



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 38th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 38^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 14 November 2006

Mardi 14 novembre 2006

Speaker
Honourable Michael A. Brown

Président
L'honorable Michael A. Brown

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

Copies of Hansard can be purchased from Publications Ontario: 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. e-mail: webpubont@gov.on.ca

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

Des exemplaires du Journal sont en vente à Publications Ontario : 880, rue Bay Toronto (Ontario), M7A 1N8 courriel : webpubont@gov.on.ca

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 14 November 2006

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 14 novembre 2006

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ONTARIO ARTISTS

Mrs. Julia Munro (York North): Today is the all-party arts day at Queen's Park. We recognize the contributions that arts and culture make to our society and welcome members of the arts community and the Ontario Arts Council.

Today is also a day we mark the government's broken promise to Ontario's arts community. The McGuinty Liberal government made a solemn promise to Ontario artists in their 2003 election platform. It said, "Within the first two years of our mandate, [the minister's advisory council for arts and culture] will produce a report on the status of the artist in Ontario in the 21st century. This report will be used to develop status of the artist legislation for our artists in Ontario..." More than three years later, neither this House nor Ontario's arts community has seen either a report or legislation. This is a broken promise by the government.

I have to ask, when will they release a report? When will they introduce legislation? Why is simply writing a report within two years such a hard promise for the Liberals to keep? Maybe the government doesn't want an act, and, by waiting so long, there will not be any time to pass one before the next election. Ontario's arts communities want answers, and if they don't get them, they will remember next October.

Applause.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): This would be a good time to remind our guests that only members can participate in the activities of the Legislature.

CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE

Mr. Shafiq Qaadri (Etobicoke North): It's a privilege today for me to stand in recognition of World Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Day, or World COPD Day. I can tell you that it's a very important realm of illness and I say that, of course, both as a physician as well as an MPP.

COPD includes emphysema and chronic bronchitis. In a kind of rough-and-ready definition, it's sort of like

trying to breathe through a straw all day long. Unfortunately, people with COPD have difficulty performing simple tasks like walking upstairs, because they struggle for every breath.

Unfortunately, there's something in the order of 270,000 patients diagnosed with COPD in Ontario today, and probably an equal number who remain undiagnosed. Unfortunately, about 115 individuals are admitted with COPD to hospitals daily. It's ranked as the fifth major cause of hospitalization.

Tomorrow is World COPD Day. In recognition of this, the Ontario Lung Association, along with its federal counterpart, is hosting an event this evening in the legislative dining room from 5 to 7 p.m. I would encourage all MPPs and their staff to attend. At the event, the lung association will be releasing startling information about the impact of COPD generally, and particularly on women, because COPD is now one of the few leading causes of death for which the impact is increasing rapidly.

Thank you for this time. I invite you to join us for autographs with NHL star Dennis Hull.

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer (Kitchener-Waterloo): I'm also going to speak today about World Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Day, which is tomorrow, November 15. It is a respiratory disease that unfortunately is increasing but to some extent is still quite unknown and unfamiliar to people. It is a disease that causes the airways of our lungs to be inflamed and become obstructed or blocked. It makes it difficult to breathe in the same way that chronic bronchitis and emphysema do. People with COPD have that shortness of breath, and obviously their activities are quite limited. They often will tell you that having COPD is like breathing through a straw every minute of every day. I think you can imagine how difficult that would be for an individual.

There is no cure, but symptoms can be managed. It is a leading cause of death, and a cause of death that unfortunately is on the rise. It's the fourth leading cause of death in our country. Again, I want to say that 50% of Ontarians will tell you that they've never heard of COPD.

Today we have a special event in the dining room. All MPPs and staff are invited to attend. They're going to be sharing some information about the impact of it on women. We will hear that deaths among women are almost as high as deaths from breast cancer. So we do want to make sure that people are aware of this serious disease.

ONTARIO ARTISTS

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): I tabled a resolution, and this is it:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Minister of Culture proceed forthwith to introduce status-of-the-artist legislation as promised by her in this Legislature on May 15, 2006.

Today we celebrate the arts at Queen's Park, and I ask that we also celebrate the artist—not only celebrate, but also assist, as our artists are suffering. Ontario lags behind other provinces and other jurisdictions in provisions for artists. We desperately need status-of-the-artist legislation, legislation that was promised in this House on May 15 of this year by our Minister of Culture. We need protection for children in the arts and income averaging for those whose income varies dramatically every year. We need benefits and retraining for artists and we need housing for artists. As the corporatization of our culture continues unchecked, we need opportunities for our artists, and by “artists” I'm speaking of musicians, filmmakers, writers and actors as well as visual artists. To celebrate the arts and not bring in promised legislation—that is, status-of-the-artist legislation—for the artist is not to celebrate the arts at all. Without artists, there are no arts.

1340

QUINTE AMATEUR RADIO CLUB

Mr. Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward–Hastings): There are about a hundred thousand reasons why I'm proud to represent the riding of Prince Edward–Hastings, that number reflecting the number of individuals who live in my area.

I would like today to recognize a group of my constituents who since 1947 have very quietly contributed to our community. They're the members of the Quinte Amateur Radio Club. This club was formed by a group of engineers from Northern Electric, now Nortel. While obviously the club was formed to enable hams to communicate with each other, they have considerably extended the services they provide to our community. The Quinte Amateur Radio Club has regularly become involved in such events as the Super Cities Walk for MS, the Cheerios Mother Daughter Walk for Heart and Stroke, the Belleville Community Policing Halloween Safe Streets project and the Prince Edward County Marathon. They performed yeoman service during the ice storm a few years ago.

I'm particularly excited by the most recent project, which is supporting one of our schools, Centre Hastings Secondary School, to have direct radio contact with astronauts on the International Space Station, scheduled to happen on Monday, November 20. This will be only the 14th radio contact by a school with ISS in Canada and the fifth in Ontario. I am especially proud that this will be the only contact for this space station crew with any school in North America. This fantastic experience

for the students is possible only because of this radio club and the wonderful work done by the teachers in our school system.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Quinte Amateur Radio Club on their 60th anniversary and to thank them for the tremendous contribution to our community and province.

COMMUNITY SAFETY

Mr. Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): Today I'd like to welcome the Police Association of Ontario here on their annual lobby day. I know president Bob Baltin and CAO Bruce Miller are here, and they represent 30,000 uniformed officers here in Ontario. I think there are a lot of things we can do in this House to improve community safety and to make improvements for not only the folks here in Ontario but for people right across the country.

One of those things is to get the legislation that the Harper government has brought forward and stop the obstruction by the opposition. One thing the Liberal Party here in this House can do is to ask their cousins in Ottawa to stop the obstruction we're seeing on some very valuable legislation. Since the beginning of the Parliament in Ottawa, only three of 11 crime bills have actually been passed, because they have been obstructed by the federal cousins of these folks here, right across the floor. For example, C-10, mandatory minimum sentences for serious drug and firearms crimes, has been halted right now, as we speak. Bill C-21, which amends the Firearms Act, has been delayed as well. The age of protection—protecting children from sexual predators by raising the age from 14 to 16 years of age—has also been delayed by their federal cousins in Ottawa. If there's anything this government can do to help people in this country and in Ontario today, they can get their federal cousins to stop the obstruction and get this legislation passed to help all Canadians and Ontarians.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FORMATION LINGUISTIQUE

Mr. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans): I rise today to recognize English-as-a-Second-Language Week and French-as-a-Second-Language Week in Ontario. I commend the dedicated instructors of ESL and FSL for the important work they do in assisting newcomers to settle in this province.

Notre gouvernement reconnaît que les nouveaux arrivants auront plus de succès lorsqu'ils développent une compétence soit dans la langue anglaise ou dans la langue française—les langues parlées dans le monde du travail.

That's why we are working to transform adult, non-credit language training in Ontario so that it better fits the needs of our newcomers. Last year, more than 140,000 newcomers arrived in Ontario to begin new lives. They are better educated and more skilled than ever before.

They are skilled in fields ranging from medicine to architecture. The sooner they are able to put their talents to work for Ontario and the global marketplace, the better off they are, and the better off we are as a province.

The McGuinty government recognizes the challenge and the importance of helping newcomers get the language training they need so they can thrive in the workplace and life here in Ontario. Ontario invests more than \$130 million annually on language training and settlement services, more than any other province. Our success in helping newcomers obtain the English and French language skills they need has been, and will continue to be, built through partnership with organizations like TESL Ontario and almost 4,000 instructors who work with the newcomers.

Notre gouvernement va continuer à travailler avec nos associés pour fournir des soutiens qui vont contribuer au succès de nos nouveaux arrivés.

SYLVIA SUTHERLAND

Mr. Jeff Leal (Peterborough): I rise today to pay tribute to Mayor Sylvia Sutherland. I had the distinct pleasure of serving with Her Worship for 12 of my 18 years as a member of Peterborough city council. During those years, she faced many challenges and made many tough decisions that weren't always popular, but always had the residents of Peterborough's best interests at heart. She was tough when she had to be and accomplished much while in office.

In the days following the flood of July 15, 2004, she demonstrated courage and leadership as she spearheaded the recovery effort. Sylvia was a mayor with vision and understanding of the need to create an economic plan that would benefit Peterborough today and in the future.

I recently had the opportunity to attend an event in her honour, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a seat or a parking lot spot to be found. She leaves behind a legacy of accomplishments that any one of us here today, sitting in this House, would be proud of. The residents of Peterborough owe her a great debt of gratitude.

I'd like to conclude by saying congratulations to Mayor Sylvia Sutherland, the longest-serving mayor in Peterborough's history, on a job well done. May you have a long and happy retirement.

BRUCE DUNCAN

Ms. Jennifer F. Mossop (Stoney Creek): I rise today to advise the House of the passing of one of Ontario's most devoted environmentalists. Bruce Duncan died in an automobile accident last Saturday.

Mr. Duncan was the very able chief executive officer of the Hamilton Conservation Authority. Previously, he had been with the Grand River Conservation Authority for 15 years. He was one-time president of the Hamilton Naturalists' Club, and in 1991 founded the Niagara Peninsula Hawkwatch program.

In his early years with the Hamilton Conservation Authority, Mr. Duncan instilled in thousands of children an appreciation for nature. He reached a wider audience as a frequent guest on radio and television in Hamilton, and I remember his very gentle and very effective manner.

Mr. Duncan was respected in the environmental community for his passion for conservation, but, equally, he was respected in development circles for his realistic advice on development issues near watersheds.

I had the pleasure of working with Mr. Duncan very recently, as the government made a special gift to the conservation authority. Just two weeks ago, Minister Caplan and I were able to hand over the deed to 180 acres of the Eramosa Karst lands in upper Stoney Creek to the authority. It was something Bruce worked very hard on, and he and the authority had some wonderful plans for those rare heritage lands, which will soon be open to the public as part of a trail system. It will indeed be part of a very rich legacy of environmentalism and advocacy for nature left by Bruce Duncan.

Mr. Duncan's passion for the outdoors was exceeded only by his love for his family, and I ask members to join with me in extending our deepest condolences to Mr. Duncan's wife, Janet, and his children, James and Katie. Bruce Duncan was 60 years old.

VISITORS

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): We have with us today in the Speaker's gallery 10 recent university graduates who are interning at the House of Commons under the auspices of the Canadian parliamentary internship program. They are participating in a comparative study tour of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Please join me in welcoming our guests.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga West): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly and move its adoption.

The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Lisa Freedman): Your committee begs to report the following bill as amended:

Bill 52, An Act to amend the Education Act respecting pupil learning to the age of 18 and equivalent learning and to make complementary amendments to the Highway Traffic Act / Projet de loi 52, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'éducation concernant l'apprentissage des élèves jusqu'à l'âge de 18 ans et l'apprentissage équivalent et apportant des modifications complémentaires au Code de la route, the title of which is amended to read, "An Act to amend the Education Act respecting pupil learning to the age of 18 and equivalent learning / Loi modifiant la Loi sur

l'éducation concernant l'apprentissage des élèves jusqu'à l'âge de 18 ans et l'apprentissage équivalent."

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Shall the report be received and adopted?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1349 to 1354.

The Speaker: Mr. Delaney has presented the report of the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly with respect to Bill 52. All those in favour of having the report received and adopted will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Balkissoon, Bas	Duguid, Brad	Parsons, Ernie
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Peters, Steve
Bentley, Christopher	Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq
Broten, Laurel C.	Jeffrey, Linda	Racco, Mario G.
Brownell, Jim	Kular, Kuldip	Ruprecht, Tony
Bryant, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Sandals, Liz
Caplan, David	Leal, Jeff	Sergio, Mario
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Levac, Dave	Smith, Monique
Colle, Mike	Matthews, Deborah	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce	McNeely, Phil	Van Bommel, Maria
Delaney, Bob	Milloy, John	Watson, Jim
Dhillon, Vic	Mitchell, Carol	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Zimmer, David

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

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Horwath, Andrea	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Prue, Michael
Bisson, Gilles	Klees, Frank	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Kormos, Peter	Tabuns, Peter
DiNovo, Cheri	MacLeod, Lisa	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Marchese, Rosario	Tory, John
Elliott, Christine	Miller, Norm	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hardeman, Ernie	O'Toole, John	Yakubski, John

The Deputy Clerk (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 42; the nays are 24.

The Speaker: The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

VISITORS

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I just wanted to introduce some guests that we have here today whom we should be proud to have in our midst. We have the Writers' Union of Canada. We have the American Federation of Musicians, representatives from the Canadian office; the Brantford Musicians Association, representatives there; ACTRA, many representatives, including Ms. Fiona Reid herself, Order of Canada and Dora winner. Thank you.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie–Lincoln): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on estimates.

The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Lisa Freedman): Mr. Hudak from the standing committee on estimates presents the committee's report as follows:

Pursuant to standing order 61(c), the following supplementary estimates (2006-07) are reported back to the House as they were not selected by the committee for consideration:

Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, vote 606, citizenship and immigration capital, \$1,000.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to standing order 61(c), the report of the committee is deemed to be received and the supplementary estimates of the ministry named therein as not being selected for consideration by the committee are deemed to be concurred in.

VISITORS

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne (Minister of Education): I would like to acknowledge some special visitors. The grade 5 students from Mrs. De Lorenzo's and Ms. De Koe's classes at St. Bernard Catholic School are visiting the Legislature today.

Hon. Mike Colle (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I would like to introduce the students, parents and staff from John Ross Robertson school in my riding—some of the best students from the best school in North America.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I seek unanimous consent to put forth a motion without notice regarding the membership of the standing committee on regulations and private bills.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Agreed? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Bradley: I move that Mr. Delaney be added to the standing committee on regulations and private bills.

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

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding a committee time

change for the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Agreed? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Bradley: I would like to make a correction on that last one. It's going to say the following, if the two opposition House leaders are listening to this. It should have read: I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding a committee time change for the standing committee on finance and economic affairs.

The Speaker: Mr. Bradley is really asking for unanimous consent for a time change for the standing committee on finance and economic affairs. Agreed? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Bradley: I move that in addition to its regularly scheduled meeting times, the standing committee on finance and economic affairs be authorized to meet from January 22, 2007, to January 25, 2007, January 29, 2007, to February 1, 2007, and February 22 and February 23, 2007, for the purpose of pre-budget consultations.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Agreed? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Bradley: I move that Mr. Ouellette and Mr. Miller exchange places in order of precedence such that Mr. Miller assumes ballot item 60 and Mr. Ouellette assumes ballot item 75, and that, pursuant to standing order 96(g), notice be waived for ballot item 60 and ballot item 62.

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

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 14, 2006, for the purpose of considering government business.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1404 to 1409.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Phillips, Gerry
Balkissoon, Bas	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bartolucci, Rick	Jeffrey, Linda	Racco, Mario G.
Bentley, Christopher	Klees, Frank	Ramal, Khalil
Bradley, James J.	Kular, Kuldeep	Runciman, Robert W.
Brotten, Laurel C.	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Brownell, Jim	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sandals, Liz
Bryant, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Scott, Laurie
Caplan, David	Levac, Dave	Sergio, Mario
Chambers, Mary Anne V.	Matthews, Deborah	Smith, Monique
Chudleigh, Ted	Mauro, Bill	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	McNeely, Phil	Takhar, Harinder S.
Crozier, Bruce	Meilleur, Madeleine	Tascona, Joseph N.
Delaney, Bob	Miller, Norm	Tory, John
Dhillon, Vic	Milloy, John	Van Bommel, Maria
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mitchell, Carol	Watson, Jim
Duguid, Brad	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wilkinson, John
Duncan, Dwight	O'Toole, John	Witmer, Elizabeth
Elliott, Christine	Ouellette, Jerry J.	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Parsons, Ernie	Yakabuski, John
Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve	Zimmer, David

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Kormos, Peter	Tabuns, Peter
DiNovo, Cheri	Marchese, Rosario	
Horwath, Andrea	Prue, Michael	

The Deputy Clerk (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 66; the nays are 7.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

DIABETES

Hon. George Smitherman (Deputy Premier, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I'm pleased to rise today and mark the occasion of World Diabetes Day. Diabetes is a serious chronic disease that, if not managed properly and with care, can lead to long-term debilitating complications. Some 800,000 people have been diagnosed with diabetes in Ontario alone, and another 200,000 may be unaware that they have diabetes. Of that total of one million Ontarians, more than 300,000 people will develop debilitating complications. That's an awful lot of people potentially facing amputations, blindness, dialysis, cardiac surgery, heart attacks and strokes.

Our government is well aware of the ramifications of diabetes. That is why we currently provide some \$53 million in annual funding for diabetes programs and services. They are particularly focused on wellness, health promotion, diabetes education, early intervention and effective prevention of diabetes-related complications. We are doing our best to make diabetes care for everyone more than just a slogan. Health services like these are crucial in meeting our government's priority to keep people of all ages healthier. And it's thanks to health ser-

vices like these that we are successfully building a patient-centred chronic disease management and prevention system that not only responds to community needs but also brings better management to the delivery of care.

Our government is also providing \$18.1 million to enhance existing community diabetes education programs and to create 76 new programs as part of the government's chronic disease management strategy. This new funding represents an increase of more than 51% over last year. As well, the government recently added a new drug, Actos, to the province's list of medicines that will now be covered by the Ontario drug benefit program under Bill 102's new conditional listing mechanism.

Today, on World Diabetes Day, I'm proud to announce that the Ontario government will now cover 100% of the cost of insulin pumps and related supplies for children and youth age 18 and under, retroactive to April 1.

People with diabetes need to monitor their blood sugar levels daily. This takes self-discipline. It's especially challenging for children and youth to manage their own health when they'd rather be playing, spending time with friends or doing countless other activities that could be more fun. We want kids to be kids. That's why we wanted to provide this assistance. Insulin pumps will give more of them the freedom to live and to play. They will have one less thing to worry about.

An insulin pump is a small mechanical device about the size of a pager that is worn outside the body, often on a belt or in a pocket. It pumps insulin into the body through a narrow tube or very fine needle inserted under the skin. The pump is programmed to deliver insulin at a steady rate, based on the individual's needs. A top-up of insulin for meals or high blood sugar readings between meals can be manually programmed into the pump by the user.

We've designated funding of \$9.65 million in 2006-07 for the purchase of insulin pumps and ongoing related supplies for youth 18 years and under with type 1 diabetes. With this initiative, the government of Ontario recognizes the special needs of children with type 1 diabetes. Children are our first priority because they are at most risk for developing serious complications of type 1 diabetes, such as kidney disease, obesity, coronary disease and hypertension. Roughly 6,500 children in the province of Ontario have type 1 diabetes, and approximately 600 are currently using insulin pumps. With this new funding initiative, some 1,000 of the 6,500 children who have type 1 diabetes are expected to benefit.

The insulin pump program will be delivered through the 34 regional pediatric programs of the Network of Ontario Pediatric Diabetes Programs. The NOPDP provides pediatric diabetic services to more than 90% of children with diabetes in Ontario. Since its inception in 2001, network programs have served a total of more than 9,000 clients. With this new funding initiative, we have an opportunity to ensure that young people with diabetes receive the care they need to help them lead healthier, happier lives. Ontario is the first province in Canada to fund the purchase of insulin pumps.

I'd like to take this opportunity to acknowledge several groups, including the Canadian Diabetes Association, the Diabetes Hope Foundation and the juvenile diabetes association, who are here with us today on this important occasion. I'd especially like to single out Terry Anne Thomson, the coordinator for the Ontario Diabetes Action Partnership. Terry was key in raising awareness of this issue and engaging the government and other community groups to help lead us to where we are today with this new initiative.

I also want to acknowledge the efforts of my colleague from Thunder Bay-Superior North, Michael Gravelle. A year ago he introduced Bill 15, which had the same goal of increasing access to insulin pumps for individuals with diabetes. I know that all members of the House have been very supportive, and Mr. Gravelle has had a measurable impact in bringing awareness to this issue that the government first addressed last spring in our budget and that is being announced today.

The McGuinty government is expanding its program to help more people with diabetes improve their quality of life. We're strengthening a chronic disease management and prevention system that responds to patient and community needs. Today's initiative is another example of our plan to build a health care system that helps people to stay healthy, delivers good care when they need it and ensures that the health system will be there for their children and grandchildren.

SOUTIENS À L'EMPLOI

EMPLOYMENT SUPPORTS

L'hon. Christopher Bentley (ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités): Investir dans les ressources humaines et leurs compétences est une des pierres angulaires de la stratégie économique du gouvernement McGuinty. Nous ne réaliserons pas notre potentiel en tant que province tant que chaque Ontarienne et Ontarien n'aura pas réalisé son propre potentiel. Aider la population et les entreprises de la province à trouver facilement et rapidement les services de formation et de soutien dont elles ont besoin est crucial si nous voulons réaliser ce potentiel.

We will not reach our potential as a province until every Ontarian reaches their potential. Assisting Ontarians and Ontario businesses to easily and effectively find the training and support services they need is essential if we are to reach that potential. Last week, I announced a new initiative which will help do exactly that. It's called Employment Ontario, Ontario's employment and training network.

1420

The McGuinty government has been investing substantially in skills and employment support services. In fact, this year, we'll spend approximately \$340 million on employment support services, including an increase of \$42 million over the past two years. This is in addition to

the substantial post-secondary investments we have been making.

Our investments include \$100 million this year in Employment Ontario's apprenticeship programs, including an expansion of the Ontario youth apprenticeship program, the pre-apprenticeship training program and the college co-op diploma apprenticeship program to help facilitate the route to an apprenticeship. This is in addition to the apprenticeship training tax credit and the apprenticeship scholarship and employer signing bonus, which both encourage employers to hire apprentices. These initiatives have helped keep us on track to meeting our goal of 26,000 new annual registrants to apprenticeship by 2007-08.

Literacy and academic upgrading are essential if we're to reach our economic potential. These programs give thousands of Ontarians a fresh opportunity to reach their potential. Studies consistently show that investing in literacy has a positive economic impact.

Employment Ontario's Job Connect services provide over 80 communities in Ontario with access to job information, employment workshops and one-on-one employment services. Our \$127-million investment in Job Connect includes a \$10-million increase to provide services to both youth and adults, as well as support for the opening of three new Job Connect centres with specialized services for newcomers. In fact, Ontario now has a substantial network of programs to help provide our province with the skilled workforce we need to make our economy strong.

About 470 different service providers in almost 900 locations will serve over half a million Ontarians with employment and training needs this year, including 76,000 employers. But this itself is a challenge.

What we haven't had in Ontario is a way to coordinate our services to make sure they are properly linked together. With so many providers of service in so many locations, where do you start? Are they properly coordinated? Does one lead effectively to another?

Employment Ontario is the place to start when you don't know where to start. It will help Ontarians make better use of the employment and training services we have by providing a single point of access to our newly coordinated network. Behind that, the services will be coordinated so that if you access a service which is not what you need, you will be referred to the one that you do need.

The existing services you are used to accessing and which perform such important work will continue. Employment Ontario will support them by providing a very important window onto those services, which should make them even more effective. We are building on the strengths of what's working.

Last week, I had the privilege of visiting two Job Connect centres, ACCES in Toronto and JVS in Markham, to launch Employment Ontario. This new initiative includes: a toll-free number, 1-800-387-5656, with expanding capabilities to help Ontarians get detailed information on the services they need in their local com-

munities; a new website with updated training and employment information and access to a database of our employment and training service providers in Ontario; new multilingual access to program information in 21 languages in addition to English and French; and a new name—Employment Ontario, Ontario's employment and training network—to give people and businesses a place to start when they don't know where to start.

These are important initiatives, but you should know that we are doing even more to plan for the future. That is why we signed the labour market development agreement and the labour market partnership agreement with the federal government. These two agreements will strengthen and add to our ability to help employers find the skilled workers they need or retrain the ones they have to help meet market opportunities and challenges. They will also help Ontarians find the extra skills and education that will give them the ability to achieve their goals.

Whether you are looking to add to your skills or rebuild them, Employment Ontario will help. Whether you have a job and might be looking for a better one, or are looking, Employment Ontario will help. It will help community groups and agencies refer their clients to the services they need to achieve their goals. It will also provide greater local input to planning, directing resources to where they can best help employers, workers, newcomers and people looking for work. Employment Ontario will also focus on meeting local needs to help all of our different regions participate in economic growth.

Employment Ontario will help Ontarians take advantage of the programs we have and ensure that those programs reach the people who need them. It will help every one of us reach our potential.

POLICE

Hon. Monte Kwinter (Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services): I rise today to pay tribute to the Police Association of Ontario and its members as they join us for their ninth annual legislative day here at Queen's Park. I'd like to acknowledge the presence of Bob Baltin, president of the PAO; chief administrative officer Bruce Miller; vice-president Brenda Lawson of the Ottawa Police Association; and Karl Walsh, the president of the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

As members know, the Police Association of Ontario is the official voice of Ontario's front-line police personnel. More than 30,000 police officers and civilians serving in police services throughout Ontario make up its membership. These are the people who put their lives on the line, day in and day out, to ensure that our province remains safe, secure and prosperous.

We owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the members of the Police Association of Ontario for all they do for our community. They are on the side of families concerned about crime and safety, as is the McGuinty government. Working together, we have accomplished a lot in our fight to make Ontario safer and stronger.

Last November, for example, we introduced the Mandatory Blood Testing Act, 2006. This is an issue of great interest to the Police Association of Ontario, and I'm grateful to them for their input and significant contribution to the content of the bill. If passed, the Mandatory Blood Testing Act, 2006, would help resolve many of the issues that concern our police and other community safety workers and give them the peace of mind to go about their work with greater confidence.

The PAO was also instrumental in helping us develop the Private Security and Investigative Services Act, legislation that was passed by this House last December. The act calls for professional standards, advanced training, and licensing and better regulation of the private security business. We expect the regulations to be in place by the summer of 2007. These will lead to a more professional, modern industry in a very important sector of Ontario.

Another PAO contribution was its input in the development of the Safer Communities-1,000 Officers partnership program. Together, we have worked to make it a success.

The McGuinty government is working on many fronts to make the work of our front-line police officers more effective and efficient and to make our communities safer. The Law Enforcement and Forfeited Property Management Statute Law Amendment Act, 2005, proclaimed on August 1, 2006, will help police and communities combat the threat to community safety posed by illegal marijuana grow operations. The Mandatory Gunshot Wounds Reporting Act, passed by this Legislature last year, will require public hospitals and other prescribed health care facilities to report the names of people who are treated for gunshot wounds to their local police service. The \$51-million anti-gun violence initiative announced by Premier Dalton McGuinty in January 2006 is increasing the police services' ability to deal with organized crime. And we earmarked \$26 million for a new state-of-the-art operations centre for Toronto's guns and gangs task force.

While these initiatives are aimed at addressing the law enforcement issues faced by front-line police personnel, the McGuinty government has also addressed the PAO's concern with regard to retirement and pensions. We passed legislation that shifted responsibility for the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System from the province to the contributors and beneficiaries themselves. And over the next two years, we're providing \$10 million in funding to help cover the start-up costs of supplemental plans for police, fire and paramedic personnel, the start-up costs of the new sponsors corporation and for a facilitator to work with the sponsors corporation.

The McGuinty government is grateful for the hard work, honest feedback and healthy dialogue we have been able to maintain with the PAO. We will continue to do our part to ensure that our partnership with the PAO continues to thrive, and that Ontario is safer and more prosperous as a result.

Today, I am pleased to salute the dedicated and hard-working people who make up the Police Association of Ontario. I thank them for helping us make Ontario a stronger and safer place in which to live, work and play.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Responses?
1430

DIABETES

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer (Kitchener-Waterloo): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to recognize that today is World Diabetes Day. I'd like to recognize those individuals in the audience who have worked so hard to continue to raise awareness and bring to our attention the need for us to do what we can, obviously, to prevent and reduce the complications of diabetes.

Unfortunately, we know that diabetes is on the rise in almost every country throughout the world. It was in that light, in 1995, that our government actually introduced the diabetes strategy and also introduced the Pediatric Diabetes Initiative and a primary prevention framework for type 2 diabetes. So this announcement today builds on work that has been done in the past.

I know that at the prebudget hearings last year, my colleagues Toby Barrett and Tim Hudak brought forward an amendment that insulin pumps for children should be funded. I know that in the budget of this year there was an announcement of funding for these children. Then we had a reannouncement on October 20 of this year. I hope now, as we hear it for the third time, that the government will move ahead to provide the funding for these children, so that approximately 1,000 of the 6,500 children will be provided with this service.

It's very important that we do what we can today. It has a devastating impact on children and their families. Obviously today's announcement is certainly a step in the right direction. We need to continue to do what we can for those who continue to suffer.

EMPLOYMENT SUPPORTS

Mr. Ted Chudleigh (Halton): In response to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, I have to wonder when members of this government will stop saying anything to get elected and make Ontario a more competitive place to do business.

This government continues to ignore the real issues faced by businesses and investors in Ontario. Moreover, they continue to ignore the reality of hundreds of thousands of families facing unemployment and loss of jobs in the manufacturing sector. When are they going to put an end to the punitive regulations, high energy prices and unfair property, income and business taxes that hinder jobs and investment in Ontario? It is, after all, this government's policies of broken promises, high costs and saying anything to get elected that most crush business investment in Ontario.

This government would do better to address their frivolous tax-and-spend policies and try to put an end to

the stories we hear about the closing of manufacturing plants in Ontario and the demise of manufacturing jobs, the backbone of Ontario's economy.

In the first three years of our government back in 1995 to 1998, 363,400 jobs were created, mostly by the private sector—about 90% of them by the private sector. That's 110,000 more jobs than the dismal record the Liberals have accomplished, with only 274,000 new jobs in this province. Our government was coming off the worst recession that we'd had in this province in 50 years, whereas this government was coming off a very buoyant economy, which they have managed to wrestle to the ground.

Ontarians are growing very weary of this government's policies of saying anything to get elected.

POLICE

Mr. Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I too would like to welcome the Police Association of Ontario here today, on behalf of John Tory and the PC caucus. I did have an opportunity earlier to do a member's statement on the PAO lobby day, and I wanted to ask some of the members of the government, who have particularly stood in this House time and time again and blamed the federal government, week after week and day after day, about concerns they have with things that are happening in the province of Ontario.

But I can tell you that the Harper government has introduced 11 bills related to crime, and so far they've only had the opportunity to pass three. Why? Because the federal Liberal Party has obstructed at least eight of those bills. If this government can do anything to help the Police Association of Ontario and all police officers in this province, call on your federal cousins to quit obstructing that legislation and get on with passing it so that we can help families and we can make our communities safer here in the province of Ontario. I urge you to do that. Help the Police Association of Ontario to help all citizens of Canada and Ontario make this country better. You can pass that legislation and it will make it better. We finally have a federal government that cares about crime here in Canada.

Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): New Democrats join others in welcoming police officers and staff from the Police Association of Ontario to Queen's Park here yet once again, nine years successively. We always look forward to the opportunity to learn from police officers out there on the ground about the difficulties that police officers continue to face here in this province of Ontario.

It's remarkable that the minister can say what he did, citing, among other things, Bill 28. Yet the government sat on it for darned near a year. It was opposition members and opposition caucuses that had to drag the government kicking and screaming to the chamber to debate it.

Interjection.

Mr. Kormos: Over a year, and it still hasn't passed. The Minister of Community Safety stands and speaks

about Bill 28 as an indication of this government's commitment to the welfare of police officers. If that's an indication of your commitment to the welfare of police officers, cops in this province are in deep trouble.

You talk about guns and gangs. The fact is that the money that has been invested in the city of Toronto has driven guns and gangs out into smaller-town Ontario, and those police services are starved for the resources that they need to respond to the guns-and-gangs crisis that has been transferred into their municipalities.

Your Law Enforcement and Forfeited Property Management Statute Law Amendment Act proclaimed on August 1, 2006, I tell you, will do nothing to assist police officers in busting grow-ops. Police forces across this province have for the last year been very successful through their own hard work and diligence at busting grow-ops, no thanks to this government.

The fact is that police forces across this province, and municipalities across this province, need hard resources assisting them in the maintenance of adequate levels of policing. Most police services in this province are hard-pressed to even deliver core services, never mind deal with extraordinary demands placed on them.

Do you want to talk about needs? Talk about northern Ontario: communities like Attawapiskat and Peawanuck, the riding of Howard Hampton or of Gilles Bisson, Timmins-James Bay. I've been to some of those NPS services. They don't even know you exist, because you don't know they exist. They're operating police stations with cell doors that won't lock, snowmobiles without tracks, boats without motors. What an embarrassment for this government to talk about its support for police when you've abandoned police forces across the province, and especially in northern Ontario, where police forces have to deal with more and more difficult tasks and you ignore them. You pretend they don't exist. You may not even know they exist.

EMPLOYMENT SUPPORTS

Mr. Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina): I wanted to respond to Mr. Bentley's so-called new initiative. It includes a toll-free number, a new website, new multi-lingual access to program information and, lo and behold, a new name: Employment Ontario. Hardly Olympic stuff; hardly the stuff of innovation. All we can think of in terms of what the government is doing is that it's just like handing a newcomer or a worker a phone book and saying, "Here, look it up." Hardly Olympic.

But if you looked at what Quebec has done, Minister, you might pick something new and innovative. Quebec did something very innovative 10 years ago. It's An Act Fostering the Development of Manpower Training. It was adopted in 1995. The act reached, in 2005, all employers with a payroll superior to \$1 million a year. The goal is to improve manpower qualification through increased investment in manpower training. A concerned employer must spend, in training of its personnel, at least 1% of its payroll each year.

Furthermore, a fund was established, independent from the state, under the name Fonds national de formation de la main-d'oeuvre, sometimes labelled the partners' fund. When an employer doesn't reach the 1% minimum, he must pay the difference to the Ministry of Revenue, and this sum is redirected to the fund. Many institutional developments were initiated by Quebec social partners with the support of this fund.

This is bold; this is new. It's similar to what they did with the status-of-the-artist legislation 10 years ago. Yes, it needs improvement, but they were the first to do that as well and the first to offer \$7-a-day child care. That's innovation. I would love to debate stuff like that rather than, once again, another announcement of a government website and hotline that is supposed to solve the complex and challenging problems faced by newcomers and others looking for training and apprenticeship opportunities. That's not innovation, Minister. Sorry.

1440

DAVID MOUNSEY

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I believe we have unanimous consent for all parties to speak up to five minutes to recognize a fallen police officer.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Mr. Bradley has asked for unanimous consent for all parties to speak up to five minutes in recognizing a fallen police officer. Agreed? Agreed.

Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron-Bruce): On October 14, 2006, Constable David Mounsey, a well-known and well-respected member of the Huron county detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police, sustained critical injuries in an on-duty automotive accident. Constable Mounsey, who was also a volunteer firefighter in the community of Blyth, was responding to a call for service at the time of the accident.

I'm saddened to inform the House that on Monday, November 13, after spending nearly a month in a coma, Constable Mounsey succumbed to those injuries and passed away peacefully. David is survived by his partner, Brenda Carey, who is also an active member of the Huron detachment of the OPP. He is also survived by one child, Ryan, as well as two stepchildren, Wyatt and Dalton, and a brother in England, John.

David started his career in law enforcement as a member of the Royal Air Force in Britain before becoming an active constable of the Ontario Provincial Police on April 24, 1998, in the Haldimand-Norfolk OPP detachment. David transferred to the Huron county OPP detachment in 2001, where he served until the time of his passing.

David was also a committee member of the OPP's western region ceremonial unit.

In addition to his duties as a provincial police constable, David was an active volunteer on the Blyth fire department since 2005. David had been a very active

member and a tremendous asset to the department since his arrival.

David and his partner, Brenda, have both recently returned from running the 46K Royal Victoria marathon in Victoria, BC. David had undertaken this incredibly physical commitment not for personal gratification, but as a means of raising money for the Blyth fire department to purchase a defibrillator machine for their public service. I would also like the House to know that by collecting from local sponsors and completing the gruelling race, David and his partner were successful in their mission. This is a testament to his amazing commitment not only to the fire department and the police department, but also to the safety of his community.

This is a man who will be truly missed by his colleagues and friends alike. David's professionalism and his bravery will be honoured with a full police funeral to be held in the town of Wingham on Friday, November 17, at 1 p.m. This will be a celebration of David's life and the immense impact that one man can have on his community.

This is yet another example of the risks that are inherent in the jobs of all of our emergency service professionals and how these men and women often make the greatest sacrifice to keep our communities safe. When an officer of the law loses his life while carrying out the duties of his office, it is a loss felt by all of those in our communities. We will honour and remember their devotion to the public good, and we must not take their sacrifices for granted. I would request a moment of silence to show respect for Constable Mounsey and his family for their great loss, and I would request this moment at the end of all tributes.

Mr. Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): It is an honour to stand here today and join all members of the House, on behalf of our leader, John Tory, and the PC caucus, as we pay tribute to the life of Ontario Provincial Police Constable David Mounsey.

Constable Mounsey passed away yesterday morning as the result of an on-duty accident that occurred on October 14 of this year. I didn't know Constable Mounsey, but I know he is survived by his spouse, Brenda, and their three children: Ryan, Wyatt and Dalton. He began his career with the Royal Air Force in Britain before joining the OPP. He showed his pride of the OPP as a committed member of the western region ceremonial unit.

The statement "Heroes in life, not death" is the wording that is seen on the police memorial wall here at Queen's Park and on lapel pins that are worn by fellow officers and citizens following the death of an officer. I know a number of the officers here today, on lobby day, have these pins on. They'll continue to wear them up until the funeral, and next year as well on the wall of honour day, on Police Memorial Day here at Queen's Park, the first Sunday in May, when David Mounsey's name will be placed on that wall of honour.

I just wanted to point out a couple of things. I actually met a police officer in a Remembrance Day service on the weekend and he had one of these pins on. I said, "I'm surprised you have that pin on today." He said, "Well, I

wear these myself during Remembrance Day services because I feel the remembrance of my colleagues whom I may have known in the past with the Ontario Provincial Police or the police services.” During that discussion, I was actually paying a compliment to the police services because I thought what a wonderful job they had done on Remembrance Day services throughout our province, but particularly in my riding where they kept traffic control and patrol to a minimum and kept the noise down so we could pay tribute to our veterans on this very special day.

Now during Remembrance Day services we see many police officers taking part, because they are people who are dedicating their lives as well. It's not war but, I tell you, they're protecting the rights and freedoms that we have here in Ontario. I just want to say, on behalf of our leader, John Tory, thank you to his family and to the community.

I wanted to close with a quote from the newly appointed OPP Commissioner, Julian Fantino. It says, “The men and women of the OPP and the entire policing family are mourning the tragic loss of a fellow officer and a friend. Constable David Mounsey was an excellent, dedicated police officer. We'll miss him very much.”

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River): Every day, police officers keep our families and communities safe. Every day when they put on their uniforms and say goodbye to their own families, they do so knowing that they may put themselves in harm's way in order to protect all of us. Today, we acknowledge and remember a police officer who has made the ultimate sacrifice.

On Monday, Ontario Provincial Police Constable David Mounsey died in hospital. Constable Mounsey succumbed to injuries he sustained one month ago when his police cruiser skidded off the road on the way to a transport truck rollover.

As we've heard, Constable Mounsey led a distinguished career, first in the Royal Air Force in Britain and then with Ontario Provincial Police detachments in Haldimand–Norfolk and Huron county and with the OPP western region ceremonial unit.

Today, we join with the people we represent from across Ontario in mourning this loss. We thank Constable Mounsey for his dedication, his courage and his good work in keeping our communities safe, and now for his sacrifice. We extend our most sincere condolences to his wife, Brenda, his children and to all family, friends and colleagues.

The Speaker: I would ask members and our guests to rise for a moment of silence in memory of Constable David Mounsey.

The House observed a moment's silence.

1450

ORAL QUESTIONS

MUNICIPAL FINANCES

Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Premier. Premier, three months ago, to

great fanfare, as usual, the government announced the provincial-municipal fiscal and service delivery review. As happens so frequently with this government, nothing has happened since. We haven't heard a peep of any kind whatsoever, and three months have passed: nothing from the Premier, nothing from the minister; no terms of reference; no membership of the review committee. No announcements of any kind, just the standard line: Don't take any responsibility. Blame somebody else. Blame Ottawa. Don't do anything.

When are you going to act? When is this review going to get under way? When are we going to start to find out how people can have input on this as local governments prepare to approach their budget season yet again?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): I want to thank the leader of the official opposition for the question. I infer from the question that he is very much in support of our initiative and that he believes we should continue to work with Ontario municipalities and to strike the very distinctive chord that we have struck during the course of our mandate, which is to treat our municipal colleagues as genuine partners and to have a shared sense of responsibility when it comes to meeting the needs of our shared constituents.

I know that the minister will shortly provide my colleague with more answers, but let me tell you something about some of the stuff we have been able to do together.

We have a new memorandum of understanding in place that ensures that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario is consulted on changes that affect municipalities. We have put in place a two-cent gas tax transfer to our municipalities for them to invest in their public transit. Those are real, practical and tangible and demonstrate the good relationship that we have with Ontario municipalities.

Mr. Tory: We support the initiative but don't support the timetable in two respects. The first is that you announced from the beginning it was going to take 18 months to get this work done, and the second, which makes it even worse, is you have now wasted three months of the 18. I hope they're not cumulative, because that would make it 21 months to get on with it. We want this review and we want it to happen fast, because there are urgent problems in the local communities across the province. We think that when you appoint a review like that and let it stretch out 18 months, it looks like you're trying to kill the bad headlines and put it, of course, after the election.

On September 28, 2006, the House passed a resolution moved by the member for Oxford that states that the review is taking too long. The resolution reads, in part, that the review “is needlessly drawn out and that a full review to balance the delivery of services with the ability to pay should be completed much more expeditiously, in order to avoid hitting Ontario taxpayers with unsustainable property tax hikes or significant reductions in service.” Will the Premier keep his promise to the muni-

cialties and keep his promise to respect the will of this House and speed up the review process? Get on with it.

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: I know the leader of the official opposition will want to remind himself that the good work we did with the city of Toronto took us about two years. That's for one, albeit significantly large, urban centre. That took us two years. We now want to address all municipalities throughout the province, about eight million other people living in those municipalities: big, small and in between. We think it's important to take the appropriate amount of time to get it right.

I note in passing that when it came to the City of Toronto Act, which we think is a significant piece of legislation that will help strengthen the city of Toronto, the leader of the official opposition voted against that bill. We will continue to move in the appropriate direction, working with our partners to ensure that we ultimately strengthen them and their cause.

Mr. Tory: The City of Toronto Act definitely had some steps forward, but it didn't deal with the fundamental issue we're talking about here, which is actually getting on with some reform to the finances so they will have the resources to fix some of the problems they have. The fact is, you didn't deal with that, notwithstanding you started talking about it years ago.

Municipalities have passed resolutions calling for you to expedite this process; 100 municipalities have written to us indicating that they think you can and should expedite this process and get on with it and take a lot less than the 18 months you're taking to postpone this until after the election. You're ignoring those 100 municipalities in taking this 18-month delay that you can't really explain. Every single one of these communities, and more, agrees that your dithering and delay are making things worse for them, and instead of acting you're sitting on your hands. Will you listen to the scores of municipalities—100 and more—that have written so far, saying you should speed this process up, get on with it and get on with the reform and helping them out? Are you going to do that?

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: A few points in response: First of all, the Conservative Party should recognize that the reason we're getting involved in this is to clean up their mess. That's number one. We're trying to find a way to correct the downloading foisted upon Ontario municipalities.

Secondly, we've been doing much in the interim. In addition to that memorandum of understanding, we have in place this new gas tax to support public transit. In our last budget there was Move Ontario, a \$1.2-billion initiative supporting roads, bridges and the like. We have put in place 14,000 new child care spaces. We're uploading public health costs and land ambulance costs and, yes, we are pursuing this review of services together with our municipal partners. Yes, we will continue to take the correct amount of time to get it right. We'll do it in a collaborative way, a co-operative way, something that is relatively unknown to the former government.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Premier again. They just want you to get on with it, that's all, just get on with it and all these other projects that are written down in disappearing ink.

Let's move to another one. It's the same kind of thing. This is another concern to the municipalities: the shortages of justices of the peace. In July 2003 there were 323 justices of the peace in Ontario. Today there are 298, and that includes five you are going to appoint tomorrow. Forty per cent of those will be retiring within 10 years. The result of this shortage is delays in the court system, court backlogs and the loss of municipal revenues.

Today you said you would love to be able to dole out more money to the municipalities. The fact is, they would be really grateful if you'd stop handcuffing them and cutting off the source of revenue they have today. In refusing to deal with this file, you've cost \$700,000 to Hamilton, \$765,000 to Niagara and \$39 million to Ottawa in lost revenue, and then you voted against a PC motion to allow access to the MTO database so people can track down those who haven't paid. Why did you refuse this reasonable request to give the municipalities access to this information?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): To the Attorney General.

Hon. Michael Bryant (Attorney General): Why did you block a bill that could have had JPs sitting in those courtrooms a year ago? We had a bill before this Legislature that would have allowed us to put JPs in those courts to assist those traffic courts in a timely fashion, and the only reason we didn't have that done a year ago is because this official opposition decided to obstruct it. So I say to the member, we got the JPs into the courts; we got the bill passed. Why did you try to obstruct that bill?

Mr. Tory: The member for St. Paul's will have plenty of opportunity to ask questions from over here soon enough. The fact is that the minister didn't bring the bill forward for months, he brought forward an omnibus bill dealing with four or five different subjects, and the real facts are 323 JPs in 2003 and 298 today.

It's not just about money not collected. Municipalities are shelling out big bucks for your failure: a \$50-million bill for courthouse security and for courthouses that are sitting empty.

A story from the Port Hope Evening Guide said, "When one court was cancelled without sufficient notice, five police officers on overtime showed up to participate. The town ended up paying 20 hours of overtime to officers who were probably in court about two minutes."

You congratulate yourself for bringing 21 JPs out of retirement. This is the same government that voted down an amendment in the very bill you talk about to extend the retirement age to 75, as recommended by the association of JPs. Why didn't you pass that amendment if you were so concerned about getting JPs into the courts?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The government has appointed 45 new justices of the peace since we took office. When the

Conservative government was in power, between 1995 and 1997, do you know how many JPs they appointed? Did they appoint 45? No. Did they appoint 14? No. They appointed zero justices of the peace.

In addition to the JPs who have been appointed and in addition to putting into place the per diem JPs who will deal with ongoing caseload, this government will not take any lectures from that party when it comes to ensuring that we have access to justice in the province of Ontario.

1500

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Final supplementary.

Mr. Tory: Here are the numbers. For all your great claims, here are the numbers: 323 JPs in 2003; 298 today, including five tomorrow. I'm even crediting you with the five you're going to do tomorrow. That doesn't sound like much of an improvement to me.

During the very same Bill 14 committee hearings, Jane Moffatt, the vice-president of the Prosecutors' Association of Ontario, said the central east region had lost a total of 12 JPs since 2004. That's all on your watch, by the way. You've yet to fill half of those vacancies.

The result is, as Brian Rosborough of AMO told the justice committee: "...police officers waiting sometimes for hours to meet with a justice of the peace on warrant issues. This waiting time results in fewer police officers on the street, a diversion of police resources and added costs for municipalities."

My question is this: Why is this government dithering on this file? Why has the number of JPs gone down on your watch, up to and including today? Will the Premier commit to appointing the JPs that are needed in communities across the province to alleviate this crisis? Will you get on with it?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: The government has got on with it, and we could have gotten on with it a lot earlier if that party hadn't blocked Bill 14.

Contrary to what the member said, the president of the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police provided credit to the government for passing Bill 14 as an important step in modernizing the procedures for prosecuting provincial offences through the available technology. In fact, what we've done is update the traffic court system in terms of the evidence, the prosecution, and the justices of the peace who have been appointed. It's the most significant update to the justice of the peace system, I'm told by the Chief Justice, since 1327. We could have gone on with it a lot earlier and we could have got it done in 2005 if that party had not dragged its feet.

So I say again to the member, we've got on with it all right, and we could have got on with it a lot quicker and a lot—

The Speaker: Thank you.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River): We've heard of the McGuinty government blaming other

governments, but reaching back to 1327 is something none of us, I think, can understand.

A year ago in October, the McGuinty government signed a deal with Bruce Power—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): I need to know who the question is to.

Mr. Hampton: Oh, this is to the Premier.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Hampton: —a private nuclear company. At the time, your energy minister boasted, "This agreement will ensure fair prices and the capacity to meet Ontario's future energy needs."

Premier, do you stand by those comments today? Do you still believe your Bruce Power deal is a good deal for Ontario consumers?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): To the Minister of Energy.

Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy): The Bruce Power deal was signed. In fact, it wasn't me who said that; it was the outside people we brought in to assist us—CIBC World Markets—who said, in fact, it was a "fair deal." It was something called a fairness letter, which very clearly outlined that in the view of the outside body that was advising the government at the time, this would be a good deal.

Just to be certain, I then asked the Provincial Auditor to review the deal, something we felt was appropriate, and sent the deal over to the auditor. The auditor is continuing his review of the deal, and I look forward to his input and advice on that deal. Suffice it to say, the power at Bruce represents an opportunity for us to keep the lights on in Ontario, something we think is very, very important.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Hampton: This is the McGuinty government's confidential document dealing with the electricity transmission problem. This is the document the McGuinty government tried to hide from the people of Ontario for the last year, and now we know why you were trying to hide it: because it explains that you don't have the transmission capacity to carry the additional electricity that Bruce Power is supposed to produce starting in 2009. Then it says that if the transmission capacity isn't there by 2009, you'll have to pay Bruce nuclear penalty fees of \$460 million a year, while hydro consumers get no additional electricity.

My question to the Premier is, how is paying half a billion dollars for no electricity a good deal for Ontario's hydro consumers?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: I think the power authority released a document last week that said there are a number of solutions that will have the adequate transmission to get the power out of Bruce by 2009. The power authority, an independent body, feels that's adequate; we feel it's adequate. We feel the deal is fair, we feel it's the appropriate deal, and it is the proper way to proceed.

As I say, I rely on the Ontario Power Authority in that regard, and they're very clear in their document today that there are a number of ways, and I look forward to the

member's support then, because that transmission is important for wind power as well. So I know he'll work hard with us to make sure that transmission is on stream by 2009 in order to free up the wind resources that are very present in Bruce county.

Mr. Hampton: We'll deal with the Ontario Power Authority document in a few minutes, but this is the government's own document. It paints a very telling picture. The government put together this sweetheart deal with Bruce nuclear, a rush deal, and on page 5 it explains that Ontario should build a reliable transmission line to carry the additional power, but since that new transmission line won't be ready by 2009, it points out that you're going to duct tape the existing system, at an additional cost of \$260 million. So half a billion dollars for electricity that people won't be able to use, and then a further \$260 million for a Red Green duct tape job.

I ask the Premier this: How is that a good deal for Ontario's electricity consumers?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: Again, the amount of money and the temporary changes will remain in place. It's not like they'll be shut down when the permanent line is brought on. That additional capacity is needed to help bring wind power out of the Bruce county area, which is in addition to the nuclear power that's coming out. It's an important investment, in our view, one that we think will pay dividends to the people of Ontario, the province of Ontario. Again, the power authority has indicated, and we support the view of the power authority, that in fact there will be adequate transmission to get the power out of Bruce county—not just the nuclear power but, just as importantly, the wind power. I know the leader of the third party will work with us as we bring those new wind opportunities online, as we need that new transmission. I take this as an indication of his support, that he'll support the government as it moves forward with new transmission capacity out of Bruce county.

Mr. Hampton: To the Premier: I don't think anyone is going to support a deal where Ontario Hydro consumers could end up paying \$800 million and get no additional electricity. This is the Ontario Power Authority report that was just released. When you read this report, it makes it very clear that a permanent transmission line is needed to get the electricity out of the Bruce Peninsula to the greater Toronto area, but it also makes it clear that that new transmission line will be delayed until 2011 or 2012, possibly—not ready in 2009. It makes it clear that your duct tape interim solution is acceptable only as a short-term stopgap measure.

I say to the Premier, you signed this sweetheart deal with Bruce Power. It could well end up costing \$800 million more for consumers and get no power. Do you still agree this is a good deal for consumers?

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: To the Minister of Energy.

Hon. Mr. Duncan: Let's be clear; let me just re-emphasize: Yes, you're repeating what the Ontario Power Authority, the ISO and Hydro One said last week, that in fact, to get the permanent line, it will be 2011. If you read earlier in that document, you'll see that they

recommended a number of relatively easy changes to the existing transmission infrastructure that will allow power not only from nuclear but from wind power in Bruce county—and, by the way, to our friends in rural Ontario, from anaerobic digest; there's a number of farm opportunities in the area to get that power out of there.

1510

That figure of \$800 million you're quoting is just hooey. You're twisting the numbers, you're taking them out of context and you're adding things up that shouldn't be added up. I would suggest you read the documents and the comments of the experts. I don't pretend to be an expert, but I know this: We have the ability to get the power out by 2011 and we have an interim solution at 2009. That investment in the interim solution will continue to pay dividends beyond 2011. Therefore, unlike—

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister. Supplementary.

Mr. Hampton: Here's the reality: Nuclear power options have a long history in Ontario of massive cost overruns, but this one will be a first. The hard-working women and men of Ontario are out \$260 million for duct tape aid to the transmission system, but even if the duct tape system is there, it still may not be able to carry the electricity, in which case they pay another \$460 million and get no electricity. This is bizarre, in anybody's estimation, and no amount of trying to hide it from the public is going to work.

I say to the Premier again, do you think this is a good deal for the electricity consumers of Ontario, when they could be on the hook for close to \$800 million in costs and get no additional hydroelectricity?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: Again, I will stress that in the opinion of CIBC World Markets, which we engaged for an independent review, it is a fair deal. There are risks, and we acknowledge that; there are risks in any of these projects. I look forward to the Leader of the Opposition working with us as we bring on new transmission at various parts of the province to access wind, hydroelectric opportunities. I hope he won't be opposing those kinds of opportunities, because they are important. I acknowledge there's risk in this. That's why we sent the deal to the Provincial Auditor, and I look forward to his comments on the deal. But the greater risk is if we do what his government did and don't address the fundamental challenges before this province. We were facing blackouts, pure and simple. This deal is a risky deal by any standard, and it will be. But it's a fair deal, it's one that will have the power to markets on time and at the cost outlined, and we believe it is the appropriate course of action to pursue in all the circumstances.

Mr. Hampton: The Minister of Energy says that this is a risky deal but a good deal. This is like a general manager of a hockey team putting out lots of money for a washed-up player, and then when he realizes he's washed up, he goes out and pays even more for a temporary player and says to the public, "This is a good deal." There's \$460 million at risk right off the top and then a further \$240 million at least at risk, and the people of Ontario potentially stand to get no additional electricity. I

say to the Premier, how do you justify these kinds of sweetheart deals with your private electricity friends when the hydro ratepayers of Ontario could end up paying a bundle?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: Again, I say to the leader of the third party, first of all, that his numbers are not in touch with reality. They're just taken out of context and mixed together. There will be adequate transmission capacity to get the power out of Bruce once the refurbished reactors are online. It's an appropriate deal. Again, we asked CIBC World Markets for an independent fairness letter, and they provided that. In addition, I've asked the Provincial Auditor for his view on the deal. It's important that we move forward with this development. It's important that the transmission come online by 2011. By 2009, according to the Ontario Power Authority, the Independent Electricity System Operator and Hydro One, we will have adequate transmission resources to get the power from Bruce. It will continue to serve Ontario and make sure we keep the lights on throughout the province.

OTTAWA LIGHT RAIL PROJECT

Ms. Lisa MacLeod (Nepean–Carleton): My question is for the Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal. This weekend my constituents in Nepean–Carleton and throughout all of Ottawa were scared. They were contemplating the fact that you are going to take away \$200 million for a rapid transit expansion. On Friday afternoon, three days before the municipal election, this Liberal government issued a letter to city officials regarding the proposed north-south light rail project. Former Mayor Chiarelli claimed this letter meant the province would veto any light rail plan but his and that the \$200 million committed by the province was in jeopardy. Ottawa's recent municipal election was a referendum on the former mayor's light rail project, and Larry O'Brien, who is not firmly committed to the proposed light rail project, became the new mayor of Ottawa.

My question: Will the minister clarify the former mayor's comments and will the Ottawa council have the same flexibility it did in 2004 when there was a three-level Liberal McGuinty-Martin-Chiarelli—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. The question has been asked.

Hon. David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Deputy Government House Leader): I think the member has a future in comedy. This government has signed in good faith, but it has been her mentor, Treasury Board President John Baird, who has thrown a monkey wrench into it.

I want to read from Susan Sherring—you must know Susan from Ottawa: "So it seems Progressive Conservative leader John Tory is 'disappointed' ... 'threatening' to withdraw transit funding if Bob Chiarelli isn't elected.

"Well, I'm disappointed Tory can't read," says Susan Sherring. "For the life of me, I can't understand why some believe it's okay for Treasury Board President John Baird to go back on his word, and withhold federal fund-

ing, and yet Tory is up in arms because the province says it will honour its commitment.

"Near as we can tell, Tory is upset because the provincial Liberals are keeping their word."

Shame on John Tory, and shame on you for bringing this farce to this House.

Ms. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. Minister of Finance, I'm not going to warn you again.

Ms. MacLeod: I too wish life was like a box of chocolates, but the minister can't Gump this up. That \$200 million is important to the people of Ottawa, and I'll tell you one thing: At least John Baird did the honourable thing and he has let the new Ottawa council keep the \$200 million that the federal government committed. Right now, CFRA is reporting 12 of the 23 councillors will vote against the light rail project as it is today. According to his website, the new mayor is committed to negotiating with Siemens and PLC to implement a six-month delay to allow the city to provide—

Interjections.

Ms. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker, I can't hear over them.

The Speaker: Minister of Economic Development, I'm not going to warn you again either.

Ms. MacLeod: I'm going to make it simple for the minister: The mayor wants to provide realistic alternatives to what he calls "the clear failings and deficits in the current plan." But this Liberal government, in its letter of November 10, told Ottawa voters that any contemplation of other potential alternative investments would be inconsistent.

The so-called referendum on light rail was won by over 45% by Larry O'Brien yesterday, who ran on alternatives to the rapid transit plan, a plan that this government's own letter states would be inconsistent. Will the minister commit to keeping his government's promise in 2004 of \$200 million for infrastructure funding in Ottawa, yes or no?

1520

Hon. Mr. Caplan: My, oh my, Speaker. On April 21, 2005, I had the great privilege of signing a memorandum of understanding with the city of Ottawa and the federal government. Unfortunately, it is the federal President of the Treasury Board, John Baird, who has mused aloud and seemingly thrown a monkey wrench into this. The province, of course, has been very clear. We have clarified with the city of Ottawa that we believe in and stand behind our agreement of April 21, 2005.

Now, this member could help. This member could write to John Baird. This member could talk to her colleagues, her kissing cousins in Ottawa, and get them to honour their agreements, which they seem to have a lot of trouble doing—certainly the Canada-Ontario agreement that my colleague the finance minister talked about in this House, which it looks like Prime Minister Harper and Treasury Board President John Baird are renegeing on. This member could help and make sure that—

The Speaker: Thank you. New question.

HOMELESSNESS

Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York): My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Today, in the little Church of the Holy Trinity, just behind the Eaton Centre, we were all reminded of the tragedy of homelessness, because this afternoon they posted the 500th name added to the Toronto homeless memorial. Sadly, the numbers have actually gone up in the past three years. These deaths are preventable; you know they are preventable. Toronto's homeless must be provided with the housing that they need.

Mr. Minister, I have a very simple question: What is your plan to immediately house these homeless so that they do not die at the rate of one per week on our streets?

Hon. John Gerretsen (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I thank the member for the question. As the member well knows, as he's heard in this House on numerous occasions, this government signed an agreement with the federal government a year ago last April to put up \$602 million worth of affordable housing in this city and in this province. We're working at it. We've got a housing allowance program that helps people of low income with their housing needs. We've got an affordable housing program, where people are moving into affordable housing units across this province. Some 128 projects have been approved, and have either been built or are in the planning process. We have a rent bank program that has helped over 5,000 individuals in an emergency situation in this province who need help. They've been given the money so that they can stay in their own home. There's a lot of work to be done, but—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Supplementary.

Mr. Prue: Mr. Minister, your government is quick to make these announcements and re-announcements, but not very quick to actually build the homes; 1,653 are actually occupied, by your own figures. This amounts to only a tiny fraction of the 20,000 units plus the 6,000 units of supportive housing that you promised in the last election. Your government has \$400 million set aside in an account that you are not spending on the housing that is so desperately needed. We want you to build that truly affordable housing, and we want it built now.

My question again to you: When will you keep your promise to build the 20,000 units of affordable housing and the 6,000 units of supportive housing and keep our people from dying on the streets?

Hon. Mr. Gerretsen: Once again, for years and years prior to our government taking over in October 2003, absolutely nothing happened, both federally and provincially, as far as affordable housing is concerned. We've made a good start. Is there more work to be done? Absolutely. In addition to the programs I talked about earlier, we've got an additional 3,500 units where people are getting rent supplements now that weren't available to them in October 2003. That means people are getting subsidized rents so that vulnerable individuals with

limited means can have a roof over their head. We realize a lot of work has to be done.

As far as the money in the trust fund is concerned, that money is there, we're looking at various program options, and they will be announced as soon as we're in a position to do so.

ALIMENTATION EN ÉLECTRICITÉ
ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

M. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans): La question supplémentaire va être posée par le député de Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh.

Ma question s'adresse au ministre de l'Énergie. Plus tôt aujourd'hui, vous avez annoncé la signature d'un accord entre Hydro One et Hydro-Québec qui permettra à l'Ontario d'avoir accès à jusqu'à 1250 mégawatts d'électricité propre et renouvelable.

Renewable power is something that my constituents strongly support. They are constantly telling me that they'd like to see the government invest more in hydro and wind and solar. Today's announcement is a perfect example of how we are listening to them. This is in stark contrast to the previous governments, who either did nothing to bring new renewable sources online, like the Conservatives, or governments who cancelled important renewable projects, like the NDP.

Minister, when can Ontarians expect to start benefiting from this announcement? What does this mean for Ontario's energy system and its economy?

Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy): I'd like to thank the member and all his colleagues from the Ottawa region who helped so much in making this a reality. We're very grateful.

This morning we announced the signing of a deal that will create another interconnection between Ontario and Quebec and increase our import and export capacity with Quebec by almost 100% over the next three years. That will allow us to import clean, renewable hydroelectric power from Quebec, and by extension we will be able to export power to Quebec on an as-needed basis.

This is an important development for Ontario. It lessens our dependence on foreign power, gives us more capacity, creates jobs in the Ottawa region and helps us to clean up the environment. We think it's important. It's a win-win-win: a cleaner environment, it's good for Quebec, it's good for Ontario and, most importantly, it's good for Canada.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Supplementary, the member for Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh.

Mr. Jim Brownell (Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh): Minister, renewable power isn't the only energy-related issue my constituents bring up. They also bring up energy conservation, because they know, like I do, that it's cheaper to save a megawatt than to build a megawatt.

I often hear the member from Kenora–Rainy River talk about conservation and criticize our government's action on the file, although I find it quite rich that he does so after his party voted against the Energy Conservation Responsibility Act. Minister, could you clarify for the House and for my constituents what Ontario is doing to reduce energy consumption?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: The Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance gave this government a B+—that's up from a D average under the previous government—and they expect we'll be the leader in Canada by this time next year. That's because we are committed to conservation. More than 500 programs are going on across the province now. Just some examples of how we're saving: 57,000 megawatt hours in home conservation projects; Toronto Hydro's summer challenge, 50,000 megawatt hours, a project that we have just expanded province-wide; London Hydro's fridge retirement program, 12,000 megawatt hours; and the list goes on and on.

We are on target to meet our government's own internal conservation target of 10%, and we are on target, according to the conservation bureau, to meet the 5% peak demand reduction by 2007 that we set out. This government is committed to a cleaner environment. It's the first government in Ontario's history that's actually done something—

The Speaker: Thank you.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr. John Tory (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Minister of Health. We've had brought to our attention today the case of Ms. Crystal Caligiuri. She's in the Markham Stouffville Hospital emergency room, where she has been since Sunday night. She's on a stretcher there. She has been on a stretcher since she's been there. She's suffering from multiple myeloma, which has spread to her liver. Her liver has shut down; her stomach has apparently shut down; her belly is distended by a foot. There is no bed for her. She can't go on chemotherapy, so they have her on a morphine drip. She has been on that drip on a stretcher in the emergency room in the Markham Stouffville Hospital for more than 24 hours now. She's not eating or drinking. She's literally lying there dying on a stretcher.

I wonder how this can be, in the province of Ontario, and I wonder, after you came here with the kinds of announcements and pronouncements and advertisements that you've had, how you can explain this and what you have to say to Ms. Caligiuri and to her family.

Hon. George Smitherman (Deputy Premier, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): Firstly, what I would say to any family member in the province of Ontario is that the circumstances with respect to our health care system are a shared challenge.

The honourable member doesn't like the cut and thrust of partisan debate in here, and he asked me a torqued question like that. How could it come to this? Your party cut acute—

1530

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Smitherman: Oh, now they don't like it. They can bring the hard question, but they can't even bear to address the fundamental accountability that was, for eight and a half years, their reputation and record.

Acute care beds—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): The member for Waterloo–Wellington needs to come to order.

The Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Smitherman: To address the circumstances on point: We had a situation in Ontario where acute care beds were cut by 22%. This is a capacity challenge. We're in the midst of a very significant rebuild. The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal can speak to that. Markham-Stouffville is a community where a new hospital is coming. In fact, the 905 part of the GTA will see 45% of all the new bed construction that's ongoing.

We've worked very hard to support hospice and provide the necessary support for people—

The Speaker: Thank you. Supplementary.

Mr. Tory: The woman in question, Ms. Caligiuri, has been there since Sunday night. She's got multiple myeloma. Parts of her body are shutting down. She's on a morphine drip. They can't get her on chemotherapy because they can't get her a bed, which is a problem we hear about over and over again. When I asked you how it's come to this, the best you can tell me after you've been in government for more than three years now—you've had three different reports on emergency rooms, you've been collecting the health tax, which is a tax you promised you wouldn't bring in, for more than three years, had all that money, and all you can do is blame some previous government.

What are you prepared to do for Ms. Caligiuri and for her family? What are you prepared to do for this woman, who is lying on a stretcher—not even a bed—in the emergency room of the Markham Stouffville Hospital, other than get up and make this kind of statement? What are you prepared to do? You are the Minister of Health. What are you prepared to do for her and her family specifically?

Hon. Mr. Smitherman: What I'm not prepared to do, for the point of the honourable member's excitement, is to bring an individual case like this forward. It dictates that people who are involved in making hundreds of thousands of clinical decisions every day make the very best ones that are possible in the circumstances. There are challenging circumstances like this—nobody pretends about those—and they have existed on the watch of all political parties.

On point, the honourable member asks about the premium. He proposes to cut it. If the circumstances are challenging now, when we've made a \$2.5-billion investment annually in health care as a result of the greater contribution of the people of Ontario, which he proposes to cut, how will that improve circumstances?

We're building new bed capacity. We've enhanced our capacity to support. We're building new regional cancer centres. We're building beds back into the system. We're creating better community supports. We brought a home hospice and residential hospice program to provide support for people at the end of their life. The point is that we believe in public health care. We're working hard to rebuild it. We agree, there are challenges every single day and—

The Speaker: Thank you. New question.

ONTARIO ARTISTS

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): My question is for the Minister of Culture. We have in our gallery today some incredibly patient artists from ACTRA and the Writers' Union of Canada. We had Ms. Fiona Reid here a little earlier, but we've managed to drive her out with our bad acting.

Interjection.

Ms. DiNovo: Oh, is she here? There she is. Hello. We also have the American Federation of Musicians—the Canadian office of that organization—and the Brantford Musicians Association.

These artists are here for a reason. They've been waiting for your report on the status of the artist in Ontario, which was to have been completed within the first two years of your mandate—and still no report. The report was to lay the foundation for status-of-the-artist legislation that would improve the living standards of tens of thousands of Ontario's artists. My question is very simple: Minister, when is this long-overdue report finally going to be released?

Hon. Caroline Di Cocco (Minister of Culture): I would like to welcome so many talented artists here today and also say how much we value their contributions to our cultural fabric and to the economy of Ontario. Today, we also had the High Park choir here singing, as well as a trio, which filled the halls in this place with music, a magnificent sound.

I'm pleased to convey to the member that this government has made some significant strides in creating a strong, healthy environment for arts and culture to thrive, and that in turn helps artists in Ontario. But we also have undertaken the largest consultation process of its kind, involving 4,000 individuals and associations.

My ministry and this government are committed to ameliorating the socio-economic conditions of artists, and we're working toward that end.

Ms. DiNovo: Meanwhile, her budget has been cut by about \$88 million; meanwhile, status-of-the-artist legislation is still not in place; meanwhile, many who are artists in our province are classified as independent contractors and are not covered by the Employment Standards Act; meanwhile, child performers are not protected; meanwhile, income averaging is not in place. She promised on May 15 of last year that it would come in momentarily—it's in Hansard, Madam Minister. So

my question again is, when will you bring in the report, when will you bring in status-of-the-artist legislation?

Hon. Ms. Di Cocco: We have a very strong record of support for artists in this province. I'm going to state again that this ministry and this government value artists and are committed to ameliorating the socio-economic conditions of artists. I want to assure artists in this province that we're working toward that and making progress on that.

I know that this member is new to the Legislature, and I just want to provide one bit of information that I think is important for her to know: On June 24, 1991, the Minister of Culture of the day, Mr. Marchese, said, "I'm committed to working with the arts community and my colleagues in other ministries to develop a strong and effective status-of-the-artist policy in Ontario." In five years, they made absolutely no progress, but we're making progress on the—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. New question.

BROWNFIELD SITES

Mr. Jim Brownell (Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh): My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. On November 9 last year, I had the sad responsibility of announcing the closure of Domtar Fine Papers. This closure signalled the end of the era of big manufacturing as a principal source of employment in Cornwall. Since then, the community has shown its resilience and, with the support of this government, has begun its renaissance.

A big part of that renaissance was the announcement recently of the sale of the Domtar property to a local consortium. The announcement of the sale to a local buyer is truly good news, as it means there is interest in developing the former Domtar lands with the needs of the community in mind. I know that local municipal economic development officers will be working hard with the new owners of the Domtar property to attract new investment and promote the Domtar lands as some of the most desirable real estate in eastern Ontario.

Minister, what is your ministry doing to assist economic development teams at the local and municipal levels?

Hon. Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Economic Development and Trade, minister responsible for women's issues): Thank you very much for this question. It's important to note that the provincial government is prepared to go where help is needed, and the area of Cornwall is a very good example of this. The officials at MEDT, the economic development ministry, literally rushed in to see what they could do in preparing for the future of Cornwall and worked diligently with the economic development officers there. We've also hired new staff for this area to work with local officials to develop, and what recently came out of that is a report that has unveiled 35 areas now ready for investment in terms of manufacturing sites. This is the kind of collaboration

that's required so that all of our regions across Ontario can be investment-ready. We're very pleased to say that we have three offices in the eastern Ontario area with six business officials on the ground, working with every potential opportunity. May I say as well that the local officials whom we've been glad to work with have done a tremendous job in making this area ready for investment.

Mr. Brownell: One of the biggest challenges in making this transition from our traditional heavy manufacturing base is in rejuvenating brownfield sites. Beyond the Domtar lands, there are many opportunities for converting industrial lands into vibrant mixed-use development. Just this August, the Minister of Labour had the opportunity to witness the redevelopment at the historic Cotton Mills on Cornwall's waterfront. The city of Cornwall, Chuck Charlebois of Groupe Renaissance and the Kaneb family of Cornwall Warehousing are to be congratulated for their hard work and vision on the Cotton Mills lands. However, municipalities and community groups like Renaissance face difficulty financing major brownfield projects.

Minister, what sort of incentives does the province offer to municipalities and developers to take on brownfield development?

1540

Hon. Ms. Pupatello: I'll refer it to the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): There is a little bit of what I describe as the Cornwall miracle going on in eastern Ontario, an area where we've seen some job loss, but also some real revitalization in the economy. One of the reasons we are moving forward on strengthening entities that want to create new jobs on brownfield sites is because of the way in which it inspires a new generation of economic growth in places like my friend describes.

Right now we have very specific tax incentives for entities that are willing to develop on brownfield sites. I know that my friend from Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh is working directly with the communities, and I expect to see some really interesting new developments as a result of his work. Thank you, sir.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 107

Mrs. Christine Elliott (Whitby-Ajax): My question is for the Premier. During the last election campaign you talked about cynicism among the electorate with respect to Ontario politics. You explicitly promised, and I quote, "Your MPP should be free to represent your views, not just parrot the views of his or her party. We will make sure all non-cabinet MPPs are free to criticize and vote against government legislation." Premier, Bill 107, your proposed destruction of Ontario's human rights public complaints and investigation system, is not yet law. According to the website of the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal, a transition team already has been hired and is

working to design a new tribunal. What happened to your campaign promise? You're presuming that Bill 107 is going to pass, thereby making a sham of the committee process. How can you possibly expect your MPPs on this committee to vote without even considering the views of their constituents? And what do you have to say to the many racial—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. Premier.

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): To the Attorney General.

Hon. Michael Bryant (Attorney General): I'm not quite sure what language is used on the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal's website. As you know, the tribunal is at arm's length from the Ministry of the Attorney General. Certainly nobody in this House—and neither the tribunal nor the commission in any way, shape or form—presumes to know what this Legislature will do in any matter. If you're suggesting that the tribunal is engaging in that activity, that's not my experience at all. In fact, I think what the tribunal is trying to do is look at the various options that may be ahead for the system in the event that Bill 107 moves forward. Certainly nobody presumes to question in any way, shape or form the wisdom of this Legislature as it continues to look very closely at Bill 107.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Mrs. Elliott: My question again is for the Premier. Your campaign promise was, and I quote, "We will make our institutions more democratic by freeing your MPP to represent you," and "We will give more independence and power to legislative committees."

Premier, as you know, the justice policy committee is going to be voting tomorrow on a proposal to extend the hearings on Bill 107 until the hundreds of concerned organizations and groups have had the opportunity to make their presentations before the committee.

Given the precedent that was established during the summer committee hearings, that everyone who wishes to make a presentation before the committee can do so, are you going to allow your Liberal MPPs on this committee to vote freely on open and democratic hearings and to follow the established precedent, or are they going to have to act like trained seals and shut off the hearings?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: Obviously, the committee will have a number of matters that it's going to be considering this week. It's in the hands of a very good committee. I note that the reason there is significant interest in this bill is that we have not had the opportunity to provide and update the human rights system in more than 40 years.

When the Conservative Party was in government, there was absolutely zero interest in reforming the human rights system. They cut funding to the human rights system, they showed nothing but disdain towards the issues faced by the human rights system and they made no effort to reform the human rights system. So it is good to see the Conservative Party's new-found interest in human rights reform.

I look forward to the matter being debated in the committee, not only tomorrow and the next day but

however long it takes. As the member knows, that's in the hands of the House leaders and that's in the hands of the committee, where it should be.

SAULT AREA HOSPITAL

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. When the McGuinty government approved the plan for a new Sault Ste. Marie area hospital in April 2005, you told people in Sault Ste. Marie that construction would start in early 2006, and you said the hospital would open in late 2008. Then you said construction would start in spring of 2007 with an opening in 2009. Now the chair of the Sault Ste. Marie hospital planning committee says no hospital at least until 2010 because of “delays getting into the bidding process.”

Premier, will you guarantee today that the construction of the Sault-area hospital will start in the spring of 2007 and will be completed on time in 2009, and on budget, like you promised?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal.

Hon. David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Deputy Government House Leader): The leader of the third party was in the Soo and spitting out these kinds of lines. The vice-president of the Sault-area hospital called his remarks “trash and nonsense” and, in fact, they are. Construction of the new Sault Area Hospital is on schedule. It is anticipated to begin in the summer of 2007. The tendering process, including evaluation of the proposals, is scheduled to be completed in spring of 2007, on schedule. The completion date for the project will not be confirmed until the negotiations with the successful bidder have been concluded and a construction schedule has been submitted. This has been the fact since the very beginning. The member well knows this. In fact, this announcement and this process and this project have been so well greeted by the people of Sault Ste. Marie, who have been desperate for a new hospital—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you.

Mr. Hampton: I didn't hear a guarantee there, and I know why. Because construction delays are already a reality for your profit-driven private-finance hospital in North Bay, and the Belleville profit-driven private-finance hospital project deadlines have been pushed back three times. Even your member from Sault Ste. Marie told the Sault Ste. Marie Star, “No one knows exactly when the completion date is for the Sault Area Hospital.”

I say to the Premier, what the people of Ontario want to know is, how much additional money and how much additional time will the McGuinty government's profit-driven private-finance hospital scheme cost our health care system?

Hon. Mr. Caplan: The public, not only the people of the Soo but the people of Ontario, will be price-protected. Unlike the NDP and their former member, Mr. Martin, who could not deliver a new hospital in Sault Ste. Marie,

a new cancer centre in Sault Ste. Marie, David Oraziotti, the member from Sault Ste. Marie, is delivering a new facility that will be 20% larger than the existing two hospitals, that will have an emergency room twice the current size. A 289-bed publicly owned hospital will house a radiation treatment satellite and provide closer-to-home access to life-saving care for more than 100,000 residents of Sault Ste. Marie. Speaker, I would want you to know that Algoma region residents too will share in this great news. In fact, once we have a project agreement finalized and signed, a copy will be posted on the Infrastructure Ontario website so that not only Sault Ste. Marie residents but all Ontarians will be able to—

The Speaker: Thank you, Minister.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mr. Khalil Ramal (London–Fanshawe): My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Last year, the members of this House took a strong stand on accessibility when they voted for the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, which will make Ontario more accessible to people with disabilities by law. Could you, Minister, tell us what steps are being taken to implement this act?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for franco-phone affairs): Thank you very much for the question. We all know the devotion of the member from London–Fanshawe with regard to accessibility. As all honourable members of this House know, the act lays out the road map to make Ontario accessible to all people by 2025—and 2025 is not the beginning, it is the end.

1550

Under the act, new and mandatory accessibility standards are being developed which will bring down barriers that many people with disabilities face in their daily lives. In October 2005, we announced that the first two standards to be developed would cover the areas of transportation and customer service. I am pleased that the customer service standard development committee has agreed upon a proposed standard on accessible customer service. The standard has been posted for consultation with the public.

We have also begun accepting applications for membership on the third standard development committee. I invite everyone—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you.

PETITIONS

DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PERMIT PROGRAM

Mr. John O'Toole (Durham): It's a pleasure to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

"Whereas a disabled person parking permit can only be issued to qualified individuals who are unable to walk unassisted for more than 200 metres in eight minutes or less without causing serious difficulty or danger to safety or health; and

"Whereas the inability to walk unassisted as defined by the Ministry of Transportation is not always determined by a visible disability; and

"Whereas invisible disabilities can often result in difficulty or danger to safety or health when walking; and

"Whereas fines and revoked privileges resulting from misuse of disabled person parking permits are not always enforced;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislature of Ontario to further extend the disabled person parking permit program to include invisible disabilities, and ensure that enforcement is emphasized and carried out to a greater degree."

I'm pleased to present this to Philip, and to sign it and endorse it on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham.

TUITION

Ms. Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East): I have a petition here which is to stop tuition fee hikes and improve access and quality in post-secondary education. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario from the University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council, and it reads:

"Whereas the Ontario Liberal government cancelled the tuition fee freeze after only two years and approved fee increases of up to 36% over the next four years; and

"Whereas tuition fees in Ontario have increased by more than four times the rate of inflation over the past 15 years; and

"Whereas a majority of Ontarians oppose tuition fee increases and support greater public funding for colleges and universities; and

"Whereas improvements to student financial assistance are undermined by fee increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario government's recent increase to student loan limits is set to push student debt to approximately \$28,000 for a four-year program; and

"Whereas per-student investment in Ontario still lags significantly behind the vast majority of jurisdictions in North America;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, support the Canadian Federation of Students' call to stop tuition fee hikes and petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to:

"—reduce tuition fees to 2004 levels for all students in Ontario and implement an immediate tuition fee freeze;

"—increase public funding for post-secondary education to promote access and quality;

"—expand access to financial aid in Ontario, especially for part-time students; and

"—double the number of upfront, need-based grants for Ontario students."

Mr. Speaker, I present this petition. I agree with it and send it down to the table by way of Colby.

COMMUNITY MEDIATION

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga West): I have a petition to the Ontario Legislative Assembly in support of community mediation. I'd like to thank Syed Hasan and Gavin Riddel of Mississauga for collecting the signatures and sending it to me. It reads as follows:

"Whereas many types of civil disputes may be resolved through community mediation delivered by trained mediators, who are volunteers who work with the parties in the dispute; and

"Whereas Inter-Cultural Neighbourhood Social Services established the Peel Community Mediation Service in 1999 with support from the government of Ontario through the Trillium Foundation, the Rotary Club of Mississauga West and the United Way of Peel, and has proven the viability and success of community mediation; and

"Whereas the city of Mississauga and the town of Caledon have endorsed the Peel Community Mediation Service, and law enforcement bodies refer many cases to the Peel Community Mediation Service as an alternative to a court dispute; and

"Whereas court facilities and court time are both scarce and expensive, the cost of community mediation is very small and the extra expense incurred for lack of community mediation in in Peel region would be much greater than the small annual cost of funding community mediation;

"Be it therefore resolved that the government of Ontario, through the Ministry of the Attorney General, support and fund the ongoing service delivery of the Peel Community Mediation Service through Inter-Cultural Neighbourhood Social Services."

I'm pleased to support this petition and to ask page Kelsea to carry it for me.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING

Mr. Ted Chudleigh (Halton): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas section 23 of the recently passed Planning and Conservation Land Statute Law Amendment Act, 2006, Bill 51, exempts energy projects from the municipal planning process; and

"Whereas we believe that it is essential to have more transparency and openness in the planning process, not less; and

"Whereas we believe that public consultation and municipal planning on the location of power plants is essential to ensure healthy sustainable communities;

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

"To amend section 23 of the Planning and Conservation Land Statute Law Amendment Act, 2006, to include a process for appeal."

I'm very pleased to sign this and give it to Philip, who is going to take it to the table.

TUITION

Ms. Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East): I have more petitions on tuition fee hikes. This is from the University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council, as well. A number of signatures are on this petition, and it reads:

"Whereas the Ontario Liberal government cancelled the tuition fee freeze after only two years and approved fee increases of up to 36% over the next four years; and

"Whereas tuition fees in Ontario have increased by more than four times the rate of inflation over the past 15 years; and

"Whereas a majority of Ontarians oppose tuition fee increases and support greater public funding for colleges and universities; and

"Whereas improvements to student financial assistance are undermined by fee increases; and

"Whereas the Ontario government's recent increase to student loan limits is set to push student debt to approximately \$28,000 for a four-year program; and

"Whereas per-student investment in Ontario still lags significantly behind the vast majority of jurisdictions in North America;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, support the Canadian Federation of Students' call to stop tuition fee hikes and petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to:

"—reduce tuition fees to 2004 levels for all students in Ontario and implement an immediate tuition fee freeze;

"—increase public funding for post-secondary education to promote access and quality;

"—expand access to financial aid in Ontario, especially for part-time students; and

"—double the number of upfront, need-based grants for Ontario students."

Again, I send this down to the table by way of Eshan.

IDENTITY THEFT

Mr. Tony Ruprecht (Davenport): I would like you to know that the subject of this petition is identity theft, and it is sent to us by the Consumer Federation of Canada. It reads as follows:

"To the Parliament of Ontario and"—especially—"the Minister of Government Services:

"Whereas identity theft is the fastest-growing crime in North America;

"Whereas confidential and private information is being stolen on a regular basis, affecting literally thousands of people;

"Whereas the cost of this crime exceeds billions of dollars;

"Whereas countless hours are wasted to restore one's good credit rating;

"We, the undersigned, demand that Bill 38, which passed the second reading unanimously in the Ontario Legislature on December 8, 2005, be brought before

committee and that the following issues be included for consideration and debate:

"(1) All consumer reports should be provided in a truncated (masked-out) form, protecting our vital private information such as SIN and credit card numbers.

"(2) Should a credit bureau discover that there has been a breach of consumer information, the agency should immediately inform the victimized consumer.

"(3) Credit bureaus should only report inquiries resulting out of actual applications for credit and for no other reasons.

"(4) Credit bureaus should investigate any complaints within 30 days and correct or automatically delete any information found unconfirmed or inaccurate."

Since I agree, I'm delighted to sign my name to it and send it to you by page Kelsea.

1600

GREENBELT

Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie-Lincoln): I'm pleased to present a petition signed by Bill Griffiths of Beamsville, Tod Lamit of Smithville and many others regarding the financial impact of the greenbelt. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the Greenbelt Act was passed by the Ontario Legislature in 2005, economically affecting all ownerships of properties in Ontario; and

"Whereas municipal property assessment caused financial changes to these properties; and

"Whereas the Ontario Legislature did not study the economic impact of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas an effect of protecting environmentally contaminated land as a greenbelt area was not addressed financially;

"Resolution 1"—they want to see an ordering of an economic impact study on the Greenbelt Act that will further the protection of the green lands. In support, I affix my signature.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

REGULATORY MODERNIZATION ACT, 2006

LOI DE 2006 SUR LA MODERNISATION DE LA RÉGLEMENTATION

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 25, 2006, on the motion for second reading of Bill 69, An Act to allow for information sharing about regulated organizations to improve efficiency in the administration and enforcement of regulatory legislation and to make consequential amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 69, Loi permettant l'échange de renseignements sur les organismes réglementés afin de rendre plus efficaces l'application et l'exécution de la législation de nature réglementaire et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott): When we last dealt with Bill 69, the member for Niagara Centre had made a presentation to the House, and we didn't conclude the questions and comments. Now we'll go to questions and comments relating to the presentation by the member for Niagara Centre. I'm pleased to recognize the member for Thornhill.

Mr. Mario G. Racco (Thornhill): Let me say how much I appreciated the comments made by the member for Niagara Centre. I certainly was very happy that the member is supporting the objective of the bill, and I'm also very happy that the member from Niagara Centre is satisfied with the briefing given by the Ministry of Labour staff when he requested it.

I also want to assure the House and the member for Niagara Centre that I know one of the reasons for the current approach is that many of our regulatory statutes contain confidentiality provisions that limit or prohibit any sharing of compliance information among ministry programs and with other ministries. Therefore, the difficulty faced by a ministry in sharing information presents obstacles to understanding where greater attention and resources are required.

I can tell you that many business owners and members of the public in particular are surprised at the restrictions. They ask, "How can government be efficient if ministries cannot talk to each other?" The taxpayers of this province find it hard to believe that there isn't communication, it's their understanding that there is, and quite often, when a number of individuals approach them, they keep on asking the same question, "Why are they coming back to us to ask the same question?" They don't necessarily appreciate the reality that the law presently allows. Therefore, this bill is attempting to answer those questions that taxpayers in Ontario have asked. But I trust that this debate will assist us in understanding the bill better.

Mr. John O'Toole (Durham): I've only had the opportunity to just listen to the member's remarks and have this to say: Quite frankly, the general impression initially would be that our caucus would be supporting this bill. We'd have some different arguments than the member from Niagara would be talking about.

But here is the essence of this bill. This bill is eight pages, and yet there are 25 statutes that are being amended. It's being amended in such a way as to, on first review, become more efficient, allowing interdepartmental sharing of both information or privacy issues that need be to fully discussed as well as sharing of some enforcement measures between ministries—natural resources and environment would be a perfect example—and sharing of information on the person who is being considered as having violated some statute. The information from another ministry could be used, on prior convictions and things like that.

So there's a great deal of goodwill here on the opposition side of the House, but certainly the rights of individuals as well as the release of and privacy of information are things that the public need to fully understand. There are eight pages, 25 statutes. There is more to be

said on this bill, and I hope to have the opportunity later today to speak on the bill, but the member from Niagara Centre is always informed on the issues dealing with law, and I think his comments are relevant to the debate on Bill 69.

There's just one more thing. When I look at the more recent report by the Environmental Commissioner, there's a perfect example. The auditor and the Environmental Commissioner, these independent commenters on government, are a valuable resource, and we should be following up on things that they say in their reports by whoever is responsible. So there are things that we do support in that respect.

Ms. Andrea Horwath (Hamilton East): I too want to commend the member from Niagara Centre, my colleague Peter Kormos, who did an excellent job when he was speaking to this bill the last time it was before the Legislature. In fact, I recall that evening having been one of our what I so affectionately call evenings of classic Kormos. When I read his speech and look at the issues that he raised, I remember fondly that many members of this House quite enjoyed his discussion.

Interestingly enough, in one of the points that he was talking about, he was using a piece of material that perhaps might not have been appropriately used, and the Speaker at the time may have made comment about that. But in fact it was a certain item called a calendar, a calendar that was put together by some firefighters. Coincidentally, here in the Legislature tomorrow we will have a number of firefighters because they will be here to talk about some of the issues that are of concern to them, one of which, of course, is Bill 111, a bill that brings presumptive legislation into place in Ontario, as is the case in many other provinces.

But what we're talking about here is Bill 69, and our lead critic made some really important observations about that bill, particularly the extent to which inspectors are going to become, under this legislation, something of super-inspectors or mega-inspectors. They will be empowered to undertake the inspection of many different areas: not simply, for example, Ministry of Labour inspectors inspecting workplaces for occupational health and safety violations, but also maybe doing meat inspections as well as they moonlight as inspectors who can do many different jobs. So this multitasking has some implications. New Democrats are concerned about those implications and we look forward to this bill now going into a committee process where those implications can be outlined in greater detail.

Mrs. Liz Sandals (Guelph-Wellington): I too am pleased to comment on the remarks of the member for Niagara Centre on Bill 69. I think again, because those remarks were last week sometime, it may be useful just to remind people what Bill 69 is about.

The way many acts are currently structured, each ministry is in essence a silo describing what its own inspectors can do and what information it can collect, and there is a wall between the ministries. What this bill does is simply allow ministries of the Ontario government to

share information with each other, which seems quite a reasonable thing.

There has been quite a bit of conversation about how that will aid the ministries' inspection and enforcement, but I think perhaps less comment on how that will help small businesses themselves. One of the things that I have done is chaired a paper burden reduction task force as part of the Small Business Agency of Ontario, and in that context, one of the frustrations which many small businesses have raised with us is the fact that because of these silos, they keep giving the same information to ministry after ministry, and that this is very frustrating and time-consuming. In fact, one of the things this Bill 69 would allow would be that, for that information which is common, we could collect it once and then share it amongst various ministries. So there is some potential here for a positive impact for small business, as well as simply those inspection and compliance impacts that people have already discussed.

1610

The Acting Speaker: That concludes the time available for questions and comments. We will return to the member for Niagara Centre, who has two minutes to respond.

Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): When the parliamentary assistant rose to comment on my remarks to Bill 69, I immediately thought of the biblical Joseph, but then I realized that wasn't accurate either, because Joseph's coat was of many colours. I say to the parliamentary assistant, your coat is very colourful nonetheless, but second certainly to that of Joseph, although you may well generate as much envy amongst your brothers and sisters here with a monochromatic coat as Joseph did with his polychromatic garb.

One concern that we have, of course, is the issue of multiple inspectors. That's why this bill has to go to committee. I think there has to be a clear understanding of what the implications are for, let's say, a Ministry of the Environment inspector versus an MTO inspector. I talked about that when we talked about this a couple of weeks ago. We want inspectors to develop expertise unique to their area of work. A Ministry of the Environment inspector may not have the expertise to make the judgment calls that an MTO inspector or a Ministry of Labour inspector has to make. So this is something about which we should be cautious.

I'm looking forward to that being spoken to during the course of committee. I expect the parliamentary assistant will be stewarding this bill through committee. I look forward to that. I suspect this is a bill that can go to committee during the winter break—January, February, March—at least until March 19, when we come back. That would be an ideal time, and then this bill could be wrapped up. It's one of those bills that could be wrapped up in the spring session, once we come back on March 19, 2007. I look forward to that spring session.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn (Oakville): It certainly is a pleasure today to come back after a few days of not being

in the House and be able to speak to Bill 69, the Regulatory Modernization Act, at second reading.

I think it's interesting to look at the intent of the bill and what we're trying to accomplish by the passage of this bill. I have been a small business owner myself. Quite often when you hear people offer advice about small businesses, you can tell if the person has been a small business owner or if they would like to be a small business owner, or perhaps they just like to talk about small business. Owning a small business and meeting the challenges of turning a profit, making sure all the employees are paid, making sure you are keeping up to date on the regulations, making sure you are complying with the regulations, is certainly a task in itself, and it's no small challenge. So my own hat is off to those people, the entrepreneurs of this country who on a daily basis put their own name on the line, who aren't beholden to employers themselves but actually provide the incentives and the machinery that I think keeps this economy going.

I come from a community that has some very famous large companies, companies like Ford and Goodrich, companies that are known throughout the world and certainly are wonderful employers in our community. But what really keeps the Oakville economy thriving—and I think this can be said of many small communities—is actually the small business owners, those people who decide to take a risk with their own money, with their own capital. They have an idea perhaps and would like to put that idea forward and perhaps see if they can sell a new product to people. There are a variety of reasons why people go into business.

I think it's incumbent upon the government to realize that governments do not create jobs; business creates jobs. The government's role is to make it easy for business to create jobs, to make it easy to comply with reasonable and sound regulations that ensure that workplaces are clean, that they're safe, that they are complying with all the regulations that we deem to be reasonable in a modern society like we live in in Ontario.

Now, we had our local elections in Ontario just yesterday, and I'd like to congratulate those people who were able to meet with the favour of their local electorate. A good friend of yours was elected, Mr. Speaker, in Oakville yesterday. We have a new regional chair: Gary Carr. We have a new mayor in Oakville as well: Rob Burton defeated long-standing incumbent mayor Ann Mulvale. So there are certainly a lot of people who have put their names forward to serve as elected officials.

When you talk to people at the local level, when you talk to them about things that they would like to see changed or that they think could perhaps be improved with the administration of local government, quite often you get the word "duplication." Quite often people say, "We can't have any duplication within the provision of our services. We simply can't afford to pay two people to do one job. We don't need to have to deal with people at the region when the same service is being provided at the town, or vice versa. We don't need to deal with people at the school board if the same service is being provided at the town."

I think those at the local level who work very closely with their electorates understand how you have to balance a budget. Municipalities do not have the opportunity; they're simply not allowed to run a deficit. They have to run a balanced budget, so they need to make sure that they're using every penny that they collect from taxpayers in a wise manner. That means that they have to take all the duplication out of the system. Sometimes when you get up to the larger levels of government, at the provincial and federal level, you'll find that levels of duplication simply do exist, and despite the best efforts from time to time from previous governments in the past to remove those dual layers of jurisdiction, quite often we'll find that they still exist in legislation. And that's what I think is so exciting about this bill. If you can say that a Regulatory Modernization Act can be exciting in any way, this would be the exciting part: We are starting along the path to remove some of the duplication and to make it easier for those people who are in business in Ontario to comply with the rules and regulations of this province.

I've talked to a number of stakeholders in this regard. I've talked to a number of people from small business agencies. I've been in touch with people from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. They want to be included. They want to make sure that their voices and opinions are heard, suggestions that they're making, as business people who on a daily basis go out into the marketplace and keep our economy running. They want to know that their voice is being heard in this process. I've assured them that we are a government that listens. We want to hear those suggestions. We want to hear suggestions for improving this bill when it goes to the stage where it can be amended. I'd like to see all the suggestions from all the stakeholders, not only from the organizations that represent business, but from those people who are actively involved in the businesses themselves. I think there is a willingness to consult on this bill. It's a bill that certainly makes sense.

I belong to the Small Business Agency of Ontario, as do a number of parliamentary assistants on the government side, and the role of that group is to sit down with representatives of small business organizations, representatives of small business themselves, and ensure that the government is doing all it can to make the lives of small business people in this province easier. It's a group that I'm very pleased to be with, because I think it's an example of how when you work together with an agency or work together with people who are actively involved as stakeholders, you are able to actually make some changes that make life easier, make our economy more profitable, allow companies to create more jobs, allow them to pay more taxes, allow us to provide more services, allow us to invest in our health care system and our education system, and a variety of ways in which people expect their public services.

People expect that public services will be made available to them in the province. They know that public education is extremely important. That needs to be

funded, and it's funded by personal income tax, funded by provincial income tax, but a good portion of the revenues for the province come from our businesses.

1620

The proposed legislation that's being presented today would enable regulatory ministries—and those are obviously the ministries that administer regulations—to work together much more effectively. That's what the people of Ontario really want to see: They really want to see us working together as a team. This proposed legislation brings what I think is a team approach to regulatory enforcement.

People use the word “communication” a lot today and say that we need to improve our communications in a variety of areas. This bill goes a long way to improving communication between ministries. Often the term “The right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing” is applied to government at all levels. This is a bill that aims to take that away, that aims to allow—in fact, compel—ministries to work together, to talk to each other. It means that a business person does not need to get a visit from 13 separate ministries; it means that those visits can be scaled down when inspections are being done.

It's certainly going to improve the way that businesses comply with the laws in the province of Ontario. The intent of those laws in large part is to protect the public of Ontario. So when you get greater co-operation, when you get information sharing amongst ministries, there are some of the key points that ensure that businesses comply with the laws in Ontario, which the vast majority of the responsible small and large business owners in corporate Ontario want to comply with.

You could probably take a few practical examples. What it would do is, if there was a field staff person paying a visit to a certain business and noticed that something else perhaps needed to be inspected—they noticed that there was another point that the business owner needed some confirmation on—he or she could pass that information on to their colleagues in the Ontario civil service who just happen to work for another ministry. In a lot of respects, that is not allowed today. There are rules and regulations that prevent that from happening. This bill would allow it to happen.

We've heard so often from business stakeholders that they often have to provide duplicate information. Over and over again, they're providing the same information to the government. The intent of this bill is that that be streamlined, that they be able to talk to their governments in a way that doesn't mean that they have to hire people to fill out forms on a repetitive basis, that the paperwork is reduced to a minimum but the regulatory compliance is raised to a maximum.

With the passage of this bill, we'll certainly be going along the road to ensuring that we get maximum protection for the public of Ontario and we allow for a streamlining of rules and regulations for business in this province, and that's what they've asked for.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr. John Yakabuski (Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke): I thank the member for Oakville for his contribution to the debate on Bill 69. I'm going to have the opportunity to speak a little more at length shortly, but he touched on a couple of things that are correct in some respects. Sometimes, if you can streamline things and remove some obstacles to the trading of information, that can be a very positive thing. But we also have to ensure that people are protected, that boundaries are not exceeded, and also that this doesn't lead to less efficiency as opposed to more efficiency, because you have more government departments perhaps meddling in areas where they don't currently have any expertise. There are a lot of questions yet to be answered about this bill.

On principle, if you can find something that streamlines a process, I think that's a good thing. I hearken back to the Red Tape Commission of the previous government, which was one of the best things they did: to try to remove legislation that was redundant and created obstacles to efficient government and efficient business and stood in the way of citizens when it came to being able to get things done in the province of Ontario. We had whole scads of those things on the books that impeded people's progress here in Ontario. There are probably still hundreds of those statutes in existence that could be cleaned up and cleared out of the way so that we actually have a more efficient way of doing business here in Ontario, and that's something that probably should continue.

Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York): I rise to comment on the speech that the member from Oakville has just made.

Although I think it was an aside in his speech, I would be remiss if I did not comment on it as well: He talked about his own riding of Oakville and the election of a new council and a new mayor. Of course, as politicians, we all commend and laud and congratulate the winners—and Mr. Burton is to be done so—but I would be remiss if I didn't talk about my long association with Ann Mulvale, who was, in my view, one of the best mayors that Oakville ever had and in fact is one of the best mayors that I had the privilege of meeting in all of the time that I was a mayor in East York. When we used to meet monthly during the mayors' conferences and the big-city mayors' conferences, you could always count on her being there as a very strong voice of reason, not only for her own municipality but for all the municipalities of Ontario, and the tremendous work that she went on to do with AMO. We are going to miss her. I know politics is a rough game and you can't win them all, but I hope there is a future for her, maybe even in this House.

In terms of what the member from Oakville had to say about businesses and this bill trying to help business, I would remind him that although there have been very few public comments on this, at least that have reached my desk so far, the only people who are reticent to accept this bill on face value so far, to me, have been businesses. Businesses are worried about a number of factors, and I will be dealing with them in my own speech. They are

worried about the regulatory modernization. They are worried that business is going to have some difficulty accepting some of the changes or how far the bureaucrats are going to be allowed to enforce the bills. Perhaps the member in his two-minute exchange will tell us how this is going to help business.

Mr. Dave Levac (Brant): I appreciate an opportunity. I thank the member from Oakville for giving us an umbrella view of what the legislation is attempting to do. When you think of the 13 regulatory ministries that we're going to try to compartmentalize in terms of communicating with each other, it's actually very laudable and doable. But the member from Beaches–East York gives us the challenge: Will business accept this? Well, quite frankly, a lot of that gets done with stakeholder conversations. We want to make sure that our discussions with them clarify and “de-mythdify” what the attempt is in this piece of legislation. It's not to create more angst for them; it's to remove the angst that they're going to be feeling, that they presently feel.

Other pieces of legislation like this don't exist in the United Kingdom, in Australia. There is something similar to this in Florida, and they have had a very successful transition when they've talked about how effective the legislation has been. So I think we're headed down the right path. I think this is progressive. I also want to say that other provinces haven't actually done this. They've done legislation to talk about enforcement for law purposes in communicating back and forth to ministries, but they haven't created this one to help business get rid of that stigma, of the piles and piles of paperwork that they face in a regular business, particularly small businesses. That is precisely why this bill is being designed the way it is.

The parliamentary assistant will be providing us with some more evidence and more pieces of information to show us exactly how this piece of legislation is going to answer some of those concerns. Quite legitimately, there are some concerns being raised by the opposition about how it is going to affect small business, how it is going to affect big business, how it is going to affect our capacity to be able to communicate from ministry to ministry. And guess what? I think this is the right direction we should be going in, particularly when we're now doing way more inter-ministerial discussions than we've ever done in the past.

I look forward to this. I believe it's the right direction, and I want the member to know that he's got my full support.

1630

Mr. Norm Miller (Parry Sound–Muskoka): It's my pleasure to add some comments to the speech from the member from Oakville on Bill 69, which is An Act to allow for information sharing about regulated organizations to improve efficiency in the administration and enforcement of regulatory legislation and to make consequential amendments to other Acts. The bill's fairly small but affects many different statutes, and I think there is going to be a need for consultation

I note some of the select stakeholder reactions so far. The Retail Council of Canada speaks out with regard to the creation of inspectors—super-inspectors, I'll call them—who can inspect in different fields. They say, "RCC is concerned that authorizing field officers to make observations—visual or otherwise—for potential contraventions of a statute under which they have no training is irresponsible and unfair. Without proper training, inspection officers do not have the expertise to determine what is relevant to another statute or ministry."

That is certainly a very valid concern. I hear stories about Ontario government inspectors that do know their industry, and you get feedback from industries where they feel that the inspectors are not being reasonable or don't know their particular industry. So if you're asking one inspector to be knowledgeable about many different industries, there certainly could be problems.

I note also that you hear from business all around the province, particularly in the north, about the problem of red tape. What did this government do? They did away with the Red Tape Commission that was meant to do away with unnecessary red tape to make it easier to function in business here in the province. So I was very disappointed when this province did away with the Red Tape Commission that had been in place.

The Acting Speaker: That concludes the time for questions and comments. I'll return to the member for Oakville for his two-minute response.

Mr. Flynn: It certainly is a pleasure to follow the members from Parry Sound–Muskoka, Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, Beaches–East York and Brant, who all provided what I think are very reasonable, progressive and good comments on this bill.

The question's been asked, how does this make it better? How does this make it easier? I guess the easy answer would be, as a former small business owner—and I say that to pass comment on small business and what it feels like to be a small business owner. You really have to be one, or you have to have been one in your past, to understand what it's like some weeks to make sure that the bank gets paid, the rent gets paid, the suppliers get paid, and the employees get paid; some weeks, everybody gets paid but you. But for some reason, there's a spirit of entrepreneurship in some people that just keeps going. That's how small businesses grow into large businesses. What they don't want is to be inflicted with having to deal with 13 or 14 different, separate agencies that pay 13 or 14 different visits to that same business and take away from the productive time for the manufacture of goods, the provision of services, or whatever that small business is engaged in providing to the public or to its clients. It needs to concentrate on being productive.

We're in a global economy. We need to be competitive. We need to beat countries and we need to beat and meet other economies around the world. You don't do that if you're filling out forms; you don't do that if you're preparing for visits from the government. If we can streamline those visits, if we can make that regu-

latory approach very simple, something that's easy to comply with, I think you'll find that will meet the favour of most small and responsible business owners in this province, and large businesses as well. I think this bill deserves the full support of the House.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr. Yakabuski: I'm pleased to join the debate on Bill 69, An Act to allow for information sharing about regulated organizations to improve efficiency in the administration and enforcement of regulatory legislation and to make consequential amendments to other Acts. It sounds like a good idea, and it probably is. The member for Oakville talked about the right hand and the left hand, that sometimes they don't know what the other one is up to. So from that point of view, it's a good thing to try to meld things, or rationalize them if you want to call it that, so you have more efficiency. The question is, will this bill actually lead to that? I think it's the best intention of the government to do that, but will this actually accomplish it?

Our experience in this House and as citizens and people who have followed government over the years is that no matter what piece of legislation comes forward—and many times it is one that all parties even endorse—there are unintended consequences of that piece of legislation that come back to bite you, so to speak, after its implementation. You have to look at those pieces of legislation—review them—to see if there are things that were not considered or were left out, or that maybe should have been left out.

I think this is one of those bills. I wouldn't pretend to be able to predict all the consequences, good or bad, of this particular piece of legislation. I haven't had the time or the opportunity to analyze it at great length nor to determine what my conclusions would be on certain aspects of the bill. But there are some groups who have already let it be known that they have some concerns about this bill; the Retail Council of Canada is one of them.

I think this is one of those pieces of legislation that, while there wasn't a great hue and cry out there for a bill for this exact reason, there was certainly enough concern that there were more efficient ways of doing business that perhaps the government felt it was imperative for them to act. It is now just as imperative for them to say, "Okay, this is the bill and this is the process. We're now going to ensure that this bill gets out for some opportunity to be vetted by the people who are going to be most affected by it."

As my friend from Beaches–East York said, the only real negative feedback or concerns he's had have been expressed by people in the business community. The good Lord knows we don't make it easy on people in the business community to do business in this country. We're a very regulated regime. We tend, or our practice has been, to err on the side of more laws and more regulations, as opposed to fewer laws and regulations, under the guise that we're protecting consumers. But sometimes we're actually hurting our competitiveness and

hurting the ability for businesses to survive and possibly thrive in this environment.

There's no question that this bill needs to be sent for further examination. Of course, that's why we have the committee process as part of our legislative process. I'm certainly hopeful that the government will take this bill and give us an opportunity to have hearings with stakeholders who have the most to gain or lose by any piece of legislation. They're going to be very helpful in assisting us in the process of dissecting this bill and ensuring that at the end of the day we get something that works.

There's nothing in here that strikes us as monumentally negative or positive, but I do want to speak to what the Retail Council of Canada has said. This is an organization, as you know, that represents hundreds of thousands of businesses across the country and really does speak for them on matters of concern to retail business. I just want to get that; I do have it somewhere. One second, Mr. Speaker. I have it right here.

What the Retail Council of Canada says is, "We are particularly concerned about the inclusion of complaints in this section. There is insufficient protection against the publication of frivolous complaints which may cause damage to a company's reputation and brand, a concern which is especially acute in a highly competitive industry such as retail"—on the publication of organization information. So that's one of their complaints.

1640

As I said, this is one of the groups that has the most concern about it, and you can understand, if you've ever read stories about someone who was falsely accused of something and then you heard about the effect that that had on their lives, even if, after going through the process, those people were found to be innocent of all charges. The fact that that has been bandied about in the public domain, in the press and possibly television, depending upon the nature of the situation and the profile of the people involved, we all know how damaging that can be. So business is concerned that a false or frivolous complaint could cause significant damage to their reputation and/or brand. You understand in today's day and age that if a brand gets negatively affected by bad publicity, it can be out of business—out of business, gone—so we have to be doubly sure, triply sure, that we're not doing things that could have dire consequences to businesses in the province of Ontario.

One of their concerns is that when you're having a sort of multi-jurisdictional authority, if you want to call it that, when persons who may have the power to lay charges in a field where they do not have the normal expertise or in areas which were not the expertise of their particular ministry are now transferred to another one, they may not have the necessary background to make proper decisions when they're going across what are today current jurisdictional boundaries. They're concerned that there may be a weakness there with regard to the training. Training is a concern for them. I saw that in one of their submissions, and that's a concern for all of

us; it's not just theirs. I think you've got to ensure that if you are going to pass this kind of legislation, the people to whom you entrust the enforcement of this legislation are properly trained. That doesn't come without a great deal of effort and it doesn't come without an expense. So we have to ask ourselves what the cost of implementing this particular piece of legislation is going to be to the taxpayers of Ontario as well.

Having said some of those things—well, I have said all of it. I haven't just said some of them; every bit of this last bit has been said by me. But having said that, again, we certainly don't have serious concerns. I think we can work with all of these things to ensure that at the end of the day we have a piece of legislation that if its intent is, and I accept that the intent is, to streamline things, we may have something positive here. So let's see where we can get with that.

I want to make a few more comments about that, but I just wanted to also touch on the fact that of course the municipal elections took place yesterday all across the province of Ontario. I am home to 17 municipalities in my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke and I don't actually have all of the results. Some of them came in late last night and didn't hit the papers before they went to publication, so I don't have all of the results from all of the elections in my riding. But I represent 17 municipalities in my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke: Mayor Gibeau re-elected in Arnprior; McNab/Braeside, a new reeve, Campbell; Horton, Reeve Johnston re-elected; Renfrew, Mayor Heins re-elected; Admaston/Bromley, Mayor Briscoe acclaimed; Whitewater, Mayor Rathwell acclaimed; Pembroke, Mayor Jacyno re-elected; Petawawa, Mayor Sweet re-elected; Laurentian Valley, Reeve Wilson re-elected; Killaloe, Hagarty and Richards, Reeve Bush re-elected; Laurentian Hills, Mayor Gutzman—we should do something so that all municipalities are either mayors or Reeves; I say we should make them all mayors—re-elected; Head, Clara and Maria, all in by acclamation; Bonnechere Valley, Mayor Mintha acclaimed; North Algona/Wilberforce, Mayor Weckworth acclaimed; Madawaska Valley, Reeve Hildebrandt re-elected; Brudenell, Lyndoch and Raglan, Reeve Lentz acclaimed; Deep River, Mayor Aikens acclaimed; South Algonquin, Mayor Bresnahan acclaimed.

I don't have the numbers for all of the councillors and all of that, but I do know all of the reeve and mayor elections. That's 17 municipalities that I represent. So it was quite an election night in my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. I congratulate each and every one of them. I will have a full list of the councils as well at a later date, but I congratulate all of those people who have been re-elected and/or acclaimed. I also congratulate those who haven't been elected and thank them for involving themselves in the great democratic process that we have here in this country, and I certainly commend everyone who is willing to put their name on a ballot and have their views scrutinized, to allow the public to decide whether or not they will have them representing them for a prescribed period of time in a specific jurisdiction.

Back to the bill, Mr. Speaker—and I do appreciate your indulgence on that. But I did want to talk about those elections in my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

This legislation, if passed, will allow for the publication of certain types of collected information. It will permit the designation of individuals to exercise functions under more than one regulatory scheme. It will allow a court to consider prior convictions under multiple regulatory schemes in determining the appropriate sentencing of a defendant. That's a pretty significant aspect of the bill. Even in a court of law sometimes you're not allowed to deal with previous convictions. Judges often rule on those kinds of things. So in the scheme of business and regulations, we need to see just what kind of effect this would have and whether or not it is even constitutionally acceptable. These are things that I think we need to determine through the committee process.

One of the questions I have—and let me preface this by saying we have a great public service here in the province of Ontario. But I also know that bureaucrats sometimes can go too far. One of the concerns I have is, how far can and will a bureaucrat go with this new authority that they may have under this legislation? That's always a concern for people. That's always a concern for business. It's particularly a concern in rural Ontario.

I want to tell you about a little situation in my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke in the town of Renfrew, where the Canadian Food Inspection Agency a few weeks back descended upon the Renfrew Home Bakery, a business of over 30 years that's been providing a tremendous product to the people of Renfrew and area. In fact, it produces a special rice bread—I might get this wrong—for celiacs, people who are wheat intolerant and can't eat bread made from wheat. That particular product they make is sold even as far away as here in Toronto because of its quality, its taste and the overall great product they're offering. The CFIA descended upon them because they weren't putting proper labels on a loaf of bread. So there's a law on the books since 1972 that requires that you label things in a particular fashion. That law, when it was passed, probably with the greatest of intentions, was there to supposedly protect the consumer. But you see that unintended consequences thing I was talking about earlier: What happened is that now you've got this overzealous bureaucrat who decided he was going to see if he could enforce that legislation on little Renfrew bakery. The only complaint I've ever heard about the Renfrew Home Bakery is that—you know what?—sometimes they're out of stock because their products are in such demand, they're so good and the people in Renfrew want their products. Sometimes you show up there for one of the fine wares they're selling and they're sold out because, you see, they can only produce so much, and at some point in the day they may be out of stock. That's the only complaint I ever heard about the Renfrew Home Bakery. Rick and Pam Power do a great job there.

1650

What's the intention of coming down on people like that? Oh yes, we've really got a lot to worry about from the Renfrew Home Bakery. It's a home bakery. They're in the middle of town. Their neighbours are their customers. You don't have to worry about some poison from mushrooms coming out of Thailand or something that haven't been properly inspected. No, this is the home bakery, for goodness' sake, in Renfrew. But the Canadian Food Inspection Agency decided—I shouldn't say that; a bureaucrat employed there decided. But I must say that I'm encouraged by the fact that our federal member of Parliament, Cheryl Gallant, has also gotten involved in it. I believe that Chuck Strahl, the Minister of Agriculture, who's responsible for that, is going to take a good look at that. I believe that the federal government has a better outlook on these issues affecting rural Ontarians than this provincial government that we have, which seems to be fairly immovable in its attempts to bring the hammer down on rural people when it thinks they might be out of line. So I'm really encouraged and hopeful that we're going to have more progress on this federal issue. I hope the Renfrew bakery is going to be producing some of its great products for years and years to come.

I don't want to get off the topic too much here, because we have limited time, but that's what can happen, that old story I was telling you about unintended consequences. For every good thing that you may get out of a piece of legislation, you have to be prepared for those unintended consequences. That's a situation we have that we're going to have to take a look at with Bill 69 to ensure that those people who need to be protected are protected, but that we don't have that old bugaboo of unintended consequences coming up to bite us.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Ms. Horwath: It's my pleasure to make a few comments on the remarks of the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke on Bill 69. But first, before I do that, something of utmost importance has recently occurred, and that is that two wonderful women from Hamilton are here to join us on the status-of-the-artist day to participate in that as artists and art supporters—Renée Wetselaar and Betty Ann Bushell—both from the wonderful community of Hamilton. So it's important to acknowledge that they came all the way from Hamilton, not during rush hour, likely, and hopefully they won't have to go home during rush hour, but nonetheless it's good to see them here. In the work they were doing with status of the artist and artists' day here in Queen's Park, they decided to come in and hear us debate Bill 69.

I do want to comment that the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke raised a number of important issues that I think need to be reviewed by the committee process once this bill finishes its current stint in second reading debate. There are a number of issues that New Democrats have put on the record around this bill, particularly acknowledging that there are risks involved in expanding the powers of an inspector for one ministry to be able to inspect other areas; for example, a labour employment

standards inspector going off and inspecting in the health field or the food field, which I think is what the member was talking about. These mega-inspectors bring with them some implications, not the least of which is that we want to make sure inspections are done well, are done properly—do the right thing—but that the ministries are funding these positions in a way that inspectors are doing enough of the good work they need to do.

Mr. Racco: I wanted to thank the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke and assure him that it's my opinion that we will be able to satisfy his concern as we move on this bill.

I also want to take the opportunity to congratulate the new councils of both the city of Vaughan and the town of Markham, which I represent, and in particular, if I may, my wife, who was re-elected in the city of Vaughan.

I also want to assure the member from Hamilton East that we have no intention of creating super-inspectors or super-inspectorates with this legislation—she raised that issue. For one thing, super-inspectors are not a feasible option, given the complex and technical nature of inspection and enforcement work done by our well-trained ministry staff. The intent of this legislation is to bring together special teams that can work together on special compliance projects. Where a special team is set up, the bill would require specific limitations to be set out in writing, including the scope of the assignment and the time period for the team's operation.

This legislation is about changing how government works for Ontarians in a way that is responsible and effective; that is really the objective. Improved communication means less duplication, and less duplication means fewer headaches for both large and small businesses. Of course, by changing our approach to regulatory compliance, we would be able to use compliance information more effectively and target enforcement reports better. It makes sense.

Mr. Miller: It's my pleasure to add some comments on the speech by the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke on Bill 69, the Regulatory Modernization Act. The Ontario PC caucus recognizes the importance of a sound regulatory and enforcement regime; however, we wish to ensure that those charged with enforcement and inspection, especially across regulatory areas, are able to competently assess regulatory procedure to avoid unnecessarily burdening employers.

The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke was talking about unintended consequences. He told a story about a small bakery, the Renfrew Home Bakery. Certainly we all have situations like that in our own ridings, and particularly, I would say, in small rural ridings. I certainly have concerns about creating inspectors who may not have the expertise to know what they're inspecting. It's always difficult to build common sense into this type of legislation.

1700

I look at the area that I'm critic for, MNR, and I see the conservation officers and hear stories from all around the province of how they're not being properly funded to

adequately do their job. In fact, before the session broke for Remembrance Day, I brought in a situation in Blue Mountains where the municipality has paid \$1,000 to hire MNR conservation officers to train OPP officers to do their job of inspecting the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, because this government broke a written promise to fully fund the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, the fish and wildlife program, that they had made to the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters in the last election campaign. But I think the point that the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke brought up about unintended consequences is one we need to pay attention to.

Mr. Prue: I listened intently, as I always do, to the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. As he listed off the 17 municipalities in his riding, I could not have anything but awe, bewilderment and wonder at the 17 municipalities, whose total population must approximate 100,000 people. I remember, going back to the megacity debate, when arguments were made in this House that the borough of East York, at 115,000 people, was too small to exist. I'm just in total awe, and I wonder how these many municipalities, 17 of them, can exist. But good for them that they do.

I do have to question whether democracy is alive and well, because he listed off at least four or five wherein the mayor or the reeve was acclaimed. I don't know. I certainly know that here in Toronto, such a thing has not happened for almost forever—

Mr. Yakabuski: Since 1347.

Mr. Prue: Since 1347, perhaps.

Having said that, he also went on to talk about overzealous bureaucrats—and I must stand up for the lonely and much-maligned poor bureaucrats—overstepping the bounds. Quite the opposite is true, having once been a bureaucrat myself, albeit in the federal sphere. Bureaucrats are tightly controlled by the legislation they are sworn to enforce, and one ought not to malign those bureaucrats. They do a job that they are paid for, and they do it very well. They do it honestly, they do it with supervision, and they must be able to back up what they do in the courts and tribunals of the land. So just a word for the bureaucrats and the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke: Those bureaucrats are doing the work that this Legislature entitles them to do, enforces them to do and wants them to do.

The Acting Speaker: That concludes the time for questions and comments. I'll return to the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, who has two minutes.

Mr. Yakabuski: I appreciate the comments from members from Hamilton East, Thornhill, Parry Sound–Muskoka and Beaches–East York.

The member for Hamilton East started to talk about it, and it's exactly what we need to see happen with this bill so that we don't have those unintended consequences: that this bill get to committee and be properly vetted through hearings, so that those who have a real understanding and a stakeholder connection to this bill take a long, hard look, attend those committees and give us the

kind of advice we need so that this piece of legislation can be made better. Clearly, there are some issues with it, and if we can use the process to improve that piece of legislation, that's great.

On the issue I started with, the Renfrew Home Bakery: I started with how I believe the federal government has a better handle on circumstances affecting rural communities and rural Ontario than this government does. A case in point: We don't want to have a situation like we had last year where church suppers are being shut down, sandwiches are being Javexed and farmers' markets are shut down because somebody comes in and takes a piece of legislation and enforces it to the letter of the law. With all due respect to the member for Beaches—East York, yes, they are carrying out the law and we pass these laws, but everybody has got to have judgment too. There's the letter of the law and there's the spirit of the law. And when people are bent on enforcing the letter of the law, they lose the spirit of the law many times. That's why you have church suppers being shut down in the province by this government over here.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr. Prue: I started out by reading this bill and found it to be a rather dry piece of legislation, as we often do. What intrigued me most is the limited capacity to which this bill can possibly be used. I started out by looking at "Meaning of 'organization,'" and it caused me some degree of angst because it says, "In this act, a reference to an 'organization' means an entity to which designated legislation applies and in respect of which some or all of the types of information set out in section 4 are collected under the authority of or for the purposes of the designated legislation."

That didn't tell me a whole lot, because an organization quite literally now can be anything. It's whatever the government designates to be an organization. It can be a company. It can be a church group. It can be a Boy Scout troop. I don't know where this ends. It can be a political party. I don't know what it can be. It can be anything, because the legislation here is not clearly defined.

I went on to see what kind of information can be collected, and it's pretty timid stuff that's contained within the body here. First of all, I skipped down. Respecting the owners or the officers or directors of this nebulous, ethereal organization, which I guess could be a Boy Scout troop, it says that we can collect "his or her name, home address and home telephone number." I don't think anyone's going to lose too much sleep over that. It goes on to say, however, "the types of information described in paragraphs 8 and 9 where they pertain to the owner, officer or director in that capacity." It seems to me that you can collect a name, address and phone number—not, I guess, a serial number of a person—or you can collect what's in 8 or 9. I thought, "Let's go to 8 and 9 to see what this government is trying to collect." And here is where the rubber hits the road:

"8. Information compiled in connection with an examination, test, audit, inspection, investigation or other inquiry....

"9. Information related to an organization's compliance with designated legislation...."

Again, that's pretty timid stuff. If you're an individual, you can only have information conveyed which is of a very public nature. If you are an organization, there's a whole bunch of stuff that can be collected, but it's hardly stuff that I think would cause many people to lose sleep:

"1. The legal name of an organization." The government can publish that. My goodness, how earth-shattering is that?

"2. The name under which an organization operates, if it is not the legal name." So if you have a numbered company and you own a company, they can publish both of them.

"3. The address, telephone number, fax number...." Big deal.

"4. Any identifying number, symbol...." So I guess Coca-Cola—if that's an organization—can use the symbol of Coke.

"5. Statistical information about an organization....

"6. ... a licence, permit, certificate....

"7. ... complaints filed....

"8. ... examination, test, audit, inspection....

"9. ... compliance with designated legislation...."

Then comes the kicker, and I think this is probably what's going to bother most of the companies. I'm going to deal with them at the end of my speech. They're just a little bit worried. They have to be worried about number 10. I don't know why governments add this. I know it's a catch-all and I know they can't think of everything, but this is what causes a great degree of confusion and angst amongst ordinary business people—when the government includes "10. With respect to an organization, any other type of information that is prescribed." There it is. If you wonder why people are afraid of the legislation, you just have to read number 10. I don't think the other ones will cause anybody too many sleepless nights, and perhaps they should not. But businesses are the ones who have conveyed, to me anyway, their real worry about what is going to be contained within the body of the legislation, what number 10 can be expanded to include and, I guess, how that's going to affect the operation of ordinary businesses.

1710

I do have some degree of sympathy for government. I have some degree of sympathy for people who work in government—not the nameless bureaucrats my friend from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke was talking about, the overzealous ones, but the people who enforce our laws day in, day out, and the many instances of wrongdoing, the many instances of information that they uncover in the course of their daily duties.

As members of the Legislature, many of you will know I worked for some 20 years in the immigration department of Canada before becoming a full-time politician. In that period of time, it struck me very often that the information that was obtained in the regular performance of a bureaucrat's duty, an immigration officer's duty, someone who was employed by the federal

government of Canada, often could not be conveyed to its rightful place.

I understand what the government is attempting to do here, albeit in a very timid way. I understand that the information that should be conveyed would be very popular to the government and would probably be very popular to the majority of people who look at the legislation, people who see that occasionally an organization or an individual will step outside the four walls of a piece of legislation, will try to do things in a way which may in fact be contrary to law and will attempt to hide that information, knowing full well that the person most likely to discover it is not in any capacity able to use it or to convey it to the proper authorities.

I would assume it's a very popular public thought that if you could catch people cheating the system, if you could bring those who are transgressing to justice, if you could make sure that tax monies are collected equally from amongst the population and from amongst corporations, they would think that this was a really good thing. But then there are, of course, those who would be opposed to this blanket collection of information. Those would be, I think, probably civil libertarians who would wonder whether or not the collection would stress beyond the bounds of privacy—and of course you would find that those who were somehow discovered would be very angry that the information was conveyed to anyone at all.

As I said, I worked in immigration for a long time, and when I worked there it was not uncommon for us to find a great many things during the course of investigations. We would find social insurance numbers sometimes in dozens of names in an individual's pocket. These were used for all kinds of illegal activities, everything from working to applying for hospitalization, OHIP, using the resources of government. They could be used for banking, for fraudulent practices. I remember one time finding a great many social insurance numbers on an individual and we couldn't do anything with them. We couldn't even seize them, even though we knew that they were being used improperly. When we tried to go to our own department, which was then the Department of Employment and Immigration, the employment side, who handed out the cards, to tell them we had the cards, we were rebuked for having done so because privacy legislation would not allow us. It seemed bizarre to me then; it seems bizarre to me now.

If the legislation is going to help in any way, although it's pretty timid—and it's the same thing with health cards: We often found people with health cards who did not have the right to use them, in names that were not their own, and so they were taking advantage of the province's OHIP system, were going to hospitals and doctors on cards that were obviously either forged, fraudulent or not their own. When we tried to hand those over to the Ontario government and say, "Perhaps you should take a look at it," we were forbidden to do so. This undoubtedly cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and ensured that for people who were using the fraud-

ulent cards nothing would probably ever happen to them, save and except if an inspector within the health department found them himself or herself. The fact that they were found by a federal agent ensured that nothing ever happened to them.

The same thing happened with public housing. I remember one time going into public housing and finding that a woman who was living there on rent-geared-to-income, as she was entitled to do, was renting out two out of the three bedrooms to other people, and we were forbidden by law to tell public housing that she was renting out. She was making more in rent from those two rooms than she actually paid in public housing. She was making a profit by living there, which I think would have caused a great deal of concern to the government of Ontario and then later to the city of Toronto, to whom that was downloaded.

I remember finding equally true the frustration that people who worked in other government departments—federal government departments and Ontario government departments—would have information which they declined to forward because they could not do so. Almost always it was people who were living outside the systems, people who were cheating the largesse of the programs, people who were taking advantage where they had no right to take advantage. The only exception that I ever really found when I worked in the immigration department was with the police, because somehow it seemed to me, and seemed to all of us, that they would release any information they found at all in the course of their investigations. They thought nothing of turning over the information to customs, to immigration, to the employment side, to the Ontario government, to Ontario Housing or to anyone else who might make use of it.

I wonder in this legislation—I know where the government's trying to go, but it is a pretty timid piece of legislation. It is timid to the point where you can collect a name, a telephone number, a licence that's been issued and you can convey that to another government department. It seems to me pretty timid, but be that as it may. This is your legislation. We'll see what happens to it in committee.

I looked at the merging of enforcement bodies, and I really have to question this. I don't question this so much as some of the other speakers have said, but I question this in terms of the expertise. We have seen in too many government departments within the province of Ontario, the federal government and even sometimes municipally, where an individual is required to enforce too many laws, to become knowledgeable about too many laws, and that the knowledge required to do it is certainly watered down. Individuals who have to enforce the health act, the fisheries act and the Building Code Act, I would think, would have a very hard time, because each one of those acts comes with tomes of information on jurisprudence, on policies, on regulations, on procedures. It would be quite literally impossible in a very modern and complex society, in a modern and very complex set of legislation put forward by the government of Ontario, to do equal justice to the many jobs that he or she is required to do.

So I'm worried about merging of the enforcement bodies. Far better, it would seem to me, to give each section that requires enforcement the ability to go out there and hire the additional personnel who would be properly trained and equipped to look at their niche, to look at what they needed to do in order to enforce it. Share the information, yes, but make sure you have expertise. It's quite clear if you watch the court proceedings, if you have an opportunity to go into the courts, as I did for many years, and watch when individuals who are hired by government bodies are forced to be put in the witness chair and are examined and cross-examined, usually by competent and aggressive counsel, and are required to lay out in detail their authorities under law, lay out in detail what they were looking for at the time they found the information from whence the information was conveyed. It will become extremely difficult and very complex and literally quite impossible for a lay person required to have too broad a range of duties to do adequate justice to the government's case.

So I'm a little concerned about merging of the enforcement bodies because of the complexity of the law, because of the complexity of the jurisprudence, and because I know full well what happens in the court system when an officer is called and cannot adequately answer the questions of defence counsel. Invariably the enforcement activity is defeated. The workers become demoralized. They wonder why they can't get prosecutions, why they cannot enforce the laws that this government and all governments intend them to carry out.

1720

We have the whole question of the publishing of the information. As I said, I find it kind of timid, but I do want to see, in spite of the timidity of the proposals here before us, what the privacy commissioner has to say about this. It's my understanding that as of today's date, the publishing of the information or the whole aspect of what is to be released has not been reviewed by the privacy commissioner. This needs to happen. We need to know as a government, we need to know as a Legislature what can be released, whether or not this is an exhaustive list, whether it can be expanded, whether the privacy commissioner will say that it passed the test.

There's the whole question of cost-cutting. The minister has said that this is not a cost-cutting exercise. He has not said, though, whether or not additional workers are going to be hired, and I think we need to know that. We also need to know if you're going to ask the workers to do more and more, if you're going to ask them to delve into the responsibilities of one or more ministries or one or more departments within ministries, whether or not these workers are going to expect additional pay. I don't know whether the government has thought of this, but when you expand the duties of public employees, invariably there is a classification process involved. If you expand them, I'm sure that many of the employees who are required to do double or triple duty, who are required to know more than one set of pieces of legislation, more than one set of acts, more than one jurisprudence, are

going to require and probably be eligible under the terms of the public service employment act to be justifiably compensated. This may in fact not result in additional cost savings to the government; it may require even more.

We also have the whole problem here, I think, of moonlighting. Perhaps some people don't worry too much about this, but you have the whole problem of workers working all day and then saying they can go off to work for another government department at night if they want overtime or if they want to moonlight or if they want a second job. I'm not sure. It's not set out in the body of the legislation. I merely ask the question whether or not this is the intent, or is this a consequence of what may happen? So I would ask the parliamentary assistant to perhaps look at that, because it's something that would certainly bother me, were I in the managerial portion of the government having to look at the public employees: (a) Are they going to be paid more for this, as they would be entitled to under the classification; and (b) Is there going to be permission or a possibility that they will be moonlighting, that is, working at more than one job in the provincial public service?

As I said in my two-minuter and at the beginning of this speech, the only complaints I've had to date come from business. We've received three of them. I'd just like to put them into the body of the record.

One is from Judith Andrew of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. She wrote to the minister on April 28, 2006, and asked a pretty strong and salient question. I quote it here: "CFIB"—that's the Canadian Federation of Independent Business—"strongly recommends that before the substance of the Regulatory Modernization Act, 2006 (i.e. the enforcement push) is brought to bear on SMEs, the regulatory burden must be brought into line with the capacity of SMEs to cope with it. To do otherwise would be the height of harshness and unfairness."

George Waggott of Lang Michener wrote to the minister in a brief: "Business can only hope that this leadership comes in the form of greater government efficiency and less regulatory interference as opposed to a more intrusive and restrictive approach to doing business." I think that question needs to be answered as well.

Last, but not least, is the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, which writes, "Overall, the intent of this legislation is commendable, however COCA is concerned with how the government might first define a bad actor, and subsequently how much business/personal information will actually be published and available to the public."

Those are the three comments we've had. They all come from business. I guess business has been a little shell-shocked over the years as government intrudes more and more into what they're doing. I don't think most businesses would mind giving out the information that's contained within the body of the bill, and certainly I as a legislator would welcome any opportunity to even expand upon this if it's going to stop people from committing or being part of illegal actions.

Having said that, business is mindful and business wants some answers. I expect they will be called before the legislative committee. I would welcome any input they have, and, to assuage my fears and those of business, anything the parliamentary assistant may have to say here today.

In conclusion, the legislation may be okay, but there are some very strong questions that need to be asked, and we intend to ask those when we go to committee.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bruce Crozier): Questions and comments?

Mr. Racco: I want to thank the member from Beaches–East York and assure him that in our discussions we will certainly clarify all his concerns. But I do want to stress a few points.

On the issue of safeguards, we have heard stakeholder concerns about information sharing, and we have safeguards in the bill to ensure lawful sharing of information among ministries and other provincial regulators. The bill would not open the floodgates to information sharing. It will not expand the types of information that the government can currently collect.

On the consultation issue, the government is committed to consulting with stakeholders on the statutes that would be designated for the purpose of information sharing. The types of information about organizations that could be collected, used and shared would be primarily compliance-related, and the collection, use and disclosure of any information about individuals under the bill would be in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act or other clear statutory rules. We have consulted with the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, and it is comfortable with the approach we are taking.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that those concerns, as I have indicated, have been taken care of, and in future discussions the member will certainly be provided with the information he's asking for. I trust he will be able to support the bill.

Mr. Ted Chudleigh (Halton): I wonder if I could ask the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature—I think they should issue sunglasses when the member from Thornhill stands up with that jacket on. It's kind of bright in here.

Interjections.

Mr. Chudleigh: Yes, Hockey Night in Canada. Don Cherry would be jealous of said jacket.

This particular piece of legislation is the kind of legislation that very much concerns me. I can well remember from my life before politics that it seems very reasonable to people making decisions that when you have two or three or four different branches of inspectors out doing inspections in two or three or four or five different areas, it would be wonderful to combine all that and make it simple: "Look at all the money we could save. It would be wonderful."

But do you know what happens? You get people who are involved in very, very important parts of private, independent business people's business, and they're not making decisions from the base of knowledge; they're

making decisions based on a book. And the decisions they make out of the book are not always in the best interests of the people they are making these decisions or laying these charges against.

It becomes a very, very dangerous piece of legislation, especially to small business in Ontario, when unknowledgeable people are coming in and disrupting the normal flow of what is a very acceptable type of business. When you get that kind of thing happening in Ontario, it creates an environment that small business is not comfortable in, and it basically drives small business out of the province or at least makes it more difficult for that small business to survive. That has been the modus operandi of this particular government, and I think this piece of legislation perhaps needs a lot—a lot—of committee time.

1730

Ms. Horwath: It's my pleasure to make a few remarks on the titillating speech of my friend from Beaches–East York. He brought some extremely important issues to light. In fact, I note that he remarked briefly on his own experience in a previous life when he himself was doing work that required certain kinds of inspections when he was with Employment and Immigration Canada. Interestingly enough, I'm sure that my friend did not share with you the very interesting stories that he has shared with me about some of the incidents that he had come upon during that time in his life. Some of them were very interesting. I don't even know how else to describe it.

Nonetheless, all joking aside, the bill itself—and the member from Beaches–East York raised some of those points as well—has details in it that need to be reviewed at a committee process, and we're certainly looking forward to that. I don't think anybody would automatically oppose anything that seems logical, but there are things we need to keep in mind.

For example, a situation came up in my own community very recently where I received a call from a federal government employee whose expertise is advising senior citizens, retired people particularly, about their various pension incomes and how they all relate to each other and how to deal with these matters in a way that is best for them financially, within the context of the taxation system federally. The issue became, though, that these people were taken from their "expert" job descriptions to become generalists within the tax department. They found that they were unable to provide that very specific and good service to senior citizens in our community and they were concerned about that. Similarly, we wouldn't want to see good inspectors lose their expertise and see us, as a province, lose our access to them.

Hon. Christopher Bentley (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities): It's my pleasure to add my comments to those of the member from Beaches–East York. It's important to focus on what this legislation is all about, and I appreciate the member's comments about some business concerns. This is about making sure that people who work for the government of Ontario are able

to exchange information with each other on issues of provincial concern.

Example: a Ministry of Labour inspector goes in to inspect, either unannounced or to follow up an investigation, a business, one of the hundreds of thousands of businesses in Ontario. If that Ministry of Labour inspector then sees, during the course of his or her inspection, an issue that the Minister of the Environment would be very concerned about, a spill of a hazardous substance behind the shed, the inspector for the Ministry of Labour can't pass that concern on to the Ministry of the Environment inspector. That is the state of the current rules and regulations.

What we need to do is have a system whereby legitimate concerns by those who are trained to be inspectors and understand the importance of being careful with information—just to be able to give pertinent information to another ministry's inspector so they can follow up on it, for the betterment of us all. This is not a super inspector; this is just about exchanging information in a common-sense approach.

Although the member from Beaches–East York referred to words like “prescribed in the legislation” as a source of some concern, he would know that virtually every piece of legislation, particularly regulations, has wording of that sort, because it is impossible to anticipate all of life's eventualities when you draft legislation or regulations. That is a good bill.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Beaches–East York, you have two minutes to respond.

Mr. Prue: I would like to thank the member from Thornhill, the member from Halton, the member from Hamilton East and the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities.

The member from Thornhill assuaged my fears and then the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities reinstated them. So I thank the government benches, because there is one saying, “We're going to look at all these things,” but then the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities says he simply wants to pass on the information. In the body of my speech, I agree with passing on the information. I gave my own history within the immigration department and the people with whom I came in contact in other agencies, and even in the same department, and how we were singularly unable to pass that information. I am in total agreement with what the minister says. You need to be able to pass on that information between one government body and another where it is going to help save lives, where it is going to make for a cleaner environment, where it's going to make the legislation that we are passing here meaningful. But then he went on to talk about the prescription at the end, number 10. This always causes me some grief, and I'm sure this is what is causing the business community grief. Yes, I know it's in most of the legislation, but when you leave something open to regulation, when you leave something open to a prescription some years in the future, you are playing upon, I suppose, the worst fears. I would ask the government to think very carefully about

whether you want to do that. You can easily get the legislation through without that particular section.

To the member from Halton, yes, he's correct. Small business is the key aspect for which there has been some negative comment, and we need to make sure that small business is listened to intently so that whatever is passed here is not going to do damage to people who are helping to build our economy.

Last but not least, my good friend from Hamilton East, yes, I have shared with her many good stories, but she is right. We need to make sure that we have experts and not just generalists.

The Deputy Speaker: The member from Halton raised a point about sunglasses. The Chair suggests that if the member from Thornhill wore the member from Beaches–East York's tie, or the member from Beaches–East York wore the member for Thornhill's jacket, there would be a need for glasses and Don Cherry would indeed be envious.

Further debate?

Mr. O'Toole: It's a pleasure. I've listened to many of the comments on Bill 69 and had a chance to review the rather small bill, actually, in terms of its content compared to some of the bills. It's roughly eight pages in English and eight pages in French. In a general sense, probably most of it on the surface you'd agree with. It's streamlining, harmonizing, simplifying and making economic use of human resources.

That being said, I think the member from Beaches–East York and others have pointed out quite succinctly that there are concerns that have been raised by a number of sectors in the economy in a very practical sense of more or less the change in the culture of enforcement, discipline and persons visiting your place of business or your place of work and imposing certain kinds of strategies or styles of doing business. Quite honestly, if they enter your premises, you're probably going to feel somewhat intimidated, or at least vulnerable. If that person is, so to speak, very specialized, as the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities used in his example—you had a person from the Ministry of Labour who was visiting a work site and was very well aware of the Ontario Labour Relations Act and other statutes governing workplace issues—it would be very comfortable for them to make observations.

Where it becomes problematic, of course, is the second part of the streamlining, or allowing shared information from one ministry to another ministry. The person from the Ministry of Labour, in their report of the site visit for a work stoppage, for instance, might make some false assumptions about the materials or substances that constituted the hazard. In fact, you could say that there were things in cleaning the product that were of potential risk to the environment—you know, being washed off—and that was going down the drain and constituting—and they could make some poor assessments of the real situation because they're not expert in all of the areas; they're expert in their Ministry of Labour function.

I think the point has been made in other examples. This is where the member from Beaches–East York had problems with the responses from the two Liberal members. In fact, it would say to me that it reinforces our argument here that this bill probably needs public hearing, or at least public clearing, so that people understand, and honestly understand, the efficiencies of this bill we would support, the efficiencies underpinned with the proper training and expertise by the persons doing the observing. I could go on.

1740

There have been comments, and I'll just list for the record a couple of the observations, because I do have a couple of minutes here to complete my remarks. We have heard input from the Retail Council of Canada with respect to their concerns that the act as currently drafted may in fact frustrate those intentions. These are the intentions, basically, of harmonizing and collecting information, two or three ministries working co-operatively together.

One of the areas they talk about is information sharing. The Retail Council of Canada is concerned that the scope of information that can be collected, used and disclosed is too broadly defined in the act, which raises another issue. In the privacy information, there's really a whole body of discussion on privacy. The key terms that I recall in the health privacy act were "collect"—collecting data; "use"—what it's used for; and "disclose." So when you're talking about information on individuals or corporations, you're looking at three things, primarily: Collecting it—who does it and what's the framework for that? Using it—what's it used for? Is it used for resources or is it used as statistics to analyze, data mining? Disclosing it—disclosed to whom, by whom and under what conditions?

As has been said, our privacy commissioner, Ann Cavoukian, apparently has not been consulted on the bill. As I said before, when you look at collecting, using and disclosing, there should be some relationship between who's collecting the data and are they trained to collect it? Are they prepared to not contaminate the information? Are they properly trained in collecting the data or the information or the samples—blood or other types of samples? Using it and using it to imply a violation of a statute is something else that needs to be clarified very clearly. What are the rules of evidence and the laws to ensure that the information that's being collected is in fact the information that was collected? Disclosing it—there's a whole body of discussion on that. When you're talking about disclosure, you're talking about, did I give consent for the disclosure of the information that you've collected? That's implied consent, or is it informed consent? Did I say you could take my saliva test or not? If I didn't, are you allowed to disclose information, whether it's on a person or on a property? These things will be challenged in court and the litigation would become far more complex.

If you just look at those two issues, you then have to ask the philosophical question of who's checking the

checker. That's the oldest question in time. If I'm to assume that the information provided for the prosecution is accurate, who collected it? Do you understand? What security and confidence do I have in the process?

This is a good framework bill. At this point in time, I can assure you—and I mean this respectfully—it is nothing more than a framework bill. There are 25 statutes that are being amended. Those statutes, for the most part—I could go through them in some detail—are quite honestly not widely understood.

There's the Cemeteries Act. Someone spoke to me, because there was a Remembrance Day event this weekend, about some implication on the Cemeteries Act, that they have to have these reserve funds for perpetual care. Did I know much about it? I said, "Well, I haven't seen too much being amended on the Cemeteries Act, but under the whole funereal business"—there are two different acts: the funeral directors act and the Cemeteries Act. There are two sets of rules and regulations, and there's a whole change in that industry culture, from traditional burials to non-traditional burials, cremation—a whole bunch of cultural things that are starting to change. So I said, "I imagine that cemeteries themselves will need to be changed over time. The oversight for crematoriums and who's going to make sure that all the"—so I'm saying, I just picked one out of a list here that are in themselves a purpose for a reasonable debate. Now, if you, Lord forbid—I think most civil servants I've had the privilege to be in touch with here are well-intended, generally well-informed and capable. But Lord forbid if you have an overzealous inspection officer in the job—a former frustrated OPP police officer or whatever—and they take the role a little bit to the extreme. You have a nasty situation of a small business person being uninformed of a visitation, some assumptions made by a person who gives a heads up to the next inspector who's called in, and you've got a conundrum. Guess what happens to the small business person? Bingo: Get the chequebook out; you're getting a lawyer. Do you understand? The rules of presumed innocence are out the window.

Once the government arrives, as I said initially, you feel a little bit vulnerable. If you've ever been involved at all—and I have in my prior life, not for anything more than that I worked for a large company that obeyed the rules to the best of its ability. But when they show up, if there's a workplace safety issue, the whole place shuts down and you wait for this inspector. You could wait for hours for this inspector to show up. Meanwhile, you're losing one, two, three, four—maybe quite a bit of time, quite a bit of production and quite a bit of money with 4,000 or 5,000 employees sitting around. You've got a problem. But out of respect for that process, they did wait.

When you make it that while they're there, they're looking not just at safety issues but at labour relations issues—maybe it's too far to the washroom or whatever. I don't know some of the rules they may be looking at, but it could paralyze. How does the company, then, get

the disputes resolution mechanism dealt with? I just see a number of problems. As I said before, I've heard from the retail council, who wrote to the deputy minister and brought this to their attention.

Also, the publication of compliance or non-compliance: This sharing of information and the publication thereof becomes evidence in a court battle. It could affect the shares of the company. If, all of a sudden, some pharmaceutical company is visited and there's contamination—what happened to that chocolate company, Hershey's, this weekend? The food inspection agency was brought in. It could affect the shares of the company—not that they should not be unduly, but they should be protected from wrongful information being disclosed.

What is the process here to deal with validation of the information collected? It's eight pages; it's almost like an atom bomb in a plastic bag. Quite frankly, there are 25 bills, and I challenge: Most of the members here, myself included, would not be familiar with five of the statutes that are modified. Those statutes themselves each have different enforcement and information training issues that these inspectors need to be trained on—the changing societal things.

Conceptually, I want to restate that it's a very good idea to streamline and harmonize, and to make efficient use of human resources. There's great agreement and concurrence on that. The issues that are being brought to our attention, I suspect, would be issues that would be part of the public meetings.

There was a good article right after the minister's statement. The minister introduced this bill—I just want to make sure I have the right date for the record; it was February 27, 2006. Here's a small bill. It's been almost a year since this bill was introduced. I don't get it, personally. What's the holdup? Why hasn't it already been out for hearings? I would imagine that the House leaders will make some decision that this bill would probably go out for hearings over the winter, and I would support that. At this point in time, I don't have enough information on it, and our caucus position hasn't been clearly defined either. But that's what I would see.

The article was written by Richard Brennan on February 28, upon the bill's introduction. He questioned Minister Peters at the time, and I would say there wasn't a clear account or response. I quote the Toronto Star article: "Peters said current bureaucratic rules and regulations, for example, prevent a meat inspector from tipping off the environment ministry if he noticed a slaughterhouse was pouring oil down the drain." There are a lot of assumptions in the minister's response. Who said it was oil if it's not there anymore? What evidence and what rules about evidence collection were there? It's absolutely humorous, quite honestly, from my point of view. That's just the minister responding to a newspaper quote on the day of first reading of the bill.

1750

Mr. Kormos had some specific regard or questions when he responded to the bill. I'll leave that up to his side.

Mr. Wilson, the member from Simcoe–Grey, in his response as our critic of the day said, "...sweeping powers to government inspectors. I'll say at the beginning that it's sad that you need to change the laws—or you feel you need to change the laws—because inspectors aren't able to pass on information today. I'm not sure that's totally true and I'm not sure you want to give this much power to the first inspector who walks on the premises." He mentions the idea of an overzealous liquor inspector. These could be workplace-related issues and a whole plethora of issues that Mr. Wilson brings up.

But a very good article—I would say this was written to the assistant deputy minister as well from the Council of Ontario Construction Associations, who have raised some concerns. Their concerns were around a couple of issues.

I'll just put this on the record in the brief time that is left. Under section 9 of the act, "observing and disclosing," proposals to allow field staff acting under the authority of one statute to disclose observations that are likely—it's a very ambiguous rule, "likely"—to be relevant to another statute to a person who administers or enforces the other statute. You talk about vague language there: is likely to be affecting another statute by another person who might enforce that statute.

My question would be, on what qualification or expertise did the person make the observation? How did they know it was oil or whatever? Did they take a sample? Did someone witness the sample of the oil or whatever it was? That's kind of under the heads-up provision. Quite honestly, when you go through it, it's on that tone. I may sound a bit clinical or critical when I'm speaking to the bill, but all we're saying here is, on the general premise—repeating it for the third time—we think it's a good idea to use human resources wisely. But on the element of training, there's nothing in here I see of cross-training or other enforcement or—how would you say?—implementation issues that need to be dealt with. They may possibly be dealt with. I want to be clear on that. That's why the only thing I could do here in substance is to raise a few things that have been brought to our attention by stakeholders, and for the protection of the public and the safety and small business issues that have been mentioned, and due process so that everyone is presumed innocent until they're—their product or their company or those jobs could disappear because of some incorrect assumptions that get in the newspaper. Do you know what I'm saying? You really want to make sure there is due process here.

The Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters have commented on it. The Ontario Mining Association has commented on it. The issue of inspectors reporting across regulatory lines has business concerned that a rash of unwarranted investigations will result. That's all we need: another swarm of bureaucrats running around the small business manufacturing climate of the province, causing some concern.

We've even had input from the Osler law firm, LLP, who also characterized the potential impact on business

in the following manner. It goes on to outline the risk to disclosure of information, technically, that wasn't correct.

I think we would like to be on the record as saying we have every confidence in the public sector being able to work co-operatively, the public sector and other sectors who may in the future be performing functions in sectors that are covered by some of these statutes that may not be—if I look at some of the acts, the people working in them, they are arm's-length agencies. OMVIC, which is the motor vehicle group, does a lot of the industry regulation. They're not government employees but they—as I say, these acts, the Nutrient Management Act, the Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act, the Public Vehicles Act, the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, the Technical Standards and Safety Authority—there's one I'd like to talk about sometime. When they show up, get out the chequebook. The travel industry, TICO, is another good one that's certainly over the Internet and other travel agencies and emergencies and things like that.

I hope they don't think there's anyone qualified, unless it's related training—I think at the end of the day it comes down to training. Most of us here don't know anything unless we've been trained in the broad areas of things we speak to, and there is a process to get briefed or to get briefing notes to find out the intention. Reading the bill itself, you look at the purpose. But this one here is a dangling participle. It goes on for five pages—actually, it's one page, to be honest.

In that respect, I think I would tend to share the information with the other members who are still here in the House to see what the next steps are for this bill. Quite frankly, I think it should go to public hearings. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that those are my observations at this time of the day. Thank you for your indulgence in listening.

The Acting Speaker: It being close to 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until later on this evening at 6:45.

The House adjourned at 1756.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. James K. Bartleman
Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. Brown
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, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (L) Speaker / Président	Haliburton–Victoria–Brock	Scott, Laurie (PC)
Ancaster–Dundas– Flamborough–Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)
Barrie–Simcoe–Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC) Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Hamilton East / Hamilton-Est	Horwath, Andrea (ND)
Beaches–East York / Beaches–York-Est	Prue, Michael (ND)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Hon. / L'hon. Marie (L) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for democratic renewal / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre responsable du Renouveau démocratique
Bramalea–Gore–Malton– Springdale	Kular, Kuldip (L)	Hamilton West / Hamilton-Ouest	Marsales, Judy (L)
Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Jeffrey, Linda (L)	Hastings–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Hon. / L'hon. Leona (L) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Brampton West–Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest–Mississauga	Dhillon, Vic (L)	Huron–Bruce	Mitchell, Carol (L)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kenora–Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (L) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Millroy, John (L)
Chatham–Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	Kitchener–Waterloo	Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	Van Bommel, Maria (L)
Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Caplan, Hon. / L'hon. David (L) Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, deputy government House leader / ministre du Renouvellement de l'infrastructure publique, leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement	Lanark–Carleton	Werling, Norman W. (PC)
Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (L) Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation	Leeds–Grenville	Runciman, Robert W. (PC)
Dufferin–Peel– Wellington–Grey	Tory, John (PC) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Matthews, Deborah (L)
Durham	O'Toole, John (PC)	London West / London-Ouest	Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (L) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Eglington–Lawrence	Colle, Hon. / L'hon. Mike (L) Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration	London–Fanshawe	Ramal, Khalil (L)
Elgin–Middlesex–London	Peters, Hon. / L'hon. Steve (L) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (L) Minister of Small Business and Entrepreneurship / ministre des Petites Entreprises et de l'Entrepreneuriat
Erie–Lincoln Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L) Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président, Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Mississauga East / Mississauga-Est	Fonseca, Peter (L)
Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	Cansfield, Hon. / L'hon. Donna H. (L) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Peterson, Tim (L)
Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Qaadri, Shafiq (L)	Mississauga West / Mississauga-Ouest	Delaney, Bob (L)
Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (L) Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement	Nepean–Carleton	MacLeod, Lisa (PC)
Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)
Guelph–Wellington	Sandals, Liz (L)	Niagara Falls	Craitor, Kim (L)
Haldimand–Norfolk–Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)	Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)
		Nipissing	Smith, Monique M. (L)
		Northumberland	Rinaldi, Lou (L)

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Oak Ridges	Klees, Frank (PC)	Stormont–Dundas– Charlottenburgh	Brownell, Jim (L)
Oakville	Flynn, Kevin Daniel (L)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (L) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Thornhill	Racco, Mario G. (L)
Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Mauro, Bill (L)
Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (L) Premier and President of the Council, Minister of Research and Innovation / premier ministre et président du Conseil, ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior- Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Watson, Hon. / L'hon. Jim (L) Minister of Health Promotion / ministre de la Promotion de la santé	Timiskaming–Cochrane	Ramsay, Hon. / L'hon. David (L) Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs / ministre des Richesses naturelles, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Ottawa–Orléans	McNeely, Phil (L)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Ottawa–Vanier	Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (L) Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones	Toronto Centre–Rosedale / Toronto-Centre–Rosedale	Smitherman, Hon. / L'hon. George (L) Deputy Premier, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / vice-premier ministre, ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Oxford	Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Toronto–Danforth	Tabuns, Peter (ND)
Parkdale–High Park	DiNovo, Cheri (ND)	Trinity–Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Parry Sound–Muskoka	Miller, Norm (PC)	Vaughan–King–Aurora	Sorbara, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (L) Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / ministre des Finances, président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement
Perth–Middlesex	Wilkinson, John (L)	Waterloo–Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC) First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Peterborough	Leal, Jeff (L)	Whitby–Ajax	Elliott, Christine (PC)
Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge	Arthurs, Wayne (L)	Willowdale	Zimmer, David (L)
Prince Edward–Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	Pupatello, Hon. / L'hon. Sandra (L) Minister of Economic Development and Trade, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce, ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke	Yakabuski, John (PC)	Windsor–St. Clair	Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (L) Minister of Energy / ministre de l'Énergie
Sarnia–Lambton	Di Cocco, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (L) Minister of Culture / ministre de la Culture	York Centre / York-Centre	Kwinter, Hon. / L'hon. Monte (L) Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
Sault Ste. Marie	Oraziotti, David (L)	York North / York-Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Duguid, Brad (L)	York West / York-Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)
Scarborough East / Scarborough-Est	Chambers, Hon. / L'hon. Mary Anne V. (L) Minister of Children and Youth Services / ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse	Burlington	Vacant
Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	Berardinetti, Lorenzo (L)	Markham	Vacant
Scarborough–Agincourt	Phillips, Hon. / L'hon. Gerry (L) Minister of Government Services / ministre des Services gouvernementaux	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	Vacant
Scarborough–Rouge River	Balkissoon, Bas (L)		
Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)		
Simcoe–Grey	Wilson, Jim (PC)		
St. Catharines	Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (L) Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, government House leader / ministre du Tourisme, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées, leader parlementaire du gouvernement		
St. Paul's	Bryant, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (L) Attorney General / procureur général		
Stoney Creek	Mossop, Jennifer F. (L)		

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

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

Continued from overleaf

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 14 novembre 2006

DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

Formation linguistique

M. McNeely 6068

DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

Soutiens à l'emploi

M. Bentley 6072

M. Chudleigh 6074

M. Marchese 6075

QUESTIONS ORALES

Alimentation en électricité

M. McNeely 6082

M. Duncan 6082

M. Brownell 6082

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2006 sur la modernisation de la réglementation,

projet de loi 69, *M. Peters*

Débat présumé ajourné 6104

CONTENTS

Tuesday 14 November 2006

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Ontario artists	
Mrs. Munro.....	6067
Ms. DiNovo.....	6068
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	
Mr. Qaadri.....	6067
Mrs. Witmer.....	6067
Quinte Amateur Radio Club	
Mr. Parsons.....	6068
Community safety	
Mr. Dunlop.....	6068
Language training	
Mr. McNeely.....	6068
Sylvia Sutherland	
Mr. Leal.....	6069
Bruce Duncan	
Ms. Mossop.....	6069

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on the Legislative Assembly	
Mr. Delaney.....	6069
Report adopted.....	6070
Standing committee on estimates	
Mr. Hudak.....	6070
Report deemed adopted.....	6070

MOTIONS

Committee membership	
Mr. Bradley.....	6070
Agreed to.....	6070
Committee sittings	
Mr. Bradley.....	6070
Agreed to.....	6071
Private members' public business	
Mr. Bradley.....	6071
Agreed to.....	6071
House sittings	
Mr. Bradley.....	6071
Agreed to.....	6071

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Diabetes	
Mr. Smitherman.....	6071
Mrs. Witmer.....	6074
Employment supports	
Mr. Bentley.....	6072
Mr. Chudleigh.....	6074
Mr. Marchese.....	6075

Police

Mr. Kwinter.....	6073
Mr. Dunlop.....	6075
Mr. Kormos.....	6075

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipal finances	
Mr. Tory.....	6077
Mr. McGuinty.....	6077
Justices of the peace	
Mr. Tory.....	6078
Mr. Bryant.....	6078
Electricity supply	
Mr. Hampton.....	6079
Mr. Duncan.....	6079, 6082
Mr. McNeely.....	6082
Mr. Brownell.....	6082
Ottawa light rail project	
Ms. MacLeod.....	6081
Mr. Caplan.....	6081

Homelessness

Mr. Prue.....	6082
Mr. Gerretsen.....	6082

Hospital services

Mr. Tory.....	6083
Mr. Smitherman.....	6083

Ontario artists

Ms. DiNovo.....	6084
Ms. Di Cocco.....	6084

Brownfield sites

Mr. Brownell.....	6084
Ms. Pupatello.....	6084
Mr. Sorbara.....	6085

Consideration of Bill 107

Mrs. Elliott.....	6085
Mr. Bryant.....	6085

Sault Area Hospital

Mr. Hampton.....	6086
Mr. Caplan.....	6086

Accessibility for the disabled

Mr. Ramal.....	6086
Mrs. Meilleur.....	6086

PETITIONS

Disabled persons parking permit program

Mr. O'Toole.....	6086
------------------	------

Tuition

Ms. Horwath.....	6087, 6088
------------------	------------

Community mediation

Mr. Delaney.....	6087
------------------	------

Municipal planning

Mr. Chudleigh.....	6087
--------------------	------

Identity theft

Mr. Ruprecht.....	6088
-------------------	------

Greenbelt

Mr. Hudak.....	6088
----------------	------

SECOND READINGS

Regulatory Modernization Act, 2006, Bill 69, Mr. Peters

Mr. Racco.....	6089, 6096, 6100
Mr. O'Toole.....	6089, 6101
Ms. Horwath.....	6089, 6095, 6100
Mrs. Sandals.....	6089
Mr. Kormos.....	6090
Mr. Flynn.....	6090, 6093
Mr. Yakabuski.....	6092, 6093, 6096
Mr. Prue.....	6092, 6096, 6097, 6101
Mr. Levac.....	6092
Mr. Miller.....	6092, 6096
Mr. Chudleigh.....	6100
Mr. Bentley.....	6100
Debate deemed adjourned.....	6104

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors

The Speaker.....	6069
Ms. DiNovo.....	6070
Ms. Wynne.....	6070
Mr. Colle.....	6070

David Mounsey

Mrs. Mitchell.....	6076
Mr. Dunlop.....	6076
Mr. Hampton.....	6077

Continued overleaf