



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)**

Monday 3 June 2002

Lundi 3 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

Monday 3 June 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 3 juin 2002

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HIGHWAY 69

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): Today I challenge the new Minister of Northern Development and Mines and the new Minister of Transportation to commit immediately to the four-laning of Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound.

For too long this government has paid lip service to the wishes and needs of my constituents. This government says they're now different. They can prove it: commit in a tangible way to putting money toward the four-laning of Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound.

For too long there have been too many accidents, too many personal injuries, too many deaths and too much carnage along Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound. The time for action is now.

In 1996, I launched a postcard campaign "Highway 69 Worth the Investment." Some 13,000 Sudburians responded to that postcard, saying that this government should act. Today I launch a petition campaign to reinforce the message that my constituents have not changed their minds. It is time for this government to four-lane Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound.

My constituents and northern Ontarians want to see the plan and the timeline. They are demanding that this government prove that it is different. They want the four-laning of Highway 69 from Sudbury to Parry Sound to take place immediately.

AGRICULTURE ROUND TABLE

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I rise in the House today to recognize the efforts of Premier Ernie Eves and the agriculture minister, the Honourable Helen Johns, for this year's Premier's round table on agriculture, which will be held on June 6, 2002.

As a former parliamentary assistant at the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and chair of the Premier's Task Force on Rural Economic Renewal, I know that there are several areas where consultation with stakeholders will have positive results. Moreover, this will be an opportunity for the farming community to have

a direct line to the highest level of government in Ontario.

The Premier's round table will focus on important rural issues such as the success of OSTAR and OSTAR-RED, which provide \$600 million over five years for infrastructure in rural Ontario. As well, these upcoming discussions will be an opportunity to review the ideas outlined in the report of the Premier's Task Force on Rural Economic Renewal, which was released last year.

Only a few short months ago, Premier Eves committed to holding a Premier's round table on agriculture. I congratulate him on moving forward so quickly on this issue. I look forward to the new initiatives which will be generated at this conference.

Our government recognizes that farmers are an important part of Ontario, and no one more so than our new Premier, Ernie Eves. He is sending a great signal to the people of rural Ontario. Thanks again to Premier Eves, Minister Johns and all those who are working so hard to make this event a reality.

LAURIER BRANTFORD

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): Laurier Brantford in my riding, a campus of Sir Wilfred Laurier University in Waterloo, opened its doors to students and to a university education in September 1999. The first degrees were granted last week on Wednesday, May 29, 2002.

Many members of the Brant community played an important role in bringing the university to Brantford. Some of the key players, along with Laurier, included the Grand Valley Education Society, the mayor of the city of Brantford, Chris Friel, and city council, and the mayor of Brant, Ron Eddy, and county council.

Since its inception, Laurier Brantford has been characterized by academic innovation. It stands as a testament to the conviction shared by the university, the city of Brantford and the county of Brant, that advanced education plays a vital role in establishing and sustaining a flourishing community.

Further, I would like to congratulate Dr James Hillier, who was granted an honorary degree last week by Laurier. Dr Hillier's long and distinguished career began in Brantford. A scientist, engineer, inventor with over 40 patents and a research director, his contributions have made a significant impact on all of our lives and our understanding of the world around us. Among his many accomplishments, Dr Hillier played a significant and pivotal role in the development of the electron microscope. Dr Hillier continues to contribute to scientific

endeavours by supporting a scholarship for students from the riding of Brant continuing their studies in science.

Congratulations to everyone involved. Our dream has become a reality.

EDUCATION

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): I rise today to commend the parents, the teachers, the students, all of those who assembled yesterday afternoon on Queen's Park lawn in a program of "Need to Succeed" for our students.

There was a group there, People for Education, which last week did a whole analysis of what is happening in the Toronto area in education. What they have said is chilling and startling. What they have said is that 21% of the school librarians are now gone from the schools in Toronto. They told us that 22% of the physical education teachers are now gone from the schools in Toronto. They have told us that the music teachers are down 25% in the city of Toronto. They have told us that 31% of the ESL teachers are gone from the city of Toronto, and they have told us the only thing that has gone up is the waiting list for special-needs students, up by 11% in just one year.

In my own riding of Beaches-East York, Earl Haig Public School has talked about what will happen if they are forced to have a compliance budget. They will lose half of a library teacher, half of a secretary, four lunch-room supervisors, two music teachers. They will have no attendance counsellor, and they will have no school community adviser.

The people yesterday said that we need to succeed for our students. We all need to do that. We need the government to move. We need them to change direction.

JAMES MORDEN SCHOOL

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): This year in celebration of James Morden School's 50th anniversary, an open house was held at the school on Dorchester Road in Niagara Falls on Saturday, June 1. I had the great pleasure of dropping in for a visit with many former students and staff, who exchanged memories of their experiences at James Morden School. James Morden School officially opened in 1952. Since then there have been students who have become teachers at the school and others who have their children currently enrolled there.

During my visit, I toured the school with teacher Kerry Felstead who, among other things, took me to see his Detroit Red Wings shrine. I also toured the school with Mr McLean, a young new principal at James Morden.

I should also note that over the years, many principals and vice-principals in other Niagara schools first started their careers at James Morden. Some staff at the school have been there for 15 to 25 years. The school has a real family atmosphere, and I was really impressed by the number of people who came by for a visit with their

former teachers and to look at old class photos that were on display.

I'd like to thank James Morden for their 50 years of service to Niagara kids. Best of luck in the years ahead as you continue to serve the citizens of Niagara Falls.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): Sarnia-Lambton has had an unprecedented number of school closures. Four elementary schools have closed in the city of Sarnia since 1997, ever since the Conservative government introduced the controversial funding formula. Closed were Clarke, Parkview, Our Lady of Mercy and St Josephs, and others have closed in the rural part of the county as well.

The St Clair Catholic District School Board has recently put St Helen school on the chopping block. St Helen school does not even meet any of the criteria for closure: its junior kindergarten class is at capacity, the school is in good condition and its enrolment is not in decline. St Helen is 90% full, with an enrolment of 305 students, and it's located in a growth area. Most of these students walk to school.

It is well documented that students actually do better in small schools, yet 88% of schools closed in Ontario have been small schools.

The Minister of Education has admitted that there is a problem with the funding formula, so stop all the school closures and fix the real problem, which is this government's education policy, a major factor in all these schools being shut down.

1340

TERRY RYAN

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I rise in the House today to pay tribute to a fallen police officer, Terry Ryan, chair of the Police Association of Ontario.

Terry passed away last Friday as the result of a tragic motor vehicle accident. Our thoughts and prayers are with Terry's family and the 13,000 police officers who are very much part of Terry's extended family. He served them with distinction and commitment.

Police personnel across Ontario and Canada have lost both a friend and a leader. Durham Regional Police Chief Kevin McAlpine was visibly moved when he commented on Officer Ryan's death.

In my role as MPP for Durham, I, as well as the other members from Durham, met Terry on many occasions. I remember him as a capable and respected spokesman for the police officers, both as president of the Durham Regional Police Association as well as chair and director of the Police Association of Ontario.

Terry Ryan was also a career police officer of almost 30 years. He spent 20 years on the board of directors of the Durham Regional Police Association. Terry Ryan championed safer communities for the men and women of Ontario's police departments and the communities they serve.

I respected his advocacy on behalf of the association. He was always firm but fair.

I would like to express my condolences and the condolences of this House to fallen police officer Terry Ryan's wife, Carol, his sons, Kevin and Jamie, as well as his family and many friends and colleagues. He will be missed.

HIGHWAY 77

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex): About 25% of the provincial highways in my riding are in disrepair. That in itself would be a startling figure, I am sure, except that the government of the day has downloaded so many provincial highways in our area that there are hardly any left.

But I speak specifically of Highway 77. I am told there are currently two capital construction projects for Highway 77. They are currently on the five-year plan. If you know what the five-year plan is, it means that something can be on the five-year plan forever, just in five-year instalments.

Highway 77 is in considerable disrepair. I would like the minister to know just how bad it has gotten, so what I have suggested is this: since the condition of the highway is so unacceptable and since the construction projects are in fact on the books, I would like to invite the Minister of Transportation to join me for a leisurely drive on Highway 77. But he'd better bring a soft pillow, because it's a rough one. To entice him even more, I have offered that I would buy the minister lunch when he comes down to see us.

FILMING IN MILLBROOK

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): Hollywood is alive in Peterborough county. The village of Millbrook, part of the amalgamated township of Cavan, Millbrook and North Monaghan, is being transformed into River City. With the arrival of work crews constructing the set of Disney-Touchstone Television's *The Music Man*, the main street is being changed into River City, Iowa, circa 1912.

The movie crews arrived this past week, and filming of the remake of the 1962 movie is set to begin in the village on June 12. It will air on ABC next year.

The changes to the small Ontario town have been interesting to the residents and local business people. For example, the historical society's offices on the main street are being turned into an old-fashioned ice cream parlour. The interior has been painted a bright minty-green colour. A barn-style feed mill is being constructed in front of the Masonic Lodge.

The filming of the movie in an Ontario village is a boost not only to the community but also to the surrounding area. Ads ran in local newspapers a few weeks ago seeking cast members. People are employed in the construction of the sets. The workers from outside our area are purchasing gasoline, food and accommodations.

The filming of a movie in Millbrook creates excitement and a positive mood for everyone living there. Congratulations to Millbrook on being chosen the Hollywood of Peterborough county.

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I'd like to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table a copy of an order in council appointing Mr Rick Bartolucci, MPP, as a commissioner to the Board of Internal Economy, appointed by the caucus of the official opposition in place of Dominic Agostino, MPP.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs): I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Monday, June 3, Tuesday, June 4, and Wednesday, June 5, 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 those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1347 to 1352.

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	Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia
Arnott, Ted	Gerretsen, John	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John
Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hardeman, Ernie	Parsons, Ernie
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hastings, John	Patten, Richard
Boyer, Claudette	Hodgson, Chris	Peters, Steve
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Brown, Michael A.	Hudak, Tim	Pupatello, Sandra
Bryant, Michael	Jackson, Cameron	Ramsay, David
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Runciman, Robert W.
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Sampson, Rob
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Klees, Frank	Spina, Joseph
Crozier, Bruce	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sterling, Norman W.
Cunningham, Dianne	Levac, David	Stewart, R. Gary
Curling, Alvin	Marland, Margaret	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Dombrowsky, Leona	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Duncan, Dwight	McDonald, Al	Wilson, Jim
Dunlop, Garfield	McMeekin, Ted	Witmer, Elizabeth
Ecker, Janet	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Kormos, Peter	Martel, Shelley
Churley, Marilyn	Marchese, Rosario	Prue, Michael

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 75; the nays are 6.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon Mr Baird: I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Thursday, June 6, 2002, for the purpose of considering government business.

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

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

All 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 1356 to 1401.

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	Galt, Doug	Mushinski, Marilyn
Arnott, Ted	Gerretsen, John	Newman, Dan
Baird, John R.	Gilchrist, Steve	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Gill, Raminder	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	Parsons, Ernie
Beaubien, Marcel	Hardeman, Ernie	Patten, Richard
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hastings, John	Peters, Steve
Boyer, Claudette	Hodgson, Chris	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Brown, Michael A.	Hudak, Tim	Ramsay, David
Bryant, Michael	Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sampson, Rob
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Sergio, Mario
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Sorbara, Greg
Colle, Mike	Klees, Frank	Spina, Joseph
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sterling, Norman W.
Crozier, Bruce	Levac, David	Stewart, R. Gary
Cunningham, Dianne	Marland, Margaret	Tascona, Joseph N.
Curling, Alvin	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
DeFaria, Carl	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Dombrowsky, Leona	McDonald, Al	Wilson, Jim
Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted	Witmer, Elizabeth
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Ecker, Janet	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David
Elliott, Brenda	Munro, Julia	

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Kormos, Peter	Martel, Shelley
Churley, Marilyn	Marchese, Rosario	Prue, Michael

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 77; the nays are 6.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

VISITORS

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I rise to introduce visitors in the visitors' gallery. Mike Reader is executive director of the Ontario

Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and with him is Greg Farrant, also of the federation.

Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: May I introduce in the gallery the parents, Stephanie and Ludy Carter, grandmother and uncle, Vera and Viktor Djatschenko, and best friend Elizabeth Robinson of our own page, Emily Carter.

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY
AND RESPONSES****SENIOR CITIZENS**

Hon Carl DeFaria (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors): It is a great honour to rise today to acknowledge Ontario's senior citizens. June is Seniors' Month in Ontario. It is an opportunity to reflect on the important role older Ontarians play in the ongoing growth and vitality of this province and to support the concept of learning for life.

Ontario is currently home to more than 1.5 million seniors. Our seniors' population will continue to grow steadily as the baby boomer population ages. By 2041, a quarter of Ontario's population will be over the age of 65. The needs of our growing seniors' population are a priority to us.

This government is planning for our aging population. We are doing this in conjunction with other provincial, territorial and federal ministers responsible for seniors. We are guided by the five principles agreed upon as part of the federal-provincial-territorial national framework on aging: dignity, independence, participation, fairness and security.

As Ontario's Minister of Citizenship and minister responsible for seniors, I am proud of the far-sighted approach we are taking to planning for the needs of older adults. This approach includes a multi-ministry focus and includes the co-operation of a variety of stakeholders, including major seniors' organizations.

The government has invested in a wide range of strategies and programs. We are increasing our annual long-term-care spending by \$1.2 billion by 2006. This money adds 20,000 new long-term-care beds and re-builds 16,000 existing beds. All 36,000 beds will be built to new state-of-the-art design standards.

Our \$1.2-billion health investment also increases annual spending on long-term-care community services by \$550 million for services. These services include visiting nurses, therapists and personal support workers, Meals on Wheels, day programs, volunteer transportation and friendly visiting.

Ontario currently spends \$1.5 billion annually on home care and community care services, more per capita than any other province. Spending on home care has increased by approximately 70% since 1995.

Our strategies include our five-year, \$68.4-million strategy for Alzheimer disease and related dementias and

also our recently announced \$4.3-million strategy to combat elder abuse.

Today, my colleague the Attorney General, David Young, and I joined Mel Lastman in launching the elder abuse awareness strategy for the city of Toronto just a couple of hours ago.

Both are examples of this province's world leadership in addressing issues affecting the health and well-being of older Ontarians. These strategies affect 140,000 Ontarians who suffer from Alzheimer disease or related dementias and the estimated 4% to 10% of Ontarians who suffer from elder abuse.

Through our Alzheimer strategy, we produced and recently released *A Guide to Advance Care Planning*. The guide is designed to educate people about the benefits of advance care planning. Through advance care planning, seniors can communicate to loved ones their wishes about their future care.

Starting this fall, a series of Ontario seniors' seminars will provide seniors across the province with valuable information on healthy aging and healthy lifestyles. They will include seminars on advance care planning, seniors' safe medication use, avoiding financial frauds and scams, safe driving for seniors and healthy eating for healthy aging.

Like all of the work of the Ontario Seniors' Secretariat, the education series is developed and delivered in partnership with Ontario's major seniors' groups and provincial organizations serving seniors.

I hope all members of this House will play a role hosting seminars with local seniors' groups, and I'm looking forward to assisting any member of this House who would like to do so.

1410

Later this year, as part of our public education activities for seniors, we'll be launching a guide to programs and services for seniors in Ontario. This guide will provide valuable information in one place about the programs and services to which seniors are entitled.

Much of the prosperity that we enjoy today in Ontario is due to a lifetime of hard work and sacrifice by our seniors. This government values the contributions that seniors make to this province and is committed to an Ontario where all seniors can live safe from harm with dignity and independence in their own communities and where their contributions are recognized and respected.

I encourage all Ontarians to pay tribute to at least one senior in their life, to reach out to a relative, a neighbour, a friend or a colleague, a community member, and thank them for their contributions.

Mr Speaker, I am very pleased to make this statement today in this House on behalf of the seniors of Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Further statements by ministries? Seeing none, responses?

Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin): The first thing I would like to do is to officially welcome the minister responsible for seniors to his portfolio and to congratulate him on that post. It is my first opportunity to do this.

I'm delighted on behalf of Dalton McGuinty and the Liberal caucus to acknowledge the seniors and their leadership in our communities, not only today but across the decades. We appreciate their contributions tremendously.

Last week I was wandering up to the Legislative Building and I noticed the bed of tulips and I thought how fitting it was that we would set aside the month of June to recognize seniors. After all, June is the month of promise and rebirth; it is the month of hard work to ensure the gifts of the summer.

I see seniors in our communities taking their grandchildren to very many special places to bring back memories. Just last summer I visited Leeburn, where a group of seniors had refurbished a schoolhouse. It brought back the early years of this pioneer community for all to see and for all to understand. I see them labouring over their quilts and over their handiwork to donate those to worthy causes in their community. I see them preserving and teaching the lessons of our collective past and of their individual past. I see them taking up recycling with a vengeance. I see them sitting at malls selling raffle tickets for community organizations. I see them volunteering at long-term-care facilities. I see them at hospitals and animal centres. I see them volunteering in classrooms. I see them as the backbone of their places of worship. I see them at the Royal Canadian Legion functions, passing on the torch, as it were, to the next generation.

Just yesterday at the Manitoulin cenotaph—every year since 1921 people have been coming to that cenotaph to remember the sacrifice of people. The Royal Canadian Legions in Gore Bay and Little Current deserve to be congratulated for that, and what I really want to do is acknowledge our Silver Cross mother who was there, Joey Hanson, from Little Current.

I see seniors embracing life's challenges to the best of their abilities or disabilities, and I think how fortunate younger generations are that they have continued to play such vital roles, in spite of bodies that are not as strong as they once were, in spite of having lost friends, perhaps spouses, even children, in spite of living often on fixed incomes. They keep on as long as life allows, trusting that their labours will not be in vain.

These are the people who built this great province, this great country. They've defended this province and this country. That is why I'm incensed when I learn that an ailing constituent in my constituency is getting less health care than they deserve. I am angry when I hear people in nursing homes getting shortchanged in hands-on care. Just last week, we presented tens of thousands of petitions asking for adequate staffing levels in our long-term-care facilities. I'm upset when the seniors I represent in the great riding of Algoma-Manitoulin have to travel sometimes hundreds of kilometres just to see a general practitioner. That is not acceptable.

I would also like to bring to your attention on behalf of the seniors we advocate for that the government has cut back dramatically on the number and amount of

services that are provided to our seniors in communities. The cutback to chronic in-home services has been huge. There isn't a member on any side of the House who hasn't received hundreds if not thousands of phone calls in their office from seniors whose home care has been cut off. These are people who need home care, these are people who deserve home care, these are people who have earned home care, and it is up to this government to quit playing with numbers and fix this problem on their behalf.

Seniors in our province have built this province. We owe a great debt of gratitude to these seniors. We need to understand that their contributions are important to us and that they have earned all the respect this society can pay to them.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): On behalf of New Democrats, it is my pleasure to acknowledge Seniors' Month and the enormous contribution that has been made by seniors to life in Ontario, not only in terms of seniors' contributions during their paid working life but the contribution they make now as volunteers to thousands and thousands of organizations across the province.

When I think of that worthy contribution, I am astonished at the blatant disregard this government shows to Ontario seniors. I want to spend my time talking about the cuts to services and funding that this government has made to seniors.

Let's deal first with the delisting of OHIP services. This government last August delisted hearing-aid evaluations and re-evaluations so that seniors have to pay for that out of their own pocket. Male seniors in particular who worked in heavy industry would have a significant need for that type of evaluation and re-evaluation. Many of those who are now on a fixed income can't afford those kinds of costs. That's how the government shows how committed it is to seniors.

Let's look at funding for community-based long-term-care services. I'm astonished to hear the government say that they are increasing the investment in community-based long-term-care services by over \$550 million. If that's the case, why is it that community care access centres had their budgets frozen last year, are living with that same frozen budget this year, and thousands of seniors across this province can't get home care services, can't get homemaking services, can't get discharged from hospital because they can't get the home care they need in order to be discharged, are on a waiting list for services or have to go through a waiting period for services? Why doesn't the government tell the truth, which is that the government has stopped funding increases to community-based services at about \$275 million and hasn't allocated the funding it promised over an eight-year period in the last two years? That's why seniors can't get the home care they deserve.

Let's look at some of the regulation changes this government has made which have dramatically affected seniors. This government in 1999 limited the number of hours of home care services that clients can receive to two hours per day. We know there are many seniors

across Ontario who need more than two hours per day of home care services. What has happened with that reduction is that many seniors who want to stay in their home, and could with adequate nursing supports, have now been forced into long-term-care institutions.

1420

The second regulation change is a change that says that clients must now have personal support needs in order to even be considered for homemaking services. So if you don't have a need for personal hygiene services or daily living services—and many seniors don't—you are therefore ineligible to receive housekeeping services, laundry services or assistance with shopping. So those very same seniors who don't have a need for basic life supports now can't stay in their own homes because they can't keep up with the maintenance and care of their homes, and we force them into long-term-care facilities, which is far more expensive to the health care system in this province.

Look at copayments in medication. This was the government that brought seniors a copayment for their prescription drugs, be it a flat \$2 fee, depending on income, or now they have to pay the dispensing fee as well. This is the government that gutted rent control and cancelled our government's affordable housing program. Many of those seniors were housed in units where housing costs were affordable, and with this government we now have the scenario that many, many seniors are being forced to go to food banks because they cannot pay their rent and cannot pay for some of their other basic necessities.

This is the government that cancelled the requirement of 2.5 hours of hands-on care for seniors in our long-term-care facilities—cancelled that requirement. We are now in the unenviable position, according to a study done at the behest of this government by PricewaterhouseCoopers and released in January 2001, that seniors in Ontario are at the bottom of the heap when it comes to hours of hands-on nursing care, hours of rehabilitation care and hours of care provided to seniors who present themselves with behavioural problems in long-term-care facilities. If this government had actually gone forward with my patients' bill of rights last week—the Tommy Douglas patients' bill of rights—a health care standards commissioner would have had the authority to set standards in long-term-care facilities to ensure that seniors are receiving the decent quality of care that they deserve in facilities.

Finally, one other point: in their brief to this government, among many other things United Seniors of Ontario say the following: "Don't privatize water, don't privatize hydro, because we know that will have an increased cost on people who can't afford it."

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to introduce the following resolution:

That this House deplores the derogatory, untrue and unkind comments made about Maritimers by Canadian Alliance leader Stephen Harper, and seeks to reassure the

people of eastern Canada of their value and worth as an integral part of Canada. This House expresses our regret for Mr Harper's unfortunate comments and conveys our good wishes in writing to the citizens of the Maritime provinces through their respective Premiers.

Mr Speaker, I grew up on the east coast, specifically Labrador, and I'm sure if this resolution is passed—

Interjections.

Ms Churley:—many of whom live in our communities in Ontario.

The Speaker: The member has asked for unanimous consent. Agreed? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

RAPPORT DE L'ENQUÊTE SUR WALKERTON

WALKERTON INQUIRY REPORT

M. Gilles Bisson (Timmins-Baie James): Vous savez que le mois de janvier de cette année le gouvernement a déposé le rapport de Walkerton. J'ai demandé une question dans cette assemblée le 22 parce que, jusqu'à cette date-là, le rapport n'était pas disponible en français. Le ministre responsable de l'environnement m'a rassuré que oui, premièrement ce n'était pas acceptable que le rapport n'était pas en français, et il a donné un engagement, que le rapport serait disponible dans les plus brefs délais.

La semaine du 27 mai—justement le 27 mai—le gouvernement a déposé le deuxième rapport de Walkerton ici à l'assemblée même. Le ministre de l'Environnement est venu me voir et il m'a assuré que le deuxième rapport ainsi que le premier pourraient être disponibles « cet après-midi, le 27 » ici à l'assemblée. Je me suis levé pour un point d'ordre et j'ai demandé à travers l'assemblée, « Est-ce que vous allez garantir que ce rapport, le deuxième rapport, sera disponible en français? » Le ministre m'a dit, « Oui. » Aujourd'hui à 13 h 30 j'ai vérifié: ni le premier ni le deuxième rapport est disponible en français.

M. le Président, je vous demande simplement d'assister les membres francophones de cette assemblée et les francophones à travers la province à s'assurer que le ministre garde son engagement et que ces rapports seront disponibles en français aujourd'hui même.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The minister of Francophone Affairs on the same point of order.

L'hon John R. Baird (ministre associé des Affaires francophones): M. le Président, mon collègue le ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie a dit très clairement que c'était son choix que les rapports seraient disponibles aussitôt que possible, et le but doit toujours être d'avoir le rapport à la même heure. Je suis sûr que le plus tôt possible les rapports seront disponibles en français et en anglais. C'est la réponse que le ministre a donnée à mon collègue la semaine dernière. Je suis sûr du travail qui a été mis en place pour rendre les rapports disponibles aussitôt que possible. Cette politique doit être la priorité.

The Speaker: The member on the same point of order?

M. Bisson: Très brièvement, j'ai été assuré la journée du 27, quand le rapport avait été déposé, que cette même après-midi-là le rapport serait disponible. Aujourd'hui encore, ni le premier ni le deuxième rapport n'est disponible. Je veux avoir l'assurance que le rapport Walkerton sera disponible aujourd'hui même. Tout ce que je demande, ce sont mes droits comme francophone.

The Speaker: On a point of order, the minister responsible.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I just want to respond to what the member said. I think what I said at the time was "as soon as possible." I appreciate the fact that can mean different things to different people. The O'Connor report, I think, is some 700 pages. We're in the process of translating it as quickly as we possibly can. If you'd like, I think we can partially put it up, as far as we've translated it, and that may accommodate you to some degree. But it's a 700-page report, which takes some time to translate. I said at the time you asked me the question, "I will undertake to get it up as soon as humanly possible." I understand that can mean different things to you and me but, honestly, it's going to take more than a couple of weeks to translate a report that voluminous.

The Speaker: That wasn't a point of order, but I do thank the minister for his clarification and the member for bringing that to the minister's attention.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 65

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if the government House leader could clarify something for me. Today's orders and notices paper indicates that we will be considering government order G135 in this afternoon's session. That's time allocation on Bill 135.

My verbal understanding is that in fact the government intends to call G65, which is the bill with respect to post-secondary institutions introduced by Minister Cunningham, An Act to enact, amend or revise various Acts related to post-secondary education and opportunities. I wonder if the government House leader could confirm the agenda for this afternoon.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Yes, that's the agenda.

Mr Duncan: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker, arising out of what's happened in the House today: one of the components of Bill 65 deals with the University of Ontario Institute of Technology. That institution was promised by the government and was in fact part of another piece of legislation that was introduced in December. The government has chosen to put this piece of legislation with some others, but the point of privilege I raise with you, sir, relates to what I would define as contempt.

In order to place my case, I'd like to refer to a ruling by then-Speaker Stockwell with respect to advertising and an advertising campaign that had been raised by the government of the day with respect to another issue that appeared to anticipate the action of the Legislature, and I'm referring specifically to the Journals of this House, volume CXXVI, 1995-96-97, part 2 of 2, 36th Parliament, first session, page 455. Quoting from the Speaker's rulings, he rejected the argument at the time that privilege had been violated but addressed the issue of contempt of the Legislature. He cited Erskine May's definition of contempt and, if you'll permit me, I'll read that into the record:

"Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence. It is therefore impossible to list every act which might be considered to amount to a contempt, the power to punish for such an offence being of its nature discretionary...."

It's come to our attention that the University of Ontario Institute of Technology has in fact hired staff, it has set up a Web page, it has taken a number of steps that would appear to contemplate the Legislature having already passed the enabling legislation.

1430

Speaker Edighoffer, some years ago, and you yourself, Mr Speaker, have dealt in different rulings with the question of whether it's appropriate for public servants to begin the implementation of projects that would emanate from legislation. The Speaker will be aware that on a number of occasions Speakers have found that—and I'll quote Speaker Edighoffer's original ruling—"It is perfectly valid for the public service to proceed"—and I highlight the word "proceed"—"with plans based on a bill that is already in the system in order to be able to act swiftly...."

The point I'm raising with respect to contempt is that, (1) this House has not in fact passed the legislation that would enable the university to be established, and (2) from the perspective of the official opposition the actions that have been taken to date—and this is where we need your help, Mr Speaker; we can't determine if it's by the government or by officials associated with the school—go beyond planning. They are a contempt of this Legislature that is impeding our ability to deal with this issue meaningfully without the bill being passed. In fact, one of the parties in this Legislature, the third party, blocked passage of that bill in December.

Mr Speaker, I would ask that you review this. It is our understanding that a number of people have been hired and the proposed university contained in this bill has everything ranging from Web sites through to other expenditures, which would appear to go well beyond planning, and that would therefore hold this Legisla-

ture—paraphrasing previous rulings—up to ridicule or impugn its ability to deal with bills before it.

Accordingly, and given the fact that the government just this morning notified us that they wish to call the bill this afternoon, I would ask you to look into this situation as we believe that if the bill hasn't been passed, how can we have staff on, how can we have Web sites up and running, how can we be doing things that on the face of it appear to go well beyond planning for the implementation of this legislation?

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The member for Niagara Centre on the same point of privilege.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Speaking very briefly to this matter, clearly the Liberal House leader has changes of mind as well. I want to advise the House that the New Democrats have no intention of joining with the Liberals in this obstructionist tactic to this legislation. We want the legislation to proceed through debate, second and third readings, in due course. If the Liberals want to obstruct and delay it, God bless.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Mr Speaker, I would heartily suggest to you that the sage and thoughtful advice for the House leader of the third party is the position you should probably follow on this. It is truly obstructionist. Any person who has spent some time in this House would understand by a reading of the rules that contempt needs to fall under categories. I don't know how this argument about contempt today meets any category that could remotely be classified as contempt of the Legislature, let alone any category I've seen.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I appreciate what he said; I heard him. I'm just responding.

First and foremost, it is the University of Toronto that is moving forward, not the government of Ontario. They have seen legislation that is before this House and, by being before this House, they have done what every government has done in the past 30, 40 or 50 years. Speaker Edighoffer was correct: you may proceed and plan for eventualities. The civil service often moves when legislation is drafted and before the House to proceed and plan. There's a long, long way to go between proceeding and planning, and simply advertising—implicating—that the legislation in fact moves forward.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Would the minister take his seat. I've said on numerous occasions that it's fine to argue, but during points of privilege or order, I need to hear without the heckling. I would ask for all members' co-operation. The other side waited patiently for the point of privilege from both sides. I expect the same co-operation from the official opposition. Sorry for the interruption, government House leader.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Mr Speaker, I suggest if you check through the history of this place, you will find circumstances within universities and outside universities where significantly more than 16 people were hired in preparation—significantly more. In fact, my first thought would be hundreds when setting up a new or different

administrative process to prepare and plan to proceed if an eventual adoption of legislation proceeds forward in this House.

Everybody would know that. Anybody who has spent any time in the Legislature as a government minister would know this happens on a routine and regular basis. That's why Speaker Edighoffer ruled as he ruled, to prepare and proceed with plans. That's exactly what is taking place. They're preparing and proceeding with plans in the eventuality that this legislation would pass. That is a common, century-old tradition that has been used by every government in this place and every administration that has happened to sit in this place at the time it was in fact the government.

Third, Mr Speaker, I don't know what the member would expect if there is nothing given to you in actual form, because he provided no evidence, nor have I been provided with any, that in fact this is taking place, just hearsay documentation that I've seen. He may have, I guess, a couple of news Web sites and so on. That wasn't provided to me. I can only presume, Mr Speaker, that if he didn't provide it to you, he hasn't provided it. So ultimately he's making an argument on evidence that he doesn't want to supply the opposition with, which of course is kind of bizarre. He's asking you to rule on something, claiming we should take his word for it and providing absolutely no evidence.

Lastly, I don't know what he suggests you do—go on a fact-finding mission to the University of Toronto? It is patently absurd that in this chamber a member of the opposition would suggest there's legislation before this House that could potentially change the role of universities to offer degrees, and he wants you to go on a fact-finding mission to—where?—Ryerson, the University of Toronto and the other ones. This is absurd. This is not a contempt motion; this is a dash through the woods to see if they can hear any trees falling.

To suggest for a moment that this is contempt is ridiculous. I'm in favour of holding up our calling this bill today for the purpose of reviewing, until of course the time to call it is concerned, because in the old vernacular of the schoolyard, this is what you call a slam dunk. There's nothing here.

Mr Duncan: In response, the minister forgets his own findings and ruling when he was Speaker. In fact, we did not call a point of privilege, because privilege does have specific categories. What you found, Minister, when you were the Speaker was that contempt is much broader and you don't have to be specific.

We will table this. In fact, it had been our hope to give a more full presentation, but the government told us Thursday they'd be calling one thing this afternoon and then late this morning dropped another thing on our laps without giving us the opportunity.

What the minister will find, if he reviews a number of Speakers' rulings, is that the issue does revolve around what is proper planning. I cannot find a ruling that defines what is appropriate planning. I will table today copies of the information we have. Today's Web site

posted a new hiring: director of public relations. There have been a number of newspaper accounts outlining what has been undertaken.

We believe it's important for you, sir, to define this carefully. You may in fact find there is no contempt of the House. We ask you to look into it.

The Speaker: I thank the member very much. The member for Niagara Centre very quickly, if he could, please.

Mr Kormos: Perhaps I have to accept some responsibility, because I've given a number of interviews to the media over the last week where I've explained that the government has a majority and that if the government wants this bill or any of its predecessor stand-alone bills to pass, they indeed will pass. The only problem is that to date the government hasn't wanted it to pass.

The Speaker: I've heard enough. Let me say very clearly that the member hasn't provided very much information. If in fact it's just people hired and Web sites set up, that wouldn't be enough to go through with it.

You will also know, as the government House leader pointed out, that I do not do the investigations. If you do want to provide me with some subsequent information, I will take a look at it. But let me be very clear: based on the information you've given me today, we can proceed with that bill this afternoon. If the member does provide some information, I will take a look at it and see if it warrants any investigation.

1440

ORAL QUESTIONS

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Premier. Today my education critic, Gerard Kennedy, and I put forward an emergency plan to help students who are falling behind because of your flawed funding formula. Kids can't wait, Premier, until your review is completed and then, after that, until such time as you finally make your changes.

One of the things that our plan calls for is a moratorium on school closures until the review is completed. It simply does not make sense to close schools which could very well be kept open under a revised funding formula. Would you not agree, Premier, that we should be putting school closures on hold until you get the funding formula right?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): As the leader of the official opposition well knows, school closures have been going on in this province and in every board for many, many decades.

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): Not like these.

Hon Mr Eves: I say to the honourable member for Windsor, she may be interested to know that between—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Premier, take your seat. The member for Windsor West, please come to

order. He's trying to answer the question and you're yelling across. You're very close and it interferes with his being able to reply.

Sorry for the interruption, Premier.

Hon Mr Eves: This new-found concern for the education system by the honourable members opposite—between 1985 and 1990 when David Peterson's government, of which they were a part, was in power, there were 37 public and separate school closures in Toronto in those five years. In seven years, between 1995 and 2002, there have been 20 school closures in Toronto. So I'm glad to see that the leader of the official opposition is now concerned about school closures.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, just so we're clear, so far under your funding formula 178 schools in Ontario have closed and 10 more are scheduled to close in Toronto next year—just so we have that right.

Tests show that there is a record number of students who are falling behind. This is another matter that we think cannot wait. In fact, double the number of students are failing under the new curriculum in comparison to the old. The group that is particularly having difficulty, the group that is really struggling, is next year's grade 12 class. They're having a very hard time, particularly with maths and sciences. As you will note, Premier, they are the first group to be in the compressed high school curriculum, going from five to four years; they're going to be competing, as well, as part of the double cohort. I am sure you will agree, Premier, that next year's grade 12 students are not stupid, they are not lazy, and I know they can make it if they just get the necessary supports.

My question to you, on behalf of them and their parents is, will you act to put in place necessary supports like remedial classes and homework help?

Hon Mr Eves: I'm sure the Minister of Education can provide a very direct response.

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): Our government has worked very hard in order to provide the appropriate level of support for the students in our secondary and our elementary schools. In fact, I think it's important to note that since 1999 we have provided \$55 million in funding for remediation. In fact, this past month, as the leader of the opposition knows, we provided additional money for the students in the elementary grades for English and for math. As well, on May 10 of this year, we announced additional funding for the school year 2002 to 2003, including \$15 million for the learning opportunities grant to help students who are at risk of not achieving their academic goals. We are giving the appropriate level of support, we are responding to the needs of parents, students and teachers, and we will continue to be responsive.

Mr McGuinty: Madam Minister, you and your predecessor in your government were so responsive that you took \$1.8 billion out of education funding in Ontario. That's the degree to which you've been responsive.

There are 39,700 students on a waiting list for their first special-education assessment. These are our highest-need kids, and you are making them wait the longest.

Hon Mrs Witmer: How many?

Mr McGuinty: Thirty-nine thousand, seven hundred students, Madam Minister.

This year, it's going to cost somewhere between \$50 million and \$70 million of scarce education money on a very bureaucratic paper-shuffling approach—this is something the boards have to go through to get the funding necessary for these kids. These kids can't wait. That money could be better spent on meeting their needs.

Why not replace your convoluted paper-shuffling exercise with a simpler audit system and turn that money over to the kids so their special-ed needs can be met?

Hon Mrs Witmer: We have consistently increased special-education funding. Overall, it's 17% since 1998 and 1999—

Interjections.

The Speaker: It's too loud. Order. The Minister of Education.

Hon Mrs Witmer: As I say, we have increased the funding by 17%. But more importantly, we have kept our promise to protect funding for vulnerable children. We are providing over \$1.37 billion in special education.

I might recommend to the leader of the opposition that the numbers he is throwing around today should be checked and verified. In your news release today, there is more fiction than fact. You have drawn numbers out of a hat, you have referred to data that has questionable methodology, and you have based it on very, very limited information. I would be very careful about the data. It's not our data; it's your data.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question to the Premier. Premier, as much as you would like Ontarians to forget it, you were Mike Harris's Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance. You were a four-star general in the Common Sense Revolution.

In those roles, you were instrumental in the decision to exempt the new Ontario Hydro companies from both the freedom of information act and the salary disclosure act. Can you tell us why you decided to hide the pay and perks over at Hydro One and OPG from public view?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): If the facts were hidden from public view, we wouldn't have had questions about them in the House for the last two weeks.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, you would know that was the result of a prospectus being filed. Had that not happened, we would never be aware of those salaries.

By choosing to exclude Hydro One's board from the FOI laws, you laid the groundwork for outrageous salaries. Then over the course of the past three years, behind closed doors, you quietly supported the ridiculous increases in pay. In 1999, the president and CEO got a salary of \$1 million. You agreed to that. In 2000, it went to \$1.5 million. You agreed to that. In 2001, it went to \$2.2 million. You agreed to that. Not once did you speak out against these numbers. Not once did you say they were wrong and that you were not going to stand for it.

Your job was to protect hydro ratepayers. You had an option. Why did you roll over for the board? Why did you not stand up for ratepayers?

Hon Mr Eves: First of all, Hydro One salaries are listed in publications and posted on the Ministry of Finance Web site: for 1997, April 1, 1998; for 1998, April 1, 1999; for 1999, December 27, 2000; for 2000, May 24, 2000. They were all there for everybody to see. They were not, quite frankly, at the ridiculous amounts for 2001 that the leader of the official opposition points out in 1997, 1998, 1999 or 2000.

1450

Mr McGuinty: Apparently the Premier was well informed of these issues at all times: he was aware of the \$2.2-million salary, he was aware of the \$6-million severance, he was aware of the \$175,000 for a car, he was aware of the \$172,000 for vacation pay, he was aware of the money that was sunk into a yacht as a promotional exercise. He was aware of all these things, and yet he did nothing.

Can you tell me once again, Premier, why it is that when push comes to shove, you're on the side of the board of directors and you didn't stand up for ratepayers?

Hon Mr Eves: The leader of the official opposition knows, or should know, full well that the huge increases to the CEO and other executives at Hydro One occurred on March 28, 2002, and on May 8, 2001. For his information, I was not a member of the Legislative Assembly on either of those dates. He was—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. It's too noisy. Order.

New question, the leader of the third party.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. People across Ontario are furious about the way your government is wasting their money. Under your government, public money, the people's money, is used at Hydro One to sponsor luxury sailboats and multi-million dollar salaries.

Now we learn that under your government Hydro One has also been sponsoring politicians. Last year, under your government, Hydro One gave \$7,500 to the Conservative Party and \$5,000 to the Liberal Party.

Premier, is it acceptable under your government for a government-owned corporation, Hydro One, to be giving the people's money to the Conservative Party and to the Liberal Party?

Hon Mr Eves: I'm not aware of the amounts that the leader of the third party is talking about. I'd be happy to take them under advisement if he has them available.

Mr Hampton: Well, Premier, this happened in the by-election in your old riding after you decided to go to Bay Street as an investment banker. Hydro One contributed \$7,500 to the Conservative campaign and \$5,000 to the Liberal Party.

Interjection.

The Speaker: The member for Trinity-Spadina, please put that down. Sorry for the interruption, leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: Premier, we could slap a sticker on you and Mr McGuinty: "Sponsored by Hydro One," or "Property of Eleanor Clitheroe and Hydro One." But Hydro One is owned by the people of Ontario, and the people of Ontario never authorized your government to use Hydro One to funnel public money to the Conservative Party or to the Liberal Party.

Premier, the people of Ontario need to know that the government of the day, your government, is not funneling their money, their public money, into the Conservative Party. Will you guarantee that the Conservative Party will return the \$7,500 to Hydro One, and will you admit it was totally wrong for this to have happened in the first place?

Hon Mr Eves: I'm not aware of the amounts and the circumstances he talks about. I'd be happy to take them under advisement.

Mr Hampton: It is there in the auditor's report from the 1991 by-election: \$7,500 to the Conservative Party, \$5,000 to the Liberal Party. But the bigger issue, Premier, is that if democracy is to work, the political process must be clean and must be seen to be clean. Instead, we've got Admiral Eves and First Mate McGuinty joining Captain Clitheroe on HMS Hydro One Excess.

Is this what you mean when you say that Hydro One must submit to private sector discipline, that Hydro One should start doling out million-dollar salaries and political contributions, like the rest of your friends on Bay Street, to the Conservative Party? That might work for the Conservative Party; you might get a lot of political donations from privatized hydro. But the only thing that happens to the ratepayers is their hydro rates get increased to pay for this kind of excess.

Premier, the bigger question is this: will you listen to the people and cancel the privatization of Hydro One so more excesses like this can't happen—

The Speaker: I'm afraid the member's time is up. Premier?

Hon Mr Eves: I have several comments, actually. First of all, I don't believe there was a by-election in 1991, but he may or may not wish to change his mind about that. Hydro One I don't believe even existed in 1991, to start with.

I am certainly not qualified to be an admiral; I'll leave it to the leader of the official opposition to decide whether he wants to be a first mate or is qualified to do so.

With respect to his question about the privatization issue, the formation of Hydro One and the continuance of it, you can't have it both ways, I say to the leader of the third party. He argues on the one hand that he wants Hydro One to stay exactly the same as it is today because it's doing such a great job, and on the other hand he stands up and asks questions every day about what a crummy job it's doing and asks, "Why won't you fix it?"

The Speaker: New question.

Mr Hampton: Premier, wherever privatized hydro has happened, whether it's California, Montana, Pennsylvania or Alberta, people are paying more for their rates

and they have less control over an essential public service. But the issue here is that you have known about this, or you should have known about this, for over a year. The by-election in 2001—the financial reports were in almost a year ago. I warned your Minister of Energy six months ago about the bloated salaries that were being paid out at Hydro One under your government, and so far you have done next to nothing.

So I'm going to give you a hand. I'm going to introduce tomorrow a private member's bill, the Clean Up Hydro One Act. It will bring Hydro One senior management salaries down to the level of companies like Hydro-Québec or BC Hydro and the severance packages will be in accordance with the law. Premier, if you want to do something about this, will you pass my Clean Up Hydro One Act and start to do something about what's happening here?

Hon Mr Eves: Obviously I would be interested in looking at any proposed legislation that the leader of the third party might have, as indeed I was interested in looking at Ms Churley's legislation.

Mr Hampton: We know on the record that even though BC Hydro and Hydro-Québec are much bigger companies than Hydro One, their executive salaries are limited to \$400,000. So a generous interpretation would keep Eleanor Clitheroe's salary down to \$500,000 or less.

But there are other measures that need to be implemented. We need to make it illegal, if it isn't illegal already, for government-owned corporations to then make financial contributions to the government party. Are you in support of those measures, Premier?

Hon Mr Eves: I'm just as concerned as he is about compensation levels of senior executives at Hydro One.

Mr Hampton: Then do something.

Hon Mr Eves: With respect, we are doing something.

The Ministry of Energy asked the board at Hydro One to rectify the situation that they had created with respect to issues that concern all of us in this Legislature. There has been a response, as I understand, a fairly detailed response from Hydro One's solicitors to the solicitors for the government, for the Ministry of Energy. Unfortunately, that response seems to be somewhat qualified and somewhat unacceptable, and we will be required to take further action.

1500

HOME CARE

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. I want to talk to you about the Leatham family, who have joined us today in the Speaker's gallery. They have written to you twice now and have written a number of times to the Minister of Health, and they are looking for your help.

Marlo is suffering from cerebral palsy, spastic quadriplegia and developmental delay. She cannot walk, dress or even roll over on her own. The Leathams used to receive 54 hours a week of care from their local com-

munity care access centre. That has been cut by your government to 15 hours a week—from 54 hours a week of help to 15 hours a week. This family is in a desperate position, Premier, and they're looking to you for help. What help will you provide for them?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I'd ask the Minister of Health to directly respond to this concern.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I believe I have replied to the honourable member in writing but perhaps he has not received it yet. I can tell this House that of course CCACs make decisions every day. Some of those decisions are difficult and some of them involve facts that are certainly not brought before the government, are particular to the particular circumstances. I'm not about to talk about a particular case in this Legislature, but if the honourable member has not received my letter in due course, I'd be happy to brief him on it.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, I want to go back to you and quote to you a letter just recently sent to you, I think in the last week and a half, from the Leathams. It says, "We have already been in contact with the Honourable Tony Clement ... on several occasions.... He has refused to meet with us, speak with us or assist us.... we have had no assistance from him in the past 16 months. We are asking you to help us."

They have come here today—and that is a considerable undertaking in and of itself, Premier—and they're asking you to agree to look into their personal circumstances and to take an interest in their plight, and then after having done that they want you to help them. It is unfair to plead that this is somehow the independent activity of a CCAC. CCAC boards are now appointed by the government and their funding is controlled by the government. That funding was cut from 54 hours to 15 hours every week. This family is struggling to keep up with a tremendous responsibility and they want you to look into this and they want you to help, Premier. Will you do that?

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Clement: I hope the honourable member understands that I'm at a bit of a loss. There is some information that I do have on this file. I do not feel it is appropriate to release this information publicly in this venue. I'd be happy to do so if I get a release from the family to do so, but in the meantime I want to assure this House that there are efforts underway. I suppose that is the best I can do, given the state of our laws and for very good reasons.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): My question is directed to the minister responsible for francophone affairs. For several decades the province of Ontario has provided all official documents and reports in the two official languages. Most of the time reports and documents in both official languages are tabled in the Legis-

lature at the same time. Minister, can you explain to the people of Ontario and in particular to the people in my riding why it is so important to table the French adaptation at the same time as the English copy, even though the English version could be tabled much earlier?

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs): The French Language Services Act, adopted by all three parties in this House more than 10 years ago, requires that documents, like government reports intended for broad public distribution, be made available to the public for both anglophones and francophones in both French and English. Wherever possible we do our very best to ensure that these reports are made available at the same time, for the simple reason that we want anglophones and francophones in Ontario to have equal access to the important information contained in these reports.

Mr Galt: I certainly agree with your response, Minister. However, the need for French adaptation has caused a significant delay in tabling reports such as that of the select committee on alternative fuel sources. As you're well aware, the committee was given a mandate to report by May 31, 2002. The all-party committee worked extremely hard, and I compliment the members for meeting the deadline. They worked hard to meet that required deadline only to find out that the translation could not meet the deadline of the end of May.

Minister, in many cases the private sector is delivering services in a cheaper, faster and more efficient manner. However, in this case, where is the accountability of the private sector firm in delivering the French translation services?

Hon Mr Baird: It may come as a surprise to the member of my party that the Ontario Legislature is not covered by the French Language Services Act. However, by long-standing tradition and policy, all of us in this House do our very best to provide documents in both French and English at the same time.

The select committee in question, on which the honourable member has very capably served, did meet all of its timelines, as did all members of this House, in providing their report. The committee did request from all three House leaders that an extension of one or two weeks be granted to allow for a proper translation of the report. There was absolutely no public policy reason to provide the English copy prematurely, so the House was happy to do that.

We want to ensure that when reports are translated, they not just simply be translated but they be translated in a quality format so that all Ontarians, whether they be French or English, in any part of the province, have access to good, quality information.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I just want to respond to Mr Bisson's question with respect to the French translation. I've been informed it should be on the Web site in French before the end of question period today. Part 1 is still a couple of weeks away.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I thank the House leader for the clarification.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question is to the Premier regarding your standards for conflict of interest. You will be aware that Mr Al Leach is on the board of directors of the Highway 407 corporation, a private company that owns the 407. They have seen their company quadruple in value in the last three years. It's an enormously profitable operation for them, and it benefits from congestion. Your government, however, has recently appointed the same Al Leach to be the vice-chair of GO Transit, a public company that is designed to relieve congestion in the GTA.

It is, in my opinion and the opinion of many, a direct conflict. He is serving the private owners of the 407 corporation and trying to serve the public as vice-chair of GO. My question to you is this, Premier: is it acceptable for Mr Leach to be on both boards and to try and serve both masters?

Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I'd be happy to take the circumstances outlined by the honourable member today and get back to him with a response.

Mr Phillips: I appreciate that, but it is a relatively straightforward matter dealing with your principles of conflict. The facts are that Mr Leach is on the board of directors of the 407 corporation. The 407 corporation initially had an equity investment of about \$750 million three years ago; now it's worth \$3 billion. It has quadrupled in value. The 407 corporation is an enormously profitable operation and he is on the board. But you have just recently appointed him to be the vice-chair of GO, and their job is to relieve congestion. Every single decision made by Mr Leach will have a financial implication for the 407 corporation. We see it today. We see that as GO is seeing some labour disputes the 407 is benefiting substantially.

It's a fairly straightforward question, Premier, on your principles. Do you see this as a conflict of interest and will you move to eliminate this and other similar conflicts?

Hon Mr Eves: I don't recall appointing Mr Leach as vice-chair of GO Transit. My memory may not be serving me well today, but I don't recall that appointment going through any cabinet meeting that I was at. So I will be happy to take the honourable member's question under advisement and get back to him.

1510

PETERBOROUGH REGIONAL HEALTH CENTRE

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): My question today is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, last Friday I attended an event to announce the relocation of the Peterborough Regional Health Centre

helipad. I am pleased to tell you that at that announcement we drew more than 100 people, which gives you and this House an idea of just how important this initiative is for a new hospital in Peterborough. Minister, can you give this House some additional details of that particular announcement and initiative?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I thank the member for Peterborough for the question and, if I may, Mr Speaker, also indicate to the leader of the official opposition that we are arranging for a meeting with the London family to which he referred in a previous cycle. I neglected to mention that.

Back to Peterborough; I can tell you that the Ernie Eves government has provided \$750,000 in funding to make improvements to the Peterborough Regional Health Centre. That will be toward the relocation of the air ambulance helipad, and this will allow the hospital in turn to have better access for incoming and outgoing air ambulance services. This means better, safer, faster and more convenient and efficient service for all of his constituents. I believe this project is a giant and important first step to the hospital's ongoing redevelopment project.

Mr Stewart: Thank you, Minister, and you're absolutely correct; this is a major initiative for Peterborough and for all of the citizens in the community.

Minister, it is my understanding that the helipad is just one of many initiatives this government has undertaken in the hospital in my riding, needless to say, as well as in many hospitals throughout Ontario. Can you please tell the members of the Legislature some of the other initiatives your ministry has made at our hospital as you continue to make health care one of Ontario's priorities?

Hon Mr Clement: I think it should be put on the record how important this project actually is for the people of Peterborough. And I should say that Peterborough Regional has been working with us. It's been a true partnership. There has been a major fundraising campaign which has raised over \$14 million locally, exceeding the goal of \$10 million raised locally. In addition to the \$200-million new hospital that that fundraising campaign is a part of, I can tell you in the meantime there have been ongoing investments by this government for the city of Peterborough in health care: an additional MRI which became operational in July 2001; 120 additional acute-care beds; funding for surgical sites; funding for diagnostic imaging; and emergency room expansion. This is the new and improved Peterborough Regional Health Centre and it will help the citizens of Peterborough, and too, the new hospital is up and running as well. Congratulations to the entire city.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): My question is to the Premier. Premier, I want to draw your attention to the international language program and the African heritage/black cultural program. Both of these programs have been around or taught in the city of Toronto since the late 1970s. You will know that in the

international language programs, Chinese is taught, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Italian, Farsi, Gujarati, Hindi, a multitude of languages, and what is taught in African heritage is the pride and the learning of black heritage, black culture.

You know that the African heritage program is not funded at all by you but rather by the Toronto board, and the international languages get some money from you but not a lot. The Toronto District School Board recognizes that these programs are vital in a globalized economy, but they're on the chopping block. They won't be able to do it without your help. Are you going to be there to help them keep these programs?

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

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): We take very seriously the issue of funding for these students. I'd like to just say that for 2001-02, the per pupil funding amount in the ESL component, the language grant, was increased. These changes increased board spending on ESL by approximately \$20 million or 16.4%.

Mr Marchese: I do want to assist the minister by reminding her that the international program and the African heritage/black cultural program are radically different from ESL. It's a different program. And she ought to know, given that she raised it, that teachers in the ESL programs have been cut by 60%. We know that. But that is a different program altogether.

I want to help you, Minister, by saying to you that the international language program gets some money from you but not a lot. There's very little money for co-ordination, there's no money for professional development, and the African heritage/black cultural program gets absolutely no money from you whatsoever. It's on the chopping block. It was about to die last year and it will certainly die this September. They need you. Will you be there to keep these programs alive or will you abandon the field altogether?

Hon Mrs Witmer: We take very seriously the issue that has been raised by the member of the third party. I would just remind the member that we have recently made available to school boards throughout the province an additional \$350 million this year. As you know, there is a local funding component and certainly they have the opportunity—there's flexibility there—to use that money as they would best see fit. This is what school boards have asked us for. They have asked us to provide flexible funding in order that, depending on the circumstances of each board—obviously, the needs of boards up in Thunder Bay are radically different from those in Toronto, so there is the opportunity there for them to use the local priorities grant to respond to these types of initiatives.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): My question is for the Minister of Health. Minister, we've learned

that you indeed have plans to cut funding to radiologists in Ontario. Their response is that if you go ahead with this plan, it will literally force hospitals to shut their CT scanners off. This comes at a time when we already have out-of-control waiting lists for diagnostic tests. You'd probably be interested to know that the waiting list for a mammogram at the Dufferin-Caledon Health Care Corp is eight weeks long.

Breast cancer is the leading cause of death among women. While you are making some women wait as long as eight weeks to get a medically necessary test done, I'd like to know why you're choosing to put the lives of women in Ontario at risk by denying them proper, timely access to these diagnostic tests.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): The first part of the honourable member's question had to do with funding and she's just plain wrong. I don't know where she's getting her information.

Interjection: The Toronto Star.

Hon Mr Clement: Oh, the Toronto Star. That explains a lot. She's just plain wrong and there's nothing more that has to be said about that. Indeed, it is the Ernie Eves government that has committed in the throne speech to add more diagnostic machines and to increase the number of OHIP-funded hours for MRI diagnostics, for instance.

The honourable member mentions mammograms. She should be aware that I participated in a highly regarded celebration in Barrie, Ontario, recently with the honourable member for Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford where we in fact opened up more time and more space and more procedures. This is happening across the province. So yes, there are additional challenges to be met, but I can tell you that certainly this government and the previous government have made the right kind of investments to ensure that this is a priority.

Mrs Pupatello: In Oshawa people have to wait six weeks to get an X-ray to see if they have colorectal cancer. You'll know that colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer among both men and women. We know that when it comes to diagnostics and treatment of cancer, timing is everything. It's often a matter of life and death.

In Ontario, under seven years of this government's watch, the problem has gotten worse. In our hospitals the average waiting time for radiology tests has increased two and a half weeks in the past year alone. Ontario families want to know why you have not made this a government priority. Why have you allowed this problem to spiral out of control—an average increase in Ontario hospitals of waiting times of two and a half weeks?

1520

Hon Mr Clement: The honourable member is now talking about another terrible disease which we all wish was not prevalent in our society, but the fact of the matter is, new investments in cancer services have been the hallmark of this government. I believe it is close to a 30% increase over the last five years alone. The fact of the matter is, whether we like it or not, we know that the

incidence of cancer is increasing in our society. I wish it were not the case, but it is the case, and therefore our kinds of investments have increased as well.

The honourable member should know that we have had an increase in the Ontario breast screening program, just to answer the previous part of her question, of \$24.3 million recently. So the investments, again, are there.

If the honourable member has a particular case where the standards of this government or of this society are not being met, tell us about the case. We should be aware of that, certainly. But in terms of the investments being made, the concentration to ensure that we have the right investments in the right place, this government is doing what it said it would do and doing the job for Ontario's citizens.

ARTS AND CULTURAL FUNDING

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): My question today is for the Minister of Culture. Minister, first of all let me start off by congratulating you on your recent appointment. We all know you as the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, but as many of us also know, you're a great aficionado of the arts. The people of Ontario, I believe, will be well-served by you in this new portfolio.

Minister, we all know that this government has a proud record of sound fiscal management, unlike previous governments that we won't talk about. This government has balanced the budget for two consecutive years, and we expect the 2001-02 budget to remain balanced despite the economic downturn. All along we've been able to invest record amounts into health care, but we all know that there are other important areas, such as culture, in which this government plays a very important and critical role.

Minister, can you tell this House what this government is doing to support cultural institutions in this province?

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture): I'd like to thank the member from Scarborough Centre for her kind remarks.

First of all, this government places a great value on arts and culture. Speaker, I'll indicate to you some of the ways in which millions of dollars have poured into the arts and culture community which have tremendous returns not simply in culture but also in tourism and in the economy in this province: the Ontario Arts Council, for example, \$25 million; the Ontario arts endowment fund, \$50 million; the cultural attractions fund, \$50 million; the Trillium Foundation, of course; SuperBuild, \$300 million. These are great investments we've made, recognizing the value not only to culture and art but also the value to the economy.

Ms Mushinski: Thank you for that response, Minister. I had known that this government has always been very supportive of the arts in Ontario. In fact, this is illustrated by the throne speech that was delivered by the Honourable James Bartleman on May 9 this year, which

states our government's commitment to working with the federal government to enrich the arts and cultural institutions in the province.

Minister, could you please tell me what specifically this government is doing to encourage co-operation between the federal government and the provincial government and its cultural institutions? It would be interesting to know if the Liberal opposition is also interested in this question.

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: Last week marked two very important cultural events. First of all, on June 3, my grandson Ethan turned 3, and he indicated that when he grows up, he wants to be exactly like Tie Domi.

The other event, equally as important, of course, is that last Friday I was able to be there at Premier Eves's announcement, along with the Prime Minister, in support of a strategic investment in seven flagship cultural projects. I was pleased to be there as well with the associate minister of health, Dan Newman; the member for Scarborough East, Steve Gilchrist; and the member for Scarborough Centre, Marilyn Mushinski.

This heralded a renaissance of growth and prosperity in Toronto for the cultural community. We have invested \$233 million jointly between the federal government and the province through the Canada-Ontario infrastructure program, which will directly assist the Royal Ontario Museum, the Canadian Opera Company, the Art Gallery of Ontario, the National Ballet School, the Royal Conservatory of Music, the George R. Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art and Roy Thomson Hall in their capital improvement projects. This will maintain these world-class institutions in Toronto as leaders in their fields. Of course, this needs investment; I believe we have done so.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Last week you were bragging to this House about your government's hard emission caps on Ontario's electricity sector. Your boasting came in defence of a scathing report on your government's environmental record. Last week, NAFTA told us that your government, since its election in 1995, has been the worst environmental performer of any government in the North American jurisdiction. Your government has turned its back while over 20,000 extra tonnes of lethal toxic environmental contaminants have been released into the air, water and soil since 1995.

Today we learn of another environmental failure of the Eves government. We learn that your own coal-fired electricity plants exceeded their pollution caps by 6,600 tonnes last year. In other words, your government's plants exceeded pollution limits by over 6,000 tonnes in 2001 and you've done nothing. You failed to make this information public and, in consequence, you failed to let the public know of the risk posed to their health due to your government's pathetic environmental record.

Minister, two questions: first, why are government-owned electricity plants exceeding pollution limits, and

second, why has your government failed to notify the public of this disturbing lethal breach of pollution laws by your own plants?

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I can honestly say that in one minute I didn't hear one accurate statement.

Mr Bradley: Honestly say?

Hon Mr Stockwell: Not one accurate statement in one minute. First of all, we weren't the lowest-ranked jurisdiction in North America; let's get that straight. Second, who were the highest-ranked jurisdictions? Hawaii, Guam, Prince Edward Island. Why? Because they don't produce a lot of product out there. They don't produce jobs; they don't produce prosperity.

If we listen to the thinking of the critic for the environment, the only way he wants to get up to number one is that we close down all our infrastructure, close down all our plants, close down all our manufacturing and lay everybody off and put them on welfare. Then we'll be number one. That's the logic the critic has: close everything down, don't create any jobs, no prosperity, put everybody on welfare and we'll be number one. We'll be like Guam. That's the kind of logic.

Look, there were two parties that tried that for 10 years and they're both sitting over there. That's not the kind of prosperity we see. We're still hard on pollution. We're putting the caps in place and we've introduced—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Supplementary.

Mr Bradley: As an environment critic I couldn't have asked for a better answer than that. Thank you very much.

Minister, this year over 1,900 people will die prematurely because of lung cancer, heart failure or other conditions related to smog, produced in large part by your coal-fired plants. Thousands more will be hospitalized with respiratory problems. Your coal-fired plants already emit 23% of the acid-rain-causing, lung-irritating sulphur dioxide in the province. Your coal-fired plants emit 23% of this province's lethal nerve toxin called mercury. Your coal-fired plants produce thousands of tonnes of the chief smog-causing pollutant nitrous oxide. Despite this, you and your colleagues in the Conservative government are allowing your own coal-fired plants in Nanticoke, Lambton, Mississauga, Thunder Bay and Atikokan to commit breaches of pollution limits.

The Speaker: Question?

Mr Bradley: Given the serious threat posed to the health and safety of Ontario residents by your law-breaking electricity generators, and given that your OPG plants' pollution emissions are spinning wildly out of control, will you today commit your government to the elimination of coal-fired electricity generation in Ontario and will you provide us with a timetable for this elimination?

Hon Mr Stockwell: As Minister of the Environment I couldn't ask for a better critic.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Do you know what? I don't need notes for that question. Take my word for it. There are no notes needed for that question. If there was anything accurate in it, I may need notes. But since there's nothing accurate, I don't.

Let's be clear: first and foremost, you were Minister of the Environment. You were running coal-fired plants. Why didn't you shut them down?

1530

Mr Bradley: That was years ago—a long time ago.

Hon Mr Stockwell: That was a long time ago. That was before you became an environmentalist, when you could actually do something about it. That's when it was.

Second, we all know about the coal-fired plants and we all know about OPG. We all know that emission reduction credits were accepted by the pilot emissions reduction trading program. I know he knows that, he quite often quotes it to me, and OPG is able to reduce their net emissions in line with voluntary commitments.

What does that mean in layman's terms? They've gone lower than the standards. They've reduced more than they've been told to reduce. They're below those standards.

Finally, as Minister of the Environment, if you were so concerned about the coal-fired plants, why didn't you shut them down? You didn't because you know that during peak periods of time, we need the coal-fired plants to keep the hydro on in certain people's homes.

So are you suggesting that we shut them down and turn out the lights for seniors across this province? If you're saying that, stand up and say it. Otherwise, the question is moot.

TRUCKING SAFETY

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): My question is for the Minister of Transportation. We all know that Ontario's economy is booming. Ontario is expected to grow faster than any of the G7 countries in the next four years. Productivity in Ontario's manufacturing has improved dramatically, averaging 4.3% annual growth over the 1990-95 period.

Of course, all this economic activity brings an increase in truck traffic. With more and more trucks on the road, motorists grow more and more concerned about truck safety. What action has this government taken to ensure that trucks on our highways are safe?

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Transportation): Our government has a proven commitment to truck safety here in Ontario.

During Transportation Week I was glad to meet with owners, operators and people who drive trucks. They have indeed helped and benefited our economic viability in Ontario to a tremendous degree.

Even though we have increased the number of trucks in Ontario because of the economic development that has taken place, our truck-related accidents have gone down by some 26% or 27% over the last decade.

We have some of the toughest rules, regulations and laws surrounding truck safety. We have some of the highest fines in North America for unsafe trucks, up to \$20,000 per offence. We've made wheel separations an absolute liable offence of up to \$50,000—no excuses; you are convicted. We have removed over 800 unsafe trucks from our roads during the past number of years.

Mrs Munro: Minister, Ontario is one of the leading trading jurisdictions in the world. Ontario exported over US\$130 billion worth to the United States alone in 2000. As a separate jurisdiction, Ontario would have been in third position among the top suppliers of US imports, after Japan and Mexico. During 1995 to 2000, Canadian exports to the US grew at an astonishing average rate of 11.5%. With so much interjurisdictional trade activity on our highways, it is clear that truck safety is a multi-jurisdictional problem.

I am aware of this week's truck safety blitz that is to take place across North America. What can you tell us about this partnership to increase truck safety?

Hon Mr Sterling: The truck safety blitz, which is an international week of concentration on truck safety, is extremely important. It's important so that we can compare our performance here in Ontario against the performance of other jurisdictions in North America.

Happily, last year when this same week took place, it was shown that, overall, our record was 4% better than all the rest combined. Four per cent may not seem like a lot to some of the opposition, but that means that in our case, our trucks are safer with regard to each and every one that is checked at the truck safety station. We, again, are involved in this particular week. We believe in working with other jurisdictions because many of the trucks that are travelling our roads come in from the United States and therefore we have to ensure that their trucks are safe as well.

We have good comparisons with other jurisdictions in North America and we're doing better than most.

DISTRICT HEALTH COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Minister of Health. Minister, two years ago Ottawa city council chose two councillors to sit on the Champlain District Health Council, councillors Alex Munter and Alex Cullen. You, Minister, were not happy with these choices and so you told Ottawa city council to submit different names for consideration. It's not lost on the people of Ottawa that council's choices don't fit with your own personal ideology. Having said that, the net effect over the past two years is that 700,000 residents of Ottawa, 70% of the population served by the Champlain District Health Council, have had no voice in decisions regarding local health care, because city council, to its credit, refuses to bend to your demand to put forward different candidates.

Minister, when are you going to stop playing politics with these appointments and accept the legitimately chosen representatives from Ottawa city council?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): This is really too rich by a half. Every other city, every other district, has a way to work with the provincial government under the rules that we set forth in consideration of them. We say to them, "Simply provide us with a list and we can make a choice based on the list." Every other jurisdiction does that; Ottawa doesn't do that. I'm sorry; Ottawa has to play by the same rules as everyone else so we can be fair to everybody. Who is playing politics? You're playing politics.

Ms Martel: It's clear that the only rules are your rules, because you would rather deny the residents of Ottawa two voices on the Champlain District Health Council because those two councillors don't have a membership in the Conservative Party. That's why those appointments are being held up.

Your government took control of the CCAC boards in December because you didn't like boards that might publicly criticize you for the underfunding of health care. Then, in that same bill, you also determined that the government and the government alone would determine what information would go from CCACs to the public, again to control any possible criticism.

Now you have the scenario that two Ottawa city councillors, duly chosen by Ottawa city council, cannot exercise their right to sit on the district health council because you don't like their politics. Minister, when are you going to stop playing these petty partisan games and accept the appointment of Alex Munter and Alex Cullen?

Hon Mr Clement: We have no problem finding excellent representatives in her region; we have no problem finding excellent representatives in Windsor; we have no problem finding excellent representatives in Toronto or in Kingston or in Hamilton or in Niagara. We have no problem finding excellent representatives in Ottawa either; I'm sure there are those that are, but they have to play by the same rules as everyone else. If you can't understand that, that explains a lot about 1990 to 1995.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): My question is for the Minister of Energy, and it's with respect to your predecessor's comments last week in published reports to the effect that the executive officers in the Hydro One board for some time had been uncontrollable. I think the minister said that they should fire the whole lot of them. I think the minister said the board could not be controlled, and time after time he has said he tried to control the board and he could not. I say to you, because I have to say to you, because I can't say it to this minister: he had an option, sir. He could have held that board accountable. He could have fired that board at the time. He could have taken responsibility as the sole shareholder, and he sat back. He was there at the christening of the good ship privatization as it headed off with a tidal wave of spending of taxpayer dollars. And so I say to you, the Minister

of Energy, how are you going to take responsibility for what this board has done?

1540

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I think the Premier responded to the question earlier in question period. He suggested that we received a letter, through our solicitors, from the Hydro One board, and we decided that that response, by our definition, was unacceptable. So we're going to have to take action with respect to how we're going to move forward on it, and we will take that action quickly.

I also want to enlighten the member opposite as well as the leader of the official opposition. All this information was in fact public: 1997—it was made public April 1, 1998; April 1, 1999; December 27, 2000; May 24, 2000; May 8, 2001; March 28, 2002; May 17, 2002. I might add that during the last two public disclosures, the pay packages were significantly less than they were very, very recently done. So we are taking the position that we're going to take very strong action.

To conclude, your member stood up today and said he had no idea what it was, we were keeping it a secret. All he had to do was go on the Web site, punch in www—

PETITIONS

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Petitions? The member for Sudbury.

HIGHWAY 69

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This is the first of many, many thousands of petitions concerning Highway 69, which is worth the investment.

"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 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 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.

EDUCATION FUNDING

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

“Whereas many high school students in Ontario, outraged at the harshness of the new curriculum, choose to leave school on May 15, 2002;

“Inadequate funding made difficult the implementation of the new curriculum;

“High school students should not be used as forced labour in addition to the extra hours required for the new curriculum;

“There is inadequate funding for the double-cohort year. Universities and colleges will have trouble providing room for all those students;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

“We demand that a committee with government, teachers, trustees, parents and high school students establish a funding model to correct the shortcomings in the system;

“Further be it resolved that a committee with government, teachers, trustees, parents and high school students make recommendations to help those students who have had to change their career paths due to the harshness of the new system;

“Further be it resolved that students are no longer to do compulsory volunteer work;

“Further be it resolved that adequate funding be given for the double-cohort year.”

That’s signed by Linda Mariage, Rachael Warriner, John Pruyne and hundreds of others. I’ve affixed my signature as well.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): I have a petition here—and they’re coming in by the thousands—addressed to the Ontario Legislature. It states here:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I affix my signature in full agreement with this and I will give it to Naguib to give to the Chair.

CHILDREN’S HEALTH SERVICES

SERVICES DE SANTÉ POUR ENFANTS

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): I am very pleased today to present to this Legislature a petition that was gathered together by the mother and grandmother of a seven-year-old beneficiary of the great work of the children’s cardiac surgery unit at the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario. This petition, signed by over 200 of my constituents from the Arnprior area, reads, in part:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario has continued to provide excellent cardiac care coverage; and

“Whereas many citizens of eastern Ontario rely on the existence of a first-class pediatric cardiac surgery unit in close proximity to where they live;

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

“To immediately halt the proposed closing of CHEO’s pediatric cardiac surgery unit.”

I’m delighted not only to present this petition but to sign it and to endorse it.

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): J’ai une pétition signée par 80 enseignants et enseignantes à la retraite de Glengarry-Prescott-Russell qui ont à coeur la santé de nos enfants.

« À l’assemblée législative de l’Ontario :

« Attendu que le gouvernement de l’Ontario est en train de fermer le service de chirurgie cardiaque à l’intention des enfants fonctionnant actuellement à l’hôpital pour enfants de l’est de l’Ontario;

« Attendu que cet hôpital traite chaque année 140 enfants gravement malades à proximité de leur foyer;

« Attendu que la centralisation des services de chirurgie cardiaque pour les enfants à Toronto obligerait les patients et les parents à s’éloigner de 400 kilomètres à 600 kilomètres de leur foyer à un moment difficile;

« Attendu qu’une partie du personnel de ce programme à l’hôpital CHEO parle français, et que de ce fait la population francophone a accès à des conseils médicaux de qualité supérieure en français,

« Nous, soussignés, demandons à l’assemblée législative de l’Ontario d’annuler immédiatement la décision du gouvernement d’abolir ce programme, qui sauve des vies, et de veiller à ce que chaque enfant de l’est de l’Ontario continue d’avoir pleinement accès à des soins de santé de qualité supérieure. »

J’y ajoute avec fierté ma signature.

PODIATRIC SERVICES

Mr Mario Sergio (York West): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it's with respect to "Foot care is not a luxury.

"Whereas services delisted by the Harris government now exceed \$100 million in total;

"Whereas Ontarians depend on podiatrists for relief from painful foot conditions;

"Whereas the new government policy will virtually eliminate access to publicly funded podiatry across vast regions of Ontario;

"Whereas this new government policy is virtually impossible to implement in underserved areas across Ontario;

"Whereas this policy will lengthen waiting lists for patients and therefore have a detrimental effect on the health of these Ontarians;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario to demand the government move immediately to cancel the delisting of podiatric services."

I concur with the petition and I will affix my signature to it.

1550

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): The provision of mental health services to children in Thunder Bay is truly threatened by a lack of government funding. A major petition campaign has been launched, and I'd like to read petitions sent to me by hundreds of people.

"Whereas for the first time Lakehead Regional Family Centre has a deficit budget of \$200,000 due to the lack of adequate funding from the provincial government and the sharp increase in the demands for children's mental health services in the city of Thunder Bay; and

"Whereas referrals to Lakehead Regional Family Centre have increased 150% since 1995, and no additional permanent funding has been received to help meet the needs of our community; and

"Whereas since 1993, the government's investment in core funding for children's mental health services has declined by 8%, and salaries for staff are up to 30% lower than in hospitals and other government services; and

"Whereas according to the Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 18% of children and youth in Ontario have a diagnosable mental health disorder, and yet Ontario only treats one in six of these children; and

"Whereas without immediate additional permanent funding, children's mental health services could be severely restricted to those children and families who need it the most,

"Therefore we, the undersigned citizens of Ontario and residents of the city of Thunder Bay, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"For the provincial government to provide an immediate infusion of additional permanent funding to the Lakehead Regional Family Centre to help fight the crisis situation facing children's mental health services in the city of Thunder Bay."

This petition is signed by hundreds of people, and I am pleased to add my name to this petition.

CORMORANTS

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): I have a petition signed by literally thousands of people from and around the Gore Bay area, Sault Ste Marie, Sudbury and various points around the province. It was put out by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Ministry of Natural Resources is in year two of a five-year study on the impact of cormorants and possible management strategies which was to have included experimental controls beginning in 2001; and

"Whereas recently the then Minister of Natural Resources, John Snobelen, reiterated at the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters' annual general meeting and wildlife conference that the MNR is committed to experimental control of cormorants at specific local sites in 2001; and

"Whereas cormorant populations in Ontario have increased to over 260,000 birds in the past several years,"—that's a lot of birds—"and

"Whereas cormorants are having obvious local effects on habitat and have demonstrated negative effects on fisheries on the New York side of Lake Ontario;

"We, the undersigned, petition the now Minister of Natural Resources immediately begin control of the cormorant population in a meaningful way where there are obvious habitat or fishery effects and to make public the experimental design and results to date."

HYDRO ONE

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex): I have a petition 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 have signed this petition, which comes from Ridgetown.

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One, which includes Ontario’s electricity transmission grid;

“Whereas there’s been little evidence and no public case which proves that selling the grid will benefit electricity consumers;

“Whereas the selling off of the transmission grid is one of the largest privatizations in Canadian history;

“Whereas the Conservative government never campaigned on the selling off of this public asset, and the people of Ontario have not been consulted on this plan;

“Whereas the government does not have a clear mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario;

“Whereas this sale is proceeding hastily and without transparency;

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

“To demand that the Conservative government of Ontario under Premier Ernie Eves move immediately to halt the sale of Hydro One.”

I affix my signature to this petition.

COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): I have further petitions from my riding of Hamilton West.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“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 join with my constituents in adding my name to this petition.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENT OPPORTUNITY ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 OFFRANT DE NOUVELLES POSSIBILITÉS D'ÉDUCATION POSTSECONDAIRE AUX ÉTUDIANTS

Mrs Cunningham moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 65, An Act to enact, amend or revise various Acts related to post-secondary education and opportunities /
Projet de loi 65, Loi édictant, modifiant ou révisant diverses lois liées à l'éducation postsecondaire et aux possibilités en la matière.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Minister?

Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women’s issues): It’s my honour and my pleasure to speak today in support of the Post-secondary Education Student Opportunity Act, 2002. This act brings together a number of bills which received first reading in the previous session of the Legislature. In the interests of a full debate, we are bringing these forward as one bill which, if passed by the Legislature, would help us to increase the opportunities for post-secondary education that are available to Ontario students.

Let me be very clear: never has it been more important to give our students the supports and choices they need to receive a first-class education right here in Ontario. As the recent throne speech pointed out, our government is committed to choice and fairness in all levels of Ontario’s education system. Our qualified and motivated students, regardless of their economic circumstances or their geographic location, deserve the chance as generations before them did for a brighter future. They have hopes, they have dreams and they’ve never been more excited about their opportunities.

Students and their parents want to know that a wide range of high-quality post-secondary educational opportunities is available here in Ontario and they are increasingly motivated, more optimistic, because these are the times that these young people intend to let us know exactly what they want. Hopefully, we can improve upon what we already have by implementing this legislation, and if it does indeed pass, it will pass in a timely fashion because we have more students entering our post-secondary system than ever before.

The legislation we are discussing today will accomplish so many of their great opportunities by bringing together four pieces of legislation. They are:

The University of Ontario Institute of Technology Act, 2002, which if passed would establish the University of Ontario Institute of Technology. The UOIT would provide innovative and responsive training that would prepare students for a highly competitive and knowledge-based economy. Our government is working to be sure that we are ready for students to enrol in 2003, which will be another important year of increased enrolment in this great province.

1600

The second piece of this bill is the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, 2002, which would set up a separate act for the establishment and governance of colleges in order to give colleges the flexibility to meet the changing needs of students and employers and remove those powers from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Act.

The third part is the Ontario College of Art and Design Act, 2002, which would give the college the power to grant degrees and would officially change its name from the Ontario College of Art to the Ontario College of Art and Design.

I was at OCAD not too long ago, as were other colleagues across all political parties of this Legislative Assembly, to witness, I believe, the groundbreaking or the announcement of their new building, which I think will certainly change the face of Toronto and make us competitive across Canada and North America with this wonderful institution. At that time I was reminded by a parent that this legislation is forthcoming and that they would very much appreciate our passing it, because he himself had a student graduating this year who didn't have the opportunity, in fact, to receive a university degree. There are many examples of young people—because this has been on the agenda of the Ontario College of Art for a number of years, and in fact they have passed a very strenuous process in order to become qualified for the privilege of granting degrees to our students. So I'm hoping this will receive the timely attention of my colleagues.

The fourth part of this legislation is the amendments to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority Act to allow the authority—that means TVO—to give credit for distance education programs. This is necessary because the independent learning centre, which offers credit distance education courses—it's been a long-standing practice in this province to offer opportunities to our secondary school students to complete courses and to get credit, and this is now the responsibility of TVO. In order for them to have the authority to give these credits, we must bring this legislation to this assembly.

There are many people waiting for us to move forward. We have had quite a length of time because we did table this legislation for the first time in November 2001. So I have had queries and opportunities to discuss what all of this means with my colleagues, as appropriate, and it's a very important time in the history of our province to move forward.

In addition, the bill changes the name of private vocational schools to private career colleges. This is because

across our country our private vocational schools in every other province are referred to as private career colleges. So there's a sense here of consistency for our young people, and in the interest of labour mobility, both on qualifications and opportunity, I think this is a very important step to take.

Of course, Ryerson Polytechnic University has asked that they have their name changed to Ryerson University. This has been a request for some period of time, and we have decided to include it in this legislation because I believe all members of this House would want to respond to Ryerson, one of our great institutions, named after one of our great role models and mentors when it comes to education not only in Ontario but in Canada. It is one of our institutions that brings us a great deal of pride and an institution also that has conferred degrees on many of our children and many of the citizens of this great province and country.

Each of these initiatives is part of our larger plan to bring post-secondary education into the new millennium, but I would like to discuss today the particular importance of the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act and the impact it will have on our network of colleges here in Ontario. I choose this because this particular piece of legislation is one that we have consulted broadly on. It has been worked on not only by our colleges but our students for more than a year and I think there has been a lot of thought given by the government in bringing forward this legislation. I will say also that we have talked to our colleagues in the colleges about regulations that would be appropriate for this legislation, if passed.

Legislation to establish a college system in Ontario was introduced in this House in 1965 by then-Education Minister Bill Davis, one of our extremely important and successful former Premiers. This was under the premiership of the Honourable John Robarts, who did in fact represent London North at the time. When I first came to this Legislative Assembly in 1988, I was probably under the encouragement of many people in London—my constituents—who had also supported Mr Robarts in this riding at a former time. So some would say these are very big shoes to fill, and I think, Mr Speaker, one always does their best to meet the demands, the expectations, of one's constituents, as you well know.

This was an entirely new type of education for our province at that time: occupation-oriented programs that would meet the training needs of the local community and prepare our students for entry into the workforce. As you know, even today almost 50% of our young people go directly to work from school. So this was an effort, and I think a great effort, on behalf of Mr Davis to meet the needs of these young people who wanted to go on to post-secondary, but more for training than for what the universities offered at that time in the arts, humanities and sciences.

In his statement to the Legislature, Mr Davis referred to the time as an age of "technological change and invention," and indeed it was. The 1960s, 1970s and 1980s revolutionized the way we communicate, saw the

introduction of breakthroughs in health care such as the heart transplant and saw space exploration come into its own.

In 1967, 19 colleges opened. That number is now 24—24 institutions currently operating in more than 200 communities, and I underline “communities.” Approximately 45,000 students graduate each year from a wide variety of programs in business, technology, the applied arts, health professions and apprenticeships, just to name a few of the opportunities that our young people have—and, I might add, people of all ages, because this province is and has always been committed to people. No matter where they live, no matter what age they are, we have promised them a post-secondary education.

I think we would all agree that the colleges have done an excellent job of providing accessible, affordable, cost-effective and high-quality—and I underline that; we’re known for this in Ontario—education for our students.

Last year, 89% of our graduates were employed within six months of graduation, and 91% of their employers were satisfied with the education graduates had received.

1610

At this time, I should say that we should be very proud of our students. I don’t think they’ve ever been more committed. They’re certainly energized. Their future is one of jobs. We have had a few generations before that didn’t get jobs upon graduation, like the 89% that I referred to. But they’ve always been very appreciative of probably one of the best investments that they and their families have ever made, and that’s the opportunity to go on to our colleges.

I will say that we should also be very grateful for and appreciative of and say thank you to our college leadership, their boards, our instructors, our staff and our community partners who provide opportunities for our young people to have training, perhaps in some instances even have jobs—I’m now talking about apprentices—at the same time that they attend our community colleges.

If the pace of technological change seemed rapid in 1965, what can we say about the rate of change in our present times? Our society is changing more quickly than anyone could ever have dreamed of in 1965. This in turn is placing significant demands on our post-secondary education and training systems. For Ontario to continue as a place to live, work and raise a family with their hopes, dreams and aspirations as former generations had, we must ensure that we have a workforce equipped with leading-edge knowledge and skills.

I think there would be no one who would disagree that here in this province the best health care policy is to have a job. If people want to work and they have a job, then our health care system perhaps would not be as strained. We owe it to our young people, we owe it to anyone who is looking for technical training and opportunity to make sure that we have leading-edge knowledge and people prepared with the skills.

This is actually quite an exciting portfolio that I have and I enjoy all of it, including this morning at Conestoga College as we made an announcement for more than

\$350,000 to go into IT and technological and skills training for women. They were a group of people who have been given a different opportunity in their lives. Many of them were single parents. They were so enthused about a whole year, or 50 weeks, of pre-apprenticeship training.

Classes before have in fact got jobs. Not only do I believe that they will be successful in completing their apprenticeships and having good-paying jobs, but I think their enthusiasm and the kind of organizational skills they seem to have in balancing their families and their work, and the friendships that they have created over that period of time as women, will keep them forever as our role models in the future.

I say that because the world of work in the trades is under-represented. Only 12% of women are in apprenticeship programs, and when they get into their jobs they will probably be very much under-represented. What we have learned is that the kind of connections one makes through school gives them the opportunities to keep in touch; Men would call it “networking,” women now call it “networking,” and I think it’s a great success story and I hope we can do much more of it.

I just thought I’d let you know that there are many people counting on government, counting on our leadership and our vision, but without their assistance, without women like these women in the UOIT program at Conestoga—that’s the program for technology—and the skilled trades program at Conestoga and others, we wouldn’t have opportunities to provide programming that we know works, and keep the kind of data where we have success stories like this, where we can improve upon it by focusing our dollars into programs that get people good-paying jobs.

I think we’ve never had a better opportunity to respond together to what our young students are demanding. They are thinkers, they have enthusiasm and commitment, and they do well. Our institutions are for them, so in fact we are listening to them. We know that they, as our clients, have probably been in the best position to give us good advice. They’re studying, they’re getting jobs, they’re paying down their student loans and they’re preparing for a future where they have huge hope.

We have enacted the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000, which enables colleges to offer applied degrees. We’ve seen the successful implementation of undergraduate collaborative nursing programs, finally colleges and universities working together in the best interests of our nurses. We’ve made significant investments aimed at strengthening the skills of our workforce through new apprenticeship initiatives to prepare our workforce for the future. We’ve invested through our colleges and pre-apprenticeship training, as well as for journey person upgrading. We are using a \$50-million apprenticeship enhancement fund to renew facilities and equip colleges to support our efforts to recruit more apprentices and to help colleges provide training that meets industry standards. These measures are an excellent start. I truly believe that in order to successfully adapt our post-secondary system to meet current

challenges, we must all work together in the best interests of Ontario students.

We have consulted extensively with our colleges and our students, and they have advised us that they need more flexibility in order to fulfill their mandate. The proposed new legislation for colleges would recognize the fact that Ontario colleges have evolved. They have evolved in response to fast-paced technological and economic change. This proposed legislation provides the base for future diversity to encourage and support the development of the college system into the 21st century.

Colleges have told us they need change to better meet the needs of students, the workforce and their communities through the delivery of applied degrees, more diversity within the system and more local autonomy. We need colleges that continue to be responsive and market-oriented. If Ontario is to maintain its competitive position in the global economy, colleges will need to respond rapidly to employers in changing economic and social conditions. The ability to adapt and evolve will be vital for future success.

This bill would remove some of the bureaucratic requirements related to the need for ministerial approvals and will provide for more local decision-making and determination. Colleges will continue to have a community focus but will have more flexibility to determine which communities they will serve, be they local, regional or provincial. In some cases, the community may even be as broad as national or international.

Colleges will be encouraged to continue to develop and respond more effectively to the needs of their students and communities. When we speak of communities today, we are speaking of geographic as well as knowledge and electronic communities. Accountability to these identified communities and to the taxpayer will be enhanced through updated accountability mechanisms which focus on achievement of outcomes and ongoing communication.

We're looking at results. Our young people know that when they take a course, first of all they want to be successful, and second, they want it to be meaningful. We are looking at results as we focus our funding in this direction.

Across the province, characteristics of the various colleges vary significantly in size, the nature of the communities they serve, the role of the college in the community, the range of programs they offer and the partnerships they have with local business, industry and other educational institutions. They vary in the way they deliver programs and courses, whether in the classroom, through apprenticeship, over the Internet, in remote communities by day, evening or weekend. We want to enable colleges to be better able to respond to the different circumstances of the communities, their student bodies and their local economies.

1620

In fact, many of our colleges work seven days a week. Students are there mornings and afternoons. I'm not aware that they're there Sunday evenings, but I will say

that our colleges are responsive. However, one size does not fit all. They are also very different in their implementation.

The new legislation will allow for this diversity and even greater diversity between and among colleges or groups of colleges. They need to be able to specialize. It's no longer sustainable for colleges to be all things to all people. Each college undoubtedly will continue to offer a core of programs to address the needs of its students and its communities. However, it is intended that increasingly colleges will build on their strengths and focus the majority of their programming in a few broad areas, eliminating unnecessary overlap and duplication.

Colleges may specialize in a number of ways, addressing the needs of particular industries or clusters of industries, regional or provincial priorities; addressing the needs of a particular segment of the population or continuing with a predominantly local focus.

We have many examples of specialization already in place. I'll say at this time that our 24 colleges are probably one of our best-kept secrets. What their young people are doing, what their instructors are doing, the dedication, the knowledge, the total commitment, is a way of life for them. There's no way that I could take the time to talk about areas of strength and specialization and success stories across the system, except to say that one of the most important evenings is the success story and the awarding of our Premier's Awards that happens once a year, where our young people have graduated and have succeeded in being nominated for the awards or in winning the awards. They come back to Ontario so that we can present them with our Premier's Awards. They are working all over the world and they are stars.

I'll say a few things here about some of the diversity, but I will also say that these are young people and mature people whom we are very proud of.

Centennial College has its expertise in transportation. Sir Sandford Fleming is renowned for its school of natural resources. The Northern Centre for Advanced Technology, NORCAT, at Cambrian College, is an excellent example of a college supporting local economic development. NORCAT is involved in developing new technological applications and prototypes for mining and related industries.

A number of our colleges are beginning to become involved in applied research in areas of unique expertise. Increased partnerships with business, industry, professional organizations and other educational institutions are another evolving feature of the college system which the proposed legislation seeks to strengthen and encourage by removing the existing requirement for ministerial approval.

I recently participated in the opening of a new hospitality and tourism centre at Canadore College, which will provide programs such as tourism, hotel, restaurant and resort management and ecotourism, and brings together the private sector, post-secondary education and government. Those students continue to have lots of expecta-

tions and lots of good advice. We meet them where we travel around the world, as my constituents and others remind us. They're good at their work, they are sought after, and we are very proud of them.

Fanshawe College delivers a new, 50-week pre-apprenticeship program for women as part of the Ontario Women's Directorate's province-wide women in skilled trades initiative. Other colleges, and even a school board, are participating in this program designed to channel women into trades careers in areas of skills shortages.

I spoke earlier about Conestoga. The program at Fanshawe relates of course to automotive, and this was a great success story of women who will have peers and friends as a result of this great opportunity and who will contribute significantly in the area of women in skilled trades.

The dental hygiene program at Fanshawe consists of a significant portion of clinical experience in which the students develop clinical skills in the dental clinic at the University of Western Ontario, and in brief community experience in the offices of local dentists.

So our colleges and our universities are sharing our students, so to speak, and our young people are the beneficiaries. We can go from dental hygiene to nursing to multimedia production and many other areas where nine of our colleges and universities actually have buildings that they are building together as part of our plan for our double cohort. These shared programs in these wonderful new buildings are just one small piece of our plan to meet the needs of these special students. We are providing our students with a wide range of choices and high-quality post-secondary education and continuing the strong occupational orientation of college programs.

As the college system evolves in its growth, Ontarians will be the beneficiaries. We will have the skilled workforce we need to be a thriving, vibrant society. With the help of our colleges, people in labour and business, I must say that this government plans to double the number of apprentices. We are smartly moving forward with the help of our college system.

They are also partners in our Ontario youth apprenticeship programs. If one were to go to Durham College, they would see the school board there partnering with Durham so that our young people can get opportunities while in secondary school to get credit toward their apprenticeship programs when they go on into our colleges and into the workforce.

It is a very modern system, and we couldn't do it without the people that are working both within my own Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and their partners in various programs throughout the system.

In conclusion, we as a government are committed to providing the finest possible educational opportunities to Ontarians right here in Ontario. Our government believes that education is the cornerstone of our province's growth. We want our citizens to be equipped to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing global economy, and we also want to be sure that our institutions have the ability to respond to the changing priorities of students and

employers. We cannot ask them to do this without giving them the tools that they need to make these kinds of changes. In fact, they've asked us to make changes, they've told us what we need to do and we are responding.

Right here in the Legislature we must, across all parties, show our colleges, our students, their boards of governors, their instructors, our business communities and our communities that in fact we too can respond to Ontario's changing educational needs by bringing into reality this legislation, the Post-secondary Education Student Opportunity Act, 2002.

It has been my privilege to have these few moments this afternoon to speak about many activities in our college system. As minister, I have to say that I have been absolutely overwhelmed by the vision of the leadership of our colleges, by the excitement of our students, and with the assistance, I think, of my colleagues in this Legislative Assembly, we can look forward to their ongoing growth, to the statement they're making to many other parts of North America and the world, and to supporting these young people, whose visions and dreams have never been more alive. If you meet them, and when we see them, we know we don't have to worry about our future.

1630

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson):

Members now have up to two minutes for questions and comments.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I'll take up at the end of the minister's comments about the students' aspirations and hopes, and say that so many of them are being dashed now with the situation confronting them with the double cohort; that is, students coming from what we would call both grade 13 and grade 12 into the system of colleges and universities in this province. There simply will not be a sufficient number of positions open for these children, who of course are no longer children by that time but young women and men who want an opportunity to go to university or college in this province.

Without a doubt, no matter whom you talk to, except the government, they will tell you this is a real problem. I hope the colleagues of the minister would be kind enough to be supportive of any initiatives she might have to try to increase spaces in universities and colleges in this province.

A second problem they'll confront in terms of their hopes will be the cost of education today and the amount of debt they have to accumulate as a result of that. It's not only the tuition fees; it's ancillary fees as well, other user fees, if you will, that colleges and universities are applying to students today.

In addition to that, they're facing a circumstance where in effect there's no rent control left in this province. When premises are vacated a landlord has the right to raise the rent. As you would recognize, Mr Speaker, being from a university city, as I am, students tend to be mobile. They may go home for the summer months and therefore try to get new accommodations.

So the costs are great, the operating costs for both universities and colleges are tremendous and the pressures are there. To this point in time, the government has not provided sufficient investment in post-secondary education to make those hopes and aspirations come true.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Just on the surface, I want to talk about the Durham College part of this bill, because I think most members of this House agree on the direction we want to take with that.

I remember that bill being called for second and third reading by way of trying to get unanimous consent on, I think, the last day the House sat in December. At that time, our caucus took the position that we would not accept doing that type of thing: basically, 10 seconds—wham, bam, thank you, ma'am—and the bill is passed without debate.

We as New Democrats, as members of this party, think it's important that bills do have the time to come to the House so people can have proper debate, (1) so that the minister, the critics and other members who are interested are able to come in and voice the views and opinions they've heard on behalf of the constituents they represent, and (2) to give a proper opportunity to take a look at a bill so we know what's in it, what we can do to strengthen it and what we can do to make it work for the people it's intended for.

Far too often what ends up happening is that people try to get bills through the House by way of time allocation motions, which have become a habit around here, or people ask for unanimous consent without debate, and then we find out that the bill doesn't work. For example, we've now had the bill that did the restructuring of municipalities come back to this Legislature for, I believe, seven amendments because the government didn't take the time to have proper debate.

So we say congratulations to the minister for bringing the bill to the House so we can debate this, so people can hear what this bill is all about, (1) so we can represent the views of the constituents, the people we're voted in to represent, not only in our constituencies, but within the greater constituency of the critic areas we represent, and (2) so we have the ability to table amendments that may be necessary to strengthen the bill.

I'm sure our education critic will have more to say about that when he's here in the next hour.

Mr Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): I want to take this opportunity to thank the minister for bringing this bill forward. She certainly has done a great deal to advance the quality and the work of colleges and universities in our province since she has had this portfolio. Once again, this bill will do precisely that: ensure that more and more young people in our province have access, have the availability of a solid educational background.

The minister made reference to the 24 colleges in our province that are delivering exceptional service in this province, not only to students who live here in Ontario but also to students who come from other parts of the world to take advantage of the quality of education we have here.

I had the privilege of attending the graduation of Canada Christian College on Saturday evening, and it was a pleasure to see, first of all, the student body that was there and the degrees that were being handed out, earned through very high academic standards, and particularly a college like this that I know will be sending students out to various areas around the world to carry on in their profession in various aspects of their calling in life. They will be able to point to Canada Christian College, a college that was grounded and founded here in Ontario. I know they are very grateful to this government for establishing the framework within which they can deliver their services.

I commend the minister on bringing this legislation forward.

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): I'd like to thank the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities for painting a compelling picture of support yet invoking the name of Ryerson. In this bill we change the name to Ryerson University, and she says it is a proud moment for him. I beg to differ in terms of the overall picture of what's happened in education. Just ask the trustees in the school boards about what his vision was for governance of education in Ontario. I'm sure that he wouldn't be exactly jumping up and down praising the government for its actions in the school board situation.

Nonetheless, I will say that she has some good components to this bill, something of a mini-omnibus bill that includes several factors. I do have some concerns about one of them, and maybe a couple of questions. But the one I want to ask the minister about is if she is aware of the work of the Brant skills development group in my riding that is doing a grassroots operation about skills development and skills training in our community, with partnerships across the broad spectrum.

Why I bring that up is because they're very, very disappointed in the \$400 application fee that the people have to raise on their own to pay for classroom work. It's not a one-time \$400; it's each classroom activity—first, second, third, fourth levels—up to \$1,600 that the apprentices have to come up with in their classroom time. That's an extra—maybe call it a tax or a user fee. Unfortunately, they are not happy with this and they have invited the minister to come and talk to them about it. I would encourage her to take that opportunity to get a hold of this group. They are doing some modelling, by the way, Minister, that you would be very proud of and I'm sure you would like to have some of that material to use.

My colleague from Hamilton Mountain will be speaking. Her work and mine in committee pointed out a few problems with the private colleges that I think she should pay attention to as well. They were falling like flies and there are a lot of people out of work.

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities has up to two minutes to respond.

Hon Mrs Cunningham: In response to the member from St Catharines, who mentioned a concern about spaces, tuition and accommodation, we have a plan. We

have planned for the number of students, 78,000 new spaces. We have 25 new college buildings, 25 new university buildings, nine in addition that are shared, the operating dollars we have promised in the throne speech that every new student who is qualified will in fact be funded. It's certainly not something the opposition wants to believe, but the funding will be there. I've said it before, so now he hears me.

On the accommodation side, I'm interested in this. You know, there was a time when he went to university when he had to live in somebody's house. Nowadays the universities and colleges are choosing to build their own buildings.

Interjection.

1640

Hon Mrs Cunningham: To the member who is screaming at me, he doesn't know the rules. The public does not pay for the accommodation for our students. In fact, operating dollars is exactly what we're talking about—that's for spaces. They're getting \$6,800, since you were mentioning, for the universities. This is exactly for students.

Interjection.

Hon Mrs Cunningham: In his ignorance of how universities work and his lack of attentiveness around asking me to help him understand, he continues to shout.

I want to end by saying we do have a plan. We've put the operating dollars in spaces. We've put \$1.8 billion for capital. We've put money into research and development, unprecedented. We have put money into student assistance.

We have a plan, and it would be very helpful if members of the opposition would get into their communities, be part of the ambassador program and help the young people learn the answers to the real questions, and that is, there is hope and opportunity for them as in the past.

The Deputy Speaker: It is now time for the leadoff speech for the official opposition. The Chair recognizes the member for Hamilton-Mountain.

Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain): It's a privilege to speak on any post-secondary issue, because the one thing we can agree on in this House is the importance of post-secondary education. Another thing that we seem to agree on in this House is what a fine job our post-secondary institutions are doing, at times under very challenging conditions.

I'd like to talk first about the process with which this bill is being presented and then talk about the bill itself and respond to the honourable minister's statements. We didn't sit for five months. For five months we didn't sit in this Legislature and didn't have the opportunity to debate any bills, never mind this bill. And then last Thursday we got an omnibus bill which is basically five bills—six pieces of legislation being amended, but five bills—and were asked to pass it with second and third readings last Thursday, which I think is an insult to the democratic process, to introduce a bill of such magnitude and then to ask for second and third readings on the same day. Now, the following legislative day, the Monday

after that Thursday, we're asked to do second reading and debate on an extensive bill.

So I'd like to comment on the process of that. We don't like omnibus bills. It puts us in a difficult position. There are good things in this bill, a lot of good things, but there are things we have concerns about on which full debate would have enlightened not only the Legislature but the public, and therefore we could make more intelligent voting decisions in this Legislature. We don't have the opportunity to do that. The government has a majority and we respect that, but they're trying to push through this bill and who knows how many others in the near future in a very quick fashion.

Education is dear to all our hearts, because we know that our children and our youth will not have a bright and a healthy future without appropriate education and training. I've had the privilege of teaching in many of our fine institutions before being elected. I'm from Hamilton. I had the privilege of teaching at McMaster. I lived in Toronto for many years and I taught at Ryerson before it became a university, as well as Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology.

I'm amazed at the diversity of our institutions, at the fact that they try to meet the needs of their local communities, as well as the province, as well as the world. We are well known in the world for the quality of our institutions. One of the main reasons we're known for that is that they're public. That has changed under this government. It hasn't actually changed yet, but by law it has changed, and we're waiting with concern for when the first private universities come to Ontario. We voted against that bill and we have concerns.

Again, we weren't against part of that bill, the applied degrees in the colleges, but we were forced to vote against the part we supported because the major part of the bill introduced private universities, which we had a great deal of difficulty with. My friend from Brant and I, whose ridings are very close, and the students in our two ridings—well, actually in all those ridings—share a lot of the negative experiences with the private colleges that folded. They're businesses, and if business doesn't go well, you fold. The best interests of the student are not first at heart. So we do have concerns about the part of this bill that wants to upgrade the name of these colleges to "career colleges." Right now they're called private vocational schools. Three of them closed in one year alone in my riding.

I'm sorry, Speaker. I failed to mention that I'll be splitting my time with the members from Sarnia-Lambton, St Catharines and Prince Edward-Hastings. I apologize.

Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs): Oh, so now you're going to keep them around here.

Mrs Bountrogianni: I'm sorry, Mr Whip, but our job is to stay around here.

Interjection.

Mrs Bountrogianni: I'm talking about the government whip, John. settle down.

We're very concerned about that part of the bill that upgrades private vocational colleges to career colleges. It may sound like a small detail but it's not. It is confusing. Right now, when students go on to Web sites or talk to their guidance counsellors, there's a clear distinction between our high-quality community colleges that are publicly funded, publicly run and directly run by the province and the government and those that are businesses. Some of them are good businesses and some of them have good programs, but a lot of them don't.

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke North): Let's attack all of them.

Mrs Bountrogianni: I'm not attacking all of them, Mr Hastings. It seems I've hit a bone across the way, even though I'm being extremely balanced in my debate.

There are some very good vocational schools, but there are some that are basically businesses. Three of them closed in my riding alone, leaving the students without a diploma, with \$10,000 to \$20,000 of student debt and without any way of paying that debt, because of course they don't have a diploma to get the appropriate job. So we have concerns about that part of the bill.

The other thing I'm concerned about is how much time we'll have for debating this bill in committee. There are a lot of stakeholder groups that want to comment on this bill, and I'll be talking on their behalf as well today. I'm wondering, is it one day, two days, three days? Is it half a day? We don't have that much time left before the end of the Legislature, and I'd like to know that.

Overall, the college charter is a positive document, and I agree that on this one piece of legislation, of all the pieces of legislation here, the government did consult with the stakeholder groups. They did consult with students and they did consult with the colleges. Although the colleges and students had a few concerns, overall they supported the college charter, and therefore of course we supported the college charter, because the stakeholder groups did too: the students did, the families did and so did the institutions.

There is a concern about the charter, though, on the part of the colleges that has to be brought here. They are concerned that section 8 of the charter may make community colleges third-tier educational institutes. They are concerned about that and they would like the minister to respond.

We support the Ontario College of Art and Design being given the authority to grant bachelor's and master's degrees. In fact, my colleague Monte Kwinter is a big proponent of that college. There are amazingly talented students who graduate from there and are well known internationally.

Although we'd like to know more details, we are supportive of distance education, and that is through the part of this bill that amends the Ontario Educational Communications Authority Act—TVOntario—to recognize the new role of the Centre for Excellence in Lifelong Learning. This will enable TVO to fully operate distance education programs and give credits through this TV programming. We think, in principle, that that's a posi-

tive thing. With the busy lives, the just-in-time lives that our families live today, it's often not possible to actually go to an institution to get a degree or a diploma. So we believe this is a positive start. We want to know more details, though. We have some concerns about possible conflict of interest with the Premier on this part. He did promise he would step outside of any discussions that had to do with TVO, and I'm sure he will honour that promise.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We've got at least three different conversations going on on the floor in addition to the member for Hamilton Mountain. Could you please take those outside the chamber? Sorry for the interruption.

Mrs Bountrogianni: That used to bother me in my first year here, but I'm sort of used to it now; it just happens. But thank you.

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): You guys from Hamilton have to stick up for each other.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Yes. Thanks, Hamilton Speaker.

The bill we had concern with, that we wanted to know more about, was the bill on Durham College turning into a university. Again, in principle, it's good to have an institution to deal with the demographics and it's good to be creative when you're developing these new institutions, but there are some concerns we have and that the colleges and universities are having out there. As I said on Thursday, they may be reluctant to openly talk about them with government members because they don't want to suffer the same sort of retribution that the hospitals suffered under this government in having their budgets affected by their criticism.

1650

I will give you their concerns. First of all, there was a 15% cut to colleges and universities in 1995, as soon as this government took office. Their opinion was that they needed those cuts to balance the budget. That was their opinion. We can argue whether that opinion was right or wrong. We feel on this side of the House it was wrong, but the fact that there was a 15% cut is a fact. We had almost half a billion dollars cut in 1995.

The colleges and universities are telling us that they have a lot of unfunded students—in other words, students whom the colleges and universities accepted, knowing that they wouldn't get per capita funding for. At McMaster alone—and the Speaker would be interested to know because McMaster is in his riding—we have \$5 million a year of unfunded students. In other words, McMaster absorbs the cost of educating these students. Ryerson has even more than that per capita, and Nipissing as well has more. I think those are the top three that have difficulty with unfunded students, although all of the institutions have these unfunded students.

We have students who aren't funded; we have this huge cut of 15% in 1995 that the colleges and universities have still not recovered from; we have a double cohort looming—

Mr Bradley: Shell-shocked.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Shell-shocked, yes. And we have a double cohort looming on us where we still don't know exactly how much money the government will give.

Some colleges and universities have said to us, "It's already late," because they need money to plan, and yet this government still hasn't told them exactly how much money. In fact, the government hasn't told them yet how much money they'll be getting in September for the 2002-03 students.

Under all this insecurity, \$60 million is going toward Durham College, so what we have is suffering to open a new institution. I'll get into more aspects of our concerns about that institution, but that is the major difficulty here: starving the public system and opening another institution in Durham, in a riding in which I think perhaps there could have been a little political opportunism for some of the hopefuls in the Tory leadership race.

The double cohort comes in 2003, but even this fall, 2002, we have a 20% increase in applicants because they want to beat the double cohort. The universities and colleges still don't know—this is a fact, this isn't rhetoric—how much they're getting in September. If in fact 20% of the applicants do end up staying in Ontario, that is an increase. They would have to hire more professors. You have to give a lot more money so that there aren't more unfunded students.

I don't know why you're shaking your head, member. That is a fact. That's planning, and they need to know how much money they're making.

Interjection: Sore neck.

Mrs Bountrogianni: Sore neck, OK.

I guess what we're saying is, if you haven't planned for 2002, where there is only a 20% increase, significant as that is, what about 2003, where there is up to—we accept the fact that the numbers are not certain, but a recent study from People for Education found that up to 20,000 students may be left out. So if we don't even know what will happen in three months, how can we have confidence that you will take care of the biggest demographic surge since the end of World War II? We're very concerned about that.

We don't have any difficulty with Ryerson dropping "Polytechnic" from its name. In fact, in a sense, that has happened in reality. This is just a housekeeping item. As I said, we agree in principle on TVO offering distance education and credits. We agree, for the most part, on the college charter because it has been widely consulted.

We have concerns over private vocational schools being named "private career colleges" because of the default of the loans that the students have there. Their business is basically that they close up when they're not doing well. There's no responsibility toward a student of these places. That is also married to the fact that we're opening private universities now. We're very concerned about that.

The part of this bill that concerns us the most—process-wise, if nothing else—is the University of Ontario Institute of Technology Act. That is what we have the

most concerns about. Other stakeholder groups that have not been consulted also have concerns—the faculty association, for example. I'm going to go over some of their concerns, just in case we don't have a lot of time for debate in committee on this. Maybe we won't have committee debate on this; I don't know. Who knows, with this government?

The number one concern of OCUFA is the government's intent to push through this legislation without public consultation and debate. They have that concern as well.

Also, "OCUFA believes it is ill-advised to establish a new institution until the appropriate resources are provided to existing universities in the province." We would agree. It is unfair to set up and give \$60 million to a new institution when the existing ones are having a great deal of difficulty competing.

"OCUFA believes that the resources directed to creating a new institution could be spent more efficiently and effectively by expanding the capacity of an existing university. Events in British Columbia are instructive" of this. "The Technical University of British Columbia, established under the previous NDP government, proved to be a very costly and controversial endeavour." Like the university about to open in Durham, "it too was intended to offer university courses focusing on technology and applied sciences. Escalating costs led the new ... government ... to eliminate the independent status of TechBC and fold it into Simon Fraser University. TechBC is now a campus of Simon Fraser." If nothing else, we should maybe study what happened in British Columbia, which is a very similar situation to here.

In the first reading of this bill, I asked the minister if the quality assessment advisory board would be looking at the content of the programming before this university opens. I don't think there's time for that now. They've already hired people—six deans, I believe. There's up to \$800,000 already committed in salaries for the first year for these people. The Web site is up. A new person was just hired this week. Maybe at the end the minister can advise me. I don't know if the quality assessment advisory board actually had time to assess the programming of this place. OCUFA believes and we believe that it makes sense to do that before an institute opens, not after it opens.

According to OCUFA, the faculty association of Ontario, "This is especially troubling given the inadequacies of UOIT's mission, objectives and governance structure. As indicated by" the act, it "is not a university but an applied degree-granting polytechnic college with a highly circumscribed mandate, flawed governance structure and no guarantee of academic freedom and tenure." These are some of the concerns.

The government is not establishing a university in the commonly understood sense of the term, but rather a polytechnical institute, a hybrid college. Some of these applied degree programs will probably be offered in the future at other Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology. It's closer to an applied degree-granting

college than a university. The council of universities also had a concern with the title “university,” Ontario “university” of technology. Perhaps if this does go to committee and gets debate, we can make an amendment to change the title of this institution.

York University also has some concerns over this institution. They too share the concern about the name. They also believe that an “economic/demographic analysis under which a new university in this part of the province is justified” should be questioned, “especially since the planning section of the Ontario government announced only two weeks ago that all the growth is in the northwest of the GTA, the Niagara Peninsula and around Hamilton-Guelph-Waterloo.” That is where the growth is. York questions, and we agree, the decision of where this institution is being placed.

“The estimated operating costs of this new institution”—they’ve already been awarded \$60 million. When Ryerson became a university, it was a very expensive endeavour. Again, at a time when we’re cutting back on other institutions, why fund this one so richly?

Also, “an explanation of why private sector ‘partners’ will support this institution if they are not now supporting other college and university programs with proven track records in the same fields”—the government often talks about SuperBuild, but I know that the institutions are having difficulty coming up with the matching funds they promise. Again, I think it’s a good question for the minister: what are you and this government going to do if in fact the colleges and universities don’t come up with the matched funding they promised, which was a requirement for the SuperBuild funding to build all these wonderful buildings the minister is talking about?

1700

Buildings are great and we need them, but what we need even more are people to teach the students in those buildings, and that is where we come back to operating grants. With the 15% cut and with the lack of any kind of information for this fall as well as the fall of 2003, we don’t know. We already have the highest student-to-professor ratio in the country. Part of that is because provincially we’re funded last in the country and second to last on the continent. Comparing with the United States has its difficulties, because it’s a different culture down there, but even if we just compare with the other provinces, the province funds us last, and that’s part of the problem.

The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance is also concerned that they weren’t consulted about this new institute. Their concern is that university education should be, yes, about gaining skills for employment, but should never be just about gaining skills for employment. The community college system in Ontario has created the infrastructure for the employment sector. They believe the universities should be that and more and they’re concerned about the narrow focus of this institute.

They are also concerned about the governance structure, that it will not have both a senate and a board of governors or trustees the way our public universities do

have now. This doesn’t guarantee whether there will be students on the board of governors. Right now, as we all know, there are students as part of the governance. They don’t have a lot of voting power on any board or on the senate, but they are there. The senate members know they are there, the professors know they are there and the administration knows they are there, and if there’s a difficulty the students speak up.

Another of the concerns that I brought out last Thursday over this bill is that a couple of other institutions have complained that this institution jumped the queue. Again we’re talking about process. Queens has a bachelor of tech education already. Half of their applicants were turned down for the fall session because of funding, and we really need tech education teachers. There are 174 unqualified people teaching tech education right now across the province. So Queen’s has that concern.

Trent University in Peterborough has asked the question, “Why did they get this all of a sudden, all this money and this program, when we have been asking for this program for years?” There’s another institution that feels they haven’t been consulted or listened to.

There is, although it’s still early, I know, the question of quality. At least one employee in a very high position left another public university to work there and lasted five weeks. He says he couldn’t look at himself in the mirror because of the lack of quality and the kinds of decisions that were made. I don’t know the details, and we definitely will keep an eye on the situation, but that’s indicative of the hurriedness of this process.

We have an omnibus bill after five months of not sitting. We’re expected very quickly now to pass legislation. We may agree with the majority of it but we want to know more about one large piece of it. We feel that the process has been hurried and that consultation has not been done appropriately. The major criticism we have is that a new institute is being opened at the expense of the existing institutions. We have universities and colleges across this province that are complaining about the lack of funding and are wondering and hoping and praying that in the next budget they will be able to service their students in the fall, especially in the fall of 2003. Instead, this government gives \$60 million to a new institution.

This morning we had a point of privilege that the Speaker voted down on how this was done, that even though the bill wasn’t passed, professors are being hired; deans are being hired. I don’t know; maybe a building is being built that we don’t know about. We are concerned about that process. I don’t have the experience to know how much that is done in politics, but it seems to me that a bill should be passed first before people are hired at the institution that the bill endorses.

Like our stakeholders, we are waiting with bated breath for the budget for September. If you are going to open this new institution, (1) make sure it’s a quality institution; (2) ensure that the existing institutions have enough funding so they can compete fairly with this new institution. Have the quality assurance board very quick-

ly, before it opens, assess every single aspect of the program. The quality assurance board is an infrastructure that this government brought in for the private universities, for the applied degrees, and it should apply to this new institution.

We're not against new ideas and we're not against creative ideas, as long as they are ideas of quality. We have concerns about this particular institution at this point in time taking money away from other institutions and about the quality of this institution at this point in time. We hope, for the students' sake, in that region and across the province, that these issues are addressed.

We are for the majority of this bill. We wish we had sat earlier so that we could discuss it and have more days of debate. I would like to know by the end of this debate how many days of debate the minister is planning on this bill so that we can have at least a couple of days of debate from the stakeholders' groups.

I would end by saying I'd like to take this opportunity to implore the government, to beg the government, to look at more funding for the universities for 2002 and 2003.

I'd like to also ask the government not to entertain, as you did entertain, a deregulation of fees at universities the way you did entertain the possible deregulation of undergraduate degrees at Queen's University. The majority of our students across this province are in undergraduate arts and sciences programs. Tuition is already high enough. It has increased by 60% under your mandate; we don't want it to increase any more. There are many students—and three studies have shown this—from poor families who cannot afford to go to university or college any more because of the increase in tuition.

Because of the underfunding, Queen's wanted to deregulate the fees and you were entertaining that thought. In the end you said, "Not at this time." We appreciate that, but we would like you to say, "Never." At least arts and sciences degrees, undergraduate degrees should not be deregulated. That is the one hope for students who cannot afford the \$10,000- to \$15,000-a-year tuitions, and more, that medical schools, law schools and business schools charge.

So please, take your time with this legislation. It's massive. We agree with most of it but we have concerns with some of it. Go to the public with it and debate. Please let us know today if that will occur and for how much time, if possible, that will occur. Fund, very quickly, the universities and colleges for 2002. We have many more applicants than expected. Fund the double cohort appropriately, because we're not talking simply about putting money into education, as important as that is; we're talking about investing in our future, we're talking about job creation, we're talking about the health of our citizens in the future. Research study after research study shows that the more educated you are, the healthier you are. With increased poverty comes increased health costs, increased crime costs. It's an investment.

We are supposed to be the economic engine of the country. It's an embarrassment that we are funded,

provincially, last in post-secondary education in the country. We should be funded first. We should be first in the country in post-secondary education. We should be leaders, the way we once were leaders in post-secondary education in the country. We should give our students the brightest futures. They deserve it. And these are the students—

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): And not the leftovers.

Mrs Bountrogianni: That's right. My colleague Leona Dombrowsky says, "Not the leftovers." We should not force students to leave the province to get an education. They always have that choice, and for those who have that choice financially, wonderful; it's a great experience to travel. But for those who don't have the choice, it is our ethical duty to ensure that they have a quality education right here in Ontario and that universities and colleges should be funded because of the programming they deliver, not because of political opportunism during leadership debates. I implore the government to do the right thing, to cut the \$2.2-billion corporate tax cut and put part of that money into post-secondary education for the sake of our children and our youth and for ourselves in the future.

1710

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): I am pleased to join the debate on this bill, though it is always difficult to follow the member for Hamilton Mountain. She covered virtually every point on this bill, and in an excellent manner.

I'm going to focus on the community college, kind of the orphan or forgotten part of the post-secondary system but extremely valuable to this province, not just to the students who attend the college but to the province itself.

It's interesting, as we've seen the decrease in funding to community colleges in order to fund the corporate tax cuts, we're also hearing from the corporations that they want highly skilled, educated students, and we're failing to provide that for them.

I know from the community college system—having been a teacher at one for 25 years—at my community college, during the life of this government the funding dropped from \$5,000 per student per year to \$3,000. The rationale is always, "Well, there's some fat in the system." There was nowhere near 40% fat in the system. I'm not even sure there was any. I watched in the years prior to that as class sizes increased and user fees were starting to rise, but this was a massive slam to the college system. They were able to do it because they fund them, because they are servants of this government. The government has abused the power they've had over the community colleges and they fund them at a lower rate.

Now here's an even crazier way that they fund them. The colleges are facing increased enrolment, particularly with this double cohort situation that's approaching. The colleges have the students come and they register them. They have to staff in order to teach the students who are there, but they get paid for the number of students who were there two years earlier, which invariably is a

smaller amount because the enrolment is increasing. So they are in the position of having more students than they are receiving funding for each and every year, and then this government has had the audacity to reduce the total global dollars coming to the colleges for it. So they have had to manage this slip funding; they've had to manage this underfunding. How they manage it, I believe, is not in the best interests of this province.

First of all, before I get to that, I should mention that the minister even recognized that funding was an issue and asked the college presidents to put together a recommendation on what the funding level should be. The college presidents collectively said, "We should be funded at a level not the highest in Canada; we should be funded at the Canadian average"—just at the Canadian average, so that Ontario would fall right in the middle. That was rejected. So while we've seen other provinces and US states increase the funding, this government has reduced the funding to the young people who will serve to attract industry to this province, who will serve to make industry successful, and when industry is successful and these individuals are successful the province will be successful. If they talk about the trickle-down effect, as has been popular but not proven in Great Britain and the US—we're still following it because we've got to make our own mistakes—in theory, making all of these young people successful at a college should make the province successful. But we're not putting money into them. We're saying to the colleges, "You've got to do more with less." Well, I can assure you they're doing less with less.

One of the victims in this has been a reduction in the number of program hours. Each student who comes into a college program doesn't have a sense of what was taught or how many hours were spent in the previous year, so they have no sense of the effect of cutting a 28-hour-a-week program to a 22-hour-a-week program. The reduction—and that's a typical reduction—is catastrophic on the amount of material that can be covered. It's easy to hear the rationale, "Well, they've got computers now and there's computer-assisted learning so they don't need as many hours in the classroom." I would assure you it's just the opposite. We're doubling the knowledge in this world in less than every 10 years. They need more time and more information rather than less. They need access to these computers and they need access to the hours to cover what industry is covering as they move forward so rapidly. But, no, we're seeing a reduced number of hours and our students leaving not as well-equipped to make our province successful.

These graduates will compete but they're not competing with graduates from the next community college or the next province; they're competing with graduates from all over the world. When industry decides, "Do we locate in Japan? Do we locate in Mexico? Do we locate in Ontario?" our graduates have to compete on a worldwide basis and they're not able to do that with the program hours cut.

The colleges are being put in a position of having to cut full-time staff and replace them with part-time. In

many of the colleges they've reduced the full-time staff by almost 50%. That means that a significant number of the programs are being covered by part-time. It used to perplex me as to why the government would want this to happen, but then I realized over the last five-month break that this government wants part-time legislators, so why shouldn't they want part-time college teachers? At least they're being consistent—consistently wrong, but consistent.

The difficulty with part-time faculty is that no matter how great they are, and there are many great ones, they come into a college and teach their hours, but in order to make a living they have to go and work in other places at other times. There is a value in having a part-time professor come in from industry, but there is an optimum mix. Because of the larger classes, we're seeing students who sometimes need to talk alone to the professor, and that's not possible when you have a part-time individual.

We've seen them put forward proposals for funding capital works that rely on matching funding from the local community college. That is very, very difficult for small colleges in rural areas. It's not a level playing field. A college that's located in an area that has a strong industrial base is going to be far more successful in its fundraising. Should the quality of education for that student depend on local fundraising ability? No. We need to have an equal level of education all the way across the province, and they've been shortchanged on that, greatly shortchanged.

The province also came out with a wonderful system called key performance indicators, which measure employment and the attrition rate. It sounds reasonable: "We will reward colleges that do well versus colleges that don't do well." But when we look at the final numbers, the colleges are all clustered very, very closely together at the top. The message I get is that these key performance indicators are a kind of exercise or make-work or busywork for someone. All the colleges are working because the faculty and the administration are making them work; it's not with help from the government. They're spending time filling out these forms when the government doesn't want to acknowledge what a great system they have.

We hear the statement made that every qualified student will have access to the program. I beg to have a definition of the word "qualified." Does that mean every student who has an Ontario secondary school diploma will be admitted to a college? Absolutely not.

Right now we can play with the word "qualified." What that means is that colleges and universities will be able to set a bar. Some years universities will say, "For everyone going into engineering, we draw the line at 86%. Anyone below 86% is not qualified to get into our program." Colleges are going to be put in that same position. Where they have more students than they can accommodate in a program, they're going to draw the line at where they have the resources for building, which the province is giving them money for, or at operating, which the province is not. We've heard promises of

operating funds for some time, but to parents out there and to students who are graduating it's important that you differentiate: there is not a commitment that every student will have a seat in a college program; it is every qualified student, and the word "qualified" is open to a great deal of variation.

This bill also includes provisions to transfer some of the distance education to TVOntario—not a bad idea. But you need to recognize that quality distance education costs money; it's not just enough to move it over. The curriculum to be delivered on a distance education basis requires an altogether different format and altogether different preparation than the curriculum that's delivered in a classroom. You can't simply take a classroom curriculum and use it the next day on TV.

There needs to be a recognition that if you want to make distance education work—and you should make it work—you need to fund it at a level that not only can you do adequate curriculum development, but you also provide support to the students. Ultimately they need a mechanism to ask someone a question. There's nothing more frustrating than being on your own and puzzling over something for a day or a week, when access to someone related to that program could answer the question and allow them to move on. So please do more than just a name change. Please fund it so you can make it work. For much of Ontario that doesn't have access to a college or university, or for individuals who work certain hours, this is great.

They're going to change the name from private vocational schools to private vocational colleges. Now, we need to think about that, because right now in order to be a school, you have to fill out a form where the most difficult question is the address. "College" has a certain significance that the rest of the world puts some faith in. In my community, we have some excellent private schools that I could see being named colleges and would have no difficulty with it. But I'm also aware that there are other operations that open up which are intended, perhaps, to bring students in from outside of this country. They have no standards to meet. There is no curriculum to meet.

1720

I urge the government to reconsider this part of it. Although I'm going to support the bill, I urge them to reconsider the part about the private colleges. If they're going to be called colleges, there needs to be a standard established. There needs to be a curriculum that is approved. There needs to be a minimum standard, so the public can tell the difference between the various institutions and know that if they're going to take their life savings or borrow money, they're not going to be faced with a school that goes bankrupt or that doesn't deliver the curriculum.

So I urge the government to establish minimum curriculum and operating standards if they are going to change this name. Certainly, the sound is there that the government is going to do something, but I urge them to put their money where their mouth is.

Quality education is expensive. Ignorance is cheap. We want quality education in this province. This bill doesn't do anything to actually deliver a better product to the student.

Mr Bradley: Here we are in the middle of a debate affecting colleges and universities in the province. As I indicated in my two-minute response to the minister, the telephone calls I'm getting, the letters I'm getting, the discussions I'm having, are with a variety of people who are concerned about both access to education and quality of education; access in terms of parents, the general families of the students and, I think, some who work at the colleges and universities themselves, who recognize it's increasingly difficult for students, financially speaking, to gain access to our colleges and universities.

Certainly, with the forthcoming double cohort, when the students from grades 12 and 13 arrive at the same time at the colleges and universities, we recognize that there will be a—I think "crisis" would be a word that we could use quite accurately. Certainly, that's the forecast. Despite the government's assurances there's going to be money forthcoming to address that problem, I can't find anybody in the college or university sector who believes that to be the case, though they are hopeful. The minister certainly believes that to be the case. I simply can't find those individuals. The minister will have to help me out in that regard.

We recognize the circumstances facing those students. Tuition has gone up dramatically over the past few years. This is an imposition on students. It makes it more difficult.

At one time, there used to be a lot of summer jobs that were quite lucrative for students. I think in my own community the paper mills, General Motors, TRW and Hayes-Dana, which are all major industries, used to employ a lot of students in the summer. Far fewer of those students have access to those jobs now. As a result, they're unable to obtain the funds they need and therefore, they have to borrow those funds or work during the school year, perhaps to the detriment of the studies they're undertaking on a full-time basis.

So there is a problem out there with accessibility. In terms of graduate studies, it's increasingly becoming evident that the richest kids, the most privileged kids, in the province have the best chance at those positions. I've talked to students from the University of Western Ontario who say they have noted a different demographic of those who are in medical school now, that more and more, it seems to be young men and women from very wealthy families and not too many from the smaller communities. That's a result of the cost of tuition going up dramatically for those courses. There are others now thinking out loud about deregulating tuition for undergraduate courses.

There is a concern that we'll go back to the days of years and years ago, before we tried to make post-secondary education easily accessible to people, where only the wealthiest or the extremely bright people who could get scholarships were those who could access post-secondary education.

As my colleagues have mentioned in their earlier speeches in the House, this is an imposition not only on those students and their families, but also it's not good for our province because we want our province to be competitive in a competitive world.

My friend Gerry Phillips, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, who is our finance critic, has said on many occasions that when he looks around at how other adjacent jurisdictions advertise to get businesses to go to their states or to get investment in their states, they will tell you what a fine education system they have: how much they've invested in it, how many graduates they will have, the quality of those graduates. We in Ontario simply wave a stick of the lowest tax rate. We like to talk about the lowest tax rate. That's only one of the factors that they look at. I would think I would make a good judgment when I say there are a lot of other factors that make a jurisdiction more attractive for investment than simply lowballing everybody else, because you're never going to get below Alabama and Mississippi and those states that do not provide many services to their citizens but are havens for people who want to come in and have the very lowest taxes. So it's an investment we're talking about.

The minister makes reference to some capital investment. There has been some, but a lot of it now is based on private-public partnerships. I notice circumstances where more and more the people who are going to be invited on to the board of governors of any post-secondary educational institution are going to be those who have access to private funding or the connections to be able to obtain private funding. While it is nice to see, from time to time, the private sector making its investment in post-secondary education, because it benefits immensely from the students who come out of community colleges and universities, it is nevertheless troubling when we see a diminishing of the amount of investment that is forthcoming from the government of Ontario.

Some interesting statistics emerge. One is that when adjusted for inflation, the government operating grants per university have decreased by 29% over the past decade and the government operating grants per college have decreased by some 40%. Since 1992-93, all 50 American states and eight of the nine other provinces have made a larger increase in post-secondary investment than Ontario has. State support for post-secondary education in the United States has increased by an average of 24% while it decreased 17% in Ontario.

Student debt load has risen from an average upon graduation of \$9,000 to over \$25,000. So those students immediately face a major financial impact. Tuition fees for regulated undergraduate university programs have increased by 62% since the Harris government came into power. That is a tremendous increase and very onerous on the students and their parents.

This government has cut funding to universities and colleges by \$400 million in 1995. By 2003-04 university enrolment is projected to be 16% higher than in 1995, yet

funding will have increased only some 7%. Funding per student, therefore, will be down 8%. If inflation is factored in, funding per student will have fallen 23% by 2003-04. The government's own report, *Portals and Pathways*, identified deferred maintenance costs of \$900 million at universities, \$300 million at colleges and the post-secondary sector needs an investment of some \$800 million in capital funding to keep the buildings from falling apart.

I guess the point is that I think there are a lot of people in this province now who see post-secondary education as an investment in our future, not simply some frivolous expenditure that governments get into. There is a payback. If people are only interested in a financial payback, there's a payback because the better educated and better trained the people are, the better jobs they're going to get, and probably because their income is higher, their taxes might be higher, though with the way this government is going, that isn't necessarily the case in our province.

Even though there are some aspects of this bill that are certainly supportable, there are a couple of hostages in there that make us uncomfortable in supporting the legislation, though in total, if we look at the bill, I think we would find that it is supportable.

1730

But I make this plea to the government on behalf of the students of this province and their families: that they make a significant investment in post-secondary education; that they stop this spiral of increasing tuition fees; that they re-impose rent control in this province so that students are not faced with spiralling increases in terms of private accommodation out there.

I would like to take into account that in a few years there are going to be a lot of professors retiring, and to compete with other jurisdictions for the best professionals to come into our universities and community colleges is going to require significant investment. All this is worth a lot more than an additional \$2.2-billion gift to corporations in this province in terms of tax cuts, another \$500 million in assistance for private school tuitions and another \$945 million in income tax cuts. If you ask the people of this province, they will say, "Invest in our future, invest in post-secondary education," and that's the plea I make to this government today.

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): I didn't realize that the member from St Catharines was going to be so timely, so succinct, so brief. Anyway, I do rise to speak to this bill. It's important that we as a Legislature—I think I'm out of breath; maybe I'm just not as fit as I used to be in my younger years.

First of all, Bill 65 is an omnibus bill. As we have heard in the Legislature today, it is dealing with approximately five different acts. Omnibus bills are interesting creatures in that they insert a multitude of acts, some of which are excellent and some of which you have no opportunity to question because the acts may not be as valid as the other ones.

The word "omnibus," in case anybody is interested, comes from the Dickens era when there existed a bus—

literally a physical bus—and on that bus you would have various cargo. It would transport humans, it would transport livestock and various cargo. It was called an omnibus because it was a catch-all and it didn't just transport people. Thus of course we've got the words "omnibus bill."

This bill, as we know—I'll just read it through, but we've heard it many times in here—deals with the University of Ontario Institute of Technology Act, 2002; schedule B deals with the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, 2002; schedule C deals with the Ontario College of Art and Design; schedule D, amendments to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority Act; and schedule E deals with amendments to the Ryerson Polytechnic University Act, 1977, the Private Vocational Schools Act and related consequential amendments.

My colleague from Hamilton Mountain is very knowledgeable about the details of those acts and she spoke very effectively on the specifics of those sections.

I want to speak to what the minister talked about this morning. She was talking about the knowledge-based society and the need to develop a more creative and probably a stronger, I believe she said, post-secondary system. I must speak to this, because a knowledge-based society requires that education at all levels is supportive of the other. We have to have a very good foundation in elementary years, a very good foundation in secondary, and then of course we move on to post-secondary. It's extremely important that the government look at these things holistically and not just in what is going to appease, if you want, what I sometimes call very strong lobby groups to make some changes intermittently. I believe there have been a number of other institutions that have suggested we are spending money now without sustaining and putting money into the current institutions that are there at the post-secondary level.

I had the opportunity to speak with our Lambton College president, the new president there, Tony Hanlon. We have a small college; it isn't a large college. He talked to me about the fact that funding in these small colleges is at the 1989-90 level, which is amazing. He felt almost as if education was certainly not a cornerstone of the Conservative government agenda. As you have seen here, the funding the colleges have received has deteriorated, until we are now 59th out of 60 jurisdictions. That is a shame, because we are the most prosperous province in Canada.

I want to ask again for support, and I want to convey this message to the Conservative government about Ontario community colleges. Sarnia-Lambton has a community college, we don't have a university, and our college is fundamental to our economic base there. It works with industry and it's fundamental to the well-being of our community and yet it has a decline in funding—a huge issue.

How do we sustain and how can we talk about the well-being of a knowledge-based society or the development of a knowledge-based society when we see that, in

every single sector, all we've had is seven years of sustained cuts and instability?

One of the things Tony Hanlon told me was, "I believe there's been deferred maintenance on many of these institutions"—huge, huge numbers, and it's over \$1 billion of deferred maintenance. All they can do is their emergency repairs. What happens is that if you don't maintain your buildings, if you don't maintain what you have, pretty soon you will have buildings that are going to require major renovations. We all know that. You have to fix your windows. You have to sometimes replace the floors. You have to paint. They've been deferred and deferred until some of these buildings don't look like the first-class buildings they should be.

One of the other issues that I was told in our discussion—and again this is reality. We can sit here and we can be pro and against things, but these are the realities that the colleges that are delivering the services are facing. My colleague speaks better to the details of universities and to the details of the act, but I would like to say that the government has failed the youth of this province. If you take a look at our education system, going right from elementary all the way to post-secondary, the question has to be asked, are we in a better position today than we were seven years ago? That's the question that's fundamental, those seven years whereby in this unprecedented economic growth—we talk about tax cuts but we have had unprecedented economic growth and yet our educational institutions are the ones that have felt the impact of ruthless cuts over and over again.

I know this bill is going to be hotly debated in this Legislature. I'm hoping there will be a chance to have public hearings so that all of the issues can come out, considering it's an omnibus bill. I know that in the days to come we will hear much more about the pros and cons facing us, but education has to be a priority and I'm afraid the actions of this government show that it hasn't been a priority over the past seven years.

1740

The Deputy Speaker: Members now have up to two minutes for questions and comments.

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): I listened quite carefully both in person and on the television to the comments that were made and I find myself very much in agreement with much, of what was said. Particularly, I would like to focus on the remarks of the member for Hamilton Mountain. She spoke first and longest and I think most eloquently on this. She talked about our pride in post-secondary institutions, and I think there can be no doubt in this province that we have great pride, and should have great pride, in the post-secondary institutions that have been developed not just by this government but by all governments, going back right to the time of Egerton Ryerson. She spoke quite eloquently about how the people who have gone to school in Ontario have benefited from a plan that is generations old.

She also spoke about the need for continuing debate and the need for this to go to committee. I think her

points were well taken, because there are many stakeholders here who need to be heard in order to make the bill even better than, with respect, it already is. She talked about non-consultation that has taken place and about the \$60 million going to a new institution. Certainly we need to expand our post-secondary institutions all the time. As the population gets bigger, as we become more and more technological as a society, we will need new institutions, there can be no doubt. But we also have to be careful that we do not underfund the old ones at the same time. I believe the point was very well made.

She talked about the difficulties in British Columbia of establishing a new institute for technology and it has now been folded into Simon Fraser. That was very good. In the past, many universities, including the University of Toronto, York University and Carleton, have established satellite campuses and it's something that we should look at too.

Finally, she talked about the deregulation of degrees, and we need to make sure that the degrees that are earned in the province of Ontario are of the highest calibre and are world-recognized.

Mr Hastings: I am happy to respond to some of the comments made, some of the more disturbing comments made, particularly by the member for Hamilton Mountain. What I am referencing there is that there seems to be a branding or putting all together of some of the colleges in the private vocational sector that did foul up in terms of their financing, but "Let's sort of use a broad-brush approach and apply that whole thing to the good colleges."

It's interesting to hear a silence from members opposite as to how they see the role of the private education provider helping in the so-called double cohort. We don't hear anything in that regard—zero. I want to put on the record that over the years I have had an excellent working relationship with one private vocational school, and that is the Regal Constellation College of Hospitality, which has provided hundreds of jobs to the hospitality industry in this province and internationally.

But it would appear that the member for Hamilton Mountain and some of the other critics across the way would sort of lump that college in with all the rest. I think it's absolutely shameful to say they haven't served a useful role.

Ontario is not the only province in Canada where the term "career college" is not used, except for PEI, which has no private colleges. In my estimation, we need to set the record straight that the private vocational sector has served a useful, beneficial role for many students in this province, across Canada and internationally. I hope the member sets the record straight on that when she makes her concluding comments.

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex): I am pleased to rise and make comments on the lead off by my colleague from Hamilton Mountain, as well as on the remarks by the members for Prince Edward-Hastings, St Catharines and Sarnia-Lambton. They did an excellent job with an overview of this bill. Some five bills are contained in this

one, and I think they've put some very excellent remarks on the table.

In the agricultural community, and in other communities as well, we recognize that if you don't keep up the maintenance of your house, you're likely going to be in a position where you will spend more in the long run. If you don't keep up the roof on your home, you're going to spend more in the long run. It just makes common sense; it makes perfect sense.

But we understand from our critic that the government is deferring \$1 billion worth of maintenance. This is not the way one would operate their home or their car or any other item they might have. It's foolish, and I think we're going to be paying dearly for that.

I've had the opportunity to talk to many young students who are in anywhere from grade 11 to grade 13 currently, who are asking me this question: who is going to be allowed to go to college or university, and should they be in one grade or the other? One has an average of 79% but has gone to school much longer than the other student, who has an average of 78%. But they will both be entering university or college at the same time. They look worried when they ask me this question. They're very concerned about it, and in some cases they have almost a defeated attitude about it, because they don't know what the government's stand will be. They're competing within their own grade and against another grade. They want to go to university, and they'd like that clarified. They're bewildered, they're frightened and some lack the will to try.

Mr Bisson: Mr Speaker, as you know, our critic Mr Marchese will be up speaking on this particular bill in a few minutes, and I know he has a number of points of view that he wants to bring to this legislation. But I want to remind the government and the Liberal opposition that this bill was brought to the House in December. At that time, the government and the Liberal opposition wanted to have the Durham College bill passed without any debate, passed by unanimous consent and just thrown through the House in a matter of seconds.

We New Democrats said at the time, "No, that's not the way the legislation should be dealt with. There are a number of issues that need to be dealt with by way of debate." I am pleased to see today that the government and the Liberal opposition are debating this bill. They have spoken to Durham College, and I congratulate them for that.

I also hear calls to allow this bill to get to committee so we can allow people to come forward who have some issues they want to raise around those particular issues. I heard one member—I'm not sure if it was the member for Hamilton Mountain or the member for Sarnia-Lambton—say that one of the issues is, how can we justify spending \$60 million on a college, which we all support, and at the end of the day we will vote for it, but at the same time we are not putting dollars forward to existing universities that are out there?

In my constituency, l'Université de Hearst, with three campuses, is operating, I believe, on a budget of \$3 mil-

lion and could certainly use some extra dollars to provide much-needed programs and relief to that university. They're doing a really good job with not a heck of a lot of money and could do a lot more if we were to give them some support. From the perspective of that university, they're saying, "Listen, it's great that you want to do something for Durham College, but what about doing something for us?"

I look forward to this bill getting to committee so that those people involved in that sector can come before us and hopefully convince the government, if we're going to have largesse by way of its supporting Durham College, which is a good thing and we will support it, that we do the same thing financially for other colleges and universities that are out there.

1750

The Deputy Speaker: Any one of the original speakers now has up to two minutes to respond. The Chair recognizes the member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mrs Bountrogianni: I'd like to respond first to the member for Etobicoke North, who maybe not purposely but very definitely misinterpreted what I said. I gave a very balanced response to the private colleges. There are some good ones out there, we know that, but there are many that aren't, that close up their businesses. As soon as they stop making money, they close up. Three closed in my riding alone, leaving students with student debt and without a diploma to get a job to pay that student debt. So I'd just like it on the record, although anyone who for whatever reason would read Hansard would see that is what I originally said.

I'd also like to thank the member for Timmins-James Bay and agree with his comments. He may know, being from the north, that the then Minister of Northern Development had actually asked the college presidents to develop a proposal along with the city in order to increase economic development in the north. Then they had another meeting, the college presidents came, and the minister said, "It's not what I wanted," and stormed out. He insulted them; he rejected a proposal that he himself had asked for. As well, Mr Bisson may also know that of all the applied degrees granted by this government to colleges, not one was granted in the north. So we feel that you've written off the north in more ways than one, particularly in post-secondary education, and on this side of the House we're disgusted with that. Thank you for reminding me, because I omitted that in my debate earlier.

Mr Bartolucci: The Liberals are—

Mrs Bountrogianni: The Liberals are definitely in support of the north.

In summary, then, we would like to have debate on this. I'm looking forward to hearing from the minister how many days of debate we will have on this so we can in a very democratic fashion examine the bill, listen to stakeholders and make amendments to this bill.

The Deputy Speaker: It is now time for the leadoff speech for the third party. The Chair recognizes the member for Trinity-Spadina.

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): Thank you very much, Speaker.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): Could we have dinner first?

Mr Marchese: Dinner comes after. First the speech and then the dinner. But we've only got a couple of minutes. You can wait another five minutes for dinner, for sure.

I want to take up where the member for Hamilton Mountain left off with respect to the issue of discussion, hearings. Last December, to remind you of what my friend from Timmins-James Bay said, New Democrats said that we can't simply pass bills on the basis that the government introduces them and New Democrats should be saying yes because they're simply good and we should move on. It's just not right to do that. It would be a profound mistake to do that. In fact, mistakes have been made in the past where bills have been introduced and voted on in short order and we move on, and of course corrections have to be made soon after bills have been presented because mistakes are made and can be made.

Mr Bisson: Like the Planning Act.

Mr Marchese: The Planning Act: one bill after the other. There were seven bills introduced in the space of—what?—six months, seven months, eight months. Seven or eight bills—talk about government incompetence in terms of what it does and what it doesn't do and how better to do it—in the space of six or eight months. This is the government that's supposed to be better at governing than presumably the rest of us on this side. The public says, "Oh, Tories know how to govern. They know how to manage." Seven or eight different bills on the issue of—

Mr Bisson: It was the Municipal Planning Act.

Mr Marchese: The Municipal Planning Act, taxation and all those other issues. Is that good planning? No. They made mistake after mistake and they had to come back over and over again to fix previous mistakes. This from a government and for a public that believe they know what they're doing. So how could you expect, public or even Tory members, that we New Democrats would simply say, "OK. You want the bill passed, someone you're supporting out there wants this bill passed. We'll simply close our doors, shut our books and close our minds, presumably, and everything will be OK." We can't do it. We need debate in this place.

We also need, for constituents who have concerns about the bills that are before us, to debate and to have the opportunity to raise concerns that they might have, or even, for that matter, to come in front of a committee and say, "We agree with what the government has done." This permits government and opposition members to hear the pros and the cons of a particular bill. It even permits the government to make amendments from time to time. It doesn't happen very often, but it does allow for the government to learn to listen, to learn and then to possibly say, "Yes, maybe we can make some amendments, because it'll make the bill better." That's the purpose of bringing a bill in front of this place: first

reading, second reading debate, taking it out to committee and bringing it back for final debate. Once you've done that, then you can proclaim it; rightfully or wrongfully, then you can do that. But that's what this place is all about.

We refused to give unanimous consent last December, and we took a lot of flak; we did. From the Ontario College of Teachers, from the folks who are supporting the University of Ontario Institute of Technology in Durham, we got a lot of flak. We got whacked by friends and foes in the Durham area. In fact, we had New Democratic friends who came and said, "You've got to help us. You've got to pass this bill." We said, "We can't do it." To those New Democratic types out there in Durham who said, "We need this bill," the government said, "You've got to go to the NDP. They're holding this up." And they did, they came and they called. And, yes, we could have bent to the will—

Mr Bradley: Ed Broadbent was on the phone to me.

Mr Marchese: Not that particular Broadbent.

And, yes, they wanted us of course to bend to the will of those individuals who came, because they were New Democrats, and while we respected them for supporting this bill and we respected their views, we hoped that they would respect ours, that we have a job to do. Our job was to present an alternative point of view; our job was to be critical of the government in terms of what it does, what it does badly, and we need an opportunity to debate in this place.

The public needs to know that universities and colleges in this province are last in terms of funding in North America. We're not even just talking about here in

Canada; we're talking last in North America. It's a big country. Canada is a big country. North America is even bigger than this little province, and we're at the bottom of the heap when it comes to funding.

You see, if we said yes to these bills that come before us, we wouldn't be able to say it. We wouldn't be able to say that a province as rich as Ontario is at the bottom of the heap when it comes to funding.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): Yes, but we're number one in debt, and you did that.

Mr Marchese: You are number one in having increased debt in a good economy. That's what you're number one at. In a good economy, you have increased debt. Money is coming in and the debt is going up. This is the good management of Tories in power. I ask Ontarians, is this the kind of governance you're looking for? Increase the debt, decrease the services; that's the kind of government we're getting from these Tories. Without debate, we couldn't make these points. Without debate, some of you would believe that this government is doing OK and that they know how to do things.

Speaker, you will alert me when the time is running out, because it's hard to see the clock. Just a couple of—

Interjection.

Mr Marchese: I'm ready to sit down, if you are.

I want to say to the public that we will continue this debate, and I will have approximately 53 minutes tomorrow around 3:30, more or less. Please tune in.

The Deputy Speaker: It now being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 this evening.

The House adjourned at 1800.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon / L'hon James K. Bartleman
Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr
Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers
Clerk Assistant / Greffière adjointe: Deborah Deller
Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Agostino, Dominic (L)	Hamilton East / -Est	Chief opposition whip / whip en chef de l'opposition
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Waterloo-Wellington	Parliamentary assistant to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Education / adjoint parlementaire à la vice-première ministre et ministre de l'Éducation
Baird, Hon / L'hon John R. (PC)	Nepean-Carleton	Associate Minister of Francophone Affairs, chief government whip, deputy House leader / ministre associé des Affaires francophones, whip en chef du gouvernement, leader parlementaire adjoint
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Bartolucci, Rick (L)	Sudbury	Deputy opposition House leader / chef parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition
Beaubien, Marcel (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre des Finances
Bisson, Gilles (ND)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Chief New Democratic Party whip / whip en chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Bountrogianni, Marie (L)	Hamilton Mountain	
Boyer, Claudette (Ind)	Ottawa-Vanier	
Bradley, James J. (L)	St Catharines	
Brown, Michael A. (L)	Algoma-Manitoulin	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Bryant, Michael (L)	St Paul's	
Caplan, David (L)	Don Valley East / -Est	Deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary (PC)	Oakville	Speaker / Président
Christopherson, David (ND)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	Deputy Speaker / Vice-Président
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Finance / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre des Finances
Churley, Marilyn (ND)	Toronto-Danforth	
Clark, Hon / L'hon Brad (PC)	Stoney Creek	Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Cleary, John C. (L)	Stormont-Dundas- Charlottenburgh	
Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony (PC)	Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Coburn, Hon / L'hon Brian (PC)	Ottawa-Orléans	Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associé des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Colle, Mike (L)	Eglinton-Lawrence	
Conway, Sean G. (L)	Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	
Cordiano, Joseph (L)	York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	
Crozier, Bruce (L)	Essex	
Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne (PC)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Curling, Alvin (L)	Scarborough-Rouge River	
DeFaria, Hon / L'hon Carl (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Sarnia-Lambton	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Dombrowsky, Leona (L)	Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington	
Duncan, Dwight (L)	Windsor-St Clair	Opposition House leader / chef parlementaire de l'opposition
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / -Nord	Parliamentary assistant to the Premier and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / adjoint parlementaire au premier ministre et ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet (PC)	Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Minister of Finance / ministre des Finances
Elliott, Hon / L'hon Brenda (PC)	Guelph-Wellington	Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services / ministre des Services à la collectivité, à la famille et à l'enfance
Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie (PC)	Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey	Premier and President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC)	Whitby-Ajax	Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation
Galt, Doug (PC)	Northumberland	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation
Gerretsen, John (L)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	
Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	Scarborough East / -Est	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Environment and Energy and government House leader / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie et leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Gill, Raminder (PC)	Bramalea-Gore- Malton-Springdale	Parliamentary assistant to the Premier and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / adjoint parlementaire au premier ministre et ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Gravelle, Michael (L)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	
Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	
Hampton, Howard (ND)	Kenora-Rainy River	Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services / adjoint parlementaire à la ministre des Services à la collectivité, à la famille et à l'enfance
Hastings, John (PC)	Etobicoke North / -Nord	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Affaires civiques
Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)	Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Hoy, Pat (L)	Chatham-Kent Essex	
Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim (PC)	Erie-Lincoln	Minister of Consumer and Business Services / ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises
Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron (PC)	Burlington	Minister of Tourism and Recreation / ministre du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen (PC)	Huron-Bruce	Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Johnson, Bert (PC)	Perth-Middlesex	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Kells, Morley (PC)	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Parkdale-High Park	
Klees, Frank (PC)	Oak Ridges	
Kornos, Peter (ND)	Niagara Centre / -Centre	New Democratic Party House leader / chef parlementaire du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Kwinter, Monte (L)	York Centre / -Centre	
Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	
Levac, Dave (L)	Brant	
Marchese, Rosario (ND)	Trinity-Spadina	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Marland, Margaret (PC)	Mississauga South / -Sud	
Martel, Shelley (ND)	Nickel Belt	
Martin, Tony (ND)	Sault Ste Marie	
Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Cambridge	
Maves, Bart (PC)	Niagara Falls	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Transports
Mazzilli, Frank (PC)	London-Fanshawe	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General and Minister responsible for Native Affairs / adjoint parlementaire au procureur général et ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
McDonald, Al (PC)	Nipissing	
McGuinty, Dalton (L)	Ottawa South / -Sud	Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition
McLeod, Lyn (L)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	
McMeekin, Ted (L)	Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough- Aldershot	
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound-Muskoka	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Molinari, Hon / L'hon Tina R. (PC)	Thornhill	Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associée des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Munro, Julia (PC)	York North / -Nord	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet and Minister of Culture / adjointe parlementaire au président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement et ministre de la Culture
Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Environment and Energy and government House leader / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie et leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities and Minister responsible for Women's Issues / adjointe parlementaire à la ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités et ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan (PC)	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre associé de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Durham	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Ouellette, Hon / L'hon Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Parsons, Ernie (L)	Prince Edward-Hastings	
Patten, Richard (L)	Ottawa Centre / -Centre	
Peters, Steve (L)	Elgin-Middlesex-London	
Phillips, Gerry (L)	Scarborough-Agincourt	
Prue, Michael (ND)	Beaches-East York	
Pupatello, Sandra (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	
Ramsay, David (L)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	
Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	Minister of Public Safety and Security / ministre de la Sûreté et de la Sécurité publique
Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Davenport	
Sampson, Rob (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	
Sergio, Mario (L)	York West / -Ouest	Deputy opposition whip / whip adjoint de l'opposition
Smitherman, George (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	
Snobelen, John (PC)	Mississauga West / -Ouest	
Sorbara, Greg (L)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	
Spina, Joseph (PC)	Brampton Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Travail
Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC)	Lanark-Carleton	Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Peterborough	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Richesses naturelles

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris (PC)	Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	Minister of Environment and Energy, government House leader / ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Énergie, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Business Services / adjoint parlementaire au ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises
Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H. (PC)	Markham	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture / président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement, ministre de la Culture
Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David (PC)	Don Valley West / -Ouest	Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre associé de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation
Wetlaufer, Wayne (PC)	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation / adjoint parlementaire au ministre du Tourisme et des Loisirs
Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener-Waterloo	Deputy Premier, Minister of Education / vice-première ministre, ministre de l'Éducation
Wood, Bob (PC)	London West / -Ouest	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Public Safety and Security / adjoint parlementaire au ministre de la Sûreté et de la Sécurité publique
Young, Hon / L'hon David (PC)	Willowdale	Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

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

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

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

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Norm Miller
Ted Chudleigh, Marilyn Churley, Mike Colle,
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist,
Dave Levac, Al McDonald, Norm Miller
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: James J. Bradley
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Michael Gravelle
James J. Bradley, Leona Dombrowsky, Michael Gravelle,
Bert Johnson, Tony Martin, Frank Mazzilli,
Wayne Wettlaufer, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Vacant
Toby Barrett, Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant,
Garry J. Guzzo, Ernie Hardeman,
Peter Kormos, Al McDonald, Lyn McLeod
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Présidente: Margaret Marland
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Ted Arnott, Caroline Di Cocco, Jean-Marc Lalonde,
Margaret Marland, Julia Munro, Marilyn Mushinski,
Michael Prue, Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier
Bruce Crozier, John Gerretsen, John Hastings,
Shelley Martel, Bart Maves, Julia Munro,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

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

Chair / Président: Rosario Marchese
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop
Gilles Bisson, Claudette Boyer, Garfield Dunlop,
Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy, Morley Kells,
Rosario Marchese, Ted McMeekin, Bill Murdoch,
Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

**Alternative fuel sources /
Sources de carburants de remplacement**

Chair / Président: Doug Galt
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Marie Bountrogianni
Marie Bountrogianni, James J. Bradley, Marilyn Churley, Doug
Galt, Steve Gilchrist, John Hastings,
John R. O'Toole, Jerry J. Ouellette, Ernie Parsons
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

CONTENTS

Monday 3 June 2002

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Highway 69	
Mr Bartolucci.....	541
Agriculture round table	
Mr Galt.....	541
Laurier Brantford	
Mr Levac.....	541
Education	
Mr Prue.....	542
James Morden School	
Mr Maves.....	542
School closures	
Ms Di Cocco.....	542
Terry Ryan	
Mr O'Toole.....	542
Highway 77	
Mr Crozier.....	543
Filming in Millbrook	
Mr Stewart.....	543

MOTIONS

House sittings	
Mr Baird.....	543
Agreed to.....	544

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Senior citizens	
Mr DeFaria.....	544
Mr Brown.....	545
Ms Martel.....	546

ORAL QUESTIONS

Education funding	
Mr McGuinty.....	549
Mr Eves.....	549
Mrs Witmer.....	550, 554
Mr Marchese.....	554
Hydro One	
Mr McGuinty.....	550
Mr Eves.....	550, 551, 552
Mr Hampton.....	551
Mr Bryant.....	558
Mr Stockwell.....	558
Home care	
Mr McGuinty.....	552
Mr Clement.....	552
French-language services	
Mr Galt.....	552
Mr Baird.....	553

Conflict of interest

Mr Phillips.....	553
Mr Eves.....	553
Peterborough Regional Health Centre	
Mr Stewart.....	553
Mr Clement.....	554
Cancer treatment	
Mrs Pupatello.....	554
Mr Clement.....	555
Arts and cultural funding	
Ms Mushinski.....	555
Mr Tsubouchi.....	555
Pollution control	
Mr Bradley.....	556
Mr Stockwell.....	556
Trucking safety	
Mrs Munro.....	557
Mr Sterling.....	557
District health council appointments	
Ms Martel.....	557
Mr Clement.....	558

PETITIONS

Highway 69	
Mr Bartolucci.....	558
Education funding	
Mr Kormos.....	559
Hydro One	
Mr Curling.....	559
Mr Hoy.....	560
Ms Di Cocco.....	561
Children's health services	
Mr Conway.....	559
Podiatric services	
Mr Sergio.....	560
Children's mental health services	
Mr Gravelle.....	560
Cormorants	
Mr Bisson.....	560
Competitive electricity market	
Mr Christopherson.....	561

SECOND READINGS

Post-secondary Education	
Student Opportunity Act, 2002,	
Bill 65, Mrs Cunningham	
Mrs Cunningham.....	561, 567
Mr Bradley.....	565, 573
Mr Bisson.....	566, 576
Mr Klees.....	566
Mr Levac.....	566
Mrs Bountrogianni.....	567, 577

Mr Parsons.....	571
Ms Di Cocco.....	574
Mr Prue.....	575
Mr Hastings.....	576
Mr Hoy.....	576
Mr Marchese.....	577
Debate deemed adjourned.....	578

OTHER BUSINESS

Board of Internal Economy

The Speaker.....	543
------------------	-----

Visitors

Mr O'Toole.....	544
Mr Martiniuk.....	544

Walkerton inquiry report

Mr Bisson.....	547
Mr Baird.....	547
Mr Stockwell.....	547

Consideration of Bill 65

Mr Duncan.....	547, 549
Mr Kormos.....	548, 549
Mr Stockwell.....	548
The Speaker.....	549

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 3 juin 2002

PÉTITIONS

Services de santé pour enfants

M. Lalonde.....	559
-----------------	-----

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2002 offrant de nouvelles possibilités d'éducation

postsecondaire aux étudiants,	
projet de loi 65, M^{me} Cunningham	
Débat présumé ajourné.....	578

AUTRES TRAVAUX

Rapport de l'enquête sur Walkerton

M. Bisson.....	547
M. Baird.....	547
M. Stockwell.....	547