



Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

First Session, 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

Première session, 38<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 17 May 2005**

**Mardi 17 mai 2005**

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.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 17 May 2005

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 17 mai 2005

*The House met at 1330.*

*Prayers.*

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF POLICE SERVICES BOARDS

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North):** I rise in the House on behalf of John Tory and the PC caucus to welcome the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards to Queen's Park.

The OAPSB met with John Tory and me this morning to explain their key issues in detail. We heard specific examples of how the lack of justices of the peace puts additional pressures on municipal clerks and causes cases to be thrown out of court. We learned, to our great astonishment, that Elgin county doesn't even have a JP and requires video conferencing to London for this service.

We learned that the OAPSB is concerned that Minister Kwinter has left too much up to regulations in his private security legislation, Bill 159. We also learned of yet another Liberal broken promise to the public safety community: the McGuinty promise to allow for local bargaining of some aspects of the pension plan for police and other municipal employees. Before this morning, I hadn't even heard of this Dalton McGuinty broken promise.

Anyone who has watched this House since October 2003 will know that I am fully aware of the McGuinty Liberals' broken promise to put 1,000 new police officers on the streets for community policing. I wouldn't be surprised if the Liberals took advantage of Police Week to deliver some sort of joke reannouncement to make it look like they actually care about keeping their word to police.

The other day we delivered a budget, and the words "police" and "community safety" were not even mentioned in the budget. Imagine how police stakeholders in this province feel about that type of budget. I'm expecting that Mr. Kwinter will make an announcement tomorrow on community safety and policing. I suppose he will reannounce his September 24 announcement on hiring new police, or maybe it will be an expert advisory panel on community policing. Anyhow, we expect some kind of announcement.

#### CHET GERVAIS AND ADAM SINASAC

**Mr. Bruce Crozier (Essex):** I rise today to congratulate two very talented grade 11 students from Sandwich

Secondary School in my riding, Chet Gervais and Adam Sinasac. Using off-the-shelf hardware and software, these two students stunned scientists and engineers across Canada and across the world by developing a three-dimensional imaging system that can reliably detect breast tumours without using MRIs or CT scans, and in a fraction of the time.

There is presently no medical imaging system commercially available in the world that can produce comparable co-registered mammography and high-resolution breast ultrasound images. This medical device has significant patient care advantages, providing 100 times more breast ultrasound imaging information to the radiologist for review than during conventional breast ultrasound imaging.

Competing against top teen scientists from around the world, this new medical device, dubbed the Matrix probe system, earned Chet Gervais a first award of \$3,000 under the medicine and health category and an honourable mention for best use of photography to gather data at the recent International Science and Engineering Fair.

These two students prove beyond a doubt that there's nothing that can't be accomplished when you put your mind to it. Their ingenuity and imagination are an inspiration. On behalf of everyone in my riding—everyone in Ontario and Canada, for that matter—I thank these students for their hard work and perseverance.

Congratulations, Chet and Adam.

#### FARMERS AND RURAL ONTARIO

**Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk–Brant):** Yesterday in Ottawa, hundreds of Ontario farmers rolled on to Parliament Hill to deliver their verdict on Liberal governments that have turned their backs on the people of rural Ontario. Many tractors carried signs that read, "No Farms, No Food, No Future." That's the reality many are facing as they consider the only option this government gives them: selling out the family farm. That is the reality that faces all of us if this government continues the direction of ignoring the needs of our rural families.

Take a look at the budget. No matter how you add it up, \$613 million less in spending on agriculture compared to last year is another in a long line of refusals by this government to address the challenges of our already struggling farmers and rural residents. I'll tell you, we will see a lot more tractors taking to city streets as the people we depend on and rural Ontario become more desperate to find a way on to this Liberal government's agenda.

As organizer and Lanark Landowners' Association president Randy Hillier noted yesterday, "We found support from all parties—except the Liberals." That is because all parties except the Liberals understand that support for rural Ontario is essential to the success of the province as a whole. When are Liberals going to wake up and stop fiddling with our future while the potential of rural Ontario burns?

#### BURIAL OF INDIGENT PERSONS

**Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** Regional councillors down in Niagara are grappling with a provincial regulation that restricts them to paying no more than \$1,000 for a burial plot and burial costs for people on Ontario Works and other persons dying in abject poverty, when in fact municipalities across Niagara region regularly require more than \$1,000 for the burial plot, the average price being \$1,318. Indeed, the regional municipality of Niagara spent \$217,000 on the burial of indigent persons last year and has budgeted yet \$200,000 more this year.

I join them in their request, not just for clarification but in fact for updating the regulation to ensure that the costs that are allowed to be paid for the burial of indigent persons accurately reflect what the realities are in terms of the cost of a municipal non-profit burial plot, among other things. Funeral homes are already co-operating by providing significant discounts in their charges, but more significantly, the people of Niagara want to know why they are still having downloaded on to them almost a quarter of a million dollars a year in a provincially mandated responsibility, the burial of indigent persons, when that cost should clearly be borne by the province of Ontario and not by property taxpayers in those good municipalities across the regional municipality of Niagara.

The real issue here is for the government to pick up the tab and pick up its responsibility and pay these costs at the level where they should truly be absorbed.

#### NURSES

**Mr. Tony C. Wong (Markham):** Last week I had the opportunity to see first-hand just how hard our Ontario nurses work every day. On May 13, as part of Nursing Week's Take Your MPP to Work Day, I accompanied Markham nurse Janet Crozier on a patient home care visit.

Ontario nurses ensure the health and well-being of all Ontarians by providing compassionate and dedicated care. I would like to recognize those all too often unsung heroes. The job of a nurse is a difficult one by nature, made all the more difficult by the drastic cuts in health care made by the previous government. Our government's May 11 budget demonstrates a commitment to continue to change the conditions in health care left by the Tories. The Tories cut funding to hospitals by \$557 million in their first two years in office but they did not stop there. After spending nearly \$400 million on firing

8,000 nurses in the province, they then spent hundreds of millions in a desperate attempt to rehire them, while at the same time referring to nurses and other health care professionals as Hula Hoop workers. This is yet but another Tory legacy.

#### 1340

Our 2005 budget made record investments in home care funding. We will expand services to almost 50,000 additional Ontarians, including end-of-life care for 4,300 additional people. Our investments will result in more jobs for nurses, building on more than the 2,000 that have already been created.

The McGuinty government is committed to Ontario's nurses and the health of this province. We have made strides in cleaning up the mess left to us by the Tories. Once again I thank Janet Crozier, Markham's Saint Elizabeth Health Care and all nurses for their dedication.

#### ONTARIO BUDGET

**Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie-Lincoln):** Equal time, Mr. Speaker.

I know there are a few members here who were there. Wednesday's budget was a lot like David Peterson: déjà vu all over again—big spending, a big deficit and phase 2 of a record tax grab. Let's look at the facts.

Due to the tax hikes on working families and businesses and hydro rate hikes, they are raking in \$13 billion more than the last PC government. Despite this brazen tax grab—and let's not forget about those broken promises—they are still managing to run a deficit of some \$3 billion. You talk about fiscal mismanagement; they have it in spades across the floor. In fact, that is a pace of runaway spending that would make David Peterson gasp for air.

The Canadian Federation of Taxpayers pointed out that the spending per capita under the Dalton McGuinty government, some \$6,578, adjusted for inflation, beats Bob Rae and David Peterson without taking a breath.

The finance chair for the region of Niagara, the hard-working Councillor Doug Martin, is here today. I know he's going to be concerned that despite this record rake-in in tax revenue, they are seeing cuts in important ministries for Niagara, like municipalities, tourism and agriculture.

When it comes to making tough choices on spending, I already talked about it being like David Peterson all over again. But to use another Yogi Berra metaphor, when Dalton McGuinty comes to a fork in the road, he takes it.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM FUNDING

**Mr. Khalil Ramal (London-Fanshawe):** Ontario's economy depends on the strength of its people. The people of Ontario depend on an infrastructure that is modern, efficient and affordable. Children learn better in schools that are in good repair, and patients cope better in comfortable, up-to-date hospitals. Commuters need

reliable public transit and highway systems to travel from home to work. Business needs transportation networks to get the resources required to produce goods and services.

I rise in the House today not to lecture you or the people of Ontario on basic truths but to inform you and them of the investment this government made in the 2005 budget to make them possible. The McGuinty government is committed to a five-year, \$30-billion infrastructure investment plan. This plan fulfills three key objectives: renewing infrastructure, building new infrastructure and managing it better. The mayor of London, Anne Marie DeCicco, observed that the budget is focused on the priorities of Londoners: health care, education—post-secondary education in particular—and infrastructure needs. She thinks the budget is great news, that our message is clear, and the good news is being well received. The government cares about the short- and long-term livelihood of our urban, rural and northern centres and communities and the businesses and people of this province who keep them running.

#### CHILDREN'S SERVICES

**Mr. John Milloy (Kitchener Centre):** I rise in the House today to talk about what our government is doing through our recently tabled budget to improve the lives of children in this province. Not only does our budget propose a huge boost to postsecondary education in Ontario, but it also confirmed our investment in our youngest citizens' education. Our government understands that the foundation for students' success begins in the early years. That's why we are so proud and excited about our Best Start program. Best Start will significantly increase child care spaces for children in junior and senior kindergarten and make child care fee subsidies available to more families.

I'm proud that the budget is also making it easier for families to keep their children safe. Last December, Bill 73, An Act to enhance the safety of children and youth on Ontario's roads, was passed. Regulations under this act would make booster seats mandatory for children who are too big for child car seats, yet too small to be properly protected by seat belts. The budget proposes an amendment to the Retail Sales Act. The amendment would ensure that families get a retail sales tax exemption for child car seats, including booster seats.

I am proud to say that these measures and others in our 2005 budget will go a long way to help keep our children safe and give them the best possible start in life.

#### POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Ms. Kathleen O. Wynne (Don Valley West):** In the leadup to this year's budget, my constituents made it clear to me that a key priority for reinvestment this year was post-secondary education. I heard from many more constituents on that issue than on any other issue, and I want to share some examples with you.

A proud grandmother wrote to me, "We have the brains and the teachers. Let's give them the means."

A mother with children soon to graduate from high school said, "I support increased funding for universities, for the sake of my children's future and for the future of our province."

Another constituent wrote, "If Ontario is to remain and/or become a leader in education, it is imperative that the recommendations of the Rae report receive the attention and support of the Ontario government.... The students of Ontario deserve the opportunity to be the very best they can be, and that requires a commitment by the government."

With the largest investment in post-secondary education in 40 years, our budget came through on these constituents' desires, and it came through for the future of Ontario.

My riding of Don Valley West is the proud home of Glendon College, Toronto's bilingual university. Glendon is important to my riding and to the province. Locally, it gives students an excellent post-secondary option right in their backyard, and for the city it gives students a real opportunity to congregate in a bilingual environment right here in Toronto. Glendon gives our students a great set of learning opportunities and the chance to benefit from the advantage of true bilingualism.

The additional funding we're providing to universities and colleges will only help Glendon to do a better job for my constituents and for Ontarians. Our government's investment will build Ontario's economic and intellectual future.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order.

I empathize with the member from Don Valley West for having to shout over all the conversations going on in the House. Could you keep that down a bit.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Members may have observed, in the west gallery, Douglas Moffatt, member for Durham East in the 30th Parliament, visiting us here today. Let's welcome him.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mrs. Linda Jeffrey (Brampton Centre):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on general government and move its adoption.

**The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Lisa Freedman):** Mrs. Jeffrey from the standing committee on general government presents the committee's report as follows and moves its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 155, An Act to amend the Family Responsibility and Support Arrears Enforcement Act, 1996 and to make consequential amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 / Projet de loi 155, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1996 sur les obligations familiales et l'exécution des arriérés d'aliments et apportant des modifications corrélatives à la Loi de 1997 sur la protection du poisson et de la faune.

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

The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### GREENBELT AMENDMENT ACT, 2005

#### LOI DE 2005 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA CEINTURE DE VERDURE

Mr. Hudak moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 200, An Act to amend the Greenbelt Act, 2005 by establishing the Niagara Greenbelt Advisory Committee and the Holland Marsh Greenbelt Advisory Committee / Projet de loi 200, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2005 sur la ceinture de verdure en créant le Comité consultatif de la ceinture de verdure du Niagara et le Comité consultatif de la ceinture de verdure du marais Holland.

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

**Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie–Lincoln):** This bill, if passed, would follow the advice that we heard at committee, that we create two advisory committees to the minister for the two specialty crop areas outlined in the bill: one for the region of Niagara, and one for the Holland Marsh area.

### HEALTH INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT (PSA TESTS FOR PROSTATE CANCER), 2005

#### LOI DE 2005 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ASSURANCE-SANTÉ (TEST PSA POUR LE DÉPISTAGE DU CANCER DE LA PROSTATE)

Mr. Mauro moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 201, An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act / Projet de loi 201, 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. Bill Mauro (Thunder Bay–Atikokan):** This bill would amend the Health Insurance Act to make PSA tests an insured service under OHIP. A PSA, or prostate-specific antigen test, is a blood test to assist doctors in looking for prostate cancer.

## MOTIONS

### 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 p.m. till 9:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2005, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** The government House leader has moved government notice of motion 372. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I can always hear on the first sound.

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 1353 to 1358.*

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

#### Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Duguid, Brad	Peterson, Tim
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Phillips, Gerry
Bentley, Christopher	Fonseca, Peter	Pupatello, Sandra
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gerretsen, John	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bountrogianni, Marie	Gravelle, Michael	Racco, Mario G.
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Ramal, Khalil
Brotten, Laurel C.	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Kennedy, Gerard	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smith, Monique
Caplan, David	Levac, Dave	Smitherman, George
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Marsales, Judy	Van Bommel, Maria
Colle, Mike	Mauro, Bill	Watson, Jim
Cordiano, Joseph	Meilleur, Madeleine	Wilkinson, John
Craiton, Kim	Milloy, John	Wong, Tony C.
Crozier, Bruce	Mitchell, Carol	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Delaney, Bob	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Zimmer, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	Oraziotti, David	
Dombrowsky, Leona	Peters, Steve	

**The Speaker:** All those against, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Baird, John R.	Klees, Frank	Prue, Michael
Barrett, Toby	Kormos, Peter	Runciman, Robert W.
Bisson, Gilles	Marchese, Rosario	Scott, Laurie
Chudleigh, Ted	Martel, Shelley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tory, John
Hardeman, Ernie	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Horwath, Andrea	Murdoch, Bill	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	Yakabuski, John

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 52; the nays are 27.

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

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 till 9:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2005, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker:** The government House leader has moved government notice of motion 373.

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

All those against, please 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 one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Duguid, Brad	Patten, Richard
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bentley, Christopher	Fonseca, Peter	Peterson, Tim
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Bountrogianni, Marie	Gravelle, Michael	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq
Brotten, Laurel C.	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramal, Khalil
Brown, Michael A.	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Kwinter, Monte	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smith, Monique
Caplan, David	Leal, Jeff	Smitherman, George
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Levac, Dave	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Colle, Mike	Marsales, Judy	Takhar, Harinder S.
Cordiano, Joseph	Mauro, Bill	Van Bommel, Maria
Craiton, Kim	Meilleur, Madeleine	Watson, Jim
Crozier, Bruce	Milloy, John	Wilkinson, John
Delaney, Bob	Mitchell, Carol	Wong, Tony C.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Dombrowsky, Leona	Oraziotti, David	

**The Speaker:** All those against, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Klees, Frank	Prue, Michael
Baird, John R.	Kormos, Peter	Runciman, Robert W.
Barrett, Toby	Marchese, Rosario	Scott, Laurie
Bisson, Gilles	Martel, Shelley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Chudleigh, Ted	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tory, John
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Horwath, Andrea	Murdoch, Bill	Yakabuski, John
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	
Jackson, Cameron	Ouellette, Jerry J.	

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 56; the nays are 28.

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

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. till 9:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 19, 2005, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker:** The government House leader has moved government notice of motion 374. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those against, please say "nay."

I think the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1410 to 1415.*

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

#### Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bartolucci, Rick	Fonseca, Peter	Peterson, Tim

Bentley, Christopher	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gravelle, Michael	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Jeffrey, Linda	Racco, Mario G.
Brotten, Laurel C.	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramal, Khalil
Brown, Michael A.	Kwinter, Monte	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Levac, Dave	Smith, Monique
Caplan, David	Marsales, Judy	Smitherman, George
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Mauro, Bill	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Colle, Mike	McMeekin, Ted	Takhar, Harinder S.
Cordiano, Joseph	Meilleur, Madeleine	Van Bommel, Maria
Craiton, Kim	Milloy, John	Watson, Jim
Crozier, Bruce	Mitchell, Carol	Wilkinson, John
Delaney, Bob	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wong, Tony C.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Oraziotti, David	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie	Zimmer, David
Duguid, Brad	Patten, Richard	

**The Speaker:** All those against, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Baird, John R.	Klees, Frank	Prue, Michael
Barrett, Toby	Kormos, Peter	Runciman, Robert W.
Bisson, Gilles	Marchese, Rosario	Scott, Laurie
Chudleigh, Ted	Martel, Shelley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Churley, Marilyn	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tory, John
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Horwath, Andrea	Murdoch, Bill	Yakabuski, John
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 62; the nays are 29.

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

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** In the Speaker's gallery is a good friend, Senator the Honourable A.J. Nicholson, Q.C., Attorney General and Minister of Justice of Jamaica; the Honourable Mr. Justice Lensley Wolfe, C.J., Chief Justice of Jamaica; and Mrs. Carol Palmer, J.P., the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Justice, Jamaica. Let's welcome them here today.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

#### SUBVENTIONS DESTINÉES À L'ÉDUCATION

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**L'hon. Gerard Kennedy (ministre de l'Éducation):** Je me lève dans cette Assemblée législative pour exposer le plan du gouvernement McGuinty visant à transformer nos écoles secondaires de sorte qu'elles soient équipées pour faire pleinement ressortir le potentiel de chaque élève.

Our government is well aware of the unacceptably high dropout rate. An estimated 30% of high school

students may not graduate. That is why last June we announced a comprehensive program to help struggling students, supported by a \$100-million investment that meant student success leaders in every school board, resources for principals and teachers to deliver local action plans to meet students' unique needs, revisions to the curriculum to offer more flexibility and options, and training for teachers.

That investment has begun delivering results for students, and progress is being made.

1420

The grade 10 literacy tests for English-language students in the applied stream who took the test for the first time are a case in point. This year, 62% of these students passed, compared to only 49% last year. That's a 27% increase in just the last year.

There is, though, much more work to do for all Ontario students. That is why this year's budget includes an \$820-million boost for education overall. I am pleased to outline the first details of that investment for members today.

C'est pourquoi le budget de cette année incluait un coup de pouce de 820 \$ millions pour l'éducation en général, et j'ai le plaisir d'exposer aujourd'hui aux membres les premiers détails de cet investissement.

In total, \$158 million will be dedicated to expanding our concentrated student success program. This investment is part of our effort to fundamentally change the focus of high schools and enable them to deliver a good outcome for every student in them. This funding increase is backed by a strategy to keep students in school, learning, and to prepare them for their destination of choice, whether that is a job placement with learning, an apprenticeship, or a college or university. Our high school investment is about opportunities and it's about results.

Of the \$158 million, \$89 million will provide for 1,300 new secondary teachers in our high schools September 1 of the next school year. More than 800 of these will be dedicated to student success programs. The number of new teachers will rise to over 1,900 in the course of the next three years. In addition, another \$25 million has been brought forward for one-time funding, bringing the total to \$45 million to expand technological education programs and to buy new equipment.

Our education investment also means smaller class sizes in specific courses, targeted support for students with English as a second language or French as a second language, and more resource teachers, such as librarians and guidance counsellors, who benefit all high school students. In addition, \$23 million in special projects will support struggling students and those with English as a second language.

This year, \$14.5 million has been set aside to purchase new textbooks, on top of existing budgets for our high school students, and \$6 million has been provided to replenish, through one-time funding, resource material for secondary school libraries.

Over 70% of parents expect that their students will attend university. In reality—and our jurisdiction is the

best at this particular outcome—33% of students get there, to university, after graduation. For those students who do not go on to university, Ontario's high schools must provide an equal path to success. We believe that every student should receive a good outcome from Ontario's public education system.

Nous pensons que chaque élève devrait obtenir de bons résultats dans le système d'éducation financé par les deniers publics de l'Ontario. Aujourd'hui, nous honorons cet engagement.

## SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Hon. Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for women's issues):** I rise in the Legislature today to inform the House about yet another step the McGuinty government is taking to restore integrity to Ontario's social assistance program. Today is a giant step forward, a step that will help move people from welfare to work by breaking down barriers that stand in their way and by providing the appropriate supports to get them to succeed, to help them take those first important steps to getting back on their feet and getting out of the welfare trap.

Our changes recognize that social assistance clients are not just statistics; they are real people who are willing to work. They want to improve their lives and the lives of their families. We think our welfare program should work too.

That's why I'm pleased today to announce that, beginning this August, we are implementing a host of changes that will help Ontario Works clients stop working for welfare and start working for a living.

Number one, we are introducing a new transitional health benefit that will provide six months of basic health coverage for such things as prescription drugs, vision and dental care for people who are leaving Ontario Works for employment. We know from experience that many jobs such as temp work, contract work or self-employment don't provide health benefits to employees, and those that do often have a wait time of six months before a new employee is eligible for coverage. Right now, the fear of losing basic health benefits is an enormous barrier and disincentive to employment, especially for people who have children. We don't want the fear for a sick child to be that thing that keeps someone on welfare when that person can work and wants to work.

Secondly, we are scrapping the complex and very confusing earning exemptions regime—all those rules—and replacing it with a very straight, simple, 50% flat rate exemption. It is clear, it's understandable and clients will be able to see, without any complicated calculations or long explanations, exactly what they're earning and what they are keeping. Finally, the financial benefits of working will be crystal clear.

Third, we are eliminating the two-year limit on the variable portion of the earnings exemption. If we want people to stay in the workforce, gain skills and turn their lives around, why would we suddenly begin clawing

back virtually all of their earnings after 24 months? What kind of message does that send to our clients? Ontario Works clients need to see that working for a living is better than working for welfare.

Fourth, we are increasing the amount that Ontario Works clients can deduct for informal child care costs for the first time in 16 years. For 16 years, the maximum deduction for informal child care expenses has been stuck at \$390 per month, an amount that completely fails to acknowledge what a critical support informal care is for families who work part-time, shift work or anything other than a 9-to-5 day. Beginning this August, we are increasing the maximum informal child care deduction amount to \$600 per month. This increase will allow parents working full-time to use informal care as needed.

Remember, thanks to our minister for children, this past year, \$58.2 million was delivered for child care, creating more than 4,000 subsidized child care spaces, and we've signed an historic agreement with the federal government that makes child care a top national priority, with a clear commitment to improve quantity and quality. We thank our children's minister for that because this is the minister who delivered it for Ontario and for Ontario families.

Number five, we are introducing a new full-time employment benefit of up to \$500 to help Ontario Works clients with the very real costs they face when starting a full-time job. This will not only help them with things such as transportation costs, but it will provide an additional incentive for people to work hard to get back into that workforce.

When our government was elected, we said that we expect people to take responsibility for improving their lives, and in turn we will live up to our responsibility for helping them get there. That's what our changes do. They're changes that make a real difference for those thousands who are Ontario's poorest citizens. They're changes that will help thousands and thousands escape that welfare trap. They're changes that recognize that Ontario's people are its greatest resource—and we've heard Premier McGuinty talk about that time and time again. We must never stop finding ways to help them obtain a quality of life that is second to none, right here in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Responses?

1430

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges):** Another photo op for the Minister of Education, another reannouncement of a former announcement. When will the minister take seriously his responsibilities as the minister with responsibility for all schoolchildren across this province?

Do we support new funding of textbooks? Of course. But what I want to ask the minister is, what has he put in place to ensure that those dollars will in fact go to purchasing textbooks and not to paying for the 10.5%

increase he guaranteed for teachers' salaries over the next four years? Do we support lower class sizes? Of course we do. Would anyone object to an announcement of additional resources for technological education programs and new equipment? Of course not; we're all in support of that. Few would object to these programs, because they are positive.

But there is one group of parents who are left wondering how the minister can justify continuing to make multi-million dollar announcements for some students and continue to ignore their children, and those are the parents of autistic children. Not only is the minister refusing to honour the Premier's written guarantee to provide funding for children with autism over the age of six, he is dragging those parents through the courts, appealing a Superior Court decision ordering the government to provide those services. The minister and the Premier continue to pronounce their empty catchphrase, "Every child in this province deserves an equal quality education."

Minister and Premier, why does that not apply to autistic children? When will you have a photo op and an announcement with those parents and those children who are appealing to you, not for additional textbooks, not for additional technological equipment, but for the very basic skills of communication and mobility? I call on this minister and this Premier to get their priorities straight and to honour their commitments to all children in this province.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Cameron Jackson (Burlington):** I went through the budget, figuring we might find something in it that dealt with the issue of job training for persons on social assistance in this province. I'm sad to report that there is none. So today I'm not surprised to hear the minister commenting about her changes, given the fact that she has not made the kind of financial commitment to persons on social assistance to give them the training, the literacy and the other supports that are required in order for them to move off social assistance.

What's very clear—although it isn't clear on the face of the minister's comments, which is very much her stock-in-trade—is that this is working on welfare for life. When you take a person on social assistance who can have a part-time job for the next two years, at which point people, including municipalities, say, "Maybe it's time, if you work an extra several hours, you can get off welfare," but the government has decided that it's OK to stay on welfare, to keep a part-time job and benefits for the rest of your life. You can gild that lily any way you want, but the truth of the matter is, that's the effect. In our view, that's an admission that your steps to employment programs are not working.

Again, the minister failed to get any mention from the Treasurer in the budget. All there is is a reiteration of a commitment made a year ago about a couple of pilot

projects, with no progress report and no targeted number of new persons for employment.

The second issue: The minister underscores the notion that the \$500 is new. Well, it's not new. What's new is that they're going to give \$500 cash to people and say, "I hope you'll go out and buy safety boots and safety glasses"—whatever is needed. Under the previous government and under the system that exists until August, those expenses have to be documented and are provided for through the municipalities in order to effect proper employment. If we're going to give them \$500 cash with no questions asked, maybe this government assumes it will be an easier way. But frankly, these are not steps to employment; this is a pause to employment.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Rosario Marchese (Trinity–Spadina):** The most positive thing I could say about the Minister of Education's announcement is the following: Should these promises come to fruition, it would be a good thing. But I frankly do not believe it or them, and I have no faith in this government.

I've got a couple of examples. Take the special education dollars. Last year, the Minister of Education announced in July, at the end of the school year, \$100 million for special education, and then in August he swindles \$100 million from the boards, claws back the same \$100 million. So in the end, what do we have? No money for last year for special education and no money for this year for special education, even though the minister claimed there would be \$50 million available for boards to access that \$100 million that was properly owed to them the year before, and no processes in place and not one cent went back for special ed. That's one example.

The second example: the capital expenditure amortization fund. This minister last year announced that \$200 million would be available for capital projects and that would raise \$3 billion, only to discover when he made this announcement four months ago that no money was ever spent. When the minister was asked about this, he said this was simply there so boards would know that we would make another announcement a year later about this announcement that is made this year where \$280 million is available and, good God, we will have available \$4 billion. Next year, \$6 billion will be available.

You get my drift? No money is ever spent. You have announcements and nothing gets spent, and then you reannounce. I can't tell a pronouncement from a re-announcement from a non-announcement. We have no time frames. We have no tracking available to know what this minister or this government is spending. They are just plainly announcements.

That is why I urge the Minister of Education to fulfill the promise that he made prior to the election, and that is that we will have a standing committee on education finance in order to be able to know where the money is and where it's going, where it's being spent, if promised.

Minister, I urge you, set up the standing committee. It was your promise; it was McGuinty's promise. Two years later, we still don't know where the money is. A good announcement, if ever we're going to see the money. I don't believe it.

#### SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York):** To the Minister of Comsoc, I looked at your bill; I listened to your speech. You talk about a few lucky people who are on Ontario Works. There is not one word in your statement, not one word in your speech, about the tens of thousands of people who are on the Ontario disability support program. You and your colleagues stand in this House and talk about the disabled, but when you bring forward a bill like this, you don't do a single thing for the disabled. You don't include them in this bill. You don't talk about them at all.

You don't talk about all those people who are between 60 and 65 years of age that the previous government took out of the Ontario disability support program and put into Ontario Works. You don't talk about them. How are they supposed to be finding jobs? How are they supposed to be making ends meet?

You and your government have done absolutely nothing in terms of the promises you made. I'd like to quote you in this very House, because what you say isn't what you mean; what you promise isn't what you do.

In this very House on December 17, 2003, you stated, "I will repeat the McGuinty government commitment during the last campaign, which is what our party campaigned on and what our party will deliver on, and that is an increase to the ODSP and welfare rates to match COLA." That is what you said back then. What do you do now? You do absolutely nothing. You do nothing to help the people. You do nothing about the clawback. You continue to claw back the money from the poorest kids. You do nothing about welfare rates. You do nothing about rent supplements. You do nothing for housing. You do nothing for the shelter allowance, which would help these people more than anything else I can think of.

You have promised a few things to a few people who might go out and find a job, and good luck to them. But for the overwhelming majority of the poor, you are a disgrace.

1440

#### VISITORS

**Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Order. I would like to hear this point of order, please.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Minister of Community and Social Services, I'd like to hear this point of order.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** I'm waiting until the member from Ottawa Centre—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** Order. If I can't get any order, maybe today will be another naming day.

The member from Oak Ridges has a point of order.

**Mr. Klees:** Thank you, Speaker. I'm sure you will find this a point of order.

I want to draw your attention to the presence of regional councillor Mr. Barrow from the town of Richmond Hill, who is in the west gallery. I ask honourable members to welcome him.

**The Speaker:** That is not a point of order, but we shall move to the next item on the agenda.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'd like to draw attention to and welcome the chair of the Hamilton Police Services Board and the representative for ward 3 in Hamilton, Mr. Bernie Morelli.

**Mrs. Liz Sandals (Guelph-Wellington):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**The Speaker:** If this is a point of order, will you draw attention to everyone here then, so I don't have to entertain any other points of order like that any more?

**Mrs. Sandals:** This, in fact, was my intent, Speaker, to explain that we have a number of members from the Ontario Association of Police Service Boards with us in the gallery, and I hope we would welcome all of them.

**The Speaker:** And that will take care of everyone here who's on the police services board.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### ONTARIO BUDGET

**Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier. On page 76 of last year's budget and on page 71 of this year's budget, there are two charts showing the state of Ontario's finances for the next five years.

In only one year, your government has revised its five-year spending plan up by \$13.4 billion, an incredible 25%. Meanwhile, you are only forecasting revenues to grow by an extra \$6 billion.

Can you tell us where this money is going to come from? Is it from borrowing or from taxes?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** It's all laid out in great detail in the budget, which, by the way, I believe has been well received by the people of Ontario.

We've been very clear about the kinds of choices we are making on behalf of the people of Ontario through this budget. One of the choices that the leader of the official opposition will be called upon to make later today when we have a vote is whether or not he supports our unprecedented massive injection of funding into the post-secondary education system in Ontario.

The people of Ontario know where we stand when it comes to better funding our post-secondary education system. I think they will be interested in learning where Mr. Tory stands this afternoon.

**Mr. Tory:** I would say to the Premier, if he wants to separate out the funding for post-secondary education from the unprecedented breaking of promises, the doubling of the health care tax, the huge increase in the debt, then maybe we could talk about it.

This year's plan, the fourth financial plan from the McGuinty Liberal government in two years, shows a huge gap in spending versus revenues.

Premier, do you think it's right that by 2007-08 you'll be adding an extra \$1 billion a year to debt interest in this province? Do you think that's the right thing to do?

**Hon. Mr. McGuinty:** Let's remember what we inherited and how far we've come in a relatively short period of time. We inherited close to a \$6-billion deficit. We have cut that nearly in half in one year. That's a sound accomplishment. We're bringing prudent and responsible financial management to the people's money. That is something they've been longing for. At the same time, we are making desperately needed investments in better schools, better health care and more opportunity for all our young people through training opportunities, college opportunities and university opportunities. We think that builds a strong foundation for a robust economy. Those are the kinds of choices we've made through the budget.

Again, the people of Ontario have perhaps at least a little bit of interest in learning where it is that Mr. Tory stands when it comes to this budget and the investments we are making for Ontarians.

**Mr. Tory:** So, as part of this so-called prudent and responsible financial management, we have the debt going up by \$15 billion over the term of your government and we have debt interest charges up \$1 billion a year by the end of the term—\$1 billion that will not be available for health care and education and all the things you talked about. On top of all that, every single Ontarian will pay twice as much money in health taxes this year, thanks to you, as they did last year. You know how to tax and you know how to spend and you know how to borrow, but you don't know how to save any money.

My question is this: Will you commit to tabling, right here, right now, the specific details of the so-called list of savings of \$330 million referred to in this House many times by your Minister of Finance so we can see if there are really any savings at all, or don't you know how to save any money?

**Hon. Mr. McGuinty:** It's passing strange and a little bit rich that the leader of the official opposition, belonging to a party that added \$48 billion to the debt in a time of strong economic growth, is now condemning us for trying to clean up their mess at the same time as we make desperately needed investments in better public services.

We're proud of the choices we are making, I say again, but it's really hard to try to figure out where the

leader of the official opposition is coming from on these things. He tells us that we should spend more and that we should spend less, that we should balance the budget and that we should balance it sooner but not right now, and that we should cut taxes notwithstanding the fact that we're running a deficit. That's how we ended up in the mess we find ourselves in. We will not go down that road again. We will bring strong and responsible financial management to the people's money and we will make investments in better public services for all Ontarians.

### HOSPITAL FUNDING

**Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition):** This question is for the Premier. It's obvious now that there is no list of \$330 million in savings, no list whatsoever. It's obvious there's no plan; it's obvious there's no interest in helping beleaguered taxpayers; just borrowing and spending and taxing.

The hospitals have on their books \$330 million in deficits from the year just concluded. They will have to fund an upcoming wage settlement with nurses that could cost as much as \$100 million. When you factor out one-time money and capital spending, your government has provided hospitals with a 1% funding increase this year. That's according to the Ontario Hospital Association. Will you force hospitals to cut services to balance their budgets, or will you let them run deficits this year? Which is it?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** Better hang on, because we're all going to suffer from whiplash here. This leader of the official opposition, a moment ago, was accusing us of spending too much money, running up deficits and adding to the debt over a long-term basis. Now he's telling us that we're not spending enough on the hospitals. That's why the people of Ontario are frustrated in trying to figure out exactly where the leader of the official opposition stands on these issues. We are very clear where we stand: We're for cleaning up their mess and investing in better public services.

**Mr. Tory:** The fact of the matter is I told the Premier no such thing. I simply asked you a question. I asked you a question, and I'll ask it again, and the question—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Order. I'm having difficulty hearing the leader of the official opposition.

**Mr. Tory:** The question I asked was very simple. I made no statement of any kind whatsoever. What I asked was a question: In light of the fact that you have allocated this 1% increase to the hospitals of Ontario, and in light of the fact that they have said this is not going to be enough to cover the pressures they're facing, therefore, would you want them to be running deficits this year, or are you wanting them to cut services? You've left them with no other choice. I simply wanted to know, as I do now and I ask you again, which of the two choices is it:

Let them run a deficit this year, or have them cut services? Which will it be?

1450

**Hon. Mr. McGuinty:** Again, we are investing half a billion new dollars in our hospitals this year through this budget. My friend opposite wants to take \$2.4 billion out of our health care system. So I fail to understand the philosophical foundation on which he presumes to stand when it comes to making these kinds of arguments.

We will continue to work with Ontario hospitals. More than 60% have now put themselves in a balanced budget position. We have worked with our hospitals in the past; we will work with them into the future. We are providing a significant increase in funding, and we will find a way to balance those budgets so that we do not compromise the quality of services we're delivering to Ontarians.

**Mr. Tory:** Of course, the Premier knows I have made absolutely no such statement whatsoever. He knows that. What I have said, just for example, is that I would look for real savings and efficiencies in this government, and unlike the Minister of Finance, when I said I found \$330 million or \$450 million or \$650 million in savings and efficiencies in the government, I would come in with an actual list of dates, times and places, unlike this back-end-loaded bafflelegab that is in the budget today. I talked about it in my speech.

Let me just try one more time on the question. If, as the Ontario Hospital Association says, you are giving them 1%—maybe I'll let you get the answer from the Minister of Health here—and that's not enough, I simply want to know, are you going to let them run deficits and encourage them to do that, or are you going to tell them they should cut services? Which choice are you putting them in the position of making? Which one are you approving?

**Hon. Mr. McGuinty:** The leader of the official opposition may be dismissive of a half-billion-dollar increase in hospital funding, but we happen to believe that is very significant, and that's in addition to the hundreds of millions of new dollars in last year's budget.

As I said, we are also working with our hospitals to ensure they can manage this new funding increase. More than 60% of our hospitals have already found a way to balance their budgets in a way that does not compromise the care they are offering to their patients. Beyond that, I am proud to say that, for the first time, we will shortly be announcing the exact figures on a per-hospital basis, and I can say we are also putting in place, for the first time, multi-year funding, which our hospital administrators have been looking for for a long time.

So hospital funding is going up in Ontario. We have a government that is committed to working with our hospitals on an individual basis so that we can do this in a way that does not compromise quality of care, and more than that, we are providing multi-year funding. This is good news for Ontario hospitals and Ontario families.

## CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

**Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** My question is to the Minister of Children and Youth Services. The courts ruled on Friday that a class-action suit involving parents with children with special needs can go forward. These families allege that the government violates section 30 of the Child and Family Services Act by refusing to enter into special-needs agreements with them to provide the care their children need, and instead forces them to give up custody of the children in order to get the treatment their children require. Minister, can you confirm today that the government will not appeal this decision, will not drag these parents through court, and instead will sit down with the families and negotiate a settlement of their concerns?

**Hon. Marie Bountrogianni (Minister of Children and Youth Services, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** The Attorney General.

**Hon. Michael Bryant (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs, minister responsible for democratic renewal):** I'm happy, in any supplementary on the specifics of what our government is actually doing to improve conditions for special-needs children, to refer to the Minister of Children and Youth Services.

I'll just say that, with respect to the member's question regarding the finding by the court allowing the plaintiff's appeal to certify the action, we are still in a period where we are reviewing the decision and determining whether or not to seek leave to appeal. As long as we are in that time—obviously I can't comment on the matter before the court—I will say to the member that, on the subject of settlement issues and negotiations and so on, it has never been the practice of any Attorney General in this province or any officials in the Ministry of the Attorney General to discuss those kinds of things, because all it ends up doing, really, is prejudicing all the litigants involved, and we don't want to do that.

So the matter is before the courts. The appeal is before the courts. An action was brought by some individuals against the government of Ontario, and I'll continue to exercise independent judgment to determine what is in the interest of this action. In the interim, I'm happy to refer questions to the Minister of Children and Youth Services.

**Ms. Martel:** My supplementary is to the Minister of Children and Youth Services. I wonder when you're going to start taking the interests of the families and these kids into account and making that a priority. You see, if you really wanted to help these families, you would announce today that you are not going to appeal the court decision and that you are going to sit down with these families and negotiate a settlement to their concerns.

Since 1997, when the former government unilaterally decided not to enter into special-needs agreements, families have been forced to go to children's aid and give up temporarily or permanently the custody of their children just to get the care they need. Your government has also refused to enter into special-needs agreements, and

under your government, families have also been forced to do the unthinkable: give up custody of their kids just to get the special care they need.

Minister, you could end this situation today by saying you will respect the law, you will enter into special-needs agreements and you will ensure that these families get the services they need without giving up custody. Will you do that today?

**Hon. Mr. Bryant:** That's not a question with litigation, so I'll refer it back to the Minister of Children and Youth Services.

**Hon. Mrs. Bountrogianni:** I obviously can't comment on the appeal, but I can say what we will be doing for these children. I welcome the honourable member's concern. I know this has been very frustrating for the families. This is a situation that we inherited. The Ombudsman, as you know, sent me a report last week—

*Interjections.*

**Hon. Mrs. Bountrogianni:** The member for Nepean—Carleton is heckling me, when it was his government that cut funding to children's programs, which is part of the cause of this problem. If he will allow me to, I will answer the other honourable member's question.

By the end of the week, I will be responding to the Ombudsman's report. In the meantime, even before we received the Ombudsman's report, we had begun to work on this file. It's very complicated. Child protection is at stake, as well as special-needs children. I will be responding by the end of the week to the Ombudsman.

**Ms. Martel:** Minister, you could respond today. And with respect to your saying that this is a situation you inherited, I need to remind you that your government as well has refused to enter into special-needs agreements, and your government, as well as a former Conservative government, has forced families to give up custody of their children to get the special care they deserve. It's not just a problem that you inherited; it's a problem that you have reinforced.

I say to the minister again, if you care about these families, don't wait until Friday. Announce today that you will respect section 30 of the Family and Child Services Act, that you will enter into special-needs agreements with the families so that the children can get the care they need, and you will do that so that these parents are not forced to give up custody just to get the care they need. Will you do that on behalf of your government today, Minister?

**Hon. Mrs. Bountrogianni:** As the Attorney General stated, I can't comment on these particular families and this particular case, but I will say that a solution to this complicated problem will be forthcoming very soon in my response to the Ombudsman's report.

## POLICE OFFICERS

**Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** To the Premier: How many new police officers has your government funded since your announcement in October last year?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs):** To the minister, Speaker.

**Hon. Monte Kwinter (Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services):** I'm pleased to respond. What we have done is carried out and extended the community policing program, which funds 1,000 police officers. We've done that, and it's \$30 million a year. We've made a commitment for another 1,000 police officers, that commitment will stand, and in due course you will hear how that will work.

**Mr. Kormos:** Minister, we would like to hear numbers, because you and your government are like the Wizard of Oz when it comes to community safety: When you pull back the drapes, there's nothing there.

You've told cash-strapped municipalities to hire 1,000 new cops, and you are going to pay a meagre fraction of the price of doing that. Those cities can't afford to keep your promises for you. How many of the 1,000 new officers that you promised will be on the street by the end of this year?

1500

**Hon. Mr. Kwinter:** We have actually committed to provide the shared cost of 1,000 police officers. We will deliver those during the term of our mandate. That was in our platform and that is what we will deliver. I can tell you that we are working with various community leaders, we are working with the stakeholders, to come up with the formula. We will be making that announcement in due course.

**Mr. Kormos:** We know what your promises are, and we know that, rather than delivering on the promises, you've merely broken them. Your ministry budget has been flat-lined, Minister. There's no new money. That means that the 1,000 new cops that you promised aren't going to be hired. We need those police across this province, in communities big and small, to deal with dangerous offenders, guns, gangs, and to improve community safety.

It's your ministry that was flatlined. Why are you breaking your promise to improve community safety?

**Hon. Mr. Kwinter:** For the member to say that we have broken our promise doesn't make any sense. If you take a look at the budget you will see that the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services got an increase of \$27 million year-over-year. You will also know—and I'm sure you recognize—that we made a promise to fund firefighters. We did that, for \$30 million. We made the announcement one week, and the next week the money was delivered. It was the first time since 1982 that any government has provided funding. Not only that: When they did provide funding, they never delivered.

We made the commitment, and we did deliver. We made the commitment on the 1,000 officers, and we will deliver.

## HOSPITAL FUNDING

**Mr. John O'Toole (Durham):** My question is for the Minister of Health. Minister, hospitals are now preparing to cut nurses and other health care providers because of your recent budget. The OHA has said that they'll be cutting core patient services and eliminating 4,000 nursing and essential medical staff.

In my riding of Durham, the Lakeridge Health system is struggling from last year's cuts in funding from you. This year they're facing even less—less than 1% of their budget while their operating cost pressures are 7% to 8%. You should know that. This is not to mention that the 905 residents are already underfunded by \$544 million, less than the rest of the provincial average. Minister, can you make—no false promises; I just want you to tell us straight up that no nurses will be fired and no essential services will be cut from the hospitals in Durham region.

**Hon. George Smitherman (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** The member who himself spikes the question asks for the information straight up. Well, I'll give it to him. The reality is that there is but one party represented in this Legislature that does not have in its history, in its legacy, cuts to hospitals. That is our party. In two years of government, Lakeridge Health has received more than \$13 million in additional funding. In the first two years of that party's responsibility for the provision of health care services, Lakeridge Health's operating baseline budget was cut by \$13 million. That is the reality.

I'm happy to tell the honourable member, building on the excellent answer that the Premier provided earlier, that very soon the very high-quality leadership of Lakeridge Health will receive, from our government, notice not only of this year's allocation, which recognizes growth for the 905, but also two subsequent years of allocation, delivering on our government's commitment of stable multi-year funding—the first party in this House to deliver on that commitment—

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Thank you. Supplementary, the member from Oshawa.

**Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa):** Minister, I need to bring forward another major challenge facing Lakeridge Health. The ministry's funding formula still does not recognize the financial challenges and needs associated with multi-site facilities. As pointed out, Lakeridge has saved \$15 million. It's doing its very best to balance its budget. Minister, what steps are you taking to recognize and correct the funding for multi-site facilities such as Lakeridge Health?

**Hon. Mr. Smitherman:** I appreciate the support and the long-standing commitment that this honourable member has shown to the issue of multi-site funding. We recognize that in many of our hospital corporations in the province of Ontario there is more than one site operating. Our government, as far as I know, was the first, in financing last year, that actually provided resources to hospitals in recognition of the special reality of multi-site. This is something that I continue to push for. I'm glad to

see that it's a position of your party, and I would ask for your continued work in putting pressure on organizations that help to shape the funding formula in the province of Ontario, because as much as I think it's important to continue to work on the issue of multi-site, there is not a consensus on this point, and some people in the hospital environment continue to push for the flexibility that exists if you're not targeting funding. But I believe that these multi-sites, often the smaller of these, are incredibly important and well connected in their communities, in places like Port Perry and Picton, and I'll continue to be a supporter of recognition of the multi-site reality.

#### FOREST INDUSTRY

**Mr. Gilles Bisson (Timmins–James Bay):** My question is to the Premier. You know that the forestry industry in northern Ontario is in crisis as we speak. We've already got mills that have closed down and other mills that are scheduled to close over the next short while, and we have, as you know, a significant problem in the industry. My leader in this Legislature has been raising with you a number of times the need to put in place a forestry strategy to help reposition the industry, in order to protect the good-paying jobs that industry provides.

Yesterday, Jamie Lim, President and CEO of the Ontario Forest Industries Association, put out a press release that I want to quote: "There are 12 forest industry mills identified as being at risk in northern Ontario, and, should they close, the impacts on the entire province, including southern Ontario, will be significantly harsh. 'We need assistance from this government now. The forest industry is in crisis and the loss of our industry is a loss for the entire province'" she said.

Premier, when can we expect you work with us in northern Ontario to develop a forestry strategy to help secure those jobs in northern Ontario?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**Hon. David Ramsay (Minister of Natural Resources):** As the honourable member knows, I have received an interim report from my competitive sector committee, and in that, there are some terrific recommendations as to how the government can step up to the plate and help the industry. I think the member is aware of the announcement of the one plant in Ontario but also the many plants that are closed in Quebec as of today. This is a national problem, but we are working on it at the provincial level. I'm working on that with my colleagues, and soon we'll have what the member wants.

**Mr. Bisson:** Premier, I'm not here to represent the province of Quebec; I'm here to talk about what's happening now in Ontario. We went through this back in the early 1990s, when pulp and paper mills and sawmills across this province were in deep trouble. Our government stepped up to the plate, and we worked with communities—Kapuskasung, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay,

Atikokan and many others—in order to safeguard that employment. You have now been at the helm for almost two years, and all we've got is basically this dog-and-pony show you've been travelling around northern Ontario, which has yet to do anything concrete to help those mills.

I ask you again: Rather than being part of the problem and closing down mills like you have in Opasatika, will you work with us to put in place what's necessary in order to safeguard the jobs in that very important industry?

**Hon. Mr. Ramsay:** I would say to the member that he should be the last one to boast about his government's record when it comes to forestry. There were thousands of jobs lost in that sector right across the north. My colleague the Minister of Northern Development and Mines reminds me that 11,000 jobs were lost. We don't have that.

I say to the member that he should know we're working not only with the industry; we're working with labour, we're working with communities and we're working with the First Nations of the north so we can come up with a comprehensive plan. We have that comprehensive plan, and I say to the member, it's coming and the industry is going to be very happy with what they're going to see.

#### FEDERAL MEMBER

**Ms. Kathleen O. Wynne (Don Valley West):** My question is for the Minister of Finance. Today we learned that former Conservative leadership candidate Belinda Stronach has crossed the floor. She has now joined the federal Liberal government, and will be serving in cabinet. Minister, our Premier has been leading the campaign to narrow the \$23-billion gap for some time. He has gained the support of all parties in this House, of our hospitals, our chambers of commerce, boards of trade and average Ontarians. As we move forward with our campaign for fairness, can you tell us how Belinda Stronach's new position will help Ontario narrow that gap?

**Hon. Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance):** I can tell my friend from Don Valley West that although it's only a matter of two or three metres—the aisle that divides one political party from another in a place like this Legislature or the House of Commons—it takes a great deal of political courage to cross the floor and join another party, and it's not without risks.

#### 1510

In my view, the good news here is that Ms. Stronach is very aware of the extent to which Ontario is at a disadvantage, as a result of the \$23-billion gap, which is the difference between the funding that Ontario pays to the federal government and receives back in services. I'm of the view that she will be a very strong advocate for Ontario on this matter.

**Ms. Wynne:** I agree with you, Minister. I think it's great to have such a strong advocate for narrowing the gap at the cabinet table.

I was surprised to hear the comments of the member for Leeds–Grenville on this issue. When the going got tough, I understand that he resorted to offensive and sexist comments. This is not a small thing in a society where women still have to struggle to increase representation in boardrooms and in our—

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Order.

**Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie–Lincoln):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Surely the member from Don Valley West doesn't have to descend to this kind of level to get into cabinet.

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Ms. Wynne:** Any comment that diminishes women and diminishes politicians who aspire to represent women in Parliament diminishes the whole office.

**Mr. Hudak:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'll ask you to rule whether this question is in order and if it has to do with parliamentary matters or matters with respect to the ministry. I suggest that this kind of question is not in order.

**The Speaker:** I didn't find anything out of order with the question that is coming forward.

The member from Don Valley West, you've got 10 seconds to wrap this up.

**Ms. Wynne:** I'd like the Minister of Finance to comment on the comments by the member for Leeds–Grenville, because it's a critical piece of our going forward that respect for all members of Parliament be shown by this House.

**Mr. John R. Baird (Nepean–Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Questions are to be addressed with respect to a responsibility of the member of the executive council, not to solicit their personal views.

I also would note to you on page 20 of the standing orders, standing order numbers 23(h) and 23(i) state that the Speaker shall call the member to order if they make "allegations against another member" or impute "false or unavowed motives to another member."

I'd like to ask you to rule on those three standing orders, Speaker, and whether this actually has to do with the conduct of the ministry that is governed by the minister opposite.

**The Speaker:** You asked me before about the same point of order you're speaking on, and I've ruled on that before. I find the question quite appropriate.

Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Sorbara:** I think my colleague the minister responsible for women's issues wants to comment.

**Hon. Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for women's issues):** Mr. Speaker, I think I will speak for most members in this House in answer to that question. The member from Leeds–Grenville was way out of line in that kind of discussion this afternoon. I think everyone in this House is going to agree to unanimous consent for an apology in this House. Every single woman is diminished

when we hear that kind of language. The truth is that that particular member well knows that MP to be bright and intelligent and, thankfully, now in our party.

So let me just say that what it points to more is this: It speaks more to the leadership of the Conservative Party. I am demanding from the leader of the Conservative Party—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Thank you. Order.

**Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I would now ask you to rule on the content of the minister's response where she calls, in this House, into question the honour of an honourable member. I ask that you consult with the table on this issue. It is very serious, and if you allow that kind of comment to be made in this House by one member against another member, this place no longer deserves to be called an honourable place. Please, Speaker, I ask you to rule on that.

**Hon. Ms. Pupatello:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the House for unanimous consent to allow a member to apologize to the House.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Let's quiet down a bit.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I'd like some order in the House.

We'll take a five-minute break.

*The House recessed from 1518 to 1523.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Please be seated.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. I'd like the members to show some respect to the Parliament too, as I speak on this matter.

I have been having great concern over a couple of days about the decorum and some of the questions that are being put that are not really relevant, sometimes, to the minister, and some questions are put to ministers that are not relevant in his or her category. And I want to warn members that the tone itself has not been very good.

Also, as I listened to the questions today, and I reflect back on what was said in this last question, I think it was inappropriate, in a way, to have directed a question and to have some concern about a member and some statement outside of the House, of which I have no knowledge and cannot rule on. I think that that comment is a bit out of order. We must be cautious about that, when we talk about other members making statements outside of this House and bringing it inside this House.

At the same time, I've also watched as questions of the same nature come from the opposition side. But today it has accelerated to a point that we must be more concerned and give more concern to the discipline of this Parliament. When that goes down, we all go down, in a sense, as to how the public sees us. I would ask and beseech you all that you conduct yourselves in such a manner that we can call this a Parliament we can respect.

At this time, since I've got the floor, I would also say to many of the ministers that I expect some sort of concern and some discipline in the way they listen, with the heckling that goes on even by ministers themselves

when questions are being asked. I would ask you also to watch yourselves in that nature.

I'm going to move on to the next question. The leader of the official opposition.

#### COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

**Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a question for the Premier. As the Premier will know, I sent across a letter to him at the beginning of proceedings today when he came into the House which asked him to consult with his colleagues and allow for a real opportunity for the Information and Privacy Commissioner to fully state her concerns regarding Bill 183, the adoption disclosure legislation currently before the committee.

As the Premier knows, the committee to which this bill has been referred, a committee that the Liberal government members control, has only allowed her 15 minutes to make her presentation, plus five minutes—I believe I'm right—for each party to ask questions of her. I think the Premier would also know that Ms. Cavoukian has very serious concerns about the bill and has received volumes of correspondence from concerned people on both sides of the debate.

I've requested in my letter and I ask you now, are you willing to allow Ms. Cavoukian to have a total time of 120 minutes for her presentation and questions? I think I suggested 90 minutes for her presentation and 30 minutes for questions, divided between parties. Could you help us to make sure this happens, so the voices of people who have communicated with her can be heard?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I'm going to allow my House leader to speak to this because he has more information.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader):** The committee time allocations were outlined and agreed to at subcommittee and then at full committee. Now, we are always prepared to negotiate these and other items. We're quite prepared to do that at House leaders' meetings, as we always have. I will, however, remind the House that all three caucuses agreed to the times that were set up, the amount of time for delegations. I would welcome this representation to be made at a House leaders' meeting. We can discuss that in the context of a number of legislative initiatives.

Those hearings were sent to committee. Committee hearings have been held on all our bills, something that didn't happen up until 2003, and we haven't had to use time allocation. So I would suggest that if it is the desire of the opposition to discuss this at greater length, we can certainly talk about this issue in the context of a House leaders' meeting.

**Mr. Tory:** The matter here is complicated because there were two different subcommittee reports. Actually, I voted in favour of the bill on second reading, as the Premier and every other member of this House knows. But I think it is important that on a matter like this, where someone in a position of responsibility like the privacy commissioner has expressed some concern and has letters

from—I won't say thousands—many people across the province who find it difficult to appear in front of a committee, their voice should be heard.

I gather there were two different subcommittee discussions, one of which the government members voted down, to allow for a longer period of time to have some proper notice so people could come in and be heard. All I'm asking today is whether the Premier would agree that a 15-minute time period allocated to the privacy commissioner to represent all these people is inadequate, and that we might simply give her a total of two hours: 90 minutes to make her presentation and half an hour for questions? That's all I'm asking. Yes or no?

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** I understand the challenge the Leader of the Opposition has with his divided caucus on this issue. I'll remind him that his caucus wouldn't even allow the minister to speak to this bill at this committee. So to the leader of the official opposition, this government has had more hearings on more bills than any government. We'll be happy to discuss this issue at the House leaders' meeting. The commissioner has been heard already, and we look forward to the opportunity to have her back to the hearings as well to discuss this bill.

**Mr. Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The House leader has offered the House completely erroneous information. He is completely—

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Order. You made some unparliamentary comment, and I would ask you to withdraw that.

**Mr. Arnott:** I made no unparliamentary remark, Mr. Speaker.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. We know the procedures here. And I'm sure you also know the procedure, too.

1530

**Mr. Arnott:** I do indeed, Mr. Speaker, and I show no disrespect to you by saying that the minister has offered the House completely erroneous—

**The Speaker:** Order. I'll have to ask you if you choose to withdraw it or not.

**Mr. John R. Baird (Nepean-Carleton):** Point of order.

**The Speaker:** Order. I have a point of order on the—you're always doing this, member from Nepean-Carleton. I'm dealing with a point of order here.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. If you all want to run the clock, that's fine. Minister, would you come to order, please.

You do intend to withdraw?

**Mr. Arnott:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to show you absolutely no disrespect because of the high regard I hold you—

**The Speaker:** You know the rules. I don't need a speech.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker:** I will regard that as a withdrawal.

New question.

## LANDFILL

**Ms. Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East):** I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. It's about an excavation that's taking place at the Rennie landfill site in Hamilton.

Your Hamilton staff assured the CLC, the community liaison committee, that your ministry is testing materials that are going to the Taro landfill. The Taro certificate of approval forbids domestic waste, as you may be aware, but we've learned that excavated material from the Rennie Street dump contains domestic waste like old newspapers, old shoes, bottles of pickles, those kinds of things.

Minister, is your ministry allowing Taro to accept this prohibited domestic waste from Rennie? Further, at Taro, is the Ministry of the Environment inspecting every load of waste that's coming from the Rennie Street dump? If so, will you release all test results to prove there is no illegal dumping occurring at Taro?

**Hon. Leona Dombrowsky (Minister of the Environment):** I thank the honourable member for the question. Certainly the Ministry of the Environment does prescribe, under the certificate of approval, specific conditions that must be followed. I would say that today, the best information that the Ministry of the Environment has is that the appropriate conditions are being met. If the honourable member has information to the contrary, I would welcome her to send that to me directly. I will meet with her after this session here this afternoon.

I think it's important to say to this House that the Ministry of the Environment wants to ensure that people in the community are protected. That is why we are working with the community liaison committee. That's why we've established a community liaison committee. We take their issues very seriously, and I've indicated that I would be prepared to receive any new information that the honourable member might send to me.

**Ms. Horwath:** Thank you, Madam Minister, but the information is not new. In fact, the CLC has been hearing about it for quite some time now. I first asked you about this myself back in October 2004, and you've done nothing. As a result, the controversial Taro landfill site has once again become a major concern to the citizens of Hamilton.

Minister, bottles of blood were found at the Rennie Street landfill, and as a result, the police had to be called, but you have been invisible from the beginning in this process. Will you at least come to the table now? Will you finally investigate the Rennie excavation and the possibility of illegal dumping at the Taro site and provide the Rennie community liaison committee with all of the test results and a full report, or do you not care at all if the Taro landfill is causing deep concern in Hamilton? Who do you think needs to be putting these rules in force? It's your responsibility. The information is out there. It's not new; it's been told at the CLC, week after week. Will you do something about the illegal dumping in Taro, if it exists?

**Hon. Leona Dombrowsky (Minister of the Environment):** For the honourable member to suggest that this minister and this ministry have done nothing—I would like to remind the honourable member that I have met with these people, with her present in the room. We have talked about the responsibility the Ministry of the Environment has. We have a community liaison committee. Staff from the Ministry of the Environment continue to work with community representatives.

I don't doubt that members of the community bring information forward. Ministry of the Environment staff have a responsibility to pursue that. I would suggest that Ministry of the Environment staff are doing what they are required to do to ensure that the conditions of this activity are being met, and being met safely. Again, I say to the honourable member that if she has concrete evidence to the contrary, she should bring that to me directly, and I commit to her that I will pursue that personally.

## ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

**Ms. Jennifer F. Mossop (Stoney Creek):** My question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Last week, this Legislature took an historic step forward with unanimous approval in this House to pass the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. This legislation will have a profound impact on 1.5 million people in Ontario and their families. Minister, could you please explain for us why this act and its passing will make Ontario a world leader for people with disabilities?

**Hon. Marie Bountrogianni (Minister of Children and Youth Services, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** I'd like to thank the honourable member for the question. I was extremely proud of all my colleagues on both sides of the House last week, when we unanimously passed the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. That alone made such a difference to people with disabilities in this province, the people we invited here that day to listen to and watch the proceedings. This legislation will create an accessible society where every Ontarian will fulfill their potential.

As the member indicated in the question, Ontario will be one of the world leaders in improving accessibility for people with disabilities. This act is very significant because of its approach. It's built on collaboration, on the standards being developed with business, with the disability community, with government. We will see action in five years or less, and those standards will also be enforceable. In other words, if business or the public sector does not comply, there will be fines.

**Ms. Mossop:** There is one area we need to clarify. Critics were saying that business would not go along with this, that they would push back. In fact, especially in my region, Dofasco has been a real leader in accessibility. What impact will this have on business, because it can be costly to bring things up to standard?

**Hon. Mrs. Bountrogianni:** Yes, a lot of people were saying that business would not go for this, but I'm

honoured to say business actually stepped up to the plate—and we're very proud of Hamilton. Leaders in Hamilton, like Dofasco, were crucial in the development of this legislation, along with people with disabilities. We had the first-ever in Canada formal meeting between people with disabilities and business at a round table about a year and a half ago. There was 95% agreement on virtually every issue. People with disabilities understood the importance of business; people in business understood the human rights of people with disabilities. It was amazing to see what you can do if you do it the right way.

With an aging population, 20 years from now, one in five Ontarians is likely to be a person with a disability. Right now, people with disabilities have \$25 billion a year in spending power. Imagine the potential for business, which of course would increase the tax base, which is good for programs for people in Ontario. This is a win-win all around for people with disabilities, for business and for government.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM FUNDING

**Mrs. Julia Munro (York North):** My question is to the Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal. I noted with some surprise in the budget that you are now including a role for the private sector in your infrastructure spending. This came as a shock, given your position in the election. Dalton McGuinty said in the middle of the campaign that public-private partnerships were a waste of money. Since you promised one thing before the election and then did the exact opposite after the election, how will you persuade business to trust you when you keep changing your position?

**Hon. David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal):** Nothing of the sort has happened. In fact, the Premier said we would bring into the public realm the former government's attempts to make private hospitals, which is precisely what we've done. In fact, hospitals, schools and our water systems, under our proposals, will always remain in public hands. The most important thing, and I would really bring this home to the member opposite, is that our valuable public assets must always remain under public control. That was the real flaw in the previous government's fire sale of Highway 407, where the government does own the rights of way on Highway 407, but we have completely lost control of a vital piece of infrastructure, to the point where Ontarians in her riding are being gouged exorbitant rates because of a government which has sold out the users, which has sold out the owners, the people of Ontario. We have taken a principle-based approach to getting the critical investment that we need in public infrastructure, and I would ask and encourage the member to join with us to realize that kind of investment.

1540

**Mrs. Munro:** Ontarians want to know that they can trust their leaders to keep their word. Dalton McGuinty very publicly opposed private funding of infrastructure

before the election. However, now the Minister of Finance has said in his speech that using private money to help finance public projects is an idea whose time has come. Your new name for this is alternative finance and procurement, which you said in a speech is "a technique for encouraging investment by the private sector in public facilities." Minister, why did you change your mind?

**Hon. Mr. Caplan:** I'm curious that the member is now opposed to seeking private investment in public infrastructure. In fact, the member would be aware that back in July, I issued a government policy paper called Building a Better Tomorrow. It outlines five key principles under which we will gain the necessary investments in our infrastructure. I want you to know that public interest will be paramount, that we will get appropriate value for dollars and have the kind of accountability that the previous government lacked. I could go on with the others: appropriate public control and ownership, and fair, open and transparent processes. But one of the great stories of our budget was a \$30-billion total investment in infrastructure that had been lacking under both previous governments.

We reject the debt-laden method of the third party. We reject the privatization method of your government, I say to the member opposite. There's a third way, there's a better way, a way that will gain the necessary investment that we desperately need in our infrastructure. I encourage you and other members—

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** New question.

#### REFINERY CLOSURE

**Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** Premier, last Thursday Inco told its employees at the copper refinery that they were close to finalizing a deal to ship raw copper out of Sudbury, to be refined in Quebec. If the deal goes through, Inco will shut down the refinery in seven months and some 160 good-paying union, management and technical support staff jobs will be lost from the community. This is an urgent situation. That is why I called your office on Friday, May 6, requesting a meeting between you, myself and representatives of the Steelworkers union to determine what you are going to do to save these jobs and the refinery. Despite calls from myself and from the Steelworkers to your office, we haven't been able to arrange a meeting yet. Premier, will you have your staff arrange a meeting as soon as possible so that we will know what you're prepared to do to stop Inco from transferring these jobs to Quebec?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** To the Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** This obviously is a very, very big concern in our community, and we as a government continue to keep the door open to meetings. We've arranged meetings, we continue to communicate with both sides, and let's set the record straight with regard to what we as a government have done. Inco has been very

clear, because of their discussion with the union, because of their interaction with our government, that there will be no layoffs if the proposed closure of the refinery goes through. In discussion with the union and in discussion with our government—I'm very, very proud to say that the collaboration between union, company and government has resulted in 125 new union jobs being created since January and 17 new staff positions being created. The reality is that the door is open to communication. We want to bring the sides together. We want to ensure—

**The Speaker (Hon. Alvin Curling):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Martel:** To the Premier, to set the record straight: If raw copper is allowed to be processed in Quebec, our community will lose 160 good-paying jobs and our community can ill afford to lose 160 good-paying jobs. StatsCan just recently reported that the community lost 800 jobs in April alone.

Back to the Premier: Inco can afford to make the necessary renovations to make the refinery more efficient. Inco made \$612 million last year. They made over \$300 million in the first quarter of 2005 alone, and \$215 million of that came out of the Ontario division, which is essentially Sudbury. Inco has the money, and Inco should be told that they're not going to be allowed to take raw copper out of our community to be refined in Quebec. Premier, I ask you again: We have asked for a meeting with you so that we can deal with this serious situation. Are you prepared to meet with myself and the Steelworkers so we can know what you are prepared to do to stop this from happening?

**Hon. Mr. Bartolucci:** Stats Canada will also tell you that the unemployment rate in Sudbury was 7.4%, which was the lowest unemployment rate in the last 15 years in Sudbury. So I think we should be very optimistic. Listen, the reality of this situation is that we are going to try to minimize any job reduction in the community. We are going to work with the union; we are going to work with the company. We will bring collaboration to this issue. We want to ensure we maximize new job creation. We look not only at the short-term situation, we look at the long-term situation. We want to create jobs both for the short term and the long term. We will do that by working with both sides.

#### NORTHERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. David Oraziotti (Sault Ste. Marie):** My question is to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. As you know, infrastructure is vitally important to northern Ontario and to my community of Sault Ste. Marie. Under both former governments, we experienced devastating cuts to infrastructure spending and programs in northern Ontario, particularly to our northern highways. The previous government made announcements about four-laning highways, but did nothing. We know there's a big difference between a Conservative IOU and a Liberal bank deposit. Minister, please elaborate on what our government is doing to improve infrastructure

in northern Ontario and what is different about our government's plan for northern Ontario highways.

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** The member from Sault Ste. Marie asks a very important question. This government this year will invest \$485 million in northern infrastructure, including an unprecedented investment of \$297 million in northern roads rehabilitation and expansion. Never in the history of our province has this much money been committed to northern roads by any government. I'm also pleased to announce that finally we have a plan and the dollars for completing the four-laning of Highway 69. My colleague has asked about a very important distinction between former governments and the McGuinty government: The reality is, we're about action and they're about rhetoric.

**Mr. Oraziotti:** Thank you for the response. This is very good news for northerners, but my constituents are also concerned about other infrastructure projects and jobs in Sault Ste. Marie. We've seen the benefits of our northern prosperity plan in important projects in Sault Ste. Marie such as the new Flakeboard plant, the new Sutherland Group centre, the Gateway project and the boardwalk project. Minister, can you reassure the constituents in my community that we'll continue to provide the tools necessary to improve northern economic prosperity?

**Hon. Mr. Bartolucci:** The member from Sault Ste. Marie has worked very hard to bring job creation to his community of Sault Ste. Marie. The budget is going to help him this year because it solidifies our government's commitment to the newly refocused northern Ontario heritage fund, with an annual contribution of \$60 million. This represents the largest annual commitment to the north, through the northern Ontario heritage fund. In addition to this significant contribution, in 2005-06 the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corp. will get an additional \$55 million for commitments made under the old mandate. In addition to this, the Northern Ontario Grow Bonds Corp. will invest approximately \$13 million from the successful sale of grow bonds. We have laid the foundation for positive growth in northern Ontario.

1550

#### COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

**Mr. Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington):** My question is to the Premier, and it concerns Bill 183, the adoption bill. Last Tuesday, the subcommittee of the standing committee on social policy met to discuss how this bill would be handled, and the subcommittee developed a report that would have been recommended back to the full committee. It would have allowed for a full public process, including advertising of the fact that the committee hearings were taking place so as to allow people who are interested in this bill to have an opportunity to come forward and speak to it.

On May 12, two days later, another subcommittee meeting was called. At this subcommittee meeting, the

member for Don Valley West brought forward new government marching orders to compress the time frame for the hearings considerably from the previous subcommittee's tentative decision and to ensure that there would not be advertising of this bill.

My question to the Premier is this: Is he willing to use his influence as the head of government to ensure that there is a suitable public process on this bill, so that everyone who has an interest in this bill is informed of it and is given an opportunity to present at the public hearings?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** This is a matter for the House leader.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader):** As I indicated in my response to the member's first question, we will certainly be happy to discuss this at the House leaders' meeting again.

I'll remind the member that in addition to the Information and Privacy Commissioner, who, I understand, is speaking this Thursday for 15 minutes, which, as I understand it, is the amount of time allocated to each delegation, certain members of the committee wouldn't allow the minister to come and speak.

So I think we should talk about this at House leaders. My hope is that we can come to an amicable resolution of this situation.

I can say this, however: This government supports this bill, this government sees the importance of this bill, this government is united on this bill, and this government will see this bill passed, regardless of whatever tricks you may try to use to stop passage of this bill.

## PETITIONS

### ONTARIO FARMERS

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford):** I have a petition here signed by many of my constituents and constituents from neighbouring ridings. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas thousands of Ontario farmers have been forced to take their concerns directly to Queen's Park because of a lack of response from the Dalton McGuinty government to farm issues; and

"Whereas farming in Ontario is in crisis because of the impacts of BSE, unfair subsidies from other jurisdictions, rising costs for energy and a crushing regulatory burden on farmers; and

"Whereas current prices for farm products do not allow for sustainable agriculture in Canada, with a 10.7% decline in the number of Canadian farms reported between 1996 and 2001;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to consult with Ontario's farmers to develop a long-term strategy to ensure the viability of agriculture in our province that protects our rural way of

life, and to work in the short term to alleviate the farm income crisis and listen to the concerns of farmers about the greenbelt."

I affix my signature, as I agree with the petition.

### HALTON RECYCLING PLANT

**Mrs. Julia Munro (York North):** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas noxious odours from the Halton Recycling plant in Newmarket are adversely affecting the health and quality of life of residents and working people in Newmarket; and

"Whereas local families have lost the enjoyment of their properties for themselves and their children, face threats to their health and well-being, and risk a decline in the value of their homes; and

"Whereas for the 300 members of the nearby main RCMP detachment, as well as other workers in the area, the odours are making their working conditions intolerable;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, demand that the Minister of the Environment take immediate action to halt all noxious emissions and odours from the Halton Recycling plant, and take all steps necessary to force Halton Recycling to comply with environmental rules, including closing the plant if the odour problems continue."

I will affix my signature to this, as I am in complete agreement, and give it to Elizabeth.

### DRIVER PENALTIES

**Mr. Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a number of petitions that were collected by an organization in the constituency.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there currently exists an inequity in penalties under the Highway Traffic Act whereby a driver causing death or grievous harm to another, due to unsafe turn or other act, may only see a maximum \$500 fine, and such is an inadequate penalty;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to pass into law the Highway Traffic Act amendment, as proposed by the Bikers Rights Organization, which calls for stiffer penalties for drivers involved in fatal accidents where their error caused the fatality."

This is signed by a number of people from Massey, Espanola, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury etc. They've attended my office on a number of occasions, and I have met with them on eight.

### PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

**Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton-Victoria-Brock):** "Physicians Needed in Small Ontario Communities:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Our community is facing an immediate, critical situation in accessing physician services.

“While the recruitment and retention of physicians has been a concern for many years, it is now reaching crisis proportions.

“Training more physicians in Ontario is certainly the best response to this problem in the longer term. We are, however, in urgent need of support for immediate short-term solutions that will allow our community both to retain our current physicians and recruit new family doctors and specialists in seriously understaffed areas. Foreign-trained physicians may help us to respond to this need.

“Therefore we, as the residents of Haliburton-Victoria-Brock, urge you to respond to our community’s and our region’s critical and immediate needs. For us, this is truly a matter of life and death.”

I agree with this and sign with many people from my constituency.

#### CREDIT VALLEY HOSPITAL

**Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga West):** I have a petition here from a number of residents of Erin Mills. It’s to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and reads as follows:

“Credit Valley Hospital Capital Improvements:

“Whereas some 20,000 people each year choose to make their home in Mississauga, and a Halton-Peel District Health Council capacity study stated that the Credit Valley Hospital should be operating 435 beds by now, and 514 beds by 2016; and

“Whereas the Credit Valley Hospital bed count has remained constant at 365 beds since its opening in November 1985, even though some 4,800 babies are delivered each year at the Credit Valley Hospital in a facility designed to handle 2,700 births annually; and

“Whereas donors in Mississauga and the regional municipalities served by the Credit Valley Hospital have contributed more than \$41 million of a \$50-million fundraising objective, the most ambitious of any community hospital in the country, to support the construction of an expanded facility able to meet the needs of our community;

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

“That the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care undertake specific measures to ensure the allocation of capital funds for the construction of A and H block at Credit Valley Hospital to ensure the ongoing acute care needs of the patients and families served by the hospital are met in a timely and professional manner, to reduce wait times for patients in the hospital emergency department, and to better serve patients and the community in Halton and Peel regions by reducing severe overcrowding in the labour and delivery suite.”

I’d also like to mention one other doctor I know, and that’s my sister, and wish her the best on her 50th birthday.

#### HIGHWAY 26

**Mr. Jim Wilson (Simcoe–Grey):** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the redevelopment of Highway 26 was approved by MPP Jim Wilson and the previous PC government in 2000; and

“Whereas a number of horrific fatalities and accidents have occurred on the old stretch of Highway 26; and

“Whereas the redevelopment of Highway 26 is critical to economic development and job creation in Simcoe–Grey;

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

“That the Liberal government stop the delay of the Highway 26 redevelopment and act immediately to ensure that the project is finished on schedule, to improve safety for area residents and provide economic development opportunities and job creation in Simcoe–Grey.”

Obviously, I’ve signed that petition and I agree with it.

#### ANTI-SMOKING LEGISLATION

**Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga West):** I have a petition to the Ontario Legislative Assembly from Chantal Murray of Derry Road in Meadowvale, and Jennifer Fyffe of Loyalist Drive in Erin Mills, Mississauga. It reads as follows:

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

“Whereas some 16,000 Ontarians each year die of tobacco-related causes; and

“Whereas the inhalation of direct and second-hand tobacco smoke both lead to health hazards that can and do cause preventable death; and

“Whereas more than four out of every five Ontarians do not smoke, and this large majority desires that enclosed public places in Ontario be smoke-free at all times; and

“Whereas preventing the sale of tobacco products, especially to young people, and banning the use of tobacco products in public and gathering places of all types will lower the incidence of smoking among Ontarians, and decrease preventable deaths;

“Be it therefore resolved that the Ontario Legislative Assembly enact Bill 164, and that the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care aggressively implement measures to restrict the sale and supply of tobacco to those under 25; that the display of tobacco products in retail settings be banned; that smoking be banned in enclosed public places or in workplaces, and banned on or near the grounds of public and private schools, hospitals and day nurseries; that designated smoking areas or rooms in public places be banned, and that penalties for violations of smoking laws be substantially increased.”

I wholeheartedly agree with this petition. I’ve affixed my signature to it and ask Sean to carry it for me.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Pursuant to standing order 30(b), it now being 4 o'clock, I am required to call orders of the day.

1600

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### 2005 ONTARIO BUDGET

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 16, 2005, on the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** The member for Nickel Belt has the floor if she chooses to continue the debate.

**Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I want to deal with two other matters in the time that I have remaining. The first has to do with the lack of any strategy in the budget at all with respect to the forestry sector in northern Ontario. The best that the government could do with respect to the forestry sector was to say, "We are working on ways to strengthen the forest products sector. It's a very important industry for Ontario—it employs almost 30,000 people in the north." Well, we know that, and we know that what is happening right now is that, as a result of this government's policy of high hydro rates, many of the mills, many of the pulp and paper operations are now at risk because the hydro-electricity costs are such a critical and such a large part of their operating budgets that they are consciously making decisions to shut down and move these operations somewhere else.

It's interesting that yesterday the Ontario Forest Industries Association weighed in on this matter and repeated what my party and our leader has said for some time, that if the government can do something about the film industry, if the government can do something about casinos, if the government can do something about the auto sector, then this government can do something now about the forestry sector that is taking a beating in our part of province.

Here is what Jamie Lim, who is the CEO for Ontario Forest Industries Association, had to say about this matter yesterday: "There are 12 forest industry mills identified as being at risk in northern Ontario, and should they close"—

**Mr. John R. Baird (Nepean–Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Could I get some guidance from the Chair? Is the word "erroneous" unparliamentary?

**The Acting Speaker:** It depends on the context. I return to the member for Nickel Belt.

**Ms. Martel:**—"the impact on the entire province, including southern Ontario, will be significantly harsh. 'We need the assistance of the government now. The forest industry is in crisis and the loss of our industry is a loss for the entire province,' said president and CEO of the Ontario Forest Industries Association Jamie Lim.

"Ms. Lim notes financial analysis has shown the closure of the 12 high-risk mills will result in 7,500 direct job losses in the north, 17,500 indirect job losses in the north and a further 13,000 indirect job losses in southern Ontario. 'The forest industry is second only to the automotive sector in its \$8-billion contribution to the province's balance of trade. Unquestionably, the loss of 12 mills will have severe social and economic impacts, not only on individuals, families and communities that have lost jobs, but to the province as a whole. Just consider the loss in tax revenue,' adds Lim.

"Ontario's forest industries do not want a handout, we want a hand up, and we are asking the provincial government to offer assistance, as it has for the automotive sector and the film industry,' stated Lim."

I contrast the complete lack of action by the government today on this important matter with the investments that we made in the forest industry sector when we were the government. When I was chair of the northern Ontario heritage fund, we invested over \$34 million alone in a number of sawmills and forest product operations that were having a very difficult time during the recession, when many of the banks they borrowed money from were pulling out of those operations and out of those communities: over \$34 million invested in a number of small mills and small forestry operations in the province—that doesn't include the very significant investment that we made in Kapuskasing at Spruce Falls, for example, in partnership with Ontario Hydro, where we brought in worker ownership legislation so that the workers themselves could purchase that mill, and then, working with Tembec, make it profitable again; the significant investment that we made in Provincial Papers in Thunder Bay to allow that mill to restructure; the very significant investment we made in Sault Ste. Marie as well, at St. Marys Paper, when we provided the funding to allow that operation to restructure.

It was at least \$34 million for small mills in Field, Atikokan, Dubreuilville, New Liskeard, Levack, Monetteville, Hearst, Manitouwadge, Upsala, Panet, Haig, Thessalon, Timmins, Bucke etc. All of those investments were made, along with very significant and substantial financial investments to allow some of the very big companies to restructure and some of those communities to be safe.

I say to the government, what are you waiting for? How many more mills do you want to close? How many more communities do you want to devastate by refusing to acknowledge that there is a serious crisis facing the forestry industry? You need to do something about that today. We did. Where are you, and how many jobs are you prepared to lose by your inaction? How many communities are you prepared to see go down the drain in northern Ontario because, 19 months into your mandate, you have done nothing to respond to these serious concerns?

As I pointed out, it's not just New Democrats who have been calling on this government to react. Yesterday the head of the Ontario Forest Industries Association made it very clear that they need help, and they need help

now. There was nothing in the budget to point out that this government is going to provide any investment, provide for any stability in this particular sector and certainly no indication of, if they were going to do something, when that might actually occur.

The last point I want to dwell on happens to be northern highways. We've had some fun looking at what is actually in the budget with respect to northern highways and what the Minister of Northern Development and Mines announced that isn't in the budget at all.

Last Thursday morning the Minister of Northern Development and Mines was in Sudbury, speaking to the Rotary Club. He said very clearly that the four-laning of Highway 69 was guaranteed, that the money was fully committed, that the money was in the 2005 budget to fully four-lane Highway 69 over the next 12 years. Well, I had a chance to review both the budget and the background budget papers, and I can tell you that there is no specific money set aside for the construction of Highway 69 at all—not in this fiscal year and certainly not in the next 12. Nowhere is there any specific reference whatsoever to a specific amount of money for the four-laning of Highway 69 this year or over the next 12.

My colleague Mr. Bisson and I put out a press release on Friday, and we said that it was completely wrong for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines to claim, as he did last Thursday, that the money for this important project is in the budget. I wish it were, but it isn't. The minister responded on the weekend by saying, "There's no question about it. This year's funding is outlined in the budget on page 76." I've got page 76 of the budget and I can tell you that nowhere on page 76, not anywhere, is there any reference at all to a specific amount of money for the four-laning of Highway 69 this year. The only thing that appears in the budget under "Plan 2005-06" is the amount of money that the government intends to spend on all highways in the province. I assume that that's what the figure is. I'll tell you again that nowhere on page 76, not anywhere, is there any type of reference to a specific amount of funding for Highway 69, certainly not this year and not for the next 12.

**1610**

The minister also went ahead and said, "Oh, on page 123 there is a commitment to pave the highway in 12 years." That is true. It's interesting to note that the 12-year completion date is two years longer than was promised by the Conservatives when they were in government. When the Conservatives announced it would take ten years to four-lane Highway 69, the MPP from Sudbury, now the Minister of Northern Development and Mines, was hanging from the chandeliers in this place, on and on about how this was a highway of death, that it was far too long to deal with the carnage on the highway, that it was far too long to deal with the significant safety issues. Now this minister comes forward and says his government is going to take two years longer to complete the project than the period of time he was so critical about when the Conservatives were in government.

What is happening here? How come the Minister of Northern Development and Mines was so critical of the former government for a 10-year time frame to complete the four-laning of Highway 69, and now his government comes forward with a proposal, almost two years after having been in government, to complete the highway project in 12 years?

Look, every government, ours included, allocated significant funds of money to four-lane up Highway 69. How else would we be in Parry Sound today with four-laning right through to Parry Sound? The Liberals under Peterson, the NDP under Bob Rae, the Conservatives under Ernie Eves and Mike Harris, all allocated funding for this project, as well we should have.

I assume this government is going to as well, but it is not correct, it is not true and it is not right to tell the people of Sudbury that the amount of money for Highway 69 appears in this budget, appears for this year and appears for 12 years. It does not. As I said earlier, I wish it did, but I can tell you and the people in my community and those who are watching today that it is not true to say that either on page 76 or page 123 or page 12 of the budget document that the funding amount, the actual specific amount of money for the four-laning, appears. It does not. I hope soon we will find out where the money is going to come from to complete this important project.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Khalil Ramal (London-Fanshawe):** I am honoured to stand up on the second day to speak in support of the great budget delivered last week by our government. I have been listening for the last 10 or 15 minutes to the honourable member from Nickel Belt talking about the negative side of the budget. Negativity is what she thinks the budget is all about, but I want to tell you and all the people across Ontario, I read the budget and I thought it was great news for the people of this province, because they know that we listened to them. We consulted them, we asked them, and we came back and delivered a great budget to speak to their concerns, talking about infrastructure, a great investment, about \$30 billion to rebuild the whole province of Ontario.

We talk about education. Post-secondary education means a lot to all the people in this province. As you know, our times are changing and our lives are changing, requiring from us to be well equipped with knowledge, with education. It's the only way we can achieve our goal of being a prosperous province and a prosperous nation. We have to educate our people. We have to support the colleges and universities. We have to invest a lot of money in research. That's what we did in the budget.

I know that many people in the province maybe are listening to us today and they know exactly what they are getting. They're getting good investment to look after them, to look after young people, to look after students, to look after seniors, and to look after health care. We invested big money in health care to protect our people, the vulnerable people. This government is acting. I am honoured, like many of my colleagues and many people

in the province, to work with this government and support this great budget.

**Mr. Jim Wilson (Simcoe–Grey):** I want to compliment my colleague from the NDP, Ms. Martel, the member for Nickel Belt, for her comments on the budget. First of all, I want to echo what she said with respect to Highway 69 and also to add comments about Highway 11. It's a shame. The member for Sudbury, Mr. Bartolucci, used to get up and scream and scream at us—and I was Minister of Northern Development for a number of years—about the \$1 billion we spent in northern Ontario on Highway 11 and Highway 69; a record amount of money. We actually started building those highways, as you know, starting at each end, and we were going to meet in the middle—the first time that has been done. Highway 11, for example, was one of the largest infrastructure highway projects undertaken since the 400-series highways were put in. Two of the overpasses are the longest overpasses in North America. We took enough rock out of one of the cloverleaves to fill SkyDome to the roof eight times. It was a massive project.

Mr. Bartolucci, the member for Sudbury, went around this province, as the member for Nickel Belt has said. He even had licence plate frames and bumper stickers made up, supporting 69. He had the CRASH 69 committee. He brought families down here day after day, week after week and had them in the galleries and used them as props. Now it's going to be 12 years before they're going to finish that highway. I don't know how he can ever go up to northerners again and face them.

**Mr. Robert W. Runciman (Leeds–Grenville):** He should resign.

**Mr. Wilson:** He should resign over that. It's horrible. He campaigned on it. His whole career and reputation were based on that. I don't think we can be too hard on him, because they were horrible in their treatment and disrespect for the \$1 billion that we put into northern Ontario.

Today the Minister of Transportation spends \$620 million out of his \$622-million capital budget for this year in the GTA, planting a few trees, putting up a few guardrails, repaving old roads and re-announcing things like Highway 35 and 115. There is nothing in northern Ontario in transportation, as the honourable member for Nickel Belt has pointed out. Now there is nothing for anyone outside the GTA, and just tinkering in the GTA. It's a shame. This \$30-billion proposal they have—where are the details? You're just making it up as you go along.

**Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York):** It's always a pleasure to listen to my colleague from Nickel Belt. She gives specifics when governments give generalities. She does her research when promises are made which cannot possibly be kept. If you want to know whether Highway 69 is going to be built, simply listen to what she has to say; simply read your own budget. As she so rightly said, look at page 12, look at page 76, look at page 123.

When I hear the minister speak, the minister does not make those same references, nor does the Minister of Finance. They simply say, "We have a dream, and that

dream includes building Highway 69. Someday, somehow, somewhere, when we can find billions of dollars, we hope to make that dream a reality."

Today the Minister of Transportation went to the people in the GTA, mostly in the city of Toronto, and announced that he has a dream for us—not for the people of the north, but he has a dream for those in southern Ontario where the majority of the population lives and where the majority of Liberal seats are located. He has announced the expenditure of all of the funds that are earmarked in this budget. There will be nothing left over for Highway 69, unfortunately. There will be nothing left if he spends the money in the GTA.

I'm not sure he is going to do either, quite frankly, because this is a large province. There are many roads that need repairing and many bridges that need to be done. You cannot continue to make the announcements that are flowing from this government if there is no money to back it up. That's what the budget's for. That's where we look. Is the money to speak with the promises? In terms of Highway 69, in terms of all that has been outlined by my colleague from Nickel Belt, they are not there. I commend her. She is accurate; she is diligent; she knows of what she speaks. I only wish the government did too.

**Mr. Brad Duguid (Scarborough Centre):** I'm delighted to rise today in support of this budget, a budget that I think really balances the needs of Ontarians from one end of the province to the other.

I look at the investment in post-secondary education, a \$6.2-billion investment to ensure that our post-secondary education system is accessible to our students across the province, an investment to ensure that we have excellent-quality post-secondary education in Ontario. We want to do this for two reasons. We want to make sure that we give each and every young person in this province the opportunity to be as good as they possibly can, to achieve as much as they possibly can. We want to do it, as well, to ensure that we can build the strongest, most effective and most skilled workforce in the entire world. That's a goal that can be achieved if we invest properly, if we invest strategically. This is one of those strategic investments that will ensure that we can do that.

**1620**

I know that, in my own riding of Scarborough Centre, the students and faculty at Centennial College and, in the neighbouring riding of Scarborough East, at the University of Toronto Scarborough campus, are just ecstatic about this investment in them—an investment in their future, an investment in the institutions that really are going to help us generate the wealth that we need to create in this new economy.

We're also excited about the \$30 billion going into infrastructure to repair bridges and roads across this province and our hospitals and our schools—a very important investment in our future and in building stronger communities.

We're also excited about the investment in continuing to build on our education system—building smaller class

sizes, injecting lead teachers into the system—making sure that our education system across this province is improved.

We're also very excited and proud of the fact that we've been able to ratchet down the deficit we inherited from the Tories. We've been able to cut it in half already, and we're looking forward to being able to cut it down to zero as soon as we possibly can.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Nickel Belt has two minutes to reply.

**Ms. Martel:** I'd like to thank all the members for their contributions and to just reinforce the three points that I made with respect to the budget speech.

First of all, my colleagues and I are completely opposed to the government's P3 model—or AFP model, as they're now seemingly going to call it—which essentially invites the private sector in to privately finance important public investments, important public assets like schools, hospitals, sewer and water projects etc. As the Toronto Star said on May 11, there is absolutely no difference between the P3 model that was put in place by the former government for the hospitals in Brampton and Ottawa and the AFP model, as Mr. Caplan so described his scheme for private financing. It's going to cost the taxpayers more. That additional amount of money to pay for the profits of those private consortiums is money that could be better spent on operating budgets for hospitals and schools and for the development of other important public assets. We are totally opposed to the direction the government is going in with respect to private investment in infrastructure.

Secondly—I said it before and I'll say it again—where is the government? The government is missing in action when it comes to the forestry sector. It is a sector that has a generated only less than the automotive sector in terms of value in this province. It's got thousands and thousands of people in northern Ontario who are at risk of losing their jobs, and this government has been silent on what it is going to do to deal with this important sector.

Finally, I think it's worth noting that the Minister of Northern Development and Mines went to Sudbury last week and announced \$1 billion for Highway 69. He said, "You'll find that \$1 billion on page 76 of the budget." I noticed that that money is for highways for the whole province, not northern Ontario. Isn't it interesting that the Minister of Transportation today, out of that \$1 billion, announced six hundred and some million dollars for highways in southern Ontario? It was absolutely wrong for the Minister of Northern Development to go and say that the \$1 billion that appears on page 74 was for northern highways. That is not true; there is no specific commitment for the four-laning of Highway 69 at all in this budget.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Ms. Laurel C. Broten (Etobicoke–Lakeshore):** I'm very pleased to have a chance to spend some time discussing the budget this afternoon. I'll be sharing my time with the member for Essex.

I think that this budget speaks to the balanced approach of our government. It speaks to what we believe in and what we talked about on the doorsteps with Ontarians. We said that we wanted to improve our education system, that we wanted to reinvest in health care, that we wanted to have a province where every Ontarian, no matter where they come from or where they live, could have prosperity, and that we would balance that with good fiscal management, because good fiscal management will allow us to deliver and to continue to deliver on these key commitments.

In the time I have this afternoon, I want to hit some of the highlights of this budget and why I have been so pleased to be able to go into my community in Etobicoke–Lakeshore and talk to parents, to folks in the hospitals, to business owners and to residents in my community about what's contained in the budget.

I'm going to start with post-secondary education. I'm pleased that the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities is here with us this afternoon, because this budget really speaks to the focus that our government has on reinvesting in our post-secondary sector. It was critical when we talked to parents and families in Ontario during the last election campaign. It was embarrassing, frankly, to see the level that this province had fallen to in terms of the money that we did not invest at the time in post-secondary education. We were at the bottom of the barrel. Post-secondary education is the ladder of opportunity. No matter where Ontarians have come from or what they want to achieve in their lives, we want to make sure they can go to college or university, that they can go through an apprenticeship program, that they can have the education that will open up the door of opportunity for them.

This budget is the largest investment in post-secondary education in 40 years. It's a 39% increase compared to base funding from 2004-05. Some \$6.2 billion will be invested in our post-secondary education sector by 2009. That is significant because during that period of time we are going to turn our province around and demonstrate true leadership in Ontario, a true desire to make sure that the doors of opportunity are open for all Ontarians.

Some of the critical components in this strategic long-term investment are to make sure that those opportunities are there, that we have Ontarians who can have better jobs because they have better skills, and that we have strong economic growth in the province.

That is one of the critical things. When I have a chance to speak to business leaders in the community, I tell them, and they agree, that this type of investment will make sure they can have workers who have the skills set they are looking for, that we can have employees who are ready for those high-skilled jobs, the knowledge-based economy that we talk about and yet never really put the investments into to ensure that Ontarians would have that for them.

To make sure these investments in the sector are available for all Ontarians, 135,000 low- and middle-income students will benefit from financial assistance. It's

significant financial assistance. We are going to continue our tuition freeze through 2005-06 and begin to work immediately with students, colleges and universities on a new tuition framework to be in place by September 2006.

We are going to offer, in co-operation with the federal government and the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, new low-income tuition grants of up to \$6,000 for 16,000 first-year dependent students. What that means is that those students who are able and have the grades and want to go on to university but who come from a family that simply could not consider that as opportunity for them will be able to receive a grant of up to \$6,000 and be able to go on and become contributing and successful members of our society. We're going to further enhance student support with an Ontario-only grant of up to \$3,000 for 16,000 second-year dependent students—again, a grant. It has been years in this province since grants have been available in those quantum, in that number, for Ontario students.

I want to talk a little bit about what that means for a student from a low- or middle-income family. I speak often in the Legislature about my family and my grandmother, who raised 10 children as a single mom and was able to have her children go through—many of them chose apprenticeship programs; many of them chose to go on to university. Without financial assistance, none of that would have been possible.

I am so pleased to be part of a government that is seen to be opening up that door of opportunity for all Ontario students. We need to turn the channel and make significant reinvestments in the system, and that's what we're doing in this budget. That's why I am just so proud to be part of this government that is really putting our money where our mouth is when we say we want to make sure we reinvest in post-secondary education.

I want to talk a little bit about why this budget is good for small business and business across the province. I've already talked about how business owners are people who generate the revenue in this province and who make our economy strong. They are the parents. They will benefit. They have kids in school and university. The reinvestments in both public education and university to make sure that we have smaller class sizes, the first-ever genuine daycare program for the province, and again this historic reinvestment in post-secondary education make those parents able to go out and focus on the business and on their own opportunities.

Health care is certainly another area where we are proud to make those reinvestments: more doctors and nurses; 52 new family health teams, on their way to 150 family health teams; more cancer surgeries, cataract surgeries, heart procedures, hip and knee replacements; more MRIs and CT exams. We have seen that in my own hospital, Trillium Health Care Centre, at the Q site in Etobicoke. The Q site is one of those sites offering more of these procedures and making sure that we get our wait time lists down.

### 1630

There's more community support for seniors, the frail elderly and disabled. I have to tell you about my budget breakfast, where we had an opportunity to hear from many individuals in the community who provide home care, palliative care and hospice care. They said it was the first time in a very long time—in fact, the first time ever for palliative care—that a provincial budget spoke to their issues, to the benefit that they provide to the community, and provided the investments for them to do their most important jobs. It was a real pleasure to have a chance to speak to individuals whose work I respect each and every day in the community, and to learn what they do. They really feel that they will benefit from our budget.

I want to talk for a minute about fiscal management and the fact that, for our government, it is a critical measure. We are very proud that we have cut the 2004-05 deficit by almost one half of what we inherited, to \$3 billion. The deficit is projected at \$2.8 billion in 2005-06, and it's expected to decline steadily thereafter. We also know that Ontarians contribute greatly to the future of this province. There are no new taxes in this budget. We're going to focus on discipline. We're going to hold the line on spending in 15 ministries. Why are we going to do that? Not because it's a means in itself, but because it's a means to an end, to allow us to invest in our priorities—health care, education—the priorities that we ran on, the priorities that Ontarians sent us here to deliver on. We've also identified \$400 million in savings and efficiencies and are over halfway there to a \$750-million target of those efficiencies.

Another important pledge—and it has been spoken about here in this Legislature—is the fact that for the first time in a long time, we are going to see significant reinvestments in infrastructure: a five-year, \$30-billion infrastructure plan for roads, transit, schools, colleges, universities and hospitals. That's so we're going to be able to get goods to market, we're going to be able to get people to their jobs, we're going to have a better quality of life, we're going to have hospitals that aren't falling apart and we're going to have schools that you want to send your children to because the roofs aren't leaking and the windows close. Those are important investments that we need to make and that we're proud to be able to make.

With the last minutes I have remaining, I want to talk just a little bit about what this budget spoke to and what it said to Toronto. We understand that Toronto is the economic engine of this province. By recognizing Toronto's special needs, we will help ensure that the city remains and retains its prominence as an attractive place to live, work and invest.

We're going to promote the commercialization of research through innovative networks like the MARS network. We're going to examine options to implement tax increment financing as a tool to promote urban regeneration, which will benefit a community such as mine. We're going to put in place initiatives to encourage the redevelopment of brownfields, something that will

help communities such as Etobicoke–Lakeshore. We're looking at extending the retail sales tax exemption for destination marketing fees that some hotels charge in support of tourism. We're going to provide \$1 million to the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council to help employers recognize the skills of workers. We're going to support the arts, cultural industries and cultural tourism with increased film and TV tax credits. I know my own community will benefit from that. You just need to drive around Etobicoke–Lakeshore to see the boom of the television sector and filming that is now taking place in Toronto.

This is a good budget for all of Ontario. I'm very pleased to support it. I am pleased now to cede the floor to my colleague.

**Mr. Bruce Crozier (Essex):** I'm pleased today to stand and say a few words with respect to the great budget that was presented in this House just this last week. I'm proud to represent the riding of Essex, which, as many know, is made up of small urban and rural areas. We have a great degree of concentrated agricultural products in our riding, from grains and oilseeds to the greenhouse industry, where there are flowers and vegetables, to the dairy industry, the beef industry, chickens and egg production—we have it all.

As I say, I'm proud to represent that riding and I'm proud to speak about the budget today with respect to what it will mean to the constituents in my riding. As I do, I want to talk just a little bit about history, and then we'll look into the future.

As I look at the budget papers that were presented by the Honourable Greg Sorbara last week and which, of course, have the footprint of Premier Dalton McGuinty on them, I look back at debt, because debt is something all of us understand, whether we've had to borrow money for a home, for a car or for education.

As I look back to the years 1990 and 1991 through 1995, the debt during that period increased some \$50 billion, from around \$40 billion to \$90 billion. Then we take the period of time from 1995 to 2004, when I hear about the great fiscal managers, the great balanced budgets. It might surprise some to know that the debt during that period of time went from about \$100 billion dollars up to \$140 billion. Isn't that surprising? Some would have us believe that the former government was free of all this debt business.

The only point I'm making here is that all governments have used debt financing in carrying out their plans for their constituents and for those of the province of Ontario. This budget, as a matter of fact, as it's projected through 2005-06, will increase the debt by some \$10 billion, maybe \$14 billion. We've all had our hand in the cookie jar when it comes to debt, and I just wanted to point that out.

**Mr. Baird:** Take it out.

**Mr. Crozier:** Somebody just told me, "Take it out," and we plan to do that. By the year 2006-07, we hope to have a balanced budget.

**Mr. Baird:** Jim Flaherty was the—

**Mr. Crozier:** He's not the only one who's had a balanced budget. We will argue that at some later date. As a matter of fact, that leads me to my next point, because what they're saying over there is that the sky wasn't going to fall—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the member take his seat?

I would ask the member for Whitby–Ajax to withdraw his unparliamentary comment.

**Mr. Jim Flaherty (Whitby–Ajax):** Withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Essex.

**Mr. Crozier:** I'm surprised. I didn't hear that, but thank you, Speaker. I appreciate it.

The sky is going to fall, according to the leader of the official opposition, Mr. Tory, and the leader of the third party, Mr. Hampton, but I was about to say it's somewhat like the musical *Annie*, when she sang, "Bet your bottom dollar, the sun will come up tomorrow." You know what? The sun has come up, and the sun is going to shine brighter in the future.

I want to speak a bit about that in the time I have. I want to speak particularly about agriculture, because there has been a lot said about agriculture. There has been—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Crozier:** There has been some spin, someone might say, to use a political word. Perhaps the spin has been like the debt has been over years: spread around quite a bit.

Now let's look at the budget when it comes to agriculture. The operating budget, as we will see on that infamous page 74, is going to go from \$549 million last year to \$564 million next year, a \$15 million increase. I really don't see how anybody can argue with that, because it says so right here in these budget papers that everybody has been referring to.

Let's take, for example, any one of these years, but I'll take last year, when the budget was \$549 million. What if we had said, "That's it. The budget says \$549 million. Not one red cent more is going to be spent"? Where would we have gotten, then, the money to help the farming community the way we did in this past year? Where would we have been if we hadn't spent \$733 million in in-year expenditures plus some \$444 million in extra, what are normally considered one-time, expenditures?

1640

So you know what? I'm certainly not saying, as a member of the rural caucus, and I'm sure there are others here who will support me, that \$564 million is the exact figure that's going to be spent in agriculture in this coming year. I am saying that I am committed, along with Premier McGuinty, with the Treasurer, Mr. Sorbara, and with my rural colleagues—as well, as a matter of fact, as a lot of my large urban colleagues—that that is the only figure that will be spent. That's what will operate the Ministry of Agriculture over this next year, without any unforeseen conditions or hurdles.

Now, may there be something else? May something else happen? Absolutely. Looking into the future, might

we be saying, for grains and oilseeds, that the future of their income production is not great? Absolutely. Will we have to sit down with our farming communities to look at some problems that might arise and work out solutions? I'm quite confident that we'll do exactly the same thing we did last year, and we will sit down and we will listen.

For example, I don't recall, and I may stand corrected, that the federal budget said, "Look, we're going to have \$50 billion in problems in the agriculture community next year." That is what contingency funds are for. That's why we have these funds for rainy days.

We had the former government, with all due respect, that had to deal with SARS. Was SARS in the budget that year? Not at all. Was BSE in the budget when they were government? Not at all. So it should be.

**Mr. Baird:** Did we cut the budget by 23%?

**Mr. Crozier:** Oh, and we won't talk about how you cut the budget to agriculture. I'll leave that to somebody else to explain.

But what I am saying is this: You've got representation in this Legislature, on this side of the House, that came to the plate when it was necessary in the last year or so. And by golly, I know, because I know the people sitting on this side of the House, that the Premier and the finance minister that we have will come to the plate when that's necessary. So all this argument over a budget and whether it's cut and whether it's not—it's really just a guideline, and we'll come to the plate, we'll be there to support our agriculture community, every day of the year.

**The Acting Speaker:** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Wilson:** I just want to respond to what a couple of the Liberal members across the way have said.

I don't think you have read your budget. Let's go to agriculture and what the member for Essex, a largely rural area, said. You've cut the base budget for the Ministry of Agriculture by 23%. You can flower that up with all the contingencies that may come later with respect to the next crisis in agriculture, but you've cut the ministry 23%. You promised the exact opposite. You criticized us, when we were balancing our budget, for relatively small cuts to the Ministry of Agriculture and other ministries. In comparison to this whack—this is the worst hit that the people in rural Ontario have had to take since 1982.

Do you not know what is going on in your small towns and your villages in the rural areas? The hardware stores are starting to close. The IGAs are starting to see their volume go down. All the spending that farmers do in our small towns and villages—you are starting to see the effect of them not having any money in their pockets to spend. And now you devastate them, you whack them, you hit them over the head.

And then in municipalities like Grey Highlands in my riding, and part of it in John Tory's riding and part in Bill Murdoch's riding, the fact of the matter is, they were going to have—I was at council last Monday, a week ago—I thought, a 25% tax hit as a result of your new so-called partnership fund with municipalities that replaced

the community reinvestment fund. You thought we were bad. We never, in the history of Ontario PC politics or in the history of governing in this province, ever created double-digit property tax increases the likes of which you are creating.

I went to council and said, "I think it's about a 25% hit on property taxes as a result of the almost \$1 million they've lost in transfers from the province." The mayor corrected me and said, "No, it's closer to 30% or 35%," and his treasurer was there to confirm that.

Owen Sound: devastated; double-digit property tax increases there. The Town of the Blue Mountains: double-digit property tax increases, and we just had a big ratepayers' meeting last Saturday. They are mad.

Rural Ontario is going to nip you guys and you're going to get what you deserve. You've devastated them.

**Mr. Prue:** I listened to the two debaters, the member from Essex and the member from Etobicoke-Lakeshore. First of all, I thought the member from Essex didn't say anything that controversial that I would want to talk about until he got to the very, very end of his eight minutes, when he said that the budget is really just a guideline. I have to say that up until that point the member from Essex wasn't saying anything at all controversial, but I do not consider a budget to be just a guideline.

A budget has to be the soul of what a government is. If you look at what's happening in Ottawa, that's why there is a confidence vote around the budget. It's not just another bill. It's not just something that a government is proposing. It is taking the money from taxpayers and detailing exactly how it is to be expended. I would take it that no one ought ever to say that it is really just a guideline. It is, in fact, the heart and soul of what a government is.

I listened to what the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore had to say. She did say a truth, I think, from what I heard from some of the other members. It allows the government in its expenditures to set its priorities, and yes, the government has been very clear that its priority is education. But at the same time, in doing that priority, you have flatlined 15 separate ministries. If you look at some of what you have flatlined, I would take it that this government and the members cannot be pleased. You cannot be pleased with what you are doing to aboriginal communities, you cannot be pleased with what you are doing to poor children, you cannot be pleased about the whole cause of poverty, and you must know that what you are doing to the arts community is not something to celebrate but something to be dismayed about.

**Mr. Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings):** The world that our young people are growing up in now is so profoundly different from the one that we as a group here experienced. The future they face is going to be challenging.

I've always had quite a passion for education. I believe that the best thing we can do for our children is to equip them to deal with the challenges they will face. The challenges are going to change.

I look at this budget and I see everything from Best Start, for children who are preschool, to college and university. What very much distressed me during the previous government's term was the statistics that consistently said that our young people from lower-income families were not able to go on to post-secondary. We watched the numbers of young people from families who make \$40,000 a year go from over 40% of the makeup of a college to 18%. It wasn't the lack of ability that was keeping these young people out; it was the lack of finances. So we had young people who were intelligent and hard-working but not from families that were rich financially.

We see major changes in this. We see a support in colleges and universities be state-of-the-art. My gosh, I read or heard somewhere that we double the knowledge in this world about every two and a half years. So we have a responsibility to give our children the means of keeping up with that increased knowledge.

I also see a tremendous benefit out of this. Our country and our province are facing a considerable shortage of skilled trades. Our professions, whether it be plumber, electrician or millwright, are tremendous employment opportunities with good pay and satisfaction. For both the secondary level and the college level, this budget will provide for the equipment in the programs that will equip them to meet the need this province has.

1650

**Mr. Bill Murdoch (Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound):** For the short time I have to comment on this budget, my whole question is, what happened to the rural members in the Liberal caucus? They must have all left the caucus when they discussed this budget. Rural Ontario got devastated with this. It's criminal what you're doing to rural Ontario. Then you come up with this new idea that you're going to switch around the grant system. Most of rural Ontario and northern Ontario lost on that one.

As was mentioned, Owen Sound got hit big time. All the rest of—

**Interjection:** Meaford.

**Mr. Murdoch:** Well, yes, Meaford got hit big time when you changed it all. We had two municipalities, of the 11 that I represent, get a small increase.

Then we get to the budget, and the budget forgot about rural Ontario and the environment. What happened to the environment? You guys cut rural Ontario. Rural Ontario is having one of the most difficult times in history, with the farming communities being hit hard with BSE, with the low commodity prices, and you forgot about it. You totally forgot about rural Ontario.

Did all the rural members go home? They must have gone home. I see some of them here today, but were you not around, were you not there to tell Sorbara that there is more than just urban Ontario, that there is more to Ontario than just the big urban centres? You forgot that. You totally left us alone out there in rural Ontario. Nothing for it. You even cut it. You didn't even give the farmers some hope, saying, "We'll add more to the budget so we'll come and help you." Absolutely nothing

there to help out rural Ontario. The Liberals let us down. Is this what the legacy of the Liberal government is going to be?

Then you have the audacity to blame us. We're not in government, guys. You're the government. We have a Liberal government, which is unfortunate in Ontario but we have one, and they forgot about rural Ontario. They totally forgot about us.

**The Acting Speaker:** One of the government members has two minutes to reply. I return to the member for Essex.

**Mr. Crozier:** On behalf of the member from Etobicoke-Lakeshore, I'd like to thank the members from Simcoe-Grey, Beaches-East York, Prince Edward-Hastings and Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound for their replies.

To the member from Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, I don't know that I was blaming you; I was just explaining what it was we did for the farmers and the rural communities in this past year. You said, "Where were the rural members over here?" We were over here getting in excess of another half-billion dollars for agriculture over last year's budget. That's where we were, and we'll be here the next time agriculture needs us while you're still sitting over there jabbering away.

The member for Simcoe-Grey said, "Do you really know what's going on in your riding?" You're darned right I do. When I go to the Arner Stop or the Cottam café or Shepps in Harrow, I listen to what my farmers have to say to me, what my rural community has to say to me, and do you know what they're saying? They're saying, "Thank you for what you did for us in the last year." If we run into trouble, I'm saying to them, "We'll be there for you in this coming year."

The member for Beaches-East York said he doesn't agree that the budget is just a guideline. Wait till we get to estimates. What do you think the Management Board is for? The Minister of Agriculture, Steve Peters, went back and back to the Chair of Management Board. Gerry Phillips, the Premier and the finance minister came across with enough money that the budget, the guideline, went from \$549 million to \$1.1 billion. That's what a budget is all about. That's what hard-working rural members are all about. We'll be there next time, too.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr. Flaherty:** I'll be sharing my time with the member for Nepean-Carleton.

It's my privilege to speak to the budget as the finance critic for the official opposition. I say at the outset that a couple of errors have been made recently in the debate. The member for Essex was talking about the public debt in Ontario. I encourage members to actually read the budget and particularly read the background papers to the budget, the budget papers. There's a great deal of information. If one listened to the member for Essex, one would think that there was a substantial increase in the Ontario public debt in 2000-01, 2001-02. If you just look at the lines, yes, that's true. But if you read on page 170 of the budget papers, you'll see, "The increase in total debt in the year ended March 31, 2000 reflects the con-

solidation of OEFC's \$19.4 billion in stranded debt from the electricity sector to the province's debt."

I'm sure the member knew that, but has forgotten that at that time there was a transfer of about \$20 billion. You see a big jump in the public debt at that point, and that was the reason for it. I'm sure the member would not want the people of Ontario to think that—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I would just ask the opposition members to refrain from heckling so that the member for Whitby–Ajax can make his presentation and I can hear it. Thank you.

**Mr. Flaherty:** If the member for Essex doesn't understand the significance of that, that's a problem. But in terms of the operating expenses of the government, it's a very significant point.

The more important point, I think, looking at this, is that the debt is going to be run up in the next several years in the province of Ontario to in excess of \$150 billion by the current government. It means, in practical terms—because I know that to people watching this and listening, and even some members, a billion is a billion—that next year in the province of Ontario, when people pay all their taxes, according to this Liberal budget, the first \$10 billion will go for interest on the public debt—to foreigners, some Canadians and some other people.

How much are we going to spend on education in the province of Ontario next year? He calls himself the education Premier, this current Premier does. These Liberals on the other side are so proud of what they're doing for education. We'll spend the same amount on primary and secondary schools next year as we pay in interest on the public debt. And they get the \$10 billion. Imagine what we could do in the province of Ontario if there were some effort to control the public debt. There has been effort to control the public debt—when I was in. You can look at the numbers, member from Hamilton, in 2001-02. Look at the numbers. Get out the book. You'll learn something. You'll—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I ask the member for Whitby–Ajax to take his seat.

I apologize for interrupting, but many members of the House were interrupting him. I would ask them to please refrain from heckling so that the member for Whitby–Ajax can make his presentation to the House.

**Mr. Flaherty:** If you want to read the public debt figures in the province of Ontario—the member for Essex should pay attention because there is so much to learn about the public debt and it's so damaging to future generations. You should be concerned about it.

The most substantial reduction in the history of the province of Ontario in the public debt was \$3.1 billion in 2000-01 when I was the Minister of Finance. The reason we did that is that it freed up money for health care. The member for Essex doesn't care that we'd rather pay interest to foreigners than properly fund our community

hospitals in Ontario. That's the effect of overspending year after year after year.

Regrettably, the Minister of Finance comes to this place last week with this budget and that's what he proposes to do. Year after year after year, more and more spending—and guess what?—more and more debt. Why? Because every year this government is going to spend more money than it takes in—every year. This is what they call fiscal planning. This is what they call good planning for the people of Ontario. So next year, \$10 billion in interest; the next year, \$10.4 billion; after that, \$10.7 billion. From now until then, that's an extra \$1.1 billion.

Wouldn't the folks in Whitby and Oshawa who see their local hospital laying off nurses like to have access to that wasted \$1.1 billion over the next four years? Wouldn't they love to have access to that resource? Their hard-earned tax money is going to go off and be paid in interest to other people. When you run deficits like this and you build up the public debt, you're taxing our children and you're taxing their children. Not only will they have to pay it in their taxes, they get to pay interest on it as well, which drives up the level of taxation more. If we run into a period of recession, then big trouble comes.

I sat in this gallery in 1989 and 1990 and watched the Treasurer at the time bring in budgets. This was the Peterson government, and Mr. Nixon was the Treasurer of Ontario. This was a motivation for me to get involved in public life, I tell you, because these were good times in Ontario. These were times like now, where there was significant economic growth, people in Ontario working hard, businesses expanding, and every year they would come in with more and more spending.

**1700**

This is the time when we should be paying down debt, when we should be saving for a rainy day. The Liberals in the Peterson years didn't do it, and then all of a sudden 1990-91 came, we had a recession, Mr. Rae was the Premier of Ontario for the New Democratic Party, and the cupboard was bare. People know this. Liberals, governments, I guess, know this. They just don't have the courage to act on it. People know that you have to save for a rainy day, that times aren't always good, that the economy tends to be cyclical, and certainly sectors of the economy tend to be cyclical. This is the fundamental point that regrettably is not addressed. In fact, just the opposite happens when you look at the numbers: more and more debt, more and more interest on debt, going forward in Ontario.

But we can take comfort because they talk here about—this is the economic statement last year, the comprehensive four-year plan that was going to balance the budget a couple of years from now in the election year 2007. Sorry, that plan is gone. Now we're down to a comprehensive, I guess it is, three-year plan and we're going to balance the budget maybe the year after that. Then what? I guess next year we'll have a comprehensive two-year plan. I don't know if they'll have the nerve in

the last year to say it is a comprehensive one-year plan, but maybe they will. Four plans so far.

This government cannot stick to a fiscal plan, and this is cause for concern for the people of Ontario, because if you can't stick to the plan, then you are likely to overspend and then run deficits that are even larger than anticipated. The deficit for this year as anticipated by the government was \$2.2 billion. There was this nonsense about the electricity dollars that the Auditor General caught them fooling with. So it wasn't \$6 billion, it was \$2.2 billion, but what did we see in the budget? We saw an actual deficit of \$3 billion. That's \$800 million of overspending by this government, \$800 million that was out of control, ad-hoc spending, and this is on top of very substantial windfall revenues. The windfall revenues were \$2.65 billion; it's on page 53 of the budget.

So here's a situation where the government budgets a deficit of \$2.2 billion, overspends by \$800 million, and in addition has extra revenue in your change of \$2.658 billion. They still can't balance the budget. Bob Rae would have prayed for this kind of revenue and this kind of economic growth in Ontario. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves over there, because he probably would have balanced the budget—a New Democrat. You would think Liberals with this kind of revenue would be able to balance the budget in Ontario. Anyway, I'm sure there will be another plan next year and I'm sure they won't stick to this plan, just as they've broken their promise not to raise taxes. They have brought in new and different plans every time they come here. But they are consistent, and the member for Peterborough I'm sure recognizes the government is consistent: "We will overspend. We will continue to overspend. We will continue to run deficits. We will continue to build up the public debt in Ontario. We will continue to have the highest taxes possible in Ontario. We will continue to break our promise not to raise taxes."

The member from Peterborough can go back to Peterborough in 2007 and proudly say, "I did all of those things so that the future prosperity of our province is in jeopardy, and you can guarantee your children and their children that they will be paying high taxes in the absence of a reform government changing that overspending, overtaxing, building up deficits in Ontario."

Infrastructure is fun. This infrastructure thing is wonderful. You've got to read page 35. One of the greatest needs we have is to build infrastructure in the province of Ontario. We have—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** I would ask the government members to refrain from heckling so as to allow the member for Whitby–Ajax to make his presentation to the House.

**Mr. Flaherty:** I know the member for Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge would be very interested in this, because the mayor of Whitby was talking about it today. His Worship Marcel Brunelle, known well to the former mayor of Pickering, at the mayor's annual address—the state of Whitby address, I guess it is—that I attended

today at a lovely location, the Royal Ashburn Golf Club in Ashburn, which is part of Whitby, pointed out that the greenbelt legislation that this government has brought in, in terms of employment-to-population ratio, is 1 to 3, job to population, in Durham region, and 1 to 2 in all the rest of the GTA. He wondered what had happened to the expansion of the 407 and what had happened to the new intersections on Highway 401.

You know what he has been told by this government? At least four years. Durham region is the most rapidly growing area in the province of Ontario, and the municipality that's most rapidly growing is the town of Whitby, and they are being told, in terms of economic growth, "You're going to be greenbelted disproportionately to the rest of the GTA. In addition, we're not going to build the highways you need," the basic infrastructure needed. It's shocking, really, in terms of negative planning for economic growth in the province.

The budget says that we're going to spend \$30 billion. You look for the \$30 billion and you can't find it. You find capital investment in fact going down: \$2.7 billion in 2005-06; \$2.5 billion in 2006-07; \$2.1 billion in 2007-08, and it goes on like that. Then there's this wonderful sentence. I've got to compliment whoever in the government wrote this, because this is governmentese at its—this is wonderful. It says here, "This level of capital investment will support a five-year, \$30-billion infrastructure plan." Here's the great sentence: "Planned levels of capital investment may be supplemented from the proceeds of strategic asset management initiatives."

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North):** What does that mean?

**Mr. Flaherty:** I don't know what that means. What's a strategic asset management initiative? Why didn't you just say "fire sale"? You would have saved all those words there: "We're going to sell some stuff that's owned by the people of Ontario, and we're not sure, but we might use it for infrastructure."

Here's the other fun thing with words: They can't do P3s, public-private partnerships; they can't do those because it's a Conservative idea and it works. I remember meeting in 2001 with the staff people of Prime Minister Blair in the United Kingdom. At that time, they were building over 200 brand new hospitals in the United Kingdom using public-private partnerships. His staff chief said to me toward the end of the meeting—I was the Minister of Finance at the time—"You know, this is a Conservative idea, but it works." He was apologizing for using this great Conservative idea of building infrastructure using pension funds and other private sources.

We've lost two years now: two years wasted in an economy in southern Ontario that cries out for infrastructure investment. The Fort Erie border, the Windsor border—27% of our exports are going across a bridge, and they do nothing. They've waited two years now—Highway 26, southern Ontario. How are we going to grow, how are we going to have prosperity, if we don't have the basic infrastructure in place? What do they say in this book, this budget? They say, "We'll study it; we'll

look at it. We're going to have a plan." Well, southern Ontario can't wait. It's choking on the absence of the essential infrastructure needed not only for economic growth but for quality of life.

Then you see the reality of paying more and getting less. People in Whitby and Oshawa and Ajax—an average family is paying \$1,000 more in income tax in the past year to the government of Ontario. You know, people in Ontario are fair-minded. They'll say, "All right. The government said that they had to take more money from us but that we'd get back better health care, better education and so on." Yes? Really? It didn't happen.

**Mr. Wayne Arthurs (Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge):** Yes, it did.

**Mr. Flaherty:** The member says that it did. Come out to Durham region. Come out to Lakeridge Health, which has five sites—a multi-site hospital. It's the biggest area of economic growth and the biggest area of population growth in the province of Ontario. Come on out and talk to the people there who paid this \$1,000 per family and ask them, "How's your health service? How's your local hospital doing?" You know what they'll say to you? They'll say, "You know, our hospital got less than a 1% funding increase, when their baseline increase is 8% per year." Health care spending has gone up 8.2% per annum on average over the last five years.

This government, in this budget, proposes to cut the increase on spending in health care to 3.8% in three to four years going forward—impossible; not going to happen. You won't be able to keep to the plan. It means more deficit spending in the province of Ontario and greater debt.

These are the major concerns that I have with respect to this budget. I almost hesitate to call it a budget, because it's not really that. It's a document that says, "We're not going to make choices. What we're going to do is shirk our responsibility, keep building up the spending, hope for good revenues and let future generations pay for it."

**The Acting Speaker:** The member for Nepean–Carleton.

**Mr. Baird:** I move that the amendment to the motion be amended by adding after the word "jeopardy" in the third paragraph inserting "including the grossly inadequate funding last year for the Queensway Carleton Hospital and the Ottawa Hospital."

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr. Baird has moved that the amendment to the motion be amended by adding after the word "jeopardy" in the third paragraph inserting "including the grossly inadequate funding last year to the Queensway Carleton Hospital and the Ottawa Hospital."

Mr. Baird still has the floor.

**Mr. Baird:** Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

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

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1712 to 1742.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the members please take their seats. I would ask once again, will the members please take their seats. I would ask one last time, will the members please take their seats. If the members aren't prepared to take their seats, I am going to call them individually to take their seats.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and allow yourselves to be counted by the table staff.

You may take your seats.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise and allow yourselves to be counted by the table staff.

You may take your seats.

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Claude L. Desrosiers):** The ayes are 18; the nays are 58.

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

**Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy, Government House Leader):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I rise on a point of order involving something I said in the House earlier today, to correct the record, which I believe is in order. I believe a member can correct the—

**Interjection:** By point of privilege, but you've got to give notice.

**Interjection:** No, you don't.

**The Acting Speaker:** I'm going to listen to see if he's got a point of order. I would ask the House to allow me to listen to him.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** All of the authorities quite properly note that you can rise on a point of order to correct your own record.

This afternoon during question period, Mr. Speaker, you in your capacity as a member rose on a point of order with respect to discussions around the Information and Privacy Commissioner speaking to a committee of the Legislature as part of the hearings on Bill 183. At that time—

**The Acting Speaker:** Government House leader, I recall the context and I would ask you how you're going to correct your own record.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** At, I believe, line 013 I am quoted as saying, "So to the leader of the official opposition, this government has had more hearings on more bills than any government. We'll be happy to discuss—"

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the House please come to order. The government House leader is about four feet away and I can't hear him.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** You rose on a point of order with respect to the same issue, Mr. Speaker, and I said at the time—and I quote from the Instant Hansard, which I have in my possession and will table with the House—"The commissioner has been heard already, and we look forward to the opportunity to have her back to the hearings as well to discuss this bill."

My understanding is that in fact the committee had not heard the commissioner. The commissioner is scheduled

to be heard this coming Thursday morning. I misspoke. Therefore, I wish to correct the record by indicating that the public hearings on Bill 183 start this Thursday. They are slated to begin tomorrow, and at that time Ms. Cavoukian will be appearing at the committee hearings.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member from Nepean-Carleton has the floor.

**Mr. Baird:** I move adjournment of the House.

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

All those in favor of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1748 to 1818.*

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

Will the members in favour of the motion please rise and remain standing while they're counted by the table staff.

You may take your seats.

Will the members opposed to the motion please rise and remain standing while they're counted.

You may take your seats.

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 18; the nays are 61.

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

On May 11, 2005, Mr. Sorbara moved, seconded by Mr. McGuinty, that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

On May 12, 2005, Mr. Tory moved that the motion be amended by deleting the words after "that this House" and adding thereto the following:

"Recognize that this budget is the latest in a series of ever-changing fiscal plans and that:

"The government has provided inadequate support to Ontario's hospitals, putting timely access to care in jeopardy;"

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Will the members please come to order. I think you want to know what you are voting on.

"The government is failing Ontario's farmers by cutting funding by 23.1% this year, on top of the 20% budget cut last year;

"The government has laid out no specific plan for meeting Ontario's infrastructure needs and has not explicitly budgeted for those needs;"

"Taxpayers will pay double the amount in health taxes this year, despite a promise by the Premier not to raise taxes at all;

"The government has done little to nothing specific to meaningfully attack waste and mismanagement in the government on a budget of \$80 billion; and

"These failures, these broken promises, these high taxes, high deficits, wasteful spending and burdensome regulations will harm Ontario's economy and create a

climate which will discourage investment and jobs in Ontario.

"Therefore, this House has lost confidence in this government."

On May 17, 2005, Mr. Baird moved that the amendment to the motion be amended by adding, after the word "jeopardy" in the third paragraph, the words "including the grossly inadequate funding last year to the Queensway Carleton Hospital and the Ottawa Hospital."

The first question to be decided is the amendment to the amendment to the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that Mr. Baird's amendment to the amendment to the motion carry?

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1822 to 1832.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour of Mr. Baird's amendment to the amendment to the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Baird, John R.	Martiniuk, Gerry	Scott, Laurie
Barrett, Toby	Miller, Norm	Sterling, Norman W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Munro, Julia	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Murdoch, Bill	Tory, John
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	Wilson, Jim
Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.	Yakubski, John

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Arthurs, Wayne	Duguid, Brad	Patten, Richard
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bentley, Christopher	Fonseca, Peter	Peterson, Tim
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gerretsen, John	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Jeffrey, Linda	Racco, Mario G.
Brotten, Laurel C.	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramal, Khail
Brown, Michael A.	Kular, Kuldip	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Levac, Dave	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Marsales, Judy	Smith, Monique
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Mauro, Bill	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	McMeekin, Ted	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Cordiano, Joseph	McNeely, Phil	Takhar, Harinder S.
Craiton, Kim	Meilleur, Madeleine	Van Bommel, Maria
Crozier, Bruce	Milloy, John	Watson, Jim
Delaney, Bob	Mitchell, Carol	Wilkinson, John
Dhillon, Vic	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wong, Tony C.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Oraziotti, David	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie	Zimmer, David

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 18; the nays are 63.

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

The second question to be decided is the amendment to the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that Mr. Tory's amendment to the motion carry?

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Same vote? No.

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

*The division bells rang from 1836 to 1846.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour of Mr. Tory's amendment to the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Baird, John R.	Martiniuk, Gerry	Scott, Laurie
Barrett, Toby	Miller, Norm	Sterling, Norman W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Munro, Julia	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Murdoch, Bill	Tory, John
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	Wilson, Jim
Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.	Yakabuski, John

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Arthurs, Wayne	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bartolucci, Rick	Fonseca, Peter	Peterson, Tim
Bentley, Christopher	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Jeffrey, Linda	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Kennedy, Gerard	Racco, Mario G.
Brotten, Laurel C.	Kular, Kuldip	Ramal, Khalil
Brown, Michael A.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Leal, Jeff	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Levac, Dave	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Marsales, Judy	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Mauro, Bill	Smith, Monique
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	McGuinty, Dalton	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	McMeekin, Ted	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Cordiano, Joseph	McNeely, Phil	Takhar, Harinder S.
Craiton, Kim	Meilleur, Madeleine	Van Bommel, Maria
Crozier, Bruce	Milloy, John	Watson, Jim
Delaney, Bob	Mitchell, Carol	Wilkinson, John
Dhillon, Vic	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wong, Tony C.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Oraziotti, David	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie	Zimmer, David
Duguid, Brad	Patten, Richard	

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 18; the nays are 65.

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

We now come to the motion of Mr. Sorbara, that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Same vote reversed?

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

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1849 to 1859.*

**The Acting Speaker:** All those in favour of Mr. Sorbara's motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bartolucci, Rick	Fonseca, Peter	Peterson, Tim
Bentley, Christopher	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Jeffrey, Linda	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Kennedy, Gerard	Racco, Mario G.
Brotten, Laurel C.	Kular, Kuldip	Ramal, Khalil
Brown, Michael A.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Leal, Jeff	Rinaldi, Lou
Bryant, Michael	Levac, Dave	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	Marsales, Judy	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Mauro, Bill	Smith, Monique
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	McGuinty, Dalton	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	McMeekin, Ted	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Cordiano, Joseph	McNeely, Phil	Takhar, Harinder S.
Craiton, Kim	Meilleur, Madeleine	Watson, Jim
Crozier, Bruce	Milloy, John	Wilkinson, John
Delaney, Bob	Mitchell, Carol	Wong, Tony C.
Dhillon, Vic	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Oraziotti, David	Zimmer, David
Dombrowsky, Leona	Parsons, Ernie	
Duguid, Brad	Patten, Richard	

**The Acting Speaker:** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time.

#### Nays

Baird, John R.	Kormos, Peter	Runciman, Robert W.
Barrett, Toby	Martel, Shelley	Scott, Laurie
Bisson, Gilles	Martiniuk, Gerry	Sterling, Norman W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Miller, Norm	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Munro, Julia	Tory, John
Horwath, Andrea	Murdoch, Bill	Wilson, Jim
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	Yakabuski, John
Jackson, Cameron	Prue, Michael	

**The Clerk of the Assembly:** The ayes are 64; the nays are 23.

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

It is therefore resolved that the House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

It being past 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.

*The House adjourned at 1903.*

**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	<b>Bountrogianni, Hon. / L'hon. Marie</b> (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	<b>Tascona, Joseph N.</b> (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	<b>Dombrowsky, Hon. / L'hon. Leona</b> (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	<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John</b> (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	<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher</b> (L) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	<b>Caplan, Hon. / L'hon. David</b> (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	Tory, John (PC) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S.</b> (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	<b>Peters, Hon. / L'hon. Steve</b> (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	<b>Crozier, Bruce</b> (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	Craitor, 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–Brook	Scott, Laurie (PC)	Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)
Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Patten, Richard (L)
Hamilton East / Hamilton-Est	Horwath, Andrea (ND)		

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

A list arranged by members' surnames and including all responsibilities of each member appears in the first and last issues of each session and on the first Monday of each month.

Une liste alphabétique des noms des députés, comprenant toutes les responsabilités de chaque député, figure dans les premier et dernier numéros de chaque session et le premier lundi de chaque mois.

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

**Estimates / Budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Cameron Jackson  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John O'Toole  
Wayne Arthurs, Caroline Di Cocco, Andrea Horwath,  
Cameron Jackson, Kuldip Kular, Phil McNeely  
John Milloy, John O'Toole, Jim Wilson  
Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

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

Chair / Président: Pat Hoy  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Phil McNeely  
Toby Barrett, Mike Colle, Pat Hoy, Judy Marsales,  
Phil McNeely, Carol Mitchell, John O'Toole,  
Michael Prue, John Wilkinson  
Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**General government / Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Présidente: Linda Jeffrey  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Vic Dhillon  
Marilyn Churley, Vic Dhillon, Brad Duguid,  
Linda Jeffrey, Jean-Marc Lalonde,  
Deborah Matthews, Jerry J. Ouellette,  
Lou Rinaldi, John Yakabuski  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Tim Hudak  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Andrea Horwath  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Michael Gravelle,  
Andrea Horwath, Tim Hudak,  
David Oraziotti, Ernie Parsons,  
Laurie Scott, Monique M. Smith,  
Joseph N. Tascona  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**Justice Policy / Justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qaadri  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bob Delaney  
Michael A. Brown, Jim Brownell, Bob Delaney,  
Kevin Daniel Flynn, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,  
Shafiq Qaadri, Mario G. Racco, Elizabeth Witmer  
Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Bob Delaney  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Mario G. Racco  
Donna H. Cansfield, Bob Delaney,  
Ernie Hardeman, Rosario Marchese, Ted McMeekin,  
Norm Miller, Tim Peterson, Mario G. Racco, Mario Sergio  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

**Public accounts / Comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norman W. Sterling  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Julia Munro  
Laurel C. Broten, Jim Flaherty, Shelley Martel,  
Bill Mauro, Julia Munro, Richard Patten,  
Liz Sandals, Norman W. Sterling, David Zimmer  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

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

Chair / Présidente: Marilyn Churley  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Tony C. Wong  
Gilles Bisson, Marilyn Churley, Kim Craitor,  
Kuldip Kular, Gerry Martiniuk, Bill Murdoch,  
Khalil Ramal, Maria Van Bommel, Tony C. Wong  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Social Policy / Politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Mario G. Racco  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Khalil Ramal  
Ted Arnott, Ted Chudleigh, Kim Craitor,  
Peter Fonseca, Jeff Leal, Rosario Marchese,  
Mario G. Racco, Khalil Ramal, Kathleen O.Wynne  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

*Continued from overleaf*

## **TABLE DES MATIÈRES**

**Mardi 17 mai 2005**

### **PREMIÈRE LECTURE**

<b>Loi de 2005 modifiant la Loi sur la ceinture de verdure, projet de loi 200, <i>M. Hudak</i></b>	
Adoptée.....	7100
<b>Loi de 2005 modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-santé (test PSA pour le dépistage du cancer de la prostate), projet de loi 201, <i>M. Mauro</i></b>	
Adoptée.....	7100

### **DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

<b>Subventions destinées à l'éducation</b>	
M. Kennedy.....	7101
M. Klees.....	7103
M. Marchese.....	7104

# CONTENTS

Tuesday 17 May 2005

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Ontario Association of Police Services Boards</b>	
Mr. Dunlop .....	7097
<b>Chet Gervais and Adam Sinasac</b>	
Mr. Crozier .....	7097
<b>Farmers and rural Ontario</b>	
Mr. Barrett .....	7097
<b>Burial of indigent persons</b>	
Mr. Kormos .....	7098
<b>Nurses</b>	
Mr. Wong .....	7098
<b>Ontario budget</b>	
Mr. Hudak .....	7098
<b>Infrastructure program funding</b>	
Mr. Ramal .....	7098
<b>Children's services</b>	
Mr. Milloy .....	7099
<b>Post-secondary education</b>	
Ms. Wynne .....	7099

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

<b>Standing committee on general government</b>	
Mrs. Jeffrey .....	7099
Report adopted .....	7100

## FIRST READINGS

<b>Greenbelt Amendment Act, 2005,</b> <i>Bill 200, Mr. Hudak</i>	
Agreed to .....	7100
Mr. Hudak .....	7100
<b>Health Insurance Amendment Act (PSA Tests for Prostate Cancer), 2005, Bill 201, Mr. Mauro</b>	
Agreed to .....	7100
Mr. Mauro .....	7100

## MOTIONS

<b>House sittings</b>	
Mr. Duncan .....	7100, 7101
Agreed to .....	7100, 7101

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Kennedy .....	7101
Mr. Klees .....	7103
Mr. Marchese .....	7104
<b>Social assistance</b>	
Ms. Pupatello .....	7102
Mr. Jackson .....	7103
Mr. Prue .....	7104

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Ontario budget</b>	
Mr. Tory .....	7105
Mr. McGuinty .....	7105
<b>Hospital funding</b>	
Mr. Tory .....	7106
Mr. McGuinty .....	7106
Mr. O'Toole .....	7108
Mr. Smitherman .....	7108
Mr. Ouellette .....	7108
<b>Children with special needs</b>	
Ms. Martel .....	7107
Mr. Bryant .....	7107
Mrs. Bountrogianni .....	7107
<b>Police officers</b>	
Mr. Kormos .....	7107
Mr. Kwinter .....	7108
<b>Forest industry</b>	
Mr. Bisson .....	7109
Mr. Ramsay .....	7109
<b>Federal member</b>	
Ms. Wynne .....	7109
Mr. Sorbara .....	7109
Ms. Pupatello .....	7110

## Committee schedule

Mr. Tory .....	7111
Mr. Duncan .....	7111, 7115
Mr. Arnott .....	7114

## Landfill

Ms. Horwath .....	7112
Mrs. Dombrowsky .....	7112

## Accessibility for the disabled

Ms. Mossop .....	7112
Mrs. Bountrogianni .....	7112

## Infrastructure program funding

Mrs. Munro .....	7113
Mr. Caplan .....	7113

## Refinery closure

Ms. Martel .....	7113
Mr. Bartolucci .....	7113

## Northern Ontario development

Mr. Oraziotti .....	7114
Mr. Bartolucci .....	7114

## PETITIONS

<b>Ontario farmers</b>	
Mr. Hardeman .....	7115
<b>Halton Recycling plant</b>	
Mrs. Munro .....	7115
<b>Driver penalties</b>	
Mr. Brown .....	7115
<b>Physician shortage</b>	
Ms. Scott .....	7115

## Credit Valley Hospital

Mr. Delaney .....	7116
-------------------	------

## Highway 26

Mr. Wilson .....	7116
------------------	------

## Anti-smoking legislation

Mr. Delaney .....	7116
-------------------	------

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### 2005 Ontario budget, government

notice of motion number 364, <i>Mr. Sorbara</i>	
Ms. Martel .....	7117, 7120
Mr. Ramal .....	7118
Mr. Wilson .....	7119, 7123
Mr. Prue .....	7119, 7123
Mr. Duguid .....	7119
Ms. Broten .....	7120
Mr. Crozier .....	7122, 7124
Mr. Parsons .....	7123
Mr. Murdoch .....	7124
Mr. Flaherty .....	7124
Mr. Baird .....	7127
Agreed to .....	7129

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Visitors

The Speaker .....	7099, 7101
Mr. Klees .....	7104
Ms. Horwath .....	7105
Mrs. Sandals .....	7105

Continued overleaf