

No. 72A



N° 72A

---

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

Third Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Troisième session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Thursday 12 December 2002**

**Jeudi 12 décembre 2002**

Speaker  
Honourable Gary Carr

Président  
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

---

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

### **Copies of Hansard**

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

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

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

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

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

### **Exemplaires du Journal**

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



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF ONTARIO

Thursday 12 December 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 12 décembre 2002

*The House met at 1000.*

*Prayers.*

PRIVATE MEMBERS'  
PUBLIC BUSINESS

WASTE MANAGEMENT  
GESTIONS DES DÉCHETS

**Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** It's a pleasure for me to rise in the House this morning to move the following motion:

Let it be resolved that the province of Ontario must employ cost-effective modern technology which is presently available as a progressive process to manage and dispose of waste. Furthermore, a more aggressive objective than the present goal of 50% be established to divert waste away from landfill sites must become the new criteria and goal.

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

**Mr Beaubien:** It certainly is a pleasure this morning to rise on behalf of the constituents of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex to raise the issue of landfill in our waste streams in the province of Ontario.

Why do I raise this particular issue? First of all, the Lambton part of my riding probably has more landfill sites per capita than anywhere else in the province of Ontario. There's a reason for that. The soil conditions in that part of the county, certainly in Kent and part of Middlesex, is very conducive to having landfill sites.

However, having said that, I don't think anybody wishes to have a landfill site in their backyard. But we have to come to the reality that we do create an awful lot of waste. We're certainly the leaders in the world, as a nation, when it comes to the creation of waste.

To simply landfill waste today is no longer acceptable. I say that because landfilling is archaic technology. Our forefathers used that method of disposing of their waste. They were burning it and they were burying it, and we're still doing the same thing. One reason we're still doing that is probably because it's cost-effective. However, as a province, as a nation, as responsible citizens, we have to look at what kind of legacy we're going to leave our children.

I don't want to make this an urban-rural problem, but there is no doubt that a lot of the waste is generated in

urban areas and shipped to rural areas to be landfilled. Let me say that many small rural communities, including First Nations, would be more than willing to accept the waste, but not to simply landfill it. I think we have to look at a better recycling process, better composting and, like I said in the resolution, using modern technology.

If we go back a number of years, 10 or 15 years ago we initiated the blue box program in the province of Ontario. I think it's a fuzzy-peachy way of making people aware that we should reduce our waste stream. But I don't know if you've had the opportunity lately to watch when you have one garbage truck coming down the road and then, coming in the other direction, you have a recycling truck. It's somewhat irresponsible to have two large polluting vehicles coming down the street to pick up your waste. And many, many of the recyclables—I've seen it with my own eyes in the past six months—simply go into the garbage portion of the recycling truck. I would imagine the reason that happens is because there may not be a market for the cardboard or paper or glass or whatever it is.

Consequently, we have to look at how we are going to proceed in handling our waste. We can make this a political issue, but I see that the member from Sarnia-Lambton yesterday finally realized that there is an Environmental Protection Act. If you're going to change anything in the way we deal with our waste stream, at times you may have to amend the act or the regulations, whatever the case may be. There is a process, for instance: "Guide for Applying for Approval of Waste Disposal Sites." It's a lengthy process.

One of my small communities right now, Watford, is undergoing an application where one of the local waste companies is applying to expand the waste site. I had the opportunity to attend an open house a couple of weeks ago; sometimes I'm concerned, because I think there were 12 to 14 local residents at the meeting. It was not very well attended.

When I talk about waste diversion, I think all levels of government have a responsibility to play: federal, provincial, municipal and certainly the taxpayers. I think we have to start with the packaging industry. We are somewhat over-exuberant sometimes with our packaging requirements, and consequently that creates waste.

I should also say for the record that no municipality should be forced to accept waste. For a landfill site to be expanded or created, the municipality should be a willing host.

I do have some concerns. One of the concerns I have—we talk about pollution. Pollution is a concern, I

would say, to all Ontarians. It's a motherhood issue. But when we have something like 400 garbage trucks leaving the Toronto area on a daily basis to go to Michigan, to go to New York, to go to Lambton, I wonder where the leadership is at the local municipality, namely, the city of Toronto. I had the opportunity to negotiate with them with regard to the sale of a local, municipally owned landfill site 12 years ago, and I dare say that Toronto is not any further along with regard to dealing with their garbage than they were 12 years ago.

1010

**Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):** Not true.

**Mr Beaubien:** If it's not true, why are you shipping 400 trucks a day outside the community?

I realize that the member from Sarnia-Lambton is all for closing down the Sarnia-Lambton generating station and putting 400 people out of work. But when we look at the pollution created by the Sarnia-Lambton generating station and the one in Nanticoke, they create 8% of the nitrogen oxide pollution in the province. Yet vehicles that use the 401 corridor create 32% of the nitrogen oxide pollution—four times as much.

With regard to truck traffic, in the town of Petrolia at this point in time we are receiving 90 garbage trucks a day. They're using local roads and disrupting the peaceful residential areas in some small communities. That is a concern, and I know we have to deal with this.

Like I said, there is no problem with dealing with garbage, because garbage is a by-product of our society, but we have to deal with it responsibly. If we were more conscientious with regard to composting, recycling and whatever else, maybe methane digesters, and would bring it to rural Ontario, to a community that is a willing host, we can deal with it in a responsible manner using modern technology and creating jobs in rural Ontario, creating by-products that can be used, as opposed to landfilling. Landfilling is an antiquated way of dealing with our waste stream.

I say we have to be more aggressive than having a goal of 50%. I see that the Liberals, in their recent Magna Carta, say we should divert 60% of waste from landfills. I have municipalities in my riding, small municipalities, that are diverting 80% of their waste stream already, so 50% is not adequate and 60% is certainly not adequate when most of the landfilling activity is generated from Toronto and shipped to rural Ontario, and its population is going to go from 2.5 million people to 3.5 million or whatever population maximum we're going to have. That's going to create more traffic. That's going to create more garbage.

That's why it is imperative that as opposed to having goals of 50% and 60%—there's technology in Europe, in Japan, that deals with the waste stream with a maximum of 95% to 98%. There's basically nothing in landfill. It's about time that in Ontario, in Canada, in Toronto, we start dealing with our waste stream in a responsible, cost-effective manner, using modern technology, so we can deal with some of the pollution we are creating.

When we're talking about the Kyoto accord, I think it would be a good plan to make sure that whatever program we embark on with recycling and composting and waste management, it is compatible with the Kyoto accord that is going to become law in the very near future.

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** I find it interesting that the resolution brought forward by Mr Beaubien, certainly when it comes to the words, sounds absolutely incredible. It appears that Mr Beaubien has obviously had some type of conversion on the way to Damascus when it comes to landfills in this province. I say this because at the beginning of his presentation, Mr Beaubien spoke about not playing politics with this and then proceeded to do just that. I find it a little bit interesting but also a bit disturbing, because I want to also put on the record some issues that are very, very serious about an expansion of a hazardous waste landfill that was expanded in 1997 in a fast-tracked process, and it was fast-tracked under criteria for that company to be able to expand its market share. That's the criteria, not as a problem-solving mechanism.

The reason I find this resolution interesting—I also look at actions, not just words. We can say whatever we want to say to make ourselves look good. That is something that unfortunately happens much, much too often in this political world. But it is the actions that validate what one says. When it comes to the riding Mr Beaubien represented before 1999, the municipality near Brigden, St Clair township now, actually saw an expansion. I understand the member worked for Phillips, I believe, for a period of time, so he certainly has an understanding of the waste industry, if you will.

Unfortunately, the member, as part of the Red Tape Commission, was instrumental in some areas and participated in removing regulations that I believe actually protected the public interest. When it came to the expansion of the now Clean Harbours site, which is now going to be bringing in toxic hazardous waste—we're talking about this diversion of 50% of the waste when in fact for the last four or five years, hazardous waste importation to the province of Ontario, because of the lax regulations, has quadrupled. On one hand we're saying, "We have a good idea. Let's divert waste. We don't want Toronto garbage coming into Lambton county." On the other hand, what we have done is open the doors to toxic hazardous waste from literally around the world into that area. That happened under Mr Beaubien's watch and it happened under this government's watch and continues to do so, yet we do not have any political will to change the regulations to stop this practice.

I do agree with one thing: this practice of expansion of landfills is archaic and should become extinct. It will become extinct if we at least would move forward, as other jurisdictions have done, to do what they call on-site treatment. What does that mean? That means we don't export-import waste but deal with it in the jurisdiction that actually generates the waste.

On the one hand, Mr Beaubien says we have to stop diverting, but on the other hand, he accepts the notion that we can send waste to other jurisdictions. There's a bit of a contradiction there. Nonetheless, the resolution is what I firmly believe in, that we have to stop generating the quantity of waste we do in this province, in the manufacturing sector as well as in our own personal lives.

On this conversion on his way to Damascus—I say this because I have not heard the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex speak out strongly on the notion of importation of hazardous waste. He was there when he allowed the expansion, when it was done silently, when it was done quietly. He was part of that silence when the expansion took place so it became the largest toxic hazardous waste in the country.

1020

The rhetoric here is commendable, but the actions speak to something else. I would certainly like to challenge the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex to support the stopping of the toxic hazardous waste that's coming in from Sydney, Nova Scotia, some of the most toxic substances in this country that are going to be trucked in from Sydney. I don't see the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex speaking out on this issue. His silence is overwhelming.

I would also suggest that the whole issue of environmental degradation that has caused—and I don't buy this notion that Lambton county is the best place to landfill. No place is the best place to landfill, because eventually, according to the contract on the expansion, it says that the long-term consequence is contamination of the groundwater. That's a given. I would suggest that the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex put action into the words and also take a stand to advocate for the residents in the area who feel they have become the toxic haven for North America because of an expansion that took place under his watch. Now he states in his resolution that he wants to have this goal of 50% to divert waste from landfill sites, that it must become a new criterion and goal. Again, I commend the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex for his conversion on the road to Damascus.

**Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke North):** First of all, I'd like to commend my colleague the deputy from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex for introducing this resolution. To go to the very heart of the matter, we have been discussing this issue for several years, but we don't seem to be making a terrible amount of good progress. Yet if you look outside Ontario, and even within Ontario, there are solutions. What we ought to be focusing on, particularly since the feds have now declared that Kyoto is the promised land of the future—it's incumbent on us as legislators to start finding the practical and sensible solutions for trying to get to that road. You can talk about ratifying the Kyoto solution, but you have to face some practical realities in dealing with garbage in this province or in other parts of Canada. We need to be looking at ways we can accommodate and solve the problem, because it's not getting any better.

As the heart of the resolution Mr Beaubien has suggested, the landfill method, while it may appear great in rural Ontario and the smaller municipalities, and, from the city of Toronto's viewpoint, just exporting garbage down the highway to Michigan, it is not a solution at all. It's the 12th-century, antique solution, I'd say. If that's where we want to stand as a government and the opposition wants to criticize us for that, that's fine, but it doesn't solve the problem.

So what are the solutions to dealing with the problem? Well, it seems to me that we need to look at a new focus, not on compliance and enforcement, which is the usual approach of the Ministry of the Environment of the day, particularly the ministry we have in this government. We need to be seeking out combinations of new capital and new technology to solve the problem.

If you look right in Ontario, we have one good solution, even though we had to put \$11 million into it. Go to the city of Guelph, with its wet-dry separation solution. There is a practical way of helping to solve garbage. Does the city of Guelph have a landfill problem? No, they do not. They have a new facility recycling and recovering materials and selling them back into the community or into other parts of the province.

If you move across the pond to Europe, the European Union now has a directive dealing with this issue.

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** Not that socialist haven.

**Mr Hastings:** Would you just for one time listen, member for Timmins-James Bay?

**Mr Smitherman:** Take a deep breath.

**Mr Hastings:** Thanks, member for Toronto Centre-Rosedale.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Etobicoke North has the floor. He is the only member who has the floor.

**Mr Hastings:** If the members across the way don't want to hear the solution, they can continue to be captives of their own rhetoric, as they usually are.

We need a solution that is either gasification technology or pyrolysis. Those are two new ways of handling landfill garbage. Where do we find these facilities? Well, of all places, Sweden, Denmark, Germany. Why has Europe moved ahead of us in North America and in Ontario in dealing with this solution? Because they've engaged themselves in trying to find those solutions.

Granted, there are the usual critics of emissions coming from this particular technology. If we go back to the ideological blinkers—we have all have them; I have them as well. All you've got to do is look at—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. The member for Etobicoke North has the floor.

**Mr Hastings:** Very seldom do I speak in this Legislature any more, because it has become not a place of discussion but a place of simply exchanging insults, and I have been involved in those myself. For at least three minutes, could we have a little attention? If you don't

want to hear it, then leave and go have a coffee. That's all I'd say.

Anyway, if you look at the select committee on alternative fuel sources and go through the recommendations, some 43 we've implemented on this side, the government, one of the solutions we left out was the whole waste-to-energy solution: taking all that landfill garbage and utilizing it as a recoverable resource. It was left out because a member of the NDP said, "If you're going to use incineration, it's not going to work, because you still have the emissions of furans and dioxins." Well, let's take a look at what is happening with some of the new technologies, particularly gasification, for those smaller facilities in the European Union. Effective pollution control equipment has nearly reduced it to zero. That's a pretty good record, in my estimation. If you can reduce the emissions that are damaging from a health viewpoint 99%, I'd say it is worth trying on a small scale.

If you don't like that solution, then let's look at the city of Guelph as an example that the city of Toronto needs to start thinking about in terms of a major, major initiative in having better environmental control of all the garbage we are producing in the greater Toronto region. The city of Guelph is one of the ways; it's not the only way.

The problem in this thinking is that the usual attitude is, "We can't do this unless the provincial or federal government comes through with a pile of money to get these facilities going." My proposal, in combination with the thrust and heart of Monsieur Beaubien's resolution, is to tap the private markets, whether it's the venture capital markets or any other way of involving private enterprise, particularly from the financial viewpoint of getting these facilities up and going.

The ongoing maintenance and financial controls can be done through—as in the city of Guelph, if you use that as your model, and it's not the only model available in today's modern technology market—a user fee on the amount of garbage you put out. That is how the city of Guelph, in combination with \$11 million from the province over the last number of years, plus ongoing user fees and the sale of the recoverable materials at the other end, has helped to get this facility up and going and continuing.

#### 1030

A lot of people today in this province have a pile of money and they're not quite sure where to put it. They're putting it into Ontario and Canada savings bonds or into some initial offers from companies, but there's also a growing area of income trusts. To me, if we had imagination from the brokerage community and the technology companies, they could create over time a very solid income trust that people would be willing to buy in units on the open market. Why is that a possible solution? Because over time we know we're going to have garbage, despite the best efforts of the packaging industry to reduce some of the packaging—and they have a long way to go, in my estimation, in dealing with this problem. But at least there's a continuous cash flow

distribution back to the investors. These are the kinds of new approaches that, in my estimation, we need to deal with this problem. Otherwise, we end up having the old compliance conflict between rural and urban living, of moving garbage out of large urban areas into rural areas, resulting in ongoing environmental assessments involving the dumping of garbage, which impacts very adversely the land table and the water quality in this province. So we need to break through and have new solutions.

En conclusion, je crois que cette résolution de M. Beaubien indique une grande opportunité pour créer plusieurs nouvelles directions—une nouvelle combinaison qui utilise les finances dans un partenariat avec les compagnies de technologie. On a grand besoin de cette combinaison pour trouver une solution et développer une capacité de réduire les déchets dès l'origine des citoyens de la province de l'Ontario et de la ville de Toronto.

We all talk about Kyoto. Here is an actual means of grasping this very difficult concept, where we have great rhetoric on both sides, and actually moving to try to accommodate the gas emissions to get our garbage down. What we're going to have to do is tap into the financial markets and into the technology, because it's already available. What we need is a working solutions group, in my estimation, of MPPs, députés from all sides in this Legislature, who are interested in a solution, whatever that may be. One can disagree about the technologies, but at least we're moving toward trying to solve this problem once and for all.

What we need is the engagement of the investment community, of private investors. What we need is the involvement of forward-thinking entrepreneurs and less emphasis on compliance and enforcement. That's going to be there forever, as long as you have garbage dumps. But we can do a parallel movement as we go into this 21st century that involves engaging these people to try new pilot projects, whether it's the city of Guelph or the city of Toronto. I would really like to see them develop and engage in a new solution.

What this government also needs to do is to start looking at putting pressure on municipalities, whether it's the city of Toronto or other places, that want to export garbage across the border. While it may be an exportable commodity under NAFTA, to me it's a very dangerous practice, not only from the viewpoint of drivers on the 400-series highways, but also of the wear and tear on our infrastructure.

In my estimation, this is the way to go: some kind of working solutions group to deal with the problem from the political, environmental, technological and financial communities, and move ahead. That's why I strongly support the resolution of the member as he presented it today. I have tried to refrain from getting into who's to blame and who's not to blame. It gets you nowhere. What we need are solutions. That's why I was so perturbed that somebody thinks we can't deal with it in that spirit. For once, let's make an effort. Perhaps we'll fail, but at least we can say we really tried, because at the present moment we are in an impasse, where this whole

approach is going to go on for years, and nothing is getting done. We've got to break through that kind of thinking. We've got to change our attitudes about garbage and work toward new solutions and directions that provide some breakthrough and that get us, 10 years from now, to where we will say, "Yes, this was a starting day." Monsieur Beaubien was the initiator of that new enterprise and initiative. I commend him very much for that, and I hope other members of the House would try to seek a solution in this hour rather than the usual stuff that I have been as guilty of as the rest of us, engaging in rhetoric as you look back. That's why I've refrained from it today. I would hope you'd take a new spirit, a new approach, a new attitude in trying to resolve a very complex problem.

We do need the solutions. We owe it to our younger generations, these folks who are sitting right in front of the Speaker today. Otherwise, they're going to ask in a few years, "Where was this generation in trying to solve a garbage problem?" Where were we? Let's stop this rhetoric. Let's try some new approaches. I don't have all the answers, but we need to start afresh. I hope this would be the day we could do it.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this particular resolution. I like the part of the resolution that talks particularly about waste diversion and what I think are the three Rs: reduction, reuse and recycling. I have a bit of a fear, as perhaps some others in the House do, that somewhere in this, rearing its head, is incineration.

The member for Etobicoke North, who just spoke, was a member of the committee, as I was, and there were a lot of good suggestions that came forward to us. I was pleased to hear him mention some of those suggestions that have in fact been helpful. The committee was very good in looking at a variety of options, but when it came down to it, I think what we looked at as being the hierarchy was first of all reduction. I think everybody mentions, with reasonably good evidence, that there is overpackaging in North America. We tolerate a lot of packaging that many of us would consider to be unnecessary. We recognize in food safety, for instance, and in other circumstances—medicine and so on—that packaging has to be the way it is. But in so many instances a lot of the things we have purchased commercially are well overpackaged, and we could reduce that. That's source reduction. The first thing that we as a society have to do is look at ways to reduce that waste.

**1040**

The second is, how can we possibly reuse some of the products we have out there? I can recall about a dozen years ago, when I was discussing with some people who were pretty progressive in that field then—from Guelph, for instance; that has been mentioned—that there's an opportunity to recycle a lot of wood waste. People laughed at the beginning of that. Take a look today at what's happening at wood waste, how it's being used once again. Even though some of the scrapyards cause us no end of angst because of some of the things that happen

in there, scrap dealers were some of the original waste recyclers, taking metals—particularly steel, but aluminum and other metals—and using them once again. That means we don't have to put it in a landfill or dispose of it some other way. When we talk about waste diversion, when we say "Divert," it should be to divert from a way of disposing of it. That's when we mean: diversion into something that's relatively benign.

One of the things I want to caution members about, because the incineration crowd rears its head every time you get into a crisis of this kind, is that incinerators are not the panacea that many people think they are. I commend to you a letter from Neil J. Carman, PhD, clean air program director, Austin, Texas, to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Energy, September 14, 1995. He says:

"Most of the incinerators in our territory experienced mechanical and operational problems which were often linked to human error." He goes on to say, "I am quite skeptical of the ability of incinerators to operate in full and continuous compliance with the most stringent permit requirements. It is technically remote to achieve even 80% continuous compliance." I don't have time to quote all of it, unfortunately, but at the end he says, "Incineration ... of garbage is merely trading one set of manageable problems for another set of more difficult problems."

So I simply want to say that those who hold out incineration as the panacea are, I think, moving in the wrong direction. This is not to say that we shouldn't look at new technologies. Our committee looked at many of those. Our landfill sites already produce gases. We can use that methane gas for producing electricity. Most progressive communities are now capturing that gas and utilizing it. Does that mean we want to continue to have huge landfills? No, but we are making some use of them.

We have to set ambitious goals, in my view. If you don't set ambitious goals, you end up not achieving them. I know there was a goal set that by the year 2000 we were to have 50% reduction—in other words, diversion from landfill or incinerators. Well, that's only about 25%. It's extremely disappointing and not acceptable.

Guelph is a good example. People should look at Guelph, should look at Edmonton and Halifax for these innovations: the wet-dry separation and the composting that goes on. There are a myriad of possibilities out there that we have to pursue if we're going to solve this problem, whether it's home composting or it's the municipality doing the composting. We have suggested that all over Ontario that we should have a 60% diversion rate—all over Ontario. The member says there are some communities that achieve better than that. Good for them. They should be complimented for doing that.

We should look at the alternative fuels report and many of the recommendations that have come from that. I won't get into the detail, but I think that's important. We have wood waste, we have metal waste, we have rubber waste, we have plastic waste, all of which can be converted and used once again or recycled. So we should

be disappointed and in some cases we should be ashamed as a society that we have not achieved a much greater diversion rate, but we shouldn't despair at that, because the initiatives are out there.

The member for Etobicoke North talked about Europe. Europe gives us many examples of how to deal with packaging, how to deal with waste diversion. It really takes the will to do it and it really takes goals that are measurable and goals that are enforced; in this case, it must be by the Ministry of the Environment of Ontario.

I'm a bit worried that the member is steering into incineration. I worry about that, but I do like the part of the resolution that talks about the diversion of waste from landfill and incineration and other ways of disposing.

**Mr Rob Sampson (Mississauga Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to welcome students from the great school of Michael Goetz in the great state of Mississauga who are listening intently to this discussion on landfill. I welcome them here and I know you would want to do so.

**The Acting Speaker:** Of course that is not a point of order, but welcome.

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth):** I don't know if I have much of a voice left today. Last night was my third night in a row of being here until after midnight trying to get my private member's bill, Bill 77, passed, which has not happened and will not happen.

I want to say to the member that he hasn't defined in his resolution what he means by "cost-effective, modern technology." There are many out there, but I want to say at the outset that the new word now for "incineration" is "combustible." It's not incineration any more. I remember when I first got involved in the incineration fight, when Mr Bradley was the minister, because the city of Toronto wanted to build a huge garbage incinerator in my riding. I was a private citizen at the time. We had a polluting one there that we wanted to shut down, and they wanted to build a new one.

I remember hearing all the same arguments we're hearing today about the newer technology: "Oh, it's new technology. There are very few emissions and the smoke-stack is really high and it will disperse all over. Don't worry about it. It's good technology." We're hearing the same thing today about these capital-intensive combustion technologies. I don't support them, for a number of reasons, but I'm going to give you the two main ones.

One is that these units are often privately built and operated, and they're financed by a guaranteed throughput agreement. What this actually means is that once the municipality builds one, it has to feed it garbage, so this short-circuits waste reduction efforts. That's been proven. They're also not cost-effective; they're very expensive. If we talk about garbage as also a resource, talk about it in terms of waste diversion instead of just garbage, what this is then all about is that when you get into those kinds of technologies and building those kinds of combustible capital-intensive technologies, you've got to feed it garbage all the time. Then it becomes out of

sight, out of mind, which is the spiral we've been in all these years.

We all know now that landfills are out of the question and that we have to find other ways of dealing with our garbage. The objective is to bring in very solid and very good timelines, with incentives to do more composting and to get rid of so much of the packaging, as they have done in Europe.

The other reason combustion technologies are not a good thing, are the wrong way to go, is that they always produce unstable toxic substances, whether it goes up the stack or not, which it's true, in the new kinds of technology it doesn't in the same way as just throwing it into a big hot fire. The combination of the burning of plastics at very high temperatures under that technology actually created dioxins.

I remember being told at the time, "Don't worry about that. It's such a tiny amount of dioxin and it's so well dispersed that it's nothing to worry about." The pollution abatement equipment within the existing technology would get most of the toxins out. But then what happened was you had fly ash and bottom ash, which was extremely toxic, especially the fly ash, which had to be sent to landfill. We're hearing today from the member for Sarnia-Lambton, and we all know about the problems with hazardous waste in her riding. She makes an issue of it time and time again, as she should.

#### 1050

We have to understand, as we talk about these new combustion technologies, that some of the same problems still exist, so I've outlined them. You've got the problem with taking away the incentive to do all the other things around the three Rs and getting more and more into composting, and the incentive to come up with really good timelines to get these programs up and running, as they have in Europe. That's why they're so much more advanced than we are, because governments there were forced to bring in very strict timelines when they banned incineration, banned landfill. What do you do? I met, as we all did, with some of the environmental industry representatives who were here earlier this week. They made it very clear that that's the kind of incentive they need. They are exporting some of the newer technologies all around the world because they can't get them up and running here. Why are they exporting them all around the world? Because in some areas, some jurisdictions, they have brought in these very tight time frames with the banning or the phasing out of landfill and incineration.

Garbage never just disappears. The idea of throwing it into a hole in the ground or throwing it into some kind of combustion process—you don't have the stuff coming up the stack, but it doesn't disappear. You still have, as I've said, an unstable toxic substance that is created out of that technology and these are landfilled. So we're creating in that process a situation where you have to deal with that residue. It's got to go somewhere, and it ends up going in some hole in the ground.

To get into discussions around moving toward that technology is wrong-headed. What we need to do is what



the city of Toronto did, and contrary to what members in the government today said about Toronto being far behind, the city has recently, after the big fight over the Adams mine, which we will all remember, and I am proud to say I played a very large role, along with Jack Layton and David Miller at city council, and others, David Ramsay from the Liberal caucus—we fought that very hard and we stopped that.

While I'm on that subject, let me say that we've just recently received information, a secret report, a document we've got our hands on, that shows that northern Ontario proponents of the plan—it's not dead yet; they're bringing it back again—to bring garbage from Toronto to the Adams mine have it once again on the table, and the plan this time is to get it out of the hands of government altogether. What they're trying to do, what they're proposing, is to have one of the Smart Growth panels—

*Interjection.*

**Ms Churley:** Excuse me. The mayors and others in northern Ontario have come together because they want the jobs. It's wrong that we're trying to resolve a waste management problem because of the desperate need for jobs up north. That is wrong-headed as well. We need to do some economic development up there that doesn't involve this constant fight to try to get Toronto's garbage to throw in a pristine lake up there. But it has opened up again because they now realize they're not going to be able to get the city of Toronto to agree, so they want the government to mandate a special panel and give them the absolute authority to make this decision. I want to say very clearly that we will not stand for it, that it will not happen, but it's disheartening to those who are very concerned about the environmental aspects of that that it's back on the table. We will fight that.

The government had an opportunity to do some of the things that are before today when it brought in its Bill 90. I worked very hard on that bill, and I made, I believe, about 18 amendments, which were all turned down. I want to make clear to you some of the things in the government's own bill that would have advanced us so far in terms of our timelines here and getting to 100% diversion, which is what we have to get to essentially.

But what they did was, and I made an amendment about this, the bill does not support the composting. This is the government's own Bill 90. It does nothing to support and encourage municipalities to get organics out of the waste stream. Can you believe that? The government brought in a bill to deal with waste management—I prefer to call it waste diversion—and there was nothing in it about composting. We all know that if we don't get the organics out of the waste stream—that is the worst thing that goes into landfill. It's the organics that cause all the leachate and all the environmental problems. We argued ferociously to get something in the bill about waste management on waste diversion, on composting, and they refused to accept that amendment.

Also, the bill that the government brought in also did not put a priority on waste reduction. What else did it not do? Incredibly, as we stand here today to talk about

needing to become more aggressive about how we deal with our waste, Bill 90 did not set waste reduction targets. Can you believe that? In the resolution before us today there is what I believe is still too little, too late. But the government's own bill on waste reduction has nothing about reduction targets. Again, we brought in an amendment to try to deal with that.

There are a number of other amendments I made to improve Bill 90. For instance, there are no incentives in it to reach targets. It allows industry to get away without giving any money. There are no concrete timelines for the money. It actually prevents the implementation of a deposit return system for the LCBO. It allows the newspaper companies to pay their way out of it.

That's what we had. We had an opportunity with Bill 90 as a government bill to make it very, very strong. Every single amendment that was made was turned down.

I do want to say in defence of Toronto, after the attacks from the Tory members today, that the NDP waste reduction target, by the way, is 80%, as stated in our urban vision. That number should be in this resolution today. But the city of Toronto has adopted an aggressive plan for the diversion of waste from landfill. Their targets are aggressive and they're realistic, including 60% diversion from landfill by 2006 and 100% diversion by 2010. I have their plan here. I'm not going to have time to read it all out, but I would request that all the government members who are taking great delight once again in attacking the city of Toronto—they don't live in the city. Many, many people come into this city to work and leave their garbage behind, so it works both ways. Some of our garbage is shipped out, and I agree that it's wrong. We have to find other ways to deal with our garbage. But at the same time, there are lots and lots of people coming into Toronto, leaving their garbage behind. So the reality is we're not dealing with the big problem of people just treating their garbage like garbage and just leaving it behind, wherever they may be.

In the Waste Diversion Task Force 2010 Report from the city of Toronto, summary of recommendations, "A" is source-separated organics. There's a whole section. They made that their biggest priority. They have a good plan as to how to do that and there are projects up and running now. But they also say that they want to "engage the marketplace to provide the required treatment capacity in 2002 to manage the city's source separated organics prior to the commissioning of the city's new Dufferin transfer station anaerobic digestion facility," which is now under construction. They have a take-it-back program, "that \$20,000 be put aside from the 2001 funding available for diversion programs, to help with the administration." It goes on and on about how to set up a program so that industry takes back a lot of the packaging that they are producing.

Again, we have seen that it works in Europe. When you have these aggressive policies in place—again, the environmental industry folks who were here this week said that that's what they need to get their technology up

and running here and what they need to get industry, the producers of the packaging, as they have in Europe, to actually reduce the packaging so that it doesn't have to be sent to landfill in the first place.

They talk about new and emerging technologies, but they're not just talking about these things in a study, with recommendations just in a study; they have an active task force set up to bring these newer technologies around anaerobic digestion to compost. They have a task force up and running to get these things in place. Many of the councillors at city hall agree that trucking the garbage to Michigan is not the answer either. We would all agree with that; it is certainly not the answer. I would just say to the member that I wish his target was more aggressive and that I'm really worried about incineration becoming—

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you. Response?

1100

**Mr Beaubien:** I would like to thank the members for their comments, the members from Sarnia-Lambton, Etobicoke North, St Catharines and Toronto-Danforth. I would like to comment on the comments that the member for Sarnia-Lambton made when she said that I had been converted on my way to Damascus. First of all, I don't know where Damascus is and I don't think it's a very safe place to go right now. I would like to put on the record that on Thursday, June 15, 2002, I introduced a very, very similar resolution dealing with landfill. She talks about being converted; I was converted a long time ago.

Here's what the member for Sarnia-Lambton said: "I would like to say that I'm pleased to speak on this resolution. This whole issue of environment and environmental responsibility, it's a culture of responsibility, it's not a culture of blame." I would have to agree with that. She also mentioned about the hazardous landfill site in her riding, which was part of my former riding. I do agree that everybody has concern with this. I'm going to address my comments to the people that may be watching at home. This landfill site has been in place for 40-some-odd years. Fifteen years ago, when I was mayor of the community of Petrolia, when it was under the name of Tricil they tried to expand the incinerator. The town of Petrolia raised some opposition. I would ask the people that have those "Stop the toxic sludge" on your lawns today, where were you 15 years ago?

Furthermore, with the expansion in 1997, when there were four public hearings in the community of Brigden, now the St Clair township, I attended two or three of these meetings. And I say, where were you each and every one of you at that time? That is the question we have to ask. There's no doubt that none of us like to see hazardous waste being landfill in our backyards. However, for the record, that landfill has been there for 40 years.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes the time allocated for debate on ballot item 75. I will place the questions related to the disposition of this item at 12 o'clock noon.

## FIRST NATIONS MINING AND FORESTRY REVENUES

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I move that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should, in consultation with First Nations communities of northern Ontario and with other levels of government, develop and implement mechanisms whereby those communities can share in the revenues from mining and forestry operations that are conducted in their traditional territories.

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

**Mr Bisson:** I am more than pleased to be here this morning debating this motion. I want to tell members of the assembly, this is somewhat of an historical moment because something of this magnitude has never been tried before. I want to explain to the members where we going with this motion, what it's all about and why we're calling on you to support the First Nations communities of northern Ontario.

First of all by way of background, just so you know, we're fortunate and unfortunate in northern Ontario with the find of the DeBeers mine. Just outside of Attawapiskat, DeBeers has been working on developing a diamond mine for a number of years now. It has been both a blessing and a curse to the community. It has been a blessing in the sense of an economic opportunity, but it has been a bit of a curse in the sense that there are no clear rules about how that community can share in the benefits of that operation if it should become an operating mine. For a number of years, the community has been struggling with trying to negotiate with DeBeers some sort of an equitable arrangement so that whatever benefit comes from the activities of that operation, community members and people generally within the region are able to benefit by what has happened and what could happen with DeBeers.

The problem has always been that First Nations communities are treated very differently under law when it comes to how we share with revenue. Let me put it very simply. I live in the community of Timmins. It's a mining community. Any mine that is developed in our community, there's a very simple process for the municipality to be able to get benefits from the activity of mining. It's called assessment. So when the municipality of Timmins, as all other municipalities, has an activity like that, they are able to charge an assessment through tax and collect that money to develop infrastructure, build sewer and water, develop the needs of the community. The unfortunate reality in the way the federal government has set up reserves is that they've basically given those communities no mechanism by which to share in the economic activity that happens in and around their communities and on their traditional territories. So you have a very inequitable situation. If you were to have a DeBeers set up in Timmins, clearly Timmins would have some mechanism to extract revenue to pay for community services, but because it's up on James Bay and is

in the traditional territories of the First Nations, there's no such mechanism.

So my resolution simply says that we want a process to start, by way of a declaration in this House this morning, so that the provincial government, in consultation with the First Nations communities, develops some sort of mechanism, and whatever that mechanism is will be determined by that process. I don't know if it should be a tax. I don't know if it should be assessment. I don't know if it should be a revenue-sharing formula. That's something that has to be determined through the process. All I want to have started today is that this House says, "We, this House, agree with the concept and want the government to sit down with the First Nations to start the process of discussion so we can develop policy and legislation in this province that treats First Nations communities fairly and in the same manner as other communities in the enjoyment they have in their communities."

I want to say as well that it's a bit of an irony that we're here today, because we know that back in 1977, there was a declaration that was made by the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation, the former Treaty 9. In that was a meeting between the provincial government and the then Treaty 9, which is now Nishnawbe-Aski Nation, that basically called on the provincial government to do a couple of things. I just want to read very quickly what it called for. It said, "Our custodian role must remain with us. It is our sacred duty"—as First Nations—"to pass it on to our unborn children. We do not accept the illegal seizure of our lands by the Europeans." It went on to ask that the government become involved in their right to develop their individual communities. What they called for by way of the declaration back in 1977 was to get the province, a signatory to Treaty 9 and Treaty 3 and others, to sit down with the First Nations communities so we can figure out how we can make sure the communities can get the tools they need to share in projects that happen in and around their community and to make sure they have the ability to share in what happens when it comes to economic activity.

Here we are a number of years later, and not one step has been taken since that declaration. I've got to say one thing I've learned from dealing with my friends the Mushkegowuk Cree and others: man, you guys are patient, really patient. If it was the city of Timmins or the town of Hearst or the city of Toronto that had to face what your people are going through, I don't know what would happen, but I can tell they would not be as patient as the Mushkegowuk Cree and other First Nations people in this province. I say to the government, patience only goes so far. We need to make sure we're able to take this motion forward so we can start that process.

I also want to say in passing that the problem we have in our communities is that the funding formulas set up by the federal and provincial governments to fund communities, in my view and I think in the view of my friends from the Mushkegowuk Cree, are just enough to allow the communities to fail. We never give our com-

munities enough money to allow them to do what we take for granted in our communities. We never get enough for housing.

I look at communities like Kashechewan. My good friend Leo Friday, chief of Kashechewan, is here. I look at people like—well, I'm not going to go through all the names because I'd run out of time. I'll just use Kashechewan as the backdrop. Here you have a community where there's a desperate need for housing, a desperate need to provide much-needed services that we consider to be basic in our communities. The federal government transfers just enough money so you can't make it. It puts the community in the position of failure. They don't give you enough money to do what you need to do. As a result, it just sets things up to fail.

What the First Nations communities are saying is, "If you're not going to fund us with proper funding formulas, what we really want, in the end, is our own ability to do what everybody else does, and that is to share in the resources and activities happening in our traditional territories." We, as New Democrats, and I hope all the members of the assembly, believe in the basic concept that we need to treat our First Nations people fairly.

#### 1110

I want to relate also, in the few minutes I've got left, a story that was told by my good friend Leo Friday yesterday in a meeting we had with Minister Elliott, the Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services. He related to our assembled gathering a very powerful presentation that gave the story about how in his community, unfortunately, as in many other First Nations communities, there is extremely high unemployment, as much as 90%. People are forced, because of the situation that has been imposed on them, to live in a cycle of welfare. What adds insult to injury is that the welfare is not even enough to survive. The rules, in the way they're set up and the way the money is sent out, is forcing people to make decisions about not paying a hydro bill, not buying food or not paying their rent. It puts the whole community in a situation of extreme hardship. I thought the presentation that Chief Friday made yesterday was to the point.

I hope the government understands that we also have a responsibility beyond just what my motion is today to look at what levers we have within the province to deal with the needs of the First Nations community.

We have a very different history in the province of Ontario. We are the only provincial jurisdiction to have signed treaties with First Nations communities. We signed Treaty 9 back in 1905 and amended it in 1929-30. We are only province across Canada to have been signatories to the treaties. The problem we have is that, as a province, we've never figured out what that means, because when the treaties were signed the powers the province had were somewhat different. As we assumed responsibility for various activities such as resource development, the province has never been an active participant in figuring out what their responsibility is as a signatory to the actual treaties. This motion, in my view,

will assist us as a province to determine what our role and responsibilities are as a signatory of that treaty.

I just want to say to the members in the House in the minute that I have left that I hope we're able to count on your support. The motion is a very simple motion.

The Mushkegowuk Cree are here today. We have chiefs, deputy chiefs and various people from all the communities of the Mushkegowuk council: Teresa Hall from Attawapiskat, the chief who negotiated the DeBeers agreement; we have with us Leo Friday from Kashchewan, chief of Kashchewan; we have Moose Factory represented by both deputy chief and chief, Norm Hardisty and Charlie Cheechoo; we have the grand chief of Mushkegowuk council with us today, Mr Ernest Beck; we have with us as well representatives from the communities of Fort Albany and other communities within the Mushkegowuk Cree.

They're asking you here today to support this motion so we can start the process of giving them the ability to become full partners in this province when it comes to economic development opportunities on their traditional territories. It's a simple motion. It's calling on a process so they are able to find a way, with our provincial government, to determine how they can best share in the economic activities on their traditional territories.

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** I am pleased to rise today to address the private member's business put forward by the member for Timmins-James Bay.

I appreciate the member's interest in the welfare of Ontario's First Nations. Our government does not support the concept of sharing government revenues derived from forest management with First Nations communities. However, I believe that our government has made every effort to ensure that aboriginal people share in the benefits of resource development.

I specifically want to address forest management on crown lands and the many ways in which our government has worked to ensure that First Nation communities are involved in and benefiting from forest management.

First of all, let me provide a bit of background. In order for the Ministry of Natural Resources to carry out timber management on crown land in Ontario, it needs the approval of the Minister of the Environment. The current approval, under the Environmental Assessment Act, was granted by the Minister of the Environment in May 1994. The approval is valid for a period of nine years, which means it expires in May 2003. The 1994 approval was granted based on extensive public hearings on MNR's class environmental assessment for timber management on crown lands in Ontario.

In order for forest management to continue on crown land, the term of the approval must be extended. The requirements of all the terms and conditions of the 1994 timber EA approval will be met by May 2003.

The Ministry of Natural Resources submitted its timber class environmental assessment review to the Minister of the Environment in July of this year. The ministry's submission contained a detailed account of its compliance with the 1994 approval, as well as important

proposed amendments and a recommendation to extend the approval. The review was the subject of a thorough and far-reaching process of consultation and careful study.

Public information centres were held across the province. As well, two preliminary documents were posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights registry and were available on the ministry's Web site and through mailings to the interested parties, including First Nations communities and aboriginal associations.

Significant proposed amendments were outlined in the timber class EA review, because major steps have been taken in forest management and environmental protection since the EA approval was granted in 1994. New legislation, progressive forest policies and innovative land use strategies have put Ontario at the forefront of sustainable forest management. These advancements include the development of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, the Ontario forest accord, Ontario's Living Legacy land use strategy, the Environmental Bill of Rights and the improvements to the Environmental Assessment Act. The Ontario forest accord was a particularly important milestone, as it brought together MNR, the forest industry and non-governmental agencies. The common goal of the accord is to make sure Ontario's forests remain healthy, large and diverse while providing for a healthy forest industry.

The review takes into consideration all of these developments. Ultimately, the review will make it easier to continually improve forest management activities; give the ministry more flexibility to respond to the changing economic, social and environmental values of the people of Ontario; and better reflect the roles of the forest industry and MNR.

One of the items covered in the 1994 approval was the involvement of aboriginal people in forestry. Specifically, the terms and conditions of MNR's timber class EA approval required the ministry to negotiate locally with aboriginal people to identify and implement ways of ensuring more participation by aboriginal people in the benefits that accrue from forest management. It is a commitment that the ministry has worked hard to keep, and with our forest industry partners, our efforts in this regard will be ongoing.

The ministry's district managers have been active in meeting with aboriginal people and the forest industry to hold discussions, share information, and facilitate co-operation and dialogue to find ways to improve aboriginal peoples' involvement in forestry activities and ensure they receive the benefits associated with that involvement. In fact, things have improved considerably for aboriginal communities since the 1994 approval. Economic development opportunities associated with forestry have increased. These have been outlined in the annual reports on forest management provided to the Ontario Legislature and in the ministry's timber class EA review that I have already referred to.

A wide range of business opportunities has meant more jobs and income for aboriginal communities.

Millions of dollars of silviculture contracts, joint ventures and mutual agreements are arranged each year with aboriginal people by the forest industry and the ministry. I'll give you a few examples.

In Hearst, Dryden and Sudbury districts, a number of First Nations, including Eagle Lake, Constance Lake and Sucker Creek, carry out a range of silvicultural activities, including pre-commercial thinning, manual tending, tree planting, pruning and cone collection. First Nations in the area are also involved in collecting data on regeneration, native values mapping and forest inventories.

First Nations in Thunder Bay and Nipigon districts, such as the Whitesand and Rocky Bay First Nations, have contracted for harvesting as much as 70,000 cubic metres of wood for sawlogs, veneer and pulpwood. In Fort Frances district, aboriginal businesses have contracted to haul about 40,000 cubic metres of wood and carry out road maintenance.

Aboriginal people are also directly employed in mill operations and supervisory work that takes place in the bush. The recent development of the mill in the Kenora area has seen significant commitments by the forest company in the area of aboriginal employment.

**1120**

By way of comparison, only about 100,000 cubic metres of wood were licensed to aboriginal people in 1986. By the year 2000, over 1.5 million cubic metres of wood within the area covered by the timber EA were allocated to, cut by, and contracted to or offered to aboriginal people and businesses.

About one million cubic metres of crown timber were harvested by the aboriginal people. This is about 4% to 5% of the wood harvested in the province. The estimated value is \$30 million to \$50 million.

I would also like to point out that the ministry is recommending revisions to the approval and will provide even more opportunities to aboriginal communities to take part in the development and implementation of forest management plans.

The members may be interested to know that the ministry is working on a project to realize economic potential in the far north, as well. Known as the Northern Boreal Initiative, the project could result in hundreds of jobs, with First Nations taking a leadership role in managing local forestry operations.

The work of the Ministry of Natural Resources on this initiative supports the government's commitment to promote growth along all regions and industries, and goes hand in hand with efforts of the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.

I can assure the members of this House that the Ministry of Natural Resources is committed to working with aboriginal people and the forest industry to identify ways of continuing to improve aboriginal participation in the benefits of forest management.

For the reasons that I have just outlined, this side of the House will not be supporting the private member's bill of the member from Timmins-James Bay.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I want to begin by also welcoming the grand chief and other leaders from the First Nations here today to the Legislature, and secondly, to say that I will be supporting the resolution. It is a resolution, not a bill, by the way, and I think it's a solid resolution. I'll be supporting it for a variety of reasons.

One is—and the member from Timmins-James Bay mentioned it—that there's a certain fairness element in this, where other communities do share in revenue from businesses and industries in their area, and I think in terms of fairness, the First Nations have a claim on this.

The second reason is that the one thing I'm very aware of is the enormous amount of talent in our First Nations and, I might add, a growing amount of talent, as the very talented young people coming along can make a tremendous contribution to the economic well-being of the province of Ontario. This resolution, while it will not fundamentally change things, is clearly a step in the right direction.

The third reason I support this is something I've learned here in the Legislature—perhaps I knew it before, but it certainly has been amplified here—that too often we are faced with a choice of, “You have to make your mind up.” You're either for this or you're for that. Right now I find that in Toronto, you're either for the police or you're for the black community. To me, I'm for the police and I'm for the black community. I think we sometimes make these situations where we force people to kind of make their minds up. Are you for the mine and forestry industry or are you for the First Nations? I think a legitimate answer can be, “I'm for both.” One way that can happen is to put in place mechanisms that both force dialogue and also that—to use the jargon—it's a win-win. I think this can be a win-win. I think clearly our mining and our forestry industries are fundamental to the province of Ontario. They are tremendously competitive worldwide. We have to make absolutely certain that those industries continue to grow and blossom and be cost-competitive on a worldwide basis. They provide an enormous amount of the province's wealth and jobs. But at the same time, it seems to me that that also can be done in co-operation with our First Nations. If we find mechanisms that encourage a dialogue and a mutual co-operation, I think our mining and forest industries can be stronger and our First Nations can be stronger.

The next reason I'm supportive of this is that we have, frankly, much to learn from our First Nations. The member for Timmins said they're patient, and I know that. They take a long view of things. If you want environmentalists, if you want to understand the environment, go to our First Nations. They think generations ahead, not months or weeks or years ahead; believe me. We have much to learn from them on many things but particularly on a sustainable environment. They have a right to their communities and, more important, perhaps equally important, we all benefit from those communities.

Our industries have much to learn from the First Nations on the environment. I've read some, I don't

pretend to be an expert, but I've read much of the history of the First Nations and, if you are interested in the environment, as I think all of us are in varying degrees, we can take lessons from our First Nations. I repeat myself, but Mr Bisson said if they have been patient on this issue, it's because they see things in the long term.

It gets back to my belief that one of our roles here is to find the mechanisms that can encourage co-operation between our First Nations, and in this case our forestry and mining industries. What the First Nations can bring, among other things—as I said earlier, I am very impressed with the tremendous talent in our First Nations, much of it underutilized because the opportunities have been denied. But there is an enormous and growing amount of talent. This particular resolution I think is worded in a way that provides quite a bit of flexibility. It sets us in a direction that allows the flexibility, I think, for the First Nations, and dare I say the industries and governments, to find a long-term, workable solution.

The thing that has often concerned me here is that for some reason or other we seem almost to set up situations that result in conflict rather than in resolution, as I said earlier in my remarks, that you've got to pick one side or the other. That is not a long-term solution. This provides some direction for the province, the industry, the First Nations to work together in ways that can say, "Listen, the First Nations are as interested as anyone in good economic development for the province of Ontario, but it should be done in a way that's co-operative with them, that their fundamental rights are not jeopardized and that we can get into, as I said earlier, this win-win situation."

I'm quite taken with the resolution. I think it provides the government, industry and the First Nations with a sense of direction on this. My experience has been that the First Nations are clearly people of goodwill, looking for a sustainable solution that's consistent with their fundamental beliefs. I think this resolution will help to accomplish that, so I'm pleased to stand in support of it and look forward to its adoption.

1130

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** I'm very pleased to take part in the debate of this resolution. I will be supporting this resolution and I urge all other members to do so as well.

I want to begin my comments by pointing out that this not a new issue. What I've got is a document called the Declaration of Independence for Nationhood and Governance of the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation of Northern Ontario. This is a document that was presented to Ontario through the Honourable William Davis, Premier of Ontario, during the All Ontario Chiefs' meeting at Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario, on July 7, 1977, and presented to the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, and senior cabinet during a joint meeting between the National Indian Brotherhood Assembly of First Nations executive council in Ottawa on July 11, 1977.

So what is being sought here today is not something new or revolutionary. It is something that the Nishnawbe-

Aski First Nation and the tribal councils that are part of Nishnawbe-Aski have been seeking for some time. Their statement is clear: "We say to you that we have the right to govern our own spiritual, cultural, social and economic affairs." The First Nations are geographically located in a part of Ontario where there are virtually no non-native communities, where you might find from time to time a teacher, a nurse or an airline pilot who is a non-native person, but otherwise all the communities are aboriginal communities—the largest geographic expanse of Ontario. So you have no non-aboriginal communities, all the communities are First Nations communities, and they're simply saying over and over again that NAN communities seek to establish, intend to establish, their own capacity to govern themselves and the land where they live. Why a non-native government that is essentially situated in southern Ontario would not recognize this claim and would not seek to work toward the furtherance of this claim is beyond me. If you reflect upon it, we haven't exactly done such a great job of governing our own affairs, particularly from the environmental perspective.

The document makes for very good reading. But particularly interesting are the points which are set out near the end of the document, where in 1977, and I want to emphasize that again, the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation said, "Today we are here to tell you who we are. We, the Nishnawbe-Aski, have inalienable rights. They are: the right to" govern ourselves—I don't think that's such a revolutionary concept—"the right to receive compensation for our exploited natural resources; the right to receive compensation for the destruction and abrogation of our hunting, fishing and gathering rights; the right to renegotiate our treaty as understood by our people, land and resources; the right to negotiate with the elected governments of your society through appropriate levels of representation; the right to approach and negotiate the judicial, governmental and business institutions of your society in our quest for self-determination and local control." I don't think these are revolutionary concepts. The resolution today really speaks to two of the points outlined in that document of 1977.

Why is this so important now? It's very important now because—let's take, for example, the forest industry. We know, although this government doesn't want to admit it, that we are facing a wood supply gap across northern Ontario that is already hitting in some timber harvesting areas and which will last until somewhere around the year 2035. It doesn't mean that we have run out of timber. What it means is that the mature forest that is there is rapidly being harvested, and the new forest which is growing—some of it started to grow in the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, after it was originally harvested—will not be ready to harvest in some cases until 2020, and in other cases until 2035. So there is a wood supply gap. The existing forest is being depleted. The new forest will not be ready for harvesting until 2035. Anyone who is familiar with northern Ontario, south of the 51st parallel, will know that there are literally hundreds of paper mills,

pulp mills, sawmills and other kinds of forest products mills which need a timber supply.

Some have suggested we'll get wood from Manitoba. Good luck growing timber on the prairies. Some have suggested we'll get wood from Quebec. Anyone who lives along the Quebec border knows that Quebec is trying to get wood out of Ontario, and in fact, under this government, is succeeding in getting a lot of wood out of Ontario. Some of suggested we'll get wood from Michigan, Wisconsin or Minnesota. I live on the Minnesota border. They have already run out of wood. They're approaching many private landowners in northern Ontario and saying, "Please, can we get your wood?" One of the disturbing situations that's going to happen around Sault Ste Marie as a result of this government's wrong-headed policy is that we're very likely to see wood come out of the Sault Ste Marie wood basket and head south into the United States. When that happens, along go the jobs and economic activity.

The reality is that wood, the timber to provide for those sawmills, paper mills and pulp mills, can only come from one place. It can only come from the territory of these people north of the 51st parallel. I believe, hearing the member for Peterborough's speech earlier, what he has outlined is basically that this government does not want to negotiate compensation; it does not want to a negotiate a formula for the sharing of the resource wealth. What this government has in mind, so often as we see it in southern Ontario, is that it will grant the timber rights to forest companies. The forest companies who have been granted the timber rights will then hold all of the bargaining power and then First Nations are put in the position of having to bargain with the timber companies who have the timber allocation, and try to see what they can get. That's what this government has in mind.

I just want to say very clearly to the members of this government: you are completely wrong. Your strategy is going to run into a brick wall because the First Nations understand that their territory is the only territory from which timber can come. You haven't figured out yet how to grow trees in the middle of Lake Huron or Lake Superior, and I doubt that you will in the next 20 years. The only place you're going to get the wood is from their territory. My advice to the government members is stop the masquerade and stop the process where individual timber companies try to go in and play one First Nation off against another. Stop the masquerade, and in a spirit of co-operation and recognition of mutual respect, sit down with the First Nations, sit down with the tribal councils and sit down with Nishnawbe-Aski Nation and begin the process of negotiating agreements which provide for a sharing of the resource wealth, and also provide for the elements of control, land use planning, environmental protection, and protection of traditional rights that you would want if you were living north of the 51st parallel. That's exactly what you would want.

You would not want someone who doesn't live amongst you, who has very little understanding of your

way of life and has shown not the least bit of respect for the environment south of the 51st parallel, to dictate how resource development is going to happen on your land. Let us recognize: it is not our land, those of us who reside in southern Ontario. It is very much the territory of First Nations and has been long before any of us got here.

#### 1140

The final element as to why this is so important is that the development this government wants to facilitate north of the 51st parallel without negotiating these kinds of agreements with First Nations in fact has happened in the area of southern Ontario south of the 51st parallel.

Just a brief history lesson as to what has happened, and that history lesson is really, I think, best exhibited in what I call the red pine and white pine economy: Where I grew up used to be land covered with red pine and white pine forests, some of the most beautiful forests in the world. When those forests were initially timbered at the turn of the 19th century and early in the 20th century, the logging barons who came forward employed a lot of aboriginal people. In the community where I grew up, Fort Frances, there were three large red and white pine sawmills. If you look at the employment records, many of the people who worked in those sawmills were aboriginal people from First Nations like Couchiching, Manitou Rapids, Nicickousemenecaning or Onegaming. In fact, two of the sawmills that I know of were actually located on the reserve. But after the red and white pine forests were essentially depleted and those mills were shut down and they moved to Jack pine and spruce sawmills and to pulp and paper mills, something happened. When the red and white pine mills were shut down, aboriginal people were put out of work. But when new jobs were added in the spruce sawmills and in the Jack pine sawmills and in the pulp and paper mills, aboriginal people by and large weren't employed.

When we stopped running wood down the rivers and lakes, we stopped the river drives. Many of the people who worked on the river drives in those early days were aboriginal people. But when we stopped the river drives and started transporting all the wood to the mills by truck, guess who lost their jobs? Guess who was excluded from the economy? Aboriginal people. This cannot be allowed to happen again. That is why these kinds of agreements must be reached and we must demand, as legislators, that whoever the government of the day is gets to the table and sits down in that approach of mutual respect, of recognition, and begins to negotiate those kinds of agreements.

**Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** I'm pleased to rise today to speak to the private member's business put forward by the member from Timmins-James Bay. I'd also like to welcome the members of the First Nations who have made the trip down here today to the Legislature.

I do want to applaud the member for Timmins-James Bay for his ongoing concern for the First Nations communities, but I must put on the record that much of what

the member wants has already been implemented and is already happening.

The government supports impact benefit agreements and resource development agreements between companies and First Nations. In fact, one example of this is the current Musselwhite agreement, which has a revenue-sharing provision voluntarily offered by the mining company. We applaud and encourage this type of partnership between developers and First Nations communities.

The Ernie Eves government is already consulting with our First Nations communities in northern Ontario and with other levels of government on how they can best share in the benefits that accrue to a community from mining and forestry operations, particularly when those operations and activities take place on their traditional territories. Let me tell you how.

The provincial government is providing \$500,000 over three years through the Ontario Trillium fund to assist the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation in land and resource capacity development. That's happening right now. I was just looking at the press clippings from yesterday.

Our assistance will help increase NAN's access to expertise in forestry and mining. It will help expand NAN's participation in forest management, land use planning, mineral exploration and economic development activities.

It will enable the hiring of two forestry coordinators and a mines and minerals coordinator who will contribute to the development of policies on resource development and community economic development opportunities. I know in my own riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka, through the NOHFC, recently, Niigon Technologies has opened. It's just getting going. There are many millions of dollars invested in this new high-tech plastic injection moulding plant right at Moose Deer Point First Nation in Parry Sound-Muskoka.

The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines is also participating in a working group with the Attawapiskat First Nation, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and DeBeers to help the First Nation participate in and derive benefit from a potential diamond mining operation.

I can point to one particularly successful resource development agreement that has been signed between a mining company and First Nations in northern Ontario, and that's the Musselwhite Mine operated by Placer Dome. Four First Nations and two First Nation councils signed a resource redevelopment agreement that provides benefits to the communities in proximity to the mine. The original agreement was signed in 1992 and renegotiated last year. The agreement will run for the life of the mine.

There are four signatory First Nation communities that benefit directly from the agreement. The four signatory communities are Cat Lake First Nation and North Caribou Lake First Nation from the Windigo First Nations Council, as well as Kingfisher Lake First Nation and Wunnumin Lake First Nation with the Shibogama First Nation Council.

Another eight affiliate First Nations can benefit indirectly. The agreement includes a target of at least 30%

of the mine workforce being drawn from the four signatory First Nation communities, with any remaining opportunities offered first to the eight affiliates.

Under this landmark agreement, the company provides a share of revenue from the mine to the signatory First Nations and First Nation councils.

The signatory communities also provide contract services to the mining operation, including general maintenance, food services, laundry service, road and dam construction, nursing services and air transportation. Simply put, the mine generates a substantial amount of secondary activity that creates wealth and fosters well-being in a community that would otherwise be without such opportunity.

I think it's fair to say that none of this could be happening if Ontario didn't have an investment climate that is conducive to attracting new mineral exploration.

Estimates for the far north region are that the mineral and commercial forestry resources would likely generate \$5 billion to \$7 billion a year in economic activity.

The Ernie Eves government recognizes the need to do more to assist far north residents in realizing the potential of those natural resources, the potential they hold for unprecedented economic development and self-reliance among far north communities. To that end, the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines is coordinating a comprehensive economic development approach for the area. The ministry will develop partnerships among First Nations, the private sector and other levels of government and help far north communities pursue economic development opportunities.

While some First Nation leaders oppose resource development in their traditional territories, many others see the economic benefits of developing these resources in an environmentally sound, sustainable manner. It boils down to a question of trust and understanding.

I think the members of this Legislature would be interested to know that, over the past two years, senior ministry staff have travelled throughout the far north region meeting leaders and members of First Nation communities. In these exploratory discussions, ministry staff have undertaken a dialogue with First Nations about their mistrust of the mining sector and the government.

There are also misconceptions and misunderstandings about the mineral development industry and the laws that regulate it. Gaps in credibility and understanding we can and will bridge. There are partnerships we will develop and strengthen to assist First Nations in developing natural resources for their communal benefit.

Our record speaks for itself. We are on the ground and engaged with our First Nation partners and our mineral development stakeholders. For those reasons, this side of the House will not be supporting this private member's resolution.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I want to indicate at the beginning that I intend to support this resolution. I am concerned when I hear members say—because this is private members' hour. This is where we are to take off our partisan hats. I know it doesn't always



happen, but this is where we try to take off our partisan hats and individually make some decisions. I've heard two government speakers say, "That's why we on this side will not be supporting this resolution." I would hope there are members on the governing side who will say, "I'm here elected as the member from" whatever constituency "and I'm not necessarily going to fall into line with what the whip happens to say or what a couple of speakers happen to say." They're certainly entitled to make those speeches, but I hope this isn't a government position that is going to prevent all members on the government side from either abstaining from or supporting this resolution.

First of all, look at the resolution itself. It's not a radical resolution. The member for Timmins-James Bay I think has tried to accommodate all views in this House. I look at this as a moderate resolution. It wasn't worded to provoke opposition, to somehow have those of us on this side of the House line up against those on the other side of the House and make the governing side look bad. If he wanted to do that, he would have had a much more strongly worded resolution than we see here today.

**1150**

Let me review it: "that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should, in consultation with the First Nations communities in northern Ontario and with other levels of government, develop and implement mechanisms whereby those communities can share in the revenues from mining and forestry operations that are conducted in their traditional territories."

It's a very moderate resolution, a very reasonable resolution, one that is calling for dialogue, one that is calling for implementation in consultation with all who are involved.

First Nations communities, aboriginal people in this province, do not seek to be dependent upon any level of government. If they were, it would be a very difficult life because the funding mechanisms we see today from senior levels of government are inadequate. What First Nations communities are looking to is an opportunity to tap into that which other communities in the north have been able to tap into; that is, revenues from, benefits of an economic nature from, the mining and forestry operations that are found in northern Ontario—a reasonable request.

If we were to say that a particular urban municipality in the north was looking for the opportunity to derive some revenue, some economic benefit from mining and forestry operations within the borders of their municipality, I suggest that members of this Legislature would expect that that would be fine, that that would be exactly what should be happening. We have the chiefs here today representing aboriginal people in the north, representing First Nations communities, simply asking for the same right and the same benefit.

As has been mentioned by the member for Timmins-James Bay, very often, and because of circumstances beyond the control of those who reside in the communities, there have been very high levels of unemploy-

ment. This has then compelled people to seek social assistance. There isn't anybody who wants to be in that circumstance. Aboriginal people are asking for the opportunity to be part of the development, to be part of the decision-making, to be the beneficiaries of economic development taking place in the north. Those of us who reside in the south probably cannot understand nearly so well as those who reside in the north the circumstances facing First Nations communities and the lack of opportunity, in many instances, for aboriginal people in this province.

This resolution allows us an opportunity to change that, to move forward from whatever the past was. The member did not in his speech try to cast blame on anybody. He explained circumstances that exist and why those circumstances are unsatisfactory, but he did not engage in vitriolic finger pointing in his resolution or in his speech, nor did any of the other speakers I have heard on this side of the House engage in that, nor, to be fair, on the government's side. That is why I would be hopeful that we would see some support from at least some of the members on the other side, to allow First Nations communities to be equal partners, to be partners in the development that takes place in the north rather than having to rely on the goodwill of people who are directly involved in the operations of forestry and mining industries.

Obviously, with the large number of aboriginal people in the north, one would expect that employment opportunities would be there. Many times they have not been, and the benefits have been drained from northern Ontario to the benefit of southern Ontario and very often to the headquarters of the companies in the United States.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Bradley:** Well, we have had traditional lands desecrated and environmental considerations placed in the background instead of the forefront where First Nations wish to see them. I think a moderate, reasonable, progressive resolution of this kind merits the support of all members of this House.

**Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York):** I rise just for a couple of minutes to talk, I guess, as a southern boy, someone who grew up in Toronto and who literally has lived his whole life in southern Ontario. In fact, my first opportunity to travel to some of these northern places came as an elected member of this Legislature in the last year. It was on that travel, to try to find out about questions of housing, municipal structure, social and economic conditions so that I could better be a critic in my portfolio here, that I had an opportunity to go to the communities of Port Severn, Peawanuk and Moose Factory. It was the first time I had ever been to such places.

I have to tell you, what you find there is sad. What you find is a land full of wealth and opportunity, and energetic, wonderful people who simply want to participate in what all of us here in southern Ontario have. What you see is that they live in poverty and despair. They have an absolute lack of work in some of those

communities of 90% unemployment. They do not want this for their children, as we would not want it for ours. They want an opportunity to be part of a system that can work for them as it works for us. We need to do that. We need to give them the same opportunity we give people in southern Ontario. The same opportunity we give to towns, cities and regions in southern Ontario, we need to give to the people in northern Ontario, particularly those of our First Nations communities. They need to have full partnership and ownership. If and when they have that, they won't be coming down here.

The member for Parry Sound-Muskoka questioned this and said, "We're already doing this." If we were already doing this, would this resolution be necessary and would they be here in the Speaker's gallery looking for it? The answer is crystal clear: no, they would not be, because it would already have been done.

I want for the people of our First Nations what I want for the people of Toronto: to be partners and to share in our prosperity.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? Response.

**Mr Bisson:** First of all, I want to echo what my colleague said and thank all those who participated in this debate. If the issue had been resolved and if everything is so wonderful in the province of Ontario, I say, like Mr Prue, why are the Mushkegowuk people here?

They're here because they're crying for help. They're saying they're not being treated equitably. When they look at communities south of the undertaking, communities like Hearst and Timmins, they are envious. They say, "Look at those communities that can benefit from the mining and forestry activities that relate to their communities. Why do we sit in our territories not able to share with others what is rightfully ours?"

All they're asking for is a simple thing: "Help us develop a process." Neither they nor I are telling you, "Do this or that." All we want to set up is a process so that the government can sit down with the various levels of government in consultation with the First Nations people of the Mushkegowuk Cree and others to be able to develop a process on how we make them full partners in our own province. I can't believe the government would not support that. I am almost speechless that the government would contemplate voting against something that is so fundamental. We stand up and talk about the rights of people around the world. Let's look in our own backyard. Let's look at what's happening in these communities.

I know that there are honourable members on the other side of the House. I know that Mr Young, the minister responsible, had supported this motion when I talked to him originally. I got the impression the government was going to vote for it. But I say, let's not repeat what's happening in South Africa where those people have been left behind by the colonial attitude of what's happened in the development of those countries. That exists in our own backyard. I implore you to support this resolution so that we can give the communities of the Mushkegowuk

Cree and others the ability to do a very basic thing that we take for granted in our communities, and that is to be able to share in the economic prosperity that comes from the development of resources in our communities. It's only a question of justice.

So I say to the members, the two government members that spoke, it was wonderful what you talked about but none of it affected the Mushkegowuk Cree. You talked about all of the policies that deal with everything south of the undertaking. This motion is to deal with what will happen north of 51. There is nothing that has happened up to now, so I implore you, please support this resolution.

**The Acting Speaker:** This completes the time allocated for debate on this ballot item.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT GESTION DES DÉCHETS

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown):** We will now deal with ballot item number 75.

Mr Beaubien has moved private member's notice of motion number 23. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

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

#### FIRST NATIONS MINING AND FORESTRY REVENUES

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown):** We will now deal with ballot item number 76.

Mr Bisson has moved private member's notice of motion number 22. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1202 to 1207.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour will please stand and remain standing until their name is called.

#### Ayes

Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	McMeekin, Ted
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	Patten, Richard
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	Peters, Steve
Bryant, Michael	Gravelle, Michael	Phillips, Gerry
Caplan, David	Hampton, Howard	Prue, Michael
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Churley, Marilyn	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed will please stand and remain standing until their name is called.

**Nays**

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	Murdoch, Bill
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	Mushinski, Marilyn
Barrett, Toby	Hastings, John	O'Toole, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sampson, Rob
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Coburn, Brian	Klees, Frank	Stewart, R. Gary
Cunningham, Dianne	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stockwell, Chris
DeFaria, Carl	Maves, Bart	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Elliott, Brenda	Miller, Norm	Turnbull, David
Galt, Doug	Molinari, Tina R.	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Gilchrist, Steve	Munro, Julia	Wood, Bob

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The eyes are 35; the nays are 39.

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

All matters relating to private members' public business now being complete, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock.

*The House recessed from 1210 to 1330.*

**MEMBERS' STATEMENTS****REPORT, INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER**

**Ms Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** As members know, the Conservative member for Simcoe North asked the Integrity Commissioner to review my personal use of the overseas courier. That review is now complete.

I am pleased with the commissioner's ruling that none of the specific complaints under the integrity act made against me by Mr Dunlop were valid. I welcome his statement that at no time did I intend that taxpayers incur any costs for this shipment.

I accept the commissioner's finding that I made an error in judgment and appreciate that he stressed that, "It would be unfair to characterize this as other than an error in judgment made in good faith."

While the commissioner recommends that no penalty be imposed for the unintentional breach of the unwritten parliamentary convention, I do not take his ruling lightly. As members know, parliamentary conventions are not defined in the act, and are generally accepted practices established by usage or custom. As the commissioner has recognized that "Purolator advised ... that personal (as opposed to government) shipping was done frequently by members," I would encourage all members to learn from the clarifications and advice of the commissioner. I know I will be taking much greater care in the future.

**SANTA'S VISIT**

**Mrs Julia Munro (York North):**

"Twas the night before Christmas,  
when all through the abode  
Only one creature was stirring,  
and she was cleaning the commode.  
The children were finally sleeping,

all snug in their beds,  
While visions of Nintendo and Barbie  
flipped through their heads.

And Dad was snoring  
in front of the TV  
With a half-constructed bicycle  
propped up on his knee.  
So only Mom heard  
the reindeer hooves clatter,  
Which made her sigh,  
"Now what's the matter?"

With toilet bowl brush  
still clutched in her hand,  
She descended the stairs,  
and saw the old man.  
He was covered in ashes and soot  
that fell with a shrug,  
"Great!" she exclaimed.  
"Now I have to clean the rug!"

"Ho, ho, ho," cried Santa.  
"I'm glad you're awake.  
"Your gift was especially  
difficult to make."  
"Thanks, Santa," said Mom,  
"but all I want is time alone."  
"Exactly," he chuckled,  
"so I've made you a clone."

"A clone?" she muttered.  
"What good is that?"  
"Run along, Santa;  
I've no time for chit-chat."  
Then out walked the clone—  
the mother's twin,  
Same hair, same eyes,  
same double chin.

"She'll cook, she'll dust,  
she'll mop every mess.  
"You relax, take it easy,  
go for a run."  
"Fantastic," the mom cheered.  
"My dream has come true!  
"I'll shop and I'll read—  
even sleep a night through."

From the room above,  
the youngest did fret,  
"Mommy, come quickly!  
I'm scared and I'm wet!"  
The clone replied,  
"I'm coming, sweetheart."  
"Hey," the mom smiled,  
"she sure knows her part."

The clone changed the small one  
and hummed her a tune,  
As she bundled the child  
in a blanket cocoon.  
"You're the best mommy ever.  
I really love you."  
The clone smiled and sighed,  
"And I love you too!"

The mom frowned and said,  
"Sorry, Santa. No deal!  
"That's my child's love  
she is trying to steal."  
Smiling wisely, Santa said,  
"To me it is clear,  
"Only one loving mother  
is needed here."

The mom kissed her child  
and tucked her in bed.  
"Thank you, Santa,  
for clearing my head.  
"I sometimes forget,  
it won't be very long  
"When they're too old  
for my cradle and song."

The clock on the mantle  
began to chime.  
Santa whispered to the clone,  
"It works every time."  
With the clone by his side  
Santa said, "Good night.  
"Merry Christmas, dear Mom....  
You'll be all right!"

Sometimes we need reminding of what life is all about.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** It is more clear than ever that northern Ontario residents are nothing more than an afterthought for the Ernie Eves government. Certainly the treatment people are getting through the northern health travel grant program proves that, as it is appallingly substandard. Even if your claim is approved, you must now wait over three months to get your payment. For those who are unjustifiably turned down, the system for appeal is fraught with frustration. The Minister of Health must initiate a thorough review of the program to at least make the process easier for people already under great stress due to their medical condition.

But the Minister of Health must also make some immediate corrections to the guidelines that are presently in place. Do you realize that midwives, who are funded by the Ministry of Health, do not fit into the category of specialists approved for funding under the travel grant

program? Despite the fact that most GPs no longer practice obstetrics and most obstetricians no longer accept low-risk pregnancies, making midwives the only option for many women, the ministry will not have these valued professionals included in the travel grant program. This is absurd and truly unfair.

Then we have the very sad situation faced by a constituent of mine whose wife was rushed down to southern Ontario earlier this fall for emergency care and who subsequently died. When her husband's family inquired as to whether he could receive assistance to get back home, they were told he no longer qualified for a companion grant because his wife had died. Minister, come on. This is a bitterly cruel loophole that is beyond description.

I've written you on both these issues and you've not favoured me with a reply on either matter. Please show some compassion and correct these unacceptable flaws in the travel grant program.

#### CHRISTMAS EVENTS IN DURHAM

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** In the spirit of the season, I'd like to briefly mention just a few of the many Christmas events in my wonderful riding of Durham.

In Port Perry, the Magical Christmas Eve parade was held November 30. I'm pleased to say a record attendance was reported. It was sponsored by the Scugog Chamber of Commerce. Congratulations to Ray Northey, parade coordinator and also the director of the chamber of commerce. He received assistance from Margot and Ken Gadsden, Peter Crawford and many other dedicated volunteers. I also thank Jim Grieves, who was kind enough to drive me in the parade.

On November 23, an estimated 40,000 attended the evening Santa Claus parade in Oshawa. Funds for the event were raised in part through local businesses and organizations who each adopted one of Santa's reindeers. Congratulations to the Santa's Parade of Lights committee. Its members included John Burns, the chair, Robin Burns, Sharon Young, Kevin Campbell, plus many other hard-working volunteers.

I should also mention such events as the drive-through nativity at Trull's Road Free Methodist Church in Courtice. Many have also enjoyed the readings of Dickens's A Christmas Carol at the Newcastle community hall and St Paul's United Church in Bowmanville. These charitable fundraisers are held in conjunction with the CBC. This Saturday, branch 178 of the Royal Canadian Legion will host its "stuff a bus" event to collect non-perishable food and toys for needy families.

Finally, I would like to send greetings to Henry Downing and Merrill Van Camp, two lifelong friends who have not been well recently. My wife, Peggy, and I feel fortunate because this year is the very first Christmas for our very first grandchild, Meghan Elizabeth Lohse, born December 2.

To the constituents of Durham riding, I wish season's greetings, Merry Christmas, best of health and good

happiness for the new year, and to all members of the House I extend the same greetings.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** Recently, the Minister of Consumer and Business Services made inappropriate comments about an administrator at the Grandview Lodge long-term-care home in Haldimand county. I quote Mr Hudak from the Dunnville Chronicle on November 20 when referring to his portion of the county: "I frankly put more faith in their judgment than in that of an administrator who couldn't be elected dog catcher. It reinforced my feeling that there is an arrogance in the administration of the county."

Arrogance? These are comments unbecoming a minister of the crown. Haldimand county council are in fact elected officials, and they have asked the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care to redistribute long-term-care beds across Haldimand county from the redeveloped Grandview Lodge site in Dunnville. As of today, the proposal has not gone forward and there's a belief that it is this minister who is holding back the county's plans.

It was the Harris-Eves government that downloaded services to municipalities and forced through the costly restructuring of the region of Haldimand-Norfolk. This has forced Haldimand county to make this tough decision about their long-term-care needs for the good of the entire county. For this minister to attack the county staff is unacceptable and I would ask the minister to make a formal apology to the administrator for his comments.

It is the Harris-Eves government who has underfunded long-term care in this province. They tried to sneak through a 15% increase on the copayment paid by seniors, and it is this minister and the member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant who voted against implementing minimum standards of care in long-term care homes. If anyone is to be held responsible for the reduction in the number of beds in Dunnville, he need only look into a mirror.

1340

With the attitude shown by these members, it is high time that the people of Erie-Lincoln and Haldimand county, indeed the entire province, look for real leadership and a new direction for the province based on respect, dignity and compassion, especially for our most vulnerable elderly citizens. It is time to elect Dalton McGuinty the next Premier of the province of Ontario.

#### ADOPTION DISCLOSURE

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth):** In the west gallery today are adoptees and birth mothers representing the thousands who want Bill 77 passed. I just met with them, and although there were some tears shed, there was also—

*Interruption.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I hate to interrupt; we'll start over. We can't have any demonstrations in the

gallery. I know you've come here, but unfortunately the rules do not even allow you to clap. I would ask that you don't have any demonstrations, even silent ones where you raise your hand like that. You've come a long way and we like to see you here. But unfortunately, if it continues I will have to ask you to leave, and we don't want to do that.

You can start all over again, member for Toronto-Danforth.

**Ms Churley:** Thank you, Speaker. I apologize for that.

In the west gallery are the adoptees and birth mothers. I just met with them, and although there were some tears shed, there was also a lot of anger and renewed resolve, for they've watched the sad spectacle in this House over the last few days of their human rights once again being denied them. They saw Tory member after Tory member get up and say they support Bill 77, that it's a good bill, but then say no whenever I requested third reading and a vote on the bill. They watched while the government found time for three government private members' bills to be called and one Liberal bill, which happened last night. But excuse after excuse was given whenever I called for my bill to be voted on.

The government House leader says it's because we broke a deal. There was no deal, and there was time to call the bill. If there was time to call three government bills and a Liberal bill, there certainly is time to call Bill 77. I would say with all sincerity to the government members, there is still time to do that.

It is time to stop this nonsense. We all know the reason that the government is not calling the bill. It's not about broken deals—which means nothing to these people, the kinds of deals and horse-trading that go on here. They need their human rights granted to them. We have the power to do that. What we must do is tell the truth here, that there are some people in the government caucus who do not support the bill and those few are holding up the democratic rights, the human rights, of those people in the gallery today.

On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to call for unanimous consent to call Bill 77 for third reading and a final vote.

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

#### CIVICS CLASSES

**Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex):** I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr Stephen Fischer of North-western secondary school in Stratford and Mrs Bev Gregory of St Michael's secondary school in Stratford, as well as the students in the civics classes they teach.

In the civics course, students learn about the evolution of democracies and the different types of political systems. They also study political parties, the division of powers between federal and provincial governments, our Constitution and our Charter of Rights. International organizations such as the United Nations and global issues such as human rights are also studied.

Students must also write to an elected official in their community. I have received many letters from students on a variety of issues such as literacy, health care, the voting age and the driving age. I want to take this opportunity to commend the students at Northwestern and St Michael's for the time they spent writing to me on the provincial issues that are important to them and for their interest in the political process.

Please join me in applauding the efforts of teachers like Stephen Fischer and Bev Gregory in giving our students a better understanding of our political system, our political process, and the value of being part of a democracy.

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING

##### **Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):**

It's the middle of December and all across Ontario the streets are turning to slush. This is a normal occurrence in our cold province, but taken to a higher level by Ernie Eves and the Ontario slush tour because yesterday, in one of the most cynical moves I've ever seen, he demonstrated that he leads a government that, on the one hand, grabs hold of a little billion-dollar slush fund, and then starts doling it out closer to the election, while kids who have had their special-needs assessment completed wait for the desperate kinds of services they require.

He cynically waited until such time as was the best political opportunity for him. Building on the premise that justice delayed is justice denied, then what do we take from a government that knowingly disadvantages disabled kids even further by sitting on money and waiting for a politically opportune time to offer that funding, while those kids' needs go unaddressed?

So, all across Ontario we send the message out to people that when Ernie Eves arrives in your town, toting this new billion-dollar bag of tricks, understand one thing: if he's addressing important needs in your community related to education and health, understand that he's been sitting on this money. He's been waiting for a politically opportune time to announce it. While he has done that, people across this province have suffered. That's the kind of cynicism you get from that government and that's why they need to go.

#### SUPPORT THE SHORTS

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** I would like to inform the members of this House about 10 very special people who live and work in my riding of Peterborough. These folks are employed by Purolator and have been dubbed the couriers with cold legs and warm hearts.

Early in November, the couriers distributed to their customers flyers titled "Support the Shorts," a food drive program with the one and only rule that they must be wearing shorts in order to collect a donation of a non-perishable food item for the local food banks. The program began November 12, and we all know how many very cold days we have had since November 12. As of

December 6, the couriers have collected over 6,000 pounds of food. The program ends tomorrow, December 13. This is a great testimony to the generosity of the people who live in my riding and in the province of Ontario.

Purolator has recognized Dave Allen, Mike Lacey, Terry Johnston, Art Langlois, Jason Fraser, Dave Nichols, Jeff Payne, Clark Downey, Doug Shear and Rob Green with a certificate of appreciation, and we too should congratulate them for initiating this novel idea and freezing their limbs for a great cause.

I would ask the members of this Legislature to applaud the efforts of these 10 men who got into the Christmas spirit, braved the cold, had some fun and collected tons of food for the less fortunate.

#### VISITOR

##### **Hon Frank Klees (Minister of Tourism and Recreation):**

On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want members here to join me in welcoming a good friend and one of Ontario's best athletes ever, having won seven Grey Cup rings in his history of 20 years in the CFL. Please join me in welcoming my good friend Hank Ilesic.

#### APOLOGY

**Mr Dave Levac (Brant):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Yesterday I made a statement in the House that created a stir and had another member question whether or not I was allowed to do so. Your response prompted me to look into the standing orders. The standing orders, VI, page 18, "Rules of Debate," indicate:

"(a) Speaks twice to a question, except in explanation of a material part of his or her speech in which he or she may have been misunderstood, in which case the member may not introduce a new matter.

"(b) Directs his or her speech to matters other than...."

I refer to section (h):

"Makes allegations against another member."

By this reading, I believe I was out of order. I want to speak to you, personally, as the Speaker of this place. I apologize. To the House, I apologize, and in particular to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant, I apologize. I plan to keep the decorum of this House at all times because I came here with that intent. I apologize, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I thank the member for that gesture. I thank the member very much, sincerely. If all the members were like him, I wouldn't have any problem in here, I can assure you.

#### MEMBER'S BIRTHDAY

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: we have another colleague in the Legislature whose birthday is today, and our caucus has chipped in for a little present. It's something I think he would particularly appreciate. It's a plaque. I don't

know whether any of the members can guess: who would it be?

**Interjections:** Tony Ruprecht.

**Mr Phillips:** Well, it is. Happy birthday, Tony Ruprecht.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Happy birthday.

**Hon Frank Klees (Minister of Tourism and Recreation):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to allow the member opposite to present a petition at this time.

**The Speaker:** I think the member's probably kidding, but I appreciate that, and we wish him happy birthday.

1350

#### VISITOR

**Mr Ted McMeekin (Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot):** I'd like to take a minute to introduce Naomi Ives. Naomi's a second-year master of social work student from Wilfrid Laurier, my old alma mater. My first experience here was to do a field placement, like Naomi, at Queen's Park. She's here today: Naomi Ives.

#### REPORT, INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the report of the Integrity Commissioner, the Honourable Coulter Osborne, responding to the request of the member for Simcoe North concerning Ms Sandra Papatello, deputy leader of the official opposition and member for Windsor West.

#### REQUEST FOR OPINION

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I further beg to inform the House that I have laid upon the table a request by the member for Don Valley East to the Honourable Coulter A. Osborne, Integrity Commissioner, for an opinion pursuant to section 30 of the Members' Integrity Act, 1994, on whether the Honourable John Baird, Minister of Energy, has contravened the act or Ontario parliamentary convention.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF BILL

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Yesterday, the member for Windsor West introduced Bill 228, An Act respecting Canterbury College. At the time it was introduced, this bill was unaccompanied by the usual documentation that lets the Speaker know what type of bill it is. As a result, it was assumed to be a private member's public bill. As a public bill, it is not in order.

Upon review, it is clear that the bill is intended to be a private bill. However, as a private bill it was likewise unaccompanied by the required documentation and was brought before the House outside of the normal procedures established for a private bill application.

I therefore find the bill not to be in order and have directed that it be removed from the Orders and Notices paper.

#### STATUS OF BILL

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Further, on Wednesday, December 11, 2002, the member for Hamilton West introduced Bill 233, An Act to amend the Assessment Act to more fairly permit exemptions from assessment to benefit senior citizens and disabled persons.

After first reading, the government House leader, Mr Stockwell, asked the Speaker to "review the bill for its orderliness with respect to the cost components to the financial base of the province of Ontario."

I have had an opportunity to review the bill in light of our parliamentary precedents and authorities.

Marleau and Montpetit's House of Commons Practice and Procedure states on page 898:

"With respect to the raising of revenue, a private member cannot introduce bills which impose taxes. The power to initiate taxation rests solely with the government and any legislation which seeks an increase in taxation must be preceded by a ways and means motion. Only a minister can bring in a ways and means motion. However, private members' bills which reduce taxes, reduce the incidence of a tax, or impose or increase an exemption from taxation are acceptable."

Furthermore, citation 998(1) of the sixth edition of Beauchesne states that "[a] private member may move that certain specified taxes be readjusted and that the scope of tax exemptions be enlarged."

Our own more modern precedents agree with the position taken by these authorities.

Therefore, I find that the Bill 233 does not offend standing order 56 and is in order.

I thank the government House leader for raising his concern.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

**Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, and therefore move its adoption.

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

Bill 116, An Act to proclaim Archives Awareness Week.

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

The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

**Mr Spina:** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, and also therefore move its adoption.

**Clerk at the Table:** Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 117, An Act to proclaim Congenital Heart Defects Awareness Day / Projet de loi 117, Loi visant à proclamer la Journée de sensibilisation à la cardiopathie congénitale.

**The Speaker:** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed.

The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** I beg leave to present a report on the food industry program from the standing committee on public accounts and move the adoption of its recommendations.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

**Mr Gerretsen:** Very briefly, I might note that that's the fourth report the committee has presented since this session started in September. Two further reports were tentatively approved this morning.

This particular report has six recommendations. Just highlighting three of them, one of them states that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food should conduct a review of its compliance with advisory protocols and the operation of the computerized information management system.

Another recommendation states that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food should update and expand the baseline product studies based on its risk analysis system. These initiatives are essential to the timely notification of commodity producers to ensure food safety for Ontario consumers.

The last recommendation states that the ministry should provide the standing committee on public accounts with an overview of the findings of the consultant's reports and their potential to enhance food safety in Ontario.

With that, I move adjournment of the debate.

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

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

#### VISITORS

**Mrs Julia Munro (York North):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like all members to join me in welcoming to the gallery here Andy Houser from the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, John Bell from the Ontario Sporting Dog Association, Ray Gosselin from the Canadian Outdoor Heritage Alliance and Bob Frazer from the Ontario Bear Hunting Association.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT, 2002

##### LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE MINISTÈRE DES SERVICES CORRECTIONNELS

Mr Sampson moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 237, An Act to amend the Ministry of Correctional Services Act / Projet de loi 237, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le ministère des Services correctionnels.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Rob Sampson (Mississauga Centre):** The bill amends the Ministry of Correctional Services Act to allow for the director or superintendent of a correctional institution to establish worker training programs for inmates or a group of inmates in an institution and allow them to earn credits, by doing that work, toward things such as accommodation, expenses and early remission.

##### ONTARIO DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION ACT, 2002

##### LOI DE 2002 SUR LA PROTECTION DES SOURCES D'EAU POTABLE DE L'ONTARIO

Ms Churley moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 238, An Act to protect sources of drinking water in Ontario / Projet de loi 238, Loi visant à protéger les sources d'eau potable en l'Ontario.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth):** Just as I forced the government to bring forward a Safe Drinking Water Act, I'm hoping to act as a catalyst to speed up the source protection act the government promised.

In the Walkerton inquiry report, part two, Justice O'Connor laid out the main components of what he called "a comprehensive provincial source-to-tap drinking water policy." These included a multi-barrier approach to protecting drinking water and a comprehensive source-to-tap provincial drinking water policy.

Justice O'Connor points out the painfully obvious: an essential component to providing safe drinking water is to protect the water from getting contaminated in the first place.



1400

## RECREATION RESERVE ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002

## SUR LA RÉSERVE RÉCRÉATIVE

Mr Ouellette moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 239, An Act to establish a recreation reserve /  
Projet de loi 239, Loi visant à créer une réserve  
récréative.

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

The minister for a short statement?

**Hon Jerry J. Ouellette (Minister of Natural Resources):** The legislation I'm introducing today, if passed, will specify designated portions of the Kawartha Highlands as a recreational reserve. It is our intention that the proposed legislation will address concerns brought forward by the local stakeholders during the recent public consultation process to determine appropriate protection for the Kawartha Highlands.

In short, this legislation will provide another option for natural heritage protection, an option that takes into consideration local circumstances around existing recreational uses and ensures that areas so designated will continue to provide opportunities for recreational and economic benefits to the local communities for now and for future generations.

The recreational reserve designation would also provide greater certainty for people who hold existing leases or land use permits on crown land by ensuring through legislation that traditional recreational uses would not be further constrained or eliminated over time.

The legislation will be posted on the EBR, and I encourage all interested members of the public to review the proposal and make their comments known.

On a personal note, I want to wish everyone here the best of the season and a merry Christmas.

ONTARIO WORKERS'  
MEMORIAL ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002

SUR LE MONUMENT COMMÉMORATIF  
DES TRAVAILLEURS DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Agostino moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 240, An Act to establish the Ontario Workers' Memorial /  
Projet de loi 240, Loi visant à ériger le monument commémoratif en hommage aux travailleurs de l'Ontario.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East):** This Legislature has rightly and appropriately passed legislation that has erected a police and firefighters' memorial on or adjacent to the grounds of the Legislative Assembly.

Ontario's workers are the lifeblood of this province and have contributed so much. Unfortunately, too many of our fellow Ontarians don't come home at the end of the day as a result of a tragedy in the workplace. This bill, if passed, would establish a memorial on the legislative grounds that would recognize all Ontario workers who have been killed in their line of duty and work.

## ROAD SAFETY ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002

## SUR LA SÉCURITÉ ROUTIÈRE

Mr Sterling moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 241, An Act to enhance safety and mobility on Ontario's roads /  
Projet de loi 241, Loi visant à accroître la sécurité et la mobilité sur les routes de l'Ontario.

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

The minister for a short statement?

**Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Transportation):** I will defer until ministers' statements.

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'OFFICE DE LA  
TÉLÉCOMMUNICATION  
ÉDUCATIVE DE L'ONTARIOONTARIO EDUCATIONAL  
COMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY  
AMENDMENT ACT, 2002

M<sup>me</sup> Boyer propose la première lecture du projet de loi suivant :

Projet de loi 242, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Office de la télécommunication éducative de l'Ontario pour créer des sections distinctes de langue française et de langue anglaise /  
Bill 242, An Act to amend the Ontario Educational Communications Authority Act to create separate French language and English language sections.

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

The member for a short statement?

**M<sup>me</sup> Claudette Boyer (Ottawa-Vanier):** Ce projet de loi modifie la Loi sur l'Office de la télécommunication éducative de l'Ontario pour exiger que le conseil comporte une section de langue française composée de membres francophones et une section de langue anglaise.

Ce projet prévoit aussi que les émissions de documents en français dans le domaine de la radiodiffusion et de la télécommunication éducative relèvent exclusivement de la compétence de la section de langue française.

In this way, both sections of TVOntario will be able to continue to grow and to produce the programs and services best suited to their respective audiences.

TENANT PROTECTION  
AMENDMENT ACT  
(FAIRNESS IN RENT INCREASES), 2002

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LA PROTECTION DES LOCATAIRES  
(AUGMENTATIONS ÉQUITABLES  
DES LOYERS)

Mr Bryant moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 243, An Act to amend the Tenant Protection Act, 1997 to ensure fairness to Ontario's tenants / Projet de loi 243, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la protection des locataires en vue d'assurer un traitement équitable des locataires de l'Ontario.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** The bill amends the Tenant Protection Act, 1997, in a fashion that protects tenants, which is a novelty in this province. The act will be amended so that rent may not be increased if there is an outstanding work order. It also provides for a rollback for above-guideline rent increases in circumstances of unjust enrichment and ensures that there be a rollback of above-guideline rent increases if the landlord ceases to incur the cost to justify the increase and for the rescission of increases in rent where there are no further costs incurred by the landlord for the additions provided to the tenant.

SENIORS' PROTECTION ACT, 2002  
LOI DE 2002 SUR LA PROTECTION  
DES PERSONNES ÂGÉES

Mr Colle moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 244, An Act to protect people over the age of 65 from discrimination by amending the Human Rights Code / Projet de loi 244, Loi visant à protéger les personnes de plus de 65 ans de toute discrimination en modifiant le Code des droits de la personne.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** The Seniors' Protection Act, if passed, would amend the Human Rights Code to require the appointment of a seniors' ombudsman. The ombudsman reports to the chair of the Human Rights Commission. The seniors' ombudsman acts as an advocate for the elderly and attempts to resolve complaints of abuse and neglect of the elderly in long-term-care and medical facilities.

The code is also amended to remove the reference to 65 years. This results in its being contrary to the code to discriminate in employment on the basis of age because a person is 65 years of age or older. The bill also prevents employers from changing the access to benefits or rights to benefits for workers who are 65 years of age or older.

**Mr Bill Murdoch (Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to seek unanimous consent to give third reading to Bill 74, the amendment to the Marriage Act, which was approved by all three parties in here, went to committee and had committee hearings.

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

MARRIAGE AMENDMENT ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LE MARIAGE

Mr Murdoch moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Marriage Act / Projet de loi 74, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le mariage.

**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 opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Hold it. Sit down. There was a little bit of confusion here. I was looking to this side. I will ask again, if we could, and if people would listen carefully.

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 30-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1411 to 1441.*

**The Speaker:** Would the members please take their seats.

All those in favour will please rise and remain standing.

**Ayes**

Agostino, Dominic	Gerretsen, John	Mushinski, Marilyn
Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	Parsons, Ernie
Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Beaubien, Marcel	Guzzo, Garry J.	Peters, Steve
Bisson, Gilles	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hardeman, Ernie	Prue, Michael
Boyer, Claudette	Hastings, John	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Jackson, Cameron	Ramsay, David
Bryant, Michael	Johns, Helen	Runciman, Robert W.
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Ruprecht, Tony
Christopherson, David	Klees, Frank	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Kormos, Peter	Smitherman, George
Churley, Marilyn	Kwinter, Monte	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Stockwell, Chris
Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cordiano, Joseph	Martel, Shelley	Tsubouchi, David H.
Crozier, Bruce	Martin, Tony	Wilson, Jim
Curling, Alvin	Martiniuk, Gerry	Witmer, Elizabeth
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mazzilli, Frank	Wood, Bob
Dombrowsky, Leona	Miller, Norm	Young, David
Duncan, Dwight	Munro, Julia	
Galt, Doug	Murdoch, Bill	

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please rise and remain standing.

**Nays**

Baird, John R.	Hudak, Tim	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Sergio, Mario
Clement, Tony	McDonald, AL	Spina, Joseph
Colle, Mike	McMeekin, Ted	Stewart, R. Gary
Hoy, Pat	Newman, Dan	Wettlaufer, Wayne

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 64; the nays are 15.

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

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

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I understand that an agreement has been reached between Mr Stockwell and Mr Murdoch. I suggest a page attend upon Mr Stockwell so that the page can deliver the subject matter of that agreement to Mr Murdoch.

**VISITORS**

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I'd like to point out that in the members' west gallery is Mr Derek Fletcher, the member for Guelph in the 35th Parliament. Please join me in welcoming our colleague.

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to introduce Tom Van Leeuwen and Mark and Claire, the father and brother and sister of Lauren Van Leeuwen, our page from the great riding of Peterborough.

**Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know all members will want to join me in giving the heartiest possible welcome to the grade 4 and 5 class from Regent Park/Duke of York school.

**LEGISLATIVE PAGES**

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** On behalf of the members of the Legislature and myself, I'd like to thank our pages for their help over the past few weeks. It has been a pleasure to know you, but it's the last day. I would like to wish each and every one of you all the success in your future endeavours, on behalf of all the members, and a merry Christmas.

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY  
AND RESPONSES****ROAD SAFETY  
SÉCURITÉ ROUTIÈRE**

**Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Transportation):** Earlier today I introduced a new safety bill. This is exemplary of our government, because since 1995 our government has made road safety a priority. We have introduced tough new laws to target aggressive and irresponsible driving, we have brought in stiffer fines for

those who demonstrate poor driving behaviour, and we have stepped up our efforts to combat drinking and driving.

Our efforts to improve road safety have received widespread support from the public. We have worked with our road safety partners and our stakeholders, including police services and community groups.

As a result of these actions over the past seven years, Ontario has made tremendous progress in improving its road safety record. In fact, the latest statistics indicate that Ontario's roads are the safest in Canada and the second-safest in North America.

But we cannot afford to allow this excellent record to make us complacent. We can and must do more to improve the safety of our roads. That's why today, we are moving forward to make Ontario's roads even safer with our proposed Road Safety Act, 2002.

At this point, I'd like to thank my assistant deputy minister Frank D'Onofrio, and my director of safety operations, Ernie Bartucci.

This bill would build on the province's excellent record of safety, and help us move closer to our goal of making our roads the safest in the world.

The proposed legislation is designed to accomplish several important objectives. It would target street racing with tougher penalties; improve traffic flow and safety by making the left lane a passing lane on many of our major highways; make booster seats mandatory for young children; reduce congestion by helping police to re-open highway lanes as soon as possible after an accident; and double fines for speeding in construction zones.

The bill proposes a total of 14 new legislative items. Some of the measures are designed to build on aggressive road safety initiatives we have taken since 1995. Others are in response to suggestions and recommendations from our road safety partners.

I would like to take a few moments to outline some highlights of the legislation.

We are proposing additional measures to crack down on street racing. Drivers caught street racing would be subject to immediate vehicle impoundment and the suspension of their driver's licence—both for 48 hours. This would be in addition to any other charges laid by police in relation to a street race, such as existing offences for street racing, speeding or careless driving.

**1450**

The bill would also prohibit the use of equipment and prescribed substances, such as nitrous oxide, that boost the performance of engines. The message we want to send is that street racing puts lives at risk and it won't be tolerated.

Another proposed measure would improve public safety by allowing the Ministry of Transportation to regulate the level of after-market window tinting applied to a vehicle's windshield and front side windows. This would make it safer for police to approach vehicles with tinted glass. It would also improve road safety, allowing drivers and pedestrians to establish eye contact, and drivers to see better at night and during bad weather.

One very important measure of this bill would require parents and legal guardians to use booster seats for preschoolers and primary grade children. Motor-vehicle-related deaths are the number one killers of our children. With this proposed legislation, we aim to change that statistic. Under the bill's provisions, booster seats would be mandatory for children who weigh between 18 and 27 kilograms, or 40 and 60 pounds, and whose seated height is less than 63 centimetres, or 25 inches.

If passed, Ontario would become the first province in the country to make booster seats mandatory. This is appropriate, given that we were the first province to require seat belts in 1976 and child safety seats in 1982. With this measure, we are moving to protect those children who have outgrown their child car seats, but who are still too small for regular seat belts to be effective.

The proposed bill also contains new provisions concerning the collection of fines for outstanding driving-related offences from out-of-province drivers. Under these proposals, Ontario would work with other jurisdictions to enforce the collection of outstanding fines for driving-related offences.

This would pave the way for Ontario to pursue agreements with other jurisdictions to suspend the licences of their drivers for outstanding fines that are payable in Ontario. These agreements would work both ways. We believe motorists from other jurisdictions would drive more responsibly if they knew there were tougher consequences.

Another proposed measure in the bill would require drivers in Ontario to use the left-hand lane only for passing on highways with three or more lanes and a speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour. This is to encourage drivers to keep right except to pass. With this measure, we aim to reduce aggressive driving behaviours, such as rapid and erratic lane changes and tailgating.

In addition to these new measures, the bill also includes provisions designed to build on and strengthen the work of our road safety partners to better protect the driving public. These include clarifying the rules for medical practitioners on when and what medical conditions must be reported to the Ministry of Transportation.

It would allow all municipalities in the province to set a speed limit as low as 30 kilometres per hour in designated areas where there are traffic-calming measures, such as speed bumps. The city of Toronto currently has this authority. By extending it province-wide, all municipalities would have more options at their disposal in their efforts to improve road safety in residential areas.

This bill would also clarify the powers of police with regard to the removal of vehicles and debris from our highways, by protecting police from legal liability. Highway incidents often result in major delays that impact on safety, affect the economy and contribute to congestion. This initiative would support the police in their efforts to reopen highway lanes as soon as possible after a serious incident.

This legislation would introduce a series of initiatives that strengthen the province's ability to monitor and enforce commercial vehicle safety. These measures

include: providing enforcement officers with new tools to crack down on illegal commercial passenger vans; revoking the licences of motor vehicle inspection stations that are operated by commercial carriers that have a poor safety record; requiring all taxis in Ontario to undergo annual vehicle safety inspections; and working with industry to develop a program to mark the boxes of trucks that haul gravel and other aggregates to help prevent overloading of dump trucks.

The last bundle of measures in the proposed Road Safety Act, 2002, would make highway construction zones in the province safer for road workers and drivers. If enacted, these proposals would double the existing fines for speeding in construction zones; give municipalities the authority to designate local construction zones, without requiring a bylaw, and to post speed limits in those zones; and require drivers to obey hand-held signs used by traffic control persons in construction zones and maintenance areas, the same way drivers must now obey stop signs held up by school crossing guards.

I am confident this proposed legislation would help us achieve our goal in Ontario of making our roads the safest anywhere. It underscores our government's commitment to a modern, efficient and safe transportation system, one that supports economic growth and sustains our excellent quality of life.

**Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex):** I would have hoped that the minister would have taken all the recommendations that were in my Bill 153 when it comes to protecting people in our highway construction zones. I introduced this bill a year ago in memory of Dick Van Rooyen, who was killed as a construction worker in the infamous Carnage Alley, which is in my riding. It has some of the aspects that the minister is calling for, but the minister did not go all the way. He did not provide a comprehensive bill like Bill 153, which I introduced in December 2001.

My bill would also have required that agreements would be made between the ministry and the construction company with the highways and include a provision for the use of police to protect the safety of the workers. It would require the closure of the travelled portion of the controlled-access highway while work is being done and diverting the traffic to the other side of the highway to ensure that all of those people who are standing on our roadsides would be protected.

But we are pleased that the minister took at least part of my Bill 153 to ensure the safety of those working in our construction zones. I'm sure that Liz Van Rooyen, the wife of Dick Van Rooyen, would be pleased with this very small step put forward by the minister. But I think that she would share our concern that he has introduced this on what is likely to be the last day of this sitting. He has introduced a bill to protect the public in various ways on the very last sitting day of this House.

I would have hoped that the minister, as he has taken part of my previous Bill 153, would have taken it upon himself to introduce Bill 112 as part of the government initiative when it comes to school bus safety. I introduced this bill in 1996. It has been introduced in this House five

times. It has had all-party support for second reading on two different occasions, and yet the government fails to bring this bill to committee. Not only that, it fails to take the bill unto itself and bring it back.

If this minister and the previous three or four others since 1995 find fault with the bill and want to change it, let's do that to protect the 810,000 children who ride school buses daily in this province. There are 16,000 buses driving each and every day.

I spoke in this House before of some of the impediments to finding those drivers. One was tinted windows, so we welcome that. But still it remains that bus drivers will have a difficult time identifying the face of a driver who passes a school bus illegally, due to the speed of the vehicle and whether it passes the bus from the back or the front.

Most importantly, those school bus drivers, over 16,000 of them, are taking the time to watch the 810,000 children who get on and off that bus each and every day. Their primary concern is that most precious cargo, those kids who ride our buses.

**1500**

The minister and previous Ministers of Transportation had the power to ensure that this bill would be passed. None of them have taken that unto themselves. None of them have taken my bill, as they have taken part of Bill 153, unto themselves in terms of construction zone safety. They could take the initiatives within my bill and please the 30,000 people who signed petitions in support of it, please the police, please the teachers, please the school boards, please those persons who drive school buses and please the school bus operators and owners themselves. There is widespread support for this bill across Ontario in every quarter. The only place there is no support for the protection of children in Ontario who ride school buses is on the government side. It's been here since 1996. It's been introduced countless times, with countless petitions, countless letters of support from all quarters in Ontario, and this government fails to ensure the safety of children. We don't have a conviction mechanism.

There was a blitz in Chatham-Kent just recently where the police identified 107 persons who passed school buses in just a two-month period: 107 times people risked the lives of schoolchildren by passing a school bus illegally. The police could do nothing because they have to have the identification of the driver of the offending vehicle. My bill would allow for vehicle liability. This government allows for vehicle liability—for what reason? To collect tolls on the 407. Shameful. They won't protect children in this province with the same mechanism, by an eyewitness account of a school bus operator. They use it on red light cameras. They use vehicle liability for parking violations. They use it for all manner of things, except to protect the 810,000 children who ride school buses each and every day.

**M. Gilles Bisson (Timmins-Baie James):** Imaginez-vous ce gouvernement dire qu'ils vont améliorer la sécurité sur nos routes. Quel culot. Ce gouvernement, comme on le sait bien, est un gouvernement qui, à toute

occasion qu'il a eu la chance, a tout fait, franchement, pour éviter de prendre la responsabilité quand ça vient à la sécurité sur nos routes.

Si on regarde l'agenda du gouvernement, c'est très simple. C'est quoi qu'ils ont fait? Ils ont dit, « Premièrement, on va privatiser tous les chemins. » Une fois qu'on a privatisé les chemins, on s'est rendu au nord de la province, et il faut se mettre ses patins pour descendre la 11 puis la 17 parce que c'est plein de sel. Pourquoi? Le gouvernement, à travers le contractuel du secteur privé, n'a pas assez de sel pour le mettre sur les chemins. Quel culot: ils entrent ici aujourd'hui pour nous dire qu'ils vont améliorer la sécurité sur nos chemins. Je ne peux pas accepter que ce gouvernement est sérieux.

On regarde la situation avec les policiers de la province. Les policiers, combien y en a-t-il dans la province aujourd'hui? Il y en a moins que quand ce gouvernement a été élu. Ils en ont moins, et ce gouvernement dit, « On va avoir de la sécurité sur nos routes. » Comment avoir la sécurité sur les routes si on n'a pas les policiers-là pour appliquer les lois que le gouvernement eux autres ont introduites? Impossible.

Puis là on dit, « Tout va être bien dans la province de l'Ontario. » On est si bien, M. Sterling, le ministre des Transports. Quel culot qu'il a, ce monsieur-là, j'ai besoin de dire. But, Mr Speaker, we understand that the government purports to be doing something but they are quite frankly doing the opposite.

I want to propose this to the minister, a very simple premise. When people decide they want to go out racing a car down a back road or a highway, what is going to stop them from doing it? That they can't put some ethanol or some supercharged engine underneath their hood? No. It's knowing you've got the cops on the highway who are going to pull you over if you try it. So you can do all you want by laws—you can threaten to lock them up for life—but if there ain't police on the highway to stop them, how are you going to be able to deter the very action that you say, you purport, you want to change in this law? Absolutely impossible.

So I say to the government, it's another one of those doublespeaks. They say they want to do one thing with a bill or with a statement, but when it comes to their actual actions, I'm sorry; they're quite the opposite. Deterrence is the way to deal with the issue.

As many people who live across Ontario know—ask yourself this question when you're driving on secondary highways across the province: how many times have you seen an OPP cruiser out on the road? Ask yourselves. I'm on the highway every weekend. I go from Timmins to Hearst to Constance Lake and down to Kapuskasing. I'm all over my riding on the weekend. You can count on your hand how many times you see OPP cruisers in two months. It's not because the police officers are not doing their jobs. They are hard-working men and women. It's because they don't have the staff resources to put them on the highways. They're out patrolling our municipalities.

So now the government says it's going to introduce a bill. Well, I just say what I've always said when it comes to these kinds of debates: at the end of the day, if the government wants to really do something to deter an action, you have to take away the whole perspective from the people who are thinking of doing the crime by way of deterrence.

Comme j'ai dit, monsieur le Président, c'est une question d'un gouvernement qui dit une affaire quand ça vient au projet de loi mais qui fait complètement l'opposé quand ça vient à être capable de faire ce qu'ils disent qu'ils vont faire dans le projet de loi. Ils disent, « Ah oui, on va être très bien. » Mais je dis, comme j'ai dit au commencement, quel culot.

Là, je vais retourner à mon sujet favori. Ce gouvernement qui a privatisé nos chemins, qui dit dans cette loi qu'ils veulent améliorer la sécurité, je vous donne une suggestion. Monsieur le premier ministre—si seulement vous étiez si chanceux. Monsieur le ministre, ayez au moins le culot d'aller au cabinet de l'Ontario et d'admettre à votre gouvernement et à votre cabinet que vous avez fait une erreur quand ça vient à la privatisation de la maintenance de nos routes. Sur toutes les occasions sous contrat sauf un, vous payez plus d'argent que ça nous a coûté dans le passé.

Le ministre dit, « Non, non. » C'est tout ce qu'il sait, lui. Il ne sait pas comment dire oui à la sécurité de la population. En réalité, c'est le vérificateur provincial de l'Ontario, M. Peters, qui a dit que sur toutes les occasions sauf une, ça nous coûte plus cher aujourd'hui pour entretenir nos routes en hiver, et quoi? Elles sont moins sécuritaires que dans le passé.

Je dis très simplement au ministre : si vous dites que vous voulez améliorer la sécurité, je vous donne une suggestion. Du sel, j'en ai sur ma table chez nous, j'en ai dans mon appartement. Je vous le donne, puis vous pouvez le mettre sur les routes de la province de l'Ontario, et possiblement on peut se rendre du point A au point B.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### ONTARIO SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS AMENDMENT ACT, 2002

### LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DE PROTECTION DES ANIMAUX DE L'ONTARIO

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 129, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act / Projet de loi 129, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario.

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

*The division bells rang from 1507 to 1512.*

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

#### Ayes

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

**The Speaker:** All those opposed will please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony
Bartolucci, Rick	Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton
Bisson, Gilles	Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	Patten, Richard
Boyer, Claudette	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Hampton, Howard	Prue, Michael
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Churley, Marilyn	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	
Crozier, Bruce	Martel, Shelley	

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 52; the nays are 37.

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

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

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of the Environment, Government House Leader):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Due to the unforeseen circumstances of the half-hour bell, I would seek unanimous consent to extend question period to quarter after 4.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier. I wanted to ask you about the announcement you made yesterday to help special-needs children in Ontario's public schools. As you well

know, those children and their families have been waiting for help for years. School for those children and those families has been a daily struggle. Those families have been desperate for support from you. Yesterday you told us that money was not an issue, that there was lots of it sloshing around.

My question, on behalf of those kids and those families, is, how is it that you could put your political interests ahead of the needs of those children when you tell us now that you had this money all along?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** The leader of the official opposition couldn't be wrong if he tried. To start with, we are the first government in the history of the province of Ontario that has designated money for special education. Second, we introduced the ISA process to evaluate these students. We're the first government to do that. Third, the announcement yesterday, if he can read and pay attention, was to not only fully fund all the phase 3 ISA-assessed students, as Dr Rozanski recommended in his report, but we've also gone one better than Dr Rozanski's report. We're going to fully fund all the phase 4 assessments, which won't be completed until the end of this month; next year as well. Have a nice day.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, you sat on this money and you sat on your hands and you refused to help kids. Do you want to talk about firsts? Your government was the first to accumulate a list of 40,000 kids who are waiting to get help, and you sat on your hands and you refused to help them.

For years, kids have been frustrated, parents have been pulling their hair out, kids have been falling behind, there has been a loss of self-confidence, a loss of self-esteem, and you waited until it served your political interests before you decided you're going to help special-education kids. Where do you get off, Premier, putting your political fortunes ahead of Ontario kids?

**Hon Mr Eves:** I certainly don't need any lectures from the leader of the official opposition about special-education students.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. Premier, take a seat. Sorry to interrupt, Premier. Order. It's getting a little noisy in here, on both sides. I'd ask for co-operation. Sorry, Premier. Continue.

1520

**Hon Mr Eves:** Being a parent of a former special-education student, I know exactly how difficult it is for these students. That is exactly why, when we became the government of this province, we put in place a system to assess those students, not just in the elementary and secondary levels, but even post-secondary.

Virtually now every post-secondary institution in this province, thanks to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, accounts and has a program to assist learning-disabled students. We were the first ones to identify them.

Your government, David Peterson's government, did absolutely nothing. They didn't assess one single student. They didn't fund one single student.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, you sat on this money and you allowed a waiting list of 40,000 to accumulate. It grew by 15% during the last three years. Sixty per cent of students identified with special needs failed the grade 10 literacy test. Those students will be unable to graduate. You knew about it, and you sat on the money.

During the last five years, there has been a 55% drop in the number of schools reporting regular access to psychologists, a 37% drop in the number of schools reporting regular access to social workers and a 24% drop in the number of schools reporting regular access to speech language pathologists.

You knew about every bit of that, Premier, and you chose instead to sit on your hands and sit on the money and to come up with it on your conversion on the road to Damascus because it serves your political interests. I ask you again on behalf of those families and those kids, how could you possibly put your political interests ahead of those kids?

**Hon Mr Eves:** I know it's difficult for Liberals to add, but in this process, in this school year, we have in this year alone now added \$1.16 billion in-year through public boards of education. His solution to education in this province is to add \$1.3 billion over four years. We've done that in one year, Mr Do Nothing—Mr Do-Nothing Party.

#### PREMIER'S RECORD

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, your government and your leadership have been nothing short of an abysmal failure.

Here is some of the record, and we should take the time to review it, painful though it may be for you. The Minister of Tourism resigned over indulgent expenses. You tried to sneak through a \$10-million tax break for pro sports teams. John Snobelen, with your blessing, has been spending more time caring for his horses than his constituents. You tried to legalize pension raiding in the province of Ontario. You're selling off Hydro One in a fire sale. You tried to hike long-term-care fees for seniors by 15%.

We believe on this side of the House that the people of Ontario deserve much, much better. I'm asking you, sir, if you can't deliver strong leadership, if you can't advance the interests of Ontarians, why don't you step aside and allow us to take on the responsibilities of government?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I know Liberals have short memories. You might want to remember the seven to nine cabinet ministers with conflicts of interest with their hand caught in the till that David Peterson's government had, the worst record in the history of the province of Ontario, second only to the abysmal record of the Honourable Mitchell Hepburn.

**Mr McGuinty:** No government has been more adept, more skilful and more creative at looking after itself and its closest friends, none other than this government.

There is much more. This Premier has been waving back and forth on Kyoto like a leaf in the wind. A victim of crime in this province said, "This province continually makes people beg on their knees for help that never comes." The Provincial Auditor has just finally destroyed the urban myth about this government's competence. This auditor said that half of Ontario's corporations aren't paying taxes, and this Premier won't lift a single finger to crack down on that. There are 10,000 outstanding arrest warrants in Ontario, and \$660 million is being spent on consultants when we could get the work done by our public servants for one half to one third the price.

Premier, I'm asking you again, if you can't do the job, if you won't advance the interests of all Ontarians, if you insist on looking after your friends and your allies, why don't you step aside and let us do the job?

**Hon Mr Eves:** Talk about not being able to do the job—when is the leader of the official opposition going to hold his own members to the same standard that he expects of members on this side of the House? When is the member for Vaughan-King-Aurora going to repay the pension money—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. Come to order, please. We'll just wait, then. Sorry, Premier.

**Hon Mr Eves:** When is the leader of the official opposition going to table his own expenses and those of his 44 staff members? What does the leader of the official opposition have to say today about the conduct of his deputy leader as noted by the Integrity Commissioner?

*Interjections.*

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Take your seat. We'll give you the time to start over. Order. Come to order, please. Put them down, please. Thank you.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, you could only wish that you had a deputy leader as strong, as committed and as determined as mine; you can only wish.

All we've had from this government is more and more of the same old, same old—more and more devotion and attention to yourselves and your friends and less and less attention to the needs of Ontario families.

The good news is that we have plans to bring about real change in Ontario: smaller class sizes, learning until 18, turnaround teams for our struggling schools, affordable child care and investment in the early years, cleaner gasoline, cleaner electricity, protecting the sources of our drinking water, real investments in public transit, real protection for our tenants, 1,000 new cops on the streets, 50 more prosecutors in our courts.

We've got a plan for change; they've got plans for dinner. We can't wait for the next election.

**Hon Mr Eves:** In this session alone, we have passed the Safe Drinking Water Act; we have protected consumers from abuses by the securities industry; we have restructured the electricity industry; we have protected

farmers in the province of Ontario; we have added \$2 billion to health care; we have added almost \$1.2 billion to public education.

You have a platform that changes from day to day, and I presume next week we'll be out with draft 17 of our election policy from Dalton McGuinty, to spend even less money than we've already spent in our year. Give me a break.

1530

## HYDRO ONE

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Premier, and I'm not really interested today in which of you has flip-flopped the most.

Premier, we know you are cooking a deal in the back-rooms for the sale of Ontario's hydro electricity transmission company, Hydro One, or at least 49% of it. We know why: you've got a \$2-billion hole in your budget and you need to give the appearance of covering it up, and yes, you need to feed your Bay Street friends who are hungry for privatization profits. But it's the consumers of Ontario who will have to carry and pay the bill for this. Before you try to sell off 49% of Ontario's hydro electricity transmission system, don't you think the people of Ontario deserve a say first?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** First of all, we have said consistently and repeatedly that we believe there needs to be some private sector discipline brought to Hydro One. We have also said consistently and repeatedly that we will not part with control of Hydro One. We've also said that if we don't get an offer that's satisfactory to us, we're not selling any part of Hydro One in a fire sale.

**Mr Hampton:** We've seen from the auditor's report what private sector discipline means to your government. It means consultants walk in and walk out with hundreds of millions of dollars and the public gets nothing. It means a company like Accenture, which changed their name from Andersen Consulting because they had been kicked out of so many jurisdictions around North America, just keeps going back and back to the public purse. That's your definition of private sector discipline.

We understand that SNC-Lavalin is the company that wants to be at the trough first. We also understand they want a management contract. In addition to 49%, they want to manage Hydro One and make more money off that. But it means people will have to pay still more on their hydro bill. I ask the question again, Premier, before you sell off 49% or 39% or hand over control, don't you think the people of Ontario deserve a say first?

**Hon Mr Eves:** He and his party are the last people who should be standing up in the Legislature talking about how to run the finances and the economy of the province of Ontario. You had deficits every year of \$10 billion or in excess of \$10 billion. You increased the debt of the province from about \$49 billion to \$101 billion. You increased the debt of the Workers' Compensation Board by billions. You increased the debt of Ontario



Hydro by billions. And you left future generations for many generations to come in this province holding the bag.

You had some experience with consultants yourself, as I recall. You actually managed to build low-rental housing that paid more money to consultants than it did to actually construct buildings. It cost more per square foot than the most luxury building on the waterfront in the city of Toronto. That's your record. I welcome you to trot that out in the next election campaign to see if they'd like to go back to 1990.

**Mr Hampton:** In your Ontario, seven people died and hundreds became ill because you cared more about tax cuts for your well-off friends than you cared about clean drinking water. The issue is this: this is not your hydro system; this is a Hydro system that belongs to the people of Ontario. The simple question is this: don't you think the people of Ontario deserve a say before you try to sell it off to your corporate friends? I'll tell you right now, one way or another, after the next election New Democrats will ensure that Hydro One is restored to public control and operates again as a non-profit utility. But before you even try to go down this road, don't you think the people of Ontario deserve a say before you try to hand it off to your corporate friends?

**Hon Mr Eves:** For the umpteenth time, we are not selling Hydro One. We are not parting with control of Hydro One. We will maintain control in the public interest, as we should, and we will see that it runs with the proper discipline in the future.

But to sit here and listen to the third party lecture us about economic activity and how to run anything, I'm surprised they can even figure out how to run their own offices. Come to think of it, they can't. They certainly couldn't run the province of Ontario. You ran it into the ground. You virtually doubled the debt of the province. You raised annual interest payments to over \$9 billion a year. Your priorities were to spend \$9 billion on interest instead of health care, schools, the environment and other things. Your priorities are not ours over here.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** To the Premier again: you were the Minister of Finance and Deputy Premier who ran up \$25 billion in debt. For what? Just to give your corporate friends another tax cut. That's why.

Premier, Dr Rozanski has given you a blueprint to restore the \$2 billion that you've taken from Ontario's education system. So far, you've put a little money out here and a little money out there. The question is, are you going to restore the \$2 billion that Dr Rozanski says you took out? Are you going to restore it now? That's the question.

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** The leader of the third party might want to stand up and correct the record because I'm sure Dr Rozanski wouldn't appreciate you putting those words in

his mouth. He did not say that we took out one cent from the education system in this province. The reality is, the education budget in this province has gone from \$12.9 billion to, at the beginning of this week, \$14.4 billion, and it now stands in excess of \$14.7 billion.

**Mr Hampton:** According to the Premier, the \$2 billion that he talks about in his report suddenly must have disappeared somewhere else. You are the government that cut education funding. You are the government that over the last four years did nothing for the benchmarks in terms of covering the cost of inflation or the cost of collective agreements. So the question is this, Premier. He identified \$1.8 billion that needs to be in to bring us up to the level of inflation and make the improvements that he says are necessary, and he said you need at least \$300 million for collective agreements. Are you going to put the \$2 billion back in or not? That's the question.

**Hon Mr Eves:** He did not say any such thing and you know it. This week alone we have added substantial money in-year for education. We have now provided for an additional \$1.16 billion to the public education system in this province just in this current school year, the largest ever in the history of the province of Ontario by far, and we are putting far more money into public education than we did when we started.

You can argue if you want that you think we should put \$8 billion more in and you can explain to the people—and you'll have that opportunity, I'm sure, in due course on the campaign trail—where you're getting that \$8 billion. But you never were very good at math between 1990 and 1995, and you certainly haven't improved to the year 2002.

1540

#### PREMIER'S SPENDING

**Ms Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** My question is for the Premier. As finance minister and now as Premier, you made deep cuts that have hurt people. You cut the nutritional allowance for expectant mothers. You closed 31 hospitals across Ontario. You cut \$121 million from the Ministry of the Environment, which assisted in the disaster at Walkerton. That's why I was so shocked to find this: according to public accounts and your budget, Premier, spending by your office is more than double that of the Premier's office of Bob Rae, and triple that of the Premier's office of David Peterson. You are spending twice as much as Bob Rae and triple the amount of David Peterson. My question for you is this: why is there always less money for people who need help, but more money for you and your friends?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I didn't happen to hear an apology from the honourable member about her error in judgment, as the Integrity Commissioner described it.

When is the honourable member going to do the common, decent thing and stand up and apologize for her error in judgment? When is her leader going to do the honourable thing and table the expenses? We don't know

how much you're spending because you don't bother to share that information with the public of Ontario. Why don't you do that voluntarily? Surely an honourable person would like to do that. Why don't you take the high road for a change and get out of the gutter? It's not very becoming on you.

**Ms Pupatello:** Premier, let's remind you again. You are the man who took money away from pregnant mothers, expectant mothers in this province, as finance minister. You closed 31 hospitals in Ontario. Don't you dare lecture a member of the opposition when your behaviour and your record is there.

These are the public accounts and your budget telling us that you have spent three times the amount that David Peterson did in the Premier's office and double that of the Premier's office of Bob Rae. I ask you again, and you will account for your behaviour. You tell us today, how is it that you have all the money you need for your friends and all the money you need for your pampering, but you don't have money for people in this province who need help?

**Hon Mr Eves:** Unlike the members on that side of the House, our expenses are there for all to see. The honourable members of the opposition, the official opposition, I think would want to do the honourable thing and put all their expenses and all their staff's expenses out there for everyone to see. I know that the honourable member for Windsor West would like to do the honourable thing and stand up in the House and acknowledge the error of judgment which the Integrity Commissioner says she made. You'd probably like to apologize.

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My colleague from Windsor West did in fact acknowledge that earlier today and should be applauded for that, not condemned by you.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** It's not a point of order. New question.

#### GUN REGISTRY

**Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** My question today is for the Minister of Public Safety and Security. Minister, we have been reading an awful lot in the press this week regarding the federal Liberals' boondoggle of the gun registry; specifically, concerns regarding the skyrocketing budget of a registry that was only supposed to cost taxpayers a couple of million dollars, but in reality is now topping the charts at \$1 billion and still counting. Minister, could you please bring the members of this House up to date on the province's involvement in the federal gun registry?

**Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Public Safety and Security):** Two million dollars versus \$1 billion: that's called Rockonomics. As members of this House will recall, our government vigorously opposed this ill-thought-out, totally ineffective and tragically wasteful expenditure of tax dollars. Ministers Villeneuve, Hodgson and I appeared before the Senate committee studying Bill C-68 in September 1995 and warned of the

dangers of proceeding with this ideologically driven excuse for a public safety initiative, and offered alternatives that would have had a real impact on getting guns out of the hands of criminals. Unfortunately for all of us as taxpayers, Rockonomics won out.

**Mr Miller:** Thank you, Minister, for reminding this House and citizens of this province that our government recognized the wasteful nature of the Liberal gun registry, its lack of impact on gun violence and crime, and the devastating impact it could have on turning honest, hard-working, law-abiding Canadians into criminals in the eyes of the federal government. Minister, could you also remind us of the position taken by the Liberal Party of Ontario with respect to this costly and ineffective gun registry?

**Hon Mr Runciman:** I'll be glad to remind members of the House of the position taken by the Liberal Party of Ontario. In short, they were mirror images of the holier-than-thou, "We know what's best for you country bumpkins" approach of their hero, Allan Rock. Here's a Hansard quote from Dalton McGuinty: "I want to make it perfectly clear.... I'll be working with the... federal government to implement universal gun registration." Here's another from Dwight Duncan, the Liberal House leader: "I support the federal government's gun registry."

It's clear the McGuinty Liberals supported this boondoggle, this attack on honest Ontario citizens, and the time is long overdue for someone over there to stand up and apologize to the taxpayers of this province.

#### NATURAL GAS RATES

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** A question to the Premier: in August of this year, Union Gas sent out notification to its customers in Thunder Bay, Windsor, London, Peterborough and Burlington that they were applying for a retroactive price increase for gas purchased some two years ago. Subsequent to that, the Ontario Energy Board approved the retroactive increase. We on this side of the House have asked you on three occasions now what, if anything, your government intends to do. I'll remind you that under the existing Ontario Energy Board Act, you have the authority.

You are in possession of two appeals to cabinet with respect to this issue asking cabinet to overturn the decision of the Ontario Energy Board. Given the fact that these retroactive billing increases will be arriving at people's homes and at the doors of institutions such as hospitals and schools in the month of January, will you confirm for the House today that in fact your cabinet will not allow that retroactive increase to proceed?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** No, I can't confirm that. He knows we can't talk about what goes on in cabinet meetings or what's coming up in cabinet.

**Mr Duncan:** Premier, then will you give your undertaking, as we've asked on several occasions? You yourself in this House said you didn't feel that retroactive

price increase was appropriate. When can we expect an announcement from cabinet, given the fact that the retroactive billing notices will be arriving in people's homes right across this province, likely within the next three to four weeks? When will cabinet make public its decision with respect to what this side of the House says is an unfair retroactive increase that your cabinet, under sections 27 and 34 of the act, has the power to overturn? When will you announce your decision?

**Hon Mr Eves:** I think the Minister of Energy can respond very directly.

1550

**Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs):** To correct the member opposite, there is nothing contained in the Ontario Energy Board Act which allows us to overturn an act. The member opposite knows that. He can consult the act and should do so.

I am tremendously concerned, as the Minister of Energy, as I know everyone on this side of the House is, with respect to retroactive charges. We could simply deal with this one issue or we could take a look at the whole problem. When it was immediately brought to the Premier's attention, he said that one decision wasn't enough; he wanted a review of the entire energy board act. We committed to get back to cabinet within 100 days of review of the Ontario Energy Board Act and how it can better respond to the needs of consumers in the province of Ontario. That type of decisive action will happen within 100 days, just as the Premier committed it would happen.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North):** My question today is for the Honourable Tony Clement, the Minister of Health. In 1995, this government made a commitment to improve access to publicly funded and universally available health care. We have lived up to our word and delivered on that.

Over the past seven years, Ontario has become the envy of every other province in the delivery of health care, despite the fact that the federal Liberals drastically cut their contributions to our health care system.

Since 1995, this government has increased the number of new MRIs in the province by over 300%, and more are on the way. This government has increased health spending by 45% or over \$7 billion in that time frame. Forty-seven cents of every program dollar, almost 50%, is now spent on health care in our province.

In my riding of Simcoe North, access to quality health care has always been a priority. Could the minister kindly inform the Legislature and my constituents of recent health care announcements that affect them and their families?

**Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** It's always a pleasure to address my hard-working colleague from Simcoe North and inform his

constituents, as well as this House, on health care investments that the Ernie Eves government has made in Simcoe county in particular. This fall, as part of a \$32.5-million announcement to improve ambulance response times, for instance, the Eves government earmarked almost \$1.8 million to Simcoe county.

We also wanted to improve access to primary care. The Eves government has done so by ensuring that Simcoe county receives funding for an extra seven nurse practitioners. This, without a shadow of a doubt, will enhance that community's access to very-much-needed primary care.

With increased funding for ambulance services and primary care funding, the Eves government is listening to Ontarians, including the good people of Simcoe county, in their call for the best universally accessible health care this country has to offer.

**Mr Dunlop:** I'm sure my constituents would be happy to know that we have been making wise health care investments for the people of Simcoe North. To many people, hospitals are seen as the front line in health, and this government is investing record amounts into hospital funding and construction. In fact, we will be spending over \$9.5 billion on hospitals this year, over 30% more than was spent in 1995.

In Simcoe North, my constituents and I are very lucky and proud to be home to the Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. As the minister knows, it is an award-winning facility with a world-class staff. While located in Orillia, it is the leader in health care for all of Simcoe county.

I was wondering if the Minister of Health could also inform my constituents and all the members of the Legislature about recent investments in Soldiers' Memorial Hospital and other hospitals across our great province of Ontario.

**Hon Mr Clement:** I want to thank the honourable member for the question. Indeed, we know that hospitals are a vital part of our health care system and Ontarians rely on them in their time of need. That's why they are part of what we call our priority in health care and we are investing, indeed, record amounts.

I know how much pride my colleague has in Soldiers' Memorial in Orillia. It is a great hospital and that's why this government has increased its base funding by 13% this year alone. Next spring, in order to serve that community even better, Soldiers' Memorial will undergo a major redevelopment, and we are looking forward to working with its redevelopment committee and the citizens of Simcoe county to see this project to its fruition and conclusion.

We are also working in other areas. I might want to remind this House that I announced an extra \$6 million to Windsor Regional Hospital this week. As a result of that funding, an extra 40 beds will be added to serve that community.

**Ms Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** They've got a \$10-million debt.

**Hon Mr Clement:** I know the member for Windsor West will want to join with this side of the House to

applaud this great initiative in the city of Windsor for better health care in Windsor as well.

#### FAR NORTH FIRE MANAGEMENT

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, for over six years the First Nations of the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation met with your government officials from the Ministry of Natural Resources and federal government officials from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada to develop and expand a far north fire management program. They worked very hard to protect the people of their communities from the dangers of forest fires. They worked in good faith with your government, only to be told in April of this year that your government essentially was no longer interested in the far north fire management program.

Premier, I can't describe for you the disappointment of people who, time and time again, are evacuated from their communities because there has been a refusal to provide fire protection. Will your government go back to the table with Nishnawbe-Aski Nation and the federal government and complete the development of the far north fire management program?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I believe the Minister of Natural Resources has responsibility for this matter.

**Hon Jerry J. Ouellette (Minister of Natural Resources):** Yes, we're very well aware of the concerns brought forward. The member should know that while in Halifax with the ministers from all across the various provinces and territories, we discussed this issue. I put forward a resolution at that time to move forward with the federal five-point plan that will take that into account. We are trying to work toward that. We are currently trying to set a meeting with the federal government to determine how we can move forward on a national basis that will take that into consideration.

**Mr Hampton:** In other words, it's the old game of ping-pong. Look, they are citizens of Ontario, and your government right now is putting forward the plans for mining development on their land, forestry development on their land, and yet you won't even provide them with decent fire protection. This is not a federal program. Yes, the federal government was prepared to make a contribution, but the Minister of Natural Resources wrote to the NAN chiefs in April of this year and said categorically that your government was not prepared to proceed. Now you're telling the First Nations that this is a federal program. Minister, if you want to promote forestry development on NAN land, if you want to promote mining development on NAN land, if you want the resources and the wealth that comes from those resources, don't you think you should be providing decent fire protection through the far north fire management program? If you can do one, why can't you do the other?

**Hon Mr Ouellette:** Quite the contrary, when a member of his party asked for myself to meet with individuals

from that community, we very strictly laid out a plan and asked for their assistance to work with them to move forward on this. We are trying to get the federal government—we came forward with all the jurisdictions, all the provinces across Canada, to deal with this issue, and we are moving forward on that specific issue.

#### ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

**Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, recipients of ODSP in Ontario have challenges that you and I don't truly understand. Just finding accommodation and food on their allowance, which is significantly below the cost of living in Ontario, is a disaster for them. On top of that, transportation costs are almost impossible. So to them the location of ODSP offices is vital.

I noted with interest that on September 3, 1999, the member from Niagara Falls had a meeting at the Chatter Peppermintstick Restaurant in Niagara Falls and billed \$33.55. What is interesting is that the purpose of the meeting was the closing of the ODSP office. Premier, is this how you do business? Do your members meet—because subsequent to that meeting, the ODSP offices in Welland, Port Colborne and in Niagara were closed, and the people on ODSP are forced to go to St Catharines. While your members eat cake, are people on ODSP forced to hitchhike to another? Will you assure me that you will do public business in the public and give ODSP recipients some dignity and input into the thing that affects their life so—

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

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I'm sure the Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services has a response.

**Hon Brenda Elliott (Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services):** I thank my colleague across the way for this question on the ODSP, the Ontario disability support plan. I think what he's referring to is his displeasure at the service that we're delivering to ODSP clients in field offices. What I can say to him is that this government, as part of our overall strategy to improve services and benefits to people who are disabled in the province of Ontario, has undertaken a number of changes in how we deliver not only Ontario Works but the Ontario disability support plan. I can't speak to those specific field offices; I will look into that, as he has duly noted. What I can say to you is that we have a number of ways of communicating from one office to another—through a telephone system which, in our opinion, actually makes the service more accessible, not less accessible.

**The Speaker:** Pursuant to standing order 30(b), the time for routine proceedings has expired.

1600

## HOLIDAY MESSAGE

**Hon David Turnbull (Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Before the important business that the House leader is about to bring before us, I just thought I would like to wish everybody a very merry Christmas, a wonderful season, happy holidays and, above all, peace.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## SUPPLY ACT, 2002

## LOI DE CRÉDITS DE 2002

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

Bill 229, An Act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for the public service for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 2003 / Projet de loi 229, Loi autorisant le paiement de certaines sommes destinées à la fonction publique pour l'exercice se terminant le 31 mars 2003.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Mr Stockwell has moved second reading. Minister?

*Interruption.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I'm afraid we're going to have to ask the gentleman to leave. Could the guards please assist and ask the gentleman to please leave.

Government House leader.

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of the Environment, Government House Leader):** I assume the time is being split three ways. I will offer the time up to the opposition parties to begin because I have no comments respecting the supply motion.

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** On a point of order, Speaker: I ask for unanimous consent to pass Bill 236, which is a bill that amends the Environmental Protection Act by requiring the pre-treatment of hazardous waste before it's disposed in a landfill.

**The Speaker:** The member has asked for unanimous consent to proceed on Bill 236. Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

**Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London):** On a point of order, Speaker: I rise seeking unanimous consent for third reading of Bill 143, An Act to preserve the gravesites of former Premiers.

**The Speaker:** The member has asked for unanimous consent to proceed on Bill 143. Is there unanimous consent? No.

Just so everybody knows, the clock is going to proceed now. We can do points of order, but the clock is proceeding.

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** On a point of order, Speaker: I'd like to ask for unanimous consent to give third reading to a bill which has been approved by this House previously at second reading and been approved by committee in clause-by-clause con-

sideration, and that's a bill to amend the Audit Act so there can be clear accountability for all government expenditures.

**The Speaker:** The member has asked for third reading of the Audit Act. Is there unanimous consent? No, I'm afraid not.

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent with respect to a private bill, Pr22, which has passed at the committee stage and is currently before this House but has not been brought forward. I'm seeking unanimous consent for second and third reading of Bill Pr22.

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

Further debate?

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** Is this on the supply bill?

**The Speaker:** Yes.

**Mr Conway:** My colleague Mr Phillips is around the precinct someplace and will want to have some comments, I believe.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Conway:** I apparently have 8.3569 minutes. Well, it won't take me that long.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Conway:** Do you know what, Mr Speaker? I think—

**The Speaker:** Order. If members would please have patience. It's getting late in the day. Let's allow the member to speak.

**Interjection:** It's only 4 o'clock.

**The Speaker:** It seems like a lot longer when you're up until midnight.

I'd ask all members' co-operation. He has very little time.

The member for Renfrew, continue.

**Mr Conway:** I actually have been here a fair bit in the last few days. I'm telling you, the mood of the joint is such that a rational person would probably go and whistle Dixie in the dark because, boy, if you had been here last night or the night before, you would be pretty proud to go home and tell your constituents who pay the freight for this railroad that you have some collateral responsibility for the place.

I want to say a couple of things on supply this afternoon, one of them local and one of them provincial. Let me start with the provincial matter.

I spent the evening last night reading the Rozanski report. If members have not read it, I would recommend it to you. I thought the professor, the good doctor, the principal of Guelph University, has done a really good job, particularly in making the case for the importance of public education. It's very obvious that he listened carefully to what he was told by a lot of people.

About his emphasis around core programs, the importance of equity and how equity is not always equality: speaking as a member from rural eastern Ontario, I have to tell you that I liked what he had to say about things like small schools, the need to revisit the whole question

of how we calibrate the declining enrolment factor and the importance of transportation. He has obviously heard from rural and northern school bus operators about how serious that situation is. His recommendation there I thought was particularly telling.

I was thinking that in the last couple of weeks I've heard two people, one of them named Roy Romanow and the other one named Mordechai Rozanski, and both of them I believe are first- or second-generation immigrants in this country. I think Dr Rozanski makes the point, either in his presentation or in the press release, about what public education meant for him and his family. I heard Romanow a few weeks ago talking about how important public health care was to a lot of those farmers in western Canada.

I think those of us who hold elected office would do well to listen to people who have, I think by any objective standard, done very well. Rozanski has credentials that are sparkling in the academic world: a doctorate, I think in Chinese history, from the University of Pennsylvania, one of the great schools of America. Romanow: certainly one of the really outstanding public men of Canada in the latter half of the 20th century. They remind us about the important responsibilities that are state responsibilities.

Again, back to Rozanski, on what he had to say about more money: yes, but more accountability and more transparency. I could not agree with him more. I will say parenthetically that one of the critical problems facing Parliament and facing the Legislature is the stunning degree to which we fail in that responsibility ourselves. Just in the last 24 hours I've read a column by Jeff Simpson and a column by Jim Travers—one in the *Globe* yesterday, one in the *Star* today—about the abject failure of Parliament and the Legislature to behave in the way they're supposed to behave. It's not a partisan observation. We are a disaster when it comes to holding governments of whatever stripe to account for the billions of dollars being spent in Her Majesty's name.

**1610**

When I think over 28 years of how bad it has gotten in this place, just at the very basic level, for following through the announced programs and whether or not they have had any real success in achieving the goals for which they were funded, I can't wait to get out of here. This hydro situation is one of the most significant embarrassments that I have seen in a long time. I just cannot wait to close my public career here, because this hydro thing is just a disaster and it's as though we are proud to advertise our illiteracy. But that's the way it is, and that's the way I guess it has to be.

Rozanski, in his report, makes it very clear that if there's going to be additional money provided to the education system—and I will congratulate the minister; in just the last 18 hours, we've had \$250 million for special education, \$340 million today. What's that, about \$600 million? That's clearly a recognition that however good the formula might have been, as Rozanski made plain, the government has simply not funded to the actual levels of acceptable expenditure.

So a very good report. I hope the government moves forward on not just the money side of it but finding ways that are going to give taxpayers some comfort that the monies are actually achieving the goals for which they are targeted.

It seems to me it was a year or so ago we had from the Provincial Auditor some rather disturbing things about the whole special education account. I haven't checked lately, but it's just not good enough to say that we think this is a meritorious objective; we have to know that there is actually some oversight that is going to make everybody involved more disciplined and more focused in ensuring that those objectives are met.

In my last minute or two, I want to say something on behalf of a small community in my county. It is now about six months ago, on a very hot, stultifying, late-June afternoon, a young mother and a young child were swept away to their deaths on the lower Madawaska River by an extraordinary, unbelievable event at High Falls, just downriver from the Barrett Chute generating station near Calabogie.

It is several months since the police investigation was launched. I know something about the diligence and the efforts that are being expended by the Ontario Provincial Police in that connection. But it is six months. A very hot, dry summer has come and gone. The lower Madawaska at Calabogie is freezing over, and the snow deepens there every day.

My question on behalf of that now deceased mother and her deceased child: when are we going to know what happened on that day, June 23, 2002, at Barrett Chute? I have some suspicions. I have some very grave concerns, but they are no more than this at the present time, because I have not myself undertaken that investigation.

I say to the government—and I'm pleased to see the Attorney General here, and I have spoken to the previous and the now Minister of Energy—the people of Calabogie, and most especially the family of those deceased individuals, have a right, and we have an obligation, to ensure that the truth is going to be told as to what happened that hot, sunny Sunday afternoon in late June. I just hope and pray that the truth is not going to be buried under a mound of ice and snow, because we have a situation where we have two people dead. We were very, very lucky, tragic as those circumstances were, that many, many more people were not killed. Because what happened there on that day was a remarkable and extraordinary development for which and about which we do not yet have answers.

As I take my seat now, I just want to say to the government, for the family members, for the others who were injured and for the people living along that lower Madawaska corridor, please move with some expedition to complete that report and give my constituents some comfort as to what happened and even greater comfort that that kind of tragedy is not going to recur.

With those remarks, I will take my seat.

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** Rumour has it that this is the last day the House is sitting for the year

2002. I know there are a couple of members from Niagara region who would have no qualms about the House sitting through next week and even more than a small part of the week following. But I'm afraid that if Mr Bradley and I are here by ourselves, it would be less than effective not having government members, especially cabinet ministers, here to pose questions in question period, among other things.

There have been a few disappointments, of course, over this last session. Last weekend I was down in my riding going to events where people are, where folks are. I went to the volunteer fire company number 2 annual banquet over at the Polish Hall on Ontario Road and spent good time with those good women and men. I had to leave a little earlier than I would otherwise have, because there was a fundraiser going on at the CAW hall—it used to be the united electrical workers'—on Steel Street. The fundraiser was for Cameron Walsh.

I've talked to you about Cameron Walsh before, and other kids like him. Cameron Walsh is a kid with autism. His folks—you've met them; they were here in this Legislature—have been on a waiting list for Cameron to get the autism treatment this government trumpeted, heralded, when it announced funding for that treatment. But the Walsh family ended up on a waiting list, and they waited and waited and waited. Then they realized the futility of that particular game, because once Cameron reached six he was no longer eligible for the treatment anyway, so it was all pretty feckless in the total scheme of things.

So the Walsh family, like so many other families in Niagara region and across this province, realized, as the loving, caring responsible parents they are, that they couldn't count on this government. They couldn't count on this government at all. They, like hundreds of other families, have been on waiting lists trying to get their kids treatment for autism—and the treatment works. The treatment does wonders. So they embarked on privately retained treatment.

You see, one of the interesting arguments by the government is, "Oh, there aren't enough providers for the treatment to expand access to kids who need the treatment"—horse feathers, to put it politely. There is private sector availability of treatment programs; it's simply that the government won't provide the funding, won't provide the resources necessary for every kid with autism to access treatment.

The problem is the treatment costs anywhere from \$25,000 to \$35,000 a year of after-tax dollars. Cameron's dad is a hard-working man and a caring father. Cameron's got a sibling. You learned when the Walshes were here that Cameron's folks had a starter home as their first home, and now, with two young kids, have bought what they thought was going to be the home they were going to raise the kids in, a little bigger than the one they had before, but modest in the total scheme of things. Make no mistake about it. I know the neighbourhood. I know the home.

**1620**

Because they have been forced to pay privately for treatment for autism, for their kid Cameron, they're

looking at a financial load of more likely \$35,000 than \$25,000, because if you are going to have adequate treatment, you need the more hours rather than the fewer hours.

They have indicated that Cameron has already shown remarkable progress in response to the treatment: a totally different kid than what he was before the treatment started. The problem is they've maxed out their credit cards. They've exhausted every single line of credit. They've borrowed from family, friends and neighbours. There's no more. They don't have a whole lot of equity in the house because they only just bought it, not too long ago. You know what it's like. But they're prepared and they fear they will have to sell that house to garner whatever little equity is in it to finance the payments for Cameron and the autism treatment they were forced to pay for.

Friends of the Walshes held a little fundraiser at the CAW hall, and there were raffles and there were half-and-half draws. Then there was—I probably shouldn't tell because the Alcohol and Gaming Commission would probably be interested—something that I recall as being similar to one of those wheels of chance you see at fundraisers like that. I went in there and I bought raffle tickets and half-and-half tickets. I threw a little bit of money into the kitty, just as other people were doing too.

I haven't had a chance to get back to the Walshes to find out how much money they made, but I've been at these kinds of things before and they'll have made \$1,000, \$1,500, maybe \$2,000 before the night's over. You see, the Walshes are hard-working, working-class people and their friends are hard-working, working-class people. Their friends are the salt of the earth. That's why they came out to an event like this. I'm sure they ended up spending more money in the course of participating in this fundraiser than they could really afford, but they did it because they knew the proceeds were going to help a kid, their friend's child. In the total scheme of things, as I say, I know what kind of money these events raise: \$1,500 or \$2,000, or on a good day maybe \$2,500.

It's not the solution. How many times can you call upon these people to attend fundraisers? At the same time, having said that, you know darn well that organizing one these fundraisers requires an incredible number of people spending an incredible amount of volunteer time: not just the family; the parents can't do it alone. You have to rely upon all sorts of other people. The fact is that you just aren't going to have a fundraiser a week. It isn't going to happen.

When the Walshes were up here, one of the things they thought might be productive, and I was prepared to concede we could give it a try, was to meet with the minister, Ms Elliott. I accompanied the Walshes to meet with the minister, Ms Elliott. I don't think she was particularly happy to have me join them—probably half a dozen good reasons why and twice as many bad reasons. But she sat there and she made notes. They appeared to be notes she was making. I wouldn't accuse her of doodling on the notepad in front of her. She was as tight-

lipped as cabinet ministers are inclined to be and wished the Walshes well.

The Walshes actually thought that maybe with the minister intervening, because the Minister of Community and Social Services, as historically the ministry has been known, seemed, oh-so-interested in the waiting list and was giving orders to the staff and minions who were with her, saying, "Check this out. Check out the waiting list. Maybe we'll work that out there."

It wasn't more than a couple of weeks later that the Walshes got a phone call, this time not from the minister but from, again, a minion, a young person who sure means well and probably works harder than they should for the small amount of pay they're paid as political staff in those ministries. But of course, the message from the minister was, "Too bad, so sad, guys. You guys are on your own. This minister is taking a pass on you," and Cameron and several hundred other kids like Cameron who have been on waiting lists so long that they've reached the age of six and then are no longer eligible, which of course helps the government say, "Well, the waiting lists aren't as long as they could be." You see, kids are knocked off the waiting list once they turn six, as if somehow there's no more interest in them, and quite frankly, there isn't any more interest in them from this government.

The Walshes didn't have a whole lot of hope, because they're not stupid people by any stretch of the imagination. They could read between the lines. They saw the rather condescending attitude of the minister being displayed to them while they were graced with an audience with the minister. But at the end of the day, zip, nada, zero, not a penny, not a nickel, not a dime to help the Walshes in this struggle, the struggle of a lifetime for them, the struggle of their kid's lifetime.

You see, the sad thing is that autism is a disorder that is treated with a medical model. Autism as a condition or a disorder—I don't want to be impolite or less than precise in terms of describing it—is one that can be treated, one for which there are recognized treatment regimens, and it shouldn't be the Minister of Community and Social Services at all who doles out the bucks in an oh-so-political way.

The announcement from the ministry about the funding for autism treatment was, as I say, fanfare and backdrops and spotlights and arc lights and press releases and staffers running around and people taking photographs on 35-millimetre Nikon cameras. It was. I could have sworn there was a drum and bugle corps playing in the background Hail to the Chief as the minister walked up to the podium. It was one of those classic—with the backdrop and here it is, Conservative Ontario.

We know far too much about the Mike Harris-Ernie Eves Ontario. It's a cruel, harsh, painful Ontario, and it became crueller and harsher and more painful for the Walshes when they tried to access the minister, and notwithstanding all the formal niceties and the yes ma'ams and no ma'ams and please sirs and no thank yous, they got the door slammed in their faces.

I know the Walshes and I know their boy Cameron and I know a whole lot of the other families down in Niagara and families from beyond Niagara who are taking care of their children with autism. The province of British Columbia has recently litigated the matter of autism treatment, and it has been determined in British Columbia by the courts that autism is a condition that is to be treated under the regime of health care.

So this government is way out of whack. What this government is doing is so obvious, it's so patent, it's so transparent, it's so clear. Think about this. Think about the cruelty and harshness of this. Cameron is subsidizing this government's tax breaks. Cameron Walsh is subsidizing this government's multi-million-dollar contracts with the likes of Andersen Consulting. Cameron Walsh, a kid with autism, is subsidizing ministerial expense accounts. And Cameron Walsh isn't doing it alone. Hundreds of other kids with autism are sharing that burden with him, and that's a crime.

I'll put this to you right now. If it's a matter of revenues, I as a taxpayer at my age and in my income level, yes, am prepared to pay the few bucks more a year in income taxes to ensure that Cameron and other kids like him get treatment for their autism—then roll back some of that Harris tax cut now.

**1630**

I'm not calling upon seniors to pay more taxes, or low-income or even middle-class people. Lord knows, they've paid more than their fair share. The fact is, when it came to the Harris tax cuts, they received far less than their share. The Harris tax cuts weren't for our folks, retirees, or for the lowest-income people, never mind single moms or students, minimum wage workers or, for that matter, most middle-class working families. The tax cut didn't amount to a whole lot. It was more than offset by the increase in user fees and the downloading on to municipalities and the increase in tuitions and just about everything across the board.

But those high-income people, the ones whose tax cut amounted to not just a couple of hundred bucks a year, but thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars a year, the ones who least needed the tax cut, who got the biggest tax cut, I say to them—let's face it, we know what the income is around here; members of the provincial Parliament are not exactly low-income workers—that if people my age and in my income bracket and, quite frankly, those who make a heck of a lot more than I do, have to pay a couple of bucks more a week in income tax so that kids like Cameron can get treatment for their autism, we'd better be prepared to pay it. I don't want to live in the kind of province that the Conservatives here at Queen's Park have designed and created. It's not the kind of province that my folks or my grandparents contemplated living in either, not by any stretch of the imagination.

It is imperative that we keep struggling, that we maintain the fight, along with all those families with children who have autism, along with those children themselves and their friends and their co-workers and their neigh-



bours, that we keep struggling to ensure that there's full financing, full funding, for treatment of autism and that autism is shifted from the Minister of Community and Social Services, who has no interest in the matter, no desire to act on it, and becomes a OHIP treatment regime, where it properly belongs and where the courts, for instance, as in British Columbia, have indicated it does.

It's interesting. It was on Saturday night I was over at the CAW hall at the Cameron Walsh fundraiser. On Friday afternoon, like most people, like every other member of the assembly, I had constituency office appointments. We had a doctor come in called Dr Hsu. Dr Hsu is a pediatrician down in the city of Welland. I don't know what it's like here in the big city, here in Toronto, but down in Niagara Centre, people know their doctors—women and men who work incredibly hard: the family practitioners, the general practitioners, the physician and surgeon types, and let's throw in a few specialists to boot. They work extremely hard. They're working 60-, 70-, 80-, 90-hour weeks and they're out there in the community doing other things. They're raising their own families and their kids are going to school with other people's kids, with workers from factories and with people in white-collar professions and with small business people's kids.

Well, Dr Hsu was victimized by this government to the point where Dr Hsu, who in different times may well have been contemplating retirement right now, has actually had to reflect on whether or not he should leave this province and practise medicine elsewhere.

Let me tell you what this government did to Dr Hsu. There is an organization called the Medical Review Committee of OHIP. The Medical Review Committee is a little common-turn type of organization that is probably more befitting of Stalinist Russia than it is of Canada or Ontario. And Dr Hsu hasn't been the only victim. I know other doctors who have been fearful about speaking up. They were worried about being red-flagged by the Medical Review Committee so they could be whacked one more time or they were just so darn busy that they literally couldn't find the modest amount of time to write the letters and raise the issue the way Dr Hsu has.

The Medical Review Committee actually came and scooped \$108,000 from Dr Hsu, ordered him to pay it back—legitimate billings to OHIP; no suggestion that Dr Hsu hadn't performed the services that the billings paid him for. Dr Hsu had to sell his RRSPs. He's not a wealthy man—a hard-working man, professional, skilled, trained, well-loved in the community. Dr Hsu had to sell his RRSPs. You see, \$108,000 was probably around 98.5% of his personal income that year, because of course he still has to pay staff, he still has to pay rent for his office, he still has to pay for equipment and materials, he still has to pay for periodicals and journals, he still has to pay, like every other doctor does, for the upgrading seminars and programs and licences and insurance and the whole nine yards.

Dr Hsu is an incredibly popular, successful and effective doctor, as a pediatrician. He got bushwhacked; he

got blindsided. He fell victim to this government's OHIP/MRC highway robbery. They cleaned him out, with no suggestion that he hadn't performed the services for which they demanded the money back. He would have been in a far better position had he been charged with fraud. At least he could have defended himself. He would have been found not guilty, and OHIP and the Medical Review Committee wouldn't have been able to touch a penny. But there's no suggestion that he committed fraud.

You see, the MRC has got this Byzantine, archaic, unsophisticated and, again, almost Kafkaesque reporting requirement. Of course, they attack high-volume doctors. High-volume doctors are the ones who are busy, who are working 78 or 80 hours a week like Dr Hsu, who are seeing twice and triple the patient load they should be seeing because they're making up for the doctor shortage that this government has done precious little—quite frankly, it's done nothing—to resolve in this province.

Dr Hsu and other doctors like him—let's understand what these doctors are doing; I don't care if it's Dr Hsu, Dr Bonsu, Dr Rau or Dr Abraham. They do a tremendous amount of work, which is why they're so loved and so popular and so highly regarded, that they don't bill for. When I go to the doctor, which is once maybe every five years, it's a five-minute proposition; I want out of there as quickly as possible. When I get older, I suspect I may be spending more time with my doctor. But there are other patients who need—when you're a pediatrician, working with parents as well as the child, there are patients with whom Dr Hsu will end up spending 30 minutes doing any number of things: reassuring a mother that the baby is OK, or reassuring a mother that her manner or demeanour or style of dealing with that baby, especially a newborn, is appropriate and desirable. He can't bill them; he wouldn't think of billing.

You know that for the last week and change I've been reading petitions during petition time in this Legislative Assembly, and the petitions are as follows:

“The OHIP schedule of benefits is often unclear about its definitions of good medical practice for many serious medical conditions: general checkups, rechecks, psychotherapy counselling and often major illness care by specialists;

“The Medical Review Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons has been aggressively clawing back payments to hard-working, conscientious doctors on the basis of these flawed definitions and skewed statistical analyses.

“We, the undersigned, request the Minister of Health to suspend further reviews by the Medical Review Committee; return the monies with its penalties, pending a negotiated agreement of an unambiguous schedule of benefits with representatives of affected practising physicians.”

I not only received a whack of these petitions signed by patients not from only Niagara, never mind just Welland, but now from across Toronto and other parts of Ontario. They're spitting out of my fax machine in my

office. They're just churning out. This is a serious problem. OHIP should be working with those doctors, the way they and others are suggesting in this petition, to help make it easier to practise medicine, not more difficult. What's going on here?

1640

I go to my dentist, Dr Thomas Pekar, down in St Catharines. He's a brilliant guy. He uses lasers for drilling cavities. They don't drill them; they use a laser thing. It's very expensive. He's a brilliant dentist. I don't begrudge this of Dr Pekar or other dentists, but somehow, when Dr Pekar is finished his work on me, his staff person just types out codes. They plug into the Great-West Life or whatever insurance company we have here, and it's over with.

What's going on here? Why isn't OHIP sitting down with doctors like Dr Hsu and negotiating, as the doctors are proposing, a way of doing—we understand that OHIP wants a meaningful reporting method. OHIP has any number of reasons, most of them good. They want to keep a handle on what's happening in medicine, what's happening in doctors' offices. I understand that. I presume the data is used to develop some statistical databases. I hope it is, because if it isn't, it makes it even more frustrating. But for Pete's sake, sit down with these doctors. They're ready to sit down and say what the problems are with the MRC and the standards that have been set with regard to reporting by doctors.

I want to tell you this: I know there are doctors out there making huge bucks—I presume they are—the Yorkville Avenue plastic surgeon types, the ones who advertise, but most doctors are working darn hard. You don't expect them to make peanuts, but they're working darn hard for salaries far less than the mythology would have you believe. If you ever took a look at the schedule of payments for services, you'd swallow your bubblegum if you saw how little doctors are paid for a significant number of the procedures they perform. All I know is, a long time ago I used to practise law and you might as well do a pro bono than charge what I know doctors are being paid for what I consider some pretty complex procedures, even some of the minor surgeries—never mind minor ones; some of the major ones. It's remarkable how little they are paid. Again, that's not to say that doctors aren't among the better income earners, but understand that doctors are now doing double and triple duty because of the doctor and physician shortage.

How does this help attract new doctors to Ontario when this government, with its OHIP program, maintains the MRC, as these horror stories begin to be spread throughout the province and beyond? I know if I were a non-Ontario doctor investigating Ontario as a place to practise medicine and I found out what happened to Dr Hsu, I'd say, "No way, pal. I'm out of here." So maybe Mr Clement had better start paying some close attention. This isn't a little item.

Dr Bob Frankford, a former colleague of ours—you know him well, Speaker—is a good person. He's a progressive, enlightened doctor who has a strong base in

community-based medicine, a strong background and a good mind. He was a valuable member of this assembly. He came to me with petitions as well. This is not an isolated incident and it is going to snowball. I predict, however regrettably, that if this government doesn't get its act in gear, we're going to lose doctors over this MRC conduct alone.

When Dr Hsu shuts up his office, shuts down his practice and heads somewhere else, this government sent him packing because of its failure to act around this crisis, around the jackboot style of the MRC and its claw-back of monies paid to doctors. It is an outrageous and very urgent situation. I have written to the minister. I've been tabling petitions. I will work with these doctors in any way I can to highlight their concern and their plight. We'd better respond and this government had better get moving.

Another constituent of mine had an audience with the Minister of Community and Social Services, Ms Elliott. Across this province there's a whole community of invisible parents. These are grandparents who are doing parenting. You know what I mean: grandparents who, when their own children for any number of reasons can no longer parent the grandchildren, jump in as close members of those children's families and assume the role of parenting. There are far more of them than you expect or realize.

Michael, when you're back this way, would you bring me a glass of water, please? Not that one; somebody already drank out of that one. I don't know who drank out of it. It makes me nervous.

All over this province there are grandparents raising grandchildren as their children. I appreciate that's happened historically. I'm glad it hasn't stopped happening, but those grandparents now are understanding that they've been left out of the loop. They've been invisible-ized by the failure of this Legislature and other Legislatures to acknowledge them and recognize them in that special, unique status they have.

Some of these grandparents—Sheila Volchert's one of them. Sheila and her husband are living in Pelham. They have their own grandchildren living with them. They treat them as their own. They're raising them. These people are retirees, and they're of fair but not extraordinary means. If those children were in foster care, the foster parents caring for those children would be entitled to an X number of dollars' allowance a month. The Volcherts have jumped in and assumed the role of more than mere fostering, yet receive none of the financial support they could dearly use.

Sheila Volchert and her husband know they're not the hardest done by. I've met with other grandparents raising their grandchildren as their own who are in incredibly dire straits, like the one brave woman from St Catharines who is legally blind and living on disability benefits who, notwithstanding and nonetheless, continues to raise her own grandchildren as her own. She won't surrender them up to an institutional authority because she knows those kids are better off with her—Grandma, family—and that the bond has already been set.

You'll recall that I've been reading petitions in this Legislature during petition period on behalf of those grandparents who are parenting their grandchildren. The petition makes specific reference to the report prepared by social services in the regional municipality of Niagara. I give them great credit: Susan Reid and her staff. The report recommends a number of legislative changes, both provincially and otherwise, that could be effected to make it easier for these grandparents to raise their grandchildren as their children.

Sheila Volchert had a meeting with the minister on December 2. The minister—this is Ms Elliott—made it quite clear she didn't want Ms Volchert's MPP at that meeting with her. I understand. The problem is, Ms Volchert ain't no pushover. She's a bright, capable, intelligent woman. She was pleased with the chance to sit down with the minister and present the case of grandparents raising grandkids as their own. As a matter of fact, I know the member from Ottawa would be more than a little familiar with this phenomenon. I'm sure he has had direct involvement in the quest by grandparents, even the quest, for instance, of getting custody, never mind adopting. Some of these grandparents spend thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars on lawyers and court costs to even go through the custody process. Maybe they have a child who's the parent of the grandchildren who's got a serious drug problem or an alcohol problem or problems around mental health. The hoops these grandparents have to jump through to do the right thing are profound. This Legislature could begin to make life so much better for them, for their grandchildren, who are in effect their kids, and for the communities they live in and for this province.

1650

Shouldn't we be building the kind of place that accommodates and supports grandparents doing these kinds of things instead of maintaining a climate and a culture that is more hostile than supportive?

I suppose what I'm talking about is that this environment is hostile to Cameron Walsh and other kids with autism. This environment is increasingly hostile to doctors like Dr Hsu. This environment is hostile—this province, this government—to Sheila Volchert and other grandparents like her.

This Legislature should be working to make Cameron Walsh's life better, to make the lives of Sheila Volchert and other grandparents raising grandchildren better, and to make doctors' lives better because it makes their patients' lives better and it will make for a better province.

**Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton):** It's a particular privilege for me to rise in the House today, speaking on the same issue, the supply bill, that the member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, Sean Conway, spoke on earlier. I'm not sure, but it might be his last speech in this House. He has announced his retirement. It's a great honour for me to share the floor with someone who has had such an illustrious record in this House and been known as such a great orator.

It was, I think, in November 1958 that I sat in the Speaker's gallery and listened to the last speech my grandfather gave. At that time, he was completing 40 years of serving in this House. He sat in the front desks at that time. It is a memory that is as fresh in my memory today as it was at the time it happened. So it is with some honour that I share the comments on this bill with the member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke.

The Supply Act is an important bill that we debate in this House. It relates very much to the public confidence the people of Ontario have in their government.

This past Monday, the Legislature passed a bill, Bill 198, the Keeping the Promise for a Strong Economy Act, 2002. We will be implementing measures through that bill that will provide great protection to investors and consumers. It's that protection to investors and consumers that creates the confidence people have to invest in this province. We will be setting and enforcing those high standards to protect Ontario families and the integrity of our capital markets.

While Ontario has very sound fundamentals in place, there is a great deal of apprehension out there in our capital markets brought about by the events of September 11 last year. It's to be noted, I think, that the TSX has not had the experiences with Enron and the financial manipulations that we have seen in the United States. It's a credit to the Ontario Securities Commission and to the way in which we conduct our capital markets to ensure that people in Ontario have faith and confidence when they're investing their savings, when they're investing their money in other capital markets.

In order to have that strong economy that can produce growth and prosperity, we need those strong capital markets. Those capital markets need investors who have sound information, and timely information, so they can make the kinds of investment decisions that we need in this province to go forward. Investors put their trust in markets where there's an ethical corporate governance that is the rule, not the exception.

When you look south of the border you see things taking place. Martha Stewart of course is in the news a lot today. She has been reported to have had some insider trading that took place in the US; I think that insider trading is reported to have garnered her some \$400,000 in profit. If that actually did take place, then so be it; she will be found guilty and should be punished. But for a public figure, which she is—\$400,000, in the realm of insider trading, I'd suggest is not a lot of money. However, the people who have been perhaps taking advantage of these rules in the United States are not being chased, are not being prosecuted to the same degree that Martha Stewart is. She's being prosecuted simply because she's a public figure, and I think that's wrong. That is not taking place, I don't believe, in Ontario or Canada. I think our insider trading information, the times in which—

**Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):** Michael Cowpland.

**Mr Chudleigh:** Mr Cowpland, I think, as the member points out, has paid the price for his insider trading. He is

no longer in the position he enjoyed. He has paid his fines. The system we have in this country corrected that abuse of power.

The measures that address these issues have been enacted in Bill 198, which we passed earlier this week.

The Supply Act is one of the most important bills passed in the Legislature. Much like the Keeping the Promise for a Strong Economy Act, the Supply Act has far-reaching implications for the people of Ontario. The Supply Act would allow the Ontario government to continue running the daily business of the government, the business of programs and services that benefit the people of Ontario. It would allow the nursing homes, hospitals, doctors, municipalities and general welfare recipients to receive their cheques and to receive their payments, children's aid societies and the suppliers' accounts to function knowing that their staff are going to be paid.

Earlier today I was in my riding of Halton, in the town of Milton, where we had the pleasure of opening Halton Women's Place, a new shelter for women who are undergoing situations in their private lives when they simply have to get out of the house. This is a place for them to go, a place for them to be protected, a place for them to renew their lives. The facility we're opening there is a beautiful one, one in which this government and the taxpayers of Ontario have invested \$1.5 million.

It's a very unique situation. Last February 20 I was there when we announced that this project would take place and those funds would be available. They had a very carefully drafted budget, and in that carefully drafted budget the amount of money they had for construction was X amount of money. When they went out to tender, they couldn't get anyone to construct this facility for the amount of money they had in their budget, and it looked like it was in jeopardy. They had to go back out in another fundraising episode. But then along came a local contractor, Mattamy Homes, a very large house-building operation building a lot of homes in the Milton area. They came to Halton Women's Place and offered to build this facility for the budgeted amount, and in doing so, any difference they had they took back as a tax receipt. A public-private partnership completed the project on budget, ahead of time, which was a marvellous thing for a large corporation to do, a construction company that truly has a heart, and their heart was exhibited broadly in Milton today.

We all know that the services provided by the members of the broader public sector are often provided under many very difficult circumstances. As responsible legislators, we must, in my view, enact this Supply Act for these very important programs. We want to ensure a high quality of life for our people now and also in the future. Our quality of life that we have gained here in Ontario is important. We are sitting at the pinnacle of the North American way of life, and I would suggest to you that that pinnacle is perhaps as high here as anywhere else in the world. It will be interesting to see whether the opposition and the third party find it within themselves to

support this bill to ensure that all of these services can go forward in the future.

**1700**

Just as the government is fiscally accountable, we are also responsible for sound economic fundamentals, in which the people of Ontario are the first consideration. In November, it was announced by this government that during our term of office the private sector has created more than one million new jobs. That's equivalent to almost 400 new jobs a day, each day, every day, since September of 1995.

I would like to give a brief history of that job creation situation in Ontario since 1995 and going back five years before that. In May of 1995, there were 89,000 fewer jobs, fewer people employed in Ontario than there were in January of 1990. That was the effect of the recession, many would say. I would say it was the effect of not only the recession but also regressive government policies at that time. Over that same period of time, from January of 1990 to September of 1995, the rest of Canada created 320,000 jobs. Those are new jobs created at the same time that Ontario was losing 89,000 jobs.

Numerous studies from around the world have found that tax rates are one of the most important factors in determining economic growth and productivity. Since 1995, Ontario's net exports have accounted for only 23% of our GDP. The main source of growth, the other 77% of the growth in our GDP has been stimulated by the domestic economy. Despite the downswing in the world economy, the economic outlook and the fiscal reviews show that Ontario will be leading the G7, the United States and other jurisdictions within North America in almost every category.

Private sector forecasts now anticipate that real growth in Ontario will be 3.5% this year, up from a consensus forecast of 3.2% in June. The recently released second quarter economic accounts show continued strong growth in real gross domestic product of 4.4% and exceptionally strong growth in our first quarter.

It is the kind of prudent fiscal management that this government has exhibited since 1995 that has led to the creation of this strong economy that we have in this province today. That strong economy that we have in this province today has allowed this government to reinvest in the things that Ontarians hold near and dear to their hearts. We have reinvested over \$8 billion in health care, so it's now 45% of our expenditures. We have reinvested in education, \$250 million yesterday and \$340 million today. We have reinvested in community safety, in the environment, in all of those things that Ontarians hold near and dear to their hearts and that they expect their provincial government to protect and reinvest in for the future so that this province can continue to have the quality of life that we have come to expect.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr David Christopherson):** The floor is open for further debate.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** In the very short period of time I am limited to this afternoon, I'm going to look at a few issues, some of them with a local component and some with a provincial component.

The first thing I want to talk about—I'm glad the Attorney General is in the House; and my friend from Niagara Falls, because he would be familiar with this—is the issue of the Maters Mortgages people who have been in a case against the government of Ontario. They have had a couple of case managers to move their case along.

I should tell you, Mr Speaker, and you may be familiar with this, being from Hamilton, that the people were involved with what was called Falloncrest, or Maters Mortgages. These are people who made certain investments. The Ontario government intervened, and ultimately the people were out of pocket for a lot of money. We're into millions of dollars.

Many of these people are elderly. Some have passed on because of their age and because of illness and infirmity. They have been looking for an opportunity to have their case heard in court. They have simply been asking for fairness. They are dealing with taxpayer-financed government lawyers and their case has been stretched out over a number of years now.

What they would best like, probably, is an out-of-court settlement, where the government would make a generous offer and they would be able to accept it. That would end the court case. But the very least they are asking for, and I think something the government could agree to, is a fair court case: let it go to court; let it go to trial; let a decision be rendered by an impartial judge.

They have had two case managers now. These are judges who were brought in to move the case along. They had an opportunity to meet with the former Attorney General, James Flaherty, in Niagara Falls, I believe it was, or Niagara-on-the-Lake. I think they felt a bit heartened at that time that the case would be expedited through the courts so that whatever happened, they would know they had a fair day in court. Well, that got held up somewhat.

Now they are in a situation where they thought perhaps mediation would work; that is, you bring in a mediator, you bring the lawyers for the two sides together and you try to find some common ground to see if the problem can be solved. I know they met with Gerry Phillips as well, as the critic for the Liberal Party in the field of finance and financial institutions.

I don't know how the mediation has gone. I believe they were in mediation today. What I hope would have happened is that there would have been a coming together of the two sides to agree on points to go forward with into a trial. In other words, within the early part of next year it would go to trial, the evidence would be presented by both sides—because this is a civil action—there would be a decision rendered and we wouldn't have an appeal of that decision.

I hope we don't have the government still in a position of playing hardball with these people, because they have accumulated a lot of costs out of their own pockets to defend this civil case. As I say, many people have lost their life savings as a result of this, or a large portion of their life savings. Some who perhaps had accumulated some wealth through a lot of savings find themselves

today, I won't say destitute, although in some cases that might be the situation, but certainly with far less of an economic cushion than they would have had before. What I'm hoping is that the taxpayer-paid government lawyers are not playing hardball with these individuals, with this group, and that they're trying to find an accommodation which would be acceptable to both.

As I say, the one thing they would say to me and to anybody in this Legislature is that they should have a fair day in court. If the government wins, they would be very disappointed, obviously, and if they win, they would be delighted, obviously, but what they're looking for is a fair day in court where there are equals. I think they are hopeful that the mediation process might well produce an accommodation that would expedite the case and bring it to trial.

I hope that's the case. I have seen their hopes dashed on many occasions when they've been raised a bit by something that has happened—by a question I've asked in the House or perhaps a communication that has come back from the government—but from time to time they just seem to get one step forward and there are three steps back. I hope that isn't the case, and I hope the government hasn't forgotten them.

**1710**

There's another case I want to talk about, an individual in my riding. The member for Niagara Centre and I attended an event at West Park high school in St Catharines. West Park Secondary School has a wonderful group of students, teachers and other staff and a wonderful community they draw from, and the event was a fundraiser for this individual. His name is Andy Gindroz. I can tell you that Andy has great spirit, a wonderful personality. He was in the hallway along with his parents and many friends, schoolmates and others. They had a silent auction there, they had music, they had tickets being sold, all of this to receive some treatment outside the country.

I know a lot of people come to all of us and say they would like treatment outside the country. The rule that OHIP follows, for the most part—I think almost always—is that if the treatment is available in Ontario, they will not pay for the treatment outside Ontario. This is a situation where it appears that the treatment is not available in Ontario. The member for Niagara Centre and I have explained to the parents—and they're very cognizant of this, very knowledgeable—that the most important component is a letter from medical authorities indicating clearly that this operation or these medical procedures cannot be done in Ontario and must be done elsewhere, and they have actually turned to the United States.

I'm going to share a letter with you. I don't think the parents would object to me or the member for Niagara Centre raising this matter in this way, because they've been very public about it; there have been some articles in the St Catharines Standard about it. It reads as follows:

"I am writing this letter on behalf of my family, our 18-year-old son Andy, my husband Alain and myself. Our ... physician, Dr Christina Plaskos and my uncle the

Honourable Mr Justice R.C. Rutherford”—have suggested that they come to me with this particular problem as the MPP for St Catharines. I know they’ve contacted Mr Kormos as the MPP representing the other part of the city of St Catharines. The high school Andy attends is in the riding of Mr Kormos.

“On September 25, 2001, Andy lost the vision in his right eye, and was diagnosed with an extremely serious and very complex brain tumour. He underwent extensive brain surgery on October 1, 2001, at the London Health Sciences Centre. This was performed in hopes of regaining his vision by decompressing the optic nerve. Unfortunately, Andy’s vision could not be saved since the optic nerve had been damaged beyond repair.

“With Andy’s very positive outlook and strong attitude he recovered from his craniotomy. However, he has not yet reached the end of this nightmare. The many specialists in London and Toronto who have examined and cared for Andy are unable to give this tumour a definitive name. Consequently, options for successful treatment for his condition are unknown.

“During his surgery at the London Health Sciences Centre small specimens of the lesion were biopsied in the hopes that the tumour could be identified and further treatment recommended. Because this lesion is displacing and encasing the internal carotid artery and is bony and very vascular, it becomes extremely difficult to biopsy any more than a minute amount of tissue. In fact, Andy had a second biopsy on February 27, 2002, with another surgeon at St Joseph’s Hospital, also in London, with no better results. This specimen was sent to a pathologist in Pittsburgh for examination, only to be sent back confirming that the tumour is a bony vascular malformation and still unnamed. On June 3, 2002, at the Toronto General Hospital, a third endoscopic biopsy was performed. This surgery caused our family major grief and trauma! Andy severely hemorrhaged seven times and required a blood transfusion and hospitalization for 13 days. I’m sure, as you can well imagine, it has been a very frustrating and difficult time for all of us.

“As the tumour continues to grow, Andy’s symptoms are rapidly increasing and becoming more of a concern as well as being a prime candidate for a stroke, we are therefore pursuing a lead in Iowa City at the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics for a second opinion.

“On behalf of our family, I am writing this letter respectfully asking for your assistance in helping us to receive approval for financial support from OHIP for any possible treatment options in the United States. As a first step, Dr Plaskos has written to OHIP asking for such support as well. I have enclosed her letter for your viewing.

“As a testament to Andy’s positive spirit, I’m enclosing an article that was published in the St Catharines Standard on April 13, 2002.”

By the way, that article outlined exactly the problem and brought the community together recognizing what that problem was.

“The three of us would like to thank you in advance for any assistance you may be able to provide us as our MPP for St Catharines.”

They go on to wish me well, but I’m going to tell you, I think everybody in this House would wish them well. This is a case, clearly, where there is not a treatment in Ontario. Even some people in the United States can’t identify the problem. There are many people who are going to bring this to our attention in our own communities, but this appears to be a very clear case where action must be taken quickly. We all know the costs of medical care in the United States. It’s high. There are some very competent people there, just as we have some outstanding physicians, outstanding staff, outstanding facilities here in Canada.

On behalf of the family, I share with members of this Legislature my hope that the Minister of Health, through his committee that looks at these situations and determines whether or not OHIP coverage is possible, will provide OHIP coverage, not only for some diagnostic work that has to be done, but also for any treatment that must take place, because this is unique, it’s different, it’s an individual situation.

I certainly plead on their behalf for this individual. If you could have attended and seen the people at West Park high school in St Catharines who had gathered together to raise money to help send Andy to the United States to receive some diagnosis and some potential treatment—they’ve already made some contributions, but you can only ask the community to give so much. They have generously shared their bounty, their donations. They have given items to be auctioned off and things of that nature.

I wanted to use this time to share those two instances with members of this House. It’s our job as members to do that. I certainly ask on behalf of the Mater’s Mortgages people and on behalf of the Gindroz family that assistance be provided by this government.

**Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):** I am very pleased to join in the debate with respect to the supply bill. I’m in favour of the Supply Act as proposed, as it is the responsibility of an accountable government. We need to ensure that this important bill receives the authorization it needs from the Legislature so that the government can continue to spend responsibly. One of the reasons the Supply Act must be passed is to ensure that payments to the broader public sector can continue to be made. That encompasses payments for Ontario’s vitally important health care sector, including nursing homes, hospitals, doctors and nurses. Health care, along with education and a clean, safe environment, is one of the priorities of this government.

Let me take a moment to talk about health care. As you know, the Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada released its final report, entitled *Building on Values: The Future of Health Care in Canada* but informally known as the Romanow report, on November 28, 2002.

Our government believes the Romanow report is a first step toward the federal government paying more of

its share of health care costs. However, it is not a final step. We appreciate the effort Mr Romanow has put into outlining the future direction of health care in this country. In many cases, he has recommended actions Ontario has already taken.

However, Ontario is concerned about the level and speed of additional funding Mr Romanow recommends. There is no extra money this year and very little next year. The health care funding needs across Canada are immediate. In Ontario, we have increased total health spending by \$8 billion since 1994-95, including almost \$2 billion this fiscal year alone.

**1720**

Mr Romanow's recommendation of increased funding in future years does nothing to address the shortfall in federal funding since the years 1994-95, or even this year. Next year's recommendations would yield \$3.5 billion more nationally, compared with the almost \$2-billion health spending increase in Ontario this year alone. As Premier Eves has said, it is not enough and not soon enough. Ontario estimates it will spend \$25.8 billion on health care in the year 2002-03, almost \$2 billion more than it did last year. If Mr Romanow's proposal for a new Canada health transfer were implemented today, Ontario's allocation would be about \$3.2 billion. Without any enrichment, that is only 12% of what Ontario will actually spend on health care this year alone.

If Mr Romanow's recommended enrichment of \$3.5 billion for all provinces was delivered this year—not next, as proposed—Ontario's allocation would increase by roughly \$1.3 billion to \$4.5 billion. That's about 17.4% of actual, currently planned Ontario health spending.

Even if Mr Romanow's full enrichment of \$6.5 billion nationally were made available to Ontario today, our total Canada health transfer allocation as proposed would only rise to \$5.6 billion, which is only 22% of what Ontario actually spends on health care. Furthermore, to get the \$6.5 billion in additional funding suggested in Mr Romanow's plan, health services would include home care and a catastrophic drug program. This expansion would place a tremendous burden on certain provinces, with even more pressure for higher health spending in the future. This situation is unacceptable to our government.

Having a universally accessible health care system that is available to all Ontarians where and when they need it is central to our quality of life and a key reason why people choose to live, work and raise a family in Ontario.

Health care remains a top priority for the people of Ontario and for this government. Our record on health care speaks for itself. In 1995-96, health care operating spending was \$17.6 billion. This year it is \$25.8 billion, which represents a 7.3% increase over last year alone.

Health base operating spending has increased faster than economic growth over the last two years. In 2000-01, health spending grew by 8.9% while the economy grew at 6%. Last year was even more dramatic. Health spending grew by 6.9%, at a time when the econ-

omy grew by only 2.4%. In 1995-96, health care base operating spending accounted for 38% of all government program spending. This number has grown to 47% in the years 2002-03.

Our government's increased investments have made a real difference by:

(1) Increasing the number of MRI machines in Ontario from 12 in 1995-96 to 43 this year. That also has benefited my riding of Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, where we have that equipment not only at Southlake Regional Health Centre but also at Barrie's Royal Victoria Hospital.

(2) Building 20,000 new long-term-care beds and renovating an additional 16,000 long-term-care beds. In my riding of Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford we've seen significant increases in long-term-care beds. To name a few, at Victoria Village, which is a state-of-the-art project for seniors, there were 128 long-term-care beds granted, and we also have seen that happen in Bradford, West Gwillimbury, and in Barrie at Grove Park Home. We've been seeing beds that have gone in there and a number of other homes that I would also care to mention. But that's been a significant increase in the city of Barrie, and also in the riding of Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, with respect to the increase.

(3) Establishing the Trillium Gift of Life Network to double the rate of tissue and organ donation in Ontario by the year 2005.

(4) Expanding Ontario's Telehealth network province-wide, serving some 3,500 Ontarians every day.

(5) Introducing a province-wide flu vaccination program, administering some five million doses of the flu vaccine annually. I'm proud to say that I've received my flu vaccination.

(6) Finally, doubling the number of nurse practitioners in Ontario, particularly in underserved areas.

I'm also pleased, and I thank the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, that the North Innisfil Health Centre recently began operating again, being staffed with a doctor and a nurse practitioner to serve the residents of north Innisfil and the residents encompassing Sandy Cove Acres. It's a tremendous initiative.

Also, by supporting the passage of the Supply Act, we can ensure that Ontarians' health care needs for this fiscal year will be met.

In the year 2002-03, the commitment continues. We're improving cancer care by increasing funding of \$50 million over three years to enhance the Ontario Cancer Research Network. An additional \$40 million will be allocated for new treatments for individuals with cancer and \$30 million to modernize and upgrade cancer radiation equipment.

I'm pleased to say that Royal Victoria Hospital is undergoing an expansion of their chemotherapy operation, increasing the square footage by around 10,000 square feet and working toward improving the service in the area with respect to cancer care treatment. They're also working with Cancer Care Ontario to receive support and approval with respect to a regional cancer

care centre which would provide radiation treatment to the region. That's something they're doing a lot of fundraising for in the area. I commend all the individuals involved in that fundraising, and also the staff at Royal Victoria Hospital for the hard work they've done and the steps that are being taken at the hospital in the process of providing a functional program, which they are undergoing right now, to work with Cancer Care Ontario to move toward receiving support and approval from the Ministry of Health.

Support for hospitals will increase to \$9.4 billion, allowing for the expansion of long-term priority programs such as cardiac services, dialysis and MRI scans. I was very pleased to see that in the city of Barrie, a kidney dialysis program was set up just off the old RVH hospital. It has been very successful. It has been used extensively. That kidney dialysis centre was something we brought forth a few years back. Also exciting news is the Southlake Regional Health Centre. Early next year they'll be looking at being the regional centre for cardiac care treatment, a tremendous initiative, along with the expansion of their hospital. That regional cardiac care service is going to be of tremendous benefit to my constituents in Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford, and we're looking forward to that opening.

There's also over \$250 million in additional funding for diagnostic services and payments to physicians and other practitioners, and nearly \$200 million to support residents in long-term-care facilities and to continue the expansion of long-term-care beds. I take the opportunity now to commend the hard work of the people at Victoria Village, the chairperson, Sam Cancilla, and all the other volunteers who work toward that program. They're coming very close to fruition with respect to bringing that project along. They are putting in place some tremendous initiatives: an adult daycare centre, a seniors' centre and also for the youth who will use that facility. It's also proceeding along nicely in terms of being of tremendous benefit to the entire community of Simcoe county.

On that note, I conclude my remarks. I thank the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care for his initiatives in the riding with respect to MRIs, kidney dialysis, the RVH hospital that was expanded and newly built a few years back, the chemotherapy expansion that's underway and their support with respect to bringing a regional cancer care centre to the area, and also the regional cardiac care treatment centre, which is going to be happening next year at Southlake Regional Health Centre. So there's a lot of work that's been done to bring health care services closer to home.

1730

**The Acting Speaker:** The floor is open for further debate.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I'm pleased to join the debate on supply, which is essentially authorizing the government to be able to spend money. I think the public would be far more supportive if we hadn't seen over the last week three different reports. As I say to my business associates—no longer in business,

but the ones I knew in business—the thought of the Conservatives as money managers, frankly, is a bit of an urban myth.

I'd just like to quote a few things from the Provincial Auditor's report. I think the people of Ontario appreciate that this is an independent body engaged by the Legislature to oversee and monitor government spending. The auditor issued their report just last week, and if it wasn't so serious, it would be funny, some of the gross abuse of taxpayers' money that we saw in the report. I'll just give the public a few examples. You might want to get a copy of this book.

A company called Accenture: the government put a cap on their spending on this project of \$180 million; it can't spend any more. Well, Accenture was paid, according to the auditor, \$246 million, \$66 million more than the cap. It points out here that many of the managers said that the system Accenture brought in was a step back from what they previously had. So we spent hard-earned tax money, \$66 million more than was authorized, on a system that apparently was worse than the one that was there before.

We find that over half of the corporations in the province of Ontario are not even filing their corporate income tax returns—half of them. That, I might add, is up from 1995, when I think it was about one out of six; it's now one out of two that are not even filing their corporate income tax. The people of Ontario have every right to say, "Wait a minute. I'm paying my taxes. I work hard. My income taxes are deducted right off my paycheque. How can it be that half the corporations in Ontario aren't even filing their income tax?"

And it goes on. In the use of consultants, here's one consultant who was paid \$725 a day at April 2000, in May it went to \$1,800 and in September it was \$2,600 a day—a day. It points out that at the realty corporation here in the province of Ontario, there was a written agreement that a consultant would be paid \$210,000; they were paid over \$1 million, five times what the written agreement was. It says here that there were 40 employees laid off from the law-and-order ministry, and they came back within days as consultants, paid twice and three times what they were earning before. It points out that one consultant submitted a bid, the government mis-added the numbers and the person got the contract because the numbers were added up wrong.

So I say to the public, get a copy of this report if you want to dispel what I call this urban myth about these people being able to manage your money. It was the very next day that we got this report here, which is the Economic and Fiscal Outlook. Again, I'd urge the public to take a look at it. The debt of the province of Ontario now, according to this document, is \$112 billion. On March 31, 1995, which was a few months before the government took over, it was \$90 billion. It has gone up over \$21 billion, almost 25%. We've been through a period of solid economic growth, but the debt of the province is up almost \$22 billion, almost 25%. If you look at how much interest we're paying on the debt now, it's actually \$700



million more than it was when these people came into office. What we find in the fiscal outlook is that the—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Phillips:** There goes Mr Guzzo. He loves to heckle, but he doesn't like to debate these issues. I'd say that the only way this government is going to balance its books this year is by selling off \$2 billion worth of some of the best assets in the province and they're going to use exactly the same format they used for the 407.

Let me just say to the people of Ontario: we got ripped off. The taxpayers, you hard-working people, got ripped off. Eves sold the 407 on May 5, 1999. I remember that because hours later the election was called. The 407 was purchased by the private sector. They put \$700 million of equity investment into it on May 5, 1999. Thirty months later, less than three years later, that \$700 million was worth \$3 billion. It is the most lucrative toll road in the world. Why? Because contrary to what was promised to the people of Ontario, there are no controls on the tolls. They can take the tolls up whatever they want.

I've heard people in Ajax say, "I kind of like the 407 coming out my way because I'm going to be able to use it." I say, "Have you any idea that it's going to cost you \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year to use that toll road?" That's a great favour to you. The toll road is coming out, but \$3,000 to \$4,000. If you want to drive from Ajax over into the centre of Toronto, it's going to cost you \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year. So I say, why did this happen? It was because the government needed a pile of cash the day the election was called and they sold the 407 users down the road.

We in the opposition are still fighting in court to get the details of that agreement, but the thing we do know is that the people who bought it have gotten rich beyond their wildest dreams. Can you imagine investing \$700 million and 30 months later it's worth \$3 billion? That's not a hypothetical number, because one of the owners sold off a quarter of their interest and recovered every single penny they had in it. They still own three quarters of their original equity in it and they've got all their money out.

I've said this before. For the life of me, when we talk about conflict of interest, I cannot understand why the government allows this. Mr Leach is a respected individual, a competent individual, but he sits on the board of SNC-Lavalin and the 407 corporation. SNC-Lavalin obviously loves him. He's paid \$25,000 a year as the director and \$100,000 a year as a retainer, and more power to him. He's doing very well. But Mr Eves then went and appointed him vice-chair of GO Transit. Every single decision GO Transit makes has a financial implication to the 407. SNC-Lavalin is redeveloping Union Station. Who is the biggest tenant in Union Station? GO. If this is not a conflict of interest in your mind, I don't know what is.

I checked the minutes. Mr Leach at one time declared a conflict on one issue; the same issue came back for debate several months later and he didn't declare a conflict. I just say to the government, I'm not blaming

Mr Leach, because the government appointed him. But I don't for the life of me understand how the government can accept that this is not a conflict of interest. I gather SNC-Lavalin is also bidding on the sale of Hydro One. Fine. But I cannot for the life of me understand how he can sit as the vice-chair of GO Transit when every decision GO makes will have financial implications of millions of dollars to the 407.

We're being asked to approve billions of dollars of spending tonight. I would feel negligent if I didn't point out to the public: don't assume these people know how to manage your finances; it's frankly, simply an urban myth.

**1740**

**Mr AL McDonald (Nipissing):** I'd like to say a few words in favour of the proposed Supply Act, which I believe is one of the most important bills passed in the Legislature. Passage of the Supply Act constitutes the statutory authorization by the Legislature of the government's spending program for the fiscal year. As such, it has far-reaching implications for the people of this province. Without spending authority, most payments to the broader public sector could not be made. I find it very interesting that the member opposite is arguing against this supply bill when it's close to Christmas and these individuals want to get paid; they want to buy Christmas gifts, and I don't understand why he would want to block this bill.

*Interjection.*

**Mr McDonald:** Mr Phillips, it is Christmastime. I think these employees need to get paid.

Without spending authority, most payments to the broader public sector cannot be made. That includes nursing homes, hospitals, doctors, municipalities, general welfare recipients, children's aid societies and supplier accounts. The Supply Act provides the Legislature with authority for spending from the estimates and supplementary estimates that have been put before this House and that have received concurrence of the House. We want to ensure that programs and services on which Ontarians depend, and which are run by members of the broader public service, are available when required.

We need to ensure that this important bill receives the authorization it needs from the Legislature so the government can continue to spend responsibly. However, part of being a fiscally responsible government means we must be accountable to the people of Ontario. We are responsible for ensuring that Ontario remains competitive and continues to grow and prosper.

As my colleague the honourable Minister of Finance recently announced in the 2002 Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review, Ontario's economy is in much better shape than many would have predicted at this time last year. What's more, there remain grounds for cautious optimism for the next 12 months, and we have reason for believing that economic growth, although it might be modest in the year to come, will continue to make Ontario an even better place to work, live, invest and raise a family.

Our government's record of reducing taxes and red tape has contributed to an environment in which businesses have invested, spurring economic growth and job creation. When it comes to jobs, we are particularly proud of this record. In July 2000, the government met the Common Sense Revolution's five-year goal of creating 725,000 new jobs. The government's Blueprint promise would help fuel the creation of 825,000 more new jobs over five years. Well, this government is keeping its promises. Employment rose by 32,300 in September. October saw the creation of another 20,300 net new jobs. In November, 12,800 additional new jobs were created. Since reaching the first target in July 2000, Ontario has created another 295,800 net new jobs. More significantly, in November we were very proud to announce that job creation in Ontario since 1995 has topped the one million mark. That is an amazing milestone.

Since our government's first throne speech in September 1995, our province has surpassed the one million mark, with 1,020,800 net new jobs. Ontario employment has grown by 19.9% during that time period, compared with 14.4% for the rest of Canada and 7.3% for the United States. More than 80% of the one million net new jobs are full-time positions. More than half the employment gains in November were full-time positions, which rose by 7,400.

Job growth has been the fastest for natural and applied science occupations, which have risen by 58%, or 171,000 new jobs. Likewise, jobs in businesses, finance and administrative occupations have grown by more than 12%, which translates into a little more than 127,000 new jobs. That's good news.

The best news is that new jobs have not been limited to one or two sectors. Over the past seven years, job creation has been spread across most industries in Ontario. Employment in the construction industry has increased by some 37%. Employment in the manufacturing sector has increased by about 30%. Jobs in the professional, scientific, and management service industries have grown by more than 40%. That's pretty impressive.

The demographics of job growth are equally impressive. Since 1995, women have gained 508,000 new jobs, or 51.4% of all job gains; men gained 479,700 new jobs, or 48.6%.

Ontario's spectacular record of job growth since September 1995 includes 147,000 net new jobs for young people aged 15-24, which make up 14% of all jobs created in Ontario. Youth employment gains in Ontario since 1995 have accounted for an impressive 44% of youth job growth in Canada. This is very significant, considering that Ontario counts for a 38% share of Canada's youth population. I'd like to proudly point out that youth job growth over the course of the past several years has been unbelievable. During 1998 to 2001, Ontario's youth gained 115,000 net new jobs. That is more than in any other four-year period on record. What's more, the job creation trend is continuing. In November, Ontario's youth gained 2,700 jobs, the fifth

consecutive month of youth job gains. In addition, the unemployment rate for youth edged downward to 13.6% in November from 13.7% in October. These numbers translate into great news for Ontario's youth, but our government is not content to rest. We want to make a great situation even better.

Since 1995, our government has almost doubled the number of young people involved in youth labour market programs under Youth Opportunities Ontario. I understand I'm running out of time, but I can tell you this is great news for Ontario and I'm very proud to stand up for the youth of our province.

**The Acting Speaker:** The time for debate has now expired.

Mr Stockwell has moved second reading of Bill 229, An Act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for the public service for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 2003.

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

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

Those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1749 to 1759.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Members take their seats, please.

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

#### Ayes

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

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

#### Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bartolucci, Rick	Dombrowsky, Leona	Patten, Richard
Bisson, Gilles	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bountrogianni, Marie	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Boyer, Claudette	Hampton, Howard	Prue, Michael
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Ramsay, David
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Caplan, David	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Churley, Marilyn	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Conway, Sean G.	Martel, Shelley	Sorbara, Greg

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 52; the nays are 30.

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

SUPPLY ACT, 2002

LOI DE CRÉDITS DE 2002

Mrs Ecker moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 229, An Act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for the public service for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 2003 / Projet de loi 229, Loi autorisant le paiement de certaines sommes destinées à la fonction publique pour l'exercice se terminant le 31 mars 2003.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr David Christopherson):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

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

All those opposed will please indicate by saying "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1803 to 1813.*

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

**Ayes**

Arnott, Ted  
Baird, John R.  
Barrett, Toby  
Beaubien, Marcel  
Chudleigh, Ted  
Clark, Brad  
Clement, Tony  
Coburn, Brian

Guzzo, Garry J.  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Hastings, John  
Hudak, Tim  
Jackson, Cameron  
Johns, Helen  
Johnson, Bert  
Kells, Morley

Newman, Dan  
O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Runciman, Robert W.  
Sampson, Rob  
Spina, Joseph  
Sterling, Norman W.  
Stewart, R. Gary

Cunningham, Dianne  
DeFaria, Carl  
Dunlop, Garfield  
Ecker, Janet  
Elliott, Brenda  
Eves, Ernie  
Flaherty, Jim  
Galt, Doug  
Gilchrist, Steve  
Gill, Raminder

Klees, Frank  
Martiniuk, Gerry  
Maves, Bart  
Mazzilli, Frank  
McDonald, AL  
Miller, Norm  
Molinari, Tina R.  
Munro, Julia  
Murdoch, Bill  
Mushinski, Marilyn

Stockwell, Chris  
Tascona, Joseph N.  
Tsubouchi, David H.  
Turnbull, David  
Wettlaufer, Wayne  
Wilson, Jim  
Witmer, Elizabeth  
Wood, Bob  
Young, David

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

**Nays**

Agostino, Dominic  
Bartolucci, Rick  
Bisson, Gilles  
Bountrogianni, Marie  
Boyer, Claudette  
Bradley, James J.  
Bryant, Michael  
Caplan, David  
Churley, Marilyn  
Conway, Sean G.

Di Cocco, Caroline  
Dombrowsky, Leona  
Duncan, Dwight  
Gerretsen, John  
Hampton, Howard  
Hoy, Pat  
Kormos, Peter  
Kwinter, Monte  
Martel, Shelley  
Martin, Tony

Patten, Richard  
Peters, Steve  
Phillips, Gerry  
Prue, Michael  
Ramsay, David  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Sergio, Mario  
Sorbara, Greg

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 53; the nays are 28.

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

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

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

*The House adjourned at 1816.*

*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

Deputy Clerk / sous-greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A. (L)	Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)
Ancaster-Dundas- Flamborough-Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	<b>Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)		
Beaches-East York	Prue, Michael (ND)	Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)
Bramalea-Gore-Malton- Springdale	Gill, Raminder (PC)	Hamilton East / -Est	Agostino, Dominic (L)
Brampton Centre / -Centre	Spina, Joseph (PC)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Marie (L)
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	<b>Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony</b> (PC) Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée	Hamilton West / -Ouest	Christopherson, David (ND)
		Hastings-Frontenac- Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Leona (L)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Huron-Bruce	<b>Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen</b> (PC) Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)		
Burlington	Jackson, Cameron (PC)	Kenora-Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)		
Chatham-Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, John (L)
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	Wetlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Don Valley East / -Est	Caplan, David (L)	Kitchener-Waterloo	<b>Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth</b> (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Education / vice-première ministre, ministre de l'Éducation
Don Valley West / -Ouest	<b>Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David</b> (PC) Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre associé de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation		
Dufferin-Peel- Wellington-Grey	<b>Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie</b> (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Beaubien, Marcel (PC)
		Lanark-Carleton	<b>Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.</b> (PC) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Durham	O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	<b>Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.</b> (PC) Minister of Public Safety and Security / ministre de la Sécurité et de la Sécurité publique
Eglinton-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)		
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Steve (L)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	<b>Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne</b> (PC) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Erie-Lincoln	<b>Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim</b> (PC) Minister of Consumer and Business Services / ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises		
Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L)	London West / -Ouest	Wood, Bob (PC)
Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	<b>Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Minister of the Environment, government House leader / ministre de l'Environnement, leader parlementaire du gouvernement	London-Fanshawe	Mazzilli, Frank (PC)
		Markham	<b>Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.</b> (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture / président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement, ministre de la Culture
Etobicoke North / -Nord	Hastings, John (PC)		
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Kells, Morley (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	Sampson, Rob (PC)
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)		
Guelph-Wellington	<b>Elliott, Hon / L'hon Brenda</b> (PC) Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services / ministre des Services à la collectivité, à la famille et à l'enfance		

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Mississauga East / -Est	<b>DeFaria, Hon / L'hon Carl</b> (PC) Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors / ministre des Affaires civiques, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées	Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)
Mississauga South / -Sud	Marland, Margaret (PC)	Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)
Mississauga West / -Ouest	Snobelen, John (PC)	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	<b>Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan</b> (PC) Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre associé de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Nepean-Carleton	<b>Baird, Hon / L'hon John R.</b> (PC) Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, deputy House leader / ministre de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, leader parlementaire adjoint	Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry (L)
Niagara Centre / -Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)	Scarborough-Rouge River	Curling, Alvin (L)
Niagara Falls	Maves, Bart (PC)	Simcoe North / -Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)
Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)	Simcoe-Grey	<b>Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Nipissing	McDonald, AL (PC)	St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)
Northumberland	<b>Galt, Hon / L'hon Doug</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip / Ministre sans portefeuille, whip en chef du gouvernement	St Paul's	Bryant, Michael (L)
Oak Ridges	<b>Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank</b> (PC) Minister of Tourism and Recreation / ministre du Tourisme et des Loisirs	Stoney Creek	<b>Clark, Hon / L'hon Brad</b> (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Oakville	<b>Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary</b> (PC) Speaker / Président	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	Cleary, John C. (L)
Oshawa	<b>Ouellette, Hon / L'hon Jerry J.</b> (PC) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Rick (L)
Ottawa Centre / -Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Thornhill	<b>Molinari, Hon / L'hon Tina R.</b> (PC) Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associée des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Ottawa-Orléans	<b>Coburn, Hon / L'hon Brian</b> (PC) Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associé des Affaires municipales et du Logement	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	McLeod, Lyn (L)
Ottawa South / -Sud	McGuinty, Dalton (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	Ramsay, David (L)
Ottawa-Vanier	Boyer, Claudette (Ind)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Oxford	Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	Smitherman, George (L)
Parkdale-High Park	Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Toronto-Danforth	Churley, Marilyn (ND)
Parry Sound-Muskoka	Miller, Norm (PC)	Trinity-Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Perth-Middlesex	Johnson, Bert (PC)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Sorbara, Greg (L)
Peterborough	Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC)
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	<b>Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet</b> (PC) Minister of Finance / ministre des Finances	Whitby-Ajax	<b>Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Willowdale	<b>Young, Hon / L'hon David</b> (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Dwight (L)
Sault Ste Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	York Centre / -Centre	Kwinter, Monte (L)
		York North / -Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
		York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
		York West / -Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)

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

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

**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 / Greffier: Trevor Day

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

Chair / Président: Joseph Spina  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ted Arnott  
Ted Arnott, Marcel Beaubien,  
David Christopherson, Monte Kwinter,  
John O'Toole, Gerry Phillips,  
Rob Sampson, Joseph Spina  
Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**General government / Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Norm Miller  
Marilyn Churley, Mike Colle,  
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,  
Norm Miller, R. Gary Stewart, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**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: Anne Stokes

**Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales**

Chair / Présidente: Toby Barrett  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: AL McDonald  
Toby Barrett, Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant,  
Garry J. Guzzo, Ernie Hardeman,  
Peter Kormos, AL McDonald, Lyn McLeod  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative**

Chair / Présidente: Margaret Marland  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro  
Caroline Di Cocco, Jean-Marc Lalonde,  
Margaret Marland, Bart Maves,  
Julia Munro, Marilyn Mushinski,  
Michael Prue, Joseph N. Tascona  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

**Public accounts / Comptes publics**

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier  
Bruce Crozier, John Gerretsen,  
Steve Gilchrist, Raminder Gill,  
John Hastings, Shelley Martel,  
AL McDonald, Richard Patten,  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**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: Katch Koch

Continued from overleaf

<b>Apology</b>	
Mr Levac .....	3856
<b>Member's birthday</b>	
Mr Phillips.....	3856
<b>Report, Integrity Commissioner</b>	
The Speaker.....	3857
<b>Request for opinion</b>	
The Speaker.....	3857
<b>Withdrawal of bill</b>	
The Speaker.....	3857
<b>Status of bill</b>	
The Speaker.....	3857
<b>Legislative pages</b>	
The Speaker.....	3861
<b>Holiday message</b>	
Mr Turnbull.....	3871

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Jeudi 12 décembre 2002

<b>AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS</b>		<b>Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur la protection des locataires (augmentations équitables des loyers), projet de loi 243, M. Bryant</b>	
<b>Gestion des déchets, avis de motion numéro 23 émanant d'un député, M. Beaubien</b>		Adoptée .....	3860
M. Hastings .....	3840	<b>Loi de 2002 sur la protection des personnes âgées, projet de loi 244, M. Colle</b>	
Adoptée .....	3852	Adoptée .....	3860
<b>PREMIÈRE LECTURE</b>			
<b>Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur le ministère des Services correctionnels, projet de loi 237, M. Sampson</b>		<b>DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES</b>	
Adoptée .....	3858	<b>Sécurité routière</b>	
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la protection des sources d'eau potable de l'Ontario, projet de loi 238, M<sup>me</sup> Churley</b>		M. Bisson .....	3863
Adoptée .....	3858	<b>DEUXIÈME LECTURE</b>	
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la réserve récréative, projet de loi 239, M. Ouellette</b>		<b>Loi de crédits de 2002, projet de loi 229, M<sup>me</sup> Ecker</b>	
Adoptée .....	3859	Adoptée .....	3885
<b>Loi de 2002 sur le monument commémoratif des travailleurs de l'Ontario, projet de loi 240, M. Agostino</b>		<b>TROISIÈME LECTURE</b>	
Adoptée .....	3859	<b>Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur le mariage, projet de loi 74, M. Murdoch</b>	
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la sécurité routière, projet de loi 241, M. Sterling</b>		Adoptée .....	3861
Adoptée .....	3859	<b>Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario, projet de loi 129, M<sup>me</sup> Munro</b>	
<b>Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur l'Office de la télécommunication éducative de l'Ontario, projet de loi 242, M<sup>me</sup> Boyer</b>		Adoptée .....	3864
Adoptée .....	3859	<b>Loi de crédits de 2002, projet de loi 229, M<sup>me</sup> Ecker</b>	
		Adoptée .....	3885

# CONTENTS

Thursday 12 December 2002

<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS</b>	
<b>Waste management, private member's notice of motion number 23, <i>Mr Beaubien</i></b>	
Mr Beaubien .....	3837, 3844
Ms Di Cocco .....	3838
Mr Hastings .....	3839
Mr Bradley .....	3841
Ms Churley .....	3842
Agreed to .....	3852
<b>First Nations mining and forestry revenues, private member's notice of motion number 22, <i>Mr Bisson</i></b>	
Mr Bisson .....	3844, 3852
Mr Stewart .....	3846
Mr Phillips .....	3847
Mr Hampton .....	3848
Mr Miller .....	3849
Mr Bradley .....	3850
Mr Prue .....	3851
Negated .....	3853
<b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b>	
<b>Report, Integrity Commissioner</b>	
Ms Papatello .....	3853
<b>Santa's visit</b>	
Mrs Munro .....	3853
<b>Northern health travel grant</b>	
Mr Gravelle .....	3854
<b>Christmas events in Durham</b>	
Mr O'Toole .....	3854
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr Gerretsen .....	3855
<b>Adoption disclosure</b>	
Ms Churley .....	3855
<b>Civics classes</b>	
Mr Johnson .....	3855
<b>Government spending</b>	
Mr Smitherman .....	3856
<b>Support the Shorts</b>	
Mr Stewart .....	3856
<b>REPORTS BY COMMITTEES</b>	
<b>Standing committee on finance and economic affairs</b>	
Mr Spina .....	3857, 3858
Reports adopted .....	3857, 3858
<b>Standing committee on public accounts</b>	
Mr Gerretsen .....	3858
Debate adjourned .....	3858

<b>FIRST READINGS</b>	
<b>Ministry of Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2002, Bill 237, <i>Mr Sampson</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3858
Mr Sampson .....	3858
<b>Ontario Drinking Water Source Protection Act, 2002, Bill 238, <i>Ms Churley</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3858
Ms Churley .....	3858
<b>Recreation Reserve Act, 2002, Bill 239, <i>Mr Ouellette</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3859
Mr Ouellette .....	3859
<b>Ontario Workers' Memorial Act, 2002, Bill 240, <i>Mr Agostino</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3859
Mr Agostino .....	3859
<b>Road Safety Act, 2002, Bill 241, <i>Mr Sterling</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3859
<b>Ontario Educational Communications Authority Amendment Act, 2002, Bill 242, <i>Mrs Boyer</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3859
Mrs Boyer .....	3859
<b>Tenant Protection Amendment Act (Fairness in Rent Increases), 2002, Bill 243, <i>Mr Bryant</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3860
Mr Bryant .....	3860
<b>Seniors' Protection Act, 2002, Bill 244, <i>Mr Colle</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3860
Mr Colle .....	3860
<b>STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES</b>	
<b>Road safety</b>	
Mr Sterling .....	3861
Mr Hoy .....	3862
Mr Bisson .....	3863
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>	
<b>Special education</b>	
Mr McGuinty .....	3864
Mr Eves .....	3865
<b>Premier's record</b>	
Mr McGuinty .....	3865
Mr Eves .....	3865
<b>Hydro One</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	3866
Mr Eves .....	3866

<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	3867
Mr Eves .....	3867
<b>Premier's spending</b>	
Ms Papatello .....	3867
Mr Eves .....	3867
<b>Gun registry</b>	
Mr Miller .....	3868
Mr Runciman .....	3868
<b>Natural gas rates</b>	
Mr Duncan .....	3868
Mr Eves .....	3868
Mr Baird .....	3869
<b>Health care</b>	
Mr Dunlop .....	3869
Mr Clement .....	3869
<b>Far north fire management</b>	
Mr Hampton .....	3870
Mr Ouellette .....	3870
<b>Ontario disability support program</b>	
Mr Parsons .....	3870
Mrs Elliott .....	3870
<b>SECOND READINGS</b>	
<b>Supply Act, 2002, Bill 229, <i>Mrs Ecker</i></b>	
Mr Stockwell .....	3871
Mr Conway .....	3871
Mr Kormos .....	3872
Mr Chudleigh .....	3877
Mr Bradley .....	3879
Mr Tascona .....	3880
Mr Phillips .....	3882
Mr McDonald .....	3883
Agreed to .....	3885
<b>THIRD READINGS</b>	
<b>Marriage Amendment Act, 2002, Bill 74, <i>Mr Murdoch</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3861
<b>Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act, 2002, Bill 129, <i>Mrs Munro</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3864
<b>Supply Act, 2002, Bill 229, <i>Mrs Ecker</i></b>	
Agreed to .....	3885
<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
<b>Visitors</b>	
Mr Klees .....	3856
Mr McMeekin .....	3857
Mrs Munro .....	3858
The Speaker .....	3861
Mr Stewart .....	3861
Mr Smitherman .....	3861

Continued overleaf