese, Rosario	Smitherman, George
Conway, Sean G.	Martel, Shelley	Sorbara, Greg
Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony	
Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 49; the nays are 34.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the same order of the House, this bill is ordered referred for third reading.

KEEPING THE PROMISE
FOR GROWTH AND PROSPERITY ACT
(2002 BUDGET), 2002
LOI DE 2002 SUR LE RESPECT
DE L'ENGAGEMENT D'ASSURER
LA CROISSANCE ET LA PROSPÉRITÉ
(BUDGET DE 2002)

Mrs Ecker moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 109, An Act to implement the measures contained in the 2002 Ontario Budget and to implement other initiatives of the Government of Ontario / Projet de loi 109, Loi mettant en oeuvre certaines mesures énoncées dans le budget de l'Ontario de 2002 ainsi que d'autres initiatives du gouvernement de l'Ontario.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Pursuant to the order of the House, I am now required to put the question.

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

All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1607 to 1612.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Baird, John R.	Hastings, John	Runciman, Robert W.
Barrett, Toby	Hodgson, Chris	Sampson, Rob
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Spina, Joseph
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Sterling, Norman W.
Clark, Brad	Klees, Frank	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Marland, Margaret	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.

Cunningham, Dianne	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	McDonald, AL	Turnbull, David
Ecker, Janet	Miller, Norm	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Eves, Ernie	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Galt, Doug	Murdoch, Bill	Wood, Bob
Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn	Young, David
Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan	
Guzzo, Garry J.	O'Toole, John	

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Dombrowsky, Leona	McGuinty, Dalton
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Parsons, Ernie
Bisson, Gilles	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Boyer, Claudette	Kennedy, Gerard	Prue, Michael
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Caplan, David	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ruprecht, Tony
Conway, Sean G.	Marchese, Rosario	Sergio, Mario
Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley	Smitherman, George
Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony	Sorbara, Greg

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 49; the nays are 33.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):

On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Given the occasion, I seek unanimous consent for a moment of silence commemorating the passing of the Taxpayer Protection Act.

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

Order. Let's take a second. There seem to be quite a few people who are going to leave the House; if you'd do so quickly and quietly.

RELIABLE ENERGY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LA FIABILITÉ DE L'ÉNERGIE ET LA PROTECTION DES CONSOMMATEURS

Mr Stockwell moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 58, An Act to amend certain statutes in relation to the energy sector / Projet de loi 58, Loi modifiant certaines lois en ce qui concerne le secteur de l'énergie.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson):

The government House leader to speak to the bill.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I'll be speaking as the Minister of Energy, obviously, since it is G58, which is an energy bill.

We've agreed to an hour split. I think it's part of the time allocation motion. It's 20 minutes per caucus, just to alert the other caucuses. I'm not sharing my time on this side, so you've got 20 minutes each for the hour debate.

This legislation has had much talk, much debate, much discussion in this House. I think it's been helpful, it's been interesting, it's been a little inaccurate at times, but it has been good debate that I think was necessitated by a decision by Justice Gans. Although I didn't agree with Justice Gans's decision, I've said many times it may have been a blessing in disguise, because it allowed us the opportunity of providing more public input into the decision on Hydro One, which I think was needed at that point in time. It allowed the opportunity for the Liberals to change their minds from December 12, when they were fully in favour of privatizing the transmission line; and today, of course, you know Mr McGuinty's position is that he thought too quickly that day. When he thinks too quickly, he makes mistakes. So he has learned a lesson: he shouldn't think quickly, he should think slowly.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Stockwell: The member for Hamilton East, I believe, is suggesting that some people shouldn't think at all, and I agree with him. I think he sometimes over-thinks issues. No, I just made that up.

I think it's going to ensure competitive safety and a competitive supply of energy. Bill 58 ensures that there's the necessary capital to rebuild and modernize electricity transmission and distribution, bring private sector discipline to Hydro One and eliminate and prevent recurrences of the \$38 billion in debt and other liabilities amassed by the old Ontario Hydro. Ultimately, this piece of legislation is designed to protect consumers. Ultimately, the consumers are at the bottom of every one of these debates: how do we protect consumers and ratepayers in the province of Ontario?

Although there were many machinations and much debate from the other side, there was very little debate about the fact that Ontario Hydro was a badly run operation. It was an operation that was seriously in debt and had very little in the way of assets; \$38 billion in debt and \$17 billion in assets. You know, it's one of the few collective times all parties can take credit for the mess that Hydro was in, because every party at one time or another had an opportunity to fix the mess and they didn't. Ultimately, what we ended up doing was not what Sir Adam Beck wanted us to do, which was to provide power at cost. We were providing power at below cost.

1620

I talked to many Ontarians around the province, and they said their concern is that they have bought and paid for Hydro, and their concern about privatization was that they had bought and paid for it. The reality is that they did buy Hydro; they just forgot to pay for it. By not paying for it, they ran up huge debts, to the point that 35 cents of every dollar you spend on a hydro bill goes to service debt. It doesn't go to build new lines, it doesn't go to operate better, it doesn't go to return or reduce the cost of hydro; it goes to service debt that we've acquired over these many years.

In public consultations held in April and May and in legislative committee hearings held in June, our govern-

ment consulted and listened to the people of Ontario. After listening to their views, our government has made it clear that we will hold on to at least 51% of Hydro One. We are still considering how best to bring private sector discipline to Hydro One. The net proceeds—that is, the proceeds less the cost of the transaction—from any sale of the shares will go toward paying down the old Ontario Hydro debt of \$38 billion.

The Deputy Speaker: I'm going to ask members again to please keep the noise level down. There aren't that many members in the House. There's no reason for that much volume. Please give the minister the respect he deserves.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Both the consultations held in April and May 2002 and the legislative committee hearings held in June provided thoughtful suggestions on how to achieve needed investment in transmission infrastructure. Should the proposed legislation be passed, the Ontario government would take ownership of the transmission corridor lands previously owned by Hydro One. This is the first road we crossed. There was some concern from municipalities, and I live in one of those municipalities that expressed concern—Toronto. They want to ensure that the lands the power lines beneath maintain public ownership, and we agreed to do that in this legislation. So the lands will still be owned by the government. The transmission wires can be privatized up to 49%, but the lands will still be controlled by public ownership and the government. It's important we do that, because in Toronto and other cities there are uses. Soccer fields and garden allotments are just two examples of how they use hydro fields around Ontario.

The proposed legislation will offer even greater protection to consumers through a new energy consumers' bill of rights, which would include government authority to prescribe the content and presentation of contracts; a prohibition on unfair practices; a prohibition against false advertising; extended 30-day right to cancel, requiring reaffirmation by the consumer for any contract between days 15 and 30; a requirement that consumers would have to reaffirm future contract renewals should they wish to do so, and that's basically the negative optioning argument; new owners for the Ontario Energy Board to enforce these additional requirements.

The proposed legislation would offer greater protection of the environment by strengthening the rules governing water power generators. Environmental information tracking and reporting would allow consumers to make informed choices about green energy.

That is, in a nutshell, the way the bill is supposed to work.

I want to talk briefly about why it's good to go this way with respect to privatizing OPG and looking for a market operator for Hydro One. There has been much talk by the opposition parties—and I want to try to not tease the bears too much today; I want to try to give a very concise answer to some of the concerns—about the fact that we operate coal-fired plants. I think the member for St Catharines and the member for Toronto-Danforth

made a lot of arguments about the coal-fired plants. I want to get it on the record right now, and very clearly in this calm moment, which I generally haven't had during question period. It will allow me to explain it maybe in a better way, in a more fulsome way, in a more relaxed way.

The coal-fired plants operate in Ontario and provide somewhere between 15% and 20% of our hydro needs on certain capacity days. Nobody really wants to see coal-fired plants operating. When coal-fired plants were brought to the forefront, there wasn't the knowledge then that we have today about how they are polluting the air. Many jurisdictions operate almost strictly on coal-fired plants. Ohio, for instance, operates almost strictly on coal-fired plants. In the northeastern United States, there are about 200 coal-fired plants; in Ontario, there are five. One is slated for conversion in 2007, so we'll have four. But you can see the magnitude of the coal-fired plant problem, with 200 coal-fired plants in the northeast and four or five in Ontario. They are one of the worst polluters. I don't deny they are one of the worst polluters. I know I get questions from the member for St Catharines and the member for Toronto-Danforth on a fairly regular basis asking, "Why don't you shut down the coal-fired plants?"

Interjection.

Hon Mr Stockwell: You know what, I say to the member for Hamilton East, it's not a bad idea. It is a good idea. I'm in full agreement with you. But you need to plan how you're going to go shutting these things down before you actually shut them down. The first reason is, if we did shut down the coal-fired plants, there would be blackouts in Ontario. Imagine blackouts in homes, in seniors' centres, in hospitals, where electricity is not just necessary, it's life-sustaining. There are a lot of people who live at their homes these days who need certain respirators and certain programs that hydro provides the operation for. If we had blackouts around Ontario, these people would die. It's just that simple. If hospitals didn't have power, people would die.

It may sound good to say, "Close the coal-fired plants," but the reality is, we can't. We can't close the coal-fired plants. So this government did something that I think was visionary, and it was something no government would do in the past. They privatized the generation side of power. They said, "OK, we've got to have a competitive market out there, and by creating a competitive market we'll get people into Ontario to build generators, build capacity and put power on the grid. By putting power on the grid, we will then have an oversupply, overcapacity."

At the time of having overcapacity then, governments have removed their shackles about the coal-fired plants. With overcapacity, we can now make a decision potentially in four or five years that these coal-fired plants are polluting the environment and maybe we should shut them down, without any fear that we'd have blackouts around the province.

I don't know why the members in the House were opposed to that. If they would admit—and I know they know it to be true, because I know they were in government, these same people. Mr Bradley was the environment minister when he was with the Liberals. I know the member for Toronto-Danforth may not have been the environment minister, but I know she understands the environment ministry when she was the member of the government with the NDP. They both know that they didn't close the coal-fired plants down. I don't blame them. I know why they couldn't close the coal-fired plants. I understand why they couldn't. What I do blame them for is, they didn't put a plan in place that would potentially one day close them down, and that's what this government has done.

It's an issue that I think has created a lot of energy and a lot of action and a lot of dissent, but when I end up explaining to them what the problem is by closing coal-fired plants and the plan we have to potentially one day see them phase themselves out, there seem to be a lot of eyes opened up and agreement and nodding that, "Well, OK, that seems to be the best approach to take," and that is the approach we did take.

By providing power and by providing competitive pricing for the grid and the spot market, we're getting people building wind power. We've got wind power plants. We've got a proposal for 400 wind power plants today, as we have. There's a proposal that they're going to build 400 in one spot. Bruce nuclear is building four or five this summer alone. There are companies out there in the north that are building wind power. Solar power is another one. If we can get Pickering up and Bruce A up for providing nuclear power—now, I know the NDP and the Liberals in previous lifetimes argued against nuclear power as being bad power. Well, the world's kind of changed a little bit because now they're starting to say it's green power because it doesn't pollute like coal-fired plants. But if we can get those plants up we're starting to create the supply we need in order to deal with the coal-fired plant problem.

The other problem we have with respect to coal-fired plants is, in our airshed in southern Ontario 50% of the pollution on the smog days comes from the United States. I'm not blaming the Americans. Well, I guess I am. I am blaming the Americans. I'm not apologizing. I'm not trying to skate around the issue. It still doesn't mean that we should ever have smog days in Toronto. But 50% of the smog comes from the Americans. About 7% comes from coal-fired plants, period.

I guess the difficulty we're going to have to face is that air knows no boundaries and airsheds know no boundaries. Air moves as it sees fit, and when 50% of the problem comes from the Americans we've got a problem not just internally but we've got a problem with the Americans. We've got 200 coal-fired plants in the Ohio-Pennsylvania-New York region that are spewing this stuff in the air and it's coming up to Ontario.

We've got to get some kind of federal initiative going with the provinces and the feds, and a good example of

that, I say to the members in the House, is when they did the Great Lakes work. The federal government met with the federal government of the United States and the state governments met with the provincial governments, and they developed a really good strategy to try and deal with the Great Lakes pollution. We need that kind of strategy when it comes to air, because we can't fight it on our own. We can't stop the 50% of pollutants that are crossing the border polluting our cities and towns. We can't do it on our own. We can try, but we can't. So we need an initiative started at the federal level that I'll tell you the provinces would kick into in a heartbeat to try to resolve this air issue.

1630

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Quorum.

The Deputy Speaker: Could the clerk please advise if there is a quorum?

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

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is present, Speaker.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The minister may now continue.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I want to thank the member for St Paul's for providing me with a quorum. I know he did a—

Mr Bryant: I wanted more people to hear this.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I know you did, and I know he's working for me, not against me.

I also want to talk about the transmission side of things as well. The transmission side has been a much-discussed decision of Ontario Hydro.

Let me say this: I don't want to be an alarmist. I try not to get too out in front on these issues, but the real cost structure for hydro isn't in the hydro lines. It's not the grid that's going to drive the price of hydro, although it's made the most noise, although you've had more discussion, more groups and public hearings, about the privatization of the hydro grid.

For people who don't understand what the grid is, the grid is the big wires that travel through the province of Ontario. The small wires that take the power to your house are from the distribution side. They're run by your local municipality. The big grid is what Hydro One is.

All those people who generate power, that's the third arm. They're the generators. They generate power and put it on to the grid. Then they try to sell it to the end user and it's delivered by the distribution companies.

The price of power is really not as contingent on the hydro, the big grid, as it is on how much it costs to produce the power.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): On a point of order, Speaker: The minister lost his quorum again. Can you check the quorum?

The Deputy Speaker: We'll check again for quorum.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is not present, Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

Clerk Assistant: A quorum is present, Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The minister may continue.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I want to thank those who are coming in, including my friend Bob Wood from the London region who's very understanding and knowledgeable about the hydro issues, and other things.

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs): What am I—chopped liver?

Hon Mr Stockwell: Yes. And my friend Chopped Liver. I'd like to also say—

Hon Mr Baird: What about Philip De Souza?

Hon Mr Stockwell: Philip De Souza. I know that Amanda's here, waiting to hear; Amanda Kusar. Of course, Peter Hardie's here, listening to all these words. All the good staff in my office: Maxine McGuigan's been working very hard on this file; and Sarah in my office; and Brandy, of course. Brandy's doing a wonderful job in the House leader's office. Many of those people who work very hard to—you may think, people out there, that we just show up and this stuff just trips off the tops of our heads, but it doesn't. There are hard-working people working behind the scenes who all do good works to make us all look so quick, intelligent and spot-on. "Spot-on" is a favourite phrase, I know, from the member for Hamilton West. Our short and likeable man, Mr Floyd Laughren, was Mr Spot-On in this House for five years. The trouble was, he just couldn't nail the spot-on number.

Do you know what? As I explained this around the province, with the help of those people that I mentioned earlier—Brandy, we spoke about—people seem to get to understand that it isn't quite as huge a deal about the Hydro One transmission side of things as it is about the generation side.

The generation side is the driving price of hydro. When you can generate power, most of the cost of the power is not the cost of what it takes to deliver it to your home; it's the cost it takes to generate the power. I will tell you this: since we opened the market on May 1, we have seen a reduction in power rates of some 25% to 30%, some days more. Only one day in the last 60 has the price of power exceeded what it was before we opened the market on May 1.

Privatization works. Deregulation worked on the power side. Don't confuse deregulation on the generation side with the transmission side. We have deregulation on the power side because it's a competitive market. There are lots of people who bid power, lots of people who produce power and lots of people who put it on the grid. Competition is good; I believe in competition. I know my friends in the NDP and most of my friends in the Liberal Party don't believe in it the way I do. We have a different point of view. But I believe in competition. Competition is the best way to create good, affordable hydro. It also makes it affordable because you're not running up public debt. That's what I believe in. I believe in the competition side.

But on the hydro side, the grid side, that isn't open competition. That wasn't deregulated; it was regulated. The Ontario Energy Board regulates how much money

Hydro One can make. They can only make a 9.88% return on investment. There can be no profit-taking. I appreciate the fact they try to paint a different picture, but there can be no profit-taking on Hydro One.

I know Mr Kormos understands that. The difficulty is that he chooses not to understand. He chooses to ignore the facts and regurgitate what he chooses to regurgitate, knowing full well it's wrong. I saw him downstairs in the committee hearings with Mr Murdoch's bill making the suggestion that I was in fact trying to change this bill and rob him of the opportunity to pass it in this House. The whole truth of the matter is that he was a wolf in sheep's clothing. He's the member who is opposing Mr Murdoch's getting his bill passed today. He's the one who won't give unanimous consent.

But he doesn't like not to be liked, so he goes around and fabricates to some degree and works around these issues and tries to suggest to people that it's really someone else who's working against him. I thought it was interesting that day in the House, how he tried to negotiate with Mr Murdoch and convince him that I was opposing his Bill 74. The whole time it was him. He won't give unanimous consent to Bill 74; he won't give unanimous consent to Bill 3, the clean water act; he won't give unanimous consent to Bill 148. He won't give unanimous consent to anything.

I see him work his way around this caucus and this House, trying to convince all the members who sit in here that really the bad person is the government House leader. But I know my friends in this room and I know they're too smart for that. I know they've seen that before from Mr Kormos, how he tries to connive and work his way and wheedle through these seats and talk to members and convince them that he's really not the bad guy; the government House leader is. The whole time he's a sheep, but it's a wolf. There's a wolf underneath that sheep.

You see, he puts his arms around their desks and he cuddles up to them to convince them he's really their friend, when he's not. He's working the system. He'll hug them; he'll kiss them; he'll convince them. But he's working the system with subterfuge, trying to convince his own members as well as others that he's truly working for their best benefit when we know one thing, and one thing for certain. In all the years I've been here, I know this much about the member for Welland: the member for Welland never does anything unless he's got something in it for him. If he has to sacrifice his poor caucus members who want to get something accomplished for his own good will, his own benefit, his own charge, his own re-election plans, my friends, be forewarned: he will do that. He's not a very nice man when it comes to that stuff.

Mr Bryant: I'm going to be sharing my time, in all likelihood, with the member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. We're here debating the third reading of the blank cheque bill. Let's just say this: boy, have you guys over there in the government messed up the electricity marketplace with what you've done—the botch-up, the

waffling—with electricity transmission. There has been a direct correlation between volatility in the market on the one hand and the botch-up with Hydro One on the other hand. This bill has been brought in to fix it, but this is truly a billion-dollar botch-up somehow orchestrated by the very government that put together the energy marketplace. I am, in the short amount of time I have, going to make reference to some of the supporters of the electricity competition marketplace who, during committee hearings, offered quite direct concerns and criticism of this government in terms of the effect of the Hydro One botch-up on the electricity generation marketplace.

1640

The energy minister spoke at some length about the distinction between the two and that, yes, there is not competition within the transmission side, which makes it all the more bizarre that Hydro One would have been engaging in quite a significant sponsorship of a number of good and not-so-great causes to try to raise their profile in circumstances in which they have no competition. It made no sense.

Let's not forget where this began. The Hydro One blank cheque began, I believe, on April 17. Mr Justice Gans handed down a decision that confirmed what Energy Minister Wilson had said previously, which was that there were never any plans to privatize and sell the transmission highway. Instead, the plan was to keep it public. There was no legislation to do that, yet the rule of law has taken a pretty serious beating under the Eves government. First they tried to sell off Hydro One without having the lawful authority, then I guess they tried to infringe the Taxpayer Protection Act, even though it violates the very bill that they created. Now, ironically, they're saying that the only time they're going to get tough, if you like, on observing legislation is when it comes to public education. They don't want the trustees to respond to the circumstances; only they are allowed to say that sometimes we need to admit that the government makes mistakes and then in the case of public education we need to listen to these trustees and move forward on improving public education.

But back to Hydro. This bill is a blank cheque bill which is being rushed through. This bill, of course, will permit the government to sell, do whatever it wants, with Hydro One. You don't find out what's going on here. We are subverting the parliamentary process. Instead of the executive coming here and asking the Legislature to approve what it wants to do, the executive is coming here and saying, "Give us a blank cheque and we'll do it in the middle of July or August or whenever."

We don't know what the government's going to do. We have no idea. Even if the government said what they were going to do, frankly, it would be difficult to trust that particular position, when you consider that this government said, "Absolutely, the IPO is the way to go. We must sell Hydro One." We heard it in December, in January, in February, in March and April, before the courts, and then after the decision came down we heard it

again from the Premier and we heard it again from the finance minister. Then the government filed its factum and the factum said, "Yes, we're going to sell Hydro One." Then a by-election came along and suddenly selling Hydro One was off the table. Right after the by-election it was back on the table.

We asked questions in this House and one day the status quo was on the table, one day off the table. Leaked out in the midst of scrums, we found out that an income trust, a strategic sale, a lease and other options were on the table, sometimes off the table. One moment it sounded like an income trust was the way the government was going to go, and then I think it was either the Premier or the energy minister contradicted the other. It's difficult to keep track of whether it's on the table or off the table. But now they're getting a bill, so that whenever they do make up their mind, they're going to be able to do it, but not with legislative approval; they're getting a blank cheque.

To make matters worse, not only is it defying the democratic tradition and really pulverizing this parliamentary process and tradition, but it's also being rammed through with a guillotine motion. Unbelievable, a guillotine motion on such an important issue that they're ducking. We're getting the guillotine motion, so we have very little time to debate this as a result.

The problem is, just as the Electricity Act had in it something that the government found out afterwards meant they couldn't sell it, who knows what's in this bill that the government may have to come back and fix again. As a matter of fact, I don't know if you know this, but when this bill came back through committee for clause-by-clause, the government admitted that there were over 40 mistakes in the bill—40. There were more than 40 amendments to this bill. And I have a feeling if we had another week to go there might have been another 10 or 20. Many of them were referred to as technical amendments. You know what that means. That means there was a mistake.

I know that the people who are working at the Ministry of Energy are working overtime. They must be dizzy. One day they come to work and they're told, "IPO." The day next day they're told, "No IPO." The next day they're told, "This is legal, we're going to appeal it." The next thing they're told, "We're going to bring in legislation and ram this through. But hurry up," they say, "because we've got to get this done by June." So they work as hard as they can and they get it forward. We get a guillotine motion on the committee hearings and we get a guillotine motion on debate. So if there are mistakes in this bill, they are obviously of the government's making, and this is what happens when you rush through legislation.

We found out through the privacy commissioner that there was a veil of secrecy being snuck into this bill that was going to inhibit both the officer of the Legislature, the privacy commissioner, and also all consumers from seeing what's going on. The government said, "We have to protect trade secrets." The protection is already there

to deal with trade secrets, in the existing freedom of information legislation. There are already those protections in there. So under the guise of a consumer protection bill, it's actually a consumer blindfold.

Lastly, I want to speak to this volatility. The government's electricity competition marketplace has been harmed by what has happened. We heard that from some of the very people who support this electricity marketplace. When I asked the chair of the Ontario Energy Association about his reference to disruptions during the committee hearings, he said, "I think the investment community and the energy marketplace and industry generally were very concerned about the disruptions caused by what had gone on with Hydro One." That means the volatility caused by Hydro One affects the energy marketplace, which in turn affects prices, and consumers pay the price for the government's incompetence.

But there was more. The president and CEO of the Toronto Board of Trade said, "Generally when you have a plan laid out, the smooth implementation of that plan from a business perspective is better because business likes certainty. When there's a plan laid out, they like to see that plan put forward." Makes sense. "Our comment would be," says the president and CEO of the board of trade, "that there has been a lot of recent volatility and the sooner we get that plan laid out and moving forward again, the better it will be for ensuring"—as one of the previous people mentioned—"that we have certainty back in the market so that the people who have invested take comfort and stay involved and engaged in that market."

The chair of the electricity task force of the board of trade echoed that comment and said, "The major concern is a lack of certainty.... the opening of the market went extremely smoothly, and that's a credit to all involved. That is the result of good planning. It is a pity," he said, "that that might be compromised due to lack of planning."

The concern here—it's not just about upsetting investors—is the impact it has on consumers. If you have volatility, then what you're going to have is an inhibition for others to come in, to bring in greener power, to bring in cleaner power. They're not going to come in and do that because there's volatility in the marketplace. To make matters worse, in the midst of trading, in the midst of that volatility, you're going to have prices go up. Prices will go up not just because of the vicissitudes of the market, but also because of that volatility. That means prices are going to go up even more than had the government handled the transmission file competently. They tried to ram it through at the same time as the market was opening, and there has been a tremendous amount of criticism of the government for that. Why would they do that when they know they would risk bringing in volatility?

Why would they do that? The answer is that in the midst of the market opening, in the midst of the throne speech, in the midst of the leadership race and in the

midst of the budget, the government thought it could sell Hydro One without having to come to this Legislature. It would be sort of under the radar screen. All of the efforts to decry the sale of Hydro One would be lost. They wouldn't be heard and there'd be no way to stop it. Of course that ended with the decision of Justice Gans. But the decision in December to move forward as quickly as the government did with the sale of Hydro One ended up ramming right up against the opening up of the marketplace in these early days, in many ways the most important days, the most volatile days.

1650

Yes, we've gone through a shoulder season, but we don't know if in fact prices might have been lower. We're moving out of the shoulder season now, but we don't know if prices would have been even lower had the Hydro One file not been messing with the market.

At the time, the Premier had an option. He could have said, right there and then, "We have a new direction here. We've come so far"—remember, that was his slogan—"and I don't want this disruption to disrupt the opening of the marketplace. It's too important." Years of work, discussion and debate had gone into it. A select committee had discussed and debated the very idea and rendered reports, and we've spoken about that before. He could have said right there—it wouldn't have taken much imagination.

Everybody was writing columns saying, "This will be your Spadina Expressway. You can be just like Bill Davis and show you're different." The Premier could have said, "I'm different. The Hydro One sale is off the table." Look what happened. If the government wants to try and spin this as the Spadina expressway of the Eves government, then it's an expressway that really plowed itself right into Lake Ontario. It's kind of like, "We've come so far," says the government, "and now we have no idea where we're going."

What happened on this electricity file has been a journey of incompetence that started with rushed decisions back in December, a journey of incompetence that continued through the insistence, I think by a lot of people, probably privately and some publicly, that they ought not to proceed with electricity transmission reform without getting a mandate from the people. Then there are others in the industry and the marketplace who said, "I'm less concerned about the mandate than I am about what this is going to do to the marketplace itself." Consumer groups were saying, "We're concerned," not even so much about the mandate and not even so much about the market, although they were on behalf of consumers; they were concerned about the prices going up.

Then the journey of incompetence continued as we headed into waffles: waffles in the morning, waffles for lunch, waffles for dinner; IPO on the table, off the table; income trust; strategic sale. They didn't seem to know what they were doing.

Along goes the journey of incompetence until finally we get the news: "Oh, well, maybe we aren't going to give up control over a majority of Hydro One," and the

hue and cry from the other side when we didn't stand up and give them a standing ovation. The admission by this government that a majority of Hydro One must stay public was a vindication of all those citizens who said all along that Hydro One, the electricity transmission highway, must stay public. It was a great day for them. I can't say it was a great day for democracy because we've got a bill here which is an absolute abomination in democratic terms. Nonetheless, it was a vindication.

For those who were critical of those of us on this side of the House who represented all those citizens who were opposed to the sale of Hydro One, I guess we got some political criticism for not giving the government a standing ovation. Forget it. It was vindication of all those citizens who said, "The government's got it wrong." For us to turn around and pretend that the government had it right all along frankly would have been letting those people down.

Even more so, all of us here on this side of the House believe very strongly that we have to keep watch on this file, because it has changed so often. Yes, the government has admitted—it is an extraordinary concession for the government to say, month after month, that Hydro One ought to be privatized, and then to say, "Oops, in fact, most of Hydro One should not be privatized." It's an extraordinary concession. I'm glad they made it, it's better than the alternative, but why should we trust them now with the transmission highway when they so bungled it all along? Why, when the journey of incompetence has taken us finally to a decent pit stop—not the right pit stop but a decent pit stop—should we trust the government to drive this Hydro One expressway, as it were, without keeping watch?

Well, we're not. We are going to keep watch. We have to, and that's why Ontario Liberals brought in amendments to this bill, to protect secrecy, to deal with the concerns of the Information and Privacy Commissioner—shot down by the government. What a strange way to deal with an officer of the Legislature who has raised concerns: "Thanks for your letter. No, we're not going to hear from you. No, we're not going to extend committee hearings. We disagreed with you in 1998; we disagree with you again now. Go away." No formal response, no hearings, no invitation, nothing—treating that particular officer of the Legislature with great disdain.

Another one, the Provincial Auditor, was also dismissed when he said the failure to get Pickering A started on time—it's months late and over \$1.5 billion over budget—is going to affect consumers because it's going to drive prices up. The energy minister dismissed the Provincial Auditor. He said, "That's ridiculous. No, no. He's wrong. It's not." He said that when Pickering comes on line, it's going to drive prices down. That's interesting. How does that work? If, when Pickering comes on, prices go down, doesn't that mean that as long as Pickering isn't on line, prices are driven up? Doesn't that make sense? I think that makes sense to most Ontarians, but that's not Stockwell logic. Stockwell logic is that

Pickering A nuclear plant's failure to start up, while unacceptable, is going to have no effect on prices. Poppycock, I say. That just cannot be the case. If the Pickering A nuclear plant's presence will drive prices down, it means that its absence is driving prices up.

The bottom line is that this has been a billion-dollar botch-up, a journey of incompetence, volatility brought to the marketplace because of the way the Hydro One file was dealt with. The very people who are trying to make the energy marketplace work, supporting the marketplace against some vociferous political opposition, say that the way to make it work is to lay out a plan, stick with the plan and just run the business in a way that provides for a market that's attractive, which means more power made in Ontario. It means that hopefully we won't have to one day import power from outside Ontario; it means we can produce greener, cleaner power; and it means we can convert these coal-burning plants into cleaner-burning plants.

But all that becomes jeopardized because of what happened with this bill. Besides the volatility and besides the billion-dollar botch-up, what really offends me personally more than anything about this bill is that the government wants a blank cheque. The government wants us to trust this cabinet and this Premier with the future of Hydro One, a cabinet that in one month said that selling it was the only way to go, and then in the next month said it's not the way to go.

I think the people of Ontario have every right not to trust this government with the future of the electricity transmission highway. That is why, without any hesitation, I think most citizens of Ontario will see this botch-up for what it is, will see this legislation for what it is and will not support the efforts of the government to do what it's trying to do.

The Hydro One transmission engine must stay in public hands, and the effort to take it out and then put it back in and leave people in the dark has truly been one of its darkest hours. We will be voting against this bill.

1700

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): This is a debate concerning Bill 58, the government's legislation that would allow it to privatize all or part of Hydro One, Ontario's electricity transmission system.

I have a number of things I want to say about the unwise move to take what has been a natural monopoly and turn it into a private monopoly. I have a number of comments I want to make concerning how essential electricity is in the 21st-century economy, that electricity is perhaps more essential than ever before in terms of people being able to participate in society and in the economy, and therefore this ought to remain a public service that is available to people at cost and not become a profit-driven enterprise where some people may be excluded from accessing electricity simply because they do not have sufficient income.

With your indulgence, though, I am going to put those comments about Bill 58 aside for a moment to deal with a potential crisis I was just made aware of, which might

be precipitated by one of the clauses in this bill. I apologize to the Minister of Energy for not having had the opportunity to raise this with him directly, but I will do so as soon as I sit down.

This latest development has the potential to rock the financial community not only in Ontario but nationwide. I cannot underscore enough the significance of what I am about to bring before this House, and I undertake now that should the government House leader and Minister of Energy wish to move an amendment to his bill at third reading, he has my undertaking, on behalf of my entire caucus, that we will give the requisite unanimous consent for the minister to not only introduce the amendment but have it passed without debate.

Before we get to that point, however, I respectfully request that we follow the lead of jurisdictions such as the federal Parliament in Ottawa when dealing with matters of such extreme sensitivity. Speaker, there have been times in our national history when it has been absolutely essential that a Legislature meet in camera so that confidential information can be shared with members of this House in regard to exigencies that, if not addressed before they come into the public domain, will have an adverse impact on the public interest. The conclusion I have reached in conjunction with my colleagues is that the information we have just received represents such a circumstance.

As Marleau and Montpetit remind us, “Although not explicitly provided for in the standing orders, the House has the right and authority to conduct its proceedings in private.” That is from page 350 of Marleau and Montpetit’s House of Commons Procedure and Practice. In fact, our own committees, which are but delegated bodies of this House, do it on a regular basis. Just this morning, the public accounts committee moved to hold its meetings in camera, something it would not be able to do if the House as a whole did not enjoy that same ability.

As has been done before in our federal House, the British Parliament and the French Legislature, I am therefore going to move a motion that will allow this assembly to meet in a secret session solely for the purpose of disposing of Bill 58, An Act to amend certain statutes in relation to the energy sector. Once my motion is moved and that session is held, I will be able to explain in much more detail the reasons on account of which I think it is necessary.

Speaker, I move that the remainder of the sittings in this session shall be a secret session until the House shall then otherwise order, and that all strangers be ordered to withdraw during such secret session.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. I ask the Clerk to stop the clock, and I’ll just take a moment to consult with the Table.

Hon Mr Stockwell: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am in your hands. I am prepared to argue the government’s position on what he has done today, but I don’t want to prolong it; obviously, we have an hour’s debate.

So I’ll leave it in your hands if you want to hear my concerns.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. At this point, the precedent in Ottawa is that only the government has the right to move such a motion. However, given the fact that this is coming from the leader of one of the parties, and I would take the same importance if it came from a House leader, I will afford very brief—I don’t want to get too lost here, but this is obviously very important and I want to treat it that way. But I’ll take just a moment before I enforce what I’ve just ruled to listen to the House leader from the third party, the government, the official opposition and then, if you can persuade me otherwise, I’ll reconsider. But other than that, I’m going in the direction of ruling it out of order.

I would ask each of the caucus representatives to please keep your remarks brief because it is unlikely that this ruling will change, but I will afford you that opportunity. I’ll look to the House leader of the third party first to see if he wishes the floor.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Speaker, as you know, our standing orders do not provide for this motion. Therefore, we rely upon standing order 1(c). Standing order 1(c), as you know, speaks to all contingencies not provided for in the standing orders. This—I believe it’s common ground—is one of them.

(1) You, making the decision, “shall base the decision on the democratic rights of members referred to in clause (b).” In this respect, I would put to you that standing order 1(b)(i), the democratic rights of members to submit motions for the consideration of the Assembly—that’s precisely what was done by the leader of the New Democratic Party, who submitted a motion.

(2) You shall also “have regard to any applicable usages and precedents.” What that indicates clearly is that you are not bound by usages and precedents but rather that you’re guided by them. I put to you that I am not aware of any precedents in this Legislature that would be of guidance to the Speaker. That does not mean there aren’t any. I’m simply telling you that after some thorough effort to find any, I am not aware of any. Too, I acknowledge and submit, quite frankly, that you should be having regard to precedents and usages. But again the operative word here is “regard.”

I submit as well that there is clear, in standing order 1(b)(i)—which is, if anything, the interpretive guide for the standing orders. It’s referred to so frequently, and I believe there’s no dispute about that. It’s the interpretive guide. It speaks about the purpose, and here, “that respects the democratic rights.” Again, it speaks very clearly about rights. Here it’s the right of a member, the right to submit a motion. It’s a motion that, yes, has a very peculiar impact on the standing of this House in the context of this particular debate. But I submit to you that the mere reliance, as referred to by the Speaker, on a federal precedent—I also want to make it very clear that this is a request for a session to be in camera, as compared to other somewhat similar, but certainly not identical, requests. That quite frankly goes to a request,

let's say, for the exclusion of strangers. It's a far different scenario for in camera than there is for the exclusion of strangers. For instance, for the mere exclusion of strangers, there is still a Hansard kept. "In camera" implies restrictions on the Hansard as well.

I put to you that there are some other considerations here that make this special and distinct: the rights of members to move a motion stated boldly and clearly in our standing orders, and the fact of mere regard. I submit that you have to tailor your response to the circumstances as they are here.

The Deputy Speaker: I appreciate and thank you for your submission. I look to the government House leader for the same.

1710

Hon Mr Stockwell: I don't want to take up a lot of time. This is flat-out preposterous. Relying on 1(b), yes, members have the right to move a motion of adjournment of the House and adjournment of the debate. That's all well and good. If the argument the member is proffering doesn't have any precedents, you know why it doesn't have any precedents? Because there aren't any.

The fact of the matter remains that it's a preposterous argument. These are substantive motions, fully debatable. If that's the argument the person is putting forward, all members would end up putting fully debatable motions forward in this House. There would never be any ability of the government to order the business of the House or to get the House work done.

I don't want to take a lot of time. This is a classic case of the member having had too much time on his hands. If the ruling is that opposition members can move debatable, substantive motions, then we are in a heck of a mess in this place because there is no ability for the government to order business.

The Deputy Speaker: I'll afford the same opportunity—you don't need it.

I see you rising, leader of the third party. If you've got something new, I'll listen.

Mr Hampton: My argument, as I briefly outlined, is that our own committees in this Legislature, which are but delegated bodies of this House, in fact have the capacity and the right by motion—and it need not be a motion of a government member; it can be a motion by any member of the committee—to in fact proceed in camera. That is simply the motion I am making here. If I'd made this motion in public accounts committee this morning, that motion would be in order. If I made this motion in general government committee, that motion would be in order. If I made this motion in any other committee, it would be in order. So it can't possibly be that I would have those rights as a member in a committee, which is just a delegated body of this House, and not have those rights in this House.

I again repeat from Marleau and Montpetit who say, at page 350 of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, "Although not explicitly provided for in the standing orders, the House has the right and authority to conduct its proceedings in private." I would argue that if I have

the right as a member in committee to move that motion, then I must have the right as a member of this House to move that motion in the House, because I could not enjoy a different right or more rights in committee than I enjoy in the House. That would just be a logical absurdity because the committee procedure derives its procedure from the procedure of this House.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much. I appreciate the submissions by all those who made them. My ruling is that this is indeed a substantive motion. It would be in order during motions, assuming it came from the government. Therefore, I do rule that it is out of order at this time. Please start the clock. You have the floor again, leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: I do not want to debate your ruling but I am at a loss to understand how, as a member, I could enjoy rights in a committee of the Legislature but those rights are not similarly available in the Legislature as a whole. It seems to me there is a logical absurdity here. A member in committee can only exercise the same rights and privileges in committee that one can exercise in the House.

I want to outline in just a moment again the misguided direction here of the government. What we have currently is a transmission system in Ontario where any member of the Legislature can stand and ask questions about transmission rates. You can even stand and ask questions about the exorbitant salaries, bonuses and expense accounts of the executive membership at the transmission grid company. You can ask questions about future plans for the maintenance or development of that transmission company. You can ask questions about how this will be financed and when it will be done. You can ask all of those questions.

What the government has in mind, and you have to follow their language carefully, is that this will in part, they now say, be sold to a profit-driven company. But what we must really zero in on is the Premier's comments that in effect the profit-driven company will become the managing mind of the utility. In other words, what is an essential public service, what is an essential service for the Ontario economy, for Ontario consumers, Ontario businesses, will no longer be accountable to the public, should this government have its way; it will no longer be accountable to the people of Ontario through the Legislature and through legislative committees and through question period; it will no longer be any of those things. It will effectively be controlled, managed, from somewhere else, and just as we were told for over two years that the government had no concerns about the grossly inflated salaries, bonuses and expenses that were being paid at Hydro One, we will no longer be able to get acceptable answers on this front. We will no longer be able to raise in a publicly accountable way all of these things which are so essential to Ontario consumers, so essential to Ontario industry and, frankly, so essential to persons living across the breadth of this province.

That is why debate is essential on this bill. That is why consideration—and I would argue lengthy consider-

ation—is required on this bill. This has the potential of impacting every business in this province, no matter how large, no matter how small. It has the potential of impacting everyone’s hydro bill. It has the potential of affecting people’s tax bills, because if the cost of heating the community centre, if the cost of keeping ice in the rink, if the cost of keeping public—

The Deputy Speaker: Take your seat, please. Point of order, government House leader.

Hon Mr Stockwell: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The 60 minutes has expired for this debate time. We’re now closing in on 5:30 of the clock. I understand the game plan of the third party. It’s expired. I think we should move to the vote.

The Deputy Speaker: I’m aware that we have a bit of a dilemma. At least, I have a bit of a dilemma, in that I stopped the clock to allow the debate around the point of order to take place. One of the roles of the Chair is to remain as neutral as possible. That also means being aware when one inadvertently may become part of the actions of this place in terms of the dynamic between the three parties.

In hindsight, I probably should not have stopped the clock. We wouldn’t have had a problem at all and it would have been up to the leader of the third party to decide whether he chose to use his time debating the point of order or making his speech.

With that in mind, I personally apologize to the leader of the third party for not having handled it that way. However, I do believe if that error were not corrected now, a greater error could happen with regard to my inadvertent role in what’s happening on the floor. Therefore, with my apologies extended for any error that I may have made in stopping the clock, I do agree with the government House leader that the time allocation of one hour has expired and it is now time for the House to vote.

Therefore, pursuant to the order of the House dated June 10, 2002, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Stockwell has moved third reading of Bill 58. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please indicate by saying “aye.”

All those opposed, please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1720 to 1726.

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

Elliott, Brenda
Eves, Ernie
Galt, Doug
Gilchrist, Steve

Munro, Julia
Murdoch, Bill
Mushinski, Marilyn
O’Toole, John

Wilson, Jim
Wood, Bob
Young, David

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic
Bartolucci, Rick
Bisson, Gilles
Bountrogianni, Marie
Boyer, Claudette
Bryant, Michael
Caplan, David
Churley, Marilyn
Colle, Mike
Conway, Sean G.
Di Cocco, Caroline

Dombrowsky, Leona
Duncan, Dwight
Gravelle, Michael
Hampton, Howard
Kennedy, Gerard
Kormos, Peter
Kwinter, Monte
Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Marchese, Rosario
Martel, Shelley
Martin, Tony

McGuinty, Dalton
Parsons, Ernie
Peters, Steve
Phillips, Gerry
Prue, Michael
Pupatello, Sandra
Ramsay, David
Ruprecht, Tony
Smitherman, George
Sorbara, Greg

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 44, the nays are 32.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Hon Mr Stockwell: Mr Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to call the orders for second and third readings on Bill Pr2, Bill Pr3, Bill Pr5, Bill Pr8 and Bill Pr10 so that they may be moved and considered concurrently without debate.

The Deputy Speaker: There has been a request for unanimous consent. Is it agreed? Any opposed? Hearing none, the House is agreed to that process.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE ACT, 2002

Mr Smitherman moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Wycliffe College.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Any opposed? Hearing none, the motion is carried.

Mr Smitherman moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Wycliffe College.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Any opposed? Hearing none, I declare the motion carried.

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

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT (REMEMBRANCE DAY), 2002

Mr Guzzo moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Are there any opposed? Hearing none, the motion is carried.

Mr Guzzo moved third reading of the following bill:

Ayes

Arnott, Ted
Baird, John R.
Barrett, Toby
Beaubien, Marcel
Chudleigh, Ted
Clark, Brad
Clement, Tony
Coburn, Brian
Cunningham, Dianne
Dunlop, Garfield
Ecker, Janet

Gill, Raminder
Guzzo, Garry J.
Hardeman, Ernie
Hodgson, Chris
Jackson, Cameron
Klees, Frank
Marland, Margaret
Mazzilli, Frank
McDonald, AL
Miller, Norm
Molinari, Tina R.

Ouellette, Jerry J.
Runciman, Robert W.
Sampson, Rob
Spina, Joseph
Sterling, Norman W.
Stewart, R. Gary
Stockwell, Chris
Tascona, Joseph N.
Tsubouchi, David H.
Turnbull, David
Wettlaufer, Wayne

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I declare it carried.

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

GROVES MEMORIAL COMMUNITY
HOSPITAL ACT, 2002

Mr Arnott moved second reading of the following bill:
Bill Pr5, An Act respecting Groves Memorial Community Hospital.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mr Arnott moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting Groves Memorial Community Hospital.

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

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

1397399 ONTARIO INC. ACT, 2002

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

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive 1397399 Ontario Inc.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

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

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive 1397399 Ontario Inc.

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

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

ROYAL OTTAWA HEALTH CARE
GROUP/SERVICES DE SANTÉ
ROYAL OTTAWA ACT, 2002

Mrs Boyer, on behalf of Mr Patten, moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/Services de Santé Royal Ottawa.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Mrs Boyer, on behalf of Mr Patten, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/Services de Santé Royal Ottawa.

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

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

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: There may have been an oversight. There is

another private bill on the order paper. I seek unanimous consent for second and third reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the demolition of rental housing units in the City of Toronto.

The Deputy Speaker: There is a request for unanimous consent. I'm hearing a no. Sorry, member.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Speaker, His Honour awaits.

1740

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

SANCTION ROYALE

Hon James K. Bartleman (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present meetings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant (Ms Deborah Deller): The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 58, An Act to amend certain statutes in relation to the energy sector / Projet de loi 58, Loi modifiant certaines lois en ce qui concerne le secteur de l'énergie;

Bill 69, An Act to protect victims by prohibiting profiting from recounting of crime / Projet de loi 69, Loi visant à protéger les victimes en interdisant les gains tirés du récit d'actes criminels;

Bill 80, An Act respecting directors and officers of Hydro One Inc. and its subsidiaries / Projet de loi 80, Loi concernant les administrateurs et les dirigeants de Hydro One Inc. et de ses filiales;

Bill 81, An Act to provide standards with respect to the management of materials containing nutrients used on lands, to provide for the making of regulations with respect to farm animals and lands to which nutrients are applied, and to make related amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 81, Loi prévoyant des normes à l'égard de la gestion des matières contenant des éléments nutritifs utilisées sur les biens-fonds, prévoyant la prise de règlements à l'égard des animaux d'élevage et des biens-fonds sur lesquels des éléments nutritifs sont épandus et apportant des modifications connexes à d'autres lois;

Bill 86, An Act to rescue children trapped in the misery of prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation and to amend the Highway Traffic Act / Projet de loi 86, Loi visant à délivrer les enfants prisonniers de la prostitution et d'autres formes d'exploitation sexuelle et modifiant le Code de la route;

Bill 90, An Act to promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste / Projet de loi 90, Loi visant à

promouvoir la réduction, la réutilisation et le recyclage des déchets;

Bill 101, An Act to protect students from sexual abuse and to otherwise provide for the protection of students / Projet de loi 101, Loi visant à protéger les élèves contre les mauvais traitements d'ordre sexuel et à prévoir autrement leur protection;

Bill 109, An Act to implement the measures contained in the 2002 Ontario Budget and to implement other initiatives of the Government of Ontario / Projet de loi 109, Loi mettant en oeuvre certaines mesures énoncées dans le budget de l'Ontario de 2002 ainsi que d'autres initiatives du gouvernement de l'Ontario;

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;

Bill 135, An Act to recognize Ontario's recreational hunting and fishing heritage and to establish the Fish and Wildlife Heritage Commission / Projet de loi 135, Loi visant à reconnaître le patrimoine de la chasse et de la

pêche sportives en Ontario et à créer la Commission du patrimoine chasse et pêche;

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Wycliffe College;

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa;

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting Groves Memorial Community Hospital;

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive 1397399 Ontario Inc.;

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/Services de Santé Royal Ottawa.

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

Au nom de Sa Majesté, Son Honneur le lieutenant-gouverneur sanctionne ces projets de loi.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I move adjournment of the House.

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

This House stands adjourned until 6:45 this evening.

The House adjourned at 1746.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

continued from overleaf

PETITIONS

Highway 69	
Mr Bartolucci.....	1421
Competitive electricity market	
Mr Bisson.....	1423, 1425, 1426
Mr Prue.....	1423, 1424
Constitutional documents	
Mr Chudleigh.....	1423
Hydro One	
Mrs Dombrowsky.....	1423
Mr Lalonde.....	1425
Doctor shortage	
Mr Beaubien.....	1424
Ambulance services	
Mr Bradley.....	1424
Post-secondary education	
Mr Hastings.....	1424
Health care	
Mr Spina.....	1425
Special education funding	
Mr Parsons.....	1425
Maria K.	
Mr Kwinter.....	1426
Farm implement sector	
Mr Barrett.....	1426
Children's health services	
Mrs Boyer.....	1426
Education funding	
Mr Caplan.....	1427

THIRD READINGS

Hydro One Inc. Directors and Officers Act, 2002, Bill 80, Mr Stockwell	
Agreed to.....	1428
Keeping the Promise for Growth and Prosperity Act (2002 Budget), 2002, Bill 109, Mrs Ecker	
Agreed to.....	1429
Reliable Energy and Consumer Protection Act, 2002, Bill 58, Mr Stockwell	
Mr Stockwell.....	1429, 1436, 1437
Mr Bryant.....	1432
Mr Hampton.....	1435, 1437
Mr Kormos.....	1436
Agreed to.....	1438

SECOND READINGS

Keeping the Promise for Growth and Prosperity Act (2002 Budget), 2002, Bill 109, Mrs Ecker	
Agreed to.....	1428

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

Wycliffe College Act, 2002, Bill Pr2, Mr Smitherman	
Agreed to.....	1438

City of Ottawa Act (Remembrance Day), 2002, Bill Pr3, Mr Guzzo	
Agreed to.....	1439
Groves Memorial Community Hospital Act, 2002, Bill Pr5, Mr Arnott	
Agreed to.....	1439
1397399 Ontario Inc. Act, Bill Pr8, Mr O'Toole	
Agreed to.....	1439
Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/ Services de Santé Royal Ottawa Act, Bill Pr10, Mr Patten	
Agreed to.....	1439

ROYAL ASSENT

The Lieutenant Governor.....	1440
------------------------------	------

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors	
Mr Martin.....	1405
Mr Bartolucci.....	1412
Mrs Molinari.....	1427
Mr Kwinter.....	1427
Legislative pages	
Mr Jackson.....	1408
The Speaker.....	1408
Mr Kormos.....	1408
Hydro dam safety	
Mr Stockwell.....	1412

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeu­di 27 juin 2002

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2002 sur les normes de réparation en cas de collision, projet de loi 165, M. Klees	
Adoptée.....	1409
Loi de 2002 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne les assurances (assurance-automobile), projet de loi 166, M. Sampson	
Adoptée.....	1409
Loi de 2002 sur la protection des élèves anaphylactiques, projet de loi 167, M. Levac	
Adoptée.....	1409
Loi de 2002 sur les élections au sein de Welland Hydro, projet de loi 168, M. Kormos	
Adoptée.....	1410

Loi de 2002 sur l'étude du régime de retraite des députés, projet de loi 169, M. Murdoch	
Adoptée.....	1410
Loi de 2002 modifiant le Code de la route (autobus scolaires), projet de loi 170, M. Parsons	
Adoptée.....	1410
Loi de 2002 modifiant le Code de la route (sécurité des virages), projet de loi 171, M. Kormos	
Adoptée.....	1411
Loi de 2002 sur les drapeaux en berne, projet de loi 172, M. Chudleigh	
Adoptée.....	1411
Loi de 2002 sur la protection de la vue de la cathédrale St. James, projet de loi 173, M. Smitherman	
Adoptée.....	1411

PÉTITIONS

Services de santé pour enfants	
M ^{me} Boyer.....	1426

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2002 sur les administrateurs et les dirigeants de Hydro One Inc., projet de loi 80, M. Stockwell	
Adoptée.....	1428
Loi de 2002 sur le respect de l'engagement d'assurer la croissance et la prospérité (budget de 2002), projet de loi 109, M^{me} Ecker	
Adoptée.....	1429
Loi de 2002 sur la fiabilité de l'énergie et la protection des consommateurs, projet de loi 58, M. Stockwell	
Adoptée.....	1438

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2002 sur le respect de l'engagement d'assurer la croissance et la prospérité (budget de 2002), projet de loi 109, M^{me} Ecker	
Adoptée.....	1428

SANCTION ROYALE

Le lieutenant-gouverneur.....	1440
-------------------------------	------

CONTENTS

Thursday 27 June 2002

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Appointment of select committee, private member's notice of motion number 7, <i>Mr Duncan</i>	
Mr Duncan	1389, 1397
Mr Tascona	1390
Mrs Pupatello	1391
Ms Churley	1392
Mr Galt	1393
Mr Patten	1394
Mr Bradley	1395
Mr Christopherson	1396
Agreed to	1405
Tender fruit lands, private member's notice of motion number 8, <i>Mr Bradley</i>	
Mr Bradley	1397, 1405
Mr Kormos	1398
Mr Barrett	1400
Mr Phillips	1401
Mr Clark	1402
Mr Colle	1402
Mr Hudak	1403
Mr Levac	1404
Mr Tascona	1405
Agreed to	1405

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Labour dispute Mrs Dombrowsky	1405
Just the Ticket Mrs Munro	1406
Medical imaging technologies Mr Gravelle	1406
Canada Day celebrations Mr Gill	1406
Highway 69 Mr Bartolucci	1407
Jessie Bannerman Mr Spina	1407
Government's record Mr Duncan	1407
Adoption disclosure Ms Churley	1407
Mississauga Firefighters of the Year Mrs Marland	1408

FIRST READINGS

Collision Repair Standards Act, 2002, Bill 165, <i>Mr Klees</i>	
Agreed to	1409
Mr Klees	1409

Insurance Statute Law Amendment Act (Automobile Insurance), 2002, Bill 166, <i>Mr Sampson</i>	
Agreed to	1409
Mr Sampson	1409
Anaphylactic Students Protection Act, 2002, Bill 167, <i>Mr Levac</i>	
Agreed to	1409
Mr Levac	1409
Welland Hydro Elections Act, 2002, Bill 168, <i>Mr Kormos</i>	
Agreed to	1410
Mr Kormos	1410
MPPs Pension Plan Study Act, 2002, Bill 169, <i>Mr Murdoch</i>	
Agreed to	1410
Mrs Marland	1410
Highway Traffic Act Amendment Act, 2002 (School Buses), Bill 170, <i>Mr Parsons</i>	
Agreed to	1410
Mr Parsons	1410
Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Turn Safety), 2002, Bill 171, <i>Mr Kormos</i>	
Agreed to	1411
Mr Kormos	1411
Flags at Half-Mast Act, 2002, Bill 172, <i>Mr Chudleigh</i>	
Agreed to	1411
Mr Chudleigh	1411
St James' Cathedral Protection Act, 2002, Bill 173, <i>Mr Smitherman</i>	
Agreed to	1411
Mr Smitherman	1411

MOTIONS

House sittings Mr Stockwell	1411
Agreed to	1412
Standing committee on estimates Mr Stockwell	1412
Agreed to	1412

ORAL QUESTIONS

Competitive electricity market Mr McGuinty	1412
Mr Stockwell	1413, 1416
Mr Hampton	1415
Hydro One Mr McGuinty	1413
Mr Eves	1413
Enron Corp Mr Hampton	1414
Mr Stockwell	1414

Ottawa-Carleton District School Board

Mr McGuinty	1416
Mrs Witmer	1416
Nurses Mr Beaubien	1417
Mrs Cunningham	1417
Government polling Mr Kennedy	1417
Mr Eves	1417
Protection of privacy Mr Hardeman	1418
Mr Hudak	1418
Meningitis C Ms Martel	1419
Mr Clement	1419
Angioplasty services Mrs Pupatello	1419
Mr Clement	1419
Biotechnology Mr Gill	1420
Mr Turnbull	1420
New Visions Mr Smitherman	1420
Mr Clement	1421
Cancer care Mr Dunlop	1421
Mr Clement	1421
Labour dispute Mr Kormos	1422
Mr Eves	1422
Public sector compensation Mrs Bountrogianni	1422
Mr Eves	1422

continued overleaf