



Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario  
Second Session, 39<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario  
Deuxième session, 39<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Thursday 19 May 2011**

**Jeudi 19 mai 2011**

Speaker  
Honourable Steve Peters

Président  
L'honorable Steve Peters

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **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.

### **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.

---

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

Thursday 19 May 2011

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 19 mai 2011

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Good morning. Please remain standing for the Lord's Prayer, followed by a moment of silence for inner thought and personal reflection.

*Prayers.*

LEGISLATIVE INTERNS

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** I'd like to explain to the members that this morning, I am not Mr. Speaker; I am Mr. Sneaker. I am wearing a pair of purple Chuck Taylor Converse All Stars. As many of you know, I collect the shoes, and as the honourable member from Welland knows, there's nothing clear in the standing orders as far as apparel requirements within the chamber, so I took the advantage to wear these purple sneakers today.

But I want to thank the OLIP interns. These were a gift to me from the interns. They named me an honorary intern. The interns and their advisers are sitting in the Speaker's gallery today, and I just want to thank you for the great work that you have done in support of members on all sides of the House. I hope you've had an enjoyable time while you've been here.

On behalf of all the staff and all the members here at the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, we just want to wish you all the best in your future endeavours and thank you for the great work that you've done for us.

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** If you'd just hold tight while I sit down, perhaps the camera will get a good shot for the record. I know it's not good, but I'll cross my legs and I can show off the wonderful little badge that the interns gave me. Wonderful red—I mean purple. They're actually gothic purple Converse, so thank you very much.

Now, to the business of the day.

NOTICE OF REASONED AMENDMENT

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** I beg to inform the House that the member for Wellington–Halton Hills has filed notice of a reasoned amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill 196, An Act to amend the Election Act with respect to certain electoral practices. The order for second reading of Bill 196 may therefore not be called today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TAXATION

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 16, 2011, on the amendment to the amendment to the motion by Ms. Smith on Ontario's tax plan for jobs and growth.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Pursuant to the order of the House dated May 18, I'm now required to put the question.

On May 16, Ms. Smith moved that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario recognizes that to make life easier for Ontario families and help our economy remain strong, Ontario's tax plan for jobs and growth, as reaffirmed in the 2011 budget, removes 90,000 Ontarians from the income tax rolls, provides 93% of Ontarians with a permanent personal income tax cut, maintains the harmonized sales tax at the current rate and provides \$12 billion in tax relief for families and \$4.8 billion in tax relief for businesses; and

Recognizes that with Ontario's tax plan for jobs and growth, the economy is turning the corner by creating more than 293,000 new jobs since the global recession; and

Rejects the introduction of a carbon tax as a measure that would hurt Ontario's economic growth; and

Rejects an increase to the HST rate or a decrease to the rate that would benefit the wealthiest Ontarians the most, take \$3 billion out of health care and education funding and harm Ontario's economic recovery.

Mr. Yakabuski then moved that the motion be amended as follows: by deleting all the words after "strong" in the first paragraph; deleting the second paragraph; substituting the word "it" for "and" at the beginning of the third paragraph; and deleting the words after "HST rate" in the last paragraph.

Mr. Chudleigh then moved that the amendment to the motion be amended as follows: by adding the following "or more hidden fees, or a revival of eco taxes planned by the McGuinty Liberals."

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

All those in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

This vote will be deferred until after question period.

*Vote deferred.*

## TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Gerry Phillips:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 47 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 179, An Act to amend the Child and Family Services Act respecting adoption and the provision of care and maintenance, the Standing Committee on Social Policy be authorized to meet at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, May 31, 2011, for the purpose of clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That the deadline for filing amendments to the bill with the clerk of the committee shall be 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 31, 2011. On Tuesday, May 31, 2011, at no later than 5 p.m., those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. Any division required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put and taken in succession, with one 20-minute waiting period allowed pursuant to standing order 129(a). The committee shall be authorized to meet beyond the normal hour of adjournment for clause-by-clause consideration on Tuesday, May 31, 2011; and

That the committee shall report the bill to the House no later than Wednesday, June 1, 2011. In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on that day, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House; and

That, upon receiving the report of the Standing Committee on Social Policy, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called that same day; and

That, when the order for third reading of the bill is called, one hour shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That, except in the case of a recorded division arising from morning orders of the day, pursuant to standing order 9(c), no deferral of the third reading vote shall be permitted; and

That, in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to five minutes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Debate?

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** I'm pleased to rise to speak to this time allocation motion. For me, this time allocation motion is all about lack of planning. We have had lots of opportunity to raise the issue of Bill 179. The government chose to take seven and a half years, quite frankly, to bring forward any kind of substantive amendments relating to adoption, and what we're seeing this morning

as we discuss this time allocation motion is in fact a lack of planning, a lack of forward momentum, on behalf of the Liberal government.

**0910**

Bill 179 was introduced in the Ontario Legislature within the last month. We actually had a debate when we were discussing public hearings and public consultation because, as I'm sure you know, many members—all MPPs—have been receiving letters asking—pleading with us—to take a very close look at what Bill 179 is proposing and ensure that the public has the right to hear and offer input. While we were discussing when public input could take place, the initial proposal from the government was a mere two hours of public debate, which, as you know, ends up being fewer than 12 people in all of Ontario having the opportunity to share their thoughts, concerns and, quite frankly, praise for Bill 179.

We were successful in getting an additional day of public hearings, which we have now held. We have scheduled Bill 179 for clause-by-clause on Monday in social policy committee, which is actually four hours of debate and discussion. I don't think that bills on adoption—I don't think any new legislation—should be rushed through, but particularly when you're dealing with families, when you're dealing with children that we're trying to place in care in the most appropriate way.

What we're seeing today with this time allocation motion is an attempt by a government that really didn't plan ahead. They could have brought forward Bill 179 or an amendment to it a number of months ago. The report that we're basing a lot of the Bill 179 changes on has actually been tabled for over a year, so there's quite frankly no excuse.

I find it a little hard to take that we've spent this much time waiting for some substantive changes on adoption and instead what we are seeing is an attempt by the Liberal government to rush through very serious changes to how we will view adoption, how we will view crown wards and, moving forward, how we will allow children who are currently crown wards in our various children's aid societies to be placed with adoptive families. It's discouraging. It's unfortunate that we have come down to the last five sessional days and we are forced to discuss time allocation motions instead of actually discussing the true issue, which should be how we can improve the current adoption system.

As members will know, the vast majority of children who are currently crown wards within our various children's aid societies do not have the ability or the option available to them to be available for adoption to find forever families. That's what we're trying to bring forward and discuss with Bill 179. How unfortunate that the government has waited so long into their legislative mandate to bring forward any kind of changes.

I do not want to mislead the public to assume that these are substantive changes. There are some positive changes coming forward with Bill 179. I think that if you review the second reading debates from the Progressive Conservative caucus as well as from the NDP caucus—

although I certainly wouldn't want to speak for my NDP colleagues—we have generally spoken in support of the changes coming forward with 179. For the government to think they must ram through a time allocation motion is an unfortunate way to deal with a piece of legislation that all three parties would like to see move forward in Ontario, and move forward this spring.

What I really would like to have seen is the ability for Bill 179 to be introduced earlier in the session, and to have further input and allow people to actually see what the changes are, discuss with their children's aid societies, discuss with their constituents and families within their individual ridings what the changes will mean. There aren't any of us in this chamber who wouldn't have an ability to speak to or find someone who is either adopted or attempting to go through the current adoption process or, of course, ultimately, the children's aid society, which plays such a critical role in placement and encouraging families to adopt.

For the government to talk about a time allocation motion instead of actually giving the social policy committee the time to continue to work collaboratively—as I say, all of our second reading debates, you will find, have spoken generally in positive terms about Bill 179. For this time allocation motion to come forward, it really ends up throwing down the gauntlet a bit, quite frankly. We were working together. We were finding times that were appropriate. As I say, we had four hours of clause-by-clause scheduled for the next potential sitting of the social policy committee on Monday the 31st. I think it's really unfortunate that we've now been bullied into a time allocation motion. I don't think we'll need it, quite frankly. I don't think we did need it. It puts a different view on how, collectively, the members within the social policy committee and within this chamber could work together for the benefit of crown wards and families looking to adopt in Ontario.

I'll leave it at that. I think there are better ways that we could approach these issues. A time allocation motion on a bill that we were working together on is a really unfortunate way to end what could have been a very positive story about improving adoption in Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** I confess that I find this time allocation motion puzzling. As far as I can tell from talking to my colleagues, debate was proceeding in a straightforward way. People had their opinions, weren't trying to talk this bill out, weren't trying to run the clock, and were grappling with very substantial issues; issues that, as everyone in this chamber is aware, have been left essentially to the last hour of an eight-year run by this government; issues that could have been debated earlier in this term.

We find it very strange that a bill that is of great consequence to so many children and so many families has essentially been brought in at the last minute. Now, instead of having a debate—not a held-up debate, not a debate that is going to be strangled—that allows everyone

in the House to have the say that is necessary, to give the stakeholders an opportunity to comment, it's being pushed through at an extraordinary rate, time-allocated.

I have to say to you, you're well aware that night sittings were scheduled and then cancelled. It wasn't as though we were running out of time. We are coming to the end of the session, but there was time set in the House for debate that has not been used. We look at this time allocation motion and we ask ourselves why on earth this government is acting in this way. Has it become more erratic in its planning? Is there an agenda that we're not aware of? We find it not a very productive way of running the business of this House.

Given that this motion will probably pass, given that the government has a majority, it's my hope that in the short time that will be allocated the substantial issues will get the airing they need; that there will be some debate to actually illuminate all the consequences of the bill before us. But I have to say to the government: You could have done a lot better with this. I think you misread the House. And if you didn't misread the House, then you're acting in a way that is very, very strange.

There's not a lot more to add on this, but I will say this: If the government wants to build up a record of time allocation and cutting off debate, then, with this motion, it has just continued to build on that record.

**0920**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** I certainly want to echo the comments made by the two previous speakers, particularly my colleague from Dufferin–Caledon. I think we were all very shocked to learn that Bill 179, the Building Families and Supporting Youth to be Successful Act, was going to be time-allocated. It is a very heavy-handed approach to a bill that was receiving the support of the opposition parties.

Despite the fact that the bill certainly didn't go as far as it should have, it was at least a start in the right direction. The government has had almost eight years to address the issue of adoption. Unfortunately, I think they have not given this whole issue of adoption the attention that it deserves. They received recommendations from the Honourable David Johnston in his report in 2009. There were certainly many other recommendations that had been brought to their attention regarding the need to facilitate adoption, and they have ignored it until the very end of their term.

Instead of giving us the opportunity to thoughtfully put forward amendments to the bill, give the time needed to debate those amendments, come back into this House and debate the issues that were brought to our attention during the committee hearings, we're now going to be forced into a position where the bill is rushed through.

That's very disappointing, because many people came before the committee. We have received many, many written submissions from individuals who, although they support the bill, have brought to our attention glaring

omissions and actions that are occurring now in regard to adoption that need to be improved upon.

Unfortunately, we're not giving any of those submissions the due diligence they deserve. It is disappointing, when we were all moving forward and the bill was going to be passed. I don't think anybody was prepared to stand in the way of the bill moving forward. It could have been passed before the House supposedly adjourned on the second of June.

We're now in a position where we're really saying to people, "Your thoughts and your concerns don't really matter. We're going to bulldoze through at this point in time. We're not going to thoughtfully consider all of your amendments. We're not going to have a thoughtful debate. There's going to be a limited amount of time available."

I would say to you, adoption is a very important issue. This bill makes some steps forward to support both the children, who obviously need caring homes, and the families who can provide those homes.

I also think what happened when this bill was introduced is that we soon became aware of the need to do so much more for the children who are placed in homes—the follow-up, the financial support. Many children are going to be prevented from being placed in homes simply because families can't afford the care that's going to be needed if these children have special needs.

As I say, it is regrettable that we can't air and put on the table all of the concerns that have been brought to our attention. We were certainly committed to moving the bill forward, and it's disappointing that the government rushed the bill through, introduced it at the last minute and now is not going to give the opportunity for thoughtful debate and thoughtful discussion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

Seeing none, Mr. Phillips has moved government notice of motion number 78. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This vote will be deferred until deferred votes, after question period.

*Vote deferred.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Orders of the day.

**Hon. Gerry Phillips:** Mr. Speaker, no further business.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** There being no further business, this House stands in recess until 10:30 a.m., at which time we will have question period.

*The House recessed from 0925 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** It's my pleasure to introduce Gary and Maggie Perry, who bid on a lunch and tour with their

MPP in support of the Gibson Centre in Alliston. Welcome to Queen's Park and condolences at the same time.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I would ask the House to welcome my daughter, Jesse Cowparthwaite; her partner, Stan Welsey; and their darling child, Olivia Jane Wesley, who is also my first grandchild.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** I also have with me a family that won a prize of lunch with their MPP today. They're from Allenby school, one of Canada's finest grade schools, and they're the Abbey family. I'd like to welcome Nancy Abbey; her husband, Mitch; their daughter, Megan; and their son, Jonathan. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I would like to introduce the parents of Jonah Villanueva Merali, who are here to my left. The parents are Isfahan Merali, the mother; and Sergio Villanueva. I want to congratulate these parents for having raised a wonderful young man who speaks Spanish very well. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Hon. Harinder S. Takhar:** I would like to welcome to the Legislature 90 grade 5 students from Edenrose Public School along with their teacher and volunteers from my riding of Mississauga—Erindale. I'm sure they're going to enjoy question period today.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I don't believe they are in the House yet, but—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** They're in the Speaker's gallery.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Oh, they're in the Speaker's gallery. We have a group here from Oxford Reformed Christian School from the great riding of Oxford county. We want to welcome them here today. I didn't realize they were here yet, but I knew they were coming. We want to welcome them to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** I want to welcome the school as well, but particularly a good friend of mine, the teacher, Jake Van Meppelen-Scheppink, who's here with them as well. Welcome.

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I'd like to welcome Mr. Hayter and grade 5, Mountain View Public School, to the Legislature. They're up in the gallery.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Today is personal support workers' day at Queen's Park. There are a lot of PSWs who are visiting, so I welcome them to Queen's Park. Right after question period there's a reception in committee room 1. I welcome all members to please attend.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Page Erica Geen is here today from Marchmont Public School, and her family is visiting us. Today, she is the page captain. In attendance we have her father, Andrew Geen; her mom, Claudia Swoboda; Emily Geen, her sister; Stewart Geen, her grandfather; Donna Geen, her grandmother; Jonathan Geen, her uncle; George Swoboda, her uncle; and Sandra Swoboda, her aunt.

**Mr. Ted McMeekin:** We have several students from McMaster University, my old alma mater, with us this morning, and all have been engaged at one point or another in my post-secondary advisory committee in the riding. Huzaifa Saeed is here; welcome. Alicia Ali is here

as well. Alicia, welcome. Matthew Dillon-Leitch is here; welcome, Matthew. Katie Ferguson is here, and, I understand, Duncan Thompson and Michael Wooder. Thank you very much for being with us today. Welcome.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I'd like to welcome Emily Hartman, an intern in my office, who is in the gallery today to watch question period.

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** I, too, would like to welcome a couple of folks here at Queen's Park to have lunch with me today: Kate Mackinnon and Ben Normand.

**Mr. Tony Ruprecht:** I have the real pleasure to introduce some very distinguished guests and visitors who are showcasing the great musical talents of young Canadians. They are Mr. Sridhar Iyengar, director of multicultural markets for the Bank of Montreal; Mr. Durval Terceira, business manager of LIUNA Local 183 labourers' union; Franco LaMagna and Zack Werner, iSTARS artist development, Musical Performing Arts Centre; Alan Ko, from OMNI television; Mr. João Vicente, from the OMNI diversity programming department; and Mr. John Santos, the founder and musical director of the national singing contest. Since they are celebrating their fifth anniversary today, I'd like to invite all the members to the festivities in room 163 at 11:30, right after question period.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### ENERGY POLICIES

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. For eight years, Premier McGuinty has taken billions of dollars from Ontario families and thrown it away on expensive energy experiments. Rates have skyrocketed. Seniors and parents try to avoid a 150% rate hike for mandatory time of use by getting up early to shower and staying up late to do the laundry. He has turned a temporary debt retirement charge into a permanent tax grab. Adding insult to injury, he slaps the greedy HST tax grab on top of all of it.

Ontario PCs think that's wrong, which is why our leader announced that an Ontario PC government will give families relief by taking the HST off residential hydro and home heating bills and removing the so-called debt retirement charge from their hydro bills. Minister, why won't you?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** For the second week in a row, the Leader of the Opposition has made another huge rookie mistake. Let me get this straight: You want to replace the clean energy benefit that's taking 10% off people's bills with a scheme that's going to take 8% off people's bills? That's going to cost Ontario families 2% more.

Then you want to take the \$350 million a year that's being put on to the hydro debt that you created when you were in power and add that to the provincial deficit. How is that credible? How does that help Ontario families?

Then on top of that, you want to put thousands of Ontario workers out of work. You want to tear down our

clean energy economy. You want to damage our international reputation.

This is a desperate Leader of the Opposition resorting to desperate promises that Ontario families are going to see right—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** The fact is that Premier McGuinty has simply forgotten what it's like to have to worry about paying the bills. After eight years in power, he's simply too tired and too out of touch with families and seniors who are struggling to keep up.

The Ontario PC caucus has been listening to people in our communities who are feeling squeezed, which is why our plan to take the HST off residential hydro and home heating bills and to remove the so-called debt retirement charge from hydro bills provides people with—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Stop the clock. The Minister of Research and Innovation will withdraw the comment that he just made.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Please continue.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Our plan will provide Ontario families with \$275 in immediate relief. Why doesn't Premier McGuinty listen to Ontario families and seniors who say they can't afford his tax increases and skyrocketing hydro bills?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I think the Minister of Finance has a thing or two to say about that, so I'm going to refer that to him.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** This is a reckless plan, and it is completely false that Ontario families will save \$275. That party lacks credibility. They bring in the debt retirement charge; now they're going to take it off. They're going to eliminate the 10% Ontario clean energy benefit. They're going to eliminate the northern Ontario energy credit.

Let me tell you what else they're going to have to do: They're going to have to close hospitals and close schools. It was 16 years ago today that the former leader of that party looked at the camera and said, "It is not my plan to close hospitals." They closed hospitals. They closed schools.

**1040**

This is a reckless plan that lacks credibility—no numbers. I'll be filling in the blanks on all of that as we engage this debate. Ontarians will reject your—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Members will please come to order.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Member for Peterborough.

Final supplementary.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Despite the Minister of Finance's bluster, the \$275 that an Ontario PC government would provide to Ontario families has been costed,

is realistic and can be done. All told, an Ontario PC government would give a 23% break to seniors and families on their hydro bills and we will give Ontario families a choice on how to save money by pulling the plug on mandatory time of use.

We are giving families and seniors a clear choice this October: another government led by Premier McGuinty who will increase their taxes and hike their hydro bills even more, or an Ontario PC government that respects them and gives them relief from tax increases and skyrocketing hydro bills.

How can you justify asking Ontario families and seniors to pay more?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** This reckless plan will cost jobs, raise the deficit, raise the debt, and they refuse to say what hospitals they will close.

Let me fill in some of the blanks. They are proposing \$1.3 billion in cuts and they've proposed no new revenue. We know what that means: That means that nurses will be laid off. That means cuts to education. That means cuts to the environment. That means a reckless approach that lacks credibility.

We've laid out a plan that is lowering prices for consumers across Ontario, that's building a new grid and that is building a better and safer supply of energy. Their plan is reckless, it lacks credibility and it will force the closure of hospitals and schools to accommodate their numbers that simply don't add up. No credibility and—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

#### ENERGY POLICIES

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** To the energy minister: The Ontario PCs are offering Ontario families and seniors who struggle to pay their hydro bills some much-needed immediate relief. Premier McGuinty said just yesterday when we were talking about this that he'll keep doing what he has been doing. Well, what has he been doing? He has been raising taxes and putting hydro bills through the roof. He's so desperate for money that he's still charging the debt retirement charge, even though the debt it goes to was paid off in 2010. We know it's true: He will keep doing what he has been doing because he says he will keep collecting the debt retirement charge until 2018, an extra six years. That's \$6.3 billion more out of the pockets of Ontario families.

Minister, why will you take billions from the pockets of Ontario families for a debt they've already paid?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Let me remind the member for Simcoe–Grey what he said in this House—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** I've warned the member from Lanark previously about some of these comments, and I'm just going to ask that he withdraw the comment that he just made, please.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** I withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Let me remind the member for Simcoe–Grey what he said with pride just two months ago: “I brought in the debt retirement charge”—the debt retirement charge—“when I was Minister of Energy.”

Let me tell you where he's wrong: The debt is not paid off. I invite him to look at the financial statements of the province of Ontario. They did not pay it off. In fact, this scheme that they've put forward today reminds me of the scheme they put forward 10 years ago that closed—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member from Halton will withdraw the comment that he just made.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** I withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Minister.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** They don't want to hear the facts. Their plan will force the closure of schools and hospitals, raise the debt and raise the deficit. They'll lengthen the period of time it takes to balance the budget. It is reckless. It's irresponsible. It will lead to cuts in health care and education. We will fight them every step of the way—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Supplementary? The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** They don't like it when somebody decides to do the right thing.

The Ontario PC leader wants to give seniors and families relief; Premier McGuinty wants to give them a permanent tax grab. Budget 2011 shows that Ontario families have already paid \$9.7 billion for a residual stranded debt that was \$7.8 billion. The debt is paid off, but you've pocketed \$2 billion more in debt retirement charges since it was paid off. The Premier won't say what he has done with the money. He just says he'll keep doing what he has been doing, collecting the debt retirement charge until 2018.

Ontario families and seniors need immediate relief from skyrocketing hydro bills. An Ontario PC government will give them just that. Why won't you?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Let me refer the people of Ontario to the Auditor General's 2010 annual report, where he speaks about the debt retirement charge and the stranded debt. It was introduced in 1999 by that party. Here's what he said: “Initially, little progress was made in reducing the stranded debt.” However, over the last few years, it has been steadily decreasing. According to the Auditor General, the stranded debt is now \$14.8 billion. We've reduced it \$6 billion. They are not levelling—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member from Simcoe–Grey will withdraw the comment that he just made.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** I withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Minister?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** This is referred to as the province's stranded debt by the Auditor General. You've been caught out. You're not levelling with the people of Ontario. You raised their bills. You raised their debt. You

raised their deficit. You undermine the future stability of this province. Your plan is reckless, it's irresponsible. We'll fight you in the streets, every corner—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Stop the clock.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I'll tell you what undermines this province's ability to trim the deficit: his secret OPSEU deals and bonuses for those people at eHealth who wasted a billion dollars.

Ontario families make sacrifices to pay up to \$84 a year for debt retirement charges. The public record shows that the debt was paid off last year. They shouldn't have to pay for the debt retirement charge any longer. That's the residual stranded debt, Minister. But you've turned the DRC into a permanent tax grab. Financial statements of the independent commission responsible for hydro debt show they paid the debt. The Premier will keep doing what he's doing until families and seniors have paid \$16 billion for a \$7.8-billion debt.

**1050**

It is no wonder that Ontario families are looking for a change. An Ontario PC government is offering to give them permanent relief on their hydro bills. Why is Premier McGuinty only offering to give them a permanent new tax grab?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** At the time the debt retirement charge was brought in—I'd like to read a quote from Canada's new foreign affairs minister, because he's a very credible politician. At the time, in 1998, he said, "I think we're looking at 10 to 17 years, depending on conditions," to pay it off, and he was right. The Auditor General has verified that. You've ignored the Auditor General's report. You refuse to look at facts.

This plan has no credibility. It will raise the deficit and debt. They will have to cut hospitals; they will have to cut education, Mr. Speaker. We will fight them at every street corner in Ontario. The people of Ontario will see through the rhetoric over there and listen to people like the Auditor General. They'll do right; they'll vote for a government that will build on our health care and our education, eliminate our deficit, and bring down the debt in a—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Acting Premier. Over the last two weeks, we've watched the Premier avoid serious questions about the state of his government after eight long years in office: meddling with freedom-of-information requests, public dollars ending up in the coffers of the Ontario Liberal Party, and a culture of entitlement from a government that has gotten way too comfortable after that eight years in office.

Maybe the Acting Premier can tell us: Does the Premier of Ontario really believe that there are no problems here and the McGuinty Liberal status quo is actually working?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** We have expanded freedom of information; we have improved accessibility to information not just for the hydro agencies but for hospitals and universities and colleges.

In terms of political contributions, there are rules which we all follow, and I'm confident that those rules are strong rules and that, where there are challenges, errors can be corrected.

This government has a record of openness and accountability that is unparalleled in Ontario's history. We will continue to build on that. We will continue to improve the public services that Ontarians rely on, and we'll continue to offer a credible economic plan that will help build a better future for our children and grandchildren.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** These are issues that matter to families. While Liberal staff try to hide the facts about the unfair HST, and colleges and utilities spend scarce resources at Liberal fundraisers, Ontarians are paying the highest tuition in Canada, the highest electricity rates in Canada, and \$800 a year in harmonized sales tax.

The public dollars we invest in schools and utilities don't belong to the Liberal Party. The government of Ontario doesn't belong to the Liberal Party. Why don't the McGuinty Liberals get that?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I think what Ontarians care about is health care. They care about the fact that we've introduced greater accountability in health care. We now measure a whole variety of services and wait times. According to outside independent observers, we are bringing those wait times down. That's what accountability is all about.

I think Ontarians are concerned about accountability in their school system, and that's why we've invested in the Education Quality and Accountability Office that helps parents and families understand how their kids are doing in school.

That's why we're making investments. That's the kind of accountability people in Ontario are interested in. They're not interested in false accusations and innuendo. They're interested in better schools, better health care. This government and party have a plan to continue to build on a record of success in those areas.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** After eight long years of this government's mandate, families are tired of a government that puts them last with an unfair sales tax that makes life less affordable, with closed emergency rooms and a growing wait-list for long-term care, and with the highest electricity prices and tuition fees anywhere in Canada. They are even more tired because they see that government putting themselves first, time and time again.

How can the government find time to meddle in freedom-of-information requests when they haven't

found the time to confront the challenges that families are facing?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Over a year ago, the NDP promised to post their expenses online. We just checked, and they're not there. Shame on you.

Let me caution the leader of the third party: Those of us on this side of the House are ready to go. We're implementing full-day learning, even though they stood against it. We are continuing to reduce wait times in our hospital emergency rooms, even though they don't want to do that. We are prepared to help low-income Ontarians with the support of truly progressive Ontarians. That's why I don't understand why they voted against the child benefit. We on this side are prepared for the future. We're building the future, we've laid out a plan to get there and we're raring to go. The ideas we're putting forward will build better schools and health care and a better future for our children.

Where are your ideas? Get out of this innuendo and—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is also to the Acting Premier. Families struggling to stay afloat want a little bit of help from their government, but their needs just don't seem to be a priority. The government can't find the time to give a straight answer on the HST, but they have plenty of time to stop freedom-of-information requests about it. The government can't find the money to give families a break, but public money keeps turning up at Liberal fundraisers. When did this government's priorities get so out of whack?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** We've laid out a plan, we've laid out 10 studies by independent economists, we've debated this across the province, and, by the way, we welcome the support and the acknowledgment by the Conservative Party of Ontario this morning that they're going to keep the HST. That was really, really an important announcement that was lost on many people this morning. We welcome that.

And let me tell you: We are going to continue to implement full-day learning for our kids; we're going to continue to innovate in health care to protect public health care in Ontario; we're going to continue to build a better environment for our children and lay out a plan to get back to balance as we build those public services, as we improve them, because that's what families want. I urge the leader of the third party to come clean on what you're going to do with the HST. Forget the innuendo and talk about what people really want to talk about: their schools and their hospitals and their health care system.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I'm listening to what people are saying, and here's what people are telling us. Nick and Judy Caruso in the Soo write, "Every time we see a little daylight, we seem to face another hike in our day-to-day expenses—groceries, heating, gasoline, taxes etc.

Help us to enjoy our senior years without worry." That's their plea.

Can the Acting Premier tell us how it is that the McGuinty Liberals can find money for everything from corporate tax giveaways to eHealth bonuses, but Nick and Judy can't manage to scratch a break from this government?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** When we found money for the Ontario clean energy benefit to lower rates by 10%, that member and her party voted against it. They said we should only have given 8%. When we created the Ontario child benefit to lower taxes for Ontario's most vulnerable and to help families with their children, that member and her party voted against it. When we created the northern energy credit for homeowners and businesses in the north, that member and her party didn't support it.

What she won't tell Ontarians is what she is going to do about the HST. We know that, like the Conservatives, she will keep it. That was a great announcement this morning, I must say. Judging by the looks on their faces, they are a little bit surprised by that.

This government has a plan. This party will take it to the people in October, and the people will vote for better schools and better health care, and reject the reckless plan of the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Margaret Leishman in Mississauga writes, "My husband and I are struggling to pay the high cost of heating and electricity bills with the addition of the HST. We have to sit with blankets on in the winter to keep warm, since we have to keep the thermostat down to try and save on the gas. We do everything possible to keep the hydro bills down as well, but to no avail."

Margaret could only have dreamed of getting the \$5,000 cheque that paid for admission to the Premier's fundraising dinner. When is he going to make her a priority?

**1100**

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Why, then, did that party vote against every tax break we've brought forward? Why don't they stand up for working families? That's precisely what we've done. And you know, the leader of the third party was strangely silent last week when the opposition decided to cancel 53,000 clean energy jobs.

Let me read you some quotes about that from people who actually work in these places. Somebody named Misty Oakley, a Siliken employee with three children who was on social assistance before securing her job, said that employment with the solar manufacturer means security and a good future for her family.

Get with us. Join us as we continue to implement a green energy plan that builds jobs, that will ensure a better future for our families and children as we invest in better health care and education. That's what the future is; that's what the people of Ontario want to hear about. Let's hear something of a plan—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

## EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** My question is to the Acting Premier. When the billion-dollar eHealth boondoggle first started breaking, the Premier dodged, he deflected and he stonewalled. He said everything was fine, that he had things under control, that rules were in place and he expected them to be followed. But then, the McGuinty government didn't get eHealth under control.

Now Ontario families are waking up to news that they still haven't gotten control of this runaway agency. Ontario families are looking for leadership from Premier McGuinty, but he's a no-show. He's missing in action. Is this the type of leadership that Dalton McGuinty is talking about?

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** I've reminded the honourable member in the past about the use of names.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Is this the type of leadership Premier McGuinty is talking about when he says we should keep doing what we're doing?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Let me say that I take the issue of compensation at eHealth seriously. I know Ontarians take it seriously, and that's why yesterday I spoke to the president and the chair of eHealth Ontario. I asked them to go back and take another look at this decision in light of the fiscal circumstances that we find ourselves in. That review is under way now, and I'm looking forward to the report back from eHealth Ontario.

eHealth has made tremendous progress over the past little while. We are back on track, and I look forward to the supplementary.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** It's clear that eHealth doesn't care what the finance minister, the Premier or the Minister of Government Services say. They don't respect them. You keep going to the well, and it's Ontario families who have to keep paying for all of the blunders at eHealth. Watching them let the architects of the billion-dollar eHealth boondoggle stick Ontario families with paying this bill again is why people are losing faith in this government. eHealth awarded pay increases and bonuses as though Ontario families did not go through a recession.

You said you had things under control, but the Premier, his Minister of Government Services and you are nowhere to be found when it comes to enforcing the rules protecting Ontario families' interests. Something has to change. It has to come from the start. Why didn't Premier McGuinty pay closer attention to this runaway eHealth agency, or is he just going to continue to do what he's been doing?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I think I've responded that we've asked eHealth to take a good, hard look at this decision, and I look forward to what they have to say. I can tell you that my focus is on getting results for the people of Ontario.

I just want to use this opportunity to describe one initiative under eHealth Ontario that is making a profound difference for people who have suffered brain injuries.

The ENITS program—emergency neurosurgery image transfer system—is allowing people to get the care they need in their local hospitals while obtaining expert advice from neurosurgeons who are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, because the images are available to those experts.

This initiative alone has saved \$50 million—\$50 million that we're putting into better front-line health care. This is one of many examples where eHealth is—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

## CORONER'S INQUEST

**Mr. Howard Hampton:** I have a question for the Attorney General. Over the last week, the Attorney General has said in this Legislature and to the media that the long-delayed coroner's inquest into the disappearance and death of a First Nations high school student in Thunder Bay, which occurred in 2007, can now proceed. But when we called the coroner's office today we were told that the Reggie Bushie coroner's inquest in Thunder Bay is postponed. In fact, we're told that all four coroners' inquests in Thunder Bay are postponed.

Can the Attorney General tell us why he says these coroners' inquests can now proceed, but when you talk to the coroner's office, they continue to say that they're postponed?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** The heart of the issue here is to try to do whatever we can to find out what happened and what can be done to prevent tragedies like this from occurring.

I was directing my comments to my friend's questions over the past several days about the legal issues that went all the way up to the Court of Appeal, with a possibility of further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. Those issues were resolved by the Court of Appeal—we're not appealing—so that issue can no longer hold up the coroner's inquest.

The coroner is in charge of the inquest process. If there are further questions about that, I'll send them over to my friend the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Howard Hampton:** The Attorney General continues to say that everything is resolved, but he only need read the recent decision of the regional senior judge in northwestern Ontario, Madam Justice Pierce, who looked very specifically at the issue of whether or not the jury panels in Thunder Bay district are representative or not. She looked specifically at the question and she said, just a couple of weeks ago, "It is evident to me on the testimony before the court that the process for selecting members of the First Nation communities to serve on jury panels is not representative of the population of the district of Thunder Bay"—and that's why none of these coroners' inquests are going forward.

The parents are no closer to getting the answers they deserve now—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you, Minister?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** As I said, the heart of this issue is what else can be done, what could be done and who can do it to try to make sure that terrible tragedies like this don't occur in the future.

We're working very hard within government. The coroner's inquest—the coroner is in charge of that process; they'll deal with that. That legal issue that went to the Court of Appeal—they gave a decision. We're not taking an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. We're all working very hard and we're all hoping that anything that can be found will be found and anything that can be done will be done to try to prevent terrible tragedies like this from happening in the future.

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** This question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. The opposition is confused about our province's green energy plan and the thousands of jobs it is creating across Ontario. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to Ontario's investment by Samsung in renewable energy manufacturing capacity in unparliamentary terms and has called Ontario's feed-in tariff program "unsustainable."

Regions everywhere in the world disagree. They look to renewable energy as they compare the capital costs of baseload generation, the poisoning of the atmosphere from burning dirty coal and the need for a distributed electricity grid with generation from diverse sources.

Will the minister clarify what Samsung's investment in Ontario and the feed-in tariff program have done to develop Ontario's world-class green energy industry and create high-value—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you, Minister?

**Hon. Sandra Pupatello:** I'm delighted to answer this question because the people on this side of the House are interested in going around the world and bringing new companies to Ontario to invest in clean energy—and the best example of that is an investment deal of billions of dollars by Samsung. So this so-called deal that the opposition wants to refer to is actually billions of dollars of investment that Samsung is making in Ontario, creating those jobs and the whole supply chain that that creates across our economy.

We are meeting these people every day, people like Sean Moore from Unconquered Sun, who moved from the auto industry to start a business and who is already selling to American counterparts in the area of green energy.

This is a great contrast between us and the opposition. They are for dirty coal; we're for clean—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Supplementary?

1110

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Minister, there should be no illusions or confusion as to what Samsung's investments in

Ontario and the feed-in-tariff program are all about, and what a huge boost they are to Ontario's growing world-class green energy industry.

Ontario's much-acclaimed green energy plan builds the green energy sector in Ontario and enhances many other manufacturing and science-based industries as well. It's one of the factors in Ontario's first-ever economic recovery from a recession without a corresponding US economic rebound.

Will the minister describe how Samsung's investment and the feed-in tariff program have helped create world-class green energy supply chains and helped business people start, relocate and expand world-class, profitable industries here in Ontario in a leading-edge 21<sup>st</sup>-century industry?

**Hon. Sandra Pupatello:** Thank you, and this is important. It's important that the people in Sault Ste. Marie understand that the steel from Sault Ste. Marie is going to those turbines that are being built by Samsung. Some \$7 billion worth of investment: That's the deal that Samsung is making with Ontario.

Just for contrast, the Leader of the Opposition is part of a history government that created the attempt at privatization and cost us \$20 billion in debt for hydro, compared to our government creating a \$7-billion investment deal in Ontario that creates a supply chain: everything from racking and solar panels to turbines and blades to people in Tillsonburg understanding that they are part of this clean, green energy renewal. That's the difference between the past and the future.

#### EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** My question is to the Acting Premier. In my previous question, I couldn't believe my ears when the Minister of Health defended taxpayers being billed for yet another scandal at eHealth. Ontario families are looking for the Premier to show leadership and get control over this runaway agency.

They can't count on you or the Minister of Government Services: He says the 10% bonuses were within the so-called "tough new rules" that you brought in. They can't count on the Minister of Health: She just offers crocodile tears, blames you for not following the rules and blames the runaway agency for not following them.

They're not self-regulated. Ontario families are paying you to do the job. Why isn't anyone in the McGuinty government able to defend Ontario families—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Acting Premier?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Health to defend Ontario families.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I have to confess that I'm a tiny bit confused by the question, but let me do my best.

I have a quote that I'd like to read about eHealth. "The province of Ontario, by the way, has taken some important steps forward in terms of electronic health records and so on. These are very important. The province is looking for savings ... I know that the provinces have to

be efficient and effective in health care, just as they know we're going to have some significant increases in health care over time." Who's singing the praise of Ontario's eHealth strategy? Jim Flaherty.

Let me just tell you that we are working very hard to improve front-line care. The personal support workers are with us today. Those are the heroes. Those are the people we're working for.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Speaker, I'm sure that Jim Flaherty and the folks up there are just as ashamed of her as I am for the amount of money that they have let slip away at this troubled agency.

The Minister of Health says that she met with her troubled eHealth agency after they got caught handing out 10% merit pay bonuses during a recession. It is hard to know what she had to say. You had your moral authority undermined to protect Ontario families from runaway spending on pay increases when you did nothing to deal with arbitrators and union bosses who called your bluff on a wage freeze. Then you got caught handing out secret wage hikes to OPSEU and others, and then you handed Ron Sapsford a secret settlement to go away from eHealth. If the Liberal billion-dollar boondoggle didn't get the McGuinty Liberals to make changes at eHealth, then what will?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I am very, very proud of the progress that is happening at eHealth Ontario. Make no mistake: I have asked the CEO and the chair to review the decision that was made and I'm giving them a few days to do exactly that.

In the meantime, we're looking at getting results for families. In fact, we're very concerned about your announcement this morning. Your announcement will actually increase visits to emergency departments, because as the air gets dirtier, more children will be coming to our emergency departments. Asthma is one of the leading causes of children coming to emergency departments. By cleaning the air, we're reducing that demand.

The people opposite want to smog up the air again. We're with the children in this province; we're on the side of clean air.

## TUITION

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** To the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities: Later today, the University of Toronto governing council—without even holding a vote, as I understand it—will impose a new flat-fee structure for students in the faculty of arts and sciences. Starting in September, students who take only three courses will be forced to pay for five courses. This will increase tuition fees by a staggering 66%. Does the minister support this plan?

**Hon. John Milloy:** I'm very proud that our government has worked very hard to make sure that post-secondary education is affordable for students in the province of Ontario. For the past number of years, we have worked to cap tuition and at the same time put

forward one of the most generous student assistance programs in the country.

Some of the changes that we brought in about a year ago have addressed a variety of concerns that were brought forward to us from student groups and organizations.

It's very interesting; we did an exercise, which I'm very happy to share with members, where we looked at a student from a family that was earning \$70,000 a year. When we took office, if that student went away to study, he would have received about \$4,000 in loans. Under our program, the same student would receive \$12,000 in a combination of loans and grants.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I'm not sure how this blah, blah, blah—or, to put it more delicately, this blather—is going to help students.

On the ground, university education is becoming less and less affordable for Ontario students, who pay the highest fees in Canada and shoulder the heaviest debt load.

Over 4,000 students, parents, faculty and alumni have voiced their opposition to the U of T flat-fee model because it penalizes students. Why won't the minister show some leadership and require the University of Toronto and all Ontario universities to end this unfair flat fee?

**Hon. John Milloy:** Quite frankly, I find it galling that a member of a party that, when they were in power, cut student aid by 48% and allowed tuition to increase by 50%, would stand up and do nothing short of applaud our efforts to make sure that post-secondary education in the province of Ontario is affordable.

We have a tuition framework in place which limits tuition increases at colleges and universities. If colleges and universities do take advantage of that, they have to provide additional funding and support to students who are in need.

I am proud of the fact that in the province of Ontario we have the most generous student assistance program in the country, which is benefiting students and has seen an additional 140,000 students at our colleges and universities.

I have no lessons to take from a member—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

## ELECTORAL REFORM

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** My question is for the Attorney General. In the recent federal election, voters in my riding of Guelph were allegedly subjected to extreme voter-suppression tactics. I heard from many of my constituents who received automated telephone messages claiming to be from Elections Canada and directing them to go to a new polling location. They went to the new polling location; there was no poll there.

My constituents are understandably angry that someone deliberately misled them and interfered with their democratic right to vote.

Some voters barely got back to the right poll in time to vote; others may never have gotten back to the right poll.

I know that people in Guelph who were directly targeted by this organized scam are glad that we are taking action.

Attorney General, how exactly will our—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** The member for Guelph raises a very important issue that concerns us all: the right of individuals to exercise their freedom to vote, their right to vote; their very precious democratic expression, without interference, without it being undermined.

1120

These amendments to the Election Act will specifically prohibit—because the act doesn't contain that now—people from interfering with an elector's right to vote; specifically prohibit somebody from interfering, from representing themselves as a candidate or as an elections official; and specifically raise the penalties for any such corrupt practice to a \$25,000 fine and potentially two years less a day in jail; strong protections for conduct we should all—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** My constituents in Guelph are glad that the government is taking action. It's obvious to me and it's obvious to them that removing any interference with voting should be of paramount importance to all members of this Legislature. We are, after all, a key institution in the functioning of true democracy, empowered by the people of Ontario to act on their behalf. That is why I was shocked by the reaction of some to the introduction of this legislation designed specifically to protect the right to vote. I can't understand why anyone would want to delay passage of this important legislation.

Can the Attorney General explain to this House why it is so important that we get these changes made?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I would have thought it was important to us all. I would have thought it was important—I know it's important to all Ontarians because, however they exercise their right to vote, they want to be able to—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member from Simcoe North, the member for Lanark, please come to order.

Minister?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Why are people trying to shout down these very important pieces of information? Why would anyone not want an elector to be able to go to the right polling station to cast their ballot? Why would anyone think it was okay to represent themselves as an election official or represent themselves as a candidate from another party when they were not? Why would anyone in any way condone or accept that activity? I call on the members opposite, who are so loud right now, to stand up and support—

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Thank you. New question.

#### HOSPITAL FUNDING

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** My question is for the Minister of Health. The government's budget papers indicate that she plans to spend more than \$2.5 billion on hospital infrastructure this year. My constituents in Wellington-Halton Hills deserve their fair share. When will the minister announce the capital grant for the Georgetown Hospital renovation project and when will she announce the planning grant and approval for the Groves Memorial Community Hospital in Centre Wellington to move to the next stage of planning for our new hospitals?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite for the question. I understand that Georgetown Hospital has submitted a proposal to expand their emergency department. The Minister of Infrastructure and my ministry and others are currently developing a 10-year plan so we can continue with building the infrastructure in this province.

I do understand why the member opposite might be a little antsy about this because if, by any chance, his government ends up in power after the next election, I think we'll see a screeching halt to any capital development whatsoever.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** That is utter nonsense and the minister knows it. Excuses and political bafflegab—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Stop the clock. Members will please come to order. Minister, your seatmate wants to hear the question.

Continue.

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** We have made our case for these projects. I've raised our hospital issues time and time again in this House, as members know. I've said I didn't believe that the Liberals would be so miserable as to punish our communities by ignoring our hospital needs because of past voting patterns. I'm beginning to wonder if I gave the Liberal Party too much credit.

The council of the town of Halton Hills needs an immediate answer on what support you'll extend for Georgetown Hospital. My Wellington county constituents are anticipating an announcement on the Groves project. When will the government do the right thing and approve our hospital projects, as my constituents deserve?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can tell you is that when we came to office in 2003, we inherited a disgraceful deficit when it came to our health care infrastructure. You know that, Speaker.

We are the party that, when we had the chance, started to build. We have built 18 brand new hospitals across this province—18 brand new hospitals. You're the party that closed hospitals. We have 100 major capital projects across this province and we intend to keep on building.

I think what you have to think hard about is whether you really want to be part of a party that wants to cut health care, because you cannot cut taxes without cutting health care. The first thing that will go, once you fire the nurses, is that you will close the hospitals. It's what you did before, and I would love you to stand up and say, "Keep on going," when it comes to building.

### INSURANCE RATES

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Acting Premier. This week, Ontario's insurance brokers joined a chorus of consumers and anti-poverty group in demanding an end to the use of credit scores to obtain home insurance. They've actually launched a website called [soaringinsurancerates.ca](http://soaringinsurancerates.ca) that says that about half of the big insurance companies are using credit scores to set premiums and even to deny coverage.

Why won't this government listen to the insurance brokers, to the consumers' groups, to the anti-poverty groups and ban the use of credit scores in the home insurance industry?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** In fact, we do meet with all of those groups. We have applied those rules to certain forms of insurance. We will continue to work with them.

But I am most proud of our record on auto insurance and how we've held the rate of growth on costs in auto insurance, because that's what matters to people. They've got better insurance at lower costs. We'll continue to work with consumers and the industry to ensure that we have a strong, vibrant insurance industry: home and auto. That's important to Ontarians. I'm glad we've been able to keep the rate increases low, certainly lower than the previous government, and lower than they were in the early 1990s. That's a record to be proud of. We'll continue to work with everyone in the industry, particularly consumers, to keep their prices down.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Perhaps this is information for the Acting Premier. The brokers looked at one insurance company known to aggressively rely on credit scoring. They found that credit scoring increased premiums by up to \$762 annually. Evidence shows that credit scoring discriminates against those with low incomes as well as newcomers.

Why won't this government make it easier and more affordable to obtain home insurance and ban credit scoring in the home insurance industry once and for all?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Let me give the leader of the third party just a number of the things that we've done. First of all, our government banned the use of credit scores on auto insurance. We eliminated the backdoor use of credit scores when it comes to quoting rates for a consumer. Going forward, we will continue to look into the use of credit scores. It's important that, just like our five-year review, we have a balanced approach.

The leader of the third party is probably not aware that in November, the Canadian Council of Insurance Regulators, the CCIR, posted the results of a questionnaire.

She probably didn't want to put this into her question, because it might tend to undermine the premise of it, but let me just make sure the people of Ontario get the complete story: They are now reviewing and examining the issues surrounding the use of credit information by insurers across the country so that they can work in tandem.

That's what's important. Why didn't you say that in your question? You know what's going on. It's another—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Thank you. New question.

### CONSUMER PROTECTION

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. Every member of this House and the government of Ontario work diligently to serve and assist seniors in our communities. We do so because too many seniors cannot protect themselves from the underhanded tactics of unconscientious scam artists. This is compounded when the perpetrators approach unsuspecting seniors under the names of recognizable agencies such as Summit Energy, Direct Energy, Just Energy and Active Energy. In some cases, seniors are forced to deal with a new contract they have never signed. In other cases, they incur higher costs they did not expect and are forced to pay heavy penalties if they wish to cancel. Sometimes they are told straight up that getting out of the contract is impossible.

Minister, my seniors are asking that these underhanded practices be stopped—no more abuses. They would like to hear from you.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I want to thank the member for York West for his question and let him know that I share his concerns and the concerns of his constituents about some of the unfair practices in the retail energy industry.

1130

Retailer conduct and contracts are the number one issue that the Ontario Energy Board used to hear about when it came to complaints, particularly from vulnerable consumers like the seniors the member cares so dearly about. That's why we brought in the Energy Consumer Protection Act, which took effect on January 1 of this year. Through this act, we've greatly strengthened protection for consumers by making sure the contracts offered by retailers are clear and concise, that there are ways out and that those who come to the door have to abide by a strict set of rules.

I'll be happy to expand on that further, but I want to thank the member for York West for his question and for always standing up for seniors in his community.

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** Michele Colandrea, Vincenzo Angelucci, Vincenzo Panacci, Placido Mongillo and Mario Iannuzzi are only a few of the many seniors who have been subjected to similar and other scams. Every week, we see someone who has been approached under misleading pretences, and this not only leaves our seniors shaken and frustrated but, all too often, bitter that their sincerity was abused and taken advantage of by un-

scrupulous individuals. Yes, they were indeed carrying a clipboard.

Therefore, I ask the Minister how he sees this concern and how he addresses these abuses, because our seniors deserve respect and honesty from those who may come to their door.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Grazie to the member. The simple fact of the matter is, the previous PC government opened up the market to energy consumers. When they did that, they failed to put in place any protections or safeguards for consumers whatsoever—another in a long list of the negative legacy that that party left behind when it came to the energy system.

We're seeing more of that today. When we look back to their legacy, part of their legacy was the hydro debt that they left behind. They brought in a debt retirement charge, and they didn't use that to pay down the debt. It's part of the legacy that we've had to deal with. Our finance minister will tell that you we've paid that debt down steadily since we've been in office.

Now they've got this reckless scheme which would have the effect of actually increasing bills by 2%. We stand by our clean energy benefit that's taking bills down by 10%.

They brought up their use of dirty coal by 127%. We're eliminating the use of dirty coal, and we're going to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Thank you. New question.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question is for the Minister of Education. Minister, under your government, only 56% of elementary schools in Ontario have a teacher-librarian. This is 24% lower than a decade ago. A clear trend is emerging: Despite the billions spent on education, Ontario families and students are paying more and getting less.

Libraries today are information and research centres. In a digital era, they are needed more than ever. Will you show leadership and conduct a review of school libraries to develop strategies to ensure their future?

**Hon. Leona Dombrowsky:** That is very rich coming from a member who, when in government, only cut education. This government has invested in education, and we've increased our investment by 46% since we've come to government.

That party cuts education. That party does not support full-day kindergarten. What we know today from the announcement that was just made is that our families should be very worried about the cuts that will be coming in education to pay for their reckless plan in energy.

When it comes to investing in education and investing in libraries, our government has a record. It's a solid record, and I would put it beside their plan any day.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Again to the Minister of Education: It has to be extremely disappointing for the thousands of people throughout the province of Ontario who are seriously concerned about the elimination of libraries in our schools to hear the minister refuse to address the issue.

Minister, you responded to the parents in Windsor who opposed the dismantling of the Windsor-Essex Catholic District School Board libraries in a very weak way. You urged them to do something, but you are the only person who has the power to correct this situation.

I say to you again: Remember, our libraries are information and research centres. Will you direct your ministry to review the situation and develop strategies to ensure the future of our libraries for future generations?

**Hon. Leona Dombrowsky:** I say that the people of Ontario will remember the deep cuts that libraries suffered under the previous government. People for Education's report made it very clear that between 1998 and 2002, libraries across Ontario suffered deep cuts at the hands of the previous government.

How we have stood up for libraries and recognized their importance is by increasing library technician and teacher-librarian technician positions by 12% since coming to government. We have also provided \$40 million over four years for libraries in elementary schools. In addition to that, we have provided \$120 million in one-time funding for library books.

They cut funding to libraries. We have only invested in libraries since we've come to government.

#### ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Minister, as you know, it's the Victoria Day weekend, otherwise known as the "May run" where we come from, a time when people get out their fishing poles and boats and are finally able to get out and do some fishing. Imagine how mad they are when they go to places like the Foleyet timber road and find out that your ministry has now blocked access to a number of lakes that families have been fishing for generations.

Why is it that your government continually tries to block access for law-abiding citizens in northern Ontario? All they want to do this weekend is go fishing, but they're prevented by your closure of roads.

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** I've said time and time again that the vast majority of crown land in Ontario—over 90%—is not restricted at all. When we actually do restrict access, it's primarily aimed at limiting motorized vehicular access to protect public safety, to protect sensitive fisheries and wildlife populations.

Again, I want to reassure the honourable member that whenever we restrict access to a crown road for any other reason than emergency public safety, my ministry seeks local input through numerous consultations and open houses. We do this because we know that local problems demand local solutions.

The truth is, road access restrictions are not new. There were road restrictions in northern Ontario when the honourable member's colleague was the Minister of Natural Resources. There were road access restrictions when the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. This has been happening for decades.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Supplement-ary?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** First of all, these lakes were all open when we were in government. They were open when the previous government was there. They were open when Dalton McGuinty got elected.

I have a list of what's being shut down on the Foleyet timber road: Dandilee Lake, Rainy Lake, Ridley Lake, North Ridley Lake, Little Ridley Lake, Cree Lake, Engineer Lake, Silvana Lake—there's a list of around 30 lakes just on the Foleyet timber road that have been shut down by your government over the last couple of years.

Don't come here and say you consulted. The only way people are finding out is when they go there and see the sign on the gate on the road.

I say again, why won't you open up these areas and allow people who have had access to those lakes for years to go out and do what they want to do, which is to fish on those lakes as they have for many generations?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** It's funny; whenever the honourable member from Timmins—James Bay asks me a question, I'm reminded of that old Neil Young song *You Never Call*. It's even on his album *Twisted Road*.

I could have saved the honourable member a lot of time if he'd just picked up the phone and called me. If he took the time to call me, come and see me or even tweet me, I would have told him that there are no additional road access restrictions in Timmins and Chapleau districts.

Rather than simply repeating rumours in this Legislature, the honourable member should just come and see me, and I'll give him the truth about road access restrictions. Just like the roads in northern Ontario, my door is always open.

#### ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUTH

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** My question is for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Minister, recreation and physical activity are powerful tools in supporting the development of life skills for youth and have been shown to lead to improved health, well-being and educational outcomes. That is why last spring, I was pleased to table, on behalf of my constituents, a petition encouraging our government to continue expanding youth initiatives in this province, especially in the effort to promote and improve the health of First Nations youth in Ontario.

Would the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs please provide an update on the expansion of aboriginal youth programs and how his ministry has been working to improve conditions and opportunities for these deserving young people?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** My colleague from Ottawa Centre is exactly right: These programs can make quite a magical difference in the lives of aboriginal youth who have not yet had the opportunity. Right to Play, for example: My colleague the Minister of Energy and the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs have worked hard to bring them into Ontario. There are two communities that are benefiting, and, we hope, more in the future. Canadian Tire Jumpstart has done a great job in partnering up with this ministry and with the Ministry of Health Promotion in making sure that seven communities have access to community wellness workers who engage young people in positive athletic activity, and Canadian Tire Jumpstart has provided equipment for them. We have one laptop per child that is going to five different communities in the province of Ontario.

These are just some of the initiatives. We're trying to give kids a little bit of hope and chance where they haven't had it before.

#### DEFERRED VOTES

##### TAXATION

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We have a deferred vote on Mr. Chudleigh's amendment to the amendment to Ms. Smith's motion concerning Ontario's tax plan for jobs and growth.

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

*The division bells rang from 1141 to 1146.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those in favour of Mr. Chudleigh's amendment to the amendment will please rise one at a time and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

##### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hampton, Howard	Miller, Norm
Bisson, Gilles	Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia
Chudleigh, Ted	Hillier, Randy	O'Toole, John
Clark, Steve	Horwath, Andrea	Ouellette, Jerry J.
DiNovo, Cheri	Jones, Sylvia	Savoline, Joyce
Dunlop, Garfield	Klees, Frank	Tabuns, Peter
Elliott, Christine	Kormos, Peter	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gélinas, France	Marchese, Rosario	Yakubuski, John

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time until counted by the Clerk.

##### Nays

Albanese, Laura	Gerretsen, John	Murray, Glen R.
Arthurs, Wayne	Gravelle, Michael	Naqvi, Yasir
Balkissoon, Bas	Hoskins, Eric	Pendergast, Leeanna
Bentley, Christopher	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Best, Margaret	Jaczek, Helena	Pupatello, Sandra
Bradley, James J.	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramal, Khalil
Brotten, Laurel C.	Johnson, Rick	Rinaldi, Lou
Brownell, Jim	Kular, Kuldip	Ruprecht, Tony
Cansfield, Donna H.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sandals, Liz
Chiarelli, Bob	Leal, Jeff	Sergio, Mario
Colle, Mike	Levac, Dave	Smith, Monique

Crozier, Bruce  
Delaney, Bob  
Dickson, Joe  
Dombrowsky, Leona  
Duguid, Brad  
Duncan, Dwight

Mathews, Deborah  
McMeekin, Ted  
McNeely, Phil  
Meilleur, Madeleine  
Milloy, John  
Mitchell, Carol

Sousa, Charles  
Takhar, Harinder S.  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

Elliott, Christine  
Gélinas, France

Kormos, Peter  
Marchese, Rosario

Witmer, Elizabeth  
Yakabuski, John

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**

The ayes are 24; the nays are 49.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion lost.

We will now deal with Mr. Yakabuski's amendment to the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Is it agreed? Same vote? Agreed.

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**

The ayes are 24; the nays are 49.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion lost.

We'll now deal with the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that Ms. Smith's motion concerning Ontario's tax plan for jobs and growth carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1150 to 1151.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Albanese, Laura  
Arthurs, Wayne  
Balkissoon, Bas  
Bentley, Christopher  
Best, Margaret  
Bradley, James J.  
Brotten, Laurel C.  
Brownell, Jim  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Chiarelli, Bob  
Colle, Mike  
Crozier, Bruce  
Delaney, Bob  
Dickson, Joe  
Dombrowsky, Leona  
Duguid, Brad  
Duncan, Dwight

Gerretsen, John  
Gravelle, Michael  
Hoskins, Eric  
Hoy, Pat  
Jaczek, Helena  
Jeffrey, Linda  
Johnson, Rick  
Kular, Kuldip  
Lalonde, Jean-Marc  
Leal, Jeff  
Levac, Dave  
Mathews, Deborah  
McMeekin, Ted  
McNeely, Phil  
Meilleur, Madeleine  
Milloy, John  
Mitchell, Carol

Murray, Glen R.  
Naqvi, Yasir  
Pendergast, Leeanna  
Phillips, Gerry  
Pupatello, Sandra  
Ramal, Khalil  
Rinaldi, Lou  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Sandals, Liz  
Sergio, Mario  
Smith, Monique  
Sousa, Charles  
Takhar, Harinder S.  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

**Nays**

Arnott, Ted  
Bisson, Gilles  
Chudleigh, Ted  
Clark, Steve  
DiNovo, Cheri  
Dunlop, Garfield

Hampton, Howard  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Hillier, Randy  
Horwath, Andrea  
Jones, Sylvia  
Klees, Frank

Miller, Norm  
Munro, Julia  
O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Savoline, Joyce  
Tabuns, Peter

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**  
The ayes are 49; the nays are 24.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**TIME ALLOCATION**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We now have a deferred vote on the motion by Mr. Phillips for allocation of time on Bill 179, An Act to amend the Child and Family Services Act respecting adoption and the provision of care and maintenance.

Call in the members—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Same vote? No?

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

*The division bells rang from 1153 to 1154.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Albanese, Laura  
Arnott, Ted  
Arthurs, Wayne  
Balkissoon, Bas  
Bentley, Christopher  
Best, Margaret  
Bradley, James J.  
Brotten, Laurel C.  
Brownell, Jim  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Chiarelli, Bob  
Chudleigh, Ted  
Clark, Steve  
Colle, Mike  
Crozier, Bruce  
Delaney, Bob  
Dickson, Joe  
Dombrowsky, Leona  
Duguid, Brad  
Duncan, Dwight  
Dunlop, Garfield  
Elliott, Christine

Gerretsen, John  
Gravelle, Michael  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Hillier, Randy  
Hoskins, Eric  
Hoy, Pat  
Jaczek, Helena  
Jeffrey, Linda  
Johnson, Rick  
Jones, Sylvia  
Klees, Frank  
Kular, Kuldip  
Lalonde, Jean-Marc  
Leal, Jeff  
Levac, Dave  
Mathews, Deborah  
McMeekin, Ted  
McNeely, Phil  
Meilleur, Madeleine  
Miller, Norm  
Milloy, John  
Mitchell, Carol

Munro, Julia  
Murray, Glen R.  
Naqvi, Yasir  
O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Pendergast, Leeanna  
Phillips, Gerry  
Pupatello, Sandra  
Ramal, Khalil  
Rinaldi, Lou  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Sandals, Liz  
Savoline, Joyce  
Sergio, Mario  
Smith, Monique  
Sousa, Charles  
Takhar, Harinder S.  
Witmer, Elizabeth  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Yakabuski, John  
Zimmer, David

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise one at a time and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Nays**

Bisson, Gilles  
DiNovo, Cheri  
Gélinas, France

Hampton, Howard  
Horwath, Andrea  
Kormos, Peter

Marchese, Rosario  
Tabuns, Peter

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**  
The ayes are 65; the nays are 8.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I don't believe we have any more deferred votes. This House stands in recess until 1 p.m.

*The House recessed from 1156 to 1300.*

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### MOOSE TAGS

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Bruce Munro and members of his hunting party were recently denied moose tag permits from the MNR. I'm told that MNR receives 100,000 moose tag applications each and every year, yet only about 3,000 moose tags are issued. For those who are not selected each year, they are put in a preferential pool for the following year's selection. Unfortunately, Bruce and his group will not be in the preferred pool this year because the ministry lost his application.

Bruce's application was not the only one that was lost, however. The ministry is offering to correct their own error if an individual can show a copy of the application and the receipt of the registered mail. However, individuals such as Bruce are less fortunate. He only has an affidavit from his local postmaster confirming that his applications were put in the mail which, according to the ministry, is not enough.

I would like to suggest to the minister the following advice: If applicants must protect themselves from the incompetence of the ministry by making copies of their submissions and sending them by registered mail, maybe people should be informed of the MNR's incompetence at the start of the process, not after the damage is done.

### AGAPE CENTRE

**Mr. Jim Brownell:** I rise in the House today to thank and pay tribute to the Agape Centre in my riding of Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry.

The Agape Centre strives to reduce the impact of poverty in the community by providing food, clothing and household items to those in need. The Agape Centre is run by a group of tireless volunteers and staff members who make sure operations run smoothly and the needs of clients are met.

Alyssa Blais, the newly appointed executive director of the centre, has been hard at work in her first four months on the job. Alyssa and her team recently achieved the fundraising goal of \$17,000 for kitchen repairs and new appliances in the centre.

The Agape Centre held a successful food drive over the Easter weekend at local grocery stores. The event brought in hundreds of food items for clients of the food bank program.

The Agape Centre is hosting an event, in partnership with the Cornwall Public Library, on May 31 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., to have a discussion about hunger and to launch their first Go Hungry 4 Agape fundraiser.

Since its founding in 1971, the Agape Centre has ensured that no family in Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry goes hungry or cold or without any of their basic necessities of life. I would like to thank everyone at the Agape Centre, and especially the volunteers, for everything they do and the support they provide to our community.

I would like at this time to congratulate and thank Alyssa, the newly appointed executive director, and the former executive director, Judy Dancause.

### JOE HUDSON

**Mr. Steve Clark:** It's an honour to rise and speak about Joe Hudson, one of the most outstanding business owners and citizens in my riding of Leeds–Grenville.

In Lyn, Joe operates Burnbrae Farms, one of Canada's leading producers and processors of eggs. In fact, Joe is known as the Omega 3 Man for Burnbrae's development of the Naturegg brand, Canada's number one omega 3 egg.

Recently, Joe was honoured with the 2011 Get Cracking Award at the Egg Farmers of Ontario annual general meeting.

Burnbrae Farms is not only a major employer in my riding, but the Hudson family is a tireless supporter of community causes. Joe has been a strong proponent of Ontario's agribusiness sector and supply management in his 31 years as a board director with the Egg Farmers of Ontario.

His daughter, Mary Jean McFall, stepped into his seat on the board and was director for 12 years, from 1998 to 2010.

Joe and his brother, Grant, took over the family farm in Lyn from their dad, Joseph, during the 1940s. It had been a dairy farm, and there's a great story about how Canada's top egg producer got its start. The idea was hatched when Joe raised 50 leghorn chickens for a high school science fair project in 1943. By the time he graduated, those 50 chickens had become 3,000. The rest, as they say, is history.

Burnbrae now has operations coast to coast and is an industry leader in innovation and product development.

On behalf of everyone in my riding, I congratulate Joe and his entire family on this latest recognition. I can think of no one more deserving.

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** I've had the opportunity recently to talk to people in my riding about the health care system. As is probably true with everyone in this chamber, people in my community treasure that public health care system. They have tremendous admiration for doctors, for nurses, for personal support workers, all those people who make that system function, who deliver the health care that they need.

But I want to tell you now that many of the people I talk to in my community feel that that system is under siege. They find that they can't find doctors, general practitioners. They find that services have been delisted.

They find long waits in emergency rooms. Most important, they're worried that this public health care system is something that could be lost, that its public nature could be lost.

Premier McGuinty, in his delisting of services, in his privatization of hospital financing, in his mismanagement of the eHealth file, has damaged our health care system. It's no wonder that people in my riding and across Ontario are worried about the health care system.

#### PERSONAL SUPPORT WORKERS

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I am very privileged today to rise and recognize the personal support workers across Ontario and the dozens of PSWs who have come to Queen's Park today for the second annual Personal Support Worker Day.

These workers are a critical component of our health care system and a vital support for families and seniors in our province. We owe them a debt of gratitude for the hard work and caring service they offer our citizens every single day. Their day at Queen's Park is an important opportunity for members of this Legislature to meet, listen and learn from these front-line health workers. I can assure them that we are listening.

I thank them for taking time from their busy lives to come here and help us understand their challenges and ideas. In fact, I was pleased that, just moments ago, the Minister of Health announced to stakeholders, supporters and PSWs a new PSW registry, a key step forward to ensuring excellent care at the front lines of our health system.

As our government works tirelessly to transform health care into a high-quality, compassionate and sustainable system constituents want and need, personal support workers undoubtedly play a key role in that transformation, and we are pleased to work with them as we improve our system on behalf of all Ontarians.

#### ROTARY CLUB OF COURTICE

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Last night, I had the opportunity of attending the second annual youth and community leadership dinner hosted by the Rotary Club of Courtice in my riding of Durham. The dinner was to honour and recognize the young leaders of our communities and leaders of the future.

I want to recognize the families and the schools and the recipients of this year's award, which include: Stephanie Ralston from Dr. G.J. MacGillivray Public School; Laura Humphreys and Rob Babikian from Courtice Secondary School; Zachery Prescott from Clarke High School; Alexis Wilcox from Bowmanville High School; Teri-Lynn Kennedy from Holy Trinity Catholic school; Sophie Baron from Clarington secondary school; Tanya Irwin and Hailey Douglas from St. Stephen's Catholic secondary school; Jamie MacDonald and Mark Theriault from the Interact Club of Clarington; and Warren Heimstra from the Bowmanville Rotary Club.

The evening featured the renowned motivational and sports broadcaster Brian Williams. You may remember Mr. Williams, as he has covered 13 Canadian Olympics for Canada and now with CTV. He spoke to the youth about the lessons of greatness and the efforts that people make to be great and other sporting events.

The proceeds from last night's event will go to support the building of schools in Africa as well as community projects throughout Clarington.

I also want to thank the Courtice Rotary Club and the other Rotary Clubs in the area, specifically President Sheila Hall and one of the main organizers, Marie Visser, for hosting the event. I'm proud to support this dinner and the youth in my riding who are our future leaders.

1310

#### SINGING CONTEST

**Mr. Tony Ruprecht:** We have great musical talent in our nation, and I am very delighted to make some introductions to this Legislature of the winners of the intercultural Canadian national singing contest. They are—if they would like to stand for a minute—Diana Richie, George Antoney, Melanie Frade, Julia Debowska, Olivia Amenta and Stephanie Wojtowicz. Of course, the founder of the contest is with us; his name is John Santos. The studio producer who is going to make a special effort to ensure they become famous national Canadian symbols is Hernani Raposo. Let's welcome them.

Last month, I and a thousand guests had the great pleasure to attend the intercultural Canadian national singing contest with John Santos. It was truly a Canadian multicultural event.

What I saw and experienced touched me deeply. The program was designed to showcase the real talent of each performer. Mr. Santos is an accomplished music director, and his wife, Lisa, set the stage for a most supportive backdrop.

John's music lifted the spirit of the performers to such heights, which enabled all of them to soar, to give their best and to give of themselves. The audience too was transformed into a supportive and appreciative cast.

The rhythmic music—sometimes soft, sometimes powerful, sometimes light and darkness—the colourful front and the uplifting, warm, melodious voices produced such a marvellous sound that time was forgotten and people didn't want to go home. They shouted, "More, more and more!" It was truly a night to remember.

These performers are here with us today, and they are our pride and joy, Mr. Speaker. They certainly deserve to be recognized for their enormous talent. You and I and our members will be delighted to provide some opportunity to them so they can launch their great careers. Congratulations to you.

#### YAD VASHEM

**Mr. Mike Colle:** I'd like to welcome the Canadian Society for Yad Vashem and their special guests here to

the Legislature. As you know, today we pay tribute to the Ontario Holocaust survivors who are here. The society's office is in my riding.

It just reinforced to me the incredible experience that—the Premier led a visit to Israel last year, where we visited Yad Vashem with my colleagues Monte Kwinter, David Zimmer, Minister Hoskins, and Sandra Pupatello, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. We were really deeply moved by what we saw at Yad Vashem.

To have the Canadian society honour these incredible Canadians here today is doubly important, and it just makes me think how powerful a message it is that we shall never, ever forget, and we shall make sure that the voices of those innocent people who were murdered are never forgotten. Our special guests today are here for that.

I just want to say to all of these great Canadians who are here: We really treasure you, we love you, and we encourage you to keep speaking out for all of those innocent men, women and children who were murdered by those madmen back at a day we hope we will forget. Thank you so much.

#### YAD VASHEM

**Mr. Dave Levac:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: the usual last statement. I seek unanimous consent of the House from all parties, and I believe we've spoken to each, for each party to have up to five minutes to speak about Yad Vashem.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Mr. Monte Kwinter:** In a ceremony at Queen's Park earlier today, we recognized and honoured 19 Holocaust survivors whose stories of anguish, suffering and survival of both body and spirit are a testimony to the human will to live.

These Holocaust survivors, who are in the House today—there they are, in the members' gallery—came to Ontario, rebuilt their lives and were honoured for their wonderful contributions as citizens of Ontario. Those honoured are Yael Gisela Spier Cohen, Irene (Blasz) Csillag, Valentin Drobner, Philip Epstein, John Freund, Magda Hilf, Howard Kleinberg, Nancy Kleinberg, Pepa Livingstone, Manja Mapa, Willie Moll, Rose Philip, Sally Rosen, Dr. Nadia Rosa, Leon Rucker, David Shentow, Jack (Szalom) Weinberger, Dr. Arthur Weisz, and Helen Yermus.

Today, we recognize Yom ha-Shoah V'Hagvurah, Holocaust Memorial Day—a day designated for Holocaust remembrance in communities around the world.

This is the 18th year that the Ontario Legislature has observed Holocaust Memorial Day, and I'm proud to say that Ontario was the first jurisdiction in the world, outside of the state of Israel, to officially recognize it.

Eighteen is a significant milestone in the Jewish faith. In Hebrew, it is "chai," which also translates into "life." As we mourn the death of the six million victims, we also celebrate the life of those who survived.

I have visited Yad Vashem, the Holocaust memorial and museum in Jerusalem, several times. Just a year ago, almost exactly, Premier Dalton McGuinty, Minister Sandra Pupatello, Minister Eric Hoskins, MPP Mike Colle, MPP David Zimmer and I were at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and laid a wreath on behalf of all Ontarians in the Hall of Remembrance. The memorial is dedicated to preserving the memory and story of each of the six million people who died in the Holocaust. As a Jew, these memories strike the heart and the soul.

Every Jew is touched by the Holocaust. We lost loved ones, family members or friends. All members in the community lost someone. The Holocaust echoes through generations. The loss is extraordinary. At Yad Vashem, that loss is made real. It is concrete. You can touch it.

In the Valley of the Communities, you stand before wall after wall carved out of solid rock listing the names of more than 5,000 communities that lived, breathed, had life, in which men and women loved, married, raised children, worked, laughed and worshipped. Today, in most cases, nothing remains of these Jewish communities except for their names, forever frozen in the bedrock of Yad Vashem. It was there that I found the name of the city where my father was born, Czestochowa, and the city where my mother was born, Sosnowiec.

The Holocaust reaches out of the past and touches the shoulder of every Jew.

The central theme of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2011 is Fragments of Memory: The Faces behind the Documents, Artifacts and Photographs. It focuses, in a graphic and visual way, the remembrance of the pre-war life that was, the unimaginable horror that was inflicted on the six million victims, and then the salvation and the hope for the future of the survivors.

Holocaust Memorial Day commemorates all who died in the Holocaust, not just Jews. We also remember those whom the Nazis targeted for their race, their religion, their politics, their disabilities or their sexual orientation.

It's important to set aside time to remember all these victims whose lives were taken by the Nazis. In remembering, we bear witness to what these men, women and children endured.

Tragically, other genocides have followed since World War II, in Cambodia, Rwanda, Darfur and in the former Yugoslavia.

It is evident that we must continue our struggle to keep alive the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was approved by the United Nations 63 years ago in the shadow of the Holocaust. The declaration recognized the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family as a foundation of freedom, justice and peace throughout the world. It called on the world to protect human rights by the rule of law.

We are indeed fortunate to live in Canada and in Ontario, but we must never take our good fortune for granted. We must guard our democratic institutions and democratic freedoms. We must appreciate, nurture and

protect them, and we must constantly remind ourselves how easy it is to lose them.

On Yom ha-Shoah, Jewish communities around the world recite a brief traditional mourner's prayer, the Kaddish. On the afternoon of May 1, some of our members were at Earl Bales Park for the annual Holocaust community commemoration service, and there were hundreds of people who recited the Kaddish.

On behalf of the victims, their survivors and their families, I would like to recite that Hebrew prayer that is something for which all people may pray, and I ask for unanimous consent to allow me to do that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

All members please rise.

*Prayer in Hebrew.*

1320

**Mr. Monte Kwinter:** One line of this prayer translates as, "He who creates peace in His celestial heights, may He create peace for us."

We must always remember so that the world will never forget.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** On behalf of our leader, Tim Hudak, I'm very pleased today to extend our deepest sympathies to the 19 survivors who were honoured at the Yad Vashem memorial service today and to pay the deepest respect for their struggles and courage, as was described in the ceremony today.

We stand with you in the resentment of all of the victimization that Jewish people withstood during the Second World War. It reminds each of us of the responsibility to respect others and to respect the rights of individuals. It means to me—my sister Jane's husband, Dr. Paul Goodman, died just recently. Paul's family were from Russia and survived the Second World War, where his parents and their family were lost as a result of the Nazi victimization.

Today, we remember those who we are each touched by. We respect the struggles you have been through. Also, we respect the success—I read the stories of your lives here—and the courage to go forward in a positive way and the contributions you've made to Ontario and, indeed, Canada. It's remarkable. I commend you. Keep up the great work and the spirit and faith in people.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's an honour to stand and address you, an honour to be in the presence of survivors. It's an honour to remember those who did not. Certainly, on behalf of Andrea Horwath, the leader of the New Democratic Party, and all of us, this is a day of remembrance.

It's a day also of recommitment, I believe, that this must never, ever happen again. That means a recommitment to civil liberties. It means a recommitment to all having a voice. We know, as we heard already, that some of the first to be rounded up happen to be living in Parkdale—High Park right now: Roma people, gypsies as they were called. Socialists were rounded up, LGBT people were rounded up, and of course, six million Jews were also rounded up and sent to their death.

What's very sad about history since then, in a sense, is that what we forget is not only that this was perpetrated

by a group of psychopaths but that this was perpetrated by lots and lots of ordinary people. Elie Wiesel, in a wonderful work, talks about the banality of evil: the clerks who signed the forms, those who did nothing, the neighbours who watched as their neighbours were being carted away, those people who knew what the trains were carrying but turned the other way and did nothing and said nothing. That is where evil really resides. That's what we all have to recommit to struggling against because that same evil is still very present.

I want to tell you, as a United Church minister—this is my third career—I say mea culpa on behalf of all Christians. Only about 1% of Christians actually stood by their Jewish brothers and sisters during that period of time. I think of people like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who paid with his life. Most of the churches sold you out. That is something that we need to deal with, that we need to look at every day in our own faith. So it has to do with us still.

In fact, the last time before today that I heard reference to the Holocaust was by His Holiness the Dalai Lama. I also have one of the largest Tibetan groups living in my riding. He said he looks to the Jews, really, and to your example, because they now are a community who live in diaspora, who have no homeland. They live in diaspora and because of the actions of China on their country, called Tibet, that isn't even on the map anymore. They see themselves in affiliation and also send their love.

Certainly, in working with them, we see the same old themes in humankind resurface: the themes of hatred, the themes of bigotry, the themes of the banality of evil, where good people do nothing and watch crimes perpetrated, sometimes because they are somewhere else and not here in our midst.

On behalf of all New Democrats, on behalf of all those who love civil liberties, on behalf of all those people of faith who hold to their faith and not to their religious institutions, to all of those people—to all of them—I say on behalf of us all, mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. We are sorry, because we and our ancestors are also implicated in your story.

May this day always recur. May we always remember and, more than remember, may we recommit to it never, ever happening again.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** 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. Tonia Grannum):** Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 188, An Act to amend the McMichael Canadian Art Collection Act / Projet de loi 188, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Collection McMichael d'art canadien.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed? Agreed. The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

*Report adopted.*

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Jim Brownell:** I beg leave to present a report from the Standing Committee on General Government and move its adoption.

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

Bill 181, An Act to amend the Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 / Projet de loi 181, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la prévention et la protection contre l'incendie.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Shall the report be received and adopted? Agreed? Agreed. The bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

*Report adopted.*

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### DRIVERS OVER THE AGE OF 80 IDENTIFICATION ACT, 2011 LOI DE 2011 EXIGEANT UN MOYEN D'IDENTIFICATION POUR LES CONDUCTEURS ÂGÉS DE PLUS DE 80 ANS

Mr. Sergio moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 201, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to require vehicles driven by drivers over the age of 80 to display markers or identifying devices / Projet de loi 201, Loi modifiant le Code de la route pour exiger que les véhicules conduits par des conducteurs âgés de plus de 80 ans affichent des marques ou des moyens d'identification.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** The bill amends the Highway Traffic Act to prohibit drivers who are over the age of 80 from driving a motor vehicle on a highway unless markers or identifying devices indicating that the motor vehicle is being driven by a driver who is over the age of 80 are displayed on the vehicle. Unless otherwise specified by regulation, the markers or identifying devices must depict "80 plus" in red and must be prominently

displayed and clearly visible from the front and rear of the motor vehicle.

**1330**

#### PROVINCIAL OFFENCES STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (JURY TRIALS), 2011

##### LOI DE 2011 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE LES INFRACTIONS PROVINCIALES (PROCÈS DEVANT JURY)

Mr. Hillier moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 202, An Act respecting jury trials for provincial offences / Projet de loi 202, Loi concernant les procès devant jury dans le domaine des infractions provinciales.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** This bill amends the Provincial Offences Act by allowing persons charged with an offence to choose to be tried by a court composed of a judge and jury, if any one of the following circumstances exist:

(1) The penalty for the offence includes a fine of \$25,000 or more, seizure of property or term of imprisonment.

(2) There is a reasonable likelihood that a conviction would result in termination or suspension of the person's professional licence or membership, or a licence or registration of business that is connected to the individual.

The jury is composed of 12 persons selected in accordance with the Juries Act. The jury is required to give a unanimous verdict. If the jury cannot agree, the judge may adjourn the trial or discharge the jury and direct the empanelling of a new jury. The jury may make recommendations relating to sentencing.

The Juries Act is amended to enable the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations concerning the application of the act to a jury trial under the Provincial Offences Act.

#### PROVINCIAL OFFENCES AMENDMENT ACT (SENTENCING AND APPEALS), 2011

##### LOI DE 2011 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES INFRACTIONS PROVINCIALES (PRONONCÉ DE LA SENTENCE ET APPELS)

Mr. Hillier moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 203, An Act to amend the Provincial Offences Act with respect to sentencing and appeals / Projet de loi 203, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les infractions provinciales en ce qui concerne le prononcé de la sentence et les appels.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** This bill amends the Provincial Offences Act to amend the default penalty for conviction of a provincial offence, if the law does not otherwise expressly provide it.

At present, the penalty is a fine of not more than \$5,000. The bill adds imprisonment as an alternative, at the choice of the convicted person. The court will determine the term of the imprisonment, which will be no more than six months. The bill also eliminates the requirement that a person who appeals a decision imposing a fine for a provincial offence must pay the fine in order to appeal the decision.

## MOTIONS

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I move that, notwithstanding standing order 98(b), the following change be made to the ballot list for private members' public business: Mr. Colle and Mr. Dhillon exchange places in order of precedence, such that Mr. Colle assumes ballot item 16 and Mr. Dhillon assumes ballot item 70; and that, notwithstanding standing order 98(g), notice for ballot item 16 be waived.

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

*Motion agreed to.*

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding the meeting times for the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I move that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be authorized to release reports during the summer adjournment by depositing a copy of any report with the Clerk of the Assembly.

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

*Motion agreed to.*

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I move that during consideration of private members' public business this afternoon, in the event that Bill 185, An Act to proclaim British Home Child Day, receives second reading, the order for third reading shall immediately be called and the question put immediately, without debate or amendment.

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

*Motion agreed to.*

## PETITIONS

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'm pleased to present a petition on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham. The petition reads as follows:

"Whereas citizens are concerned that contaminants in materials used as fill for pits and quarries may endanger water quality and the natural environment of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas the Ministry of the Environment has a responsibility and a duty to protect the sensitive areas of the greenbelt and provincially sensitive wetlands; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has the lead responsibility to provide the tools to lower-tier governments to plan, protect and enforce clear, effective policies governing the application and permitting process for the placement of fill in abandoned pits and quarries; and

"Whereas this process requires clarification regarding rules respecting what materials may be used to rehabilitate or fill abandoned pits and quarries;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Minister of the Environment to initiate a moratorium on the clean fill application and permit process on the greenbelt" and Oak Ridges Moraine "until there are clear rules; and we further ask that the provincial government take all necessary actions to protect our water and prevent contamination of the greenbelt, specifically at ... Regional Highway 2, Newcastle," often referred to as Morgans Road, "and Lakeridge Road in Durham."

I'm pleased to sign and support it and present it to Hamza, the page.

### REPLACEMENT WORKERS

**M<sup>me</sup> France G linas:** I have a petition from people all over Ontario.

"Whereas strikes and lockouts are rare: 97% of collective agreements are settled without a strike or lockout; and

"Whereas anti-temporary replacement workers laws have existed in Quebec since 1978; in British Columbia since 1993; and successive governments in those two provinces have never repealed those laws; and

“Whereas anti-temporary replacement workers legislation has reduced the length and divisiveness of labour disputes; and

“Whereas the use of temporary replacement workers during a strike or lockout is damaging to the social fabric of a community in the short and the long term as well as the well-being of its residents;”

They petition the Legislative Assembly “to enact legislation banning the use of temporary replacement workers during a strike or lockout.”

I fully support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask page Jonah to bring it to the Clerk.

### PARAMEDICS

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas paramedics play a vital role in protecting the health and safety of Ontarians; and

“Whereas paramedics often put their own health and safety at risk, going above and beyond their duty in servicing Ontarians; and

“Whereas the government of Ontario annually recognizes police officers and firefighters with awards for bravery; and

“Whereas currently no award for paramedic bravery is awarded by the government of Ontario; and

“Whereas Ontario paramedics deserve recognition for acts of exceptional bravery while protecting Ontarians;

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

“Enact Bill 115, a private member’s bill introduced by MPP Maria Van Bommel on October 6, 2010, An Act to provide for the Ontario Award for Paramedic Bravery.”

I will sign this petition and send it to the table with Lukian.

### MATTHEWS HOUSE HOSPICE

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** A petition to address funding inequity for Matthews House Hospice in Alliston:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the number of clients served by Matthews House Hospice has doubled in less than three years, while funding provided by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care through the Central LHIN remains substantially unchanged; and

“Whereas Matthews House Hospice is the lowest-funded hospice in the Central LHIN and among the lowest-funded in the province, serving as many clients or more than others receiving substantially more money; and

“Whereas, in February 2010, Matthews House Hospice was promised a short-term and a long-term solution to its underfunding by the Central LHIN and that the long-term solution has not materialized; and

“Whereas, in January, Matthews House Hospice was told by the Central LHIN that any adjustment would have to come from the ministry, while two months later the

ministry informed Matthews House Hospice that it would have to work with the Central LHIN to solve its funding issues;

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

“That” the McGuinty government “instruct the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care to appoint someone with authority to meet with the board representatives of Matthews House Hospice to resolve how they can get a just resolution for the people of south Simcoe needing hospice care, a resolution that ensures that their promise of a long-term solution is kept, giving them base funding equal to that of other hospices in Central LHIN.”

I agree with the petition, and I will sign it.

1340

### TAXATION

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of Val Caron, in my riding.

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

“Be it resolved that the government of Mr. McGuinty immediately exempt electricity from the harmonized sales tax.”

I agree with this petition, will affix my name to it and ask Erica to bring it to the Clerk.

### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas aggressive dogs are found among all breeds and mixed breeds; and

“Breed-specific legislation has been shown to be an expensive and ineffective approach to dog bite prevention; and

“Problem dog owners are best dealt with through education, training and legislation encouraging responsible behaviour;

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

“To repeal the breed-specific sections of the Dog Owners’ Liability Act (2005) and to implement legislation that encourages responsible ownership of all dog breeds and types.”

Thank you very much for allowing me to present this petition.

### RURAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** “Petition to Save Duntroon Central Public School and All Other Rural Schools in Clearview Township:

“Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is an important part of Clearview township and the surrounding area; and

“Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is widely recognized for its high educational standards and intimate learning experience; and

“Whereas the frameworks of rural schools are different from urban schools and therefore deserve to be governed by a separate rural school policy; and

“Whereas Premier Dalton McGuinty promised during the 2007 election that he would keep rural schools open when he declared that, ‘Rural schools help keep communities strong, which is why we’re not only committed to keeping them open—but strengthening them’; and

“Whereas” Premier “Dalton McGuinty found \$12 million to keep school swimming pools open in Toronto but hasn’t found any money to keep rural schools open in Simcoe–Grey;

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

“That Premier Dalton McGuinty and the Minister of Education support the citizens of Clearview township and suspend the Simcoe County District School Board ARC 2010:01 until the province develops a rural school policy that recognizes the value of schools in the rural communities of Ontario.”

I agree with the petition and I will sign it.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS’ PUBLIC BUSINESS

### MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AMENDMENT ACT (COMMENCEMENT OF TERM OF OFFICES DATE), 2011

#### LOI DE 2011 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES ÉLECTIONS MUNICIPALES (DATE DE COMMENCEMENT DES MANDATS)

Mr. Lalonde moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 153, An Act to amend the Municipal Elections Act, 1996 to change the date on which the term of offices begins and to make related amendments / Projet de loi 153, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1996 sur les élections municipales pour changer la date de commencement des mandats et apporter des modifications connexes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

**M. Jean-Marc Lalonde:** Monsieur le Président, c’est avec grand plaisir que je vous présente en deuxième lecture le projet de loi 153, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1996 sur les élections municipales pour changer la date de commencement des mandats et apporter des modifications connexes.

Comme nous le savons tous, après les dernières élections municipales qui ont eu lieu le 25 octobre 2010, les nouveaux élus sont entrés en fonction à compter du

1<sup>er</sup> décembre 2010, ou après avoir été assermentés après cette date.

Ayant reçu plusieurs appels des nouveaux élus, des membres défaits, des candidats défaits, des administrateurs, des commettants, ainsi que des autres conseils municipaux qui m’ont fait parvenir des résolutions, dont celle surtout de la municipalité Central Elgin—j’aurai la chance de la lire un peu plus tard—j’ai cru bon de présenter ce projet de loi.

Si les modifications sont adoptées, les nouveaux conseils municipaux commenceraient leur mandat le deuxième lundi de novembre de l’année des élections ordinaires. Mon projet de loi permettrait une période de transition plus courte qui serait de 16 jours au lieu de 35 jours. Je veux donc clarifier que, oui, l’entrée en fonction d’un conseil nouvellement élu serait le deuxième lundi de novembre.

I decided to bring forward Bill 153 after getting phone calls and meetings with mayors, members of council, municipal administrators and constituents, and also resolutions that I received from quite a few municipalities. I could read the one that I got from Central Elgin:

“Whereas the Municipal Elections Act was amended to change the date of municipal elections from the second Monday in November to the fourth Monday of October; and

“Whereas this change in date also potentially lengthened the period when council may be restricted from taking certain actions under the Municipal Act”—the lame-duck period in this case was 81 days, because after the nomination date, which was September 10, municipal councils were limited in the position they could take at that time.

“Now, therefore, be it resolved that the council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Central Elgin request that the Municipal Elections Act and the Municipal Act be amended to provide for a date in November when the newly elected council shall take office, and that a copy of this resolution be” sent to MPPs—yes, Mr. Speaker, telling me that the time between a municipal election and the date on which the newly elected council takes office is simply too long. Constituents who have municipal questions don’t know who to turn to. Many will contact both the outgoing and incoming mayor, and the files often get lost.

It used to be that the transition time for municipal elections was much shorter. Municipal elections were held on the second Monday in November, and the newly elected council could take office on December 1—a 16-day time frame—much shorter than today. Today we have a 36-day time frame.

I met with Peter Hume, the president of AMO, and he said he was very supportive of these changes.

This bill would bring two major changes to the Municipal Elections Act:

(1) Bill 153, if passed, will amend the Municipal Elections Act, 1996, to change the date on which newly elected councils take office following municipal elections, from December 1 to the second Monday in November, in the year of a regular election.

(2) The bill also amends the act to reduce the time frame within which recounts of votes must be completed.

With respect to recounts: Instead of having 30 days after the election results to pass a resolution requiring a recount, the municipality/local board would have 10 days; after the election results, recounts must be done within seven days instead of 15 days; and application for recounts shall be commenced within 10 days after the election results, rather than 30 days. If no application has been made for a judicial recount under section 63, the clerk shall, on the eighth day after the recount is completed—instead of on the 16th day—declare the successful candidate. A person who disputes the validity of a ballot or of the counting of votes may, within seven days after the clerk announces the results, apply to the Superior Court of Justice for recount of the disputed ballots—instead of 15 days.

There are a few points that are very important. There are presently restrictions placed on councils after nomination day. As I said, in the past election, nomination day was September 10. These restrictions can last the entire lame-duck period of 81 days. These don't always apply. It depends on the nature of the makeup of the outgoing/incoming council. But the united counties of Prescott-Russell have said they can be quite limiting. I will list a few of the restrictions:

The actions referred to in subsection (1) are: (1) the appointment or removal from office of any officer of the municipality; (2) the hiring or dismissal of any employee of the municipality; (3) the disposition of any real or personal property of the municipality which has a value exceeding \$50,000 at the time of disposal; and (4) making any expenditure or incurring any other liability which exceeds \$50,000. This is exactly the reason why I have tabled this bill: to make those corrections so it would be much easier for a municipality's administrator.

### 1350

At the time, I could give you some good examples. There were major companies that tried to benefit from that lame-duck period. They came into council. There was nobody to take decisions; there was only the clerk. The clerk got in touch with me: "What should I be doing?" I had to meet both parties at one point, saying, "No, you'll have to wait until the new municipal council has been sworn in before you take your position."

Remember one thing: When we say "sworn in," the date is December 1, but I've seen many councils where the swearing-in ceremony took effect on December 6. This council was not in power until they were all sworn in. If one of them is not sworn in, if it is a five-member council, only four could take their positions at that time.

Again, I'll be asking for the support of all three parties of this House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** It's certainly a pleasure to contribute to the debate here today on Bill 153. I want to begin by commending the member for Glengarry–Prescott–Russell for bringing this bill forward. Many

members of this Legislature have considerable experience at the municipal level, but there are few, if any, who can match this member's extensive record. Having served in municipal government for 25 years, 15 years as mayor of Rockland, the member is uniquely qualified to draw on his lengthy record of municipal service to propose constructive and beneficial reforms to the Municipal Elections Act.

In fact, I know that his term as an MPP is coming to an end, and I want to take the opportunity to personally congratulate him on the work that he has undertaken on behalf of his constituents and the people of this province. Since I have known him, he has always served all of those people with honour, with distinction and in a very professional manner. I would always say you've always been nothing but a true gentleman, and I shall miss you.

The issue that has been brought forward by the member is one that should be addressed, and I'm pleased to be able to support it. I've talked to people on the councils at home. Municipal governments do have an integral role to play in our province, and I do believe and support the member in that that should happen in a speedy and efficient transition of power from one council to the next.

The five-week period between the election and the swearing-in of the new council is simply too long. As has been pointed out, it results in a protracted and unnecessarily long lame-duck stage that hurts the ability of municipal governments to act in the best interests of their communities.

I'm not going to go on much longer, because I know my colleague the member for Leeds–Grenville has much that he wants to add to this discussion. I would simply say it is important that we respect democracy, the will of the people, and make the transition as quickly as possible. This bill strengthens democracy, and it does ensure that the voters are governed by the people they have elected. I encourage all members of this House to give this bill speedy passage.

Again, in conclusion, I say to the member from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell, thank you for a job extremely well done.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I want to join the member from Kitchener–Waterloo in her praise of the member from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell. It's timely. It's a good way to say a few kind words about mon ami Jean-Marc. He's got an impeccable reputation. He is a very sincere individual, and you could see that in the way he does social politics with people. He's a very gentle man and, indeed, a gentleman. I wanted to take that opportunity to say that as well of Jean-Marc Lalonde.

I take this opportunity because it's difficult to find 12 minutes to speak to a bill that I agree with, because often, when I agree with a bill, I say, "Okay, I agree"; you sit down and you just want to move on because it makes so much sense. I don't quite understand how it is that council members can be elected on October 25 and take

office December 1. The member from Eglinton–Lawrence might know; I don't really understand it. Why such a long period between when you get elected and when you take office? There must be some reasoning that I cannot fathom, and somebody will speak to it for sure. I fail to see the logic, because that transitional period, in my mind, as the member from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell has said and many of the people who wrote to him have said, just simply doesn't make any sense.

To make that transition a lot faster and seamless is useful, and this is what the bill does. It's a bit late in the session, obviously. We're heading into an election. I'm not quite sure the Premier is worried about these things at this time; I understand. But it's a bill that could be passed quickly in order to deal with the next municipal election. On the other hand, if it doesn't pass this time, we can do it again, and somebody will take the torch from Jean-Marc, the member from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell, and re-present the bill—it could happen.

But I find that what he has submitted today is reasonable, including the other part of the bill, which would reduce the time frame within which recounts of votes must be completed. That too makes sense. Why such a long delay of recounts? Again, the member from Eglinton–Lawrence might have some reasoning behind it in terms of what municipal councillors thought or what previous governments might have thought about why the delay, but reducing that time frame makes sense. Everybody, both those who thought they won and those who lost who think they ought to have won, gets a quick resolution and a quick solution to the problem.

Jean-Marc, member from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell, mon ami, it's a good bill. It will pass today; I have no doubt. Whether the government will simply try to convince the other two parties that this is something we could go ahead—I think it could, so I hope it happens.

I wish you good health. I hope you spend a lot more time with the wife—

**Mr. Mike Colle:** She wants him out.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** No, no. My suspicion is that she would like to spend a little time with him. Or am I wrong?

**Mr. Jean-Marc Lalonde:** It's true.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Because there are things you can do together, obviously. One of the things that I hope you will do together is do a lot more walking than you've been doing, because in this place, a whole lot of people sit on their you-know-what too much of the time—except those who are in good shape. You can tell those who are in good shape, who find the time to run for hours, destroying their backs and their heels as they pound on the ground to stay fit. But better that than to be sedentary and suffer the ill effects of not doing very much. So I hope you do a lot of that in your retirement. Merci, monsieur le Président.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Merci. Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** It's a pleasure for me to add a few remarks on Bill 153 and the member for Glengarry–Prescott–Russell.

First of all, I'm going to talk just briefly about the bill. I was working in municipal government when these changes were passed. I have to tell you, they were passed just before the deadline, so that candidates started to declare January 1, and this bill, I think, was passed in the middle of December 2009. I have to tell you, being a chief administrative officer at the time, I and the other CAOs and clerks wondered what the deal was with this huge lame-duck period that took place.

**1400**

Normally, as the member opposite knows—we were both former mayors—in the old days, your election day was the second Monday in November, and you took office very close to December 1. You had a special short inaugural meeting. Obviously it didn't take place on a Saturday or Sunday, but you were very close to December 1. It was a very short period of time.

In fact, I was elected MPP last March, only to learn that I was an MPP on March 4, the day I was elected. Even though I had to wait for my name to get published in the Gazette before I could actually sit in the chamber, I was an MPP the day I was elected, not like municipal councillors, where you get elected and then you have to wait. Others have that period. So, as some would say, this is a no-brainer when it comes to a recommendation.

The only other problem is that there are other changes that need to be made as well. In my own community I've had several councillors go to the judge to get reinstated because they didn't file their election expenses on time. There were a couple in the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke's riding who were acclaimed and thought that they didn't have to file because they incurred no expenses. They then had to go to the judge and pay \$2,000 for their legal costs and get reinstated.

This has happened over and over again. In the township of Athens council in my riding, all the candidates had to be reinstated because there were medical issues. The CAO's father—who was a great man; Don Brontmire, a former municipal councillor himself—was in ill health and ultimately passed away, and they were unable to file with the clerk.

Really the intent of the election law wasn't to make people go to the judge. It wasn't to have people elected on November 25 and then take office December 1 or December 6. The bill was just brought in as part of an omnibus bill—I think it was a 200-plus-page bill that amended 600 different acts—so there are things to change.

I spoke the other day to Pat Vanini, the executive director for AMO. I was president of AMO in 1989, and my executive director at the time was Mac Dunbar. Many people in municipal politics would know Mac, and obviously everyone in provincial politics now knows Pat Vanini. I think they agree that there need to be changes; changes like those proposed today from the member for Glengarry–Prescott–Russell; changes that should be done, not weeks before nominations open for the next municipal election, but early.

Whichever government takes the reins of power on October 6, they should make this change. They should

bring this change that's in Bill 153 forward; they should bring changes so that people don't have to go before a judge. If you or I or any of the members here didn't file their expenses on time, we could apply to have a 60-day extension. We wouldn't lose our seats immediately and be ineligible to run four years from now.

Some people in my riding say, "Why aren't the penalties the same for municipal councillors as they are for us as provincial politicians?" I hope that the changes that I've talked about and the changes that Monsieur Lalonde talks about in this bill get changed early on. I commend him for this bill. I will support second reading on this bill.

I want to close talking about mon ami Jean-Marc, because he and I were mayors in eastern Ontario. I was the mayor of Brockville and he was the mayor of Rockland. When I was elected to this place, he came up to me—because a lot was made about my age being 22 when I was a mayor—and he asked me how old I was, and I said, "Jean-Marc, I'm almost 50." Now I am 50. He said, "Do you still play hockey?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You're on the Legiskaters hockey team." He has a fabulous hockey mind, probably one of the best hockey minds I've met in eastern Ontario—probably in all of Ontario. I still contend that I'm probably the only player he has ever signed without a tryout, and seeing the record then of the Legiskaters, I knew why. The first game we played we won, and I think it was announced four or five times in the Legislature that day. Unknown to me, it was the first game we had won in three years.

I do want to say that under your direction, we had a great tribute for you here on the second floor for your efforts with the Legiskaters hockey team, and there were a lot of people whom you have worked with and played with who give you a tribute. I see your staff in the gallery; they're so loyal to you and such wonderful staff. I'm glad that they're here for this bill discussion today.

We've gone through a lot, you and I. One of the stories that the Speaker brought up was on the famous 1988 Olympics. When he and I were both mayors, Jean-Marc invited me down to a celebration in his riding. That's when I found out that he went to the bishop, got the Olympic flame and put it into the bishop's hands. That's how we had the torch. So we snagged a little bit of that flame for our own use in eastern Ontario. That just shows the resourcefulness of Jean-Marc Lalonde.

In closing, I want to talk about Jean-Marc as a friend. I talked about his hockey knowledge; it is legendary, at all levels of hockey in eastern Ontario. He is a former coach of Guy Lafleur; I am certainly nowhere near Monsieur Lafleur's talent.

Up until the Pembroke Lumber Kings won the Royal Bank Cup, just a few weeks ago, Jean-Marc's Rockland Nationals were the only central junior hockey team to ever aspire to that level, and it was under his direction. A couple of years after they won the cup, the Nationals faded away. Our arena in Brockville, the roof collapsed, so our team, the Brockville Braves, had to be relocated. Jean-Marc, being the resourceful mayor and the

resourceful hockey mind, offered the Brockville Braves, then renamed the Rockland Ramparts—I think that was the name we had for our time in Rockland—but it was this person, Jean-Marc Lalonde, the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who I've known for many years.

I have to tell you, in eastern Ontario, there are few politicians who garner the love from all political stripes that Jean-Marc Lalonde has. He has the respect of all of eastern Ontario for his efforts, for his work, for his vision.

I want to thank him very much for providing this bill and providing his leadership in eastern Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I want to rise as did my colleague from Trinity—Spadina to say thank you to the member from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who the Speaker will allow us to call Jean-Marc for the purposes of debate this afternoon.

Needless to say, we're supporting the bill. I think everybody's supporting this bill. That's not the question here. The question is, we're going to miss you. I wanted to add my own story to the stories that we've heard. It has to do with the Legiskaters, except not for your prowess as a hockey coach and player—thank you for doing the Legiskaters—but for your real human kindness where my husband is concerned. I know Gil sends his best.

My husband—many were in the House when this happened—went to play with the Legiskaters and had a heart attack. It was a mild one. But what was interesting about that experience, among many other things, is that, as he was lying in the dressing room—we didn't know what was wrong at that point; it could have been stomach upset, who knows?—there was one person who stayed with him until I was able to get there, and his family was able to get there. That was our friend Jean-Marc Lalonde. He stayed right to the end, made sure he was okay and made sure we got to the hospital. That's the kind of man he is. And he was the first to ask me when I came back to the House, "How's your husband doing?"

Just so you know, Gil's doing fine. He's playing hockey again. It makes me sweat, but he's doing it. He will play with the Legiskaters. He loves the game, just like you do. He will be playing it while there's still a breath in his body.

But I want to thank you on behalf of our family, Jean-Marc, for your assistance and for your care that day. It goes beyond politics and beyond this place. It's just called human. Thank you for being so human.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Yes, I was frightened when I heard the member from Parkdale—High Park talk about heart attacks and hockey because I was also dragooned into playing hockey one day a few years ago at Varsity Arena. I sort of shied away, although I'm still playing a little bit.

But, Jean-Marc, to me, this bill represents that this is a man who never stops, perpetual motion for the public

good. I know people from all sides know that. I've had the pleasure of trying to be with him for a day or so. I just can't believe the driving he does from Hawkesbury to Vankleek Hill to St. Albert. He knows every store, every person, every seniors' home, everybody who has ever played or coached minor hockey, every restaurant, gas station. They all know Jean-Marc.

**1410**

I think that if one were to do a video about a model MPP, how to be an MPP, you would just do it on Jean-Marc, but I don't think many people could keep up. This is seven days a week, and he takes everything to heart. It's not just a job, a routine; he is passionate about everything he takes on. He just never stops. Those of you across the way who have talked to him can see that it's never-ending compassion, passion and caring for the people he represents or the people we represent.

I've had the pleasure of being at the Highland games in Maxville. What an extravaganza that is, Jean-Marc. Again, as you're driving along the highway, he talks about, "Well, you know, we have a water problem, a sewage problem here, this road has got to be fixed, that hydro has got to be dealt with"—never-ending work that he does for his constituency. I just can't say enough.

The work he does for the francophone community and francophone parliamentarians is something that has really shaped Jean-Marc's career. It just burns Jean-Marc when he goes to an event in some other country and the Quebec delegation is there, and they say, "Well, we are the francophone delegation. We represent the francophonie in Canada, la francophonie dans le monde," and Jean-Marc says, "Hey, wait a minute. We have a francophone community in Ontario that's huge, over a million and a half at least." So, Jean-Marc is there trying to say that in Ontario we have all these wonderful people of the French language and French heritage, and their roots are as old as the roots on the Quebec side.

He represents an area of Ontario that is really underrated. It's one of the oldest areas. They have incredible history and incredible culture. It's a small-town culture on the Ottawa River with an incredible lifestyle. Everything they do there is really unique. It's an area on the other side of Ottawa that people don't visit enough. I think if Jean-Marc needs a new career, we've got to make him the unofficial grand pooh-bah of Outaouais, the great area of Rockland and Casselman and those wonderful communities.

I hope he continues—the member from Trinity-Spadina says his wife wants him at home. I don't know; he cannot stay in the house. I don't know if he even stays in the house for a coffee; he's probably out the door and down the road to have a coffee. So I don't know how she's going to keep him in the house.

Anyway, I just want to say that I think this bill is essential. It really struck me this time, with the change in date of the election, that it was unnecessary to have such a lag. The people who vote phone up their newly elected council and ask for help, and the councillor says, "I can't help you for five weeks." You can imagine what the citi-

zen says when he phones the mayor's office or the newly elected councillor or the newly elected school trustee: "Sorry, I can't do anything for five weeks." Sometimes it's six weeks, because there's a delay if all the inaugurations are not done on December 1. The citizens are not well served; they think the newly elected councillor is giving them the runaround. They don't believe it.

So it is about accountability. It's about getting rid of this unnecessary lame-duck period. I've asked for the rationale behind it, and I just cannot find a rationale for it.

I think that as these things take place, we need to do a constant review. Luckily, we've got four years before the next election, and hopefully it will be fixed before then, along with a couple of other wrinkles we need to iron out in terms of the Municipal Act. With Jean-Marc's leadership, we'll be able to take care of these things.

Again, thank you very much for bringing this forward, Jean-Marc. You're a mensch, you're a gran señor, you're a true, wonderful Ontarian who has his heart with the people. Merci beaucoup, mon ami Jean-Marc.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** I'm not going to speak much about this bill either, I'm going to tell you upfront.

Obviously, having a municipal background as well, I know how important this is. I remember going through an amalgamation when I became mayor of a new municipality and the struggle we had to get over the lame-duck period. As we heard from members from all sides, this is really a no-brainer. So, Jean-Marc, the people who get re-elected are going to be here after October 6. I'm sure they'll do whatever they can to push this through.

I'm just going to take a minute or so to say a couple of things on a personal note. There's a few wishes, Jean-Marc, that I hope would happen. I know some of them are impossible. One, I wish you'd reconsider, but I'm not sure that, with your plans, that's in the making. That's my number one wish, a priority, and I'll tell you why in a minute. Secondly, if you do decide to leave, which you probably have already, please leave us your energy, because I'm not sure where you find that energy to do what you do every day.

I had the pleasure about three years ago, after the election, to work with Jean-Marc on the parameters of a new fund we established for eastern Ontario. We travelled a little bit together. We met with a number of people.

We're all here for the right reason—for the betterment of our communities—but there are some people who just go above and beyond that, and Jean-Marc is one of those folks.

Jean-Marc, we're going to miss you, and the people of your riding are going to miss you, because I know your commitment, and in the few things that we did together, or you did here—when you grab hold of something, you don't let go. I just wish you, in ending here, and your family a well-rested retirement—I know you're not going to stop—from this place, and enjoy every day of your life. Thanks very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Dave Levac:** It was said that nobody wants to talk about the bill, so I will only talk about the bill. I'm just teasing because I can't resist, in the few minutes that I've got left, to talk about my friend and colleague and mentor, I would suggest to you, respectfully, Jean-Marc Lalonde.

Bill 153 does make some changes that are very important, and I will make these quick points about the bill. I've already spoken to AMO as well. They concur with your findings, Jean-Marc Lalonde. I will also tell you that I made contact with the outgoing mayor who retired from my community in Brantford, who asked me the very same question. He didn't even criticize the government. He just said, "It's one of those things where people didn't find the final details that would necessarily have a problem."

When you look at it—81 days—look at all the things that could happen during those 81 days. An expenditure of over \$50,000 is easy to come by in a quick decision that needs to be made by council, and they can't make it. They could lose opportunities for job creation; they could lose opportunities for an expenditure for the betterment of the community. Yes, indeed, we need to shorten that time period.

I agree with my friend from Leeds–Grenville. Let's take a look at other things that could be done in order for us to avoid the complexity and confusion, and that's basically what we had. The incoming mayor made the same kinds of comments, indicating a willingness that this bill should be passed and encouraging everyone to do it.

The lame-duck period does have a purpose. Our council ended up in a lame-duck situation where more people left and didn't come in, so newbies come in, and because of that circumstance—that's why they thought their experience and expertise should bring them to that point. I think there should still be a lame-duck period, but for goodness' sake, it should not be 81 days. The councillors I've spoken to concur with that as well in both communities that I represent.

Let me finish by saying to my friend, in an extremely respectful way, that I admire him immensely. He's the kind of guy who, when he comes back, everyone will be able to shake hands with him and say, "It's really nice to see you because when you dealt with us, you dealt with us as people. You dealt with us as somebody who had an idea. If you put an idea out there, and somebody else came to it, Jean-Marc Lalonde would make a decision, 'That's not right. Let's work together to fix it.'"

I'll tell you something else that I've learned about him. It's not Ontario, it's not Quebec; it's Canada. He's got relationships with people in the United States as well. This is a gentleman who is admired in Quebec almost as much as he's admired in Ontario.

Why? Because at the last event we went to together with the Ontario-Quebec parliamentarians, they gave him a rousing send-off: the Speaker of the House, the elected members from all parties, and individuals who knew that his purpose was to make things right for everybody.

1420

The connection that he has made between the franco-phone community and the English community is a testament to his capacity to be a good person. I admire him. I respect him. I consider him a role model for myself. I don't fit that bill as well as I know I should, but I will tell you this: I will continue to be as much about Jean-Marc Lalonde as I can, because I see him as a person who does nothing but work for his community.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

Seeing none, the honourable member, Monsieur Lalonde, you have two minutes for your response.

**Mr. Jean-Marc Lalonde:** First of all, I have to say that I'm going to miss you all. You can rest assured of that.

I want to thank the member from Kitchener–Waterloo. I never forgot the day that I got up—I was on the opposition side—and I thanked her for all the good work that she had done for labour mobility at the time, in 1996. I guess most of you know that when it comes down to supporting development, economic development or anything that would help communities, I would support and I would work, and I never look at the colour.

Trinity–Spadina: Rosario, as I told you before, my wife really loves watching you on television.

Leeds–Grenville: Thank you very much, Steve. Thank you, thank you, really. You touched two points. We've known each other for quite a few years, and I know that the work that I did in this chamber was for the good of all Ontarians.

Parkdale–High Park: Thank you very much. And yes, I had your husband come back to play for us, and the game is not over yet.

Eglinton–Lawrence: I have to say that you're absolutely right. I've learned through my 16 years—it's going to be 16 years next month—that we have to listen to the people. Why did I bring up that bill? It's because the people have approached me to bring up a change in the Legislature. This is exactly why I have to listen to the people. I do drive around quite often.

I don't want to forget my friends Northumberland–Quinte West and Brant.

I will definitely miss all the people, and I enjoyed every single minute of it that I worked here. I will be still continuing to work for the Ontario people.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** The time for Mr. Lalonde's ballot item has expired. We'll vote on his bill in about 100 minutes.

BANNING COLLUSION IN  
ELECTORAL ADVERTISING ACT, 2011  
LOI DE 2011 INTERDISANT  
LA COLLUSION DANS LE CADRE  
DE LA PUBLICITÉ ÉLECTORALE

Mr. Arnott moved second reading of the following bill:  
Bill 195, An Act to amend the Election Finances Act to ban collusion in electoral advertising / Projet de loi

195, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le financement des élections pour interdire la collusion dans le cadre de la publicité électorale.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the honourable member has 12 minutes for his presentation. Mr. Arnott.

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** I'm pleased to have this opportunity to speak about my private member's bill, Bill 195, the Banning Collusion in Electoral Advertising Act, and why it's needed to ensure fairness and transparency in our provincial election campaigns.

As Canadians, we rightly value—indeed, we treasure—our democratic rights. Willingly we carry out our responsibilities as citizens in a democratic society. In one of his seminal fireside chats, the wartime President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, told Americans, “We must be the great arsenal of democracy.” Yes, Franklin Roosevelt was an American, but I think it's interesting to point out that he spent countless summers at Campobello Island in New Brunswick, where his family had a summer home. He was the most Canadian of US Presidents. I'm sure there was no other American President in history who spent more of his life on Canadian soil than FDR.

In our own time and in our own context, we might discuss the arsenals of democracy in a different way. Money, as we know, is needed to sustain our arsenal of democracy. In Ontario, each campaign needs some of the financial resources of its supporters to purchase the signs, to pay for the phones, to fund the leader's tour, to print and distribute pamphlets and to buy advertising. Campaign advertising, of course, is one of the biggest expenses, and as we know, television advertising is very, very expensive.

In order to maintain the fairness of our elections, we have established spending limits. We have them, among other reasons, so that well-funded special interests cannot determine the outcome of elections, so that big money cannot buy an election. We have campaign spending limits so that one party cannot gain an unfair advantage by flooding the airwaves with advertising to the point that the other parties and other perspectives are unable to compete. I believe these limits are necessary and in the public interest.

We believe, and we assert, that the Ontario Liberal Party has attempted to gain such unfair advantage through an alliance with the so-called Working Families Coalition. In the last two provincial elections, the Working Families Coalition has funded multi-million-dollar ad campaigns attacking the Ontario PC Party, its leaders and its candidates, we believe to the direct benefit of the Ontario Liberal Party. We suspect they'll do it again this fall if given the chance.

But who are these so-called working families? Do all of its members and contributors agree with their tactics?

My wife, Lisa Arnott, has been a public school teacher for some 25 years. Accordingly, she is a member of the Ontario elementary school teachers' federation, which I understand is one of the contributors to the Working

Families Coalition. My wife supports me, and she votes for me—as far as I know, secret ballots being another factor in our democratic system. But it appears that some of Lisa's union dues are dedicated, against her wishes, to the cause of my defeat and that of my colleagues. At our house, we don't think that's fair. It's wrong, and it's one of the reasons I became interested in this issue.

If Lisa worked in the Catholic system instead of the public system, it appears she would be compelled to pay even more to support efforts to fund my defeat. This year, the Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association decided to extract an extra \$60 from each of its members to fund a \$3-million war chest for its own campaign to support the Liberals. That's in addition to what that union is doing to support the Working Families Coalition.

How many of their members, and how many members of other unions, have had their union dues taken away from them, without their consent, to fund political advertising to support a party that they as individuals do not support? This is one of the fundamental questions that the government has yet to address.

Let's look at the organizations that comprise the Working Families Coalition. This was taken off the Working Families website this morning: Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association; Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation; Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario; Ontario Nurses' Association; Canadian Auto Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Local 128; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; millwrights; International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 793; painters' district council 46; Ontario Pipe Trades Council; Service Employees International Union.

Again, these organizations have every right to participate in the election, and their members individually have every right to support whoever they want. But do they have the right to collude with one political party, coordinating their advertising to support that political party, to get around the campaign spending limits that the other parties must obey by law? I submit that they do not.

I've been fortunate to have another private member's ballot item at this late date in the 39th Parliament. Given that we're in the lead-up to a provincial election, I wanted to take this opportunity to draw attention to this important issue that may have a significant impact on that election: giving one party a significant and unfair advantage over the others.

If passed, my Bill 195 would ban collusion between a political party and a third party—in other words, an external organization—for the purposes of advertising in an election campaign.

Canadian Press reports that Working Families and other so-called third parties currently “have no limits on the amount they can spend supporting or attacking a political candidate or party during an election, while the parties themselves are limited to total campaign spending of approximately \$8 million this year.”

For the Liberal Party to be able to get around these spending limits would, of course, for them, be hugely

advantageous. It is my understanding that officials from Working Families and the Ontario Liberal Party maintain that there are no connections between their respective organizations. If that is true, we would submit that the Liberals in this House would have no good reason to oppose this bill. If they do oppose our efforts, it would be a very clear indication that there are, in fact, links between Working Families and the Ontario Liberals and, we suggest, possibly collusion.

**1430**

On May 7, 2009, the Select Committee on Elections met to consider issues pertaining to advertising during elections. The committee heard from Mr. Greg Essensa, who serves as the Chief Electoral Officer of Ontario. Mr. Essensa told the committee that he believes “that a review and update of Ontario’s election finance laws is warranted.”

He also explained that under current law, third parties are free to co-operate and coordinate their efforts with recognized parties. I quote Mr. Essensa’s remarks from Hansard:

“There is no specific provision that prohibits a third party from co-operating or coordinating its advertising with either a political party or one of its candidates, provided that the party/candidate is not actually controlling the third party’s advertising.”

To be clear, I don’t dispute the right of external organizations—or individuals, for that matter—to speak or advertise for or against any political party or candidate. That is their right and it must be protected. But if they deliberately conspire with another political party, especially when they do so simply to get around our election spending laws, we maintain that that’s wrong.

In cases of collusion, third party organizations should be prepared to face scrutiny, and their spending limits should have to come within the party’s existing spending limits. Mr. Essensa tells us that there are already more stringent requirements in place federally and in British Columbia, New Brunswick and Quebec and that there were also regulations being proposed in Alberta at the time of his testimony.

Again I quote Mr. Essensa’s testimony from Hansard: “It is, or will be, an offence in these jurisdictions to collude for the purposes of circumventing spending limits for political parties, candidates and third parties.” Similarly, Bill 195 would seek to ensure that there can be no collusion between third parties and political parties. It also extends the limit that section 38 of the Election Finances Act imposes on campaign expenses incurred by a registered party and persons or bodies acting on its behalf during a campaign period to include advertising expenses incurred by a third party during a campaign period if the third party acted with the express or implied knowledge and consent of a registered political party.

If the McGuinty Liberals are so sure that there is no collusion between Working Families and the Ontario Liberal Party, logically, they should support this bill. But if they don’t support it, fair-minded people will wonder, “What do they have to hide?”

People also need to realize that this issue goes well beyond Working Families and what we believe may well be their efforts to collude with the Liberal Party in the election this fall. This issue goes far beyond that. We must consider not only Working Families but also other external organizations with undue capacity to influence the outcome of elections, the election of 2011 and many more elections, perhaps, to come.

Mr. Speaker, you and I have served in this Legislature long enough to see things come full circle. I can recall that during the late 1980s, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers’ Federation was furious with the Liberal government of David Peterson. At that time, teachers were very concerned with the management of their pension plan. The teachers’ union wanted 50% control of the board of the teachers’ pension plan, but the Liberals refused.

When OSSTF went public with their concerns, Premier Peterson, I recall, dismissed them, calling them “silly.” That was the word that he used. I recall that the teachers’ federation leaders were inflamed by this and decided to mobilize their members against the Liberals. So, in advance of the 1990 election—my very first election—the teachers’ unions were working hard to defeat the Liberal government of the day. My recollection is that instructions from union headquarters came down urging teachers to get involved in the election and get behind the candidate in each riding who seemed to have the best chance to defeat the Liberal candidate.

My point is this: We don’t know what the political landscape will be like in five years, 10 years or even 20 years. What we do know is that when it comes to our democracy, the people of Ontario rightly expect us to uphold the highest standards of fairness. They expect all parties to obey the law in spirit as well as letter. When there is a way to get around the election laws and rules, when one party gains an unfair advantage by colluding with an outside force, we have a situation that is fundamentally unfair.

We have a situation today where the spirit of the election spending limits is being flagrantly flouted. Bill 195 represents a real and meaningful opportunity to change that. It’s an opportunity to ensure that the law is upheld, loopholes are closed and elections are fair, just as the people of Ontario would expect from all of us. That’s why I would strongly encourage all members of the Legislature to support this bill this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I want to say that I will be supporting the member from Wellington–Halton Hills, because we, as New Democrats, are as worried about collusion as anyone else.

But I’ve got some concerns, and I’m getting awfully worried about you guys. You guys are so fixated on this Working Families Coalition that I think it has had a debilitating psychological effect on all of you. It’s all you think about, each and every day. That’s why I’m concerned. I’m just stating a concern; I could be wrong.

Perhaps you don't dream about this; you don't go to bed thinking, "How am I going to get to that Working Families Coalition?" Maybe you don't. It appears as if you do, because so often you guys make reference to Pat Dillon. I'm surprised you didn't mention Pat Dillon today.

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** I did.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** He's not just after us.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Thanks for raising it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** You might want to speak through the Chair.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** But I was about to say that we are not necessarily the recipients of largesse from that group either; you're quite right. Indeed, we're not generous recipients from people like the taxpayers' federation, an organization that is not very friendly to the NDP. You probably would agree with that, yes?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** They've never attacked you.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** The taxpayer federation is, dare I say, a very conservative organization. Dare I say they are closely affiliated mostly with you guys, but they relate to the Liberals as well, especially with the corporate tax cuts and all. Some people call them a right-wing lobby—I hate the words "right-wing lobby." Do they collude with Tories against the rest of them? Would I use the word "collusion" in that regard? You understand what I'm getting at.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I think I know where you're going.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** And you know the citizens' coalition too, right? Some people say they are a right-wing lobby group. Are they Conservative? God knows, yes; oh yes, they are. And boy, are they affiliated to you guys mostly. Do they collude with you?

**Mr. Ted McMeekin:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I don't know. I don't think so. Do they connect with you? Absolutely—ideologically, philosophically—yes, they do.

But if you were to extend the same logic to the Working Families Coalition, one wonders whether or not there are similarities between that group and the taxpayers' federation and the citizens' coalition. You'll dismiss it, of course. You'll say there are no similarities. But, gee, I think there are.

I don't know that there is collusion, necessarily. They favour some over others, to be sure. I remind folks that the Working Families Coalition is not known to endorse a whole lot of New Democrats either, but they set themselves up to defend certain things, rightly or wrongly, as the taxpayers' federation does, as the citizens' coalition does.

Indeed, even the banks advertise from time to time for their own interests. Do they collude with Tories? I don't know. Are they affiliated? Yes. Are the banks close to Tories? I think so. Oh, God, are they ever affiliated and close. But they're often just as close to the Liberals, God knows, with the corporate tax cuts and all. They are such beneficiaries of the largesse of Liberal governments.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Tell them about insurance companies, Rosie.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Insurance companies similarly have a lot of good friends in the Conservative Party; indeed, they have a lot of good friends in the Liberal Party. Do they collude? I don't know.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** They concoct.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** They concoct, indeed, to collude from time to time.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I just wanted to be fair if I could. I'm trying to be fair. Am I being fair? I think I am.

There are other groups. Who else? Pharmaceutical companies, yeah. The CFIB, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business: They're not close to New Democrats that I'm aware of. Let me know if you think I'm wrong.

1440

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** But they advertise for their own interest, and they reach out as much as they can to whomever supports them.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Yes, often they've got a stranglehold on some parties more than others.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Who supports us?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Yes, I often wonder who supports the NDP. If anybody should be introducing such a motion today it should be the NDP. It's the NDP that should be introducing a motion that there shall be no collusion between the very wealthy in this country and two major political parties that are their spokesmen and spokeswomen. But I don't want to be too harsh about those things, really. I might just want to be fair.

Look, New Democrats don't like any collusion because collusion usually is between big players. That's the way I think about it in my little mind. When little people collude, it's like, what are they colluding for? How to be poorer than they are, if you know what I mean? When rich people collude, it's about being richer, getting wealthy, right? That's collusion in my mind. When oil companies get together, that's collusion. When they have similar prices at the gas stations I call that collusion. They claim there is no such collusion. When the prices are the same throughout, it appears to me that there's collusion afoot. The insurance companies, by and large, are the same; the banks, by and large, are the same. These are the big fat cats that dominate the economic field and that play us like marionettes. They play you guys but you just don't realize it. They play the Tories—no, they don't play them because they're part of it; they're affiliated, like Mike Harris, who belongs to a number of big corporations like Magna. God bless. I read that he was earning \$780,000 bucks for being a board member. Am I mistaken? Is it \$780,000. God bless, I say. Michael, what are you and I going to get when we retire out of this place?

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Peanuts.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** We don't even have a pension.

Mike Harris left with \$820,000 with his buyout. What do the Conservative members get since 1995? About \$4,000 or \$5,000 for RRSPs and the wonderful contribution plan that we got. Mike Harris got rid of that golden pension that we used to have. Remember the salaries we used to make? We used to make, I think, \$44,000 when we got here, Ted, you and I. Some \$44,000 plus one third tax free; that would have made it—what?—\$63,000, \$65,000 or something? Man, that was a big salary we were earning in those days. Mike Harris wanted to get rid of that golden pension that we had. Do you remember that golden pension that we would have had, Ted, you and I? My God, we would have been millionaires. He cuts the strings to that wonderful golden pension and he lives as a millionaire and leaves these poor schleps here with nothing.

I was getting carried away; sorry. I was forgetting myself. But now we're talking about collusion between big players who influence their own company's efforts to make a little more. That, to me, is collusion. I know that there are a whole lot of groups—by the way, some unions support us, and some of you Tories will call that collusion. I understand that. Would that union members and union support supported us, because we would be forming government each and every time. I don't call that collusion.

I want to leave some time for my—

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's okay.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Are we okay here?

If there was indeed collusion between unions and New Democrats, we would be forming government.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Member from Nepean, we wait for your comic relief to come very shortly. As you bellow your strength in this House, as your voice rebounds from one wall to the other each and every day, God bless—is there collusion between you and the banks? I don't know. You and the insurance companies? I don't know. You and the citizens coalition taxpayers federation? I don't know. Unions and New Democrats? I don't know. So I say I support this bill here today because I think it would do us all a favour. It would do us all a favour for New Democrats, Liberals and Tories to stand up and say we're against any kind of collusion—

**Mr. Mike Colle:** All collusion.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** —all collusion connected to any political party once and for all, even when we suspect collusion between Conservatives and other groups. So I stand with you today, member from Wellington-Halton Hills, to oppose collusion of any kind.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** I'm going to share my time with the member from Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock.

I've studied this bill, and, in my opinion, it's just a fuzzy piece of legislation, brought in a political year as we're approaching a political and obvious election. I say at best it's confusing, or mischievous and redundant. Let

me tell you why I think it's confusing, mischievous and redundant. I essentially want to make three points.

First of all, when you read through the existing legislation that's on the books, the Election Finances Act already distinguishes between advertising expenses incurred by third parties and advertising expenses incurred by political parties, constituency associations, candidates and others acting on their behalf. That distinction is already on the books. It's crystal clear.

When you read the existing act, it goes on and points out that if third party advertising is not at arm's-length, then it is already included under candidate reporting or spending limits. So there is already a mechanism to deal with the situation that this private member's bill is supposedly designed to get after.

Now, if it is at arm's-length, then it's third party advertising and it would not be included. That's one problem with the bill: The mischief is already dealt with in the existing legislation. So that's an either/or situation that's already captured.

My second point is that the bill is flawed. Here's where it gets really fuzzy: When you read through the bill, it talks about collusion and it talks about express or implied knowledge. There's no definition section in the bill, so nobody knows exactly what one means or what the bill is intended to capture by the word "collusion"; neither does it define what the bill is supposed to mean by "express or implied knowledge" of third party advertising expenses.

If the bill were to pass, we're going to get into a really swampy area where a whole lot of people are going to try to figure out just what is meant by collusion, what constitutes collusion, what constitutes express knowledge or implied knowledge—and "implied knowledge" is another one of those fuzzy things, like "collusion." The bill, as drafted, is going to be impossible to interpret, and if you can't interpret it, it's going to be impossible to enforce. That's why the bill is technically flawed. So you take that flaw and you match it with what's already on the books—that if there's third party advertising, it's already captured and it has got to be reported.

My third point is that the McGuinty government took steps back in 2007 with Bill 218, which was the Election Statute Law Amendment Act. What that bill said—and it's crystal clear in that bill, unlike this sort of fuzzy, mischievous, redundant piece of legislation—was that third parties that spend \$500 or more in an election period have got to register with the Chief Electoral Officer. So you've got to register them. Then, within six months of the election, that registered third party has got to report to the Chief Electoral Officer on their spending activities.

If they've spent more than \$5,000, it takes it a step further and really ratchets down on the oversight, because it says that if you spend more than \$5,000, the expenses actually have to be audited and signed off by a professional auditor. A statement of authorization is also required on behalf of third party advertising. So all of those mechanisms, to deal with what this member, in his slightly paranoid political mind, sees as collusion and

implied hanky-panky going on behind the scenes, are already dealt with.

**1450**

Furthermore, just the other day the Attorney General of Ontario, Mr. Bentley, introduced an act, the Ensuring Integrity in Ontario Elections Act, 2011, which deals with corrupt practices. There are all kinds of protections built into the act, and if the Attorney General's bill goes through, they'll be strengthened even more.

The legislation is being fuzzy and redundant and mischievous and all of that sort of stuff. One has to ask oneself: Why is the legislation being brought forward? The legislation is being brought forward on the fifth day before we adjourn before the October 2011 election, and it's just sort of out there to muddy up the waters and score some political points. It's all unnecessary, because the legislation is already on the books. It's going to be strengthened by the Attorney General's legislation. This is just a little political posturing during private members' business. For this reason, I will not be supporting this bill, and I urge my fellow members of the Legislature to see through the fuzziness and the redundancy and mischievousness of this legislation and vote against it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm pleased to put a few comments on the record in response to Bill 195, as presented by my colleague the member for Wellington–Halton Hills. I want to commend him for bringing the bill forward. It's a bill that I believe is needed in this province. We need to strengthen Ontario's election advertising laws. As our Ontario PC critic for democratic reform, I think that the centre of any true democracy is where everyone plays by the same rules, and I think that's really the heart of this bill.

The member from Willowdale uses the word "mischievous." I would use the word "necessary," because I truly believe that this is necessary: We need to strengthen these advertising laws and we need to make sure that everyone plays by the same rules.

If you want to talk about being mischievous: When Dalton McGuinty and his Attorney General talk in benign terms and then send their henchmen out to call our Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, corrupt, because the Attorney General and the Premier—Dalton McGuinty at one point says that he's just like Prime Minister Harper, and then the next minute there's a Liberal email going out insinuating that federal Conservatives are corrupt. So if you want to talk about being mischievous, if you want to talk about muddying the water, you can't have a bill that talks, as the member from Willowdale talks, about integrity.

The bill from the member for Wellington–Halton Hills puts some integrity back into our election advertising, because it's a little rich for the Liberal Party opposite to talk about adding integrity and cracking down on election fraud when they continue to skirt the election advertising laws. What we're proposing here are amendments, through this bill, that need to be done. The member

talked about Working Families, and let's make no mistake as to where that advertising is directed. It is directed at our party.

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** That's why you don't like it.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** We're going to talk about that, member for Northumberland. We're going to talk about that.

I had the pleasure of running in a by-election. The beauty of by-elections is that you don't have the play-book. You don't have the red book and the orange book and the blue book; you talk about issues and you talk about people. I'm proud, as is the member for Wellington–Halton Hills, that I had a wide variety of people support me in my election. I had teachers working on my campaign, nurses—people, as the member so aptly puts it, whose head bosses at the union use some of their money for the Working Families Coalition.

I think it's very important, when these ads are running—actually with our leader, Tim Hudak, in some of them—some people were shocked and appalled when they realized what the Working Families were trying to do.

Everyone needs to have limits. We have limits. All candidates, all of our competitors, in the October 6 election will have limits. What we're talking about is strengthening the playing field so that groups like Working Families have to play by those same rules, so that there is no collusion, there are no mischievous emails coming out—as there were this week just after the Attorney General tabled his election bill—maligning the federal Conservative Party.

You should be ashamed of yourselves for being part of that smear campaign. You should stand in your place today and support Mr. Arnott and his wonderful bill. We need to stand up for integrity—all the members. I appreciate the New Democratic Party stating their support for Bill 195.

If there's time to pass the Attorney General's bill before we adjourn, there's time to pass this bill as well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I have only a minute to speak, but I just wanted to say that I support the member from Wellington–Halton Hills. I support his initiative. It's absolutely necessary to tighten up the rules. We do not support collusion. We're not the beneficiaries of it in the New Democratic Party.

It is very interesting, following the federal election. I say to folk who are part of Working Families or any other group that pretends to be an amalgam of folk and pretends to be non-partisan but, in fact, is very partisan: It just doesn't work. We looked at strategic voting in the federal election; it doesn't work. If your aim is to attack Progressive Conservatives, for example, guess what? In the last election, it did not work.

Look at voting for someone, for heaven's sake. If there's one message I get out in the last 40 seconds it's this: We shouldn't be voting against anybody. We should be voting for someone—for party platforms, for perform-

ance, for the person or for the party—not against someone. Any group or any person who advocates that kind of manipulation of the system, whether on a gross scale or simply at the ballot box, really doesn't understand the very terms of democracy: that what we're supposed to be about here is putting forward something positive and voting for something positive.

New Democrats are absolutely opposed to union or corporate donations. We always have been and always will be. I support the bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rick Johnson:** It's a pleasure to stand up and speak to this bill this afternoon. We all know the purposes of why this is being brought forward. My colleague from Willowdale was pretty clear about this. It's because of the antics that occurred during the last federal election, and we step forward as a government to bring forward legislation to ban dirty tricks during elections.

The right to vote, we all agree, is a fundamental human right, and it's something that our forefathers all fought for to make sure that we have this maintained in this province. When things are going along, we know the reasons why this occurred. There were phone calls that were being made. This has been happening across Canada. We brought forward legislation to tighten up those loopholes, because it was a loophole. Elections Canada has it; we didn't have it in Ontario. We want to make sure that things like phone calls in the middle of the night, saying that you're working for one candidate when you're actually not, disrupting people's lives by telling them to go to other voting booths or voting poll stations—these are things that need to be dealt with. That's why we brought forward the motion that we did as a government. I think it is something that is absolutely needed and absolutely required.

Let's talk about the Working Families Coalition. This is a concerned group of people who remember the years 1995-2003. They remember the problems that were had. They remember the underfunding of education that was so predominant. I was on the school board back then when the reports were brought forward that proved that schools were being underfunded by over \$1 billion. I remember the famous statement by the former Minister of Education from that time, who said, "Let's create a crisis in education." So we've been there. The fact that there's a group that has gotten together to speak about this, raise that issue and remind people—I think they're just looking after their own interests.

**1500**

If we want to talk about organizations working against people, what about the pharmacy campaign last year, coincidentally launched in 22 campaigns? Who ran that campaign? Do you remember the name of that person?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Independent pharmacists.

**Mr. Rick Johnson:** Yeah, independent pharmacists. Right. I think his name was Mark Spiro who ran that campaign.

**Interjection:** Oh, yeah. What does he do now?

**Mr. Rick Johnson:** He's now running, of course, the PC campaign.

**Interjection:** No collusion there.

**Mr. Rick Johnson:** No, there's no collusion. No, we wouldn't call it that.

I recall the advertising going on. There was advertising that was run on the radio stations across the province, including in my area. One of the ads said that the Liberal government was cutting \$1 billion out of front-line health care, which is not true, because in our budget it showed that we are clearly increasing funding for health care by over \$2.5 billion. So we launched a complaint with the advertising council of Canada, and we got a response three days later from the advertising council of Canada. What they said was, "This is a political advertisement. It doesn't have to be truthful." To me, that is something we should be talking about, but that was the actual ruling we got back from the advertising council of Canada: "A political campaign does not have to be truthful."

We're seeing the results of this when the party opposite is talking about: "We can lower the electricity rates. We can do this without impacting you."

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rick Johnson:** The cuts are coming. That's the behind the scenes stuff.

"Collusion"—I looked it up. It says that it's "a secret agreement between two or more parties for fraudulent, illegal or deceitful purposes." The fact that a group of workers, working groups, wants to work together to tell the truth and bring things out about what they believe parties are talking about, I think there's nothing wrong with that. I think they should be working together.

When I was on school boards, we worked to lobby and raise awareness about the underfunding that the previous Conservative Party was doing to education. We fought for that, and we were successful in turning that around. It took an election to do it, but we were successful in getting it turned around.

We've taken great steps to look at the election statute ourselves under Bill 218, the Election Statute Law Amendment Act. I believe that when we're working forward on these, we will get this cleared up so that fraud cannot occur. We're tightening up some loopholes.

I commend my colleague from Willowdale—how many times did he use the word "fuzziness"? Many times he used it. But we all know what this motion is about, coming forward at this point in time. It's a chance to try to raise awareness; it's political posturing, and nothing more than that.

What we're doing is, we will be clearing up the problems, through our Bill 218, so that they don't occur this fall. You know what? That's going to be good for all parties, because nobody's an angel in all of this, I'm sure, and by tightening up the laws, we will be able to cut down on the fraud that is taking place, misleading people, taking advantage of people, trying to deflect people from it, and I think it's very important that we do this.

It's not clear to me what this bill is trying to achieve. The Election Finances Act already distinguishes between advertising expenses incurred by third parties, advertising expenses incurred by political parties and constituency associations. This was brought forward a number of years ago to Elections Ontario; it was ruled on and it's been dealt with.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I appreciate the opportunity to address this very important piece of legislation that is more than just housekeeping; it is a very important clarification that is required in our election laws in Ontario. I feel very confident that, once Tim Hudak forms government, the Ontario PC caucus will ensure that this bill becomes law if this Liberal government doesn't.

I applaud my colleague Mr. Arnott from Wellington-Halton Hills. As he's mentioned to you, his wife is a teacher who has been forced through her union to campaign against him.

I do feel badly for the members of the government, who have been given some talking points without understanding this issue from the get-go. I need to explain to them where the loopholes have come from and why this is a necessary piece of legislation.

I'm going to read some quotes from an original appeal to Elections Ontario from the Ontario PC Party. According to the Elections Ontario report, which was prepared by the law firm Torys LLP, Dalton McGuinty's former chief of staff, Don Guy, the Liberal campaign director in 2003, 2007 and now in 2011, was among the senior party members to meet with Working Families. Let me quote: "While we have concluded that the Working Families Coalition was 'independent' of the OLP within the parameters of control and agency ... the WFC's use of consultants with known Liberal connections who were simultaneously providing services both to the WFC and the OLP and, where the very person running the OLP campaign, Don Guy, is president of the polling research firm hired by the WFC"—get this—"certainly constitutes, in our view, grounds for concern which warranted this investigation."

Further, I add from Greg Essensa, the Chief Electoral Officer, in 2009: "The fourth public policy area for consideration is, should Ontario adopt stricter registration and anti-collusion provisions? Under the Election Finances Act, there is no specific provision that prohibits a third party from co-operating or coordinating its advertising with either a political party or one of its candidates, provided that the party/candidate is not actually controlling the third party's" agencies.

Furthermore, in the Torys report commissioned by Elections Ontario: "The third party advertising regime is new to Ontario. The first election under the regime disclosed a number of rough edges, particularly in circumstances where there is potential for conflicts of interest/collusion between registered parties and third parties."

That's why this piece of legislation is here, and I can tell you that if it is not passed before this election, it will

be passed before the next election. In fact, I've raised this issue many a time in the Legislature as well as with the public.

I go to an ad campaign that the Working Families Coalition ran during the Oscars, and I quote Christina Blizzard:

"You don't buy a spot during the Oscars with chopped liver. This is a well-heeled, well-organized group...."

"In 2003, Liberal backroom operative Marcel Wieder was behind the Working Families' nasty negative ad that attacked then-Premier Ernie Eves, proclaiming, 'Not this time, Ernie.'"

She goes on to say:

"There are very few rules about third party advertising.

"Third party election advertising is not subject to spending limits.

"Third parties are not required to register with Elections Ontario if they advertise outside the writ period.

"If our election finance laws have loopholes ... isn't it time to take a second look?"

Our election laws have loopholes. My colleague from Wellington-Halton Hills has decided that the time is now, before the next election, to fix those loopholes. I might add that every single one of the complaints my colleagues opposite have made about this piece of legislation could be made about the same legislation they brought forward earlier this week. In fact, if they really want to make positive change in Ontario, what they could do, instead of making spurious allegations against the Prime Minister of Canada, the Conservative Party of Canada, the Ontario PC Party and our leader, Tim Hudak, is actually add this bill to their bill and we would have no trouble supporting that.

They should also know that case law has interpreted collusion, direct and indirect. We live in a British parliamentary democracy and tradition. They should know that, on the other side. This bill could go to committee at the same time.

But it doesn't stop the fact that many of the principals of the Working Families Coalition are the exact same people who are behind Dalton McGuinty's Liberal Party. For example, Don Guy, as I mentioned earlier, is the president of Pollara. He does polling for the Working Families Coalition; at the same time, he is the director of Mr. McGuinty's campaign. In addition, Marcel Wieder, who does advertising for the Ontario Liberal Party and has contracts with the Ontario Liberal Party, is also the person responsible for doing ads for the Working Families Coalition. Then, of course, there's Pat Dillon, the head of the Working Families Coalition, who has multiple appointments by this government, who also had face time with the former Minister of Finance who is also the campaign chair for the Ontario Liberal Party, Mr. Sorbara.

We know through emails that there have been shared ads, scripts and polling details between the two organizations, and we think that it's time this loophole is closed. This is a legal issue, it is an election issue, it is a

public policy issue and it is a transparency issue, one where we need to bring back integrity to this situation.

**1510**

Again, I believe, in the work that we have done in this House and the amount of times I've challenged the Premier to tell us directly that he does not have anything to do with the Working Families, that he cannot deny it; he will not deny it, because it is true. We know that there is collusion between these two parties, the Ontario Liberal Party as well as the Working Families Coalition. That's why we fought them in court.

There is a loophole; it needs to be changed. That's why my colleague from Wellington–Halton Hills is trying to do something that will restore integrity back into third party advertising laws in this province.

Again, I am disappointed that the Ontario Liberal caucus is sitting here with speaking points and they do not know what they're talking about. I can tell you something: Once we pass this law, you will understand why it is being done—but you don't.

You are benefiting big time from the \$10-million attack-ad campaign that's about to hit the Ontario Progressive Conservatives. I wish for one moment that they could actually sit in here as legislators and not as Liberals and do what is for the public interest, what is for the public good, and close that loophole that so many members of the media have called on.

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity. I support my colleague. The Liberals can put their money where their mouth is and if they want transparency in politics, to do it this way.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** The honourable member from Wellington–Halton Hills has two minutes for his response.

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** I appreciate the members from my caucus who have supported this and who have spoken eloquently about it. I also want to express my appreciation to the New Democrats who have spoken in favour of this bill.

I will address the member for Willowdale, who criticized the bill in his brief remarks. He said the bill was “fuzzy,” “mischievous” and “redundant,” and he said it was “impossible to interpret.”

Obviously, the member for Willowdale didn't hear the remarks of the chief election officer—which were in Hansard—before our legislative committee in May 2009. Since he didn't hear that, I will repeat those comments again. This is Mr. Essensa, who is the chief elections officer of Ontario: “There is no specific provision that prohibits a third party from co-operating or coordinating its advertising with either a political party or one of its candidates, provided that the party/candidate is not actually controlling the third party's advertising.”

Mr. Essensa also reminded the committee that there are already more stringent requirements in place federally, in BC, in New Brunswick and in Quebec, and there are also regulations being proposed in Alberta that are similar to this Bill 195.

So when he says that this bill is redundant, he is incorrect. When he says that it's fuzzy, I would challenge

the member to support this bill, allow it to go to committee so that we can go into the details—perhaps have public hearings and invite some of the groups forward if they wish to make a presentation—and deal with amendments that will deal with that concern that he appears to have. When he suggests it's mischievous, I'm not sure really what to say to that, other than the fact that we have an election coming, and I'm pleased to have this opportunity to have a private member's ballot opportunity just before the election. This is, to me, a very important issue and a very serious issue.

It's interesting that, quite frankly, the bill was introduced on Monday of this week. The very next day, the Liberals introduced their Bill 196. They talk about trying to muddy the waters. That's exactly what they were trying to do.

I would say again that we are not opposed in principle to their Bill 196, but we believe that it should be amended to include the provisions of my Bill 195, to make it fair for all political parties in this next election and in the years ahead.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** The time for this ballot item has expired. We'll vote on Mr. Arnott's bill in about 50 minutes.

#### BRITISH HOME CHILD DAY ACT, 2011

#### LOI DE 2011 SUR LE JOUR DES PETITS IMMIGRÉS BRITANNIQUES

Mr. Brownell moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 185, An Act to proclaim British Home Child Day / Projet de loi 185, Loi proclamant le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the honourable member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr. Jim Brownell:** It is my pleasure to rise in the House today to speak on Bill 185, an act to proclaim September 28 in each year as British Home Child Day.

I speak on this bill with the support of co-sponsors, the member from Parkdale–High Park, MPP Cheri DiNovo, and the member from Leeds–Grenville, my colleague right across the border, MPP Steve Clark.

I wish to share with my colleagues here in the House today a story that few Canadians know anything about, a story about courage, strength and perseverance. It is a story of Canada's British home children. Daughters, sons, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of home children have joined us in the Legislature today, and they are here to remember their ancestors and to share their stories.

At this time I would like to welcome four siblings who are here today. Lynda Burke, Beth Bruder, Janet Regan and their brother, Fred Wardle, along with Fred's wife, Susan, are here today in memory of their mother, Catherine McCallum, sent from Quarrier's Village, Bridge of Weir, Scotland, in 1927.

Olivia Willar, here with her daughter, Dorothy, are remembering a mother and grandmother, Ivy Rose Elizabeth Warren.

Iris Reilly, here with her two daughters, Heather and Cheryl, are remembering Iris's father, James Forbes.

Mike Dean, from my riding of Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry, is here with his wife, Nancy—Nancy taught with me—remembering Mike's grandmother, Margarite Housley, a home child from Liverpool.

Also from my riding we welcome Carol Goddard, sitting way up in the corner, the granddaughter of Charles Frederick William Patrick Conroy, who came to Canada in 1905 aboard the Bavarian at the age of 16 years.

Al Lewis joins us today with his wife, Grace, as Al's father, Edward Lewis, arrived in Canada in 1901 at age 11, stepping off a ship named the Parisian.

Sharon Munro is here as the great-granddaughter of Marion Kelly of Scotland.

Lorraine Reoch, whose husband's grandfather, Robert Wilson Reoch, an orphan at Quarrier's Village and sent to Canada in 1886 along with his brother, John, is here in the gallery, as are Barbara Summers, Marie Sears and Marilyn Wilson, here today to remember their grandfather, Jesse Walker, and his sister, Emily Walker, who were sent to Canada by the Barnardo organization in 1905.

Gordon Fudge and his sister, Jeanette Alexander, join us. They remember their mother, Gladys Fudge, sent to Canada from England at the age of 12.

Between 1869 and 1939, about 100,000 children were sent to Canada from Great Britain, many of them to work as farm labourers and domestics in homes in Ontario and across Canada. These were the British home children, boys and girls anywhere from six months to 18 years of age. They were part of the child immigration movement. Most of them came from orphanages or other institutions, such as the Maryhill Industrial School in Glasgow, Scotland, an institution well known to my grandmother, Mary Scott Pearson.

For a variety of reasons, the children were sent to Canada and particularly Ontario, as we were a growing economy and in need of labourers. Officials believed that these children would be better off in a new land with fresh air and wide-open spaces. Most of the children were transported by British religious and charitable organizations. For the most part, these organizations believed that they were doing a good and noble thing for the children, who were worse off living in poverty in Great Britain.

In reflecting on the home children of Ontario, we think about the work of Dr. Thomas John Barnardo, the energetic founder of the Barnardo's homes that placed 30,000 children in Ontario. Hazelbrae in Peterborough was Dr. Barnardo's receiving home for girls. We think of the indomitable Maria Rye, who brought the first group of British children to Canada in 1869 and housed them in a refurbished jail near Niagara-on-the-Lake. We remember Annie Macpherson's home, originally opened in Galt in 1871 and then moved to Stratford in 1883.

Sending some 200 children to Canada each year, she came to Canada every summer to visit her children personally.

James Fegan was the founder of Mr. Fegan's Home for Boys in North Buckinghamshire, England, and in other communities throughout England. He had a distributing centre at 295 George Street here in Toronto.

To my family—and I welcome here today my sisters Mary Lafave and Judy Neville and my brother Tom. My wife, Paulette, is up here, and so is my sister-in-law, Vale, remembering John today.

We remember William Quarrier, who is remembered as the founder of the orphan homes of Scotland, having sent over 7,000 Scottish children to Canada from Quarrier's Village at Bridge of Weir between 1871 and 1938. It was from Fairknowe home, Quarrier's receiving house in Brockville—my good friend Steve Clark, MPP from Leeds–Grenville, certainly knows that place—that our grandmother, Mary Scott Pearson, and our great-aunt, Margaret Scott Pearson, were sent out from the home as domestics in Ontario.

This afternoon, I am pleased to welcome to the Legislature Keith and June McKey. They're back here for the third time. They're here along with their grandson Andrew Welch. It was June's mother, Christina Myles, who arrived in Canada as a home child in 1914, with her uncle James Myles arriving in 1915. I remember the last time I had the private member's bill, I had their two Bibles sitting right here on my desk. I know that they're up there with June today. They were sent from Quarrier's home in Scotland to the same receiving home in Brockville that I alluded to earlier.

#### 1520

As for my grandmother, she was just 42 days shy of her 14th birthday when she arrived as an orphan at Halifax, Nova Scotia, aboard the S.S. Hibernian on September 28, 1891. After spending some time in cottage 10 in Quarrier's Village, her sister, Maggie, departed from Greenock, Scotland, aboard the S.S. Pomeranian in 1894. Fortunately for these two young orphans, they were to be reunited in eastern Ontario before Maggie departed with her husband to Manitoba to homestead there.

In the gallery today is Patricia Sinclair, whose great-grandfather Henry Pouncett came to Canada on April 2, 1889, under the auspices of the Marchmont Home, the MacPherson's receiving and distribution home, in Belleville, Ontario.

The story of the British home children is one of challenge, determination and perseverance. Many home children faced adversity. Most were able to overcome it, but it was by no means easy. The British home children faced considerable challenges, and some experienced tremendous hardship. They were susceptible to mistreatment because their conditions were not closely monitored. Arriving in Ontario with their worldly possessions tucked in little wooden trunks, siblings were often separated upon their arrival, with many never to see each other again. This is an important part of story that deserves to be told.

Pat Hollins, who is here today, said in an email to me that: “under the care of Crusade of Rescue, my father, Ernest Charles Turner, and his two brothers came to Canada on June 24, 1921. Their father died in World War I, and no one is sure if the boys lived at the same residence or if they had been separated once they arrived at St. George Home in Ottawa.”

Their story does not end there. Due to their remarkable courage, strength and perseverance, Canada’s British home children did endure, and most of them went on to lead healthy and productive lives and contributed measurably to the development of Ontario.

While the British home children were underprivileged and suffered from unfortunate circumstances, they endured and almost all of them who came to Canada remained in Canada and indeed in Ontario. They grew up to raise families of their own. They contributed to our country’s economic growth and prosperity. They helped to cultivate our country’s values and defend our country’s freedom. More than 10,000 of them fought for Canada in the First and Second World Wars.

In a message to me from Ivy Succée, who is here in the gallery, I quote: “My father was a Barnardo boy who came to Canada in 1898. He suffered at first but was then placed with a lovely family that treated him as their own.” Ivy is the founder and president of the Hazelbrae Barnardo Home Memorial Group in Peterborough and has done great things to bring the home child story to her community. I understand that if this bill passes, they will be unveiling a memorial to the home children on September 28 of this year.

As well, I welcome Sandra Joyce. Her dad, Robert Joyce, came over to Canada from Quarrier’s home in 1925. He was 15 and his brother 12. Robert worked on farms in the Brockville and Smiths Falls areas, but at the age of 20 he made his way to Toronto, where he enlisted in the Canadian army and was stationed in both North Africa and Italy in World War II. Those are the contributions that the home children made to our country’s freedom and its development.

Canada’s British home children are part of our country’s history. They are part of our heritage. They represent a part of our past, and their descendants represent a part of our future. Their stories are ones that need to be taught in our schools.

I certainly am delighted to welcome Taylor and Cheryl Kennedy to this House today. Cheryl’s great-grandfather Frederick McNally was a home child who arrived in Belleville on April 11, 1892. According to the family folklore, he ran away from there to Toronto, where he worked and paid his way through school to become a government veterinarian surgeon.

Today, it is estimated that 12% of Canada’s population is made up of British home children and their descendants. That represents more than four million Canadians, and the number continues to grow. Yet there are many Canadians who still do not know the story of the home children. They are not aware of the hardships that they suffered and the sacrifices that were made. They

are not aware of the tremendous contributions that British home children made to the social and economic fibre of our great province.

Dave Penfold is here today with his parents, Mike and Helen, as Mike’s father, Frank Penfold, was a British home child. Frank sailed from Liverpool, England in 1908 on the S.S. Dominion, along with 173 other home children, to arrive in Montreal, Quebec. Frank spent his early years in Belleville, Ontario, and later served in World War I with the British Royal Navy for five years. In World War II he served in the United Kingdom for four years with the Canadian army. He later married Mary Maxwell MacDonald Anderson and worked as a letter carrier.

Last year, Canada Post issued a stamp commemorating home children. As well, the federal government proclaimed 2010 as the Year of the British Home Child. I had a chance to go to Scotland, and travelled through Scotland and learned much about my family. But today we have here in the Legislature David and Catherine Lorente. They had an opportunity to travel abroad in honour of home children. Dave and Kay, who are co-founders of Home Children Canada, were invited by the British House of Commons to go to London in 1998 to address their all-party committee looking into the welfare of former child migrants. David’s father, Joseph Arthur Lorente, was a home child who arrived in Canada in 1914 at the age of 15.

In closing, I think it is time that we honour the home children of Ontario. It is time that we set aside a day, the day that my grandmother stepped on Canadian soil—September 28; selfishly I do that—but it’s a day on which we can all be proud to recognize and appreciate and say thank you to the home children who did so much for Ontario and Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I’m pleased to rise in the House today to speak about Bill 185, which would proclaim September 28 of each year as British Home Child Day in our province. I’m also very proud to be speaking as a co-sponsor with the member for Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry and the member for Parkdale–High Park. I think it’s high time that we have this debate and pass this bill. I know that the member opposite, my eastern Ontario neighbour, has brought this before under a couple of different incarnations, and I’m glad that we’ve been able to get past the politics of this place and actually have this, if the vote goes through for it to be passed. I want to welcome all of the guests in the Legislature today. It’s a very important bill, and I want to again congratulate the two members.

When this place works, when all three parties can get together—we all know the tone of this place and how, in a very few short days, we’ll be leaving this place for the summer, and we all have our own idea of how best we can run the province, but it’s nice for us to come together today. Again, I congratulate all the members.

The previous incarnation of this speech was Bill 12, which I guess was the first time I had the opportunity to

discuss it as a member of this Legislature. I'm going to get into the Brockville connection as part of my riding of Leeds–Grenville, but I also want to talk about the personal connection to British home children that up until Bill 12 was introduced I didn't even know myself.

As some of you will remember from that debate, my wife, Deanna—her paternal grandfather, Sidney Roberts, was a British home child. He came to Canada as a seven-year-old with his brother John, who was nine. They were involved with a trip on the Dominion steamship line that departed Liverpool in July 1908, bound for Montreal. Sidney then was shifted from Quebec to Ontario, and he landed in Woodstock, where he lived with a farm family, but he was never, ever adopted.

Sidney's mother died in childbirth. He was one of 11 children, and the family was separated. Some of the children remained in England, some went to Canada, some to the United States and others to Australia. I know that if my late father-in-law David Roberts was alive, he'd be extremely pleased, not just that I was here in this place but that I got to talk about Sidney Roberts being a British home child.

I appreciate that the member for Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry talked about his grandmother and his great-aunt and the Brockville home where they were sent from as domestics.

**1530**

At the last discussion on this bill in this House, I thanked, and I will thank again today, Doug Grant, who is a historian from Brockville who has done much research on the Fairknowe Home, which was the home in Brockville—which still stands to this day, although, as I have mentioned in this place before, it's now an apartment building. I believe it was back in the 1930s that it was subdivided for homes. The home still stands, but there is no reference, there are no defining marks, of what had happened there many years ago. So, again, it's an opportunity here today for us to remember the British home children.

I want to reiterate some of the remarks that Mr. Brownell talked about earlier where he talked about courage, strength and perseverance, and I echo those words in my address today. The home in Brockville, the Fairknowe Home, the Quarrier home for orphans in Brockville, was the organization, as the member noted, from William Quarrier from the Orphan Homes of Scotland, who purchased that large home in the east end of Brockville in 1888 from Amelie and Harry B. Abbott, the previous owners. Abbott had been a vice-president and managing director with the Brockville and Ottawa Railway. Earlier, from 1847 to 1871, it had been the home of, again, a very well known family in Brockville, Caroline and George Crawford.

The picture that I had at the time and still have in my office was taken in front of the home of a new group of boys and girls that had arrived. The picture actually had William Quarrier and his wife, Isabella, and I understand from historians that there were some kids in that photo who still are unidentified to this day. In later years, the

Fairknowe Home was operated by Claude Winters, who was its superintendent, and the facility closed in 1934—again, sold to Dorothy and Arthur Hardy.

It's interesting to note that some of the early work of the children's aid in Brockville was done at that particular facility, but now it's an apartment building, there are a number of single family homes around it, and again, but for the writings and some of the work of the home child group and the work of my colleague and neighbour Mr. Brownell, some of that would be forgotten.

I do also want to make mention of a lady, Donna King, who is known to the member, who also brought many items from a gentleman she introduced me to, the late Walter Wilson, who passed away in 1979. Donna showed me documents that she had from Mr. Wilson, a British home child. She had his original certificate of education from Dr. Barnardo's schools in London, and she also had the original trunk in which he had all of his possessions, something that would be familiar to some of the people in the audience today. The other artifact she had was a personal medallion for good conduct and length of service from Dr. Barnardo. So these were fascinating.

The other thing that was fascinating to me was the fact that he actually changed his name. He was named Walter Collett, but he changed his name to Walter Wilson, and she had a notification of a change of name, which was actually signed and took place on the field of battle on December 26, 1943, which was just totally new to me. It was an artifact that I was quite interested in, and I appreciated Donna's discussion about her desire, and she had clippings from the Toronto Star and later we had the clipping from the Toronto Sun from Christina Blizzard that talked about the need—that if this place would work, we should get together and pass this bill.

It's a bit of a coincidence that as we're debating this bill, another facility in my riding, in Athens, the Athens museum, is preparing to open an exhibit highlighting the incredible contribution of home children in that community. The exhibit will open on May 28 and will run for the entire year. I'd like to thank the Lorentes for providing the pin to me today, and I also have the crest that Mr. Brownell gave me, so I'll be asking, if they allow me to, to show that crest and some of the documents at that display in Athens for the year. I really hope that we'll be able to celebrate on September 28 at that exhibit and perhaps other areas in my riding—if all goes well today—that milestone in our communities.

There are a couple more stories I want to tell in the time that I have left. There were two girls that I was told about who were at the Fairknowe Home in Scotland around 1890. I share a surname with Maggie and Martha Clarke, although they spell their names with an E, not like mine. Maggie was just 13 and her sister, Martha, nine when they were orphaned and sent from their homeland across to the home in Brockville. Sadly, after arriving, Maggie and Martha were separated. Maggie went to a live with a home in Newboro, while Martha was adopted into a home in South Mountain.

Henry Smid of the Athens Historical Society noted there was a happy ending. Apparently, years after they were separated, Martha and Maggie, now married with children of their own, were reunited. I can only imagine how emotional it must have been for them to finally get connected after so many years apart.

Finally, the Athens Museum display, which runs, as I said, for a full year, reveals another legendary figure in that community's history: police chief Scotty McLean, who himself was a home child. Chief McLean came to Canada as a home child from Scotland in 1930 at the age of 16. After settling in Leeds county in 1935, he would go on to proudly serve his new country in Second World War as a member of the Governor General's Foot Guards. He obtained the rank of captain, and after he returned to the Athens area, he settled with his wife, Katherine.

Once again, Chief McLean would answer the call by taking a job as, first, a police officer. Then, after a 10-year break from the force, he came back to be the police chief in 1962. He'd hold the job until 1980. An obituary after his death in 1991 described his approach to policing in this way: "He enforced the law with firmness and impartiality, which made him sort of a father figure to many citizens." It really speaks to the character of Chief McLean that the man who grew up as an orphan would be described as a father figure, even to those who may have run afoul of the law.

Perhaps recalling the turmoil his own life at a young age and wanting to ensure that youth in his community had role models and guidance, McLean was a strong supporter of Scouts, Cubs, Girl Guides and Brownies. He was also an integral part of fundraising efforts for the Centre 76 Arena project, a rink where a new generation of kids would learn valuable lessons from life through sports. I have to tell you, as a young person who played minor hockey in that rink, when Chief Scotty McLean was there, there was no monkey business going on in the arena. You were always, as a young person, on your best behaviour. He was role model and a wonderful man and sadly missed.

I'm humbled to co-sponsor this bill, which is such a fitting tribute to the lasting legacy of British home children, to people like Maggie and Martha Clarke, to Chief McLean, to Sidney Roberts, to all of your relatives, all of the British home children's relatives and to the legacy that has come on. I'm pleased and proud that I have my name affixed to this bill, and I want to thank the member opposite for giving me that wonderful opportunity. I'll always remember it, my friend, and thank you for your generosity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Before I begin, I just want to ask all members to join me in applauding those who've taken the time to come here and to support the member from Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry for all their work on this issue. Let's say thank you.

*Applause.*

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I also want to personally applaud the member for bringing this forward. It's not the first time; it's the third time. I also want to applaud him for his duties across the board in this place. He's one of those few members from across the aisle who has actually voted with us on occasional bills. He has gone beyond the partisan divisions of this place on a number of issues, and he has done it with integrity. It's, in part, sad that it has taken this long to see this bill come here, but better late than never. It's wonderful that we're going to pass it today. It's going to happen. I'm so pleased.

I'm going to give a little bit of a counterbalance to the words that you've heard so far because one of my favourite theologians and Christian apologists is C.S. Lewis. He had a great quote. He said, "Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive."

**1540**

I think that the British home children was one of those instances where well-meaning people's good intentions led to some very disastrous consequences for little children. Can you imagine being four years old and being shipped off to a foreign country, to a farm, to strangers, to work as an indentured servant?

This is a part of our past as Canadians and Ontarians that I didn't know about until Mr. Brownell brought it to our attention, that I then researched and was appalled by.

My background is also half British. Luckily, in a sense, we came over with advantages—not coming over as children who worked on farms.

To set the backdrop to this, which is often much worse, you look at that period in England when children worked as virtual slaves. One of Annie Macpherson's motivators was to get children out of matchbox factories, where they were working as slaves, and to possibly send them off to something better: working as indentured servants. This was the backdrop for children in those days, and it went on for some 350 years.

What is most upsetting to me is that this went on up to the 1970s, when child migration was still okay. It took British author and social worker—among others, I'm sure—Margaret Humphreys, in 1987, shining a light on this, setting up the Child Migrants Trust and everything that we've benefited from since. She and others like her worked very hard to shine a light into this dark place.

Studies have shown that two thirds of the children who came as British home children were abused by their patrons—and this is why I applaud what the co-sponsors have said—and yet still went on to found a great province and found a great nation. As you heard, 12% of all Canadians are descended from these British home children. It's astounding that from that place, surely, of disfranchisement and darkness came children's incredible ingenuity, fortitude and integrity. It came from a very, very dark place.

An Ontario superintendent of neglected children, J.J. Kelso, was one of the few who stood up and tried to change the way these children were dealt with. The British home children didn't come under any jurisdiction,

in terms of ministerial responsibility, in Ontario, but in Nova Scotia they came under the Department of Natural Resources. That's how they were considered. They were considered natural resources. Most of them didn't go to church. Most of them didn't go to school. Most of them slept in barns.

Yes, we want to applaud, but we want to, first of all, recognize and honour the price paid. That's why I wanted to give a little bit of a counterbalance: to recognize and honour the price paid, not only by these children—because it's true that many of them were orphans who were living on the streets in Great Britain, but many of them were taken from homes. Many of them were ripped from their families because it was deemed that their families couldn't afford to keep them. Imagine that. There are other instances in history we could turn to to see similar circumstances. How horrendous.

Also, part of it was simply to save money. In Britain, it cost about five pounds a day to keep a child in an institution. In Australia, for example, it cost about 10 shillings. I don't know what the Canadian equivalent was, but it was cheaper. It was literally cheaper, to deal with their problem in Great Britain, to put them on a boat and ship them overseas and let somebody else deal with it. That was part of the background as well.

So, in honouring their descendants, I also wanted to acknowledge the darkness where this came from. Certainly, just about every country that received them has apologized. Ours—and I think quite rightfully—were really applauded in our federal government in 2010.

But again, I think that what's also telling to me here is the role of charity versus the role of government. We laud those who are charitable and who try to look after those who fall through the cracks, but isn't it also so critical—and this I send out to my libertarian friends: The role of government is critical. The role of government in protecting the rights of children is critical. We remember that in Dickensian England there were not laws in place to protect children. That's why he wrote his books. That's why Annie Macpherson did what she did, and others: Because there was no legal protection for children—and here, it wasn't much better. In Australia, it wasn't much better either. That's why this happened. To protect children is surely a government's first and most paramount duty: to protect those who can't protect themselves.

One of the saddest pictures I looked at when I did research for this was a picture of literally dozens of little children, with their little valises and suitcases, standing on a pier. Most of us—I would assert all of us here; we don't have First Nations represented in this House—are immigrants from somewhere. Our parents didn't have it easy, most of them, and they came over and they were subjected to hardship. But to see dozens of little children with their little valises, standing on a pier, being shipped off to strangers in a strange land and really forgotten, for all intents and purposes, by their government and by the government that received them; treated like natural resources in Nova Scotia and not human beings—par-

ticularly, I think, as a woman, because we weren't human beings until the 1920s either, under Canadian law; we were considered property. But these children were considered property, and that's how they were treated and that was their experience.

Many of them committed suicide. Many of them died. The lucky ones didn't. The ones who had a chance went on to populate a province and a country; to result in us all, in this moment, in this time, in this Legislature, coming together to honour them and to honour their descendants, finally. I want to say “finally”—you feel like you want to broadcast the “finally”—to honour them. After 350 years of a practice, finally, it's over; finally, we know about it; finally, we celebrate those children; finally, we lift them up and say, “Let's honour their memory. Let's do the right thing. Let's at the very least set aside a day to say that this is part of the story of Canada. This is part of the foundation of all of our DNA. This is part of our history: How remarkable.”

I'm so honoured and so privileged to be standing here and to be part of that story as a co-sponsor. I want to thank the member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry again for allowing me into this story, because it certainly has been riveting. I've spent more time researching it because I was simply fascinated by it, but I find it's hard to do without tears coming to one's eyes. I find it hard to do without thinking of the lost names, the lost family connections; those ties that should bind us that are finally being woven back together again.

Just to conclude, I want to say that I hope what we're doing here, really, as legislators, all of us, in some small way is what we would want to do as parents: to put our arms around those little children in that picture on the pier and to say, “You know, times are going to be very tough”—these little frightened, overwhelmed children—“but you should know,” speaking sometimes centuries, sometimes decades down the historical channel, “that your descendants will be talking about you in the House of Commons in Ottawa, the House of Commons in other parliamentary democracies and in the Ontario Legislature this day at this time, and your descendants, your actual physical descendants, will be watching this moment and will be heralding you, applauding you, and your descendants will be honouring you.” I wish we could go back in time and, in a sense, we are in this moment, to do just that.

**1550**

So thank you, Jim Brownell. Thank you for all you've done for this place, too, by the way, and thank you for allowing us to be part of this incredible story of Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I'm honoured to rise in support of my colleague and friend from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry and his private member's bill to proclaim September 28 of each year as British Home Child Day.

This issue is one that is intensely personal for me and for many Ontarians. After all, one of the things that makes our province such a vibrant and diverse place is

the fact that so many of our people come from somewhere else, arriving here in Ontario to build a better life and a better future. They put down roots here, and whether we have just arrived or have been here for generations, we are all part of Ontario's story and its rich history.

My own grandfather, Alfred Charles Hoskins, was a British home child. He arrived here in Canada with his brother William exactly 100 years ago this very month. He was just 15 years old, his brother only 14.

With the clothes on their back and the now almost iconic trunk and bible, they left the port of Liverpool, England, bound for Quebec City aboard a steamship called the SS Tunisian. They came alone, like so many others. Their mother, my great-grandmother, had died of measles when they were young children and their father died of tuberculosis only a few years later. But they had each other, and they had hope for a better life.

But, like many others, when they arrived, they were separated. My grandfather Alfred went to work on a farm in Norwich in southwestern Ontario. He milked cows—40 of them—each day by hand. His brother William, or Uncle Bill as we knew him, was sent to a farm outside of Fergus.

I'm sure they were scared, and I bet they felt alone—alone and in an unfamiliar place doing unfamiliar work with unfamiliar people. After all, they were born in Islington which was, at that time, a very poor district of London, England. They were city boys, but they were also orphans, and so they knew how to get by with their skills and their resourcefulness—Charles Dickens's *Oliver* comes to mind. They were no doubt streetwise. They grew up in a workhouse and later, after their father fell ill, at an orphanage called Miss Macpherson's Home of Industry.

In other words, even at the young ages of 15 and 14, they were smart and experienced; they knew how to get by. These were skills and experiences shared by so many of the more than 100,000 British home children who were sent to Canada, as well as the tens of thousands more who were sent to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Unfortunately, many of these children, when they arrived, faced horrible challenges: abuse, poverty, loneliness and malnutrition.

My ancestors, it seems, were among the lucky ones. My grandfather was treated well in Norwich. He met a nice girl from Brantford. They married and moved to the town of Simcoe, where grandpa went to work for Borden's dairy. They had three children, including my father, William Alfred Hoskins, who, together with his two brothers, Don and Fred, and my mother, Jean, are watching today's proceedings.

Grandpa's brother Bill enlisted in the military not long after arriving and fought valiantly in World War I. He was deployed to France and fought at Ypres, where he took part in the battle of Passchendaele. On the battlefield, he was injured when the German forces used mustard gas on British and Canadian forces.

After the war, he returned home to Fergus, where he himself got married, and worked for 45 years as the

foreman in the sheet metal division of a washing machine factory. He was among the more than 10,000 British home children that we've heard about already who fought bravely for Canada in the world wars.

The history of the British home children, of the challenges they faced and the difficult obstacles they overcame, is my family's history. It is my history, as it is for the estimated 10% of Canadians who are descended in some way from British home children.

Theirs is a remarkable history, and it is a history that rings true for all Ontarians whose mothers and fathers, grandmothers and grandfathers made the sometimes perilous journey to Canada in search of a better life. It is history that inspires us to keep pushing forward, to keep growing, working hard and seeking out new opportunities, in their memory and in memory of all those who came before.

I'm here before you today because of my grandfather's fortitude, resilience and determination. I'm proud to honour his memory, and I am proud to carry his name forward into history. Dad, I know that grandpa would be proud to see what you have done with your life, and the wonderful legacy that you and mom have created together.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield:** I am proud to rise in support of my friend from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry and in support of this particular bill.

I'd like to share with you what David Cameron said: "One year on from the British government's apology and the tragedy of thousands of lost childhoods is still as sad and shocking as ever. We should remember the hardship and heartache experienced by those children and their families as a result of these misguided child migration schemes."

Our own government said the British home child year, 2010, "is a meaningful way to acknowledge this chapter of Canadian history ... recognizes the hardships suffered by the British home children and their perseverance and courage in overcoming" them.

The year 2010 was designated the year of the British home child as a meaningful way for the government of Canada to recognize the hardships suffered by British home children, and their perseverance and their courage in overcoming these hardships.

Here we are today, in 2011. We haven't had that opportunity, so it's time for us to make history, hopefully, this afternoon, and make sure that all of us do follow up in support.

As was heard, from 1849 to 1960, approximately 100,000 children were brought to Canada by religious and philanthropic groups. When I did my homework, I kept reading about hardships, and I couldn't understand, as a mother—how do you send your child away? Even as a relative, it's so difficult. I thought what I would do is go back in our history. I was very saddened to hear and read what I did. Let me quote for you. This is the *Manitoba Daily Press* of 1879. It speaks to the harsh realities

of these children. The article spoke of the dumping of paupers from Great Britain upon Canada. They said that such a “ruinous scheme” would be met “with most determined opposition from every man who has a grain of common sense,” but not for the reason you might think, because the paper goes on to state, “Pauper immigration at any time is a bad thing for the country,” not because it was going to displace the children, but in fact it was going to be bad for the country as a whole.

This speech was actually delivered by Mr. J. Rankin, who was a member of Parliament for Canada, and he delivered it at a church meeting in Wolverhampton: “The emigration of children in industrial schools and orphanages is by far the best possible method of disposing of them. The method of placing our children in our colonies in good homes is the best for the children themselves, and the cheapest method of disposing of them. It would be just and fair, as well as prudent that some portion of the grant might be used for purposes of emigration, and the Central Emigration Society has on several occasions pressed upon the notice of the Home Secretary this definite proposition, namely, that the government grant,” should be paid in the course of time.

**1600**

In essence, they sold the children. Do you know why? The cost of outfitting and conveying a child to Canada was £15, but the cost for the government to keep the child in an orphanage or a home was about 9 pounds and 2 shillings a year, so in two years the cost was covered, and the average stay in a home in England was five years. In essence, it was a way for them to get rid of their children. What a sad reflection. Wasn't it a good thing that they actually apologized for that part of their history?

But we were just as complicit because we accepted those children without asking why. We really accepted those children without asking why. We warehoused those children. There were some 50,000 who actually came not from the industrial homes where they had some training, but the young ones who were so tiny who didn't have any education and really didn't have anything, and they were indentured to farms. They were separated. Our government actually could have relaxed and changed the absurd restrictions and immigration policies that were placed on these children, but we didn't, so 78,000 children were exported to Canada too young and without knowledge.

The bottom line, as I said, is that both Canada and the British government supported this immigration program well into the first child law, which did not come into place until 1927 in this country. Children were sold to Canadian farmers. Siblings were separated from their families, never to see each other. There's no question that some children were very fortunate and found wonderful families, but many children ran away. They ran away because it was so hurtful where they had been sent.

But in spite of this, the children survived. They survived. They had the fortitude. They were able to build a family, build this country and support this country, as you heard, in so many ways, in spite of what we had done. Isn't it time that we actually apologized for our

behaviour and our complicity in this whole scheme of things? And isn't it time that we also remember that children are still being sold in this world and that we need to all stand up against child slavery? We all need to remember that it's happening in this country as much as it is happening in others and that we each bear a responsibility to ensure that this is stopped. I'm not sure of all the ways that we can do it, but I do know that if we lend our voices, we can make a difference.

I'm pleased to support my good friend, and I share what the member from Parkdale–High Park said: I'm going to miss you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** The honourable member, Mr. Brownell, has two minutes for his response.

**Mr. Jim Brownell:** First of all, let me say what an honour and a privilege it is to have four colleagues stand in the House today, the members from Parkdale–High Park, from Leeds–Grenville, from Etobicoke Centre and certainly the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Can you imagine? Wonderful.

I can say that your words—I set out the road map here today, and I kind of had to rush at the end of it, but you filled in all the blanks. I have to say that the words that you told, the stories that you shared and the passion that you had in your voices—there were many tears shed up there in the gallery today. I saw you.

Certainly there should be tears. I never knew my grandmother, but I've heard stories. I think of my aunt Hilda in Cornwall. I doubt if she's watching the parliamentary channel, but I'm sure she'll hear the story. I look at my mom. She's in the hospital right now and I'm sure she's watching on her hospital TV what's unfolding here today. But I do want to say that it's these stories that must continue to be told. It's the stories that have to be told. I see two young folks up in the galleries there right now, Faith and Shannon McRae. It was just last fall that we had an opportunity to do a little bit of theatre, myself being the farmer and you being the home children, and what a great day that was. You missed school today, but you got, in my opinion, a great history lesson here in the Legislature, and I want to thank you for coming. I want to thank you for joining all these other folks who have travelled here today, some from long distances, and if your name wasn't mentioned here today, there were just too many names and I had to rush through this. But from the bottom of my heart, I want to say thank you.

This is my last chance for a private member's bill, and probably the last chance to make any presentation, but if I can leave the Legislature knowing that the British home children are recognized in Ontario as they were in Canada last year and on a Canadian stamp, I will be a happy man. So thank you all for what you've done.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I think everyone is here on your side. Okay, we will go on to voting. The time for this—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I was trying to cheat, but they won't let me. We have to suspend for

eight minutes, because that's when our time would be for voting, in case people are in their offices. I'm sorry, but blame it on the Clerk.

**Hon. Monique M. Smith:** Can I ask for unanimous consent that we move this along?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Unfortunately, during private members' bills, we don't have the same rules as when the House is sitting as a whole, so we can't do unanimous consent on that. It's written pretty hard copy in the standing orders.

This House is suspended for six minutes.

*The House suspended proceedings from 1606 to 1612.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Order. I just ask members to please take their seats. The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AMENDMENT  
ACT (COMMENCEMENT OF TERM  
OF OFFICES DATE), 2011  
LOI DE 2011 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR LES ÉLECTIONS MUNICIPALES  
(DATE DE COMMENCEMENT  
DES MANDATS)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We will first deal with ballot item number 13, standing in the name of Mr. Lalonde.

Monsieur Lalonde has moved second reading of Bill 153, An Act to amend the Municipal Elections Act, 1996 to change the date on which the term of offices begins and to make related amendments.

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

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Monsieur Lalonde.

**Mr. Jean-Marc Lalonde:** I would ask that this bill be referred to the general government standing committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** So ordered.

BANNING COLLUSION IN  
ELECTORAL ADVERTISING ACT, 2011  
LOI DE 2011 INTERDISANT  
LA COLLUSION DANS LE CADRE  
DE LA PUBLICITÉ ÉLECTORALE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We'll now deal with ballot item number 14.

Mr. Arnott has moved second reading of Bill 195, An Act to amend the Election Finances Act to ban collusion in electoral advertising.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard some noes.

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

We will call in the members after the next vote.

BRITISH HOME CHILD DAY ACT, 2011  
LOI DE 2011 SUR LE JOUR DES PETITS  
IMMIGRÉS BRITANNIQUES

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We will now deal with ballot item number 15.

Mr. Brownell has moved second reading of Bill 185, An Act to proclaim British Home Child Day.

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

*Second reading agreed to.*

BRITISH HOME CHILD DAY ACT, 2011  
LOI DE 2011 SUR LE JOUR DES PETITS  
IMMIGRÉS BRITANNIQUES

Mr. Brownell moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 185, An Act to proclaim British Home Child Day / Projet de loi 185, Loi proclamant le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard some noes.

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1614 to 1619.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Order. I'd just ask members to please take their seats.

BANNING COLLUSION IN  
ELECTORAL ADVERTISING ACT, 2011  
LOI DE 2011 INTERDISANT  
LA COLLUSION DANS LE CADRE  
DE LA PUBLICITÉ ÉLECTORALE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Mr. Arnott has moved second reading of Bill 195. All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Arnott, Ted  
Clark, Steve  
DiNovo, Cheri

Hardeman, Ernie  
Klees, Frank  
MacLeod, Lisa

Marchese, Rosario  
O'Toole, John  
Prue, Michael

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** All those opposed to the motion will please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Nays**

Albanese, Laura  
Arthurs, Wayne  
Balkissoon, Bas  
Berardinetti, Lorenzo  
Best, Margaret

Dickson, Joe  
Hoskins, Eric  
Jaczek, Helena  
Johnson, Rick  
Kular, Kuldp

Rinaldi, Lou  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Sergio, Mario  
Smith, Monique  
Sousa, Charles

Brownell, Jim  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Colle, Mike  
Delaney, Bob  
Dhillon, Vic

Levac, Dave  
Naqvi, Yasir  
Pendergast, Leeanna  
Phillips, Gerry  
Qaadri, Shafiq

Takhar, Harinder S.  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

Berardinetti, Lorenzo  
Best, Margaret  
Brownell, Jim  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Clark, Steve  
Colle, Mike  
Delaney, Bob  
Dhillon, Vic  
Dickson, Joe

Johnson, Rick  
Klees, Frank  
Kular, Kuldip  
Lalonde, Jean-Marc  
Levac, Dave  
MacLeod, Lisa  
Marchese, Rosario  
Naqvi, Yasir  
O'Toole, John

Rinaldi, Lou  
Ruprecht, Tony  
Sergio, Mario  
Smith, Monique  
Sousa, Charles  
Takhar, Harinder S.  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**

The ayes are 9; the nays are 28.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion lost.

*Second reading negatived.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** We'll open the doors for 30 seconds.

BRITISH HOME CHILD DAY ACT, 2011

LOI DE 2011 SUR LE JOUR DES PETITS  
IMMIGRÉS BRITANNIQUES

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Mr. Brownell has moved third reading of Bill 185.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Albanese, Laura  
Arnott, Ted  
Arthurs, Wayne  
Balkissoon, Bas

DiNovo, Cheri  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Hoskins, Eric  
Jaczek, Helena

Pendergast, Leeanna  
Phillips, Gerry  
Prue, Michael  
Qaadri, Shafiq

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Opposed?

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 38; the nays are 0.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** I declare the motion carried. Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

*Third reading agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Orders of the day.

**Hon. Gerry Phillips:** I move adjournment of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

This House stands adjourned until Monday, May 30, at 10:30 a.m.

*The House adjourned at 1624.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Steve Peters

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
<b>Aggelonitis, Hon. / L'hon. Sophia (LIB)</b>	Hamilton Mountain	Minister of Revenue / Ministre du Revenu Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Halton Hills	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Arthurs, Wayne (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
<b>Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)</b>	Sudbury	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)</b>	London West / London-Ouest	Attorney General / Procureur général Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
<b>Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Health Promotion and Sport / Ministre de la Promotion de la santé et du Sport
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
<b>Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)</b>	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Brown, Michael A. (LIB)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Brownell, Jim (LIB)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Caplan, David (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Carroll, Hon. / L'hon. Aileen (LIB)	Barrie	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism and Culture / Ministre du Tourisme et de la Culture
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
<b>Crozier, Bruce (LIB)</b>	Essex	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
<b>DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)</b>	Parkdale–High Park	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Dombrowsky, Hon. / L'hon. Leona (LIB)</b>	Prince Edward–Hastings	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)</b>	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC) Elliott, Christine (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB) Gélinas, France (NDP) <b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Oakville Nickel Belt Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry / Ministre du Développement du Nord, des Mines et des Forêts
Hampton, Howard (NDP) Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Kenora–Rainy River Oxford	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiles et de l'Immigration
Hoy, Pat (LIB) Hudak, Tim (PC)	Chatham–Kent–Essex Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jaczek, Helena (LIB) <b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Oak Ridges–Markham Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Johnson, Rick (LIB) Jones, Sylvia (PC) Klees, Frank (PC) Kormos, Peter (NDP) Kular, Kuldip (LIB) Kwinter, Monte (LIB) Lalonde, Jean-Marc (LIB) Leal, Jeff (LIB) Levac, Dave (LIB) MacLeod, Lisa (PC) Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock Dufferin–Caledon Newmarket–Aurora Welland Bramalea–Gore–Malton York Centre / York-Centre Glengarry–Prescott–Russell Peterborough Brant Nepean–Carleton Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	Third Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Marchese, Rosario (NDP) Martiniuk, Gerry (PC) <b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	Trinity–Spadina Cambridge London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB) <b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Atikokan Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McMeekin, Ted (LIB)	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	
McNeely, Phil (LIB) <b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Orléans Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC) Miller, Paul (NDP)	Parry Sound–Muskoka Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
<b>Mitchell, Hon. / L'hon. Carol (LIB)</b>	Huron–Bruce	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York–Simcoe	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound	
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pendergast, Leeanna (LIB)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
<b>Peters, Hon. / L'hon. Steve (LIB)</b>	Elgin–Middlesex–London	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Phillips, Hon. / L'hon. Gerry (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Agincourt	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches–East York	
<b>Pupatello, Hon. / L'hon. Sandra (LIB)</b>	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	Minister of Economic Development and Trade / Ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Ramal, Khalil (LIB)	London–Fanshawe	
Ramsay, David (LIB)	Timiskaming–Cochrane	
Rinaldi, Lou (LIB)	Northumberland–Quinte West	
Ruprecht, Tony (LIB)	Davenport	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Savoline, Joyce (PC)	Burlington	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
<b>Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Monique M. (LIB)</b>	Nipissing	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Sterling, Norman W. (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto–Danforth	Deputy Third Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de parti reconnu
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga–Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Van Bommel, Maria (LIB)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
<b>Wilkinson, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Perth–Wellington	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement
<b>Wilson, Jim (PC)</b>	Simcoe–Grey	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener–Waterloo	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	
Vacant	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	

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

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Robert Bailey  
Robert Bailey, Gilles Bisson  
Kim Craitor, Bob Delaney  
Garfield Dunlop, Phil McNeely  
Yasir Naqvi, John O'Toole  
Maria Van Bommel  
Clerks / Greffiers: Valerie Quioc Lim, Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Pat Hoy  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Laura Albanese  
Laura Albanese, Toby Barrett  
Bob Delaney, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Pat Hoy, Helena Jaczek  
Norm Miller, Leeanna Pendergast  
Peter Tabuns  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: David Oraziotti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jim Brownell  
Jim Brownell, Steve Clark  
Kuldip Kular, Dave Levac  
Amrit Mangat, Rosario Marchese  
Bill Mauro, David Oraziotti  
Joyce Savoline  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Laura Albanese, Michael A. Brown  
Donna H. Cansfield, Aileen Carroll  
Howard Hampton, Ernie Hardeman  
Lisa MacLeod, Leeanna Pendergast  
Jim Wilson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Reza Moridi  
Bas Balkissoon, Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Ted Chudleigh, Mike Colle  
Christine Elliott, Peter Kormos  
Reza Moridi, Lou Rinaldi  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Bas Balkissoon  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Yasir Naqvi  
Bas Balkissoon, Steve Clark  
Joe Dickson, Sylvia Jones  
Amrit Mangat, Yasir Naqvi  
Michael Prue, Mario Sergio  
Maria Van Bommel  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norman W. Sterling  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Peter Shurman  
Wayne Arthurs, Aileen Carroll  
France Gélinas, Jerry J. Ouellette  
David Ramsay, Liz Sandals  
Peter Shurman, Norman W. Sterling  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Paul Miller  
David Caplan, Kim Craitor  
Jeff Leal, Gerry Martiniuk  
Paul Miller, Bill Murdoch  
Michael Prue, Lou Rinaldi  
Tony Ruprecht  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qadri  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Vic Dhillon  
Vic Dhillon, Cheri DiNovo  
Rick Johnson, Sylvia Jones  
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Ted McMeekin  
Shafiq Qadri, Khalil Ramal  
Elizabeth Witmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day



Continued from back cover

## DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

### Taxation

Motion agreed to ..... 6156

### Time allocation

Motion agreed to ..... 6156

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

### Moose tags

Mr. Randy Hillier ..... 6157

### Agape Centre

Mr. Jim Brownell ..... 6157

### Joe Hudson

Mr. Steve Clark ..... 6157

### Health care

Mr. Peter Tabuns ..... 6157

### Personal support workers

Mr. Yasir Naqvi ..... 6158

### Rotary Club of Courtice

Mr. John O'Toole ..... 6158

### Singing contest

Mr. Tony Ruprecht ..... 6158

### Yad Vashem

Mr. Mike Colle ..... 6158

### Yad Vashem

Mr. Monte Kwinter ..... 6159

Mr. John O'Toole ..... 6160

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 6160

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES / RAPPORTS DES COMITÉS

### Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly

Mr. Bas Balkissoon ..... 6160

Report adopted ..... 6161

### Standing Committee on General Government

Mr. Jim Brownell ..... 6161

Report adopted ..... 6161

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

### Drivers Over the Age of 80 Identification Act, 2011, Bill 201, Mr. Sergio / Loi de 2011 exigeant un moyen d'identification pour les conducteurs âgés de plus de 80 ans, projet de loi 201, M. Sergio

First reading agreed to ..... 6161

Mr. Mario Sergio ..... 6161

### Provincial Offences Statute Law Amendment Act (Jury Trials), 2011, Bill 202, Mr. Hillier / Loi de 2011 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne les infractions provinciales (procès devant jury), projet de loi 202, M. Hillier

First reading agreed to ..... 6161

Mr. Randy Hillier ..... 6161

### Provincial Offences Amendment Act (Sentencing and Appeals), 2011, Bill 203, Mr. Hillier / Loi de 2011 modifiant la Loi sur les infractions provinciales (prononcé de la sentence et appels), projet de loi 203, M. Hillier

First reading agreed to ..... 6162

Mr. Randy Hillier ..... 6162

## MOTIONS

### Private members' public business

Hon. Margaret R. Best ..... 6162

Motion agreed to ..... 6162

### Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Hon. Margaret R. Best ..... 6162

Motion agreed to ..... 6162

### Private members' public business

Hon. Margaret R. Best ..... 6162

Motion agreed to ..... 6162

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

### Environmental protection

Mr. John O'Toole ..... 6162

### Replacement workers

Mme France Gélinas ..... 6162

### Paramedics

Mr. Lou Rinaldi ..... 6163

### Matthews House Hospice

Mr. Jim Wilson ..... 6163

### Taxation

Mme France Gélinas ..... 6163

### Dog ownership

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 6163

### Rural schools

Mr. Jim Wilson ..... 6163

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS / AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

### Municipal Elections Amendment Act (Commencement of Term of Offices Date), 2011, Bill 153, Mr. Lalonde / Loi de 2011 modifiant la

**Loi sur les élections municipales (date de commencement des mandats), projet de loi 153, M. Lalonde**

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde .....	6164
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	6165
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	6165
Mr. Steve Clark .....	6166
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	6167
Mr. Mike Colle .....	6167
Mr. Lou Rinaldi .....	6168
Mr. Dave Levac .....	6169
Mr. Jean-Marc Lalonde .....	6169

**Banning Collusion in Electoral Advertising Act, 2011, Bill 195, Mr. Arnott / Loi de 2011 interdisant la collusion dans le cadre de la publicité électorale, projet de loi 195, M. Arnott**

Mr. Ted Arnott .....	6170
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	6171
Mr. David Zimmer .....	6173
Mr. Steve Clark .....	6174
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	6174
Mr. Rick Johnson .....	6175
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	6176
Mr. Ted Arnott .....	6177

**British Home Child Day Act, 2011, Bill 185, Mr. Brownell; Ms. DiNovo; Mr. Clark / Loi de 2011 sur le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques, projet de loi 185, M. Brownell; Mme DiNovo; M. Clark**

Mr. Jim Brownell .....	6177
Mr. Steve Clark .....	6179
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	6181
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	6182
Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield .....	6183
Mr. Jim Brownell .....	6184

**Municipal Elections Amendment Act (Commencement of Term of Offices Date), 2011, Bill 153, Mr. Lalonde / Loi de 2011 modifiant la Loi sur les élections municipales (date de commencement des mandats), projet de loi 153, M. Lalonde**

Second reading agreed to .....	6185
--------------------------------	------

**Banning Collusion in Electoral Advertising Act, 2011, Bill 195, Mr. Arnott / Loi de 2011 interdisant la collusion dans le cadre de la publicité électorale, projet de loi 195, M. Arnott**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson) .....	6185
-------------------------------------------	------

**British Home Child Day Act, 2011, Bill 185, Mr. Brownell; Ms. DiNovo; Mr. Clark / Loi de 2011 sur le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques, projet de loi 185, M. Brownell; Mme DiNovo; M. Clark**

Second reading agreed to .....	6185
--------------------------------	------

**British Home Child Day Act, 2011, Bill 185, Mr. Brownell; Ms. DiNovo; Mr. Clark / Loi de 2011 sur le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques, projet de loi 185, M. Brownell; Mme DiNovo; M. Clark**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson) .....	6185
-------------------------------------------	------

**Banning Collusion in Electoral Advertising Act, 2011, Bill 195, Mr. Arnott / Loi de 2011 interdisant la collusion dans le cadre de la publicité électorale, projet de loi 195, M. Arnott**

Second reading negated .....	6186
------------------------------	------

**British Home Child Day Act, 2011, Bill 185, Mr. Brownell; Ms. DiNovo; Mr. Clark / Loi de 2011 sur le Jour des petits immigrants britanniques, projet de loi 185, M. Brownell; Mme DiNovo; M. Clark**

Third reading agreed to .....	6186
-------------------------------	------

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Thursday 19 May 2011 / Jeudi 19 mai 2011

## Legislative interns

The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters)..... 6141

## Notice of reasoned amendment

The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters)..... 6141

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

### Taxation

The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters)..... 6141

Vote deferred..... 6141

### Time Allocation

Hon. Gerry Phillips ..... 6142

Ms. Sylvia Jones ..... 6142

Mr. Peter Tabuns ..... 6143

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer ..... 6143

Vote deferred..... 6144

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Jim Wilson ..... 6144

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne ..... 6144

Mr. Mike Colle..... 6144

Mr. Rosario Marchese ..... 6144

Hon. Harinder S. Takhar ..... 6144

Mr. Ernie Hardeman..... 6144

The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters)..... 6144

Mr. Paul Miller..... 6144

Mr. Yasir Naqvi ..... 6144

Mr. Garfield Dunlop ..... 6144

Mr. Ted McMeekin..... 6144

Hon. John Milloy ..... 6145

Mr. Lou Rinaldi..... 6145

Mr. Tony Ruprecht..... 6145

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### Energy policies

Mrs. Christine Elliott..... 6145

Hon. Brad Duguid..... 6145

Hon. Dwight Duncan ..... 6145

### Energy policies

Mr. Jim Wilson ..... 6146

Hon. Dwight Duncan ..... 6146

Mr. John Yakabuski ..... 6146

### Government's record

Ms. Andrea Horwath ..... 6147

Hon. Dwight Duncan..... 6147

### Government's record

Ms. Andrea Horwath ..... 6148

Hon. Dwight Duncan..... 6148

### Executive compensation

Ms. Lisa MacLeod ..... 6149

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 6149

### Coroner's inquest

Mr. Howard Hampton ..... 6149

Hon. Christopher Bentley..... 6149

### Economic development

Mr. Bob Delaney ..... 6150

Hon. Sandra Pupatello..... 6150

### Executive compensation

Ms. Lisa MacLeod ..... 6150

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 6150

### Tuition

Mr. Rosario Marchese ..... 6151

Hon. John Milloy ..... 6151

### Electoral reform

Mrs. Liz Sandals..... 6151

Hon. Christopher Bentley..... 6152

### Hospital funding

Mr. Ted Arnott ..... 6152

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 6152

### Insurance rates

Ms. Andrea Horwath ..... 6153

Hon. Dwight Duncan..... 6153

### Consumer protection

Mr. Mario Sergio..... 6153

Hon. Brad Duguid ..... 6153

### Education funding

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer ..... 6154

Hon. Leona Dombrowsky ..... 6154

### Access to public lands

Mr. Gilles Bisson ..... 6154

Hon. Linda Jeffrey ..... 6154

### Aboriginal children and youth

Mr. Yasir Naqvi ..... 6155

Hon. Christopher Bentley..... 6155

*Continued on inside back cover*