



No. 62A

N° 62A

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 38th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 38^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 15 June 2004

Mardi 15 juin 2004

Speaker
Honourable Alvin Curling

Président
L'honorable Alvin Curling

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

Tuesday 15 June 2004

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 15 juin 2004

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

the spectacular scenery and attractions like our new submarine.

ESTIMATES

Hon Gerry Phillips (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): I have a message from the Honourable Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31 March 2005 and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

SAM LAWRENCE

Ms Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East): It's my privilege today to rise and pay tribute to the 70-year anniversary of the first CCF member elected to the Ontario provincial Parliament, Sam Lawrence.

As members will know, Sam Lawrence was elected from the jurisdiction of Hamilton. He originally hailed from the country of England. He was a very active member of the trade union movement and in fact joined the Masons back in England in 1897. In 1912 he moved to the city of Hamilton with his family and remained very strongly committed to the causes of working people through his entire public life, which was quite extensive.

In 1922 he was elected initially to the city of Hamilton council and served there as a ward councillor, and then, many years afterwards, as a member of the board of control. In 1934 he was elected to the Ontario Legislature, becoming the first CCF member at Queen's Park, and served as the leader of the CCF, of course, in that capacity.

He was president of the Stone Cutters' Union, spent 60 years as an active member of that union, and not only did he participate in the causes of working people in the city of Hamilton, but he represented the interests of working people in Ontario as a CCF member. So it's my pleasure to recognize the 70th anniversary of his membership here at the provincial Legislature.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HALIBURTON FOREST AND WILDLIFE RESERVE

Ms Laurie Scott (Haliburton-Victoria-Brock): I rise today to share news of an exciting new tourist attraction located in my riding. This past Friday, the only passenger submarine operating in freshwater anywhere in the world was launched. Visitors to the Haliburton Forest and Wildlife Reserve can now take a submarine ride that takes them 70 feet below the surface of pristine MacDonald Lake.

MacDonald Lake is home to the Haliburton gold lake trout and Haliburton Forest and Wildlife Reserve. It offers visitors the unique opportunity to see the abundance of fish and the intact ecosystem of the glacial lake. The lake trout have been isolated at MacDonald Lake and nearby watersheds for around 100,000 years.

Frequent visitors to the area will already know about the other attractions that are available at the wildlife reserve—I'm sure the Chair of Management Board will know this—including a canopy walk, which takes visitors 70 feet above the forest floor through a stand of old-growth pine trees, dog sledding, a wolf exhibit, an observatory and a planetarium. The canopy boardwalk is over half a kilometre long and winds through the treetops between two platforms suspended from the treetops above. There is a spectacular view across the lakes and forests.

Tourism is important to the economy of this province, and very important to the economy of my riding. As we move into the summer tourist season, I want to wish all the tourist operators a successful season and encourage members from all sides of the House to visit and enjoy

ANNIVERSARY OF GUYANESE INDEPENDENCE

Mr Shafiq Qadri (Etobicoke North): To the people of Ontario, on behalf of my constituents in Etobicoke North and beyond, I rise today in commemoration of the anniversary of Guyana's independence and to let people know that there is a grand independence festival in Toronto this weekend.

It was on May 26, 38 years ago, that Guyana, the "land of the waters," achieved independence from the United Kingdom. Today it is a fellow member of the Commonwealth and has enjoyed good diplomatic relations with Canada since 1964. Though it's located in South America, over half of its population is of South Asian ancestry. This fusion of cultures has led to a distinct society that is renowned for its hospitality, festivals and energy.

This year, from June 18 to June 20, Toronto's Guyanese community will be holding its ninth annual independence day festival. The event holds the distinction of being the largest annual gathering of the Guyanese community outside of Guyana itself. This year, the festival begins with a launch reception on Friday at 7 pm, and events will continue Saturday and Sunday at the L'Amoreaux Community Recreation Centre.

I invite all my fellow members of Parliament and all the people of Ontario to celebrate Guyana's independence, to meet with Guyanese Canadians in their constituencies and to exchange ideas about the future of both of these great members of the Commonwealth.

RAIL OVERPASS

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): I rise today to ask the Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal to take the safety of the citizens of the town of Ingersoll into consideration and allocate funding through the Canada-Ontario municipal-rural infrastructure fund toward the construction of a much-needed railway overpass.

The county of Oxford has met with the Minister of Finance and has sent a business plan to the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal outlining the risks to public safety and the need for provincial funding. This plan demonstrates the significant public safety risks caused by railroad tracks which run directly through the town and sever traffic movement from one side of the town to the other.

These tracks carry over 40 trains a day and are often used to shunt cars back and forth. As a result, emergency service vehicles are frequently unable to cross the town to provide services to the citizens on the other side of the tracks. The Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal's news release states that the Canada-Ontario municipal-rural infrastructure fund is meant to address local priorities like local roads and bridges, as well as help address other health and safety priorities.

I urge Minister Caplan to include the town of Ingersoll in those health and safety priorities by funding the provincial portion of this overpass so that the emergency service vehicles can serve all citizens of the town at any time of the day. I urge the minister to do this without delay and demonstrate his dedication to the safety of all the citizens of Ontario. Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you, Minister Caplan.

1340

REBOUND YOUTH PROGRAM

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): I'm pleased to rise today to speak about an important program in my riding that has been reaching out to help troubled youth for two decades. Sarnia-Lambton Rebound is a volunteer-based, non-profit organization that has been supporting at-risk young people in my community since 1984.

Rebound provides programming for youth who are beginning to experience difficulties with their families,

their schools or the law. For 20 years, Rebound has helped over 10,000 young people to develop skills that promote a positive response to self, to others and to their community.

Rebound's success has been outstanding: 92% of youth who work with Rebound remain out of trouble with the law, and that's an amazing success rate. Rebound is estimated to have saved the Ontario government more than \$13.8 million by diverting youth away from the court system and on to better lives.

I'd like to take this opportunity to commend the large number of volunteers and staff at Rebound for their tremendous contribution to the community for over 20 years. They do us all a service by helping our young people to grow into better citizens and lead better and happier lives.

RITSON ROAD ALLIANCE CHURCH

Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa): It is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate the Ritson Road Alliance Church in my riding of Oshawa on 50 years of prayer, celebration and giving to our community.

The Ritson Road Alliance Church began as a group of individuals meeting in a tent to celebrate their faith, led by then Reverend Bill Newell. When the weather became too cold, they moved indoors to a facility across town to continue their worship. The church finally constructed a permanent residence in 1970 at the corner of, yes, of course, Ritson Road and Oshawa Boulevard, where the congregation still meets today.

The Ritson Road Alliance Church has a long history of community involvement, especially with children, youth and teens. Since the inception of the church in 1954, programs have been organized for the younger members of the community, such as children and teen camps, day camps during the summer, and most recently basketball camp for teens.

Pastor Al Nikkel, staff and the congregation of the Ritson Road Alliance Church are networking with other local churches in the community in the hope that together they can provide bigger and better programs for the youth of Oshawa.

I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join me and take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate the great efforts of the Ritson Road Alliance Church for 50 years of giving to our community.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH LONDON

Mr Khalil Ramal (London-Fanshawe): I rise today to honour one of London's longest-running community-based crime prevention programs. In June, Neighbourhood Watch London will celebrate 21 years of continuous service. Starting in 1983 with a single watch established by a concerned citizen, it has grown to cover one third of London, with over 450 watches serving more than 40,000 households.

Neighbourhood Watch has proven to be extremely successful. Over 76% of break-and-enters in London occur in an area where residents do not participate in that program. Their success comes by sharing crime prevention techniques and by the constant vigilance of more than 10,000 volunteers.

Neighbourhood Watch continues to grow with the support of the city of London through base program budgets and fundraising initiatives such as HomeFinder. HomeFinder is a highly reflective plate that attaches behind existing house address numbers and reflects emergency vehicle lights back to the street, making it easier to find addresses more quickly in an emergency situation.

Working with the London Police Service and other community partners, Neighbourhood Watch is helping to make the neighbourhoods of London safer.

This government is committed to community justice programs, and we recently expanded youth justice committees in Toronto to help neighbourhoods deal more effectively with low-risk young offenders.

Studies have shown that community-based crime prevention initiatives and court alternatives are successful in helping to create strong and safe communities. I applaud Neighbourhood Watch London. I congratulate the program on its 21st anniversary.

COMMUNITY-BASED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs Linda Jeffrey (Brampton Centre): I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the health minister for investing in community mental health services. One in five Ontarians experiences mental illness in their lifetime. As many as four in five Ontarians have a family member, friend or colleague who has experienced a mental illness in their lifetime. I've learned that over 70% of Ontarians with moderate mental illness never receive help.

There have been 19 provincial government reports since 1988 that have recommended increases to the core budgets of community mental health services, yet the last increase to the core budgets of community mental health services was in 1992.

Our government is fixing this serious deficiency. Increased funding to community health services will give Ontarians better access to quality care closer to home. I'm particularly happy with the focus on prevention and intervention. This will provide greater support to families and caregivers, while relieving overload by expanding case management, crisis response and taking action before things spiral out of control.

Bonnie Yagar of the Fair Share task force recently congratulated our government for our recent initiatives on mental health after years of little or no funding in Peel for mental health.

It is critical that greater access be provided for people with moderate and severe mental illness. Yesterday's announcement gives me great hope that this will be accomplished and I applaud the health minister and our government for this directive.

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): Here we go again, déjà vu all over again: recycled Harris-Harper Reform-Conservatives pushing reckless tax cuts and service cuts and private health care. Another part of their platform that particularly caught my eye is their plan to deal with municipalities, or rather, a plan not to deal with cities.

Harris-Harper Reform-Conservatives look at the gas tax and see it as an easy way to buy themselves some votes. In essence, they plan to transfer part of the gas tax to the province and then make up the lost revenue by eliminating the Canada strategic infrastructure program and the municipal-rural infrastructure program. What they propose is to give with one hand and take with the other. This is a high-stakes game. The people of Ontario will see through this hidden agenda.

In contrast, the Liberal platform promotes a new deal for cities. The new deal is about transforming the relationship between levels of government and improving the places Canadians call home. The key word here is "municipalities." It is clear which leader truly understands the values and goals of the citizens of Ontario. Mr Harper refuses to recognize or invest in our cities.

I believe our Premier said it best when he said, "We need to have a respectful and productive partnership with the federal government, working together on behalf of Ontarians, instead of squabbling with each other, at the expense of Ontarians."

I know we can work together on behalf of Ontarians come June 29. I only hope the next federal government has the best intentions of our provinces and our communities in mind.

ANNUAL REPORT, INFORMATION AND PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the 2003 annual report of the Information and Privacy Commissioner.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ELECTRICITY RESTRUCTURING ACT, 2004

LOI DE 2004 SUR LA RESTRUCTURATION DU SECTEUR DE L'ÉLECTRICITÉ

Mr Duncan moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 100, An Act to amend the Electricity Act, 1998 and the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998 and to make consequential amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 100, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur l'électricité, la Loi de 1998 sur la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois.

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

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

All those against the motion, say "nay."

I think the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1350 to 1355.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Pupatello, Sandra
Arthurs, Wayne	Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq
Baird, John R.	Hudak, Tim	Racco, Mario G.
Bentley, Christopher	Jackson, Cameron	Ramal, Khalil
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramsay, David
Broten, Laurel C.	Klees, Frank	Runciman, Robert W.
Brownell, Jim	Kular, Kuldip	Ruprecht, Tony
Bryant, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Scott, Laurie
Caplan, David	Marsales, Judy	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Matthews, Deborah	Smith, Monique
Cordiano, Joseph	Mauro, Bill	Smitherman, George
Craitor, Kim	McNeely, Phil	Sorbara, Greg
Crozier, Bruce	Miller, Norm	Van Bommel, Maria
Dhillon, Vic	Milloy, John	Watson, Jim
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mitchell, Carol	Wilkinson, John
Dombrowsky, Leona	Murdoch, Bill	Wilson, Jim
Duguid, Brad	O'Toole, John	Witmer, Elizabeth
Duncan, Dwight	Ouellette, Jerry J.	Wong, Tony C.
Dunlop, Garfield	Patten, Richard	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Fonseca, Peter	Peters, Steve	Yakabuski, John
Gerretsen, John	Peterson, Tim	Zimmer, David
Gravelle, Michael	Phillips, Gerry	

The Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, please rise and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Horwath, Andrea	Marchese, Rosario
Churley, Marilyn	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Hampton, Howard		

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 68; the nays are seven.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr Duncan?

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): I will have a ministerial statement.

HEALTH INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT (SUPPLEMENTAL NEWBORN SCREENING), 2004

LOI DE 2004 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ASSURANCE-SANTÉ (DÉPISTAGE COMPLÉMENTAIRE DES NOUVEAU-NÉS)

Mr Baird moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 101, An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act /
Projet de loi 101, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-santé.

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

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean-Carleton): This bill would include, under the public insurance program, coverage for a condition that many infants and children

unknowingly suffer from, called medium chain dehydrogenase deficiency, which may be the cause of one out of 100 infant deaths thought to be related to SIDS. It is a piece of legislation that is being strongly pushed for by many families around the province, including a family that has been touched by this in my constituency.

I should give credit: It was originally presented as a private member's bill by the now Minister of Energy, and I hope that it can get all-party support.

MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Do we have unanimous consent to put forward the motion? Agreed.

Hon Mr Duncan: I move that pursuant to standing order 96(g), notice be waived for ballot item 28.

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

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Tuesday, June 15, 2004, for the purpose of considering government business.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Mr Duncan has moved government notice of motion number 132. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

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

All those against, say "nay."

I think the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1402 to 1407.

The Speaker: All those in favour, please rise and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Gerretsen, John	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bentley, Christopher	Gravelle, Michael	Racco, Mario G.
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoy, Pat	Ramal, Khalil
Bradley, James J.	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramsay, David
Broten, Laurel C.	Kular, Kuldip	Rinaldi, Lou
Brownell, Jim	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Bryant, Michael	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Marsales, Judy	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Matthews, Deborah	Smith, Monique
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Mauro, Bill	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	McNeely, Phil	Sorbara, Greg
Cordiano, Joseph	Meilleur, Madeleine	Takhar, Harinder S.
Craitor, Kim	Milloy, John	Van Bommel, Maria
Crozier, Bruce	Mitchell, Carol	Watson, Jim
Dhillon, Vic	Patten, Richard	Wilkinson, John
Dombrowsky, Leona	Peters, Steve	Wong, Tony C.
Duguid, Brad	Peterson, Tim	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Duncan, Dwight	Phillips, Gerry	Zimmer, David
Fonseca, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra	

The Speaker: All those against, please rise and be recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Arnott, Ted
Baird, John R.
Barrett, Toby
Bisson, Gilles
Churley, Marilyn
Dunlop, Garfield
Hampton, Howard
Hardeman, Ernie
Horwath, Andrea

Hudak, Tim
Jackson, Cameron
Klees, Frank
Kormos, Peter
Marchese, Rosario
Miller, Norm
Murdoch, Bill
O'Toole, John
Ouellette, Jerry J.

Prue, Michael
Runciman, Robert W.
Scott, Laurie
Sterling, Norman W.
Wilson, Jim
Witmer, Elizabeth
Yakabuski, John

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 56; the nays are 25.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

ELECTRICITY RESTRUCTURING

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): For the past 10 years, the people of this province have witnessed our electricity system decline from being the envy of the world to a point where if we don't act quickly and prudently, we will find ourselves in very serious trouble. With this legislation, we begin to unravel the mess that was left by the previous government, as witnessed in Bill 35. Of Ontario's present generation capacity of 30,000 megawatts, almost 18,000 megawatts are due for retirement or refurbishment by 2020. During that period, peak demand is expected to grow by 400 megawatts per year. We find ourselves in this situation because previous governments failed to act prudently, failed to act responsibly and sometimes just failed to act.

From its first days in office, the McGuinty government has made energy issues a top priority and has moved boldly to bring positive change where it was desperately needed, but we have much to do to secure our energy future. This we know for certain: All else remaining constant, if Ontario's electricity system were left to continue on the course it has followed, it would cease to serve us, cease to power our economy and cease to be the great enabler it has been for more than a century.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Order. Member for Nepean-Carleton, I'd like you to be quiet so I can hear the minister.

Hon Mr Duncan: Therefore, it gives me great pride to stand in the House today to introduce the proposed Electricity Restructuring Act for consideration by this assembly. Through this legislation, we are charting new ground in the history of Ontario's electricity sector. We are putting Ontario back on a solid footing by taking a balanced approach that addresses the critical need for new supply, increased conservation, consumers' desire

for price stability, the importance of public leadership and the need for private investment.

Our plan includes a strong public leadership role, clear accountabilities and a coordinated planning approach to address the growing gap between electricity supply and demand, in order to keep the lights on now and far into the future. Beyond all else, our proposed legislation will create stability in a sector that has been rocked far too often. It would reorganize the institutional structure in a way that will best suit the people of Ontario over the long term.

Under our proposed legislation, the Ontario government would continue to set targets for conservation and electricity from renewable sources and set guidelines for diversity of supply. However, responsibility for ensuring long-term supply adequacy, a mandate that no existing institution in Ontario's electricity sector now carries, would belong to a new institution, the Ontario Power Authority. It will ensure that never again will we find ourselves in the predicament we're in today.

The power authority would assess adequacy and reliability of electricity resources and forecast future demand. It would also prepare an integrated system plan for generation, transmission and conservation, to be reviewed by the Ontario Energy Board. In addition to its planning functions, the power authority would have the power to procure new supply and demand management initiatives, either by competition or by contract. When necessary, it would use a competitive and transparent procurement process which would foster innovative and creative approaches to meeting our supply needs.

It's crucial that private investors be allowed to enter Ontario and support the construction of the thousands of megawatts of electricity that we need to build over the next 15 years. We must send a clear and unambiguous message that Ontario's electricity sector is a great place in which to invest.

Having a fully functioning electricity sector is not only about generating raw power. To that end, the power authority would establish a conservation bureau, headed by a chief energy conservation officer, to provide leadership in planning and coordination of electricity conservation and demand management measures that will help consumers save energy and money. This would be the first time for this type of initiative in Ontario. The conservation bureau would help us build a true conservation culture, which, as the Premier has clearly stated, must be a cornerstone of Ontario's long-term energy future.

Under the proposed legislation, the wholesale electricity market would continue to operate but there would be several changes in the oversight mechanisms. The Independent Electricity Market Operator, or IMO, would be renamed the Independent Electricity System Operator, or IESO. It would continue to operate the wholesale market and be responsible for the operation and reliability of the power system. Responsibility for the market surveillance panel would be transferred from the IMO to the Ontario Energy Board. The Ontario Energy Board already has oversight powers to guard against abuse of

market power. The transfer of the market surveillance panel to the board is consistent with the board's consumer protection responsibilities and will consolidate and strengthen this mandate.

Under the proposed legislation, the Ontario Energy Board would continue to have a strong role in protecting consumers through licensing and rate regulation, and would ensure economic efficiency, cost-effectiveness and financial viability of the elements of Ontario's electricity system.

With regard to electricity rates, the board would approve an annual rate plan for low-volume and other small consumers, who would pay a blended price based on regulated, contract and forecasted competitive prices. This would ensure that prices to consumers are fair, stable and predictable and that those who use power will pay its true price.

Under the proposed legislation, consumers who do not wish to participate in the regulated rate plan would have other options, such as purchasing their electricity from energy retailers.

Medium and large businesses would continue to have the flexibility to pay the market price for electricity, or could use energy retailers or financial hedging instruments to manage energy costs.

There is no doubt that this legislation is very complex. In addition, there are many technical regulations that will need careful and thorough attention because they will have far-reaching implications for our citizens and our economy.

Accordingly, this bill will be subject to extensive consultation and input over the summer in order to ensure we get it right, and to ensure that changes are made in the best interests of Ontarians.

We know we will need the ongoing benefit of the ideas, expertise and dedication of those in the electricity sector to meet the challenges that face us. We also invite all citizens to bring us their ideas and concerns at those hearings.

If we work together, we can build an Ontario that has an electricity supply that is the envy of our competitors and a magnet for investors. If we work together, we can make up for over a decade lost in Ontario's electricity sector and ensure Ontario's prosperity for decades to come.

The proposed legislation is a start. By ensuring a reliable, sustainable and diverse supply of power at stable, competitive prices, and creating a conservation culture, we are delivering the real, positive change that Ontarians need and deserve.

The Speaker: Responses?

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I want to first say that I attended the minister's announcement just a short time ago in the press gallery, and it really is important that I stand here today and recognize former ministers John Baird and Jim Wilson.

There's absolutely nothing new in this bill. In fact, it's a reannouncement of what I heard on April 15 at the Empire Club. Really, the only things you've added here

are two new layers of bureaucracy, and how you're going to pay for that on top of that is going to be in the bill. At the end of the day, this is about raising the cost of electricity.

The new power authority you've announced replaces the IMO, which has been doing the planning and implementation. No one here on this side would disagree with the conservation authority you're announcing. The only issue is, you've cancelled the tax credits in your last budget that we had already implemented on energy-efficient appliances.

Minister, you've got to know that you're running out of time. The clock is ticking. While you're eliminating 25% of the generating capacity, what is the cost to the taxpayers of Ontario? Ultimately, all of this is going to show up in your bill at your house.

The consumers of Ontario should be put on notice today by you and this government that you have no intention of keeping any promises. This is yet another broken promise, because you are raising electricity prices.

Look at the objectives of our government. No one would disagree with sustainability, increased conservation and engaging the private sector; they're all laudable. In fact, we support those initiatives. But there's a gaping hole in the generation part of the equation. You know that. In three years, this province could be plunged into darkness because of your inaction. You've created more bureaucracy and not one new kilowatt of power.

Minister, you should know that your false commitment to shut down the five coal plants, which are laudable objectives, was hasty and reckless. You simply can't remove 7,500 megawatts of generating capacity out of the system with no plan. How long is it going to take you to replace that lost generation capacity? The people of Ontario should be concerned, because at the end of the day, you, the consumer of Ontario—that's you and I—are going to pay the price.

1420

The minister isn't being truthful. In fact, I wonder if his own caucus is aware of the great risk. There has been much study done on this. Our previous minister, John Baird, set up the generation-conservation-supply task force, an excellent report. There is the Manley report, the Epp report; you can go back to the Macdonald report. We've studied.

Over the summer, I'm going to be watching and I'm going to be encouraging the consumers of Ontario—the small businesses, the dairy farmers who know their price for electricity is going to double. That's the warning shot that's been made here today.

Minister, you really have no plan except to create more bureaucracy and increase the price. Of course you can create more supply, but the issue remains, at what price? You think you can provide natural gas as a short-term solution, but with all the information I've heard on the supply of natural gas or liquefied natural gas, the question remains for all the experts, at what price?

Be straight with the people of Ontario and tell them your bill today really isn't the restructuring of electricity,

it's the repricing of electricity. You have to be straight with the people.

I can recall the debate on electricity. In the last several years, we've had several attempts—when we were in government you encouraged and in fact voted for the freezing of the rates. You know that the rate is the issue here.

All you've done is confuse the civil servants. The IMO is confused, the Ontario Energy Board is confused, and the new power authority is not sure what its mandate is. You didn't answer the questions at the press conference today, and I expect over the next few weeks there will be more questions than answers. But I can assure the people of Ontario there is one certainty: You can rest assured there is going to be less supply and higher prices, thanks to the inaction of the Liberal government and the broken promises.

Be truthful with the people of Ontario. In fact, the reason I voted for it is I do support conservation and I support stability in supply and confidence in the customers. The Liberals have supplied none of the above. So over the next month or two, during the summer, I look forward to watching closely, and not just on behalf of the constituents in Durham.

I was also surprised today, Minister, at how you openly criticized Ontario Hydro. You should be ashamed of what you announced today. It was nothing more than two more levels of bureaucracy.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): Now we know why all the accountants and the lawyers and the lobbyists on Bay Street have been rubbing their hands and are almost absolutely giddy. The reason is because what they're going to get from the Liberals is the Mike Harris-Jim Wilson hydro privatization scheme. You should take a bow because the grand imitators have just lifted your hydro scheme.

Oh, yes, there is some Liberal doublespeak around the edges to hide some of it, but at the end of the day this is about private power. This is about private hydro-electricity. Private companies will want at least a 15% profit. Up goes the hydro bill. And they will want the Eleanor Clitheroe-style executive salaries: \$2 million a year, \$1 million in bonuses, a \$1-million-a-year pension, a \$6-million severance payment, the expense accounts, the limousine and—how can I forget?—maybe even the yacht. Guess what, consumers of Ontario? That's going to be on your hydro bill.

The private companies, if they are going to build a \$1-billion generating station, will have to borrow the money. But when they go to borrow the money, they'll pay at least 2%, perhaps 3% more in interest rates; \$1 billion paid back over 20 years at a 2% higher interest rate. That's about \$200 million. Guess what, consumers? That's going to go on your hydro bill.

Then there's the doublespeak. While this is a private market, while this will be private purchases of electricity and therefore more expensive, to try to hide it, the Liberals are going to create more bureaucracy. So now, not only will you have the Ontario Energy Board, but you

will have something called the Independent Electricity System Operator and the Ontario Power Authority, and these folks will all want to be on the gravy train as well. They will want the big salaries and the big executive offices. And guess what, consumers? You will pay for that on your hydro bill. What the minister didn't say to consumers is, "Get ready for your hydro bill to go up again"—yes—and to go up significantly and increase on a year-over-year basis.

I can tell the minister that private sector companies will only come here if they get the price they want, as you know and I know. For example, natural gas is saying, "Hey, we want eight cents a kilowatt hour." That is significantly higher than what people are paying right now, and that's why their hydro bill will go up.

But there are some other things here that people need to understand. What we've had in Ontario, actually, is control over our electricity supply. What the Liberals will now do is turn electricity into a completely tradable commodity, just like natural gas or oil. I've heard people say, "Gee, the oil comes from Canada and the natural gas comes from Canada. Why do we have to pay the same high rate for natural gas that they're paying in Chicago?" The reason is that under the North American free trade agreement, oil and natural gas are tradable commodities. We pay what they're willing to pay in Chicago.

The Liberals are now going to do the same to electricity. So electricity that's produced in Ontario will not necessarily belong to Ontarians any more. If somebody in Chicago is prepared to pay much more for the electricity, that's where it goes, and we either have to pay the same price or we don't get it. People need to understand that. Liberals are now turning our electricity system into a completely tradable commodity, and that will mean, down the road, that if we want to keep our own electricity, we have to be prepared to outbid New York or Chicago or Detroit. The price of that will be very, very expensive, and it too will show up in the hydro bill.

You know, I was expecting an actual plan today, but we still don't have a plan. What the government is saying is, "We're going to create these new bureaucratic bodies and perhaps they will create a plan." The timeline is growing shorter, yet instead of having a plan, we get more gobbledegook and more bureaucratic creations from this government. That means that while these people wait, coal burns, and it means that while they wait, the electricity shortage problem grows more serious.

VISITORS

Hon Harinder S. Takhar (Minister of Transportation): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am very pleased to acknowledge in the House the presence of a very distinguished individual from India, Mr Sukhraj Singh Bajwa. He was the former session judge and Registrar General of the Rajasthan high court and was appointed as advocate of the Supreme Court.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): That is not a point of order.

We have in the east gallery a former member, Murray Elston, the member for Huron-Bruce in the 32nd, 33rd, 34th and 35th Parliaments.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Mr Ernie Eves (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Premier, and I'm pleased to see that he brought his copy of the budget with him today.

Yesterday in question period, the leader of the New Democratic Party asked the Premier very directly a question with respect to sewer and water pipes and the health care premium, as it was then called—now called a health care tax for reasons of convenience. The Premier certainly left the impression in his answer to that question that there was nothing wrong with spending the health care premium on sewer and water pipes. Yet today, on his way into caucus, he said something totally different in a scum, and on June 2 this year the Premier said, "I'm Dalton McGuinty, and I want you to know that every penny of Ontario's new health care premium will go to health care."

Yet on page 44 of his budget it says, "To ensure that there will be funding, both for health care and for other health enhancing priorities, the government will introduce proposed legislation to create the Ontario health premium to support a \$2.4-billion increase in funding for the programs that contribute to healthier Ontarians this year."

That statement in the budget certainly leads one to believe that—

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Thank you, Premier?

1430

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I'm delighted to have this opportunity to demonstrate that the leader of the official opposition and the leader of the third party are completely, absolutely and utterly wrong with respect to their interpretation of what we're doing here.

On page 43 of the budget, it indicates that we're making an additional \$2.2 billion, roughly speaking, by way of new investment in the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. The premium this year is only going to generate \$1.6 billion. Every penny that we generate by the new premium will be invested through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care in better quality health care for the people of Ontario.

The Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr John Yakabuski (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): My question is for the Premier. First you brought in your health tax—broken promise—that has inflicted such punishment on working families and seniors in Ontario. Now they find out that that money is going into infrastructure projects and not just health care. The people of

Ontario and the people of my riding of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke don't equate infrastructure investment with health care. They equate health care with a visit to their family doctor or a medical procedure of some kind or another.

Premier, your finance minister stated in the budget that, in short, every cent of this premium would be invested in health. You reiterated that commitment in your radio ads. We now see that this is not the case. You performed a sleight of hand with the facts.

My question is this: How do you expect to restore faith in government—in particular, your government—when you treat the truth as if it were playdough to mould and shape any way you see fit for your own political purposes?

Hon Mr McGuinty: The honourable member has a problem accepting the facts and reality. I'll repeat it. We're making an additional \$2.2 billion in investments through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care this fiscal year. The health care premium will generate \$1.6 billion. Every single penny of that \$1.6 billion of revenue generated by the health care premium will be invested in better health care through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care for the people of Ontario.

Mr Yakabuski: Mr Premier, your answer to the questions yesterday was quite different. Your answer to the questions admitted that money from that health care tax was going into infrastructure programs. In light of this fact, would you at least do the right thing for the people of Ontario and order that those misleading ads be withdrawn immediately?

Hon Mr McGuinty: Again, the member doesn't want to allow the facts to get in the way of his particular story. But I will repeat it for the sake of clarity and in order to drive it home once again: We're going to invest an additional \$2.2 billion in health care through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care this year. The premium will generate \$1.6 billion. Every penny of that \$1.6 billion will be invested in better quality health care for the people of Ontario through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.

HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Mr John R. Baird (Nepean-Carleton): My question is to the Premier. In Mike Harris and Ernie Eves's Ontario, debt went down, taxes went down, and health care spending went up by \$11 billion.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Order.

Mr Baird: Elderly, frail seniors could visit a physiotherapist in Ontario and present their health card for health care services. Now, under a Dalton McGuinty government, your health card is no good; you need your Amex card to get health care.

I want to ask the Premier directly: What should a frail, elderly senior do who has neither the money nor the Amex card to get physiotherapy services? What should they do?

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs): I can understand why the honourable member would not like to cast his mind back to what happened, but this former government added some \$31 billion to the people's debt. He asked me what we're doing on behalf of seniors. I'd be delighted to tell him that.

One thing in particular is we're creating the opportunity for 100,000 more Ontario seniors to receive home care in their homes, so that they won't have to go into a nursing home. We think that's a good investment on behalf of seniors in Ontario.

Mr Baird: The health care system that you demonized in opposition is now very close to being the law of the land in Ontario. Not since Oliver North diverted funds from arms sales to the Contras have we seen such an outrageous diversion of funds from health care: in the form of chiropractic, in the form of physiotherapy, in the form of optometry. You're diverting funds from health care for sewer pipes. It's outrageous and it's wrong.

I guess by your logic you could put health care money into roads because ambulances use roads. Where do you draw the line on this outrageous diversion of funds? Will you now stand in your place and admit that it's a sham and that no one in the province believes you?

Hon Mr McGuinty: I'll give him marks for creativity. He indulges in some wonderful fiction, but I think the people of Ontario are entitled to the truth. I spoke to this matter a moment ago. I said specifically that when it comes to investment—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Would the member from Erie-Lincoln and the member from Oak Ridges come to order. Premier.

Hon Mr McGuinty: One of the additional benefits that we're providing to seniors through this, our first budget, is a significant investment, close to half a billion dollars, in nursing homes. By way of that investment, we'll be hiring 2,000 additional staff, including 600 nurses. We'll ensure that a registered nurse is on duty on a 24/7 basis in our nursing homes.

We are guaranteeing that our parents and grandparents who find themselves in nursing homes will be getting at least two baths every single week. We're increasing the comfort allowance for people who find themselves in our nursing homes by a 3% increase. Those are the kinds of investments that we are making through this budget in the interest of Ontario seniors.

Mr Baird: I say to the Premier opposite, boy, it takes gall for you to talk about honesty and the truth. Right around the province of Ontario, I'll put my credibility against yours any day of the week.

We've discovered this diversion of funds from health care to sewer pipes. You now stand in your place and you say that every penny from your new health tax will go to health care. That's not what you said yesterday. I suppose you'll now pay for the sewer pipes out of the federal health transfer. By your logic, physiotherapy, chiropractic and optometry are less important than sewer

pipes. Premier, will you now join the official opposition? Will you now join the New Democratic Party? Will you now join a growing number of your own backbenchers—
1440

The Speaker: Question?

Mr Baird: —and every single Liberal MP from the province of Ontario who is calling upon you to back down from these irresponsible and reckless health cuts and restore these—

The Speaker: Order. Thank you.

Hon Mr McGuinty: Suddenly we have a newly converted member here with respect to championing health care. Let me tell you about the position that he held as a proponent of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation and their pre-budget submission, just so we know what it is that the members opposite would have had us do with respect to preparing our first budget. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation said that we should cut health care funding by almost \$1 billion; we should cut education spending by \$431 million; we should cut the Ministry of the Environment by 25%; we should cut municipalities by 25%—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I will be starting to name members, especially members in the front row of the government who have been shouting across and also the member for Nepean-Carleton. We have to proceed during question period in an orderly manner.

HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): Premier, I asked you yesterday why, under your budget, sewer pipes were now being counted as a health care service. At the time, you said, "The member opposite may not believe that safe and clean drinking water is a prerequisite to good health in Ontario, but I want to commit to him and to his constituents that we will not apologize for doing" this. In other words, you defended your actions. Then this morning, when confronted by the press, you changed your story.

Premier, instead of changing your story from day to day, why don't you just admit that you made a mistake with your budget? You made a mistake in terms of cutting optometry and chiropractors and physiotherapists, and you made a mistake in terms of trying to include sewer pipes as a health care service. You made a mistake. Withdraw it and start over with something that is fair and actually does the job for health care.

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs): Again, the \$1.6-billion health care premium will be invested entirely in the new \$2.2-billion by way of expenditures in the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. The balance, of course, will be coming. We put \$1.6 billion into the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Our total investment is \$2.2 billion. We are short \$600 million; we get that from the federal government. They are also giving us an additional \$200 million and we are investing that in a way which we

think is appropriate and entirely proper on behalf of the people of Ontario. For example, we are spending \$25 million on children's mental health services. We think that's related to health. We are spending \$42 million from the federal money on the Ontario drug benefit plan. We think that is connected to health. We are investing some \$50 million in total in the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to train more doctors and more nurses. We think that is connected with health. Those are the things that we are doing on behalf of the people of Ontario through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care with our premiums and through the other money that we're receiving through the federal government.

Mr Hampton: You've still got a big problem, in that you are trying to count things like installing sewer pipes and water pipes and ads by the Ministry of Tourism as health care services. Because when you go to page 70 of the budget, which lists your revenue, what is very clear is that you are getting \$726 million in health transfers from the federal government. Then you tack on the \$1.635 billion you are taking from modest- and middle-income families through the health tax, and it works out to \$2.361 billion, which you don't have, \$2.361 billion of actual health care spending, so you bring in \$200 million of sewer and water pipe, and you try to call that health care spending, health care services. How many times do we have to show it to you? Will you admit that you were wrong to cut chiropractic care, wrong to cut optometrist care, wrong to cut physiotherapy care and then include sewer pipes as part of health care?

Hon Mr McGuinty: It's always a pleasure witnessing the vigour with which the member puts the question. Again, \$1.6 billion generated by way of the new health care premium will be invested through the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.

But I want to quote something that I know the honourable member will be interested in hearing, and that's a section from Public Power: Practical Solutions for Ontario, put out by Howard Hampton and the NDP. Practical solution number 12: "Get back to the job of helping people maintain their health in the first place, not just treating the sick." Our plan includes protecting the quality of drinking water at source.

Mr Hampton: What the Premier doesn't understand is there's wide agreement that protecting water is important, but no one ever before has tried to say that this is a health care service. No one is trying to say that this should come out of the health premium.

Here's your choice: Either you're taking \$200 million that the federal government gave you for health care services and spending it on sewer and water pipe, or you're taking \$200 million out of the new health tax and spending it on sewer and water pipe. Either way, it's not a health care service now and not a health care service then. When are you going to be clear with people?

It's wrong to cut the services of chiropractors, physiotherapists and optometrists, and then try to spruce up your budget by including almost \$200 million of sewer and water pipe and trying to call it a health care service.

Hon Mr McGuinty: The member finds himself hoist with his own petard. He's been found out. During the course of the election, he maintained that a plan that included protecting the quality of drinking water at its source was integral to delivering good-quality health care.

And if he now doesn't remember his own platform, then I'll quote from Mr Justice Dennis O'Connor. Subsequent to the travesty that unfolded in the community of Walkerton where seven died and 2,000 were made ill, he prepared a report that said the following: "Protecting source waters by introducing sewage treatment is one of the most important public health measures ever devised."

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Order. Stop the clock.

I'm going to ask the members again that they conduct themselves in a manner so we can have good decorum in the House. The fact is, the next time I'm going to start naming people, because we don't seem to be proceeding in a manner that the House should be conducted.

I'm going to ask now to start the clock. New question from the third party.

ELECTRICITY RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): To the Premier: Next week the Premier will be telling us that when he fixes some potholes it's a health care expense because the ambulance happens to go down the road.

I want to ask you now about your fascination with Mike Harris's hydro privatization. You spent the election campaign telling people that you believed in public power, that the market was dead, and what do we find out today? We find out today why all the lawyers, fee-takers and commission-takers on Bay Street are so happy: because what you've introduced or reintroduced today is a full-scale program of privatized hydroelectricity. Can you tell me, Premier, when did public power and "The market is dead" during the election campaign become full-scale privatization for Ontario Liberals?

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The Minister of Energy.
1450

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): The member seems intent on hoisting himself on his petard yet again with this question.

This is not about full-scale privatization. This is about undoing Bill 35, which left the people of this province and electricity consumers to the vagaries—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): The member from Nepean-Carleton, I'm going to warn you. The next time I'll be naming you.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Duncan: It was a full-scale—

The Speaker: I would also warn the member from Simcoe-Grey.

Hon Mr Duncan: The members opposite don't want to face reality: no new supply; inadequate creation; inadequate going forward for the people of Ontario. This government is moving in a prudent way to provide regulated power, to get in new supply, to address the crisis that was left for 14 years by that party and by that party. We're moving prudently and decisively to ensure that Ontarians have a secure and affordable supply of electricity going forward.

Mr Hampton: Minister, let me take you back to the summer of 2002. You must remember that you voted for hydro privatization then. In the summer of 2002 the spot market opens and people's hydro bills go through the roof. The only change you've made is that the Ontario Power Authority is going to be out there buying in the privatized market; otherwise it's a completely privatized market. That much is clear. When the spot market takes off again, people's hydro bills, small business hydro bills and industrial hydro bills will skyrocket once again.

Tell us, when did Liberal policy for hydroelectricity become the Mike Harris Conservative policy for hydroelectricity, which forced people's hydro bills through the roof?

Hon Mr Duncan: The fact is, it never did. This is undoing the Harris-Eves policy. The member forgot to mention conservation. No wonder, because his party cancelled all conservation measures when it was in power. This plan will provide price stability. Again that's something he ignored, because when his party was in power, electricity prices went up 40% in three years.

Just last fall, the member said this government's initiatives would lead to a 20% to 30% increase in price. Do you know what has happened since our last bill? The price has come down. You were wrong about that. That member, his party, his book, were wrong.

Our party is moving to protect consumers with a blended, regulated price that protects consumers large and small, will provide security to the sector and will encourage new generation in Ontario, something that never happened under his government or the previous government. This policy will work.

Mr Hampton: I'm sure that as people open their hydro bill and see that it's higher than ever, they'll be happy to know that the Minister of Energy for the Liberal government is telling them that the price is actually coming down. People can read their hydro bill, and the hydro bill is going up, Minister, no matter how much bombast you bring to the House.

Here is the reality. Electricity is an essential service. It's something people need every day, and we all need it. What we saw from the spot market was that it turns this essential service into a casino game, and you're adopting that casino game. Yes, you may put some bureaucracy around the edges, but this is hydro privatization.

You were the people who promised you were going to keep the hydro freeze. Now we see you adopting, lock, stock and barrel, the Conservative privatization strategy. Can you tell us why you have broken yet another promise? Why are people going to continue to see their hydro bill go up, go up and go up?

Hon Mr Duncan: Their hydro bills went up 40% under the NDP. That's one thing we know for certain.

Talk about consistency. We found an advertisement for a book called *Public Power: The Fight for Publicly Owned Electricity*—\$21.95 at the time; I found it in the dollar bin last week. In any event, what does the advertisement say?

"Hampton concludes this illuminating history with his own vision of a 21st century public power system that gradually reduces our dependence on coal and nuclear power..." What does it go on to say? "... and embraces private power initiatives that contribute to the public good." That member's all over the board.

What did he say in his book? "There will be important roles for the private sector to play in the future of our electricity sector." "I am not ideologically opposed to private power any more than I'm opposed to private restaurants..." "Not sending consumers clear price signals discourages conservation." You raised prices 40%; you cancelled conservation. You have a shameless record. We're going to fix your mess, and their mess.

MINISTER'S COMMENTS

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): My question today is for Premier McGuinty. The member you appointed as the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services yesterday unfortunately told the media that the life of a Scarborough man fatally shot by police would probably have been spared if the police had instead used a Taser gun. Minister Kwinter said, "It's unfortunate that the particular officers that were there were not equipped with Tasers, (because) that would have without question resulted in a different outcome."

With this comment, your honourable minister has jeopardized a criminal investigation. He has jeopardized the current special investigations unit investigation. He has jeopardized potential civil action by the family. If that isn't enough, he has also second-guessed police, the very people he is supposed to be protecting as minister. And of course, he was not there at the scene of the incident. Premier, in light of these examples of inexcusable interference by Minister Kwinter, should the minister continue in his job?

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes, he should. Let me tell you that we have no stronger champion in this Legislature, when it comes to our Ontario police and the sacrifices they make and the work they do day in and day out on behalf of the people of Ontario, than is to be found in our Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.

Mr Dunlop: I'd like to refresh the Premier's memory on something. Back in 1998 you asked—

Interjection.

Hon Marie Bountrogianni (Minister of Children and Youth Services, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am compelled as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to ask the member behind John Baird, Jim Wilson, to retract that statement.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Order. I'm very pleased members are trying to get some decorum in here. If there was an unparliamentary word the member said, I ask him to withdraw. I did not hear the word.

Member from Simcoe North.

Mr Dunlop: I think this is a very serious issue. I'd like to refresh the Premier's memory. Back in 1998 you asked for Bob Runciman's resignation when the name of a mother of a young offender was mentioned in a throne speech. The mother had even consented to her name being used in that throne speech. Here's what you said about this in the *Ottawa Citizen* on April 25, 1998: "This has turned from a question of competence to a question of integrity."

Bob Runciman did the honourable thing. He showed integrity and he stepped aside until his name was actually cleared. In light of the fact that Minister Kwinter has commented on a case that is before the province's special investigations unit, will you ask Minister Kwinter to do what is honourable, to show integrity and resign?

Hon Mr McGuinty: Minister Kwinter has my full support.

ELECTRICITY RESTRUCTURING

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My next question, of course, is also about hydroelectricity. I simply want to ask this question: Given that hydro privatization was such a disaster under Mike Harris, that privatization and deregulation in California was such a disaster, why do you think that by simply taking the Conservative policy and wrapping some red ribbons around it, hydro privatization and deregulation will suddenly be a success for you?

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The Minister of Energy.

Hon Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader): The member opposite just doesn't get it. We are regulating the price of electricity. We are using the base assets to manage that. We do need private investment in new supply to help us meet the demand we'll have for approximately 25,000 new megawatts of power in the next 16 years. We have to have that.

1500

The other thing the member wants to do is prevent the development of renewable electricity. All of that is happening in the private sector. It's happening on small farms with biomass; it's happening on larger farms with wind; it's happening all over the world. This model not only rejects the California model, it makes sure it will never happen here in Ontario. Unlike the member opposite, this party understands what went wrong there, and when you look at this legislation, you'll see that we reject the California model. We adopt an Ontario model that will prevent a 40% increase in the price of electricity like we had under Mr Hampton's NDP government in the early 1990s.

Mr Hampton: This government obviously wants to try to take the debate anywhere but the debate on priva-

tization. Public power does not rule out energy efficiency; in fact, it accommodates it. It does not rule out alternative energy; in fact, it accommodates it.

I just want to point out to you: After California got in trouble with the privatization and deregulation move, what did they do? They created the California Power Authority, but it hasn't brought power rates down. California is going to continue to pay those very high rates for many years.

So I ask the minister again, since you've adopted Mike Harris's hydro privatization scheme lock, stock and barrel—yes, you've put a few red ribbons around the side—how do you think you can make this any more affordable than it was under the Conservatives when people's hydro bills skyrocketed? How do you plan to make hydro privatization look different now?

Hon Mr Duncan: I'll try to explain it as simply as I can to the member opposite. Unlike California, we're regulating price and we're using our hydroelectric and nuclear assets to do that. I would say to the member opposite, the Ontario Clean Air Alliance has endorsed our plan, the Consumers Council of Canada has endorsed our plan, and Constellation NewEnergy has endorsed our plan. We have had letters of support from the Dominion Bond Rating Service Ltd. What do you have against them?

I'd also say to the member opposite, somebody who opposes our plan was Tom Adams. He was a full supporter of the previous government's plan.

Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe-Grey): No, he wasn't.

Hon Mr Duncan: Oh, yes, he was. Let me tell you what he said. Here's what he said to the standing committee on resources development: "We are strongly in favour" of Bill 35. "In our view, there is no serious alternative to Bill 35 as it applies to electricity."

I know that you're onside with him. He's opposed to our bill, because we're undoing Bill 35 and we're undoing the mess you left when you had the chance to fix it.

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Ms Laurel C. Broten (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): My question is for the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet. Minister, today the Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ann Cavoukian, tabled her annual report. In the past, the Information and Privacy Commissioner has sharply criticized governments for failing to protect privacy and for deliberately interfering with access to information. In fact, in one instance, the former government was found to have committed a prima facie contempt of the Legislature for impeding the work of the commissioner. Protecting citizens' privacy as well as ensuring government's transparency are important issues to all Ontarians, and I would ask the minister what judgment has been borne with respect to the conduct of our government by the Information and Privacy Commissioner over the last eight months.

Hon Gerry Phillips (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): I might begin, on behalf of the Leg-

islature, by thanking the commissioner for her work. She's an officer of this Legislature, and she and her staff do fine work on our behalf in an important area.

I was pleased that the commissioner and her staff recognized some of the moves we've made as a new government to improve transparency and accountability while protecting personal privacy. In her report, she points out, "The first throne speech from the new government brought a renewed commitment to open and accessible government with the creation of a Democratic Renewal Secretariat." She goes on to point out, "One of the most important actions was the new Ontario government's introduction of the Health Information Protection Act." She also points out that the government "acted quickly to return Hydro One and Ontario Power Generation to the list of institutions covered by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act."

I was pleased that the commissioner recognized the initial moves we've made, and we will continue to improve the access to information and protection of privacy.

Ms Broten: In the commissioner's report Privacy and Access: A Blueprint for Change, she raises a number of important privacy issues left unresolved by the previous government and which need to be addressed by our government. For example, she calls for private sector privacy legislation, open meetings and reformation of the issues management process. Minister, what is our government doing to address these important and outstanding privacy issues?

Hon Mr Phillips: Thank you again to the member from Etobicoke-Lakeshore. We, like everyone else, received this report just today. Obviously, we'll want a chance to review her recommendations. I will say, though, that we are acting on a number of the areas. One of her recommendations is protection of privacy for private companies. Minister Watson is looking at that and monitoring the performance in BC and Alberta.

As you know, we made some amendments to the Municipal Act to ensure that more open meetings take place in municipalities. We have established a Democratic Renewal Secretariat. One of its key functions is to make sure that our government is transparent, accountable and open. The minister will continue to pursue that.

On behalf of the Legislature, we take seriously the recommendations she's made. We've already made some very significant steps, as she points out on page 1 of her recommendations, and we will be following up on the recommendations she's got in this report.

AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. You've tried to explain away the largest agricultural budget cut in the history of the province of Ontario by saying the drop is due to the end of a few special programs, one being the funding to farmers affected by BSE, or mad cow disease. The money you promised to the industry has yet to flow, and

now the possibility of any future funds going directly to farmers has been written off.

Today, Alberta cattle farmers are complaining that the government funds allocated went to the processors rather than to front-line producers, one American company reportedly receiving \$33 million. Minister, will the Ontario farmers suffer the same as their Alberta counterparts and see the only money you allocate to BSE go to big industry? And how can you accept the cut to your budget when you know the borders are still closed and the farmers are still in need of assistance?

Hon Steve Peters (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I've never heard a question so much all over the board. Let's just deal with BSE. In Ontario—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Does the member for Oxford need an answer?

Mr Hardeman: Yes, Speaker.

The Speaker: Then you should let me listen to the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon Steve Peters: I'd encourage the member, for starters, to sit down and review the detailed estimates that have been tabled today, because some of the figures he's using are not accurate.

It's important to demonstrate as well that we have flowed over \$92 million of Ontario money toward assisting the farmers of this province. As well, we signed the agricultural policy framework in December 2003, about which your previous minister couldn't come to an agreement with the federal government. We were able to come to an agreement with the feds and we have an agreement in place that has benefited farmers all across Canada, because with the signing on of Newfoundland and Labrador two weeks ago negative margins are now being covered. You weren't able to achieve that. This government, because of a new spirit of co-operation with the federal government, was able to achieve that.

As well, we're going to be announcing funding in the very near future for the mature animal program, which is going to help increase slaughter capacity in this province.

Mr Hardeman: Minister, you also stated that the agriculture budget cut is a result of the signing of the agricultural policy framework and the money it will save the provincial government. Well, some farmers still have an issue with the way the CAIS program pays out safety net funding in their commodities. Farmers who grow grains and oilseeds are concerned they will no longer have the market revenue program when it runs out. Fruit and vegetable growers worry about the self-directed risk management.

Minister, your election platform stated that these safety net companion programs would continue until new programs were developed, tested and proven. Will you, in the face of this massive budget cut—incidentally, 20% of your budget—tell the farmers of Ontario that you will continue to fund these programs, as you promised? Would you make it a straight answer—it's not a convoluted question—yes or no? Will you support Ontario farmers with the Ontario safety net programs that you promised?

1510

Hon Mr Peters: Again, I encourage the member to review the detailed estimates because, for the first time in years in this province, we're actually going to be putting capital dollars into assisting agricultural operations across Ontario, something your government didn't follow through on. We're going to come to the table with nutrient management money.

As well, I'd encourage the honourable member to have a look at what Agricorp is doing right now. They have a working discussion document out there that is looking at a price insurance model modelled on the Alberta program. Have a look at that. We'd very much welcome your comments on that. As well, I'd encourage the member to talk to the Ontario Agricultural Commodity Council because we have been working and we are looking at trying to develop a replacement program for the market revenue program. We are looking toward developing a new program for SDRM.

I would encourage the member to get out of his high seat here in the House, get out and start talking to farmers and realize how we are consulting, we are working. We're going to make sure—

The Speaker: Thank you. New question.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): My question is to the Minister of Health. You have stood in this House on several occasions and talked about the need for accrediting foreign-trained doctors. You have written letters to me stating the same thing, that we need to accredit them, and you have said, quite rightly, that it is the fastest, easiest way that we can get the 4,000 doctors we need in this province, because there are 4,000 of them here.

On May 26, Brad Sinclair from the Ontario International Medical Graduate Clearinghouse—that's a mouthful—was quoted in the Toronto Sun as stating, "Could we do more? I suspect we could, but it's a question of resources and the actual capacity to assess these people." My question to you, Mr Minister, is, when are they going to get the resources so we can get the doctors we need?

Hon George Smitherman (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I find it interesting to hear questions about doctors from a representative of the New Democratic Party, since the fact of the matter is that the biggest reason we have a doctor shortage in this province is the decision they made while they were in government to shut down the production line for doctors.

But on the matter the member raises, which is about the assessment and training of international medical graduates, I first mention to the member that there will be an announcement from our government next week. We have firmly committed to a further enhancement of our capacity to assess and train foreign-trained doctors. I think it's important to note that doctors come to our land—there's an estimate of 1,400 foreign-trained

doctors in our province, not 4,000—from 1,500 different medical schools around the world. There is, across the world, no common assessment that tells us, frankly, whether a doctor who has been produced at this school meets a standard that we would consider to be appropriate for Ontario.

But on the key point, I agree with the member that we need to enhance our capacity to assess and train foreign-trained doctors, and that's why we've committed to do that in our government's budget, increasing the number to 200.

Mr Prue: On Saturday, June 12, just a couple of days ago, Jan Wong in the Globe and Mail wrote quite a brilliant little article, and I'd like to quote some parts of it.

Number one: "Canada encourages people such as Dr. Zafar to immigrate. But then it erects licensing barriers that take years to overcome, if ever. Incredibly, top scorers on the written exam aren't even guaranteed a spot in the subsequent round of clinical tests."

She goes on to say, "The Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons, once an obstacle to foreign doctors, is now urging expanded accreditation," and then goes on to talk about how these people are so frustrated that they are taking the unusual step of a class action suit with a lawyer living in my riding, Ms Doobay, and says, "She thinks she'll win too. In 2001, five foreign doctors, including two who staged hunger strikes, brought a similar complaint before the BC Council of Human Rights. In 2002, the council awarded compensation ranging from \$7,500 to more than \$60,000."

My question is, is this the unusual step these doctors have to take to be accredited? Do they have to go to court, or are you going to change the laws?

Hon Mr Smitherman: The member opposite obviously has no understanding of the issue at hand. Change the laws? What would you wish me to do: in the sweep of a hand say that anyone who presents and says, "Hey, I'm a foreign-trained doctor. Where do I get to practise in Ontario?"—that's not the way it works. Regrettably, it's a complex situation, because we have an obligation to ensure that these foreign-trained doctors are trained to a standard that all of us in Ontario would wish to see in our communities. So it is a little more complex than the member presents.

The fact of the matter is that as a government, we're enormously committed to this because, like all members, we know people in our communities who have skills and abilities that they want to put to work on behalf of Ontarians, and we want them to do that too. That's why we're moving forward, doubling the number of spots that are available for training for international medical graduates to 200. This expansion is significant. This expansion comes at a significant fiscal cost, but on this file we know that we have more to do. That's why next week we'll make an announcement at the Ontario International Medical Graduate Clearinghouse, which for the first time brings together all of those doctors in one place so that we can assess them against one another and have the

capacity to produce more of them in communities all across the province of Ontario.

QUALITY OF LIFE

Mr Mario G. Racco (Thornhill): My question is for the Minister of Finance. My Thornhill constituents have many concerns about the future of our province. They are particularly concerned about their future quality of life for themselves and their children. Canada has always prided itself on the high quality of life that its citizens have, something recognized by the United Nations. Our quality of life is determined by many things, including health, education, economic development and transportation. Mr Minister, what public investments are we making to improve a family's quality of life in Ontario?

Hon Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance): Perhaps the best way to answer that is to make specific reference to my friend's riding, the riding of Thornhill. I know it fairly well because I represented part of that area from 1987 to 1990.

Specifically in the community of Thornhill, as a result of the initiatives we've taken in the budget, I think my friend is going to see, immediately, improvement in what goes on with the children who are in schools in that area. I think he knows the need for health care facilities right across York region and certainly in the city of Vaughan, and that family health teams and perhaps a community health care centre may be located in that area.

Perhaps one of the biggest issues, the one that affects people every day, is that as we start to fund a new generation of public transit, the gridlock that grips his community, my communities and so many of the GTA communities is going to start being relieved by very high-quality public transit.

Mr Racco: I agree that we must have good services to maintain a high quality of life in the province. However, we must also work toward lowering our accumulated deficit, a debt left to us by the previous NDP and PC governments. It is my understanding that the interest alone is costing taxpayers approximately \$11 billion, and if we would use that \$11 billion, we would build all the subways we need in the GTA. But we can't.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Just impose more health taxes.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): The member from Niagara Centre, would you come to order, please.

Mr Racco: That \$11 billion could have been spent to build subways all over the province of Ontario. Tell my constituents of Thornhill, Minister, what we are doing to turn around our fiscal deficit that those two governments left us.

Hon Mr Sorbara: I'd be pleased to do that because I think it probably is the most significant theme in the budget that we presented a month ago today in this House.

Given our financial circumstances, we have had to bring in a new revenue mechanism called the Ontario health premium. But equally important, we are putting

into place a constraint on expenditures which will permit us only to raise expenditures at a rate of 1.9%, on average, over the course of the next four years. The fact is that as our revenues and as our economy strengthen, and we keep those tight controls on expenditures, we will get this province out of the deficit we inherited, we will end the deficit spiral and we will put Ontario back into good, strong financial health.

That is the main message in the budget that we presented, and I thank my friend for the question.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

Mr Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington): My question is for the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. On March 31, 77 days ago in this House in response to a question on the double-hatter firefighter issue, the minister said, "I have met with the professional firefighters and have told them that I would like to have mediation. If we can't do that, then I'm going to bring forward legislation."

Apparently, the minister has been unable to successfully establish a mediation process which would protect double-hatters' right to volunteer in their home communities. That being the case, why hasn't the minister introduced legislation, as he said he would 77 days ago?

Hon Monte Kwinter (Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services): I thank the member for his question. I'm sure he knows that municipalities have responsibility to provide an effective fire service for their citizens. We're also very mindful of the very valuable service that volunteers provide. Having said all of that, we think it's important that municipalities work through the collective bargaining process, that they do it in conjunction with their fire chiefs, with the professional firefighters and with the municipalities to come up with a resolution that will serve the people of Ontario in the most effective way.

1520

Mr Arnott: In this House, on March 31, the minister led us to believe that he was sympathetic and somewhat supportive of double-hatter firefighters. Now he has washed his hands of the issue. Action on this issue is needed immediately, before the House rises this summer. The minister must introduce legislation to protect double-hatters. I continue to receive calls from fire chiefs and firefighters across the province, asking for protection for double-hatters. The fire marshal of Ontario has recently reconfirmed his position, in a letter to me, that there needs to be legislation brought in to protect double-hatters. The minister's own policy adviser has written recently "that the number of two-hatters currently being utilized throughout the province is continuing to decline at a significant rate."

My question is very simple. How many more double-hatters will be forced to resign because of union threats, and how many more rural communities will be made less safe, before this government takes action to protect them?

Hon Mr Kwinter: The member has put forward two propositions. On the one hand he's saying, "How many

double-hatters do we have to have before it's an issue?" The other one is, "How can we keep communities safe?" They're not necessarily the same. I'm saying to you that my preference is that we work this out with the fire-fighters, with the fire chiefs and with the municipalities. In the meantime, the fire marshal is there in his responsibility to make sure that no citizen in Ontario is put at risk because of the lack of fire facilities.

TORONTO POLICE SERVICE

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): I have a question for the Premier. Premier, I continue to be very worried about what's happening on the Toronto Police Services Board. I've asked you repeatedly, and your minister repeatedly, to bring in special legislation to have Norm Gardner removed from the Toronto Police Services Board. As you know, it's in a crisis now, at a very critical time. Gardner cannot perform his duties because he has been suspended, yet he still refuses to resign. Now it appears that he spent taxpayers' money in a lavish fashion. So I've decided, because your minister won't move on it, to introduce a Fire Norm Gardner Act. It will be special legislation allowing you to remove this obstacle to better policing in this city. Premier, will you at least support my bill?

Hon Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): No, I will not support the bill. The minister himself has spoken to this time and time again. I agree entirely with the minister. We have a responsibility to respect due process. It is unfolding before us. It may not be as quickly as we desire, we may wish we had other options, but the fact of the matter is, due process counts for something in this province and in this country, and we will wait for it to unfold.

Ms Churley: I have to remind you, Premier, that when you were sitting in the opposition benches, you didn't worry about due process when you were calling on the then government to fire Eleanor Clitheroe from Hydro. Remember that? You can do the same thing here. It is your responsibility to be concerned about what's happening to the people of Ontario and the Toronto Police Services Board at this time. You've simply got to stop washing your hands of this problem. The provincial government appointed Norm Gardner and you can therefore pass legislation to fire him.

Premier, I can't tell you again how important this is right now, given what's going on in the Toronto Police Services Board. I know everybody's asking him to resign, but he won't do it. It's a big problem. His appointment is not up until December. Members of the board walked out because they couldn't get their way. Remember that? They broke quorum. I'm asking you again, will you support my bill to get rid of Norm Gardner so we can get the police services board in Toronto on track again?

Hon Mr McGuinty: It's really the kind of thing that the Attorney General should address, but there's something important about due process and the law. If we

decide that we're going to set it aside in this particular instance for this particular individual, where do we draw the line? I think it's important in this case, and each and every case, that we respect due process and the law. That's what we're going to do.

WATER QUALITY

Mrs Carol Mitchell (Huron-Bruce): My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday and today in this House, the leader of the third party questioned why, in the 2004 budget paper on page 44, water and waste water projects are considered to be programs contributing to healthier Ontarians. The leader of the third party does not seem to understand that programs and services that support healthier Ontarians are delivered through many ministries. Minister, can you please clarify for the benefit of the leader of the third party why municipal water and waste water projects are considered to be part of the programs contributing to healthier Ontarians?

Hon Leona Dombrowsky (Minister of the Environment): It's a very important question and I'm happy to have this opportunity to share with the members of this Legislature, the leader of the third party and the people of Ontario and to make very clear that I believe the Premier pointed out earlier today that keeping water safe to drink is a broader determinant of health. The Premier's words are backed up time and again throughout this very important document that this government is committed to implementing: the recommendations from Mr Justice O'Connor. Clearly—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Alvin Curling): Order, the member for Toronto-Danforth.

Hon Mrs Dombrowsky: Justice O'Connor made it very clear in his document that the distribution system is the final barrier before delivery to the consumer's tap. Even when the water leaving the treatment plant is of the highest quality, if precautions are not taken, its quality can seriously deteriorate. In extreme cases, dangerous contamination can occur. A well-maintained distribution system is a critical component of a safe drinking water system, and that is what we are committed to investing in for the people of Ontario.

Mrs Mitchell: It is interesting that the Minister of the Environment has pointed us to Commissioner O'Connor's reference to the importance of maintaining and upgrading water and waste water infrastructure to ensure our public's health. Does Commissioner O'Connor—

Interjection.

The Speaker: I'm going to warn the member for Toronto-Danforth. The next time I'll be naming you.

Mrs Mitchell: Minister, does Commissioner O'Connor make any reference to the province's responsibility to protect public health by funding water and waste water projects?

Hon Mrs Dombrowsky: Justice O'Connor provided the government of Ontario and the people of Ontario with

an excellent framework that I'm very proud to say we are committed to implementing. In the O'Connor document, Commissioner O'Connor clearly indicates in recommendation 78 that, "The provincial government should ensure that programs relating to the safety of drinking water are adequately funded." When we came to government, what we sadly came to understand was that the infrastructure in this province was in serious condition. So obviously this government, because of our priority in ensuring that we provide safe water for the people in the province, wants to ensure that they have the resources they need to make sure that happens.

SERVICES FOR DISABLED CHILDREN

Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Kitchener-Waterloo): My question is for the Minister of Children and Youth Services. Yesterday in response to a question from my colleague, you said you would be giving a 3% increase to the base funding of children's treatment centres. Certainly this is most welcome and appreciated. However, there is a need for multi-year funding in order to allow the centres to better respond to the needs of the children with cerebral palsy, spina bifida and other disorders. Furthermore, KidsAbility in Waterloo has a rapidly growing waiting list of children. It's presently at 900 children and will continue to grow. I'm asking you today, Minister, will you commit to multi-year funding and will you commit to providing KidsAbility with the funding to meet the unique needs of a growing community with a waiting list of more than 900 children?

Hon Marie Bountrogianni (Minister of Children and Youth Services, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I'd like to thank the member opposite for the question, and all the members from the Kitchener-Waterloo area for bringing this issue to my attention. This 3% annual funding will be multi-year funding. We know the needs out there for the treatment centres across the province.

As well, we will be giving \$24 million in capital funding for treatment centres across the province. The specific centres that will be receiving this money, that information, will come out in the weeks ahead.

1530

PETITIONS

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

Mr Cameron Jackson (Burlington): I have a petition, signed by several thousand residents of Burlington, to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas,

"Elimination of OHIP coverage will mean that many of the 1.2 million patients who use chiropractic will no longer be able to access the health care they need;

"Those with reduced ability to pay—including seniors, low-income families and the working poor—will be

forced to seek care in already overburdened family physician offices and emergency departments" in hospitals;

"Elimination of OHIP coverage is expected to save \$93 million in expenditures on chiropractic treatment at a cost to government of over \$200 million in other health care costs" as a result; and

"There was no consultation with the public on the decision to delist chiropractic services;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reverse the decision announced in the May 18, 2004, provincial budget and maintain OHIP coverage for chiropractic services, in the best interests of the public, patients, the health care system, government and the province."

This petition has my signature of support.

OPTOMETRISTS

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

"Whereas the last funding agreement between the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care and the Ontario Association of Optometrists expired March 31, 2000; and

"Whereas the optometric fees for OHIP-insured services remain unchanged since 1989; and

"Whereas the lack of any fee increase for 15 years has created a crisis situation for optometrists; and

"Whereas fees for OHIP services do not provide for fair or reasonable compensation for the professional services of optometrists in that they no longer cover the costs of providing eye examinations; and

"Whereas it is in the best interests of patients and the government to have a new funding agreement for insured services that will ensure the most vulnerable members of society are able to receive the eye care they need;

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

"That the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care resume negotiations immediately with the OAO and appoint a mediator to help with the negotiation process in order to ensure that the optometrists can continue to provide quality eye care services to patients in Ontario."

This was sent to me by the Ontario Association of Optometrists. I agree with the petition, and I have affixed my signature to it.

MUNICIPAL RESTRUCTURING

Mrs Maria Van Bommel (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex): I have a petition here that says:

"Whereas the citizens of Kent county and Chatham had no direct say in the creation of the municipality of Chatham-Kent in 1997; and

"Whereas the Ontario government, by regulation and legislation, forced the amalgamation in accordance with the Meyboom report against the will of the elected local and county officials; and

“Whereas the municipality has not delivered the promised streamlined, more efficient and accountable local government, nor the provision of improved services at reduced costs;

“Therefore be it resolved that we, the undersigned, demand that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario immediately rescind the forced amalgamation order and return our local municipal government to the citizens in a two-tier model of government to be approved by referendum by the electorate....”

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): I’m pleased to present a petition on behalf of the campground recreational vehicles coalition: Al Robinson, Roger Faulkner, Gary Bruno, Melissa Cline and Brad Campkin. It reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas recreational trailers kept at parks and campgrounds in Ontario are being assessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corp (MPAC) and are subject to property taxes; and

“Whereas owners of these trailers are seasonal and occasional residents who contribute to the local” tourist “economy ... without requiring significant municipal services; and

“Whereas the added burden of this taxation will make it impossible for many families of modest income to afford their holiday sites at parks and campgrounds;

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

“That these seasonal trailers not be subject to retroactive taxation for the year 2003; and that the tax not be imposed in 2004; and that no such tax be introduced without consultation with owners of the trailers, trailer parks, municipal governments, businesses, the tourism sector and other stakeholders.”

I’m pleased to sign and endorse this on behalf of the thousands of people looking forward to summer holidays.

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

Mr Kim Craitor (Niagara Falls): I’m pleased to table this petition on behalf of my constituents and residents who have asked me to do so. It contains 1,700 signatures and is asking the government to consider supporting chiropractic services under the OHIP plan.

Mrs Elizabeth Witmer (Kitchener-Waterloo): I have a petition here for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Re: support for chiropractic services in Ontario health insurance plan

“Whereas,

“Elimination of OHIP coverage will mean that many of the 1.2 million patients who use chiropractic will no longer be able to access the health care they need;

“Those with reduced ability to pay—including seniors, low-income families and the working poor—will be

forced to seek care in already overburdened family physician offices and emergency departments;

“Elimination of OHIP coverage is expected to save \$93 million in expenditures on chiropractic treatment at a cost to government of over \$200 million in other health care costs; and

“There was no consultation with the public on the decision to delist chiropractic services;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reverse the decision announced in the May 18, 2004, provincial budget and maintain OHIP coverage for chiropractic services, in the best interests of the public, patients, the health care system, government and the province.”

I affix my signature here as well.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

“Because social assistance rates were slashed by 21.6% in 1995, and with the increase in the cost of living, that cut is worth about 34.4% today; and

“Because current social assistance rates do not allow recipients to meet their cost of living; and

“Because the people of Ontario deserve an adequate standard of living and are guaranteed such by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and

“Because the jury at the inquest into the death of Kimberly Rogers recommended that social assistance rates be reviewed so that they reflect the actual costs of living;

“We demand that the Ontario government immediately increase the shelter portion of Ontario Works and Ontario disability support program benefits to the average Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp rent levels and index social assistance to the cost of living.”

I agree with the petitioners and I have signed the petition as well.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr Jeff Leal (Peterborough): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas recreational trailers kept at parks and campgrounds in Ontario are being assessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corp (MPAC) and are subject to property taxes; and

“Whereas owners of these trailers are seasonal and occasional residents who contribute to the local tourism economy without requiring significant municipal services; and

“Whereas the added burden of this taxation will make it impossible for many families of modest income to afford their holiday sites at parks and campgrounds;

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

“That these seasonal trailers not be subject to retroactive taxation for the year 2003; and that the tax not be imposed in 2004; and that no such tax be introduced without consultation with owners of the trailers and trailer parks, municipal governments, businesses, the tourism sector and other stakeholders.”

I'll affix my signature to this petition.

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

Mr Jim Wilson (Simcoe-Grey): A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Re: support for chiropractic services in Ontario health insurance plan:

“Whereas,

“Elimination of OHIP coverage will mean that many of the 1.2 million patients who use chiropractic will no longer be able to access the health care they need;

“Those with reduced ability to pay—including seniors, low-income families and the working poor—will be forced to seek care in already overburdened family physician offices and emergency departments;

“Elimination of OHIP coverage is expected to save \$93 million in expenditures on chiropractic treatment at a cost to government of over \$200 million in other health care costs; and

“There was no consultation with the public on the decision to delist chiropractic services;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reverse the decision announced in the May 18, 2004, provincial budget and maintain OHIP coverage for chiropractic services, in the best interests of the public, patients, the health care system, government and the province.”

I agree and I've signed this petition.

Mr Kevin Daniel Flynn (Oakville): I have a petition I'd like to table today from some constituents in the riding of Oakville, where they call upon the provincial government to not delist chiropractic services.

There are 220 signatures affixed.

1540

HEALTH CARE

Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Liberal government has announced in their budget that they are delisting key health services such as routine eye exams, chiropractic and physiotherapy services,

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

“To reverse the delisting of eye exams, chiropractic and physiotherapy services and restore funding for these important and necessary services.”

I sign my name in full support.

ONTARIO BUDGET

Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a petition from my constituents in Parry Sound-Muskoka and it reads:

“Taxpayer protection:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the McGuinty government's 2004 budget will break the taxpayer protection law by not conducting a referendum on tax increases; and

“Whereas Dalton McGuinty signed an election pledge on September 11, 2003, not to raise taxes without the explicit consent of voters through a referendum; and

“Whereas Dalton McGuinty promised in TV ads not to raise taxes by one penny on working families; and

“Whereas Dalton McGuinty pledged in writing to obey the taxpayer protection law, which requires a referendum before increasing taxes;

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

“To ensure that all of the McGuinty government's tax increases are put before the people of Ontario in a referendum.”

I support this petition and affix my signature to it.

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

Mr John Yakabuski (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): I too have a petition supporting chiropractic services in Ontario.

“Whereas,

“Elimination of OHIP coverage will mean that many of the 1.2 million patients who use chiropractic will no longer be able to access the health care they need;

“Those with reduced ability to pay—including seniors, low-income families and the working poor—will be forced to seek care in already overburdened family physician offices and emergency departments;

“Elimination of OHIP coverage is expected to save \$93 million in expenditures on chiropractic treatment at a cost to government of over \$200 million in other health care costs; and

“There was no consultation with the public on the decision to delist chiropractic services;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reverse the decision announced in the May 18, 2004, provincial budget and maintain OHIP coverage for chiropractic services, in the best interests of the public, patients, the health care system, government and the province.”

I support this petition, and I've signed my name to it.

FISH HATCHERY PROGRAM

Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa): I have a petition that reads:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ministry of Natural Resources' provincial fish hatchery program annually stocks over 10

million fish into 1,200 water bodies within the province of Ontario; and

“Whereas provincial fish hatcheries contain unique genetic strains of indigenous fish species; and

“Whereas recreational fishing is a multi-billion-dollar industry and a huge contributor to tourism and the economy throughout the province of Ontario; and

“Whereas the world-class Great Lakes salmon fishery, as well as many local fisheries throughout the province, are dependent on the Ministry of Natural Resources’ fish stocking program;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, respectfully petition the government of Ontario and the Minister of Natural Resources to refrain from any cutbacks or cancellations to this provincially significant program.”

I affix my name in support.

CHIROPRACTIC SERVICES

Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have received thousands of petitions to do with chiropractic services from my constituents in Parry Sound-Muskoka. This reads:

“To: Legislative Assembly of Ontario

“Re: support for chiropractic services in Ontario health insurance plan:

“Whereas,

“Elimination of OHIP coverage will mean that many of the 1.2 million patients who use chiropractic will no longer be able to access the health care they need;

“Those with reduced ability to pay—including seniors, low-income families and the working poor—will be forced to seek care in already overburdened family physician offices and emergency departments;

“Elimination of OHIP coverage is expected to save \$93 million in expenditures on chiropractic treatment at a cost to government of over \$200 million in other health care costs; and

“There was no consultation with the public on the decision to delist chiropractic services;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to reverse the decision announced in the May 18, 2004, provincial budget and maintain OHIP coverage for chiropractic services, in the best interests of the public, patients, the health care system, government and the province.”

I support this petition and sign it.

WATER QUALITY

Mr John Yakabuski (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): I have a petition concerning the new Ontario Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002, Ontario regulation 170/03.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ontario government is implementing regulation 170/03, and in doing so will affect town halls, churches and private property owners including small

businesses, local community centres and campgrounds; and

“Whereas meeting the requirements of regulation 170/03 has meant and will mean excessive costs and financial burdens for all drinking water system owners; and

“Whereas there is no demonstrated proof that this new regulation will improve drinking water that has been and continues to be safe in rural municipalities; and

“Whereas Ontario regulation 170/03 was passed without adequate consultation with stakeholders throughout Ontario; and

“Whereas stakeholders should have been consulted concerning the necessity, efficacy, economic, environmental and health impacts on rural Ontario;

“Therefore, be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario abandon the implementation of and immediately repeal regulation 170/03, as well as amending the pertinent enabling legislation.”

I support this petition, and I affix my name to it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADAMS MINE LAKE ACT, 2004

LOI DE 2004

SUR LE LAC DE LA MINE ADAMS

Mrs Dombrowsky moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 49, An Act to prevent the disposal of waste at the Adams Mine site and to amend the Environmental Protection Act in respect of the disposal of waste in lakes / Projet de loi 49, Loi visant à empêcher l'élimination de déchets à la mine Adams et à modifier la Loi sur la protection de l'environnement en ce qui concerne l'élimination de déchets dans des lacs.

Hon Leona Dombrowsky (Minister of the Environment): I'm delighted to have the opportunity to open third reading debate on what I consider to be a very important piece of legislation. I would like to say at the beginning that I will be sharing this hour with my colleagues the member from Brampton Centre, the member from Etobicoke North, the member from Prince Edward-Hastings and the member from Perth-Middlesex.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the progress of what I believe is an important piece of legislation. Bill 49, the Adams Mine Lake Act, will protect and improve upon the high standard of living enjoyed by Ontarians. The Adams Mine Lake Act shows that the McGuinty government is serious in its commitment to protecting health and the quality of life in our great province.

All Ontario residents deserve to live in safe, clean, livable communities. The Adams Mine Lake Act, which puts an end to the Adams mine landfill proposal, is long overdue. Local residents have long voiced concerns about the project and its potential effects on their communities. They need to be able to get on with their

lives, secure in the knowledge that the proposed landfill has been stopped once and for all. We have listened to their concerns, and we have acted.

In just a few moments, I will speak about the actions we have taken. I will also update the Legislature on the contents of Bill 49 by outlining three amendments that were made following the clause-by-clause review conducted by the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly on June 3, 2004. But first, I want to remind honourable members of the context for Bill 49.

On April 5, I announced a new waste diversion strategy for Ontario. The strategy included a commitment to release a discussion paper this spring that would serve as the basis for public discussion of options to achieve Ontario's 60% diversion target. The strategy also promised the appointment of an expert panel to make recommendations on ways to improve the environmental assessment process.

Ontario must improve upon its current 28% waste diversion rate. While we have made good progress, we are still sending more than nine million tonnes of waste for disposal each year. This is material that is not being managed but is simply being deposited in our precious lands or in landfills beyond our jurisdiction. This is clearly an unacceptable situation.

1550

Earlier this month, I released a discussion paper on waste diversion. It will serve as the basis for a series of public forums we are holding across the province, and the first one will be in Kingston on Friday. We want to hear from Ontarians about how we can meet the new waste diversion target.

One of our top priorities is improving diversion rates for organic materials. Organics are now a large part of the waste stream. Organics account for 38% of municipal waste and 11% of industrial, commercial and institutional waste.

Clearly, any successful waste management strategy must include effective management of organics. Getting a handle on organics will take us a long way toward meeting our diversion goals. We are seeking input on a number of questions related to organics, including a phased-in ban on these and other recyclable materials that find their way to landfills, new means and technologies for collecting and processing organic material, and sustainable markets for products made from processed organic material.

The discussion paper also examines how to get a renewed commitment to waste diversion from the industrial, commercial and institutional sector. While we have regulations in place that require source separation in some industrial and commercial sectors, there has been much more emphasis on the residential blue box program. We are proposing to review the regulations that apply to the industrial and commercial sectors and enforce them more consistently. We also propose that the largest waste generators be required to publicly report their waste diversion rates and to phase in public reporting of waste diversion rates by other waste generators on a sector-by-sector basis. We are consulting on the best

ways of providing training to small businesses to enable them to increase the amount of waste they divert.

New waste diversion technologies clearly must be a part of the solution. In the discussion paper, we raise the issue of streamlining the approvals process under the Environmental Protection Act for such technologies. Reducing packaging and increasing the recycled content in products and packaging is another important opportunity. This is an important opportunity to explore in those areas. We want to hear about how we can improve programs in this area by working with other levels of government.

Finally, as with all efforts aimed at protecting our land, air and water, we need strong public co-operation and participation if we are to succeed. I believe that the people of the province of Ontario very much want that leadership. They want to participate, to protect our environment for future generations. The discussion paper outlines the need to work with stakeholders to deliver effective public education on reducing, reusing and recycling.

Our approach to waste management also addresses some of the underlying issues that have been a source of uncertainty in Ontario's environmental assessment process. I will shortly announce the membership of an expert advisory panel to identify ways to improve the environmental assessment process. We want to provide greater certainty and timeliness while maintaining or enhancing environmental protection. As well, we have entered into a draft framework agreement with the federal government to coordinate the environmental assessments of projects that are subject to both the provincial and federal processes.

The Adams Mine Lake Act gives us an opportunity to put an end to a project that is symbolic of the larger problems with waste management in Ontario. The proposed legislation amends the Environmental Protection Act to prevent the use of lakes as landfills. For the purposes of Bill 49, a lake includes a body of surface water that results from human activities, that directly influences or is influenced by groundwater, and that includes land that is covered by water on the date the proposed legislation comes into effect.

Bill 49 will revoke any approvals and permits related to the Adams mine project that were issued by the Ministry of the Environment prior to the effective date of the legislation. It will also nullify any applications for permits under consideration by the ministry as of the date the legislation comes into effect. The legislation will extinguish any agreements of purchase or any sale of the adjacent crown land that may have been entered into between the Ministry of Natural Resources and the owner of the Adams mine.

Any related legal action against the crown that may exist on the effective date of the legislation is extinguished by the legislation. It will also prevent any further legal action being taken against the crown as a result of the legislation.

Bill 49 also outlines a plan to provide reasonable compensation for the owner of the Adams mine proposal. The

bill also makes it clear that the Adams mine property is not being expropriated. I believe this bill protects the environment and people of Ontario, while being fair to the owner of the Adams mine.

The health and well-being of the people of Ontario is our overriding concern. The local community has voiced concerns that they believe the Adams mine landfill would contaminate their ground and surface water supplies.

For this government, the protection of our water resources is paramount. At the end of the day, we remain unconvinced that the Adams mine proposal can be operated safely to protect the environment. We promised to address the situation, and we did. I believe Bill 49 gives Ontarians the confidence that their environment is being protected and that their interests are being addressed by the government.

I would now like to bring the honourable members up to date on Bill 49's progress. Hearings on Bill 49 were held by the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly on May 20 in Windsor and May 21 in Milton. A total of 18 presentations were made to the committee over those two days. I was happy to participate in that process. I spoke to the committee in Windsor and participated in the clause-by-clause review on June 3.

As part of the review, I recommended three amendments to the Adams Mine Lake Act.

The first amendment allows Notre Development Corp to share in any compensation. Notre Development was the original owner of the Adams mine site. The amendment also provides limited compensation for expenses incurred, but not paid, prior to first reading of Bill 49.

The second amendment simply rearranges material already in the bill for ease of understanding; the material is related to reasonable expenses for which compensation will be paid.

The third amendment makes it clear that the primary focus of Bill 49 is the placement of waste in a lake. Without this change, the bill would have prohibited the use of waste disposal sites on which there was a large pond for the management of storm water, or on which there was a lake that was in no way related to the waste management operation.

These amendments were accepted by the committee.

I think it's also important to note, for the members of this assembly, that there were no additional motions for amendments made at the committee. There were none.

The point of Bill 49, the Adams Mine Lake Act, is to protect our environment and respect the wishes of our communities. I believe that when we vote on Bill 49, we have a great opportunity for all of us to make a real difference on behalf of Ontario's environment and on behalf of the people of Ontario.

I call on the members of the Ontario Legislature to support this bill that will protect our environment for generations to come.

1600

Mrs Linda Jeffrey (Brampton Centre): It is my pleasure to speak with regard to Bill 49, An Act to prevent the disposal of waste at the Adams Mine site and

to amend the Environmental Protection Act in respect of the disposal of waste in lakes.

I had the honour of chairing the hearings on this issue in Milton and Windsor, and I wanted to use the time I have today to talk about some of the delegations that appeared before us. I was very impressed with the candour particularly at the meetings, and the intelligence. I'm sure that other members who are here today who appeared and listened to the delegates were also very impressed with the quality of the delegates who came before us.

I want to talk about some of the delegations that appeared before us. One of the groups that came before us was the CAW. Their written submission and also their verbal submission indicated that the "CAW Windsor Regional Environmental Council represents more than 40,000 members on the issue of the environment.

"As an organization that represents members from Windsor to Sarnia, we have a unique understanding regarding the issue of waste disposal."

Although they had concerns about the way waste disposal from Toronto was being addressed and handled, they supported and applauded this bill as "a much-needed action to protect the traditional lands of northern Ontario."

They went on to tell us, "There is no debate that all landfills eventually contaminate our environment and pose a serious threat to our health. Therefore the government has a responsibility to take progressive, protective action on the issue of waste management."

Another individual who came before us was Daniel Acciavatti, a state representative in the Michigan House of Representatives. He came across the border to appear before our committee and spoke very eloquently about this issue. In particular, he was trying to represent his area in Michigan with regard to truck traffic, but he indicated that he felt, "What truly matters is whether the decision to abandon this particular site is followed by meaningful action that demonstrates both the vision and political will to get the job done."

He indicated to us that he was very impressed with Ontario's efforts to reduce the amount of waste going through the waste stream. He emphasized the provincial recycling programs and the other ways we want to reduce solid waste generation. He was also impressed by our decision to achieve an Ontario-wide diversion goal of 60% by 2008. He spoke quite a bit on that issue.

Another individual who appeared before us was Martha McSherry. She's from Kirkland Lake and is a member of the Responsible Environmental and Economic Prosperity Association—REEPA for short. This is a group that has existed for 15 years, since the Adams Mine site was first targeted for Toronto's waste in 1989. At that time, they felt that the pits were "in direct contact with groundwater, levelling off with the surrounding water table." They indicated to us that the "Adams Mine site is south of the Arctic watershed where water systems are divided, flowing north and south. Waters flowing from the Adams Mine site flow into a river system that

feeds a rich farm basin in south Timiskaming, which then flows into the Ottawa River valley....” They felt that Bill 49 was essential to protect the headwaters of that watershed. They thanked our committee, and the Liberal government in particular, and commended us for “taking the leadership to protect water in lakes from waste in the province of Ontario.”

They quoted Minister Dombrowsky as saying, “The endless proposals and challenges around the Adams Mine have created too much uncertainty, and for too long have drained the energy and resources of the local communities.”

At that time, Ms McSherry spoke about citizens opposing the dumping of waste and how they have spent valuable time, resources and energy protecting our environment, which could have been devoted to economic and social development in their own communities.

They spoke about “the Liberal government’s leadership for setting aggressive targets for diversion and recycling, with specific timelines....” They wanted to commend us for that.

In their concluding comments, REEPA commended the Liberal government for “their leadership in preventing the disposal of waste at the Adams Mine site, and to amend the EPA in respect of the disposal of waste in lakes.” They commended “the leadership around waste management in the province, setting targets and timelines.”

We also had a delegation from Mr Tom Adams, who is a councillor in ward 6 in the town of Oakville. He came to speak to us and also provided a written deputation, and I was impressed with his deputation as well. He spoke about the Adams Mine Lake Act and indicated that the “government is making good on its promise to deliver real, positive change to ensure that Ontario can rely on cleaner air, water and land. All Ontario residents deserve a cleaner environment in which to live, work and play.”

He indicated that he felt, “The Adams Mine Lake Act will close the door on a very controversial proposal; a proposal that worried thousands of residents throughout Ontario for its disrespect of the environment. Many people in Ontario were not convinced that the site was safe for use as a landfill. They were concerned that water contamination would result from the use of the site as a landfill.”

He spoke about the issue of Walkerton. He said, “One needs only to mention Walkerton to recall the damage that can result when governments fail to act to protect water quality for the people of Ontario.”

He spoke about Bill 49 intending “to prohibit the use of lakes as landfill sites, to prevent the use of the Adams mine site as a landfill and to deal with matters related to the government taking this action.” He said, “The proposed definition of a lake is to include surface water that results from human activities, and that is directly influenced by or influences groundwater. These are actions that I support. The use of any lake sites for landfill purposes in Ontario is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for local residents and unacceptable for future generations.”

Mr Adams also said, “Bill 49 is a good piece of legislation. In combination with the strategies to support a higher diversion rate from landfills” he felt the Liberal government was moving in the right direction. He said, “I know members of my community will support increasing the local diversion rates. I look forward to working with the provincial government to help find innovative ways to reduce, reuse, and recycle” within his community of Oakville, and he encouraged “every other community across Ontario to do the same. Encouraging the 3Rs makes sense, because it is a made-at-home solution to a made-at-home problem. We should all be responsible for solving our own problems.”

Another group that appeared before the committee was Northwatch. It’s a “regional coalition of environmental and citizen organizations and individual members in northeastern Ontario. Founded in January of 1988 ... has as a priority issues that are of a regional nature: energy use, generation and conservation, forest conservation and wild areas protection, waste management and water quality issues. In addition to acting on these issues as a representative body, Northwatch provides support to local citizens’ groups addressing these and other environmental concerns in their community.” They are “currently working with members and member groups to improve forest management, promote community involvement in mine monitoring and management, and prevent northeastern Ontario from becoming the receiving ground for foreign wastes, including Toronto’s garbage.”

We had a presentation by Pierre Bélanger in Milton. His statement was a very good one, I thought. He spoke very eloquently to the committee. Mr Belanger said:

“We wish to commend the Ontario government for this bold and forceful legislation which puts an end to an unrelenting assault on the Timiskaming watershed, the source of the water we drink and use for agriculture, business and leisure.

“We had come to a point where we despaired of ever finding common sense governance on this issue at Queen’s Park.”

He said that the “Adams mine proposal was fundamentally flawed at its very core. It proposed to dump 20 million tons of municipal waste over 20 years into a leaking fractured rock receptacle. This man-made receptacle has a depth of 600 feet, it extends deep into the aquifer. Indeed, while operating as a mine it required continuous round-the-clock pumping.”

He indicated, “The proposed landfill would have been located just south of the height of land where surface water flows either north to Hudson’s Bay or south to the Ottawa River watershed. The location guaranteed maximum damage to maximum area, had leakage occurred. This area’s lakes and rivers feed the Ottawa River—Pembroke, Arnprior, Renfrew and Ottawa’s drinking water source.”

1610

He indicated, “The proposal included no clay or plastic liners to either contain leachate or exclude contact with natural inflows of groundwater. Instead, it relied on

a highly engineered system to control volume of flow. Touted as 'state of the art,' the system consisted primarily of a granular drainage surround lining the pit walls, a perforated pipe collection network at the very bottom and a massive pumping station feeding a water treatment plant on the surface."

He said, "We applaud the government's forceful legislation."

There were a lot of really great delegations, but I have to say that some stood out head and shoulders above the others.

The Canadian Environmental Law Association also sent a body of writing to us and in their conclusions they said, "... CELA," which is the Canadian Environmental Law Association, "supports Bill 49 and commends the Legislature for attempting to terminate the intractable and highly polarized debate over the proposed Adams mine site landfill."

I'm happy to support Bill 49. I think it was the right thing to do, and I'm glad our government is taking action on it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Ted Arnott): I'm pleased to recognize the member for Etobicoke North.

Mr Shafiq Qaadri (Etobicoke North): Thank you, Speaker, and through you to the people of Ontario: It's a privilege, on behalf of the government side, to speak in support of Bill 49, the Adams Mine Lake Act, 2004.

There are a number of issues that are encompassed by this bill. It's an act to strengthen the Environmental Protection Act, preventing the use of lakes as landfill sites. It has components of just compensation; waste management of some organic waste products produced in Ontario. It is firmly in the public interest with a view to maintaining quality of life. In particular, it helps us deal with the contamination or the toxification of our environment that goes on when we, in a manner that's unchecked, store our solid, non-hazardous wastes.

As well, as has been stated by the Honourable Leona Dombrowsky, our Minister of the Environment, it is a symbolic action, a signal to Ontario, the individuals concerned in waste management and communities at large, that your government is working toward protecting the environment, all the while maintaining the public interest.

I might say that, for me, it's almost an issue of health care, because whereas it may not be directly related, say, to the health of the body, certainly it is to the health of the body politic and to the health of the province of Ontario. As was stated, we're dealing with a very significant amount of solid, non-hazardous waste, something like 20 million tonnes over 20 years.

Speaker, I will remind you, and through you to the people of Ontario, that it was Winston Churchill who said, "Politicians think of the next election, but statesmen think of the next generation." With that, I would like to salute our Minister of the Environment for making within this bill, which is receiving its third reading, choices that will affect not only the clear and present Ontarians of today but generations to come, in perpetuity.

I'd like, in that spirit, to quote for a moment from an American environmentalist, an individual who was born in 1920, Stewart Udall, and his thoughts on reading one of the great environmental tracts that was published about 100 ago, and that was, of course, *Walden Pond* by Henry David Thoreau. The quotation is as follows:

"The most common trait of all primitive peoples is a reverence for the life-giving earth, and the native American shared this elemental ethic: the land was alive to his loving touch, and he, its son, was brother to all creatures. His feelings were made visible in medicine bundles and dance rhythms for rain, and all of his religious rites and land attitudes savoured the inseparable world of nature and God, the master of life. During the long Indian tenure the land remained undefiled save for scars no deeper than the scratches of cornfield clearings or the farming canals of the Hohokams on the Arizona desert."

He goes on by saying, "A land ethic for tomorrow should be as honest as Thoreau's *Walden*, and as comprehensive as the sensitive science of ecology. It should stress the oneness of our resources and the live-and-help-live logic of the great chain of life. If, in our haste to 'progress,' the economics of ecology are disregarded by citizens and policy-makers alike, the result will be an ugly" country.

I take from this the lesson that in our haste to progress, in our haste for urban sprawl, in our haste to continue with the trappings of modern civilization, if we do not make adjustments to that frenetic pace, if we do not make adjustments to all the different aspects, whether it's our roads or our water systems or our waste management systems, then we in Ontario will be the poorer for it.

I mentioned as well that this is not a "one of" act. It is not simply dealing with one particular landfill site, the Adams mine site. It is not simply dealing with one particular waste management project. Actually, it is broadly to prevent the use of lakes as landfill sites. Of course, there are particulars that go with it, be it size and location and precisely what the water characteristics are, but it is a signal from this government, the McGuinty government, that the environment, unlike in the past, particularly in the eight years of the previous regime, which summarily and deliberately dismantled the Ministry of the Environment—as we understand it, the previous government actually ended up firing, dismissing, something in the order of about 30% of the Ministry of the Environment's staff. I think the people of Ontario will never forget some of the entirely avoidable tragedies that occurred because of those rash actions, including the most glaring, the Walkerton water tragedy.

I can say as well, as a biologist or in my physician capacity, that we often talk about the mixture of medications. For example, if a particular individual is taking, within his system alone, two, three, four, five different medications, sometimes health care practitioners are not aware of what the ultimate result will be, are not aware of what the ultimate cocktail, the mixture of medications, will lead to.

Very similarly, when you put 20 million tonnes of solid, apparently non-hazardous waste in a single site

over 20 years, despite all the various precautions that may be taken, there is no telling over time, whether it's seepage, mixtures, groundwater contamination, continued toxification, perhaps even air toxification, air pollution, what might result from this type of project, and this is what will end up happening over the future. As you'll recall, that's part of what we call the law of unintended consequences. It is for that very reason that we in the government are moving not only on this project here, the Adams mine landfill site, but also to prevent the use of lakes as landfill sites broadly across Ontario.

In summary, this is a strengthening of the Environmental Protection Act, all the while maintaining just compensation for the individuals who are involved as owners and proponents of this landfill site. It deals responsibly with waste management, all the while being guided by the underlying vision, the underlying philosophy of the public interest in maintaining our quality of life. In particular, it is a symbolic action, a signal to the people of Ontario that your government values its environment, that your government will act decisively for its protection for now and for future generations.

1620

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): I share my colleague's pleasure of being able to speak to this bill. This bill is to prevent individuals or corporations from taking garbage and putting it into a lake. You have to wonder what someone was thinking some years ago when they said, "Where's a good place to put our garbage, stuff that we don't know anything about? We don't know what's in the trucks. I know; let's put it in a lake." It just boggles my mind that someone would even think about that. I know the argument put forward, "We'll pump the water out of the mine so there won't be water in it." But it would seem to me—this is pretty elementary, I guess—that if water is coming into the mine, then there will be a stage when water will come back in, and if water goes in, water comes back out. I'm just boggled that this bill had to come forward.

I recall that in the previous Legislature there was a strong sense that the previous government wanted to put garbage into a lake. I can relate to that because in the community where I live there is a wonderful lake on the top of the hill called Oak Lake. There was a search going on, probably about 12 years ago, where they were looking to locate a dump, and one of the areas identified was Oak Lake. That certainly drew my interest, as it did all of the community's. I didn't live next to Oak Lake but I had a fair sense that a body of water such as that would affect a lot of people's drinking water. So a large public meeting was called and a large number of us showed up. The question I posed to some of the experts there was, "Where does the water come from that flows into Oak Lake?" The answer was, "We're not sure."

You see, one of the challenges in engineering is that if you're dealing with groundwater, you're dealing with unknown paths, unknown quantities. This is an aside, but I give a great deal of appreciation to the Minister of the Environment for bills dealing with not allowing people to

take any amount of water they want out of the ground, because we have no sense of how much water we have in Ontario. That's being determined now. We had no sense of how much water is actually being given or how much water was there to be used. So here on Oak Lake they didn't know where the water came from. They knew there were outlets in the lake but they didn't know where it went to, and yet it was being seriously considered. One just has to say, what was going through their minds to even consider using a lake as a garbage dump?

So this bill is being produced and it applies, thank goodness, to much more than just Adams Lake, but it applies to lakes and bodies of water in general, recognizing that if we take and pollute our rivers, that's very obvious to us, but when we take and we pollute a lake, we're going to have exactly the same effect on our environment somewhere. In the case of Oak Lake by our house, the experts believe that the water may in fact come literally thousands of miles; and being at the top of the hill, it's spring-fed, so obviously the original source of the lake, whatever is feeding it, is even higher than that. But we don't understand it. I might add as an aside that it's a lake that I have a great deal of respect for. It's a lake that I crossed one day in a snowmobile and learned that the ice was approximately one inch thinner than is necessary to support a snowmobile. So I realize that that's a very special lake and I want to keep it just the way it is, without my snowmobile or me at the bottom.

This is a very fair bill. This is a bill that provides compensation because the company that was proposing it in good faith believed that it was going to be approved. They did not realize how concerned Ontarians were about it. This isn't just a northern Ontario issue; this is an Ontario issue. Waste is an Ontario issue. First of all, I think I can say as Liberals that we were appalled at the concept that we can use northern Ontario to get rid of our garbage. That is certainly not the philosophy of this party. This party is not a GTA party or a southwestern Ontario party or a northern Ontario party; we're an Ontario party and we believe strongly that this is a provincial issue that's to be resolved, and not by putting garbage on railway cars and shipping north to one specific community. So the Adams mine company that was being led on to believe that they could in fact operate this and take the waste from Toronto will be fairly compensated. At the same time, other companies that are considering it in other areas have gotten the very clear message that this is not going to be tolerated in Ontario.

There are good exemptions in it that apply to where there's going to be solid material. Perhaps there's going to be blast rock or something put into a lake that will have no effect on the water. It's the quality of water that we're concerned about.

At the same time, as part of this bill it stops what was going to be a land giveaway by the former government for the land that surrounded the Adams mine—literally a land giveaway to enable a private firm to create a great deal of money while leaving a legacy of potentially polluted water.

Now, we know that with garbage dumps, while there's a great deal of control on them, there is always concern that there will be leaking out of the liner. Here in Adams mine, there would have been very little doubt that it would have influenced the groundwater.

If all that the minister did was stop the garbage going into our bodies of water, that would be a good bill. That alone would make this a good bill. But we're seeing much more going on in Ontario that works along with this to recognize the fact that although the one issue is not polluting the water in the mine, the other issue is that we have to come to grips with pollution in general, and with our garbage and waste disposal in Ontario.

If you want to get some sense of how much garbage we produce, we were in a store that is open 24 hours a day, and we happened to be there at about 2 in the morning when the aisles were just packed with boxes being unpacked and merchandise being put on the shelves. Very clearly, all of those boxes of items that were being opened, being put on the shelf, were replacing items that had been sold the previous day, because they do this every night. Every night they restock the shelves. That's waste with the packaging, with the cardboard boxes, with the items that will be taken home and used and ultimately disposed of.

The amount of garbage we produce is fantastic. It is easy to say, "Well, I don't produce garbage in my little community, so I really have no ownership in it." But when each of us purchases an automobile, somewhere where that automobile was produced, or where the components were produced, there was waste produced at the same time that we have responsibility for, we collectively have responsibility for, and we need to ensure that it's being dealt with properly.

Recycling started off great in this province. I think, if we look at pre-1990, we saw some great initiatives come out. That was the David Peterson government, I believe, prior to 1990, who came out with the recycling initiatives that accepted that, at first glance, it may not be economical to recycle. You can look at a specific product and say, "After it's collected, it's sold for less money than it cost to collect it," but that doesn't grasp the total picture. That doesn't recognize that by taking that item, not putting it into the waste stream, first of all, there's money saved and our environment's protected. I don't know what dollar you put on it, but that's certainly something that is highly significant to all of us, if it protects our groundwater and protects our land.

It also prevents other materials, if we're dealing with plastics, for example, that are made out of oil—we know the cost of oil, we know that it is not absolutely unlimited, and so the recycling offsets using new material. In general, you can take something such as plastic and recycle it using less energy than you initially used to produce it. So the recycling will produce that additional savings of lower energy costs. That's of concern to everyone in Ontario.

Also, from an engineering viewpoint, recycled material can often be much purer and cleaner than the

original material. The original material has been produced and they've got all of the pollutants and contaminants out of it, but in effect it gets a second run through the system, a second run through the filters. And so recycled material can be of a superior quality in most or in many cases to the original product. So we have to look beyond just what it costs us to pick up the blue boxes and take them to recycling. We have to capture the entire picture. Recycling very clearly has significant savings when you look at the total picture.

On the other hand, there is too often a belief that if we take and bury something, we can forget about it. They can put garbage somewhere in a hole in the ground, or do a landfill and cover it up, and it's gone. And we even have this idea—it's a wrong idea, often—that if we take and bury it, it all rots and it kind of turns to soil and it's actually not bad stuff. What happens when we bury our garbage is quite the opposite, folks.

1630

There's a landfill in my community, in what was formerly Sidney township. They took out some of the material that had been buried for 15 to 20 years. These green garbage bags are not just handy for us to put garbage in, which we view as a convenience. They also effectively prevent oxygen getting at anything inside of them. We opened up green garbage bags with newspapers in there that were 20 years old and we could read them clearly. We think newspapers will rot away quickly. They don't. The materials within the garbage bags tend to stay, except for the liquid portion. The liquid portions will leak out and make a cocktail that will destroy the water system in that community for generations and generations to come.

See, when the garbage truck stops at your driveway or lane and picks up the green bags, they don't know what is in it. It then gets taken and mixed with other green bags and other liquids. Chemicals are formed that create a cocktail, and we simply cannot in any way, shape or form predict what it will be. So taking it and burying it is not the right answer.

This government's decision that it will require 60% of our waste stream to be diverted to recycling is good for this generation, the next generation and every generation to come. It's the responsible thing to do, and it is attainable. It is not a number plucked out of the air. It is a number that will go a long way to address health costs, which are an issue, and to address our very survival and our flourishing as the best country in the world in which to live.

I applaud the minister for the Adams mine bill and for the associated legislation that will improve the situation in Ontario for all our future generations.

Mr John Wilkinson (Perth-Middlesex): I am pleased to join in the debate, following the Minister of the Environment and also the members from Brampton Centre, Etobicoke North and Prince Edward-Hastings.

The Lakota are an aboriginal people, a First Nation in this continent, and they have a wonderful saying that has been passed down from generation to generation: "We do

not inherit the environment from our grandparents, but rather we borrow it from our grandchildren.” I think this bill, Bill 49, speaks to the essence of that wisdom that has been handed down to us.

Today is the first day that I rise in this House in my new capacity as the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment, and I would like to start my comments by paying tribute to my predecessor. As you know, our friend and colleague, a friend of everyone in the House, the good member from Hamilton East, Dominic Agostino, passed away in March, tragically. It was a tremendous blow to this House, and I can tell you that it was a tremendous blow to the Liberal family that makes up part of this House. So it is an honour to have been asked by the Premier to take up the mantle that was so ably conducted by Dom in this House.

I'd like to say as well that I enjoy working with the minister. I have known the minister personally for many, many years. We went to the same high school. The minister will know that the good Sisters of Providence at Nicholson Catholic College in Belleville would be proud of us, that we are both here today in this Legislature. As Ms Mossop said, they were halcyon days when we were there. We were instilled, the two of us, and all our families—the minister's family from Tweed and my family from Trenton—with the need to serve, to serve our community. It wasn't enough just to take from our community; it was important that we give back, because much had been given to us in our generation and we owed an obligation back. In a sense, it fits in with my first comments, that we don't inherit the environment from our grandparents, that we are just borrowing it from our grandchildren.

The other thing I'd like to say, of course, is that I have appreciated the welcome I have received from my new colleagues at the Ministry of the Environment. Speaking from a historical point of view, the Ministry of the Environment really is an amazing ministry. It is a regulatory ministry. Like other parts of the government, it is a first line of defence. It is the will of the people expressed through legislation saying that some things must be protected and the government, as an expression of the will of the people, needs to pay attention to those things.

Our party has a tremendous legacy of environmental activism, and I speak of course to the dean of this Legislature, the Honourable Jim Bradley, who is now the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. During the Liberal administration between 1985 and 1990 he was really revolutionary, a leading proponent of changing this province to one where we would believe in and start to act on a sustainable future, where we would actually start caring more about our grandchildren than our pocket-books. So we have a high standard to meet.

It's tragic, because after Mr Bradley there were two other governments. I can speak specifically financially to the previous government, which made a decision—and they were duly elected to do so—to reduce the resources to the Ministry of the Environment, to reduce the number of people who worked at the Ministry of the Envi-

ronment. I think history has taught us all that when we turn our backs on the environment, the environment will come back and bite us, that it is not something we're allowed to turn our back on.

I'm happy to say that now it is a priority of our government. I think the greatest example of that is the budget: Just follow the money. I'm proud to say that in our budget we increased the funding to the Ministry of the Environment. In regard to their operating budget this year over last, they see an increase from \$260 million to \$304 million, and the capital budget of the ministry has gone from \$4 million to \$13 million—this in an environment where we are stretched to meet our fundamental requirements in regard to public education and public health. Despite the fact that we've had to make tough decisions, our priorities are outlined by where we allocate our fiscal resources.

Bill 49 is a first step. It isn't the be-all and end-all. It is just the first step of our government in regard to the environment. We have to reduce waste. That's why the minister has set a very ambitious target for the whole province to reduce waste by 60%. It is something we can do but it takes leadership and resources, something that our government is committed to. As well, we need to reform the environmental assessment process. We need to be able to solve local problems locally. Really, at the heart of the waste issue there is the question of, can we get somebody else to take our waste? Can we be not responsible for what we have done, what we have created, and try to shove it off to somebody else?

Whether it is in Michigan or going up a smokestack or being buried in an unsafe way, it's only natural, I suppose, for humans to take these things and try to find some other place to put them. But again, that defeats the wisdom of the ages we have received, because really we are just borrowing our environment from our grandchildren. These sins that we would perpetrate today will come back to haunt our grandchildren. We'll be long gone, our grandparents will be long gone—it's our grandchildren who have to deal with these issues. So the very thought that we would take millions and millions of tonnes of garbage, supposedly non-hazardous, and dump it in what everyone would agree, if it isn't a lake, is going to be a lake—that's what an open-pit mine is. Where you have a pit that goes below the aquifer, it's going to fill up with water. So I think this is the type of stuff we are looking toward as a first step to try to get our province back on a sustainable footing.

I would like to express my appreciation to the NDP for supporting this bill. They have been very constructive in committee. We have amendments that have come forward on the bill. Personally, I want to say that it was a great example of how it is possible in this place for parties to look for common ground to forward an initiative that we all agree on. But you know—

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): You give us so few opportunities.

Mr Wilkinson: I know we do but we're starting to work closer together. We'll leave it up to our federal cousins, perhaps, to have to work closer together.

I would like to speak on the position expressed by the official opposition in this House. I had a chance to review Hansard and what the other members from the official opposition, particularly the members for Nepean-Carleton and Whitby-Ajax—I read their critique of this bill with great concern. There are two things. One is property rights, and I think the member from Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant—I remember reading about this as well—stated that these property rights are being abrogated, and, as well, lost profits.

1640

Let's deal with the question of property rights. I remember when we were in committee in Windsor. I am not a member of the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly, but it just so happened that I was asked to help out that day. It was on June 3, actually, and there was a question that came up about property rights in the opposition. I left it to my good friend the member from Peterborough. Mr Leal, the member from Peterborough, is a great student of history. He remembers being in this place many years ago as a younger man. He enjoyed his time here and has ended up back in this place.

There was a question for a Mr FitzPatrick, who was a lawyer representing the Attorney General.

"The question of property rights"—this is Mr Leal's opinion—"is a bit of a red herring from my perspective. If you go back to the Constitution of 1982, when the Prime Minister of the day put property rights on the table, it was rejected principally by three Premiers—Sterling Lyon of Manitoba, Mr Davis of Ontario and Mr Lougheed of Alberta"—I might add, all Progressive Conservatives—"because they were concerned that if property rights were enshrined in the Constitution, provincial governments would never be able to expropriate for highways or hydro corridors, or municipalities wouldn't be able to get any roads.

"I am asking you as a lawyer"—this is Mr Leal asking the lawyer from the Attorney General—"to address this red herring that keeps getting thrown out" by the opposition. "Ask Mr McMurtry, who was the AG of the day for Ontario and helped to craft the Constitution. Trudeau," the Prime Minister, "put property rights on the table, and the Premier said, 'Get property rights off the table,' because of expropriation, for roads and hydro corridors and other things."

Mr FitzPatrick said, "I agree with what you said. It is my understanding that in the field of property and civil rights, provincial governments are empowered to do whatever they wish to do."

So there is no great protection of property rights as espoused by the opposition. There could have been property rights under the Constitution, but they were flatly rejected, particularly by Mr Davis and Mr McMurtry. I find it somewhat odd now that some people are great proponents of property rights. We are living north of the border, not south of it.

The other issue is one of lost profits. I am a businessman, a certified financial planner. We are saying to the proponent that we will give you fair compensation for

the money you put into this project. I am absolutely dead set against the concept that we would somehow come up with some idea of what the profits would have been and write a cheque from the good taxpayers of Ontario to the proponent of this proposition. I am a businessman. You take a risk. You win or you lose. There is no safety net in business. I think that we are being eminently fair to the proponent. It's a difficult decision, I agree. But the idea that somehow we should set a precedent in this House that we should be compensating people for lost profits is wrong. It is not, in my opinion, what this Legislature is all about.

I also want to talk about the three amendments. I think it is one of the strengths of the government that has been formed since, really, early November by our party that instead of rejecting going out to committee, instead of not listening to people, we have been taking our bills out to people to hear what they have to say. It is that type of reaction, that type of feedback from the good people of Ontario, that helps us to improve our bills.

A good example is Bill 8: substantially improved, in my opinion, because of the work that we did in committee. I believe that this bill is one as well. The first thing we did for the proponent is we specifically talked about one corporation that he owned, but actually, historically, there were two corporations. So we've acknowledged that in the bill and made the amendments. I commend the minister for doing that.

There was a kind of accounting question about expenses incurred but not yet paid prior to the first reading of Bill 49, which is a key date, when the minister got up in the House. Again, I think we've accommodated that reasonable request.

Also, for greater clarity in the second set of amendments, we changed the order of the bill so that it was easier for people to understand.

Then we had to deal with a great issue. I'm glad it was brought up in committee, because it had to do with the fact that we do have existing landfill sites, and they do have water on those sites. They, for example, may have an overflow lagoon, which is environmentally important to have. So we wanted to make sure we were very specific about those landfill sites, and that there was greater clarity in the bill. I commend the minister for doing that.

I've always been remarkably impressed with the work of Robert F. Kennedy Jr. I remember a speech that he gave, and it resonated with me because my wife's family is from the minister's riding, from the great town of Marmora, where there is also an open iron ore pit, and that, sir, is becoming a lake. That's what God does. When you dig a great big hole and you go through the aquifer and you leave it alone and don't pump the water out, it fills up.

Robert F. Kennedy Jr said that putting garbage in an abandoned mine, which really is just a lake that hasn't filled up yet, is the equivalent of taking garbage out on a scow, going out to the middle of the lake and sinking it there. No one in this province would allow us to do that. It wouldn't have made any sense whatsoever, but that's

the equivalent of what we're doing. I think we shared a concern with the third party that there was no way that this thing was going to be safe over the next hundred years with millions of tonnes of garbage in there leaching into the aquifer at the headwaters of the Great Lakes. That would be a bad idea. So I'm proud to support the bill.

Just to sum up, as I've said, the government of the day has decided to take a new tack with the environment. We are rejecting what has happened before us and are trying to go back where we're putting the resources, the commitment, the political will to make sure that our grandchildren will be proud of what we do in this place. And what are we doing here if we are not making our grandchildren proud? Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):

During this past hour's debate on Bill 49, our Minister of the Environment made mention of improving diversion, the diversion of organics and institutional waste, and talked of further consultations. It is regrettable that this piece of proposed legislation—it does make mention of disposal of waste, but there's no mention of recycling or waste diversion, diversion of organics or institutional waste.

The garbage strike in Toronto in 2002 has certainly served as a wake-up call to people that something needs to be done about trash, including food scraps and other organics, and I think it's unfortunate that this isn't addressed in the legislation itself. Ontario households, going beyond Toronto, produce about four million tonnes of garbage every year. Much of that is organics, food scraps, yard waste. In 1999, Ontarians composted only about 24% of the 1.6 million tonnes of organic waste that they produced. Certainly backyard composters is an idea whose time has come and gone and has come again.

With respect to the institutional production of organics—and this goes back maybe 30 years ago when I was teaching high school. I taught environmental science. Our project was we took all of the food scraps, all the organic waste from a high school of 1,000 students. Every day, a student would go up. We composted it behind the greenhouse and in the springtime, people in the town of Simcoe could come and pick up beautiful bushel baskets of tilth for their gardens. Thank you.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): As a northerner, I can tell you that I've always been opposed to this particular project. I was when I was Minister of Northern Development, when Notre Development first came to see us to see if we would be supportive. I was not interested then and have never been interested since in seeing Ontario used as a dumping ground for somebody else's waste and somebody else's garbage. It might give some comfort to some people when it's out of sight and out of mind, but it certainly doesn't deal with the much broader and more serious issue of how we deal with waste diversion, how we deal with recycling, etc. Just dumping it somewhere to get it out of your sight and out of your mind doesn't resolve the problem that I hope this government is now going to tackle with respect to recycling, etc.

But you know, we got through this one, and now before us is a proposal by essentially a federal organization to deal with nuclear waste. Here we go again with a proposal that might again make Ontario a dumping ground, this time for nuclear waste. The Nuclear Waste Management Organization, which was created by the federal government in 2002, has been looking at long-term storage options for nuclear waste somewhere in Canada. One of three options includes a permanent, deep geological repository in underground caverns in the Canadian Shield, which would be in our special part of the province. I want to say categorically today, as a northerner, as a member who represents the northeast, I am absolutely opposed to any proposal by this organization and by the federal government, who would actually make the final decision, to use northern Ontario as a dumping ground.

I think it's time now for this Liberal government to send a very similar strong message to the federal government that under no circumstances will this government let the federal government and Atomic Energy transport all of this kind of waste to be stored somewhere underground in the Canadian Shield. I hope that is the message this government is now going to send to the federal government.

1650

Mr Jeff Leal (Peterborough): I have certainly enjoyed the very positive comments from the Minister of the Environment, Ms Dombrowsky, and other members of the caucus on this issue. I did have the opportunity to sit in on hearings in Milton in May and hear first-hand why Bill 49 is so important in terms of putting waste in the Adams landfill site, but beyond that, I have some experience in the area. During my 18 years in municipal politics in Peterborough, 13 of those I spent as a member of the Peterborough county-city waste management steering committee. We spent about \$6 million during those 13 years to get an expansion of our landfill site in Peterborough.

Safe to say, I find landfilling a very archaic process and a process that needs to come to a conclusion, hopefully, in this province in the near future. By putting Bill 49 in place, I think it is a start to looking at alternatives across this province to deal first-hand with the whole issue of waste management.

The minister has spoken eloquently on the need to look at the total removal of organics from our waste stream. The parliamentary assistant to the minister, my friend from Perth-Middlesex, touched in his remarks today on the need to move this envelope forward as quickly as possible to find serious alternatives. There is no question in my mind that this is the start.

When you look at landfilling in other parts of Ontario, what ultimately is always selected is prime agricultural land because one of the needs for a landfill site is clay, to have that natural barrier to help contain leachate. I think it is an important step that we start to move forward. I think this bill is the catalyst to move this file forward.

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I am pleased to make a few comments on the leadoff of the govern-

ment on the third reading of Bill 49. I guess my problem with Bill 49 is that I have had people from my constituency ask of the Minister of the Environment the technical reasons why you closed this particular approval. This was an approved site. I'd like to get a letter from the minister or from the Ministry of the Environment on all of the technical reasons used to change the approval of this application, because you are not doing it in other parts of the province. You are simply not doing this. You are ignoring other parts of the province.

Property rights are going to be spoken to by Mr Sterling in a few minutes. He will be mentioning that in his comments. I think that you, the Ministry of the Environment, the minister and his staff, owe to the citizens of the province of Ontario the technical reasons why you have turned down and completely reversed this approval. I'd like to see that and that's why I'm asking right now for this to be put on the record. If you have them, you can submit them.

Interjection.

Mr Dunlop: Absolutely. That's all I am saying. You can sit over there and heckle all you want, but until you provide the technical reasons why you've turned this down, I will never support this bill. And I can't understand why anybody in their right mind would support this bill. There are technical reasons for this and we need to see them. The citizens of Ontario deserve to see the technical reasons why this application has been completely turned down. It's pork-barrelling. That's all it is, and you all know that over there. That's all this is about. It's pork-barrelling.

Minister Ramsay threatened to resign. You know it. That's why you've turned it down, and all of a sudden you won't submit the technical reasons. If not, submit them to us. We'd love to see that information. You wouldn't do it at the hearings and you wouldn't do it at any other time in the House. I'm asking you to do it today.

The Acting Speaker: One of the government members has two minutes to reply.

Hon Mrs Dombrowsky: First of all, I'd like to thank all the members of the Legislature who participated: the members from Brampton Centre, Etobicoke North, Prince Edward-Hastings, Perth-Middlesex, Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant, Nickel Belt, Peterborough and Simcoe North. All the comments I believe enriched the debate on this very important bill.

I think it's important, as Minister of the Environment, to highlight that the chief goal of this bill is to protect the environment in the Adams mine lake community. I believe a number of members here today spoke very appropriately about the potential risk. This government has not been convinced that the proposed hydraulic containment proposal that was approved would not have a negative impact on the local environment.

Since the time approvals were granted for this initiative, there has been a lot happen in the history of this province. We've had Walkerton. I think that was a very important event and we have to take some lessons from

that. We have to understand that protecting our water resources has to be primary. I would suggest that if this government is making any statement to the people of Ontario, it is that protecting our water resources is primary.

We will do whatever we believe we must do to ensure for people in communities across Ontario that their water resource are protected, and we're not going to make any apologies for that. We are absolutely convinced that we have a responsibility to exercise due diligence on that very fundamentally important issue for every community in Ontario. I'm very proud of this legislation and very proud of what it will achieve for people in our communities across the province.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Barrett: I look forward to addressing Bill 49. I'll be sharing my time with the members from Simcoe North and Lanark-Carleton. Congratulations to the member for Perth-Middlesex on his appointment as PA to environment.

We're debating a bill curiously titled the Adams Mine Lake Act. As we heard earlier, our Legislative Assembly committee travelled two days and heard from a number of delegations interested in commenting on the legislation that, in our view, leaves the province of Ontario with absolutely no plan for the future of garbage currently being trucked across the border to Michigan.

On this side of the House, we've been hearing from, and speaking to, elected representatives from Michigan who are pushing for this province to develop made-in-Ontario solutions to Metro's garbage problem. We've heard from mayors along the trash route who are very concerned, and we've certainly been chatting with, and have heard in committee from, Ontario regional chairs who are concerned their backyards will be targeted for new landfills. I have to say that I am now even more concerned about the real potential impact this legislation will have for communities and regions across our province.

People are nervous. They know that if the Adams Mine Lake Act is passed, it will remove from the table the only potential solution to the current ticking trash bomb travelling across our highways into Michigan, travelling at the rate of 125 tractor-trailer loads of garbage a day.

The moment Michigan elected officials take their initiative aimed at protecting the state from imported garbage headaches to their logical conclusion and close the border to Toronto's trash convoy, we in Ontario will be knee-deep in a waste problem that will only grow larger each day this government sits on its hands without a backup plan. We need a plan to remedy this potential situation.

1700

Now is not the time to be taking options off the table, especially when we have no other options on the table. Now is not the time, because I can tell you, over in Michigan, elected representatives are taking action, even as we speak, to protect their state from foreign trash. As

early as tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, the Michigan House of Representatives will be debating a resolution that was introduced by a friend of the committee, Republican representative Daniel Acciavatti. It's aimed at having this province deal with its own garbage disposal issues.

We were in touch with Mr Acciavatti's office about half an hour ago. The resolution has already been introduced. It goes to committee tomorrow and then second and third readings. His office feels it will be passed next week.

I'd like to read some of basics from this resolution. It's entitled, "A resolution to urge the Ontario Minister of the Environment to establish additional landfills and facilitate approval of pending landfill expansions."

I further read:

"Whereas, for many years, Michigan and other states and provinces have wrestled with finding the best strategies to manage solid waste to protect the environment and achieve the highest standards of health and safety. This formidable task has been made more challenging by court decisions impacting Michigan solid waste policy as they defined the limits of federal, state and constitutional authority; and

"Whereas, Michigan has been especially frustrated by increasing volumes of imported trash. Fully one fourth of trash deposited in Michigan landfills originates outside the state. While issues of commerce, authority, and, more recently, security enter the discussions about imported trash across our international border, it is essential that long-term environmental concerns remain at the heart of this debate; and

"Whereas, in an effort to protect our waters, communities and land, Michigan is in the process of establishing tougher standards of solid waste management. In doing so, our state is taking strong steps to reduce significantly the volume of materials that take up landfill space and strengthen standards designed to protect the environment; and

"Whereas, our neighbours in Ontario are facing declining landfill capacity because of impediments to obtaining timely approval for projects subject to Ontario....

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, that we urge the Ontario Minister of the Environment to complete reform of the environmental review process to enable qualified solid waste processing projects to move forward and facilitate approval of pending landfill expansions in Ontario."

Representative Acciavatti's resolution points to the need for Ontario to deal with our garbage within our borders through creation of new landfills and landfill expansions. I wonder if the minister has been able to assure Mr Acciavatti that landfill space will be available and where that space will be located. All of Ontario is really anxious to know just where the minister plans to create a new home for Toronto's garbage.

That's latest from the Michigan Legislature. I will say it builds on a series of bills aimed at reducing the impact

of waste emigrating across the US border from the GTA. As was mentioned earlier during testimony in front of our Legislative Assembly committee, Mr Acciavatti gave members insight into further actions being taken and concerns being raised over the importation of garbage.

He pointed out, "On the security side, in the global world we live in, Candice Miller was instrumental in bringing Tom Ridge to the Blue Water Bridge area." I know Representative Acciavatti represents an area south of the Blue Water Bridge. "I think he went on both sides of the bridge and looked at that crossing from a homeland security standpoint. The homeland security issue is a concern. In the global world we live in, there's a real possibility that we could end up at an orange or red homeland security level, which would affect those border crossings. So that definitely brings into conversation a whole different part of it."

Mr Acciavatti further pointed to concerns about invasive species, especially given Michigan's current problems with the emerald ash borer. This has eliminated pretty well every ash tree in the city of Detroit and has migrated to the southwestern part of Ontario. He made mention of Toronto's difficulties with the Asian long-horned beetle. In questioning his testimony, I pointed out the Michigan data, that fully 25% of the Toronto trash that goes to that landfill south of Detroit, in Sumpter township, is yard waste.

The representative had this to say:

"Yard waste is not allowed in our landfills, so that is going to pose a problem. That's one of the prohibited items, along with bottles and cans. We have a very expansive recycling bill that we use.

"As for the emerald ash borer, it devastated the ash tree population in my district and right across the river in Macomb, Oakland, Wayne and St Clair counties. It's a tremendous problem. Any other invasive species that could potentially get into our country or into your country from our country is something that is a concern and would pose a risk to our public, our health and our safety, which wouldn't help with all this and would be a concern of mine."

Mr Acciavatti's comments underline concerns being raised across the state of Michigan, and his resolution, which I have just read into the record, is just the latest from the Michigan Legislature. It builds on quite a lengthy series of state of Michigan bills aimed at reducing the impact of this waste. To give you a better idea of the bigger picture that's forming on the other side of the border, I would like to highlight some of the state government action in the last couple of months alone.

On March 26, Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm signed into law a package of legislation that consisted of 11 separate bills that deal with the protection of Michigan from out-of-state garbage in one way or another. I'd like to share some of these bills.

For example, House Bill 5234, sponsored by representative Daniel Acciavatti, regulates the disposal of solid waste in landfills. House Bill 5325, sponsored by state rep David Robertson, requires host community agreements for solid waste disposal.

Michigan Senate Bill 57, sponsored by Senator Mike Bishop, requires inspection of solid waste imported from Canada to determine if waste is being transported under state rules and if that waste poses no threat to the public's health and safety.

Senate Bill 497, sponsored by Senator Buzz Thomas, provides a definition of "beverage container" under the solid waste management law. Senate Bill 498, sponsored by Senator Patty Birkholz, expands prohibited products in landfills to include beverage containers, whole tires, oil, lead acid batteries, low-level radioactive waste and hazardous waste. Senate Bill 499, sponsored Senator Alan Sanborn, enhances inspections of landfills. Senate Bill 500, sponsored by Senator Dennis Olshove, provides increased remedies for violations of enforcement of solid waste laws.

It continues, and I go on. Senate Bill 502 specifically provides regulations for importing solid waste. This was brought forward by Senator Nancy Cassis. Senate Bill 506, sponsored by Senator Bruce Patterson, prohibits out-of-state or out-of-country waste unless prohibited waste has been removed or the other state or province has solid waste stream standards as stringent as Michigan's.

There is more legislation. There is quite a slew here. Senate Bill 557, sponsored by Senator Liz Brater, provides for the Department of Environmental Quality to issue landfill construction permits based on capacity needs.

Senate Bill 715 provides for county and municipal enforcement of solid waste. This one is sponsored by Senator Jud Gilbert.

1710

As well, on the day Governor Granholm signed this bipartisan package of legislation into law, she pointed out, "Today we take a critical step in putting a lid on Michigan's unwanted reputation as the country's trash can." That's pretty serious language. Elected officials in Michigan are very serious about protecting their state from the impact of out-of-state trash.

This legislation is part and parcel with a series of petitions that have been circulating throughout the Great Lakes state. There's one from Michigan Senator Debbie Stabenow, in which she urges constituents to "Join The Fight To Stop Canadian Trash Now!"

Senator Stabenow has already presented petitions signed by 165,627 people to the EPA, urging enforcement of a 1986 treaty that gives the EPA authority to stop these shipments immediately. As she mentions—this is on her Web site, for anyone who cares to look this up—"But the fight continues."

The threat of Michigan turning back the 125 tractor-trailers that approach the US border every day is a very real and immediate concern, when I read into the record well over a dozen separate state Legislature bills, most of which have been passed. This could have all of us scrambling for answers once the full potential of this Michigan legislation that's moving along, actually in a parallel way to the Ontario government legislation we're debating today.

The battle lines are being drawn. This has been mentioned in the House before. There may be people here amenable to seeing John Kerry become the next President of the United States. Democratic candidate Kerry is very clear on where he stands with respect to out-of-state garbage. Here's a quote from Mr Kerry to a journalist: "We shouldn't import trash from other countries." It's that simple. That's coming from a possible future President. He further promised—"this would be a Democratic promise—"to review this issue in the first 120 days of my presidency." That's from a possible future President of the United States.

It goes further to underline the need to be ready with a plan for Toronto's million-plus tonnes of trash that could well be turned back by the state of Michigan or the United States.

Again, I ask the question many nervous people in Ontario are beginning to ask themselves, their MPPs, their municipal councillors: Where is the garbage going to go? What is the plan? What municipalities will have to bear the brunt of Toronto's trash trucks?

Mr Ted McMeekin (Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot): That's why the advisory group is going to work so well.

Mr Barrett: I'll respond to the member across the way. This garbage has to go somewhere. I certainly hope this comes up at the advisory committee. Perhaps the advisory committee on diversion would be well advised to broaden their mandate to take a look, as Premier McGuinty has indicated, at the need for new landfill and expanded landfill. It's got to go somewhere.

This government seems content to close down an option. The so-called Adams Mine Lake Act shuts down a viable option, in our view. It shuts down 15 years of work, 15 years of debate and 15 years of due diligence, and closes down one of the few options left.

We've heard that Keele Valley will not be reopened. We heard that from the present government. As I've mentioned before, we realize we're seeing here a Liberal approach to governing, an approach of NIMBYism, not-in-my-backyard-ism. In my view, this rules out 71 Liberal ridings, for example, if the government is going to get political about this.

Interjection.

Mr Barrett: Someone mentioned my riding; my colleague's riding—he makes mention of it a lot.

Again, perhaps politically, 71 other ridings are ruled out for landfill or for any expansion of landfill. We saw that come to fruition with our Minister of the Environment. Steps were taken to rule out expansion of landfill in her riding. So where do we go? I will say that rural Ontario is certainly becoming more and more concerned about this.

In the first hour of debate, mention was made of the testimony, the public hearings, before the Legislative Assembly committee in Milton. We visited Milton after our visit down to Windsor. Joyce Savoline, chairperson for Halton region, spoke about "fairness, procedure, precedents, responsibility and accountability." During her

presentation, chairperson Savoline said that the current decision on the Adams mine would negatively impact her constituents, considering the fact that there are currently no other options available when it comes to waste disposal.

That region, members opposite may recall, underwent its own trash crisis roughly 12 years ago. What did the region do? They rolled up their sleeves, Halton region got to work, and the result was a forward-thinking solution through taxes. The residents of Halton paid for a landfill site. It cost well in excess of \$100 million. Prior to that landfill site project, Halton found itself in the business of exporting garbage. "When we shopped around for interim capacity, all doors were closed to us," Ms Savoline told our committee. "We even suggested reciprocal agreements. We would, at a future date, receive the same amount of garbage from another municipality that would take ours in the interim, and we were told unequivocally, 'No, thank you.'" That's the climate we are operating in in Ontario.

That was in the mid-1980s. Ontario's trash problem has grown by leaps and bounds since then, and Ms Savoline said that she certainly wouldn't like to revisit the days of finding a home for garbage even though the issue has worked out for Halton. However, the chair is very clear that Halton, for one, does not want to be one of the province's dump sites for Toronto's trash.

Mr McMeekin: So what does she want to do?

Mr Barrett: I'll read on. She is worried about a crisis. Very clearly, she is worried about a Michigan crisis.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant has the floor.

Mr Barrett: The members opposite are putting this on the Chair's shoulders.

They spent the money. They spent \$100 million. Halton has thought into the future. They have a 40-year capacity for refuse. That life capacity would be reduced to something like two years in the event that Toronto's trash needed a short-term, perhaps long-term, home.

"We can all agree that the issue of not finding a long-term waste disposal solution quickly really is a crisis in the making." That's what the chair told our committee. She continued, saying, "We know that continuing to export our garbage to Michigan is not a sustainable option. Artificial cost is narrowing the gap between that exporting venue and disposing of our waste in our own communities. So where it costs much less to ship garbage to Michigan than to look after it here, that gap is closing because of all kinds of things like gas prices," for example, "and new rules for drivers who drive those trucks."

1720

The Liberal government opposite doesn't quite understand this concern for an alternate plan. Nobody even knows if this government is working on a plan, and the fear is that they may try and take the easy way out and dump Toronto's trash on a region like Halton. That's certainly the concern in that particular region. The people

of Halton have worked toward an outstanding diversion rate of 42%. Would it be fair to these people, who understand the importance of diversion and have worked so hard, to penalize them some day by forcing Toronto's trash on them? Halton region should be rewarded, actually; they should not be punished. Yet this government cannot assure Ms Savoline and her constituents that they won't receive Toronto's trash. That's unnerving at best.

Similarly Roger Anderson, chair of Durham region—we contacted his office yesterday—indicated to us, "It's a shame to take any viable and feasible site off the table right now." Chair Anderson certainly shares our fear of what will happen if Michigan decides to close the border. A decision at this point in time, in Mr Anderson's words, is premature for this legislation to go forward.

Furthermore, Mr Anderson finds it particularly disturbing that this government would come in and make such a decision on the Adams mine when not one council—and he's referring to the New Liskeard municipal councils—but two elected municipal councils were pro-Adams mine. So Mr Anderson as well wants to know where the government's back-up plan is. Can you reassure people like Mr Anderson that you have a site for Toronto's trash if Michigan decides to say, "Game over"?

I'd like to introduce some additional thoughts concerning the issue of the road transport, the 125 tractor-trailers that are barrelling down the border. Four years ago, Sarnia Mayor Mike Bradley: "There are already too many trucks on the road and if this garbage has to be transported, it should be done by rail." Mayor Anne Marie DeCicco, of the city of London, has a similar view, expanding on the fact that if truck traffic increases, the safety issue magnifies. Both DeCicco and Bradley belong to what's referred to as the Southwestern Ontario Trash Coalition, along with representatives from Windsor, Essex county, Kitchener and Cambridge. It's a coalition whose stated goal is to force Toronto to deal with its own trash dilemma.

Again, these mayors worry that they could be dumped on if this government and the city of Toronto do not devise a plan. Mayor Bradley, for one, is on record as saying that dumping Toronto garbage in another municipally owned landfill is "a direct robbery of tax dollars." I agree with that one.

On May 10, Ian Urquhart of the Toronto Star posed a question, "What happens if the border is closed? It is a nightmare scenario that the provincial government would rather not contemplate." Urquhart continues later in his editorial, "We should be very worried, then, about a prospect of the border being closed to our garbage and we should be working on a contingency plan." He also pointed out that it was this Liberal government's environment minister who, at the beginning of May, told the Recycling Council of Ontario, "The provincial government is not taking over waste management in Ontario. Waste management, and waste diversion, is the responsibility of municipalities." Mr Urquhart questions this, as we do on this side of the House.

If landfills and waste diversion are municipal responsibilities, why have Premier McGuinty and Minister Dombrowsky pulled the option of sending trash to the Adams mine? Why was the Kirkland Lake option taken off the table? That question remains unanswered. There are no technical reasons given for that decision. Actually, their position remains unclear on this one. The question remains, is garbage the responsibility of municipalities or is garbage the responsibility of the provincial government? So far, as Mr Urquhart indicated, all Minister Dombrowsky seems to be touting is her goal of recycling 60% of Ontario's garbage by 2008, and I sincerely hope we reach that goal. It's putting quite an onus on homeowners, especially when their provincial government seems to be neglecting the issue. I've said in the past that 60% diversion in four years is an admirable goal, but there is another side to this. Last December, in questioning in the House, Minister Dombrowsky told me we would have 60% diversion by next year. As they say, that was then and this is now.

With respect to diversion, I sincerely hope this is explored in detail in the announced consultations. Sixty per cent diversion is a laudable goal. The question remains, where does the other 40% go? Where is the plan for landfill?

I wish to wrap up my comments; I've been summoned to the finance committee. I would turn to my colleagues to continue the debate. There is certainly much more to be discussed with this particular piece of legislation.

Mr Norman W. Sterling (Lanark-Carleton): It's a pleasure, I guess, in some ways, to speak to Bill 49. I think Bill 49 is perhaps one of the worst pieces of legislation, showing a total lack of understanding about what the Ministry of the Environment is about, what the government should be doing in the environment portfolio and what the future is with regard to this government's plan for the environment ministry.

This bill shows a lack of respect for process. I'm talking about the whole environmental approval process the Adams Mine site went through over a period of eight to 10 years. It shows a lack of respect for science and technology, in terms of the engineering reports, the science reports that were brought to bear during that process, which ultimately proved that this could be used as a safe landfill site. That's what the science said, that's what the engineers said and that's what the environmental appeal tribunal said as well.

Lastly, but more importantly, is a lack of respect for the rule of law in the province of Ontario. Perhaps the most damning indictment of this government is that last one; that is, they did not allow the proponent, the owners of this venture, full access to the courts for compensation, something which is—well, kings have lost their heads for it in the past, before parliaments were fully in control in our democratic system.

I'm not going to argue whether the government wanted this or didn't want that. It's obvious what the government wanted to do. It was essentially for political purposes that this government made the choice that they

were going to pull the rug out from a legitimate businessman in terms of something he and other partners and financiers had put a great deal of energy, time and money into. As well, I believe one of the objectives of a minister, a cabinet and a government is to present opportunities now, and future opportunities should our province be caught in a difficult position.

We've heard from Mr Barrett about the problem with regard to somewhere between 125 and 160 garbage trucks going to Michigan each and every day and not knowing with certainty whether that access to landfill sites is going to continue in the future. I don't know whether that's going to happen, or they don't know whether it's going to happen.

1730

What we have seen from this minister and this Ministry of the Environment is not seeking to find future options to deal with environmental problems, landfills being one of them, but a political answer or political response to everyone who squeaks a little bit about what is going on around them, notwithstanding that the proponent has followed the letter of the law—or the law to the letter, whatever it is—and therefore this is a terrible piece of legislation in that regard.

It shows a total lack of respect for the process. The process to go through for an environmental assessment, to go through for an environmental approval for a landfill site, is an unbelievably arduous, long process. You have to present reports. You have to hire engineers. You have to prove to the Ministry of the Environment, and then they had to prove, in this case, to the appeal tribunal, that in fact the science was on their side.

I sat in the chair of the Ministry of the Environment when the decision from the appeal tribunal came back. Even after they had proved to the appeal tribunal that in fact the science was right, that engineers, skilled scientists and skilled people said it was safe to use this as a landfill site, I asked for a peer review of all of the engineers' reports, so that the officials in the Ministry of the Environment would be satisfied with the decision that was made.

I had independent peers, independent engineers, look at all the work that had been done before. I was Minister of the Environment at that time. I said, "I do not want any kind of questions with regard to the science and technology that is being proposed for the Adams mine." The peer review came back and said that the Ministry of the Environment was right in the first instance, that the appeal tribunal was right in the second instance, and that the science and technology was sound. "You can use this site as a landfill site without contaminating the groundwater and without delay."

Interjections.

Mr Sterling: Some guys over there are saying, "Oh," but you're not saying it from a scientific point of view. You're not an engineer. You're not a scientist.

Interjection.

Mr Sterling: Well, we operate with rules in this province. We operate with a process you have to go through.

Essentially what this government has said to each and every businessman who might want to go forward with a venture, be it a hydro project, be it any kind of plan, be it building a road, be it anything, that businessman has to know that if they come to Ontario, with a Liberal government they're at peril. Even if they cross every "t" and dot every "i," meet every regulation and go through every process, this government can pull the rug from underneath them and say, "You're out of luck, Mr Businessman. Even if you've met all our regulations, we are going to stop your project, and we're not even going to allow you access to the courts to get compensation."

Can you believe that, Mr Speaker? They are not allowing this particular proponent to go to court and receive compensation as the court would deem fit. What they're trying to do in the bill is cut down the ability of this proponent to go to court and get full compensation for the damage that has been done to this proponent.

That is against the rule of law. The rule of law says this: that each and every one of us in this province has to be treated equally and that the government doesn't use its power to make rules against Ted Arnott, Bill Murdoch or any other individual in this province. But that's what this bill does. It singled out a business and said, "We don't like what you're doing, and therefore we're going to restrict your access to the court for full compensation." That's what the bill says. For those who don't believe me, you can read the Ottawa Citizen of April 20. Their editorial says, "Dumping the Rule of Law: Ontario's Premier"—who happens to have professed to have studied law—"Shouldn't Need Basic Civics Lessons, But a Bill now Before Queen's Park Demonstrates that Dalton McGuinty Doesn't Understand a Basic Principle of Western Civilization: The Rule of Law."

Anyone who could vote for this piece of legislation hasn't read history, doesn't understand that when you pull the rug from underneath an individual citizen with regard to his or her rights before the courts of Ontario, before the courts of Canada, this government should be very much damned for what they have done.

Interjection.

Mr Sterling: The parliamentary assistant for the Minister of Environment is saying is, "Why weren't property right included in the Constitution?" If we follow his rationale, because it wasn't in the Constitution, we don't have to respect property right in this province. Well, I've got to tell you—

Interjection.

Mr Sterling: That's what you said, sir. That's what Bill 49 says, sir. It says you do not respect property rights, sir, because you will not give this proponent full access to the court to seek his compensation that he is entitled to because he followed all of the rules that the government put in front of him.

It's very, very clear that the Liberal Party does not even want to follow one of the basic elements, principles of western democracy, the rule of law. I say to the pages who are here tonight, you probably will not see a government strip away property rights from another

individual, maybe not during your lifetime, like you've seen in this bill—not so blatant as what has been done here.

Of course, you're now demonstrating another piece of legislation where you're showing a lack of interest in property rights as well: in your Ontario Heritage Act, where you're saying you're giving to another body of government the right to change a designation on a building without compensation with regard to reducing that particular part of it.

Mr McMeekin: We all supported that yesterday. We went home early.

Mr Sterling: No, no, we don't support that bill, sir, with regard to property rights.

I guess the other part of this is, we've heard from the minister that they want a 60% diversion rate. I'd love to have a 60% diversion rate, we'd all like to have a diversion rate, but that's the same old story that I've heard over a long period of time. Whenever there is a landfill problem, the Minister of Environment comes forward—

Interjections.

Mr Sterling: Listen, you guys set up the waste management authority, OK? We didn't get out of the waste management authority anything but a \$20-million bill, and no landfill sites. Don Chant—we set him up and you continued on with this boondoggle going forward.

Every time people talk about getting rid of garbage, they come up with this diversion argument. You hold out—and I would suspect falsely; I hope it's not false, because I would love to have a diversion rate of even higher than 60%. But when a minister comes out and says, "I'm going to have a diversion rate of 60%," but she has no plans how to get there, how to implement it, and she puts out a policy paper and asks for input, a 60% diversion target doesn't mean anything. We can all say that we're going to have a diversion rate of 70%. We can all talk in politics and say, "Let's have 75%, let's have 100%." Look, folks, you can't stand up with credibility and say you're going to have a 60% diversion rate unless you've got a plan to get there. You've got no plan at all. All you're saying is, "We're going to go out and consult." I would have more respect for the minister, the ministry and the government if they had said, "Let's have a consultation on diversion so that we can increase the rates," and then after the consultation they said, "We think there are enough ideas in this package to increase it from"—they say 28%; I thought it was a lot higher than 28% right now. It must have fallen since I was minister, because we were at 38% before. I don't know what the Liberal government has done to drop it from 38% to 28%. At any rate, I suspect they're playing a game with the numbers: By knocking them way down to 28%, all of a sudden it's going to become 38%, which it actually is, and they're going to claim victory.

1740

Notwithstanding that, we would have had a lot more belief in what the minister was going to do with regard to diversion rates if, in fact, she had had this consultation, if

she wants it. I don't think there's a lot of magic to the solutions of having diversion. There's investment involved, but I don't know who they're going to get to invest, given their record with the Adams Mine and the person who put forward "an environmental solution" and then they pulled the rug from underneath him and didn't offer proper compensation.

Mr Leal: You could invest in centralized composting.

Mr Sterling: We did invest in composting, actually.

To someone who has been around for a long period of time, this bill is a tremendous disappointment with regard to forgetting some of the very basics of how you have to run a Ministry of the Environment. If you don't have a process that will stand up to scrutiny and time, and that a proponent can rely on, how can you get anybody bringing forward decent proposals? As I say, it takes eight to 10 years. If you know that at the end of eight to 10 years the government is just going to disregard you because there are some noisy objectors with regard to a particular proposal, then you're never going to have anybody come forward. Why would you waste your time, your effort, your money, your brains and all the rest of it with regard to a proposal?

We've seen this, not only with regard to the Adams Mine, but I also saw it in my own riding with regard to a very important industry in my riding, OMYA, where this minister, after a company had gone through all the processes to get a water-taking permit, just pulled the water-taking permit right off the table—didn't offer compensation, didn't offer a reason. They saw it coming, because they knew she had a political agenda against this particular company. What we have is a Minister of the Environment—a government—that is operating on political whim. They are not operating with regard to fairness. You're not dealing with fairness. Whoever squeaks the loudest is going to get their way. They're going to rely on evidence that is not scientifically based; there's no technology behind the decisions they're making.

Last but not least, they're absolutely ignoring the rule of law. They're absolutely ignoring treating everybody in this province in a fair and even-handed manner. That part of it is absolutely abhorrent. For them to make the political decision that they wanted to close down the Adams Mine—if the government wants to decide that, maybe they can do that. They can do that. They can just say, "To hell with the science, to heck with the process, we're going to close it down." But if they do that, then they've got to pay. It doesn't matter whether it's that government or the next government, they have to pay, and they have to pay according to the law as it was when they made their decision. They can't change the law after and say, "We didn't like the law because it allowed this particular proponent more compensation than we would like to give him or her." They have to do it according to the law of the day. They can't do it retrospectively. You can't go back and say, "We wish the law had been this and that you would only be allowed this much compensation." That's what you've done here. That's what Bill

49 does. Bill 49 goes back in time and says, "We don't like this proposal and we're going to deny the proponent fair compensation."

So I say to all businessmen who come to this province with this present government in place, which has a lack of respect for the rule of law and property rights, be wary. Be wary about investment. Be particularly wary about processes that include passing government regulations. Be wary of the Ministry of the Environment because it's going to make a decision which is not based on science; it's not going to be based on technology. It's going to be based on the political whim of a cabinet minister or a group of politicians or a group of people in a community who don't like a particular development. That is the truth. That is what's happening here, and it is a terrible black mark on our province that we should have a government do this so blatantly.

We have a tremendous environmental challenge as we go forward. We must deal with reality. We must deal with getting our garbage back from Michigan into Ontario. Hopefully, we can divert some of it so that we don't have to use our landfill sites. I don't like landfill sites any more than anybody else in this room, but they're a fact of life today. They are a fact of life today.

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): They're outdated.

Mr Sterling: We'll see where they get with regard to their 60% diversion rate.

Mr McMeekin: That's leadership.

Mr Sterling: Somebody across here says, "There's leadership." Leadership, my eye. Leadership is about creating realistic solutions based on science, based on a fair process, and not robbing people of their rights.

Hon Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for women's issues): I could give you 100 examples.

Mr Sterling: Not robbing people of their rights, Ms Pupatello.

We have here, as I say, one of the most abhorrent, unfair—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Lanark-Carleton has the floor.

Mr Sterling: I'm going to wind up so my colleague can say a few words as well. But as I say, I guess what concerns me most is sort of the banal tripe that we've heard back in this debate about this being the most wonderful thing since sliced bread. As I say, dealing with landfill is a very difficult problem, notwithstanding the fact that everybody would love to say we can divert all of this or reuse or recycle all of this. That ain't going to be the case. So we have to deal with this in a scientific way, with a process where people know when they get involved with it that the government will hold to their word, and if they don't hold to their word, they can go to the courts for proper compensation.

Mr Dunlop: I'm pleased to finish off the time this afternoon on third reading debate on the leadoff for Bill 49, the Adams Mine Lake Act, 2004.

I have to agree with almost all of the comments made by the two previous speakers; first of all, all the comments made about closing down the Adams mine and what could happen as a result of the closing of the American border. We know that's a real possibility and, of course, there is no plan for that, unless it's a hidden plan. I assume within the bureaucracy of the Ministry of the Environment, there will be a hidden plan, and that's to take the waste from Toronto out to different landfills across the province, because the minister has the authority to do that. That will be a war at the time, of course, but this particular piece of legislation hides her from that right now.

But really, I look at this bill and I see the threats, and I mentioned it earlier. You haven't provided any technical reasons, and that falls back on what the member for Lanark-Carleton mentioned. It would be interesting and I challenge the Minister of the Environment to send us the technical reasons for changing the approval. My own personal opinion is it's all because of Minister Ramsay. I think he threatened to resign and I think that's what it's all about. It's pork-barrelling at its best.

Mr Wilkinson: Is this speculation?

1750

Mr Dunlop: Well, he threatened to resign if it went ahead. It's as plain and simple as that. You have carried ahead with that. It's strictly for political purposes.

If I can just give you another example of a political piece of legislation and of a political move by the Ministry of the Environment, by a Liberal government, this happened in 1989. On the landfill I've been most concerned about in my riding, site 41, the Environmental Assessment Board turned down site 41. But later on that year, just prior to the election that David Peterson lost, the member who had that township at the time was a Conservative and was running against the Liberals, of course. They had no chance of winning that riding. The three municipalities surrounding it that wanted to put their waste in this site were controlled, at that time, by Mr Ken Black. He was the Minister of Tourism. Out of nowhere, an order in council came through completely reversing the environmental assessment process, and plunked site 41 and gave re-approval to it.

Mr Bill Murdoch (Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound): What was the government then?

Mr Dunlop: It was the Liberals. That's the first sign. I can tell you, that is the beginning of why there's a problem here today.

The bottom line is, the minister in the House this afternoon, both with a question and when the minister summed up, both times she—

Interjection.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Caplan, you can heckle away all you want, but the first thing is, you don't know a thing you're talking about. It's pathetic how little you really know about this issue. You should be ashamed of yourself for heckling on this issue.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Would the member take his seat. The member for Simcoe North has the floor.

Mr Dunlop: I'm showing you a picture once again of the water that pumps out of that area. This has been identified. Anybody who opens their mouth on this area is referred to as some kind of rebel. The fact of the matter is almost a whole community now are rebels. When I was at a class last week, even grade 5 kids are asking if they can sign a petition and get it down here. All of the high schools have gotten together in north Simcoe, and they're all appealing on this. They're all asking that we sign petitions to stop this from going ahead.

When I asked the Environmental Commissioner to review it under the Environmental Bill of Rights, I got an answer back from the Minister of the Environment. It goes right back to them, by the way. When I asked the question about the volume—

Hon Ms Pupatello: What were you doing for the last eight years, Garfield?

Mr Dunlop: Go back to the Walkerton inquiry. That will tell you everything. Your minister is referring to the Walkerton inquiry. Maybe you could do that. She has no idea, because the Walkerton inquiry has changed everything. Your minister is using this as an excuse.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Would the member please take his seat. I would like to ask the government members to allow the member for Simcoe North to make his points. He still has the floor.

Mr Dunlop: Very clearly, I am saying that the Walkerton inquiry changed everything. That is what the Minister of the Environment is saying about the Adams mine, although she's not providing the technical data. All I'm asking for are the technical data. She's blaming the Walkerton inquiry and the recommendations—water source protection. Now I'm hearing, "What happened over the last eight years?"

The Walkerton inquiry has changed everything with site 41. The water is pumping out of the ground at 545,000 litres per day. That's how much water will be pumped out of the ground. The Ministry of the Environment, in my question under the Environmental Bill of Rights, disputes that. They say, "No, that isn't the amount of water that's being pumped out of the ground."

But you know what? They don't give me the data to tell me how much water will be pumped out of the ground. They're telling me that while that landfill site is in existence or while it's under construction, there won't be any water pumped out. They think it's dry. They actually think the site is dry out there. If the Adams mine is a lake, then site 41, if I dig a hole 13 feet deep—that's where the water is, where the aquifer is—I'll bet you anything, in the morning the size of the whole landfill will be a lake, and we can define that as a lake. Apparently the Adams mine calls for, this particular bill calls for, nothing "less than one hectare" to be a lake.

Interjections.

Mr Dunlop: That's why I put through Bill 62. I asked for first reading. It came through the House. I'd love it.

I'd like the Minister of the Environment to take Bill 62. It parallels the Adams Mine Lake Act. It parallels it exactly. I challenge the Minister of the Environment to proceed with this piece of legislation.

Mr McMeekin: Don't challenge her. Go see her.

Mr Dunlop: Ask her. Put it back into committee. Let's see this bill in committee. Let's have committee hearings up in Simcoe county, discuss Bill 62 and see how many people love site 41. The bottom line is that that's why I can't ever support Bill 49. The fact of the matter is, you won't listen to any other problems across the province. You're only listening to the David Ramsay problem.

Mr Leal: They all leak.

Mr Dunlop: Exactly. You talk about water source protection—

Interjections.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Speaker, when the government caucus spoke, I never heckled one word. They've done nothing but yap away since I—

The Acting Speaker: I would ask the government members to please respect the right of the member for Simcoe North to finish his presentation.

Mr Dunlop: It's very simple. This particular site is four kilometres from the Wyevale municipal water system and five kilometres from the Elmvale municipal water system. I think that's a problem.

On top of that, it lies within the area of an airport. It's closer than normal regulations. Now the Huronia Airport wants to expand the facility, and the new landfill will be right in the flight path of the—

Interjection.

Mr Dunlop: It's within eight clicks. It's wrong; it's the wrong thing to do. I'm pleading with the government

and with the Minister of the Environment that if you're going to do something with Bill 49, look at Bill 62 as well. Look at site 41. It's a mistake; it's an accident about to happen. It hasn't proceeded yet, but the fact of the matter is that that's why I want it on the floor today, to say a little bit on the Adams Mine Lake Act. I have to send this message home to the ministry. I know they're not listening; I know they really don't care.

Interjection.

Mr Dunlop: Mr Wilkinson says he is listening, but I don't believe that the bureaucrats in the Ministry of the Environment are listening about this in relation to site 41.

Hon David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal): You fired them all.

Mr Dunlop: They're all there; believe me. If the Minister of Public Infrastructure would like some names, we can give you lots of names in the Ministry of the Environment. The bottom line is that site 41—

Hon Mr Caplan: Name names.

Mr Dunlop: See, here he goes; they go heckling again. We were quiet all the time they spoke, and we turned around and they've done nothing but yap and cry ever since we stood up to speak. It's too bad that they can't face the facts. They can't listen to the truth.

The truth is that Bill 49 is a mistake and site 41, in the county of Simcoe, is a mistake. As far as I'm concerned, it's something you will not change my mind about. I would appreciate any response that the ministry or the folks from the government would give me on Bill 62 and on the elimination of site 41.

The Acting Speaker: It being quite close to 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 this evening.

The House adjourned at 1758.

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 Alvin Curling
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)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Hon / L'hon Marie (L) Minister of Children and Youth Services, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse, ministre des Affaires civiles et de l'Immigration
Ancaster-Dundas- Flamborough-Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Hamilton West / Hamilton-Ouest	Marsales, Judy (L)
Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC) First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Hon / L'hon Leona (L) Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
Beaches-East York / Beaches-York-Est	Prue, Michael (ND)	Huron-Bruce	Mitchell, Carol (L)
Bramalea-Gore-Malton- Springdale	Kular, Kuldip (L)	Kenora-Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Jeffrey, Linda (L)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, Hon / L'hon John (L) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, minister responsible for seniors / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	Dhillon, Vic (L)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Milloy, John (L)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kitchener-Waterloo	Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Van Bommel, Maria (L)
Burlington	Jackson, Cameron (PC)	Lanark-Carleton	Sterling, Norman W. (PC)
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	Runciman, Robert W. (PC)
Chatham-Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Matthews, Deborah (L)
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	London West / London-Ouest	Bentley, Hon / L'hon Christopher (L) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Caplan, Hon / L'hon David (L) Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Deputy House Leader / ministre du Renouvellement de l'infrastructure publique, leader parlementaire adjoint	London-Fanshawe	Ramal, Khalil (L)
Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Wynne, Kathleen O. (L)	Markham	Wong, Tony C. (L)
Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey	Eves, Ernie (PC) Leader of the opposition / chef de l'opposition	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	Takhar, Hon / L'hon Harinder S. (L) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports
Durham	O'Toole, John (PC)	Mississauga East / Mississauga-Est	Fonseca, Peter (L)
Eglinton-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Peterson, Tim (L)
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Hon / L'hon Steve (L) Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	Mississauga West / Mississauga-Ouest	Delaney, Bob (L)
Erie-Lincoln	Hudak, Tim (PC)	Nepean-Carleton	Baird, John R. (PC)
Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L) Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président, Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)
Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	Cansfield, Donna H. (L)	Niagara Falls	Craiton, Kim (L)
Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Qaadri, Shafiq (L)	Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Broten, Laurel C. (L)	Nipissing	Smith, Monique M. (L)
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Northumberland	Rinaldi, Lou (L)
Guelph-Wellington	Sandals, Liz (L)	Oak Ridges	Klees, Frank (PC)
Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)	Oakville	Flynn, Kevin Daniel (L)
Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	Scott, Laurie (PC)	Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)
Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Patten, Richard (L)
Hamilton East / Hamilton-Est	Horwith, Andrea (ND)		

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	McGuinty, Hon / L'hon Dalton (L) Premier and President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales	Stoney Creek	Mossop, Jennifer F. (L)
Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	Watson, Hon / L'hon Jim (L) Minister of Consumer and Business Services / ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises	Stormont-Dundas- Charlottenburgh	Brownell, Jim (L)
Ottawa-Orléans	McNeely, Phil (L)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Hon / L'hon Rick (L) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Ottawa-Vanier	Meilleur, Hon / L'hon Madeleine (L) Minister of Culture, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre de la Culture, ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones	Thornhill	Racco, Mario G. (L)
Oxford	Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	Mauro, Bill (L)
Parkdale-High Park	Kennedy, Hon / L'hon Gerard (L) Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation	Thunder Bay-Superior North / Thunder Bay-Superior- Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Parry Sound-Muskoka	Miller, Norm (PC)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	Ramsay, Hon / L'hon David (L) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Perth-Middlesex	Wilkinson, John (L)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Peterborough	Leal, Jeff (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	Smitherman, Hon / L'hon George (L) Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Arthurs, Wayne (L)	Toronto-Danforth	Churley, Marilyn (ND)
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Trinity-Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Yakabuski, John (PC)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Sorbara, Hon / L'hon Greg (L) Minister of Finance / ministre des Finances
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC) First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Sault Ste Marie	Oraziotti, David (L)	Whitby-Ajax	Flaherty, Jim (PC)
Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Duguid, Brad (L)	Willowdale	Zimmer, David (L)
Scarborough East / Scarborough-Est	Chambers, Hon / L'hon Mary Anne V. (L) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	Pupatello, Hon / L'hon Sandra (L) Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	Berardinetti, Lorenzo (L)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Hon / L'hon Dwight (L) Minister of Energy, Chair of Cabinet, Government House Leader / ministre de l'Énergie, président du Conseil des ministres, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Hon / L'hon Gerry (L) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement	York Centre / York-Centre	Kwinter, Hon / L'hon Monte (L) Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
Scarborough-Rouge River	Curling, Hon / L'hon Alvin (L) Speaker / Président	York North / York-Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Hon / L'hon Joseph (L) Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Simcoe-Grey	Wilson, Jim (PC)	York West / York-Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)
St Catharines	Bradley, Hon / L'hon James J. (L) Minister of Tourism and Recreation / ministre du Tourisme et des Loisirs		
St Paul's	Bryant, Hon / L'hon Michael (L) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs, minister responsible for democratic renewal / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, ministre responsable du Renouveau démocratique		

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.

Continued from overleaf

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 15 juin 2004

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2004 sur la restructuration du secteur de l'électricité, projet de loi 100, <i>M. Duncan</i>	
Adoptée	2882
Loi de 2004 modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-santé (dépistage complémentaire des nouveau-nés), projet de loi 101, <i>M. Baird</i>	
Adoptée	2882

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2004 sur le lac de la mine Adams, projet de loi 49, <i>M^{me} Dombrowsky</i>	
Débat présumé ajourné.....	2916

CONTENTS

Tuesday 15 June 2004

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Haliburton Forest and Wildlife Reserve	
Ms Scott	2879
Sam Lawrence	
Ms Horwath	2879
Anniversary of Guyanese independence	
Mr Qaadri	2879
Rail overpass	
Mr Hardeman	2880
Rebound youth program	
Ms Di Cocco	2880
Ritson Road Alliance Church	
Mr Ouellette	2880
Neighbourhood Watch London	
Mr Ramal	2880
Community-based mental health services	
Mrs Jeffrey	2881
Federal election	
Mr Colle	2881

FIRST READINGS

Electricity Restructuring Act, 2004, Bill 100, <i>Mr Duncan</i>	
Agreed to	2882
Health Insurance Amendment Act (Supplemental Newborn Screening), 2004, Bill 101, <i>Mr Baird</i>	
Agreed to	2882
Mr Baird	2882

MOTIONS

Private members' public business	
Mr Duncan	2882
Agreed to	2882
House sittings	
Mr Duncan	2882
Agreed to	2883

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Electricity restructuring	
Mr Duncan	2883
Mr O'Toole	2884
Mr Hampton	2885

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health care funding	
Mr Eves	2886
Mr McGuinty	2886, 2887
Mr Yakabuski	2886
Mr Hampton	2887
Health care services	
Mr Baird	2886
Mr McGuinty	2887
Electricity restructuring	
Mr Hampton	2888, 2890
Mr Duncan	2888, 2890
Minister's comments	
Mr Dunlop	2889
Mr McGuinty	2889
Protection of privacy	
Ms Broten	2890
Mr Phillips	2890
Agriculture programs	
Mr Hardeman	2891
Mr Peters	2891
Doctor shortage	
Mr Prue	2892
Mr Smitherman	2892
Quality of life	
Mr Racco	2893
Mr Sorbara	2893
Volunteer firefighters	
Mr Arnott	2893
Mr Kwinter	2893
Toronto Police Service	
Ms Churley	2894
Mr McGuinty	2894
Water quality	
Mrs Mitchell	2894
Mrs Dombrowsky	2894
Services for disabled children	
Mrs Witmer	2895
Mrs Bountrogianni	2895

PETITIONS

Chiropractic services	
Mr Jackson	2895
Mr Craitor	2896
Mrs Witmer	2896
Mr Wilson	2897
Mr Flynn	2897
Mr Yakabuski	2897
Mr Miller	2898

Optometrists

Ms Martel	2895
Municipal restructuring	
Mrs Van Bommel	2895
Property taxation	
Mr O'Toole	2896
Mr Leal	2896
Social assistance	
Ms Martel	2896
Health care	
Mr Ouellette	2897
Ontario budget	
Mr Miller	2897
Fish hatchery program	
Mr Ouellette	2897
Water quality	
Mr Yakabuski	2898

THIRD READINGS

Adams Mine Lake Act, 2004, Bill 49, <i>Mrs Dombrowsky</i>	
Mrs Dombrowsky	2898, 2908
Mrs Jeffrey	2900
Mr Qaadri	2902
Mr Parsons	2903
Mr Wilkinson	2904
Mr Barrett	2907, 2908
Ms Martel	2907
Mr Leal	2907
Mr Dunlop	2908, 2915
Mr Sterling	2912
Debate deemed adjourned	2916

OTHER BUSINESS

Estimates	
Mr Phillips	2879
The Speaker	2879
Annual report, Information and Privacy Commissioner	
The Speaker	2881
Visitors	
Mr Takhar	2885
The Speaker	2886

Continued overleaf