



No. 71

N° 71

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

Second Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 9 October 2013**

**Mercredi 9 octobre 2013**

Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

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

Wednesday 9 October 2013

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 9 octobre 2013

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Good morning. Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUPPORTING SMALL  
BUSINESSES ACT, 2013

LOI DE 2013 VISANT À SOUTENIR  
LES PETITES ENTREPRISES

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 7, 2013, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 105, An Act to amend the Employer Health Tax Act / Projet de loi 105, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'impôt-santé des employeurs.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** It's a pleasure to get up and start the day with the ongoing scandals coming from the other side. It's important on Bill 105, which is trying to help small business—one more example of a government that is basically out of control.

Some \$1 billion—this is what the auditor said. This is the report. I encourage the viewer to have a look at it.

Bill 105 is really talking about tax policy—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Weaving in and out is one thing, but let's stay focused specifically on the bill and avoid any other discussion, as this is the tradition of the House.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Bill 105, of course, is a finance bill, technically, and it's providing some sort of relief for small business.

But, really, I'm looking at the input costs in businesses themselves, and we know full well this employer health tax relief was brought forward by our leader, Tim Hudak. I can tell you that that relief is only a small part of what's needed to fix Ontario—the jobs and the economy.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will link it to the scandalous increase in the cost of electricity. They have completely mismanaged that file, which is one of the significant input costs for all business.

We know that in northern Ontario, the pulp and paper industry—about 45% of their input costs are related to the price of energy. So Bill 105 is the first of many steps that are needed to take the foot off the neck of small business—small and large business. Let's not discriminate. We need to have more jobs in the economy.

This bill—let's be honest. Our significant decision was to eliminate it, this employer health tax. That significant decision has been delayed because of—I think as part of the budget process. The NDP got to them on a couple of things; bringing the Financial Accountability Office in, for example. This false suggestion in the budget that they were going to get a 15% cut in auto insurance, which is not going to happen—if you're going to pay less, you're going to get less. You're going to end up paying more for lawyers than you would have saved in the \$300 or \$400, if you were to have a claim.

Bill 105, in my view, does not get close to what's required in the economy today. Even if you look at it, the province itself is in a situation now where they have a significant revenue problem. So raising the ceiling by another half a million dollars, or whatever it is, that you don't have to pay the employer health tax on—they're capping it on the other end, because once your payroll gets to the level of, I think, \$5 million, then you aren't entitled to this relief in employer health tax. That's basically all that's in Bill 105.

I suspect there are other speakers who will bring other points of view to it, but I'd like to look at a whole range of tools in the tool box that the Premier—her famous term she's using nowadays. But I still go back to the auditor, and his report has to be repeated because it's in that context that you find out how much trouble we're in.

Which is the biggest part of the budget in Ontario? The biggest part of the budget, of course, is health care. It's probably about 40-some percent of the budget. But there was an article in the Toronto Star the other day—this is related; this is employer health tax, Bill 105. This article in the Toronto Star, entitled "Fundraisers an Increasing Necessity for Sick Ontarians," goes on to say that a woman who had a stroke was sort of taken out of the hospital, and the option was that she could stay for \$1,700 a month but get no treatment. This article, "Fundraisers an Increasing Necessity for Sick Ontarians," is from the October 3 Toronto Star. This person and her family were spending—mortgaging their house to get therapy for a stroke victim.

I have one in my riding, a fellow by the name of Jim McEwan, an engineer who at about 50 years of age had a stroke. He was a significant partner in an engineering firm, and now he's spending his lifetime savings to receive therapy as a stroke victim. He's a very intelligent man.

This is what has happened to Ontario. Now, this employer health tax, Bill 105, they're suggesting—if you go back to the way this thing started, it was implemented as

part of the original budget in, I believe, 2003-04. That was another tax tool. They've now increased almost all the taxes on business itself. When I say that, I'm saying that if you look at the WSIB rates and the College of Trades, these are all basically taxes on jobs; there's no getting around it. I know that the last time I was speaking on Bill 105, I wasn't really allowed to get into some of this stuff, health care being the biggest one in the budget.

Another article, this again is in the Toronto Star: Ornge, the air ambulance business, plans an overhaul of how to bid and improve its service. A review that went on—an independent report—says, “The review examined 40 cases where a patient died and found eight cases where Ornge operational issues had some impact on the outcome.” That means a medical system that's failed.

We're talking about Bill 105, which is a modest little manipulation of taxes for very small business, but in fact it just shifts that tax to someone else. There's no tax cut here for anyone.

If you don't think that paying an electricity bill isn't a tax, then you don't know how it works. Electricity is a tax, because it's non-discretionary consumption. What has happened to electricity in this province? The cost of electricity has doubled.

Now, that cost in Bill 105 does talk about the budget, and in that respect I'm relating elements that are not specifically in Bill 105, because Bill 105 only does one thing: It allows businesses with a payroll under \$5 million not to pay as much in employer health tax, but it's going to shift it to another class. So if you have a payroll of \$5,000,001, you're going to be paying more. That's what it is, because revenue in Ontario is the problem.

Expenditures are the bigger problem. They're spending more than they're earning, and that's really what the auditor is saying in all his reviews. Today I think they're reviewing long-term care in the public accounts committee, another failed delivery in health care.

**0910**

Does this relate to Bill 105? Every time you talk about the budget, you've got to talk about what the budget, the money, is being used for. I think we've made the point that health care is the largest one. The third-largest expenditure—the viewers should know this—is the interest on the debt. The interest on the debt is something in the order of \$11 billion.

So I see a government in trouble. The auditor's report yesterday with the billion dollars on the gas plants is just one more recent example.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John O'Toole:** The opposition can speak in their two-minute responses, and I'd be pleased to see them explain it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Trinity-Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** While I agree with the member from Durham, in part, that this is not a revolutionary bill, it is nonetheless a good one, and we support it because it makes a correction that I think is appropriate.

Currently, there's an exemption for paying the employer health tax on the first \$400,000 in an employer's payroll, and this applies to a small business, but it also applies to big businesses. We argue that giving a break to big businesses where they are doing just fine was something that wasn't necessary, but giving a break to a small business owner was a very useful thing and a good thing because we know and we realize that a whole lot of smaller companies are creating a whole lot of good jobs, and we need to support them.

But to give a break to a bank or many banks that are doing just fine in our economy just doesn't make any sense. So we argued with the Liberals that we should support small business but let the big businesses survive on their own. They're doing just fine without the support of our government and the support of our citizens in this particular example. We argued that while this exemption is appropriate for small companies, there is no reason to have the first \$400,000 of a large employer's payroll exempted from the employer health tax.

Therefore, one of the budget demands that we made was to have companies with \$5 million in payroll or more no longer be eligible for that exemption, and that is included in this legislation. We think that is okay, and that is why many of us will be supporting Bill 105.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions or comments?

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I'm pleased to stand today to speak in support of Bill 105, the Supporting Small Businesses Act.

I was very disappointed when the member from Durham did not focus on the debate today, did not focus on Bill 105. But more importantly, he is noticeably forgetful of what this bill is all about: supporting small businesses and the fact that this proposed legislation, if passed, will help more than 60,000 small businesses in Ontario, including roughly about 12,000 businesses that will no longer have to pay this employer health tax. Again, I want to remind the member from Durham that your party is supporting small businesses, and selectively you forgot what is fuelling the engine of this province: the small businesses. This is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing here, and it is part of our government's commitment through our 2013 budget, is to ask for a reforming of the employer health tax—again, targeting, helping and supporting small business across Ontario. As part of the reform, we are also attracting more businesses into Ontario, making it a place to work, a place to have a business—but more importantly, to attract growth in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, we are all here for one reason: one Ontario, to make sure businesses stay. More importantly, each one of us, all 107 of us, have a role and a responsibility to attract businesses, good businesses to Ontario. I think every one of us in this House has a responsibility to support bills that attract business to our economy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments? The member from Huron-Bruce has the floor.

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's great to see you in the chair. It's going to be an interesting morning.

With that, I want to commend my colleague the member from Durham, because he is spot-on when he talks about what really matters for small business. Time after time after time, we're seeing this Liberal government try and pull the wool over people's eyes and tinker around the edges. When we look at this bill, for goodness' sake—this is the Supporting Small Businesses Act. It's, again, just tinkering around the edges.

I thought the other day, when we were addressing this very issue, my colleague from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke hit the nail right on the head when he said, “My goodness. All this government does is really take from Paul, and because they've dug so many deep holes, they can't even give it over to Peter.” They have so many issues which all culminate today in the headlines, because the truth is finally out there.

This Liberal government has mismanaged for years and years, and finally enough is enough when yesterday the Auditor General outed this Liberal government for their absolute disregard for the Ontario taxpayer by relocating gas plants at a cost of \$1.1 billion. It is absolutely abysmal. That's why, when we have very thin bills like Bill 105 that just tinker around the edges, it's unacceptable.

People go to the polls and they select people to represent them in this beautiful chamber because they think they're going to make a difference. But unfortunately, time and time again, scandal after scandal, this Liberal government has proven they do not deserve the support of the Ontario taxpayer any longer, and we need to do more for small business as a result.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I listened intently, as I always do, to my good friend from Durham. He speaks in such a way—it's just a rolling thought pattern, going from issue to issue to issue, but always staying around the area of what is being discussed. I commend him for saying that this is a very small and tiny issue.

I think the member from Huron–Bruce, in her comment, also hit the nail pretty much on the head: This is tinkering around the edges. But we, as New Democrats, are proud of this little tinker. It was part of those things that we insisted on being in the budget if we were going to support it last spring. It's important for small business, and it is important, in fact, for the economy and for the government as a whole to take away this largesse from big companies that didn't necessarily need the money or deserve the money.

I'm very happy that the government has come forward with this bill, but I will have a chance in my hour to speak about what the government should have really done if they were, in fact, looking for additional revenues to wipe out an abysmal deficit that's rising and continuing at around \$9.5 billion this year. I think that's something that needs to be addressed far more than this tinkering around the edges, which is, in fact, revenue-neutral.

But I commend the member from Durham for what he had to say, because we need some real, healthy debate on this. We just can't stand up and say this is a good thing that the government has done, because it is minimalist, as most of the things that are done here are minimalist.

What we need to do, I think, is to take some real, good action on the economy, and I commend my friend from Durham for talking about the actions his party would take. They might not necessarily be the actions that I would take, but we cannot any longer accept simply minimalist intervention.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Durham has two minutes.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'd like to thank the members from Trinity–Spadina, Scarborough–Agincourt, Huron–Bruce and Beaches–East York.

Really, in fairness, to the member from Scarborough–Agincourt, I believe that I did speak quite passionately about small business. I think of the farms in my community, which are small business, and I think of the businesses that are mom-and-pop. The people next door to my constituency office are new to Canada, but they're the hardest-working people, day and night, running a small convenience store.

I really am concerned, though, that this bill itself—the people have to realize, too, that it is a tax, and it's a minimalist response to it. If you look at it, the exemptions are provided there. The payroll is—I don't know why they put that in. Either it's a tax or not.

Now, big business doesn't get any reward on this. In fact, they're going to pay more, because the revenue has to come from somewhere. The tax tools that they're talking about for transit—they're talking about increasing consumption tax, which is the HST. It's now 13%. I'm forecasting now, today, it will probably go to 15%. It's a nice, round number.

**0920**

The Liberals don't look at making efficiency changes. They look at getting more money. Their problem isn't “tax and spend”; it's “spend and tax,” because they're always behind. They're in deficit almost since they got elected. It's tragic.

I think the member from Scarborough–Agincourt—I've met a young constituent of hers, Liang Chen.

**Interjection:** A great lady.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** She's a great lady. She has a PhD in finance. She would be pro-small business; you can guarantee that. I'd do anything to see a person like her in this chamber someday—really. I put that out there because Liang Chen, to me, is a name that the table Clerks and Hansard should get the spelling correct for, because she'll be here shortly.

Potentially, others will speak today on this bill, and I'm going to be here to listen.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Not too diverse on that side. All white men and white women.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The minister is a little bit out of line there. I think the minister will retract her last comment about the people who are here.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** I retract.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** She has to actually stand—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** She did stand, and I'll take care of it. Thank you.

Further debate?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** This is my leadoff. I have up to an hour. I'm not sure that I'm going to take the whole hour.

This is a relatively simple bill, but it needs to be discussed in terms of where it fits in the overall economic patterns of this government and what we could and should be doing in order to revive the economy of this province and pay down our deficit.

First of all, I'd like to give a shout-out to small business in Ontario, particularly the small businesses in my riding. What has been said many times by every single party over the course of my time here in the Legislature is that the backbone of our economy are those small business people who operate, sometimes on a shoestring, but who are the real engine of our economy, the ones who move it forward. When big businesses started to fail in the depression, it was the small businesses that brought things forward and kept things on a pretty even keel.

In Beaches—East York, we have a number of groups that I think are doing a really terrific job, and I'd just like to name them and talk about them for a second, before I get into the meat of the bill.

We have BIAs, business improvement areas, along Queen Street and the Beach. We have a very nascent one on Coxwell Avenue; we have one on Kingston Road. They're trying to develop others along the Danforth, and in fact there is one along the Danforth as well. They do a terrific job in motivating small businesses, in keeping our storefronts alive, in inviting new restaurants—the community to get involved, to shop locally. They do that kind of job not only for themselves, but the benefits to our community are enormous.

When the storefronts were closing on certain portions of Danforth Avenue, close to where my constituency office is, the local business association and the neighbours came forward with pop-up stores. People go into the stores. The owner of the stores lets the people come in, clean them up—they don't pay any rent—and start a new enterprise. As a result of those enterprises, those pop-up stores on the Danforth—some of them have been successful, so that after a couple of months they start paying rent, and the store is open and you don't have sort of the blight, the urban blight, of empty stores along main streets. They've done a terrific job.

The BIA on Queen Street, on what I think is also a shoestring budget, is making major improvements with the street furniture and with the flowers, and making it inviting to walk along the street, to go into the restaurants and the small stores, to shop locally, to not have to get in the car or even on the subway to do your shopping but do it right at home.

Some of those monies, in fact, are coming back into the community, so we're seeing community festivals as a result. You don't see that with great, big, big-box retail—donating the same way to local neighbourhoods. You don't see the same thing with giant corporations, for all that they might give to charity. It's not local and it doesn't come right back to the community.

Everything that we can do in the NDP to help small business, we want to do it. That's why we are going to support this bill, even though the bill does not accomplish all of what we wanted to accomplish when we put it forward to the government as one of the demands leading up to the budget. Now, what does the bill do?

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** We have a mini caucus meeting going on over there. Maybe the member who is entertaining, from Agincourt, would like to take the meeting outside.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I didn't say anything.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Yes, you did. You were talking.

Continue.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I really don't care what you're talking about. You want to go outside with it. Go.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for attempting to try to bring some order here. It is often difficult to make a speech, particularly a technical speech as this one is going to be, with so many people nattering on—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, we have a little comedy act going over here.

You stand up when the member is speaking. Did you want a point of order?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** No, I was just—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, then I suggest you keep it cut back. Thanks.

Continue.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you. As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the member from Renfrew—with people nattering on and saying things and not listening. The important thing about this chamber, and we ought never to forget it, is that this is a place where we have debate, where we look at the ideas that other people are saying. If you don't want to listen to the debate, I suggest it's pretty easy not to be here. It's pretty easy just to ignore it and do whatever you're doing or quietly read your BlackBerry, which you're not supposed to have in here either. But the words have to be spoken, and I would hope that they would be listened to.

Mr. Speaker, what we put forward is not exactly what's contained within the body of the bill. I would like to outline the major and fundamental difference. What is here is that there will be an exemption for the first \$450,000 of an employer's payroll for small businesses of under \$5 million. What we had proposed in the lead-up to the budget debate was to leave it at \$400,000, not

\$450,000, and to abolish it for larger corporations that really didn't need the money. That would have produced revenues of some \$90 million for the treasury of Ontario.

It was part of an economic package that we put forward, because New Democrats do not believe that we can or should sustain deficits of the magnitude of what has been the norm here for the last number of years. We need to get out of a deficit situation, and we need to do one of two things. There are only two things that can be done. The first is that you have to increase your revenues; the second is that you have to reduce your expenditures. Reducing expenditures, many times, are very hurtful to people within the economy and can cause some serious repercussions to the economy itself. So we are very mindful of reducing expenditures, and they have to be surgically done; they just can't be across the board, as some would suggest. But increasing revenues can also be done surgically and selectively. One of the ways we thought that \$90 million could have been made was precisely by leaving it at \$400,000.

But having said that, I understand that this is a boon to some small businesses. It's going to be an amount of money that they're going to be able to keep, and we are very happy, if one group is going to benefit out of this, that it has been targeted to those small businesses that are less than \$5 million a year.

We are also happy with another small thing that is contained within the body of this bill. That is, the government has also moved to close the loopholes that allowed employers to segment their workforce. People out there may or may not understand this, but it is a practice of some companies to break themselves up for the purpose of income tax. You would have a company that would have, say, \$10 million or \$15 million in total revenues for the year that might not be eligible for the employer health tax. But what they do is they carve their company up into parts A, B, C and D so that each one of them only has, say, maybe \$4 million in total revenues. Then they get additional funds from the government and they are eligible for extra things like relief from the employer health tax. We think the government needs to be very aggressive. A company that is a company ought not to be able to claim they are four companies simply by filing something for a couple of dollars with the Ontario government stating that they are something which, in fact, they are not.

**0930**

So we are asking the government to move aggressively on this. It's not contained within the bill itself, but it will be left up to regulation. But the government has to be very aggressive because there will be companies out there that see this employer health tax and see the revenue tool that they may be able to get at \$450,000, and decide that they're just—you know, "Let's cut our company in half" or a quarter or three quarters or whatever number they're going to choose in order to be eligible for it, and a great many other things.

So those are the two issues here. We are a little disappointed that there isn't revenue here for the govern-

ment, but if it has to go to somebody, please let it be the small business. We are also very mindful that the government needs to be far more aggressive than it has been in the past to close off all possible ways of segmenting the workforce for payroll reporting purposes. Because, to date, that has not been done.

Now, we have larger concerns. I'd like to deal with some of those as they're related to this bill because, as I said, New Democrats think the bill is a good bill. It wasn't 100% our idea, but it was mostly our idea, and so we want to take some credit for where we were coming from. We were looking for it as a revenue tool; you were looking for it as a way to help small business, and, in the end, I guess both ideas have their merits.

But there are larger concerns that we have. There are other tax loopholes out there that the government is not considering or the government ignores or the government thinks are perfectly all right, which New Democrats cannot and will not accept.

Let's start with some of those. The Liberals claim that the provincial government needs to hit household budgets with new taxes to raise \$34 billion for transit infrastructure by 2031. Do we need new transit in this province? Absolutely we need transit. If you live in Toronto, as I do, I will tell you, as you try to manoeuvre through Toronto, whether you're on the TTC, whether you're driving your car, whether you're on a bicycle, the gridlock is enormous. With construction season upon us, it's even worse making your way to Queen's Park on days like this. A trip for me, if I'm in the car, which would normally be—

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** In the car?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Sometimes I'm in the car because I have things to do after work at night. You have to understand the nature of our job. And you know too the nature of our job is not necessarily just to be here, but the nature of our job is to go out from this place, from time to time, as I did on Monday, down to Niagara, much to the chagrin of the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure. But I also have to have the car because tonight I have functions after work in my riding, and I need the car to get there.

But as I came down this morning, the gridlock was oppressive at 7:30 in the morning. I could not believe, with the construction in the downtown core, how long it took me to get to this place. If I was on the TTC, which I often am as well—when I don't have functions at night or places I have to be during the day, I take the TTC—I actually enjoy it; I get an opportunity to read documentation and newspapers and things that I don't have a chance to do otherwise. It's a very pleasant, for me, 45 minutes to an hour to come down on the TTC. It's a half-hour by car, but the TTC is my preferred way whenever I have an opportunity to do it.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Don't forget, Michael, we don't have clean buses on Dufferin.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Well, no, I know—the clean buses on Dufferin. I'd like to give a shout-out to my friend from Eglinton–Lawrence, who always raises this issue.

Perhaps he would be mindful of the number of buses—I think we said so yesterday—2,000-something buses that could have been bought had we not spent a billion dollars in other ways. That would have put a clean bus on every single street in Toronto for that price. So you have to know what you want and you have to be prepared to do it. You can either shut down a gas plant in Oakville or you can have a clean bus on Dufferin. I would think my friend from Eglinton–Lawrence would have chosen the latter, and maybe should have been more vocal at the time for his clean buses instead of Oakville.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Always have been.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Always have been—and I agree with him, but I digress, Mr. Speaker, I digress.

This is what the government is saying: They need \$34 billion. Do we need the infrastructure? Do we need the TTC? Do we need buses and GO trains, infrastructure and bridges and things all across this province? Of course we do. Do we need the \$34 billion to do it? Of course we do. Do we need the \$34 billion to do it? Of course we do. But the question is, where does it come from? The government is saying, as I understand their argument, that ordinary taxpayers are going to have to pony up this \$34 billion.

I am reminded of a little meeting in my office some time ago with some business groups. They were coming forward to me to say, “We need infrastructure. We need infrastructure across Ontario. We particularly need infrastructure and money for subways and things in Toronto.” They were asking me to support the earliest machinations of the Premier to find \$34 billion from general revenues from taxation. They were looking at a whole bunch of things that were all going to hit ordinary people and small business.

I had to remind them—I said, “Look, meet me half-way. You, as a big business group—you meet me half-way. You come up with \$17 billion that big business is going to pay, and I will start to make the arguments for you about the \$17 billion that citizens will pay, because we all use the roads. We all use the infrastructure.”

I pointed right out my window, as they were watching, to University Avenue. More than half the vehicles on University Avenue, as I pointed out to them, were trucks, taxicabs, delivery vehicles and other things that were business-operated. They weren’t people in their cars. I said, “Businesses use the roads half as much as people use it for transportation and transit. Therefore, I think that business should be made to pay half the amount.” You can understand that that idea was not broadly accepted around the table by anyone except me, because the big business that was there didn’t want to pay anything. We, as New Democrats, say that everything has to be fair.

I want to get to that next point. At the same time, the Liberal government has committed to a series of new corporate tax loopholes and giveaways to Ontario’s largest corporations and highest-income earners that will cost the Ontario treasury over \$35 billion by 2031.

So there you have the choice: the corporate tax giveaways, the tax loopholes for those who earn huge amounts

of money compared to the rest of us, and the amount of money, the \$1 billion, between the two. You’re asking ordinary people to fork over \$34 billion, but you’re letting \$35 billion slip between your fingers from corporations and the very rich. Does this make any economic sense? Does this make any sense at all?

When we talk about this very small amount that’s revenue-neutral in this bill, we also have to look at what the government is doing, or not doing, to meet the needs of Ontario. If you’re going to give away \$35 billion, and you’re going to tax ordinary people \$34 billion, then I think there’s something wrong and I would think there is likely to be a revolution over such actions.

Just to be clear where this money you are giving away is in reality coming from: Beginning in 2015, the government will open a \$1-billion corporate tax loophole that will give Ontario’s largest corporations an HST rebate on expenses like high-priced restaurants and box seats. The annual cost is \$1.3 billion a year, and the cumulative cost by 2031 is \$18.85 billion. Now, just so everybody knows about that bill—I mean, everybody knows what that involves.

The most egregious part, of course, is that big corporations go to fancy restaurants and down to the Air Canada Centre, down to the Rogers Centre, take their corporate clients out for a night of shows and wining and dining and everything else and don’t pay any HST.

I know that when I go out to a restaurant, I pay the HST. Everybody in this room pays the HST. When I go down to watch a Leafs game, which I only do sparingly because the tickets are so exorbitant, do I pay the HST? Yes, I pay the HST. Why don’t the corporations have to pay the HST? When I go down and watch the basketball game—and I haven’t been to one now, I must admit, for the last year or so—I pay the HST. Why don’t the corporations pay the HST? When I go to the show and see a production, I pay the HST. Why don’t the corporations pay the HST?

**0940**

The Liberals have said this is not an issue. We think it is an issue. It’s a \$1.3-billion issue. If you close that loophole, will some of the corporations not take their clients out and wine and dine them and do all those things? Maybe some will. Will there be a slight reduction? Maybe there will in the number of expenses that are actually out there in the economy. But will it hurt the restaurants and Maple Leaf entertainment? I don’t think so at all. I don’t think one whit will it hurt, because the corporations have that kind of money, and they don’t need a tax loophole to do it.

The second thing: Beginning in 2018, there are planned corporate tax cuts from 11.5% to 10%. It will cost the treasury about \$800 million a year. This is according to the *Globe and Mail*, April 24, 2012. That’s what is anticipated: \$800 million, or \$0.8 billion a year, or \$10.4 billion by 2031. And that’s because the government has said all of these cuts will resume as soon as we come back into a non-deficit position. The government has said we’re going to be out of deficit by 2017, so in



2018 and beyond, we are going to start reducing the amounts of money that corporations pay to the point of some \$800 million a year. Can we afford this? Can this be afforded when we have been running a deficit for so long, when we have debts that are starting to cripple this economy, this government and this province? We should be very mindful of simply giving away money to corporations that make a lot of money. I want to help those that are in some kind of trouble, and we have programs for that, but just to give it away is bizarre.

I don't want to pick on the banks. The banks are there to make money, and the banks make money. I look at the quarterly reports; they make \$1.3 billion, \$1.5 billion, \$1.8 billion a quarter. Each one of the Big Five sisters makes that every quarter in profit. I have to ask myself, do we need to subsidize them? No. Do we need to impede them and hinder them and treat them nasty? No, we don't need to do that either. But why do we give tax money to them? Why do we give all of this money away that we so desperately need?

We have in this province many poor people. We have in this province families that live hand to mouth. We haven't increased near enough the amount of money that children who have the misfortune to grow up in families with a parent or parents on ODSP—we haven't given them near enough money, and they go to school hungry. Why do we need to allow that and, at the same time, feel that somehow in 2018 we're going to give additional corporate tax cuts of nearly a billion dollars to those companies that don't need it?

Beginning in 2018, there is also a planned tax cut for individuals earning over \$500,000 per year. That's going to cost the treasury of Ontario about \$470 million a year, or approximately \$6,110,000,000 cumulative by 2031. When the NDP—not this last budget, but the budget before—put as a condition that there would be a new income tax for those who earn above \$500,000, at first the Liberals shied away from it. At first, they said no and thought it was a terrible idea, until editorial opinion and research showed that 85% or 90% of all Ontarians thought it was a good idea. The Liberals then backtracked and put it into the budget, but they also put the caveat that that would end as soon as we got out of deficit position. Can we afford that? I don't think so.

If you look at what is happening in the United States, what Obama is trying to do as the President of the United States around that very issue—and Warren Buffett, one of his chief spokespeople, one of the richest men in the world, says it's categorically unfair that he pays a lower income tax rate in that country than his secretary does.

We are saying to the government that you cannot afford it if you have plans of building subways, if you have plans of new roads and bridges in rural Ontario, if you have plans of putting GO trains down to Niagara. If you have any plans at all for making Ontario a better place than it is already, you cannot forgo that money. We are telling you that it's not contained within the body of this bill. Maybe this is the first of many bills, but we want to point you in the direction you need to go.

Now, the cumulative total of those things alone—those three ideas alone—is \$2.57 billion a year or, over the life of the cumulative cost, by 2031 \$35.36 billion. That could pay for every single idea for transit, for transportation that the Premier has enunciated. That could pay every single dime, in and of itself. Will the government do it? I don't know. Would the NDP do it? I also don't know. There is a role for ordinary people to pay something, too, because they are going to benefit, in terms of helping to ease gridlock. I'm not going to say “end gridlock,” because Toronto is of such size and such sprawl that I don't know whether it can ever be ended, but it certainly can be eased. I have, and we all have, a duty to pay for some of that.

But start looking to where that money is, start looking to the deficits we have been running, and start looking to the debt that we are accumulating. Start looking at all of these things when you come up with economic bills. If we make the ITC permanently delayed—they've been delayed for a couple of years—but if we permanently delay them, as I said, this is going to be \$1.3 billion annually, and it should be done. We should consider it low-hanging fruit. It is one of the easiest possible things we can do.

I'd like to talk about some other things that we could do. Don Drummond said—and let's use the Drummond report for a few minutes—where we needed to find some additional revenues. Now, he was very light on finding additional revenues; he was very heavy on all the things that we could cut. But let's look at what he said about additional revenues. He estimated that we could get \$50 million in year one and \$200 million by 2017-18 by increasing corporate tax compliance. Those are big words, but literally having the tax department—which we gave away to Ottawa and which now works in Ottawa and not for the province of Ontario. The people we used to have work here and look after Ontario's interests now look after Canada's interests, with Ontario secondary—in my view anyway. But we made that corporate decision, and I voted against it and still think it was wrong-headed idea. They're in Ottawa now. But if we asked the federal government to be part of this, of getting corporate tax compliance so that people can't run around the tax system, we could get a minimum, according to Drummond, of \$50 million to \$200 million a year.

The federal government, to its credit—and I don't often have very nice things to say about the Harper government in Ottawa—in the last budget closed some of those loopholes federally. If you look at what was done, you have to think it's a good thing.

I was watching the CBC the night before last, and they showed tax loopholes and how Canadian companies located in Ontario primarily, but Canadian companies as a whole, picked Barbados, of all places, as the place to invest. They use the tax loopholes to set up sham and dummy corporations in Barbados, and the amount of money that is flowing between Canada and Barbados is phenomenal. It showed some of the income tax experts in Canada, caught on tape, telling people how to avoid paying income taxes and their fair share of corporate taxes in

Canada. It showed, as well, people in Barbados, lawyers and accountants in Barbados, bringing people from Canada to avoid compliance and to invest in Barbados. In fact, at the end of the television documentary show, at the end of the national news, it showed that Barbados, after the United States and Canada, was the third-biggest place in the world in which Canadians were now investing their money. A little, tiny place with less than a million in population was the third place in the world.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** It's 280,000.

0950

**Mr. Michael Prue:** My colleague here—280,000 people, he's saying. You may be right. I know it's less than a million.

There is the third place in the world that money is flowing into from Canada. We need to shut those things down. I don't know that Ontario can play the entire role, but we have to have the finance minister dealing with the finance ministers of the other provinces and with the federal government to cut those kinds of things down, because that is money that is literally bleeding from Ontario, literally bleeding from the people of Canada.

They make all their money here, but they don't want to reinvest back into the people who helped them make that money. They get all the roads; they get all the education; they get all the infrastructure that this wonderful province and this wonderful country can provide, and they don't want to pay taxes on it.

I am sorry; we as New Democrats cannot countenance that. We will not accept that. We ask the government to start being more serious on this very point. It's all well and good to help small business—and I'm back to that again—in this very small way that will help some of them with \$1,000 or \$2,000 a year, and I'm thankful for that and I'm sure they are too. But we have to start looking at the big players, and we have to start looking at those players that don't want to play by the rules, because the rules should apply to everyone.

I don't know of anyone who works in a factory, I don't know of anyone who works in an office, I don't know any schoolteachers, and I don't know even any politicians in this room who try to funnel their money offshore for tax avoidance or who put it into another province for tax avoidance. It isn't done by ordinary people. It's done by those who have the wherewithal, the financial accounting, the lawyers and everyone else to tell them how to do it. We need to end it.

I'd like to just go back, because I don't think I spoke enough about the HST delayed-input tax credits. I did talk about people going down to watch hockey games and going to restaurants and those kinds of things, but there are some other HST exemptions that exist today.

Large businesses, generally those making taxable incomes—including zero-rated supplies—worth more than \$10 million, and banks, trust companies, credit unions, insurers, segregated funds of insurers, and investment plans are thinking that they've got it made. But we believe that the HST tax input should remain permanent, or should be made permanent, because some of the other

things that this does for business, which I have some real problem with, is that a business can have the HST exempt for road vehicles that are less than three tonnes, including all parts, service and fuel.

Now, think about this for a minute. Probably everybody in this chamber has a car. Everybody in this chamber has a car, but not one person in this chamber and not one person that I know of the general public has an HST tax exemption for purchasing a car—anything under three tonnes—nor do they get any HST tax exemption for parts, if something goes wrong with the car, for service on the vehicle, or for the fuel that goes into the vehicle. I wonder: Why do people here want to include and continue that HST exemption? I don't get it. Why should they get it?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Because they create jobs.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Okay, here it is: My Conservative friend says, "Because they create jobs."

Here's the nub of it all: Do they create jobs with that money? If they did, I might say it was okay. But they don't create jobs with that money. Even the federal finance minister, who used to sit here in this very House, has complained bitterly that all of these tax exemptions that have been given are simply pooled and kept in their profits and kept in their corporate pockets and are not creating the kinds of jobs they were intended to do. I have some problem with that; I have some problem.

What we need to do is we have to have—not just giving away the money, as some people in this place would want to do—conditions—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Durham might want to get in his seat.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Why? You know why.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't hear what that nattering was all about, but I'm sure it was—

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Irrelevant.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I'm sure it was intended to be funny, at least.

The second thing is, I think we have to start questioning, for corporations, on this HST exemption. They are also exempt from energy, from electricity, gas, fuel and steam, except if they're in manufacturing. I find this amazing. I find this amazing that the Liberals have poo-hooped the idea every time we talked about this. They are exempt from energy, electricity, gas, fuel and steam.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** They wrote a letter, though.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Yes, they wrote a letter.

But are people in this chamber exempt? Are teachers or truck drivers or cab drivers or people who work in the grocery store? If they turn on the light, they're not exempt from the HST, I'll tell you. They see that HST on every bill. When they fuel up their car, are they exempt? No, they're not exempt; they pay it on every bill.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I want to be a corporation.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** But if you're a corporation, this government has pooh-poohed the idea that they should have to pay. I think ordinary people think they should.

The telecommunications—we were arguing this just the other day. We had a bill here about telecommunications and some of the rip-offs, but one of the biggest rip-offs is that corporations are exempt for telecommunications except for Internet and toll-free numbers. They don't pay HST. Why do I pay HST? Why do you pay HST? Why does everybody else pay, but they don't pay? They don't pay.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I know it's federal, but we need to talk about this. I started off my speech, if the member had been listening, by saying the federal Minister of Finance and the finance ministers from each of the provinces have to sit down and the HST exemption has to be taken away. This is not something that can be done unilaterally, but this is something that needs to have the guts—and not just pooh-poohing the thing. This has to be a concerted effort by the government and, indeed, from all sides of this House. That's why I'm talking about it today.

I've already talked about the meals and entertainment.

This restriction is going to be gradually eliminated. Right now it's 100%. They can't claim the HST from July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2015. But starting on July 1, 2015, it's reduced to 75%. Starting on July 1, 2016, it's going to be reduced to 50%—starting on July 1, 2017, to 25%, and on July 1, 2018, to zero. What we are going to see over the next four or five years is a reduction of \$1.3 billion until it's down to zero. I don't think we can afford it, and I don't think it's fair, and I don't think for what it's purported to do it's doing a very good job.

Manufacturing jobs have declined. Many other jobs are in short supply. If there are any jobs being created in this province—and you can ask almost anyone—they are in low-paying, non-manufacturing jobs at minimum wage and are staffed primarily by young people who have no other choice because there's an unemployment rate of 15% or so among the young. I ask the government to think about that.

Don Drummond also pointed out a number of problems with Ontario's tax collection system. He said the greatest challenge to the province relates to the ability of corporations to eliminate or decrease payment of provincial corporate income tax through creative mechanisms, including the shifting of profits and losses across Canada and outside of Canada. Again, I refer to the CBC story of a night or two nights ago, and that, to me, pretty much says it all. Don Drummond recognizes that that's a place we should go, and I'm looking forward to the future where the government looks at it as well.

A couple more things—and I'll probably conclude before the hour is up. We need to do some aggressive international tax-planning strategies so that people who earn their profits in Canada, corporations that earn their profits in Ontario, pay taxes in Ontario and pay taxes in Canada. We can no longer afford to have this money shifting around the world.

## 1000

Those who are infinitely better at computers than I have been able to uncover some of that tax avoidance. We have seen it. Of course, some of them are chased around the world by those who have a lot of money and who are pushing their respective governments to put them in jail for actually showing how this international money moves around.

So I'm asking not only the finance minister of Ontario, but especially the federal finance minister to meet with finance ministers from other countries. Just as we are suffering in this country—mark my words—people are suffering throughout most of the developed world because of those who would seek to avoid paying their fair share.

The federal government and budget went at least part-way toward curtailing foreign-controlled corporations, with the introduction of the foreign affiliate dumping rules in Bill C-45. New Democrats support this initiative. We want to see much more from the federal government, and we hope that the finance minister will lean that way, as well.

In that regard, there are just a couple of things that need to happen. We need, as a province, to insist that there is additional data review and research to identify activities of concern to this province. Secondly, we need to enter into an agreement with the Canada Revenue Agency to invest resources in additional compliance efforts; that is, finding those companies that are going around the law and making sure that they pay. We need to implement additional reporting requirements that disclose activities that cause income and losses to be allocated to a province where the underlying economic activity was minimal or did not occur. We know that there are corporations who've set up dummy offices or tiny offices in provinces where they have no economic activity in order to evade paying the taxes in Ontario. We need to make sure that that comes to a halt. We also need to ensure that companies that take advantage of loans, grants, writeoffs and other Ontario corporate tax breaks, on the assumption that they will undertake certain activities such as job creation, new plants and machinery, research and development, actually perform those activities in Ontario. We need to do that.

My friend from the Conservative Party shouted out a while ago that they create jobs. Well, if they're creating jobs, they need to create them, and if they're not creating jobs, we shouldn't be giving them money to do so.

Drummond recommended that Ontario collaborate with the federal government and other provinces to investigate options to tax corporations on a consolidated basis, with the purpose of ensuring a fair allocation of losses and income across Canada. I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, to wind up—see, I am going to be less than my hour—New Democrats support this bill, but we recognize that it is a relatively minor bill when we have major, major problems. We have problems because there is not enough revenue, and in part I think the government is to blame for this, for wasting revenues, very precious

dollars, that ought not to have been wasted. The Premier said as much yesterday.

It is a shame to waste a billion dollars when there is so much that could be done with it. It is a shame to have wasted a billion dollars on eHealth when so much could have been done with it. It is a shame to have wasted the hundreds of millions of dollars on Ornge when so much could have been done with it.

We need the revenues, but we also need to be mindful of how those monies are being spent. They need to be spent in ways that help everyone in the province of Ontario. We need to spend money on transit; we need to spend money on health; we need to spend money on education; we need to spend money on a thousand things that will help the people of this province. To get those monies, we need to make sure that everyone pays their fair share.

It is no longer acceptable to New Democrats and to the people of this province that ordinary people are being asked to pay again and again and again, when those who have the wherewithal and the money do tax avoidance by spending the money offshore. This is a land of opportunity, this is a province of opportunity, but it has to be a province of opportunity for all, not the selected few.

I commend the government for bringing this bill forward, but I also ask the government to please start bringing more meaty bills forward; have the finance minister, please, sit down with his counterpart from other provinces and with the federal government; have the government draft legislation, which, in conjunction with others, will make sure that there is no longer tax avoidance; and sit down and start really asking yourself the question about the GST/HST tax avoidance, which is going to be taken off over the next four to five years, costing the treasury \$1.3 billion that we simply do not have.

That's it in a nutshell: a small bill, a small help for small business, and part of a much larger problem where the solutions have not yet surfaced from the government bench. They need to do so and they need to do it with the next bill that they bring forward, that needs to be meatier, that needs to be more focused and that needs to actually deliver some results to the people of Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** It's a pleasure for me to speak today on Bill 105. I must commend the member from Beaches–East York for the good advice that he gave. I was very surprised. I was wondering, “Am I listening to an NDP member speaking?” I was not sure. But he brought a very, very good idea.

There's something that we both agree on: We have to help small businesses. They are the ones who are creating jobs. They are the ones who maintain the economy that we have in Ontario. They are the ones that employ the most workers in Ontario.

Today, I want to commend the small businesses in my community of Ottawa–Vanier. They are everywhere. Like I said in the past, they are our community leaders, they are our volunteers, they are the ones who contribute to

fundraisers for the hospitals, for the community centres. They are great people.

As I said before, I'm from a long line of small business. I am the only civil servant in my family. My family—my grandfather, my father and now his son—continues the business that was started in 1944 during the war, and it's still in existence. They hired not many employees, but it made the difference in the small community where I'm from, about 300 in population. They do hire about—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Questions and comments?

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** With regard to Bill 105, this is just a small bill, really and truly. I believe it just really touches upon the edges. It's a bill that, in fact, maybe gives the persona that this government is really trying to do something for small business, when, in fact, it's merely a drop in the bucket.

Again, the legislation actually exemplifies what is wrong with this government and their approach to governing, really and truly. They're unwilling to go far enough to take the decisive action which is really needed to provide real tax relief for Ontarians today.

Having been a small business owner for 25 years before I came to the Legislature, I truly believe that it's the small businesses in Ontario that are the backbone of the economy here.

**1010**

This bill doesn't really go far enough at all. Again, it's a perimeter bill which makes people think for a fact that this government is really doing something wonderful. Well, if they really wanted to do something wonderful, they'd do something about the skyrocketing hydro rates.

When I go along the streets and talk to small businesses back in the riding of Chatham–Kent–Essex, they say, “Rick, we have to turn out half of the lights in our building during the day, because that's when we're paying the high rates. We're finding the rates are becoming more and more expensive every day.” That's crippling small business; that's not helping small business. You take a look at, recently, the rate increases in WSIB—again, killing small businesses.

So, Speaker, although this bill doesn't go far enough, we will support it in the long run.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I commend my colleague from Beaches–East York for a good lead: 45 minutes of information and well-informed commentary.

Like him, I agree that exempting small companies from paying the employer health tax on the first \$450,000 is a good thing. We forced the Liberals to remove that from the larger corporations, which they agreed to, so those that earn over \$5 million are now going to be paying that tax. We think it's good, because those large corporations that make over \$5 million are probably doing okay on their own. They don't need a government hand-out, which becomes a citizens' handout, to the big corporations.

But he added something else that we want the Liberals to pay attention to, and so far they haven't taken it very seriously. Starting in 2015, the government will start offering input tax credits that will refund the HST paid by corporations on things like meals, entertainment and company cars. At the moment, they pay the HST. In 2015, they're going to start getting a credit on those input taxes. The point that we make is, do we need to do that? Can citizens of Ontario afford to allow corporations to get a refund on the HST on things like meals, entertainment and company cars? I think it's wrong. The member from Beaches–East York thinks it's wrong. But this Liberal government isn't taking that seriously.

By the way, they will also refund the HST paid on office utility bills, the heating and lighting. And while it's okay for manufacturers and factories, it's not okay for banks.

The member makes great points.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** I too want to congratulate the member for Beaches–East York for his speech. He highlighted very important points and gave us some constructive criticism, which is nice to see.

I want to say, especially for the benefit of the member from Chatham–Kent–Essex, who called this bill peripheral, that this bill will exempt businesses with annual payrolls of under \$5 million from paying the employer health tax on the first \$450,000 of their payroll each year. So, Mr. Speaker, over 12,000 businesses in Ontario will no longer be paying this tax. I think this is significant; I don't think that this is peripheral. So I wanted to make that clear.

Going back to the member from Beaches–East York, I was also glad that he spoke about BIAs. In a city like Toronto, which both he and I represent, BIAs really play an important role.

I know that in my riding of York South–Weston, I have BIAs such as the Eglinton Hill BIA, the Mount Dennis BIA and the Weston BIA. They all represent small businesses—they're all small businesses—and they're trying to revitalize areas of the city that are really in need of being refreshed. They do great work.

For those of you who may not know, this weekend, on Saturday, the BIA in Weston will be celebrating the harvest from 10 to noon. There will be lots of fun for all the families. Come on by. Come and take a look.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. The member from Beaches–East York has two minutes.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I want to thank my colleagues—the Minister of Community Safety and Corrections, the members from Chatham–Kent–Essex, Trinity–Spadina and York South–Weston—for their comments.

The comments were very generous, and I thank you for them, but I also think that they all hit a common theme. We all support small business, or should all support small business, irrespective of which party you represent. Small businesses do a huge amount of good for our local economy. They do a huge amount of good for

our local neighbourhoods. I would tell people that if you have an option of buying from the little guy or from the big guy, start looking at the little guy. Maybe it costs more; sometimes it does. But the level of service and the strength of your community depend upon the support you give to small businesses. That's why I support this bill. I'm looking forward to much more, but that's why I support this bill: because it's going to help those small businesses.

My colleague from York South–Weston talked about BIAs. Yes, BIAs are absolutely and fundamentally important. I don't know whether they exist all across Ontario. I do know they exist all across Toronto, and they exist in many other of the larger municipalities—where the municipality, from its own money, funds half the cost of the BIA, and the local BIA, through a levy of their members, funds the other half. Where you see a strong BIA, you see wonderful shopping districts spring up and stay there. You see street furniture and flowers. You see places where people can eat outside on restaurant patios. You see street life and a vibrancy of the city or town which, without the BIA, would not exist. So I take my hat off to them as well.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak this morning.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** It being 10:15, or shortly after, this House stands recessed until 10:30 this morning.

*The House recessed from 1017 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I know we have lots of dentists in the crowd today because it's ODA's lobby day. I'm not going to introduce everyone, but I do want to make special mention of the president of ODA, Dr. Rick Caldwell. Welcome to all the dentists at Queen's Park today.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I have a couple of people to introduce: first of all, Dr. Visconti, all the way from Timmins, Ontario, who is here along with all of the dentists, but also, I have Lucie Laplante, all the way from Kapuskasing. She works in my constituency office and has put up with me all these years.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** I'd like to welcome students from Don Valley East, from North Toronto Christian School, to the Legislature here today.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** It's my pleasure to introduce my constituent Guy Boone, who is a professional engineer and the chairman of Professional Engineers Ontario's government liaison program in the Ottawa chapter. Welcome, Guy.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I'd also like to welcome the Ontario Dental Association and Dr. Rick Caldwell, the president, who happens to come from my hometown.

**Mr. Rick Bartolucci:** I want to introduce Dr. Roch St-Aubin, from Sudbury. His office is on the corner of

Elm and Elgin streets. He's also the chair of the political action committee of the Ontario Dental Association. We want to welcome him and his fellow professionals here today.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I would like to welcome Dr. Kevin Roach, from my riding of Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, who is the Ontario Dental Association's representative from my area joining us at Queen's Park today. Of course, they'll be welcoming us at a reception later today as well.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I would like to welcome Sydney Brouillard-Coyle. She's a 13-year-old from Essex, Ontario. I met her at We Day. She has been fundraising and volunteering since she was six. She wants to be the Prime Minister one day. She's here with her parents. She's right there. She is here with her parents, Christopher and Christine Brouillard-Coyle. They're both here.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I'd like to introduce a couple of constituents today. I've got Dr. Dave Jones, from the Dorchester area, visiting from the Dental Association, and Maggie Head, who is also a constituent of mine back home in Union, Ontario.

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the House an old high school friend of mine, a basketball buddy and my current dentist, Peter Hryniuk, who is here as part of the Ontario Dental Association, in the east public gallery.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** We've all become very impressed with the exemplary performance of page James Prowse, from Newmarket–Aurora. I'm pleased to extend a warm welcome to his aunt Cheryl Deville and uncle Fred Gallagher.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I am delighted that Khalil Ramal, the former MPP from London–Fanshawe, is here with us today. He is joined by Dr. Mahmood Moshiri.

I'm also delighted to welcome Dr. Peter Fendrich and everyone here from the ODA—big smiles for everyone.

I'm also pleased to introduce Adrienne Palmer-Spafford and Joanna Rizi from the Ontario Long Term Care Association.

Welcome, everyone.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for Simcoe North.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Me?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That's who you are.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Oh. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear you say it.

I'd like to welcome Dr. Jerry Collins, with the ODA, who is here—he has a dental practice in Orillia—and also Mrs. Balbir Gill, the mother of Gaggan Gill, who is my assistant here at Queen's Park.

I should point out to you, ladies and gentlemen, that Gaggan will be leaving Queen's Park shortly and finding employment with a cabinet minister in Ottawa. She'll be sorely missed.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** It's a pleasure to introduce a gentleman I've known for many years who keeps me

smiling. Here for the ODA lobby day is my dentist, Dr. Steve Lipinski of Mississauga.

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** I'd just like to welcome Dr. Paul Giuliani from the great riding of Northumberland–Quinte West, who is here today. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Everyone is being co-operative. I'm going to try to get through the rest of these introductions. Please make sure you just introduce your guests.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I'd like to welcome Dr. Christina Heidinger from the great riding of Kitchener Centre, who is here for the ODA lobby day.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** I'd like to welcome again the father of Ian, our great page from Prince Edward–Hastings: Simon Chapelle—and also, from the ODA, my good friend Dr. Bill Hern.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I'd like members to welcome to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Dr. Ivan Hrabowsky from the city of St. Catharines.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** It's a pleasure to introduce a good friend and the past president of the Ontario Dental Association, Dr. Art Worth.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Would you please help me welcome Dr. Waji Khan, who's with the Ontario Dental Association, from the Kingston area.

As well, would you welcome, please, in the members' gallery, from Professional Engineers Ontario, Annette Bergeron, the president, who is also from Kingston; Michael Price; Scott Clark; and their guest, well known to everyone here, Howard Brown.

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** I'd like to welcome—and I'm sure there are others that I'm missing, so I apologize—my favourite dentist from Burlington, Dr. Larry Pedlar.

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** I'd like to welcome another dentist, Dr. Brian Teneschuk—very active with the ODA.

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I'd like to welcome Dr. Murray Pearson, whom I'm having lunch with today.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I'd like to welcome the parents and family of Ravicha Ravinthiran: mother Sonthy; father, Ravinthiran; sister Luckshika; and grandfather Sivanayagamoorthy. They're not quite here yet; they're on their way, but I want to welcome them here today.

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** I'd like to introduce Dr. Blake Clemons, who is from my riding of Perth–Wellington.

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Please welcome Lynn Posluns, founder of the Women's Brain Health Initiative. Many of us had breakfast to learn more about her project.

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I'd like to welcome Dr. Totten, a dentist from the great riding of Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** I want to welcome a good friend of mine, the former president of the Canadian Dental Association and the Ontario Dental Association and a great dentist from Ottawa Centre, Dr. Don Friedlander.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I'd like to welcome Mr. Alan Korell from the PEO, who is the city engineer in the city of North Bay.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ça me fait plaisir de vous présenter M. Roch St-Aubin, qui est un dentiste de la région de Sudbury and who is here with the Ontario Dental Association. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I want to welcome the parents of page Daniel. His mother and father and grandparent are here visiting the Legislature for the second time.

**Hon. Teresa Piruzza:** I'd like to welcome Dr. Charles Frank to the Legislature today, who is sitting behind us here—a dentist from our area.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I want to thank all members for their indulgence and appreciate very deeply that you just did introductions—it's very helpful—and, as the Speaker always does, to introduce a former colleague, Khalil Ramal from London—Fanshawe in the 38th and 39th Parliaments. Welcome.

Another reason why I am very appreciative of your indulgence is there's a method to my madness. I have some guests in the House today. This is a history-making organization from all organized support, six-times-in-a-row champions of the Intercounty Baseball League, the Brantford Red Sox—with my apologies to the member from Barrie—with owner Paul Aucoin, field manager Adam Clarke, general manager Mike Bonnano, and all of the staff and volunteers of the Brantford Red Sox championship team. Thank you for being here. The two children in the crowd also played first base and third base. Anyway, the players are here as well, and we appreciate your talents and skill sets.

1040

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### POWER PLANTS

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** My question is to the Premier. I watched your press conference last night in the wake of the latest revelations of \$1.1 billion that you wasted to protect Liberal seats. You said that you're sorry. Here's the difference between your leadership and mine, Premier: Saying you're sorry isn't leadership.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. I'll be starting immediately. Member from Sudbury, come to order. I'm going to start right away.

Finish, please.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Your style of leadership is that you believe leadership is simply saying you're sorry. I believe leadership is about holding people to account, holding people accountable for what they've done with taxpayer dollars. You failed to make this announcement last night; maybe you will this morning: Who got fired? Who is being dumped from cabinet? Who is being held accountable for this incredible waste of \$1.1 billion?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I have done exactly what I said I was going to do when I came into office. I campaigned during the leadership on opening up the process, making sure that the information was available, and that is what we've done. That's why the tens of thousands of documents have gone to the committee: 30,000 documents from the Premier's office. That's why I asked the Auditor General to look at the Oakville situation and to report on that situation. We have that report now, so the information that I said needed to be available is available. From my perspective, that's leadership. I said I was going to do it, I did it. You have the information. That's been the process.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated.

Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I think the answer, Premier, is, if you will remove nobody from their job, it's time to remove you from your job, and bring in a new team.

Let me see if I understand your alibi on this. Your alibi is that you've spent \$1.1 billion in hush money to send to TransCanada and is you had nothing to do with it. You were out in the hallway when these decisions took place. You were out of the loop.

The reality is, Premier, your fingerprints are all over this. You actually signed the deal. You had a choice. You had an option. You could have said, "No, this is not in the interests of taxpayers. This is bad for the province of Ontario." You could have set a higher standard, but you signed the deal, you signed the document. If you're going to do that and sell us up the river, why should we trust you with the finances—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** It is really important that people understand we made a commitment, as did all the parties, to cancel and relocate the gas plants. That was our commitment. So as we followed through on that commitment, we took advice from officials. I have said that in the first instance—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Shouting people down is not—I need to hear the response. Thank you.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I have said, in the first instance, that there were decisions made that should not have been made, that we should have paid closer attention to the community. I have never said, as the Leader of the Opposition alleges, that I didn't take any responsibility. In fact, I've said the exact opposite. I was part of a cabinet that made this decision, and we worked to make the decision in the best way possible. There were mistakes made. I have apologized and I do apologize for those mistakes, but my responsibility now is to make sure that this never happens again, that we have the processes in place to make sure it never happens—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

The member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound, come to order. The member from Cambridge, come to order. The member from Halton, come to order—second time.

Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** It's incredible that the Liberals give themselves a standing ovation and a pat on the back. All of you could have said no. Not one of you actually stood up and said no. Not one of the Liberal benches ever took a moment to say this was wrong—not a single one of you.

The choice is clear—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The same goes both ways. The Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, come to order.

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** Kick him out.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member who just said that might find themselves kicked out.

Please finish.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Not a single one of you said no. The only choice is to clear out this entire corrupt lot, change the government and get this province back on track.

Here's step number two: Call a judicial inquiry. Put the Liberals before the stand—the threat of jail time, the threat of jail doors closing—to compel them to tell the truth.

Premier, will you support our call for a judicial inquiry—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** If I believed for one moment that there were anything criminal that had gone on, if I had seen anything in the Auditor General's report that would have indicated anything criminal, I would order a judicial inquiry. I would be looking for that.

The fact is that it is very clear now, as a result of all of the documentation and all of the reports that have been done, that there were mistakes made. The people who were making decisions made mistakes in terms of some of the decisions and some of the paths that they went down. I've said that. I have taken responsibility for that as a member of the government. What I said I was going to do was provide that information to all of the people who were asking for it. That's what I've done. We have the information, and now it's time that we need to make sure it—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### POWER PLANTS

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier: When a group of people choose to misuse taxpayer dollars—\$1.1 billion—and then cover it up and destroy evidence, do

you know what they call that, Premier? They call it fraud. They call it perjury. That's criminal activity. There is no more clear demonstration than that as to why we need a judicial inquiry. Put Liberals, put Dalton McGuinty, put Kathleen Wynne on the stand. Let's actually hear you before a judge who can compel the truth. Maybe it's going to take the threat of jail doors slamming shut behind the Liberals to get that truth, but I'm not going to give up on that. I will do that as Premier. I'll get the truth for taxpayers, and we'll get some justice for what you've done to rip people off.

You signed the deal. You had a choice. You sold us down the river. Premier, why did you sign the deal? Why didn't you say no?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** When I came into this post, I said that we were going to open up this process, and we were going to get all the information that we could, and we have done that. In fact, the Auditor General has credited our government. What she said is that it was good to hear we're taking the report seriously and are taking some action and changing the way things are going to be done in the future. That's our responsibility. That is what governments should do in response to information that determines that there were decisions made that shouldn't have been made and that there were processes in place that should not have been in place. We're taking that action.

There are two things that are very, very important in this. One is that we site energy infrastructure differently. The Minister of Energy is putting new rules in place in terms of working with the community. The second is rules around political staff relationships with third parties and their ability to influence those deals. Those are the changes that need to be made.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Again, Premier, nobody believes that you happened to be out in the hallway when these decisions were made. You were co-chair of the Liberal campaign that chose to do this. You signed the key cabinet document that sold the province out and sold out taxpayers.

1050

These things have real-world consequences: \$1.1 billion could have built that subway for Scarborough; \$1.1 billion could have built a new hospital in south Niagara; \$1.1 billion could have built a new hospital in Vaughan, and you flush it down the drain to save Liberal seats.

Premier, the problem here is that you yourself signed the document. You sold the province down the river and the NDP sold their souls to prop you up. Isn't it time for a change? Will you call the judicial inquiry? Let's get the truth on behalf of taxpayers.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Premier.



**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I went to committee. I answered the questions about my involvement. I made it very clear that I take responsibility for having been part of the cabinet that was trying to get a deal. There is no doubt about that. We were taking advice from officials.

John Kelly, who was counsel from the Ministry of the Attorney General, said, "In my experience, after 40 years of litigating, if you can avoid litigation, you should. It's a process that's fraught with risk."

Mr. Speaker, we were trying to make a deal. We were trying to avoid litigation. We were acting in good faith in an attempt to avoid future costs. That is the information that is available. I made it clear to the committee what my involvement was, and I take responsibility for being part of the cabinet that made those decisions.

Having said that, we all agreed in this House that those gas plants should be relocated. That was the agreement. We implemented that. I've said there were mistakes and I've taken responsibility for that.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated, please.

Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Here's the reality. There are two important facts in the Auditor General's report. Number one, Premier, with all due respect, you weren't out of the loop; you were in the control room. You were calling the shots. They key decision, we find out on page 16 of the auditor's report itself—it said that the key deliberate decision was made when you signed the document and you sold the province down the river. You signed away any of the protections that taxpayers had to give hush money to TransCanada Corp. to save Liberal seats.

Premier, you signed that document. You had an option; you chose to sign that document; you sold the province down the river. I have no confidence in a Premier that makes those decisions, that has a pattern of behaviour that puts the Liberal Party ahead of the taxpayers. Will you do the right thing today? Will you call our confidence motion and let this Legislature decide if you have the ability to lead our province?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** When I look at this whole situation, the thing that I think is the most problematic is that in the first instance, we did not get the siting of these pieces of energy infrastructure right. We did not listen to the communities. We did not do the right thing in terms of taking into account the concerns of the communities in the first instance. Had we done that, Mr. Speaker, had we had a process in place, as we do now, where we would take into account the concerns of the community, we would examine those and make sure we understood what those concerns were and have community buy-in in the first instance, then we would not be in this situation.

That is the problem. We are correcting that problem. It should not have happened, and I take responsibility for

having been part of the government that made that mistake of not taking the community's concerns into account in the first instance.

## POWER PLANTS

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My first question is for the Premier. Yesterday, the Auditor General found that the cancelled power deals will cost the people of Ontario almost a billion dollars. Does the Premier plan to challenge the findings of the auditor, Speaker?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, we've accepted the auditor's findings. We thank her for the findings. I will say that the OPA has a different set of findings. They used a different set of assumptions.

One of the points of this whole exercise is that estimates of cost vary. When you look out 20 years and you're trying to estimate what the costs are going to be, it is difficult. Witness the number of different numbers that have arisen over the past month even to today, where there are two different numbers in terms of the OPA number and the Auditor General's number, using different assumptions, so the cost estimates vary. That has been one of the issues that has been very challenging, I would suggest, mostly for the people of Ontario, in order that they try to understand this situation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** It sounds to me like the Premier is saying that she doesn't believe the numbers that the Auditor General put in the report yesterday. The auditor found very clearly that the Liberal government, in their rush to reach a deal, drove up the cost of cancellation by hundreds of millions of dollars.

As a member of cabinet, the Premier signed off on that decision. How does she justify that sign-off?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Let me just say that I did not say that I didn't accept the auditor's numbers; I said I did accept the auditor's numbers. What I said was what she actually said, which is that there is uncertainty in these numbers. The Auditor General says that herself, and anyone who has spent time with accountants—and I love accountants; the father of my children is an accountant. But the fact is that numbers change depending on the assumptions, and that's what the Auditor General said.

There has been confusion about the numbers. That is why I asked the Auditor General to look at the situation. I accept her findings and, as I said, I have done everything in my power to get information out to answer the questions that have been asked, and will continue to do that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** As co-chair of the Liberal Party campaign and as a cabinet minister who signed off on the decision, the Premier knew, or should have known, that the Liberal government was driving up costs, and that the public would be on the hook. When the Premier was signing off on those decisions, was she thinking as an elected representative of the people or in her role as Liberal campaign co-chair?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I have many times taken responsibility for my role as a member of cabinet in the process that took place. It's true: We were attempting to get a deal and avoid litigation.

I will just quote from David Lindsay, who is a former Deputy Minister of Energy: "If you have a contract and you don't honour the contract, the party on the other side can sue you for breach of contract and the damages would be all the benefits they were hoping to procure ... try to avoid litigation was the strategy ... what we in the OPA were trying to do."

So there was an attempt to avoid litigation; that is absolutely true. I take responsibility for being part of a cabinet that was attempting to avoid litigation, and all the costs into the future that that would mean. I take responsibility for that. I have said that we need to have different processes in place, and that's what we're doing.

#### POWER PLANTS

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is for the Premier as well, Speaker. I have to say that, no matter how hard she tries to muddy the waters about the real numbers, the auditor was pretty clear yesterday: The government cut a great deal for TransCanada and made it easier for the Liberals to hold on to power, but they stuck it to the people of Ontario.

Now, the Premier was one of four cabinet ministers who signed off on the arbitration preventing the OPA from defending the public interest. Why did she do that?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Again, I have answered questions about my role in being part of a cabinet that was attempting to get a deal on this. We were working to get certainty, and we were attempting to avoid litigation. That is quite clear. We have said that over and over again, because we believed—and, certainly, the staff in the Premier's office believed—that to incur litigation or to go into a situation where litigation would be certain or probable was not responsible.

I've also said that we need to make changes. We need to introduce new rules that would limit political staff involvement in commercial third-party transactions. I've said that clearly. I said it yesterday. We'll be bringing in policy in the next week or so that will put those new rules in place.

It's very important that we learn from the findings of the Auditor General. That's what we're doing.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** The Premier likes to talk about how much things have changed or how much she might want to change things in the future, but she was part of a team that signed off on this crass decision in a desperate bid to hold on to power. So if the Premier thinks this was wrong, why didn't she stand up and say so when she had the chance?

1100

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I just want to step back and remind everyone that the—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Specifically, the member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound—others, as well—will come to order, second time.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we were doing was, we were implementing a decision that had been a promise of all three parties. We were determined that we were going to relocate the gas plants because that was the right thing to do.

Had we made the decision in the first place—had we listened to the community, had we examined the community's concerns, then we would not have been in that situation. But we all agreed that the gas plants needed to be relocated. We were implementing that, and there was a cost associated with that. There would have been a cost associated with it whether the PCs or whether the NDP had been in office. That's just the reality.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I'll remind the Premier that I was the only leader during the election campaign who said I would not promise to cancel those plants until I knew how much it was going to cost the people of this province because that was the responsible position to take during the election campaign. I'm the only one that took it.

The people in Ontario are now on the hook for over \$1 billion, and that much money could hire 18,000 nurses in Ontario. It could buy—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Actually, on all levels here, all members, relax.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Don't use this as an opportunity to steal some comments.

Please finish.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** That money could hire 18,000 nurses. It could buy 311 PET scanners. Instead, it's going into the pockets of private power companies.

The Premier says she's sorry today, but when she had the chance, the power, to actually do something, she chose the Liberal Party's interests over the people's interests, and she signed off. How does she explain that decision?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Let me just first say that I have said repeatedly that the cost of moving these plants was unacceptable. She's absolutely right that it was not acceptable, and it came about because of decisions that were made that should have been made differently and a process that did not work.

But the leader of the third party and her candidates opposed both plants. They said they would relocate them; they opposed those plants. That is the reality, and we have them on record saying that they would.

So what we need to do is make sure that we understand that, when decisions are made around large pieces of infrastructure, whether it's roads or whether it's energy infrastructure, when those contracts are entered into,

when changes are made in those, there's a cost attached to it. We had better make sure we've got better processes in place. That's what we're doing on the siting of infrastructure and on the processes to get out of them.

#### POWER PLANTS

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** My question is for the Premier. Yesterday, the auditor confirmed what Vic Fedeli had told this Liberal government all along: that their attempt to steal a seat in the last election cost \$1 billion.

Let's put this into perspective. Barack Obama spent less money campaigning to become the President of the United States than you spent to save the member from Oakville's seat.

It's absolutely shameful. What bothers Ontarians the most is that the Liberal campaign chair who signed that cabinet document either didn't know what she was signing with a billion-dollar price tag, or she knowingly stood in this assembly and said it was only \$33 million.

So, Speaker, my question is very simple: Is she incompetent or did she knowingly tell this House it was \$33 million when she knew it was \$1 billion? That's why we need a judicial inquiry. Will she call it?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I know the Minister of Energy is going to want to speak to the supplementary.

I just want to be clear once again, Mr. Speaker, that at every juncture, when I reported on a number, I was taking that number from information that had been given to me by officials. That is the only way that I had access to numbers. Those are the numbers that I used, and I have said repeatedly that the numbers have changed over time. That has been one of the issues around this whole situation. It's why, in fact, I asked the Auditor General to look at the situation in the first place.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Speaker, the number certainly did change. She said \$33 million, and it was \$1 billion. That's 2,640% that she was off. It proves she's got no plan, she's got no mandate, and she has no credibility left whatsoever.

She knew all along what the true costs of those cancelled gas plants were. The auditor said it as much in her documentation yesterday. She said at the time this Premier was standing up, saying it only cost \$33 million, that she had actually already paid \$330 million of that cost. She already paid a third of what it had cost. That's how much she knew when she knew it. Has she no shame?

She created the OPA to remove decision-making from the political sphere from energy decisions. Yet now she comes with her crocodile tears and says she's going to prevent political interference. She's already done it.

So, Speaker, the question is—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock.

Be seated, please.

The Minister of the Environment will come to order. Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to take the opportunity to congratulate my new energy critic. It's the first opportunity I've had in the House. She was one of three energy critics that were appointed at the time. Consequently, I asked the Premier if she could appoint two co-ministers of energy to match the three critics, but she turned me down, Mr. Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Northumberland–Quinte West, come to order a second time.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** —we're talking about the costs that are going into the pool of costs that affect the rates. Yes, these additional costs will impact and put upward pressure on the rates. On the other hand, in the last five or six months, we have taken some decisions that are going to be very significant in pushing the energy rates down. For example, there was the \$3.7 billion we saved on the Samsung deal. That \$3.7 billion is going to push rates down over the next 20 years.

#### POWER PLANTS

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** My question is to the Premier. Ontario's Auditor General said, "We believe that the settlement with TCE will not only keep TCE whole but may make it better than whole." The Liberal government made sure that TransCanada would get every nickel of profit and then some, in spite of the fact there was no reason to do that.

When the Liberal government cancelled the Oakville gas plant to save a seat in Oakville, TransCanada ended up making more money, not less. And everyday Ontarians are paying those bills.

Why did the Premier and her government put private power profits ahead of everyday families?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** The plant in Oakville was poorly sited, and the government has accepted responsibility for that and has accepted the responsibilities for the additional costs. Indeed, the Premier has apologized for that.

In response to the people of Oakville, the PCs, the NDP and the Liberals committed to relocating the plant, and no party had precise costs at that time. The Auditor General, in response to the Premier, has now provided us with her estimate of the cost to do this.

Mr. Speaker, these involve difficult negotiations. There are expert people who came before committee and have said we ought not to be litigating this issue; it should be negotiated. The contract that resulted was as a result of the give-and-take of negotiations to avoid litigation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Speaker, it's a shame the minister wasn't around when two parties in this Legislature told them, before they signed the contract, not to go ahead in Oakville. It might have saved some money.

The Ontario Auditor General said the reason that Ontario families are paying TransCanada more money

for cancelling the Oakville power plant is because the government promised to keep TransCanada whole. The promise to protect every nickel of profit came out of the Liberal Premier's office.

Why did the Liberal government put private power profits ahead of families, who are paying the bills?

1110

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** The Ontario Power Authority was negotiating with TransCanada Energy. The negotiations were tough. Estimates were made by OPA—and I want to quote from the Auditor General's report. This is the Auditor General speaking: "Making assumptions about future events and their effects involves considerable uncertainty." Those are the Auditor General's words. "Accordingly, readers should be cautioned that while our estimates differ from estimates previously announced by the OPA, they will also likely differ from the actual costs and savings that will be known only in the future." Those are the Auditor General's words on page 3 of the report.

OPA made their best estimates on their assumptions. The auditor made hers, and the result is in the auditor's report, which we accept.

#### CHILDHOOD OBESITY

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** My question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. For parents in Orléans and across Ontario, the health of their children comes first. But as we lead increasingly busy lives, it becomes more and more difficult to make sure we're making the healthiest choices for our kids.

This spring, our government's Healthy Kids Panel made a number of recommendations to fight childhood obesity. I understand that the minister made an announcement this morning in response to some of this advice.

Speaker, through you, could the minister tell the House about the government's plan to help parents make healthier choices for their kids?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member from Ottawa–Orléans for this question.

We know that the healthier our kids are, the less likely they are to develop a chronic disease later in life. That's why our government struck the Healthy Kids Panel: to give our kids the healthiest possible start. That panel provided very valuable advice, and this morning I was happy to announce that we're taking the next step in moving forward on that advice. We will help parents and children make healthier choices by giving the information they need, by putting calories on menus and menu boards.

This month, we'll begin consultations. We'll listen to parents, health professionals and industry partners, and this winter I will be introducing legislation that would require large chain restaurants to include calories on their menus.

I know the member from Nickel Belt has already indicated her support for this. I urge all members in this House to support this legislation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you to the minister. I know that parents across Ontario will be thrilled to hear that we are moving forward with menu labelling for large chain restaurants. This will certainly equip parents with more information to make better choices. But I think we all recognize that no one action will be enough to tackle the challenge of childhood obesity.

Could the minister tell the House about other measures the government is taking to give our kids the best start in life?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Last week, the Minister of Children and Youth Services and I announced the first initiatives responding to the panel's recommendations.

We need to give our kids a healthy start in life, and that starts when they're babies. So we're focusing on the first days, weeks and months of a child's life by enhancing breastfeeding supports in Ontario so that every mom in Ontario who wants to breastfeed will get the support she needs to do so successfully. This includes 24/7 Telehealth support because we know that babies are hungry around the clock.

As kids grow up, we know that good food at school keeps them healthier and boosts their academic success. That's why we've also announced an expansion of the Student Nutrition Program, to provide breakfast and snack programs for about 30,000 more kids in high-priority schools.

Because of these initiatives, aligned with the panel's recommendations to give—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. As I've indicated before, I don't like it when members do drive-by heckling.

New question?

#### POWER PLANTS

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Good morning, Speaker. My question is for the Premier. The Auditor General told us that the cost to cancel the Oakville gas plant is significantly more than it needed to be and that a number of questionable decisions caused this. The auditor states, "The province, the OPA and TCE entered into an arbitration agreement that laid out the framework..." That's what sent the price soaring. This is all thanks to you, Premier. You signed the cabinet document that gave them the power to do this.

The auditor further states this deal "waived the clause in the ... contract that gave the OPA a defensible claim of not owing TCE lost profits."

So, Premier, when you signed that cabinet minute, you wrote a blank cheque to TransCanada. Will you finally admit you are directly responsible for this scandal?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** The government House leader.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Government House leader.

**Hon. John Milloy:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier has addressed those questions. The committee has looked into it. The Auditor General outlined a possibility of what might have happened, but at the same time, we had dozens of witnesses in front of committee who spoke about the potential for litigation, that it was much better to negotiate than to litigate.

The fact of the matter is that at the Premier's behest, we have put forward cost estimates provided by the Auditor General, and the Progressive Conservative Party—which aggressively made the same promises—will not furnish us with their cost estimates. We have asked for their candidates to come forward before the committee and talk about the costing that went to it. They have refused to come forward. We've asked the member from Halton, who stood in this Legislature day after day after day and asked for the cancellation of Oakville, to come to the committee, and yet he's refused.

Mr. Speaker, we have given the information to the committee. It's time—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, it's obvious they have not learned any lessons from all this. The Premier herself said that we have 160,000 pages of documents, we've heard from 62 witnesses—yet with all of that, we still did not know the answer to the member from Cambridge's original question: How much did it cost? It took an auditor's report to tell us.

Liberal witness after Liberal witness testified under oath, yet they all denied that TransCanada was told they would be made whole.

Twice today, the Premier said, "We took advice from officials," but we know from the Auditor General that it was the Liberal government that told the OPA to locate the plant in Napanee. That decision alone, that decision to move that plant so far away, the auditor told us, added \$577 million to this bill, never mind that other issue.

Premier, despite your hollow apology, Ontarians want to know three things: Who's paying the money back, who's getting fired and who's going to jail?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please. Thank you.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I'm not impressed with somebody's actions.

Government House leader.

**Hon. John Milloy:** You can't rewrite history. The fact of the matter is that that party opposite made the exact same promises.

Daniela Morawetz, who's the president of the Chartwell-Maple Grove Residents Association in the Oakville area, went on Metro Morning. Do you know what she spoke about in May of this year? She talked about going to Queen's Park and the opposition parties being 100% behind her. She went on to say, "Nobody said, 'How much is it going to cost?' or put a maximum dollar value on cancelling it."

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Nipissing will come to order.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I'll try, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** No, you won't. You will.

Carry on.

**Hon. John Milloy:** Every single party in this Legislature made the same promise. We came forward with the Auditor General's report, and more importantly, the Premier and the Minister of Energy yesterday outlined steps that they will take in order to make sure this does not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, we call on the justice committee to undertake similar work and provide advice to this government and future governments. You cannot rewrite history.

#### POWER PLANTS

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** My question is to the Premier. Premier, the report yesterday from the auditor on the Oakville power plant was quite damning. A section in the report says, "The Premier's office committed to compensating TCE for the financial value of its contract for the Oakville plant, even though events occurred that we believe could have enabled termination" costs "at a much lower cost."

My question is, why did the Liberal government commit to paying more money instead of paying less?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** The Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, the—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for Prince Edward-Hastings will come to order, second time.

Carry on.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, the contract had a provision called force majeure. Basically, it's a cancellation clause that would come into effect at some future time. The cancellation clause date in the agreement at hand was February 2016. Notwithstanding that, the Auditor General calculated her costs and expenses based on a starting date of December 2015. So the auditor, on one hand, was saying, "This thing would be operational in December 2015," and yet she's relying on a cancellation date in February 2016. With respect to the Auditor General, there's a significant inconsistency on that particular issue.

**1120**

In addition, they were negotiating—all the parties on our side—in good faith.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** It's unbelievable that they're challenging the auditor on her decision.

The fact is, your government had an opportunity to get out from underneath this at very little cost. For some reason—and we know what that is, because you were trying to save some seats in Mississauga—you ended up doing what was the most expensive alternative.

I ask you again: Why is it that you made a decision that committed Ontarians to paying far more than they should have for the cancellation of these plants?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear. Three parties promised to cancel the gas plants—both of them. None of us had estimates at the time. In the meantime, the Premier, in her leadership, asked the Auditor General to do a report. Notwithstanding the fact that the auditor was taking nine months to prepare a report, the opposition continually tried to get the exact cost at committee.

In April, we asked the president of the OPA to come before committee with his most current estimate. That most current estimate was \$350 million—or \$310 million. The reality is, nobody knew what the cost was going to be. At that very committee hearing, I remember that the critic for the Conservatives was making an estimate of what the cost would be—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** My question is for the Minister of Rural Affairs. Minister, when we were first elected in 2003, we inherited three deficits: a financial deficit, a services deficit and an infrastructure deficit. In the first seven or eight years of government, we committed about \$60 billion to infrastructure, including major projects in my riding of Thunder Bay–Atikokan. We further committed another \$35 billion over the next three years.

Now, small northern and rural municipalities, including those in my riding—Neebing, Oliver Paipoonge, O'Connor, Gillies, Conmee and Atikokan—have benefited greatly from our infrastructure announcements historically.

My question to the minister is, can you describe for me what your ministry and the Ministries of Transportation and Infrastructure have done to benefit those smaller municipalities through programs like MIII?

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** I say good morning to the member for Thunder Bay–Atikokan, and I want to thank him for his question.

Our budget in 2013—we put \$100 million in for new infrastructure programs for small, rural municipalities right across the great province of Ontario. My colleague the Minister of Transportation and myself had the opportunity to visit Ontario—north, south, east, west—over this past summer. It was an opportunity for us to consult widely with mayors and reeves and wardens—a wonderful group of people—and to get their input on how we could allocate this \$100 million to support roads and bridges in rural Ontario.

I'm pleased to say that, last Friday, the Premier and I had the opportunity to be in beautiful Simcoe, Ontario. A wonderful mayor was there, Dennis Travale of Simcoe, saying, "This is the right program, the right time for rural Ontario."

Twenty-one communities across the province will be receiving—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** No, I stand up; you sit down.

Supplementary?

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** Thanks to the minister for that response.

This summer, Minister Murray was in my riding. He held a consultation on the longer-term infrastructure program, and he held that in Murillo, a small hamlet in the community of Oliver Paipoonge, in my riding.

Now, small communities have benefited greatly, as I said in my opening question, on previous infrastructure announcements. However, they are still very concerned with stability and permanency. These small communities, by and large, have very large geographic land bases; they have relatively small tax bases with which to support their infrastructure needs. One bridge in a small community like Neebing or Oliver Paipoonge could significantly skew their budget.

Minister, I'm asking you to tell me what we're doing to ensure that small northern and rural municipalities have some ability to plan in a very positive, proactive way on a go-forward basis.

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** I do get excited about investing in roads and bridges and waste water treatment plants—great stuff right across the province of Ontario.

To answer my colleague from Thunder Bay–Atikokan, Minister Murray and I travelled across the province. We met with over 500 municipal leaders to talk about the challenges they face. Out of this consultation, we are looking at ways for 2014 that will be a centrepiece of our budget to have—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound is warned.

Carry on.

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** In fact, Mr. Speaker, we're probably going to be doing some projects in the member's riding of Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound to help that community out with their infrastructure needs. We're looking forward to putting a permanent program in place. Hopefully we'll see that in the 2014 budget, because that's what AMO, that's what ROMA and that's what all the municipal leaders across Ontario are asking for, and we're going to deliver.

#### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** My question today is to the Premier. Premier, yesterday I asked why you were defending 200% completion bonuses for the already-grossly-overpaid TO2015 executives. You continued to rationalize wasting \$7 million for people to simply show up for work and said that the compensation packages are based on the officials who hosted successful events like the Vancouver 2010 Olympics.

That's perfect, Premier. I'm going to hold you to that and insist that you follow suit, because the government of BC actually cancelled millions in bonuses for its employees working on the Olympics. Premier, will you shut down these inappropriate taxpayer-funded bonuses?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I have said that the board negotiated these compensation packages. If you look at comparators with other games, they are consistent with those.

I just want to say that this morning the minister and I had the opportunity to open and welcome the PASO AGM, people from 41 countries who are here to be welcomed by Ontario—and the wonderful progress that we are making on the Pan Am/Parapan capital—the venues.

What is confusing to me and, in fact, embarrassing is that the party opposite is not going to take part in the reception. They are not welcoming the people from these 41 countries to Ontario. I hope that both parties will reconsider and join us, because I would like to say that the whole Legislature welcomes the Pan Am/Parapan folks—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

Supplementary?

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** Indeed, they are all welcome, but not at any cost. We are just at the tip of the iceberg with the Pan Am expensing, partying and bonuses, and nobody is fixing it—no one. The Premier, the finance minister and the minister of the Pan Am Games all scapegoat the appointed TO2015 buffer board when things go south. We see this with eHealth, we saw it with Ornge, and we saw it with the gas plants. You need to take accountability, Premier.

Tonight you have the gall to celebrate, the day after the Auditor General's report on Oakville—some \$1.1 billion in waste that could have actually financed these very games. Tonight's party will run another—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The Minister of the Environment is warned.

Carry on.

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** Tonight's party will run another \$500,000 for a good time, or up to \$1,000 per guest. Does the Premier have no shame?

Will the Premier release all the budgets and total costs for Pan Am partying?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Again, I have said that the minister has spoken to the board. We are reining in the expenses. We are making it very clear that the judicious use of public dollars has to be the norm at the Pan Am Games. But, Mr. Speaker, part of the conditions of getting the games was hosting this reception, hosting the people from these 41 countries here in Ontario.

The Pan Am Games, for me—and I said this to the PASO AGM this morning—is about all the young people in those 41 countries who are training right now. They're swimming, they're stretching, they're jumping, and

they're running. It has to do with why we went into this bid, why we wanted to bring the Pan Am Games here. Part of that is hosting the people who are involved in all of the 41 countries, bringing them here and—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

1130

#### THUNDER BAY GENERATING STATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is for the Premier. Yesterday we learned that no price is too high for Liberals when it comes to courting votes in Mississauga and Oakville. I wouldn't be surprised if the people in Thunder Bay are blowing a fuse today. Can the Premier explain how her government can blow \$1 billion shuffling two power plants out of the greater Toronto area and not even have a penny left over to convert the Thunder Bay generating station to gas?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, the plant in Oakville was poorly sited. The government has accepted responsibility for that and the additional costs incurred, and the Premier has apologized for that.

All parties committed to cancelling these two gas plants. We now have the price from the auditor. What we're doing now, moving forward, is improving the siting of large energy projects. We've asked the IESO and the OPA to travel across the province and consult with people. They provided a report with 18 recommendations. We've accepted those recommendations. Those 18 recommendations will ensure that there will be no siting errors and there will be no unwilling host communities for these large infrastructure projects.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we've done. We contracted for 21 gas plants in the 10 years, and 19 of them are—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, the people in Thunder Bay have waited a long time for some straight answers about their gas plant conversion. By the way, the minister should know that they actually want a gas plant conversion. Today, they're still waiting, even as Ontarians across the province are learning that they're on the hook for this government's \$1-billion scandal.

What's worse is that for \$1 billion, this government could have easily converted the Thunder Bay generating station to gas and would have had plenty of money left over.

Can the Premier please explain to the people of Thunder Bay why she threw \$1 billion down a hole instead of providing power for mining and resource development projects across the northwest?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** If the leader of the third party would ask a unique question, I would give a unique answer. She has asked that question before. I've indicated that we haven't made a decision on converting the Thunder Bay gas plant. It's still under consideration. We will be meeting. We've got meetings scheduled with the

task force from Thunder Bay. We're continuing to talk to them. We have advice from our ministerial agencies. The decision will be made soon, in due course. I expect that Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario will be happy with the outcome. She's barking up the wrong tree, Mr. Speaker.

#### AIR QUALITY

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** My question is for the Minister of the Environment, and it affects all people in Ontario.

Protecting the quality of the air we breathe is a fundamental concern for all Ontarians. When I was the CEO of CivicAction, reducing the number of cars on our roads was one of our objectives, in hopes of cutting down the amount of airborne pollutants. Pollutants that cause smog, for example, contribute to respiratory and other health problems for tens of thousands of individuals every year.

Lately, I have been pleased by the conversations with long-time residents from my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood, where they expressed the noticeable improvements to their air quality over the past few years relative to years prior.

Would the Minister of the Environment please share with us the extent to which smog in Ontario has been handled over the last decade?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** That's an excellent question of great public interest, and I want to thank the member for it. Our government, she would know, has taken very strong action on smog pollution in Ontario. The results really have been good.

I have some statistics here to share with members of the House. The average number of smog advisory days per year has been decreasing since 2003. There were 17 or more smog advisory days each year between 2003 and 2008. Since 2009, Ontario has had three years with fewer than 10 smog advisory days. This year has been nearly smog-day-free so far.

These observed reductions in annual smog can be largely attributed to a 36% reduction over the last several years in nitrogen dioxide, one of the major ingredients of smog, as well as a 33% reduction in fine particulate matter, one of the health-damaging components of smog.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** Again, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Residents throughout Ontario will be pleased that our government has been working hard, and successfully, to reduce smog-causing pollutants. It will be reassuring to the residents of Scarborough–Guildwood that the improved air quality they have noticed over the past few years is the product of amiable action by our government.

Speaker, through you, could the Minister of the Environment please share with this House more specifically how our government is reducing the air pollutants that lead to smog and other setbacks in our air quality?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Again, it's an excellent question. As members would know, smog contributes to

nearly 10,000 premature deaths a year in our province, according to the Ontario Medical Association.

I'm pleased to be able to mention a number of initiatives that are improving air quality in Ontario: a massive investment in public transit is obvious to all in this province; our government's phase-out of coal-fired generating stations is nearly complete, despite encouragement from the benches of the official opposition to burn more health-damaging coal. As well, over the objection of our Conservative friends, we have strengthened the Drive Clean program. Cars, trucks and vans are the biggest domestic source of smog in Ontario. So it matters that car-generated air pollution is reduced by a third due to Drive Clean-required car repairs.

The Ontario Medical Association, the doctors—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** My question is to the Minister of Health. The gas plant scandal cost the taxpayers of this province more than \$1 billion. The Ornge air ambulance scandal cost taxpayers untold millions. But more important, it cost the lives of patients. When the full truth is known, we'll find that the ineptitude and mismanagement under the watch of this government also cost the lives of four dedicated first responders. We're now told that Ornge is conducting a strategic review of its operations.

If there was one consistent theme through 18 months of hearings into the Ornge air ambulance scandal it was this: Ornge should not be in the aviation business.

Can the minister tell us if that advice that came from staff, from pilots, from paramedics and from stakeholders—is that recommendation part of the review?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I must start by saying I find it disappointing that the member opposite would prejudge the investigation that is under way with regard to the crash in May, Speaker. But I can tell you that Ornge is very committed to patient safety and to the safety of the men and women who work at Ornge. They are also very committed to ensuring that they deliver the best possible value for the money they spend. I am enormously impressed with the new leadership at Ornge. They are looking very closely at important questions. They are engaging their own staff; they are engaging people from outside of the Ornge organization who have a lot to offer. They are dedicated to improving the quality of care and the value for money at Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** So the minister doesn't know if that is part of the strategic review. We're going to assume that it's not.

There are two Transport Canada inspection reports that were issued in March of this year. Both of those reports validate the testimony of witnesses who testified to the fact that Ornge should not be in the aviation business. From aircraft equipment to pilot and paramedic training to the sustainability of the current structure, it is



very clear that Ornge should not be in the aviation business.

Would the minister tell us this: Why are she and Ornge so intent on perpetuating the Mazza scheme that will continue to put the lives of patients and first responders at risk in this province? Why will she not take the advice of sworn testimony that makes it very clear that Ornge should not be in this business?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

1140

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, what I can tell you is that the new leadership at Ornge has brought an entirely different approach to providing air ambulance. They are working with other partners in our health care system. They're working with critical; they're working with our hospitals; they're working with land ambulance. They are really working to integrate Ornge into our health care system in a way that has never happened before.

As I said earlier, I am very impressed with the work of Dr. Andrew McCallum. I'm very impressed with the work of the new board. They are determined to make the right decisions for the people of this province. I do wish that the member opposite would support them in their work and support the front-line men and women who come to work every day to save lives.

#### SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour la ministre déléguée aux services en français. Les francophones de la région de Durham ont organisé un gros rally ce matin appelé SOS Désignation Durham. Ils essaient de recevoir la désignation depuis 2009, mais le gouvernement continue d'ajouter des barrières à leur désignation.

Quand c'est le temps de se faire réélire, le gouvernement a prouvé qu'il pouvait agir très vite, comme la vérificatrice générale nous a démontré dans son rapport sur les centrales au gaz de Mississauga et Oakville. Mais quand il s'agit d'aider les francophones de Durham à recevoir la désignation, ça prend beaucoup trop de temps. Ma question est simple : pourquoi les délais?

**L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Je voudrais remercier la députée de l'opposition pour sa question. Je suis très surprise d'entendre ses commentaires aujourd'hui—son intérêt pour la région de Durham. Nous travaillons avec la région de Durham depuis très longtemps, et les délais ne sont pas causés par nous. Nous les appuyons. Nous aimerions qu'elle soit une région désignée. Maintenant, on veut l'assentiment des députés de l'opposition, et il y a des réticences.

J'ai rencontré les députés qui représentent cette circonscription, et il y a encore de la résistance.

Alors, j'encourage les gens. L'office des affaires francophones travaille avec eux. On veut continuer et on

les remercie pour leur détermination de bien vouloir être une région désignée. Je les encourage à collaborer avec nous et à essayer de convaincre les députés qui représentent cette circonscription-là.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** La région de Durham rencontre les exigences pour la désignation, mais il semble que le gouvernement continue d'en demander plus—plus de lettres d'appui, plus de propositions des différents paliers de gouvernement—au lieu de les soutenir dans leur droit d'avoir des services dans leur langue.

Quand est-ce que le gouvernement va s'occuper des communautés francophones et commencer à aider, plutôt que d'entraver, la désignation de la région de Durham selon la Loi sur les services en français?

**L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Pour la désignation, il y a des critères qui avaient été établis dès le début, et la région de Durham ne rencontre pas ces critères-là. Maintenant, comme avec Kingston—il y avait une bonne volonté de la part des élus de la région de Kingston, et ça a été facile, avec leur approbation, de désigner la région de Kingston. On n'a pas ce même appui-là de la part des députés de la région de Durham, alors je les encourage à continuer de travailler avec eux et avec le conseil municipal et le conseil régional pour s'assurer qu'on puisse désigner cette région-là. J'encourage ma collègue de la circonscription de Nickel Belt d'aider dans ce processus.

#### VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The Minister of Rural Affairs on a point of order.

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** I didn't get this in in time, earlier this morning, but Dr. Rita Kilislian, a dentist from Peterborough, is here with the ODA lobby day.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Prince Edward-Hastings.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker: I would also like to welcome some constituents from Belleville. Ralph and Diana Neale are here, and Kate Neale, who has been the spokesperson for Bill 30. I'd like to congratulate her on her hard work this year as well.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The Minister of Health and Long-Term Care.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I, too, would like to welcome the Neale family, including Trish Neale, Kate's aunt. We've heard a lot about Kate as we've debated this bill, and I'm delighted you're with us today, Kate.

I'd also like to welcome Joanne Di Nardo and Florentina Stancu-Soare from the Canadian Cancer Society, and Annette Cyr from the Melanoma Network of Canada.

#### USE OF QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Earlier today, in response to a question from a Liberal member, the Minister of Health indicated that there would be legislation coming forward later. You know that it is the custom of this House that the announcement of legislation is to take place in this Legislature—not in the form of answering a lob ball question from one of her backbench MPPs.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** A point of order, and for clarity purposes, you can anticipate and say anything you want in terms of legislation. There is no rule that says they have to do it in a certain manner. So whatever that kind of guesstimation is, is very doable.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### SKIN CANCER PREVENTION ACT (TANNING BEDS), 2013 LOI DE 2013 SUR LA PRÉVENTION DU CANCER DE LA PEAU (LITS DE BRONZAGE)

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 30, An Act to regulate the selling and marketing of tanning services and ultraviolet light treatments for tanning / Projet de loi 30, Loi visant à réglementer la vente et la commercialisation de services de bronzage et de traitements par rayonnement ultraviolet à des fins de bronzage.

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

*The division bells rang from 1146 to 1151.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** On October 8, Ms. Matthews moved third reading of Bill 30. All those in favour, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gélinas, France	Milloy, John
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gravelle, Michael	Moridi, Reza
Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia
Bailey, Robert	Harris, Michael	Murray, Glen R.
Balkissoon, Bas	Hatfield, Percy	Naqvi, Yasir
Barrett, Toby	Holyday, Douglas C.	Natyshak, Taras
Bartolucci, Rick	Horwath, Andrea	Nicholls, Rick
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoskins, Eric	O'Toole, John
Bisson, Gilles	Hudak, Tim	Oraziotti, David
Bradley, James J.	Hunter, Mitzie	Pettapiece, Randy
Campbell, Sarah	Jackson, Rod	Piruzza, Teresa
Cansfield, Donna H.	Jaczek, Helena	Prue, Michael
Chan, Michael	Jeffrey, Linda	Qaadri, Shafiq
Chiarelli, Bob	Jones, Sylvia	Sandals, Liz
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Sattler, Peggy
Clark, Steve	Kwinter, Monte	Schein, Jonah
Colle, Mike	Leal, Jeff	Scott, Laurie
Coteau, Michael	MacLaren, Jack	Shurman, Peter
Crack, Grant	MacLeod, Lisa	Singh, Jagmeet
Damerla, Dipika	Mangat, Amrit	Smith, Todd
Delaney, Bob	Marchese, Rosario	Sousa, Charles
Dhillon, Vic	Matthews, Deborah	Tabuns, Peter
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Thompson, Lisa M.
DiNovo, Cheri	McDonnell, Jim	Vanthof, John
Duguid, Brad	McKenna, Jane	Walker, Bill
Elliott, Christine	McMeekin, Ted	Wilson, Jim

Fedeli, Victor	McNaughton, Monte	Wong, Soo
Fife, Catherine	McNeely, Phil	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Meilleur, Madeleine	Yakabuski, John
Forster, Cindy	Miller, Norm	Yurek, Jeff
Fraser, John	Miller, Paul	Zimmer, David
Gerretsen, John	Milligan, Rob E.	

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 95; the nays are 0.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the bill carried.

*Third reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

## GREAT LAKES PROTECTION ACT, 2013

### LOI DE 2013 SUR LA PROTECTION DES GRANDS LACS

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 6, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin / Projet de loi 6, Loi visant la protection et le rétablissement du bassin des Grands Lacs et du fleuve Saint-Laurent.

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

*The division bells rang from 1155 to 1156.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** On February 27, 2013, Mr. Bradley moved second reading of Bill 6. All those in favour please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Miller, Paul
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Forster, Cindy	Milloy, John
Balkissoon, Bas	Fraser, John	Moridi, Reza
Bartolucci, Rick	Gerretsen, John	Murray, Glen R.
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gélinas, France	Naqvi, Yasir
Bisson, Gilles	Gravelle, Michael	Natyshak, Taras
Bradley, James J.	Hatfield, Percy	Oraziotti, David
Campbell, Sarah	Horwath, Andrea	Piruzza, Teresa
Cansfield, Donna H.	Hoskins, Eric	Prue, Michael
Chan, Michael	Hunter, Mitzie	Schein, Jonah
Chiarelli, Bob	Jaczek, Helena	Sandals, Liz
Colle, Mike	Jeffrey, Linda	Sattler, Peggy
Coteau, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Schein, Jonah
Crack, Grant	Leal, Jeff	Singh, Jagmeet
Damerla, Dipika	Mangat, Amrit	Sousa, Charles
Delaney, Bob	Marchese, Rosario	Tabuns, Peter
Dhillon, Vic	Matthews, Deborah	Vanthof, John
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Wong, Soo
DiNovo, Cheri	McMeekin, Ted	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Duguid, Brad	McNeely, Phil	Zimmer, David
Fife, Catherine	Meilleur, Madeleine	

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Jackson, Rod	Nicholls, Rick
Bailey, Robert	Jones, Sylvia	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Klees, Frank	Pettapiece, Randy
Chudleigh, Ted	MacLaren, Jack	Scott, Laurie

Clark, Steve	MacLeod, Lisa	Shurman, Peter
Elliott, Christine	McDonnell, Jim	Smith, Todd
Fedeli, Victor	McKenna, Jane	Thompson, Lisa M.
Hardeman, Ernie	McNaughton, Monte	Walker, Bill
Harris, Michael	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Holyday, Douglas C.	Milligan, Rob E.	Yakabuski, John
Hudak, Tim	Munro, Julia	Yurek, Jeff

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 62; the nays are 33.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? The Minister of the Environment.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I would ask that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** So ordered.

There is a reception for the historic Brantford Red Sox in room 340, presently to be received.

There are no further deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1159 to 1500.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I'd just like to welcome all of the engineers here. I have been a 51-year payer of a membership in the PEO, and I am just very happy that they are here today. They are going to have a great celebration downstairs tonight from 5 to 7.

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome Dr. Viran Toor to Queen's Park. He's here from my riding, specifically Port Elgin.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### CLARINGTON SPORTS HALL OF FAME

**Mr. John O'Toole:** There will be nothing in this on the gas plant scandal; it's from my riding of Durham.

I'd like to pay tribute to the local heroes of my riding who will be inducted into the Clarington Sports Hall of Fame on Saturday, October 19.

Sarah Couch became the first female in 102 years to play in the Ontario Hockey Association when she joined the Bowmanville Junior C Eagles in 1992. As a member of the Toronto Aeros, she won a provincial gold and national bronze medal. She also won a world championship silver medal on the Canadian women's roller hockey team.

Golfer Betty Ingram won various local, provincial and national championships.

Ray Preston signed with the Hamilton Red Wings and Guelph Biltmores in the 1950s. He later focused on coaching and giving back to amateur sport across Ontario.

Tom Lenehan served in many hockey and soccer capacities for more than 20 years as a volunteer, referee, coach, instructor, and president of the Clarington Recreational Hockey League.

Two teams were also inducted. The Flying Dutchman midget team were winners of the OMHA championship in 1986 and 1987. The midget C Bowmanville baseball team won the all-Ontario championship in 1985, 1986 and 1987. The list goes on.

I'd like to also congratulate the Clarington Sports Hall of Fame organizing team. The committee includes Cathy Abraham, David Blakely, Trish Stone, Hugh Walters, John Witheridge, and Clarington's community development coordinator, Erica Mittag. Thank you, and congratulations to all of those being recognized.

## HOMELESSNESS

**Ms. Peggy Sattler:** Tomorrow, in recognition of World Homeless Action Day, a public memorial will be unveiled in my community of London, Ontario, to commemorate lives lost as the result of homelessness. The memorial is a collaborative effort between the London Homeless Coalition and the city of London and responds to the desire of people who have experienced homelessness themselves to remember and honour their friends who died on the streets. It comes after two years of planning and fundraising and was inspired by similar monuments in Toronto and Edmonton.

The London Homeless Memorial says to individuals who are homeless and to the family and friends who love them that their lives matter, that they have the same rights to dignity and respect as everyone else. It also provides a focal point for efforts to address homelessness in London and to track the number of people who die on our streets.

Homelessness is a community issue that requires a community response. I am proud of the work that is being done in London to develop housing-first approaches that are individual- and family-centred and partnership-based. At the provincial level, I urge MPPs to support these efforts by ensuring adequate incomes and affordable housing to prevent the scourge of homelessness in our communities.

## SOUTH-EAST OTTAWA COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

**Mr. John Fraser:** I am pleased to rise today to speak about an important organization in my riding of Ottawa South. Last week was Community Health and Wellbeing Week, and I would like to recognize the South-East Ottawa Community Health Centre, a dedicated organization working in my community since 1974.

Since its beginning, this essential organization has offered services to thousands of families in my riding of Ottawa South, especially low-income families, new Canadians and seniors in our community. Partnering with other organizations throughout the region, South-East

Ottawa offers integrated primary health care, encourages community development and health promotion, and provides resources for youth, counselling services and outreach to high-need neighbourhoods. Their mission is to foster a healthy, welcoming, diverse and safe community; promote healthy development of individuals and families; and enable community members to help one another.

With programs like Better Beginnings, Better Futures, the Good Food Box and Early Years Outreach with community houses, the centre is delivering those services to those who need them most.

On behalf of the families of Ottawa South, I'd like to thank the executive director, Leslie McDiarmid, the staff of the centre, the board and the volunteers for all the work they do to make people's lives better.

#### COMMUNITY LIVING KINCARDINE AND DISTRICT

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** I rise today to recognize and congratulate Community Living Kincardine and District for inspiring possibilities for the past 50 years. Recently, this Community Living association hosted a 50-year celebration in Kincardine to salute the founding families, its members, its volunteers and its staff.

Director Andy Swan recognized that back in 1963, families had to find their own options for their sons and daughters. Fortunately, the families of these people had the desire, strength and commitment to push back against what were considered the possibilities of that day. These founding families—the Fergusons, the Stones and the Lamberts—became advocates, board members and fundraisers in a concerted effort to help in the creation of something other than the reality they were told their children were to live.

I attended the 50th anniversary, and when the founding families affectionately spoke of their sons and daughters and how they wanted better for them, I can tell you that there wasn't a dry eye in the house.

Today, Community Living Kincardine and District has evolved into a growing range of inclusive services that enable individuals to be contributing members of society. Local businesses in the Kincardine area offer employment to the CLKD members, as well as allowing them a level of independence and a chance to demonstrate their abilities.

To the founding families of Community Living Kincardine and District, dating back to 1963, I extend a sincere thank you and I tell them to take pride in the possibilities that they have inspired.

#### BICYCLE SAFETY

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** On November 23, 2012, Tom Samson was struck on his bicycle and killed. Tom was a much-loved primary school teacher, a husband and a father of two small children. Tom was my age. He coached basketball and chess. He was known for his

sense of humour. He took his kids to the Wychwood Barns farmers' market every Saturday afternoon. Speaker, his death struck close to home.

For years, cyclists have held memorial rides and painted a white ghost bike to remember fallen cyclists. Last winter, on a freezing dark night, I rode with our cycling community to the site of Tom's accident, and Tom's ghost bike has remained at the corner of Lansdowne and Davenport ever since.

Last spring, Tom's family contacted my office. They were concerned because the city wanted to remove Tom's memorial bicycle. Today, with the help of city councillors Layton and Mihevc, a motion is being introduced to ensure that the ghost bikes are recognized as memorials and that they are left in place for as long as the family wishes. Ghost bikes serve as a reminder to everyone to share the road and to be respectful. They are also a reminder to us, as legislators, that we must do better to protect cyclists, and that means making the proper investments to ensure that our roads are safe for our friends and families.

I hope that members of our community will join cycling advocates tomorrow night for a meeting in Davenport's ward 17 to help us advocate for safe streets for all.

#### ÉCOLE NOTRE-DAME-DES-CHAMPS

**M. Phil McNeely:** Dans un peu moins d'une heure aura lieu la cérémonie d'ouverture officielle de la nouvelle école élémentaire du Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est, le CECCE. Située à Notre-Dame-des-Champs dans ma circonscription d'Ottawa-Orléans, l'École élémentaire catholique Notre-Dame-des-Champs permet d'accueillir 360 élèves de la maternelle à la sixième année. Une garderie y est également aménagée, ce qui représente 26 places additionnelles pour les enfants de ce secteur.

Une nouvelle école, qui a d'ailleurs ouvert ses portes aux nouveaux élèves en août dernier, permettra de mieux desservir des élèves ayant droit à l'éducation catholique en langue française.

De plus, l'école est également construite selon de rigoureux standards en matière de développement durable et d'efficacité énergétique. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario continue à faire de l'éducation une priorité, et la construction de nouveaux établissements scolaires en est une des preuves.

**1510**

J'aimerais remercier, pour leur collaboration et leur travail de premier plan, le président sortant de CECCE, M. André Ouellette, et le directeur général, M. Bernard Roy, et féliciter le nouveau président du conseil, M. Denis Poirier dans son nouveau rôle. Bonne première année scolaire 2013-2014 aux élèves de Notre-Dame-des-Champs.

#### AUTOMOBILE SHOW

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I rise in the House today to tell you about a first-class event that debuted September 14 at a

world-class golf resort in my riding of Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound.

Legions of car fans from all corners of the world flocked to the shimmering lakefront award-winning Cobble Beach resort and golf course just north of Owen Sound to see a unique exhibition of 120 iconic vehicles, from horseless carriages such as a 1903 Oldsmobile Model R and a 1904 Ford Model AC and vintage sports cars to race cars like the Gilles Villeneuve Ferrari 312T3 F1 and supercars such as the Ferrari SA Aperta and McLaren 12C Spider, as well as Isotta-Fraschini, Pierce-Arrow, Rolls-Royce, Plymouth Hemi Cuda, Ford T-Bird, and Acadian Beaumont two-door coupe, just to name a few. Needless to say, they were smitten by the sight and sound of these exotic and rare collector cars.

I would like to recognize concours show chairman and founder and Cobble Beach owner Rob McLeese and his family, staff and volunteers, as well as their team of esteemed collectors, restorers and concours judges for staging a successful first-of-a-kind Concours d'Elegance show in Canada. I'm absolutely certain it will become an annual attraction, ensuring a tourism and culture windfall for Grey and Bruce for many years to come.

I'd also like to add that a portion of the proceeds from the show will be donated toward the funding of Sunnybrook Health Sciences' rooftop helipad.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to witness Canada's premier classic car concours that seemed like something out of the James Bond series of films, and I'm honoured to say that it rivalled long-established shows around the world and may be poised to become the best one, bar none.

I welcome everyone to Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound to attend this event next year.

#### FRANCOPHONE SHELTER FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN

**Ms. Mitzie Hunter:** I'd like to speak today about the opening of Toronto's first francophone shelter for women and children in my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood. The opening of this shelter is part of this government's plan for investing in the people of Ontario.

Speaker, 1.4% of the residents in Scarborough–Guildwood claim French as their first language. This is a community I've had the privilege of engaging many times before and since my election.

There is great value in creating a plan to address the issues facing Franco-Ontarians in the GTA. There is a gap in services for this group, and I'd like to thank Minister Madeleine Meilleur, as well as Minister Ted McMeekin, for their observation in addressing this gap, as well as Nathalie Dufour Séguin, president of la Maison, Jeanne Francoise Mouè, executive director of la Maison, and Kevin Pal, regional director for the Ministry of Community and Social Services, for their tireless efforts to bring this shelter to the GTA.

Domestic violence is something that no one is immune to, regardless of one's ethnic, cultural, religious, racial or

linguistic background. Domestic violence and violence against women and children is prevalent in every community. It is an issue that needs to be addressed, and I'm glad to work with a government that is dedicated to protecting this province's most vulnerable citizens. Creating a safe place for Ontario's women and children and addressing the needs of Franco-Ontarians is just one more way in which we are one Ontario, regardless of the language we speak or the country we come from.

#### BRIGDEN FAIR

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** If it's Thanksgiving weekend and you're in my part of southwestern Ontario, all roads lead to Brigden for the Brigden Fair, the largest fall fair in southwestern Ontario. It's the 163rd annual.

Brigden Fair was first established in 1850 for the promotion of agriculture through community involvement. Over those years, the Moore Agricultural Society has continued to serve the community and maintained those traditions. The first fair in 1850 was held at a settlers' farm called Reilly's farm in St. Clair township, but over the years it migrated to Brigden.

This year, they're also celebrating 25 years of agriculture in the classroom. This program started in Lambton county and it's called A Little Bit of Country.

It's the largest fall fair in our part of the county, and as we come to the end of the year, all the champions from the livestock competitions progress onward to the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto.

It's also a big day in Lambton because of the IPM awards, the International Plowing Match awards, from Lambton county, a legacy that was left over from the plowing match a number of years ago. There are four awards given every year to the young farmers, men and women who are going to go on and distinguish themselves in agriculture.

Again, come out to the fair in Brigden this Thanksgiving weekend and say hello.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I thank all members for their statements.

#### CHRIS LEWIS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The government House leader on a point of order.

**Hon. John Milloy:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that we have unanimous consent that one representative from each caucus be allowed to speak in tribute to Ontario Provincial Police Commissioner Chris D. Lewis for being elevated to the rank of commander within the Order of Merit of the Polices Forces by the Governor General of Canada.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent to do a tribute from all three parties for up to five minutes. Do we agree? I didn't even hear a no. We agree.

The Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** I'd like to welcome OPP Commissioner Chris Lewis and his daughter Stephanie to the Legislature.

I am pleased to inform the House that during a ceremony held on October 4 at La Citadelle in Quebec City, His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston, Governor General of Canada, elevated Commissioner Lewis to the rank of commander within the Order of Merit of the Police Forces. He is the first Canadian police leader to be elevated to all three levels of the Order of Merit of the Police Forces.

I was at the ceremony at La Citadelle in Quebec, and I was extremely proud to watch Commissioner Lewis receive the medal. As someone who works closely with the commissioner, it is a pleasure when others see in him what I have always seen in him: his leadership, his empathy, his devotion to his job and to the people he works with. As the minister who oversees the OPP, and also as a friend, it was an emotional experience and one that I will always remember.

The Order of Merit of the Police Forces, established in October 2000, honours the leadership and exceptional service or distinctive merit displayed by the men and women of Canadian police services and recognizes their commitment to Canada. The primary focus of the order of merit is on contributions to policing and community development, and there are three levels: member, officer and commander.

To be appointed to the Order of Merit of the Police Forces is, indeed, a great honour, but to be elevated to the level of commander of the order of merit is a tremendous achievement. Appointment to commander recognizes outstanding service and demonstrated leadership in duties of great responsibilities over an extended period, usually at the national and international level.

I am fortunate to have first-hand knowledge of Commissioner Lewis's strong leadership abilities and of his commitment to the members of the OPP and the communities and citizens he serves. I see those qualities every time I work alongside him, and I see them reflected every day in the organization he leads.

We were together in Elliot Lake after last year's tragic mall collapse. We met with first responders, with community leaders and with families. Not only did he show leadership as the commissioner of the OPP, but he showed compassion and humanity. Being himself from Sault Ste. Marie, they felt he was one of them, and his presence was much appreciated. He is not only a great commissioner, he's a great person, and we are very lucky to have him.

Just last month, Commissioner Lewis celebrated 35 years of public service to Ontario. Since joining the OPP in 1978, Commissioner Lewis has amassed a wealth of operational policing experience, particularly in front-line service delivery, various investigative disciplines and tactical operations.

He is also a strong advocate of community-based initiatives, playing an important role with the United Way and the Ontario Law Enforcement Torch Run for the

Special Olympics. His 35-year commitment to the people of Ontario as a member of the OPP and as a champion of charity makes him an inspiration to us all.

**1520**

This national honour is the highest recognition of his 35 years of public service excellence, and he certainly deserves it. Stephanie, I am glad that you are here today with your father. Throughout his life, your father has had demanding jobs and shouldered the heavy responsibility of keeping Ontario safe. On behalf of all Ontarians, I want to thank you and your family for sharing him with us all these years. I know your father is extremely proud of you, and I'm sure you're also proud of him.

He is a great leader and a great man, and I know this Legislature and the people of Ontario will join me in thanking Commissioner Lewis for his service and congratulating him on this tremendous honour he has received.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** As Ontario PC critic for community safety and correctional services, it's truly an honour to rise on behalf of our caucus and our leader, Tim Hudak, to pay tribute to Commissioner Chris Lewis of the Ontario Provincial Police. I want to welcome Stephanie here as well with Commissioner Lewis. I know that tonight you'll be feted as well at the commissioned officers' annual mess dinner, so we appreciate you being here today.

Speaker, I want to say off the top that typically when we hold one of these tributes, it's to mark the end of a distinguished career, and certainly, as the minister said, we want to mention the tremendous 35-year career that Commissioner Lewis has with the OPP; it's an outstanding career. But I want to stress that Ontarians are very fortunate that Commissioner Lewis has many, many more years of service ahead of him. Indeed, earlier this year, he was reappointed to another three-year term as commissioner of the OPP, a role he has performed with excellence since August 2010.

Today we recognize another outstanding achievement in Commissioner Lewis's impressive career: his elevation, as the minister said, to commander within the Order of Merit of the Police Forces. This distinguished honour, as the minister has said, was bestowed upon Commissioner Lewis by His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston, Governor General of Canada. As well, the minister mentioned the reasons for this award, which is to honour "leadership and exceptional service or distinctive merit displayed by" our fine "men and women of the Canadian police services."

I should acknowledge, for those watching at home, that there are three levels to the order: member, officer and commander. It's also important to note some of the things that Governor General Johnston said in regard to the fact that it's one of the most prestigious honours we have here in Canada. So it stands as a special point of pride for every uniformed and civilian member of the OPP—and, I should add, every Ontarian—to know that Commissioner Lewis is the first Canadian police leader to be elevated to all three levels. It's a significant honour

for our province and for all Ontarians. That's why I was so pleased, when we talked about this earlier this week, that the parties agreed to honour you today in this manner, which I think is only appropriate given your exemplary service to Ontarians.

I can think of no leader within police services more deserving of being that trailblazer than Commissioner Chris Lewis. Throughout his remarkable career, he has inspired those under his command to be better police officers and better citizens. But in true demonstration of leadership, Commissioner Lewis has helped build stronger communities by setting an example for those from outside the OPP to follow.

Speaker, with your indulgence, I want to quote Governor General Johnston's speech on Friday about the scope of this award and how much emphasis it places on an honoree's impact on his or her community.

The quote: "This honour recognizes the fact that your job is about ... more than strict policing and law enforcement. Rather, you are community builders in the broadest sense, helping ... create a sense of trust, belonging, well-being and, of course, security, that is so essential to strong communities and nations."

In other words, Speaker, a true leader recognizes that they must do more than just strengthen the organization under their command. Through their words and actions, they create a culture that ensures that each citizen and every organization that comes into contact with them is made better for the experience. That's not easy in any endeavour, and it's particularly challenging in policing. Our police forces have an incredible responsibility to protect the safety and security of our citizens.

The integrity and sense of duty that Commissioner Lewis brings to work with him each and every day should give all Ontarians confidence that this authority is truly in trusted hands. Coming from eastern Ontario, I have to tell you that we feel a very special pride in Commissioner Lewis. Although he was born in Sault Ste. Marie, we consider him one of our own, with his distinctive and distinguished career as regional commander for the OPP's east region. I have to say, on a personal note, I have the utmost admiration and respect for Commissioner Lewis for his steadfast dedication not just to the nearly 10,000 OPP personnel in his command but also to the communities they serve.

Every time I see you, whether it's at the AMO conference, a barbecue in Kemptville or on Sunday at the Fallen Firefighters Memorial, you always have a smile, and you always ask me about the people of Leeds-Grenville and my family. It's that personal connection, Commissioner, that makes you an outstanding and effective leader.

I want to join every member of provincial Parliament and every Ontarian in congratulating you on being elevated to commander within the Order of Merit of the Police Forces. It's a very distinguished achievement, and it's very deserved, sir. Congratulations.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further tribute?

**Ms. Peggy Sattler:** I am honoured today to rise in this assembly on behalf of the Ontario New Democratic Party

and our leader, Andrea Horwath, to pay tribute to OPP Commissioner Chris Lewis. We haven't yet had the opportunity to meet, but after what I've heard today in this House, I'm very much looking forward to making your personal acquaintance.

I'm speaking on behalf of all members of my caucus and would like to extend our very sincere congratulations to you and your family on this well-deserved promotion last week to commander within the Order of Merit of the Police Forces. The rank recognizes outstanding meritorious service and demonstrated leadership and duties of great responsibility over an extended period of time, usually at the national or international level.

Chris Lewis has embodied these qualities throughout his 35 years of policing and has consistently shown incredible dedication to the province of Ontario in his role as commissioner, with responsibility for more than 6,000 uniformed officers, 2,700 civilian employees and 850 auxiliary officers over vast stretches of land and provincial waterways.

Since joining the OPP in 1978, he has devoted himself to the delivery of exceptional front-line service. He was first appointed to the Order of Merit of the Police Forces in 2004 and was subsequently promoted within the order in 2010.

Commissioner Lewis's commitment to public safety in Ontario and his leadership within his profession are exemplified by the important policing divisions he has worked to establish in this province, including the Cornwall Regional Task Force, together with the RCMP, as well as the Aboriginal Policing Bureau. He championed the OPP's involvement in the aboriginal day of action and took a strong and principled position on the role of the OPP in providing policing support for Idle No More.

In addition to the wealth of knowledge he has gained through a lifetime of experience, Commissioner Lewis also brings to his work a nuanced understanding of the complex issues facing First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples through study of aboriginal government and law at Athabasca University.

We applaud Commissioner Lewis for his deep commitment to community-based policing and his strong advocacy for community engagement through such initiatives as the OPP's United Way Campaign and the Ontario Law Enforcement Torch Run for the Special Olympics.

Being promoted to the rank of commander is a truly extraordinary accomplishment, making Commissioner Lewis the first Canadian police leader to be elevated through all three levels of the order. Ontarians are indeed fortunate to have his leadership, and I want to once again congratulate him on having earned this significant and well-deserved honour.

1530

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I want to thank all members for their very kind and thoughtful words in this tribute in honour. As is the tradition of this place, we will see that we have a bundle and a package of both the

Hansard and a DVD of these tributes and send them to you and to your family. We congratulate you as an entire Legislature.

On a personal note, if I'm allowed, I have known Chris for quite some time now, I think about 14 years. We have become friends, and it's so nice to see a friend elevated the way that you have been, deservedly so. I really appreciate your guidance and your help, as we are co-members on the board of Ontario's Special Olympics. I appreciate your work and dedication outside of your profession.

Thank you very much again. We will be making sure that you receive these tributes so that you get to play them over and over and over and over again—just in case it's needed for you. Anyway, thank you once again.

*Applause.*

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** 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. Anne Stokes):** Your committee begs—

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

Sorry, did you read the report?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement, I guess? I think I should do that first.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** No.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** No? No statement.

*Report adopted.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Pursuant to the standing order of the House dated October 3, 2013, the bill is ordered for third reading.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### LOBBYISTS REGISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT, 2013 LOI DE 2013 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ENREGISTREMENT DES LOBBYISTES

Ms. Forster moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 115, An Act to amend the Lobbyists Registration Act, 1998 / Projet de loi 115, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur l'enregistrement des lobbyistes.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** The bill amends the Lobbyists Registration Act, 1998. The major features of the bill include the following:

Consultant lobbyists are required to file returns with the registrar within five business days after beginning to lobby.

The definition of "undertaking" in section 4 of the act is amended to provide that an undertaking to lobby on behalf of a client may be express or implied. Also, an undertaking to lobby may be in addition to other professional services provided to a client.

The definition of "in-house lobbyist" in sections 5 and 6 of the act is amended to provide that an individual employed by a person, partnership or organization is a lobbyist if any part of his or her duties as an employee is to lobby on behalf of the employer.

Lobbyists who lobby high-level public office holders are required to submit monthly reports to the registrar.

High-level public office holders are prohibited from lobbying for five years after leaving their position, with certain exceptions and exemptions.

Consultant lobbyists are required to file returns setting out political contributions they or their clients have made during the preceding 24 months if the Election Finances Act applies to the contributions.

Individuals are not permitted to lobby while they are being paid from public funds to provide services or advice to the government or a government agency.

Whistle-blowing protection is added to the act.

Certain offences are added to the act, and the maximum penalty is increased to \$250,000. The registrar is required to publish the names of individuals charged with or convicted of an offence under the act.

### MANORANJANA KANAGASABAPATHY ACT (HAND-HELD DEVICES PENALTY), 2013

### LOI MANORANJANA KANAGASABAPATHY DE 2013 (PEINE POUR CONDUITE AVEC APPAREIL PORTATIF)

Mr. Balkissoon moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 116, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to increase the penalty for the use of hand-held devices while driving / Projet de loi 116, Loi modifiant le Code de la route pour augmenter la peine imposée en cas d'utilisation d'un appareil portatif lors de la conduite.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** Mr. Speaker, this bill, entitled the Manoranjana Kanagasabapathy Act (Hand-Held



Devices), 2013, amends the Highway Traffic Act to increase the penalty for driving a motor vehicle on a highway while holding or using a hand-held device, wireless communication device, hand-held electronic entertainment device or other prescribed devices. The penalty for each of these offences is increased to a fine not less than \$300 and not more than \$700. Offenders also receive three demerit points for each offence.

I move this bill in honour of this person, who had the unfortunate situation of losing her life in an accident in my riding as a result of someone possibly using a hand-held device while driving and losing control of their vehicle. I just want to say to the family that my heartfelt condolences go out to them for losing a member of their family who did not have the opportunity to say goodbye to her husband, her two children and her granddaughter.

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

### ONTARIO AGRICULTURE WEEK SEMAINE DE L'AGRICULTURE EN ONTARIO

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, I rise today wearing my Minister of Agriculture and Food hat to honour the hard-working men and women who bring the good things that grow in Ontario to our tables every single day.

This week is Ontario Agriculture Week. It's a time for us to celebrate the important role Ontario's agricultural sector plays in our province's success.

La Semaine de l'agriculture en Ontario, qui se déroule maintenant, est un moment idéal pour célébrer le rôle important que joue notre secteur agricole dans la prospérité de la province.

Last year, the agri-food and agri-products sector contributed \$34 billion to Ontario's economy and supported approximately 740,000 jobs. It's a very, very important part of our economy.

Ontario's food processing sector ranks as the province's second-largest manufacturing industry, and our local food is valued and enjoyed beyond our borders, with food exports hitting a record high of \$10.8 billion last year.

That's really why it's so important for us to recognize the dedication of the people who have made this industry a cornerstone of our economy.

Supporting their success is part of our three-part economic plan to invest in people, to invest in infrastructure and to support a dynamic and innovative business climate across the province.

Cette semaine est importante non seulement pour nos agriculteurs et leur famille, mais également pour tous les gens de l'Ontario.

And that point, that celebrating Ontario Agriculture Week, honouring the people who produce and process

our food, is an important aspect of the one Ontario that I believe we are. This week is important not only for farmers and their families, but for all of Ontario.

From farm to fork, the impact of our agri-food industry is felt in rural and urban communities alike. Whether you live in a city like Toronto or Windsor or London or a small town like Seaforth, it's key that we fully understand that our agri-food sector unites us all in one Ontario.

When I visited Ottawa and had the opportunity to visit their large farmers' market and the Savour Ottawa festival, it really was an example of where urban and rural meet. It's very clear to me that there's one Ottawa that celebrates urban and rural alike.

#### 1540

By working together to ensure the success of our farmers, processors and retailers, we are strengthening our communities and our economy.

En collaborant pour assurer le succès de nos agriculteurs, entreprises de transformation et détaillants, nous renforçons nos collectivités et notre économie.

On Monday, I challenged the agri-food sector to double its growth rate by 2020 and to create 120,000 new jobs in Ontario. I said to the folks who attended the Premier's Agri-Food Summit that we did not expect that the sector would be able to do that alone.

To help the industry reach this target, we'll be doing more—we already are doing a lot, but we will do more—to cut down regulatory barriers that hold back investment in the sector. We'll support innovation and innovative projects through our new Local Food Fund, and that will get more Ontario food on our plates and create jobs across the province.

We'll also continue to invest in initiatives like Growing Forward 2, which will help Ontario to leverage significant federal/provincial investments over the next five years. That is an example of the federal level and the provincial level working together with the sector to come up with the right programs to increase investments over the next five years.

We'll continue to support our local food bill, which, if passed, will help us promote and celebrate the good things that are grown, harvested and processed in Ontario.

I know, and I think everyone in this House knows, that by working together, we can continue to challenge ourselves to expand our thinking and our horizons to grow our economy and our communities in a way that will ensure sustainable, long-term success for future generations. That is what I hear from the agriculture community: They want a sustainable industry that will grow into the future.

Ontario's agri-food industry is vital to this province. That's why I ask my colleagues and the people of Ontario to join me not only this week, but each and every day throughout the year, in saluting and supporting our farmers and agri-food industry, because by doing so, we are helping ourselves, our neighbours, our communities and the entire province.

Parce que c'est là un moyen de nous aider nous-mêmes en plus d'aider nos voisins, nos collectivités et toute la province.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Merci.

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK  
SEMAINE DE LA PRÉVENTION  
DES INCENDIES

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** This week, Ontario marks Fire Prevention Week. From October 6 to 12, fire services across the province are engaging with their communities to focus on fire prevention and safety.

This week is also an opportunity for us in the Legislature to help remind Ontarians that they play an important role in preventing fire losses and fatalities.

This year, the Ontario fire marshal is focusing on preventing kitchen fires. They are the number one cause of home fires in this province, and the truth is that they are very preventable.

La moitié de ces incendies sont causés par des gens qui ne font pas attention et laissent cuire des aliments sans surveillance. C'est une erreur qui peut coûter très cher. Le coût moyen des dommages causés par un incendie lié à la cuisson est de 24 000 \$.

A simple kitchen fire can quickly grow to engulf an entire house, and the risk of serious injuries is very real. Taking small steps to avoid kitchen fires is the sensible thing to do. In our busy lives, meals are a great time for Ontario families to join together. To make sure meals remain joyful occasions, Ontarians should follow some simple tips.

First, stay in the kitchen, especially if you are frying something or using a high temperature setting on the stove.

Second, keep anything that can catch fire—oven mitts, wooden utensils, food packaging, towels or curtains—away from the stovetop. Turn pot handles and any electrical wires inward so no one, especially children, can knock hot oil or food to the floor. Wear tight-fitting sleeves when cooking.

Cette approche raisonnable à la prévention des incendies, alliée à de meilleures pratiques de construction et à l'installation d'alarmes d'incendie et d'avertisseurs de fumée, a considérablement réduit le nombre de décès dus aux incendies dans notre province.

In 2012, we saw the largest-ever drop in the number of Ontarians who died in fires compared to the previous year. The number dropped from 86 deaths to 70. That number is still too high, though, and there is more we can do. That is why Fire Prevention Week is so important.

Plus de 13 millions d'Ontariens et Ontariennes sont mieux protégés grâce à l'excellent travail des pompiers de la province et à nos efforts collectifs pour prévenir les incendies, mais nous devons demeurer vigilants et tous faire notre part.

Mr. Speaker, alcohol is often a factor in many cooking fires, and that's why I'm glad to share with the members

of this House that the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management is partnering with the LCBO for this year's Fire Prevention Week. As part of that partnership, safe cooking brochures will be available in all LCBO stores across Ontario. This is an important initiative, and I thank all of those involved in making it a reality.

I invite my colleagues to take the opportunity of Fire Prevention Week to join me in thanking firefighters across Ontario. I would also like to encourage everyone in this House, and in the homes across this province, to adopt safe cooking practices so we can continue to reduce the number of fires and keep Ontarians safe. Thank you, merci and happy Thanksgiving.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Merci. Statements by ministries?

It is now time for responses.

ONTARIO AGRICULTURE WEEK

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I'm pleased to again recognize Ontario Agriculture Week. It's the second time—I also made a statement on Monday—but I'm always happy to recognize the work that our farmers do.

Ontario Agriculture Week was created by Bert Johnson, the PC MPP for Perth. For 15 years it has been a time to celebrate all the contributions of our farmers: the food they grow, the jobs they create, how they protect the environment and how they continue to support their communities.

This government has now introduced a bill that would replace Ontario Agriculture Week. We believe in the importance of local food, but not at the expense of celebrating everything that the agriculture sector contributes to our province. I appreciate that the Premier is open to our amendment to have two separate weeks and more opportunities to celebrate.

Ontario Agriculture Week is a good time to look at the state of the industry and their challenges. On Monday, the Premier challenged them to double their growth rate, but I was disappointed she provided no details on how she was going to address the barriers that our agriculture and agri-food industries are facing. She didn't acknowledge that this government is part of the problem.

In our survey, 77% of farmers and 75% of the food processors said red tape was increasing; 79% of food processors said the impact of increasing hydro rates was significant. And paying for gas plants will not help reduce that cost.

During the hearings yesterday on the Local Food Act, the consistent message was that the Local Food Act could and should be strengthened. If we want the industry to grow, it is not enough to just wish it to happen. As one member of the OFA said yesterday, we need to give them the tools, and then the government needs to get out of the way.

I hope that we'll have an Ontario Agriculture Week next year, and before then, we will have significant government action so we can celebrate that day.

### FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm proud, as Ontario PC critic for community safety and correctional services, to rise on behalf of our caucus and our leader, Tim Hudak, in recognition of this week being Fire Prevention Week. It's a week to let every Ontarian know about the important responsibility we have to protect our loved ones by doing everything we can to prevent a fire at home.

1550

As the minister noted, this year's theme is "Prevent Kitchen Fires and Get Cooking with Fire Safety." With the Thanksgiving weekend almost here, I know that many of us will be spending a lot of time in the kitchen. It's very timely to alert the public that cooking remains the number one cause of residential fires in Ontario. Every time we prepare food in the kitchen, there's a risk of fire. There are also a lot of things we can do to protect ourselves, and I appreciate some of those being mentioned by the minister.

This year marks the 91st anniversary of Fire Prevention Week, which has been happening every October in North America since 1922. Fire Prevention Week actually has its origins in the great Chicago fire of 1871, a tragedy in which 250 people lost their lives and more than 17,000 buildings burned to the ground. Today, October 9, is the 142nd anniversary of that terrible blaze.

Since then, we've had a number of changes in legislation mandating residential smoke alarms, along with the advancements in technology and building practices that have helped dramatically reduce fire fatalities. We can't underestimate the impact that fire safety education has had on reducing those numbers. The work of fire prevention officers and public safety messages delivered by Ontario's fire marshal have prevented countless injuries and deaths. I share with the minister to celebrate that we've had a significant reduction in fire deaths from 2011 to 2012. While we all welcome those declining numbers, let's never lose sight of the fact that even one single fire death is one too many.

As we mark Fire Prevention Week, I do want to acknowledge the work of the Fire Marshal's Public Fire Safety Council. My constituency office in Brockville is located just down the hallway. I know that the hard-working staff of eight, under the direction of executive director Art Pullan, have been very busy leading up to Fire Prevention Week. They have sent out more than 1,000 education kits to fire departments across Canada with information for fire prevention officers that they're going to take to schools and events throughout this week.

It's important that I also acknowledge one comment that Art made about what MPPs can do to save more lives. He said that we must finally get my colleague from Oxford's, Mr. Hardeman's, Hawkins-Gignac bill passed to require carbon monoxide detectors in homes with fuel-burning appliances or with a garage attached. That's advice from someone with nearly four decades on the front lines of fire safety and prevention, so it's critical, I believe, that MPPs need to listen to him.

Again, I'm pleased to join with the minister in recognizing and promoting Fire Prevention Week. I urge Ontarians to practise fire safety not only this week with their family and friends but every week during the year.

### ONTARIO AGRICULTURE WEEK

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's an honour to be able to stand in the Legislature to recognize agriculture week. I am proud to be here speaking on behalf of my leader, Andrea Horwath, and my New Democratic colleagues, but I am perhaps even more proud to be able to stand in this place as a farmer.

Ontario Agriculture Week is more than the \$34 billion it has contributed to the local economy by the agri-foods sector. It is more than the 740,000 jobs that are dependent on the agri-food sector in this province. It's much more than promoting local food, as important as that may be. Agriculture week is about people: the people who grow crops and take care of their livestock 365 days a year. Agriculture week is about sitting in Tim Hortons in Tillsonburg or Temiskaming Shores and listening to farmers talk about the price of soybeans—and yes, we do grow soybeans in northern Ontario. Agriculture week is about the farm families who, whether they have 50 head or 500 or 5,000, do everything they can to make sure that their livestock are comfortable and healthy. It's about harvesting a bumper crop or watching a crop being shredded by hail. That's the difference between a happy bank manager and a not-so-happy one. Agriculture week is about the settlers who originally cleared the land and the waves of immigrants from around the world who came and still come to work in Ontario, on our farms, and who eventually end up owning their own farms. The names on the mailboxes on the rural routes tell the story, and the beautiful farms at the end of the lanes testify to their hard work and determination.

To us in this Legislature, Ontario Agriculture Week should be a reminder to acknowledge those who have given so much to our province and have so much more to give. As legislators, we need to heed their advice and work with them so they can continue to do what they have done throughout our history. We need to do more than press releases and challenges. They are the greatest industry. Farmers are the cornerstone of our society and our economy. They are one of our greatest industries, and they've done absolutely wonderful things without our attention. We need to work with them and not challenge them for press release purposes. We need to work with them.

On that, I'm very proud to be able to stand here as a farmer.

### FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

**Ms. Peggy Sattler:** I'm very pleased to rise today on behalf of the Ontario New Democratic Party to support Fire Prevention Week, which is a very important fire prevention and safety initiative.

As was mentioned, cooking is the number one cause of residential fires and the number two cause of fatal fires. Three quarters of cooking fires are stovetop, with half caused by unattended cooking, meaning that very simple actions can prevent these fires from starting: staying in the kitchen when using the stovetop; regularly checking ovens; and keeping flammable items away from the stove. These are easy, common-sense ways to reduce the risk of kitchen fires—an important message for all of us, as MPPs, to pass along to our constituents.

I also want to take this opportunity today to extend the NDP's support and thanks to Ontario's brave firefighters, to whom we owe a huge debt. Firefighters carry a heavy responsibility for the lives of the people in their communities. We must always remember the sacrifices of those who have lost their lives and who have suffered serious injury in the line of duty.

Firefighting is more than a job; it's a full-time commitment, which is why firefighters need support from every level of government and why government must do more to prevent fires, not only during Fire Prevention Week.

Government must talk with fire chiefs before enacting legislation that directly affects firefighter responsibilities, and ensure that firefighters have the resources they need to do their job safely.

When it comes to fire safety, cutting corners can lead to tragic consequences, especially for our most vulnerable citizens: those living in group homes, retirement homes, long-term-care facilities and hospitals. That's why my colleague Paul Miller, the MPP for Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, has been fighting hard for two years to make sure that seniors living in care facilities built before 1998 get equal fire protection through automatic fire sprinklers in residents' rooms.

Another colleague, Michael Prue, the member for Beaches–East York, has put forward several private member's bills to improve fire safety. The first was to ensure that fire escapes are constructed from non-combustible materials, and the second would make interconnected smoke alarms mandatory.

This Fire Prevention Week, I urge all MPPs to join the NDP in moving these important pieces of legislation through this House, to save lives.

## MOTIONS

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The government House leader on a point of order.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I think you will find there's unanimous consent to revert to motions.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The government House leader has requested unanimous consent to move back into motions.

Agreed? Agreed.

Government House leader.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I seek unanimous consent to move a motion concerning the order of precedence for private members' bills without notice.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent to move the order of private members' business.

Do we agree? Agreed.

Government House leader.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I move that the order of precedence on the ballot list for private members' public business for tomorrow be changed such that Ms. MacLeod assumes ballot item number 48 and Mr. Fraser assumes ballot item number 47.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Agreed? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

## PETITIONS

### YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH

**Mr. Frank Klees:** I have a petition here that deals with youth mental health in our schools and communities, addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas youth mental health in the province of Ontario is rising at an alarming rate. According to the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 70% of mental health problems and illnesses have their onset during childhood or adolescence. Research shows that early identification leads to improved outcomes;

**1600**

“Whereas, pursuant to the Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services, studies suggest 15% to 21% of children and youth, approximately 467,000 to 654,000 children and youth in Ontario, have at least one mental health disorder. The consequences can affect children and youth now and into adulthood, their families/caregivers, schools, communities, employers and the province as a whole;

“Whereas the 2010 Ontario report by the Select Committee on Mental Health and Addictions, entitled *Navigating the Journey to Wellness: The Comprehensive Mental Health and Addictions Action Plan for Ontarians*, made specific recommendations that would address the growing mental health and addiction crisis among youth in the province, but no further concrete steps have been taken;

“Whereas waiting lists for help are at a crisis level and our schools do not have the resources to deal with the growing incidents of bullying, addiction, anxiety, depression and suicide. Education and awareness is critical to remove the stigma;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to prioritize funding and resources for our schools and communities to help our youth with mental health and addiction illnesses and the resulting consequences.”

I'm pleased to affix my signature in support of this petition.

## AIR-RAIL LINK

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas diesel trains are a health hazard for people who live near them;

“Whereas more toxic fumes will be created by the 400 daily trains than the car trips they are meant to replace;

“Whereas the planned air-rail link does not serve the communities through which it passes and will be priced beyond the reach of most commuters;

“Whereas all major cities in the world with train service between their downtown core and the airport use electric trains;

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

“That the province of Ontario stop building the air-rail link for diesel and move to electrify the route immediately;

“That the air-rail link be designed, operated and priced as an affordable transportation option between all points along its route.”

I couldn't agree more. I'm going to add my signature to the thousands and give it to James to be delivered to the table.

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Shafiq Qaadri:** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on the topic of the Sheppard East subway extension. It reads as follows:

“Whereas Scarborough residents north of Ontario Highway 401 and east of Don Mills are without a rapid transit option; and

“Whereas a strong transit system is critical for increasing economic development and tackling income disparity; and

“Whereas this geographical area continues to grow and the demand for strong rapid transit continues to increase; and

“Whereas Sheppard Avenue is a major artery for automobile traffic for commuters travelling from suburbs to downtown Toronto, and travelling from suburb to suburb; and

“Whereas ground-level rapid transit would increase traffic, restrict lanes for automobiles, and add further risk for pedestrians and commuters at dangerous intersections along Sheppard Avenue; and

“Whereas demands for underground rapid transit along Sheppard Avenue have been part of public discourse for over 50 years; and

“Whereas the province of Ontario previously approved a plan from the city of Toronto to extend the Sheppard subway line from Downsview to Scarborough Centre; and

“Whereas an extension to the Sheppard subway line will require contributions and co-operation from the city of Toronto, the province of Ontario and the government of Canada;

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

“To support the extension of the Sheppard subway line east to Scarborough Centre; and

“To call upon the government of Canada to contribute multi-year funding for the construction and operation of an extension to the Sheppard subway line.”

I am in agreement, will affix a signature and send this to you via page Ian.

## HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ministry of Transportation has indicated it will be making improvements to Highway 21 between Port Elgin and Southampton in 2014; and

“Whereas the ministry has not acknowledged the repeated requests from the community and others to undertake safety enhancements to the portion of the highway where it intersects with the Saugeen Rail Trail crossing; and

“Whereas this trail is a vital part of an interconnected active transportation route providing significant recreational and economic benefit to the town of Saugeen Shores, the county of Bruce and beyond;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario to require the MTO to include, as part of the design for the improvements to Highway 21 between Port Elgin and Southampton, measures that will enhance the safety for motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and all others that use the Rail Trail crossing; and to consult and collaborate with the town of Saugeen Shores and other groups in determining cost-effective measures that will maintain the function of the highway while aligning with the active transportation needs of all interested parties who use the Saugeen Rail Trail.”

I totally agree, affix my signature, and I'll give it to Ravicha to take to the table.

## DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

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

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

“Whereas 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 any related acts, and to instead implement legislation that encourages responsible ownership of all dog breeds and types.”

I affix my name with the thousands to this, and give it to Pratah to be delivered to the table, on behalf of—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas Scarborough residents north of Ontario Highway 401 and east of Don Mills are without a rapid transit option; and

“Whereas a strong transit system is critical for increasing economic development and tackling income disparity; and

“Whereas this geographical area continues to grow and the demand for strong rapid transit continues to increase; and

“Whereas Sheppard Avenue is a major artery for automobile traffic for commuters travelling from suburbs to downtown Toronto, and travelling from suburb to suburb; and

“Whereas ground-level rapid transit would increase traffic, restrict lanes for automobiles, and add further risk for pedestrians and commuters at dangerous intersections along Sheppard Avenue; and

“Whereas demands for underground rapid transit along Sheppard Avenue have been part of public discourse for over 50 years; and

“Whereas the province of Ontario previously approved a plan from the city of Toronto to extend the Sheppard subway line from Downsview to Scarborough Centre; and

“Whereas an extension to the Sheppard subway line will require contributions and co-operation from the city of Toronto, the province of Ontario and the government of Canada;

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

“To support the extension of the Sheppard subway line east to Scarborough Centre; and

“To call upon the government of Canada to contribute multi-year funding for the construction and operation of an extension to the Sheppard subway line.”

I fully support the petition and I will give it to page Efuua.

#### PHYSIOTHERAPY SERVICES

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ministry of Health is planning on eliminating OHIP-funded physiotherapy services currently provided to seniors in retirement homes—and changing the current provider of the service as of August 1, 2013; and

“Whereas instead of the 100 to 150 visits per year a senior may receive now from their dedicated on-site OHIP physiotherapy staff, the change would mean a CCAC therapist would provide five to 10 visits on-site

only to seniors who are bedridden or have an acute injury. All other ambulatory seniors would have to attend other community locations/clinics for physiotherapy and exercise off-site; and

“Whereas this change not only reduces the amount of money available, but also moves funds from the lowest-cost provider (OHIP physiotherapy providers—\$12.20 per treatment) to the highest-cost provider (CCAC—\$120 per treatment);

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

“To review and reverse the decision to eliminate OHIP physiotherapy services to seniors in retirement homes, our most vulnerable population and most at risk for falls; and continue with the provision of at least 100 treatments per year with a mechanism to access an additional 50 treatments, if medically necessary, with the current low-cost OHIP physiotherapy providers.”

I sign this and give it to page Kieva.

#### AIR-RAIL LINK

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas diesel trains are a health hazard for people who live near them;

“Whereas more toxic fumes will be created by the 400 daily trains than the car trips they are meant to replace;

**1610**

“Whereas the planned air-rail link does not serve the communities through which it passes and will be priced beyond the reach of most commuters;

“Whereas all major cities in the world with train service between their downtown core and the airport use electric trains;

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

“That the province of Ontario stop building the air-rail link for diesel and move to electrify the route immediately;

“That the air-rail link be designed, operated and priced as an affordable transportation option between all points along its route.”

I couldn’t agree more. I sign it with the thousands and give it to Pratah to be delivered to the table.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas Scarborough residents north of Ontario Highway 401 and east of Don Mills are without a rapid transit option; and

“Whereas a strong transit system is critical for increasing economic development and tackling income disparity; and

“Whereas this geographical area continues to grow and the demand for strong rapid transit continues to increase; and

“Whereas Sheppard Avenue is a major artery for automobile traffic for commuters travelling from suburbs to downtown Toronto, and travelling from suburb to suburb; and

“Whereas ground-level rapid transit would increase traffic, restrict lanes for automobiles, and add further risk for pedestrians and commuters at dangerous intersections along Sheppard Avenue; and

“Whereas demands for underground rapid transit along Sheppard Avenue have been part of public discourse for over 50 years; and

“Whereas the province of Ontario previously approved a plan from the city of Toronto to extend the Sheppard subway line from Downsview to Scarborough Centre; and

“Whereas an extension to the Sheppard subway line will require contributions and co-operation from the city of Toronto, the province of Ontario and the government of Canada;

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

“To support the extension of the Sheppard subway line east to Scarborough Centre; and

“To call upon the government of Canada to contribute multi-year funding for the construction and operation of an extension to the Sheppard subway line.”

I agree with this petition, sign it and send it with page Ian.

#### TIRE DISPOSAL

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I have a petition as well to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Ontario government has approved massive increases to Ontario Tire Stewardship’s eco fees for agricultural tires, increasing some fees from \$15.29 to \$352.80, \$546.84 or \$1,311.24;

“Whereas Ontario imposes tire eco fees that are dramatically higher than those in other provinces;

“Whereas other provincial governments either exempt agricultural tires from recycling programs or charge fees only up to \$75;

“Whereas these new fees will result in increased costs for our farmers and lost sales for our farm equipment dealerships;

“Whereas the PC caucus has proposed a new plan that holds manufacturers and importers of tires responsible for recycling, but gives them the freedom to work with other businesses to find the best way possible to carry out that responsibility;

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

“Please suspend the decision to significantly increase Ontario Tire Stewardship’s fees on agricultural and off-the-road tires pending a thorough impact study and implementation of proposals to lower costs.”

Speaker, I support this petition and send it to the table with page Peyton.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Apparently it’s the most popular issue on the government’s Common Ground website:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

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

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

“Whereas 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 any related acts, and to instead implement legislation that encourages responsible ownership of all dog breeds and types.”

I sign this on behalf of the thousand or more dogs that have lost their lives and give it to Ravicha to be delivered to the table.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### WASTE REDUCTION ACT, 2013

##### LOI DE 2013 SUR LA RÉDUCTION DES DÉCHETS

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 8, 2013, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 91, An Act to establish a new regime for the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste and to repeal the Waste Diversion Act, 2002 / Projet de loi 91, Loi créant un nouveau cadre pour la réduction, la réutilisation et le recyclage des déchets et abrogeant la Loi de 2002 sur le réacheminement des déchets.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you, Speaker, for the opportunity to address Bill 91, the Waste Reduction Act.

This legislation is further proof that this Liberal government has no real plan to create jobs in the province of Ontario—and will result in a whole new set of taxes. I look forward to explaining this in detail, Speaker, over the next 20 minutes. You’ve got that great joy today.

What is clear, after examination of Bill 91, is that the Liberals plan to continue to rely on eco taxes and larger bureaucracy to feed their spending addiction.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Point of order, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Point of order, the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I believe you’re correct.

**The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Anne Stokes):** No quorum, Speaker.

*The Acting Speaker ordered the bells rung.*

**The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Anne Stokes):** A quorum is present, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I'll continue with my program. I was all alone here for quite some time, and it was getting lonely talking to no Liberals.

What is clear, after examination of Bill 91, is that the Liberals plan to continue to rely on eco taxes and larger bureaucracy to feed their spending addiction.

It's mind-boggling to see what this government has been claiming in the past couple of weeks regarding Bill 91. They actually seem to think that continuing these eco taxes, doubling the cost of the blue box program and creating new taxes for Ontario consumers will somehow create jobs. Speaker, I've always said that if new taxes created jobs, we'd all have two jobs by now.

We all know just how reliable the job creation claims of the Liberals are; we need look no further than the Green Energy Act. The promised 50,000 jobs haven't come anywhere close, no matter how much they claim. That was another Liberal shell game, and we don't need a repeat of that here for Bill 91, the Waste Reduction Act. With this approach to the economy, is it any wonder that we've lost 300,000 well-paying manufacturing jobs in the last decade alone?

Basically, this bill will see this Liberal government taking money straight out of consumers' pockets in a bid to create jobs in the recycling sector. Again, we all know how little we can trust the Liberals when it comes to big promises about creating jobs.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I'm not sure if it was better when none of them were there, Speaker—or the hecklers. I'm not really sure.

The right thing to do here is create the right conditions for the waste management industry, to foster economic growth, to regulate the marketplace and to let the private sector drive job creation. Government needs to set the right conditions for success then get out of the way.

Sadly, Bill 91 proves this government just doesn't get it. Perhaps the best proof of this is the fact that, if passed, this proposed law would continue all of the Liberals eco tax programs and create new taxes to fund the expansion of the province's recycling agency, Waste Diversion Ontario, which I'll refer to as WDO for the rest of this 20 minutes.

In fact, the legislation proposes we change the name from Waste Diversion Ontario to Waste Reduction Authority. What's the significance, you may ask? Well, an authority, by its very nature, can and will tax. It can impose new fees. There is no doubt in my mind that this government, the one that is fixated with what they call "new revenue tools," plans to use this authority to impose new registration fees on industry, on consumers—quite frankly, on whomever and wherever the Liberals want.

1620

But let's back up a bit and discuss Waste Diversion Ontario. Ontarians should know that this is the agency

that approved each and every Liberal eco tax imposed on Ontario consumers. It has to answer to no one, because it's outside of the environment ministry. That's why we have said that to restore true accountability, WDO must be eliminated and all oversight authority of the recycling sector should be brought back to the ministry, where it truly belongs.

Sadly, the Liberals have rejected this, instead tabling a bill that would give WDO extensive new powers to impose new taxes. They're going to levy fines, and they arbitrarily will decide how much Ontario businesses will pay for the blue box program. We simply cannot allow this to happen.

Currently, Ontario businesses and municipalities split the cost of the blue box program 50-50. But under Bill 91, the Liberals want to empower Waste Diversion Ontario, or the Waste Reduction Authority, as it would become known, to raise the amount that businesses pay by hundreds of millions of dollars a year, without providing a property tax offset. That means Ontario consumers would have to foot the bill for these new costs when making purchases at their local supermarket or department store, while getting no relief on their tax bill.

Equally as concerning about this legislation, as it's currently proposed, is the fact that this government hasn't costed anything included in it. We don't know what any of this is really going to cost us. We don't know how much the new waste diversion tribunal this legislation proposes will cost us. We don't know how many extra staff or costs the new Waste Reduction Authority will cost.

This government is simply flying by the seat of its pants. They have governed for 10 years; if you recall my riveting speech earlier, Speaker, it was the lost decade. They have governed over the lost decade without caring how much anything they have done is going to cost the hard-working Ontarians, and they show no signs of stopping now.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Oakville and the member from Thunder Bay—Atikokan, you're extremely loud. If you'd like go out and have a chit-chat in the hall, feel free.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, the bottom line is, please don't do it. Thank you.

Continue.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you, Speaker. I was talking about the fact that the Liberals have governed over 10 years, the lost decade, without caring how much anything they have done is going to cost. And they show no signs of stopping now. If you want proof of that, the examples, sadly, are plenty. We've seen eHealth; we've seen Ornge. We certainly hear a tremendous amount about—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Last warning. You can laugh all you want in the back too.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** May I continue, Speaker?



**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** You may continue.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you. I was speaking about how the lost decade—I have many examples of proof of the lost decade. We have the eHealth example; we have Ornge. We have the gas plant scandal, where it took an Auditor General to reveal the full and true number. We hear the Premier saying, “It will never happen again. Don’t worry.” Well, last week, we had Pan Am. This week we have—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I’d like to remind the member that we’d kind of like to stick to 91, which we’re discussing. You’re drifting a little bit. Can we drift back? Thank you.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, I only had one more sentence before I was coming back—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, I wouldn’t know that.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** —and it was going to be the NBA. I had been interrupted three times, so perhaps I repeated myself a bit too much about eHealth, Ornge, gas plants, the Pan Am Games—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** You also did it again, and we won’t appreciate you doing it again. So get back to 91, please.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you, Speaker. I know, but the scandals are so plentiful that it’s hard. You could draw very similar comparisons with what is being proposed here in Bill 91 to what the Liberals have done in the College of Trades. So, Speaker, I am going to make a direct comparison between Bill 91 and the College of Trades.

The Waste Reduction Act would repeal the Waste Diversion Act, 2002, yet it would continue every recycling program, every agency, every fee created under the old act. Bill 91 would give the Minister of the Environment the power to designate new materials and classes of materials for recycling and service standards, which must be established by cabinet through regulation. The government can then require, through regulation, that “producers”—it’s important that I put quotes on “producers”—meet these yet-to-be-determined standards for designated materials.

Under the bill, these producers would include manufacturers, importers and brand owners. This is significant, because companies such as Canadian Tire, Coca-Cola, Goodyear, Panasonic, Samsung, Target, Tim Hortons and Walmart would all be producers. This is what will happen here. Bill 91 continues Waste Diversion Ontario and gives this unaccountable organization enforcement powers, a bigger, multi-million dollar budget and a new name, the Waste Reduction Authority.

Now, here’s where I’m going to draw the similarity with the College of Trades, Speaker. This authority would have the power to set and collect fees, or taxes, to fund its own operations. The bill makes it optional for the authority to disclose how they have calculated these taxes. It starts to sound similar to the recently created tax from the College of Trades.

This would be a regulatory agency—

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Point of order, the member from Thunder Bay–Atikokan.

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** The fee levied at the College of Trades is not a tax, and none of that revenue accrues to the government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, I imagine that’s quite true, but that’s for cross debate. I’m not quite sure that’s a point of order. I will not rule that a point of order.

Continue.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you. When a business gets a bill for something, it’s a tax, Speaker. A tax is a tax is a tax. No matter how they like to colour these names, we know they enjoy taxing all Ontarians. We saw that in the new WSIB tax. We saw that in the College of Trades tax. We see this in the new Bill 91 tax. This continues Waste Diversion Ontario and gives this unaccountable organization enforcement powers, a bigger, multi-million dollar budget and a new name, the Waste Reduction Authority. Similar to the College of Trades, this authority would have the power to set and collect fees, or taxes, to fund its operations. This regulatory agency would be headed by a registrar, or waste czar, whose job it would be to register producers—we’re back to that again—in the authority’s registry.

The registrar would then appoint deputies to help seek out producers, who would be forced to pay a tax to fund the operation of the authority. This tax, of course, would then be passed on to consumers as a new eco tax. The registrar would then assemble an army of inspectors to fan out across the province looking for violators to fine for not meeting its standards; again, very similar to the Colleges of Trades tax. The revenue generated from these fines would then be funnelled back into the authority.

### 1630

The authority will also be in charge of resolving disputes between municipalities who collect recyclable materials and producers who are financially responsible for recycling these materials. The strategy states, “The Waste Reduction Authority will need to acquire the human resources skills and expertise necessary to perform this important function.” So now we are creating a new bureaucracy to collect this tax. There is a lack of accountability as the authority is disconnected from Parliament, not subject to the freedom-of-information act and can only be reviewed by the Auditor General if the minister feels that it’s necessary.

There’s a section on intermediaries, as well. Although the Liberals claim that their bill holds individual producers responsible for recycling, these businesses may join an intermediary, which would also be required to register with the authority. It’s getting very complicated now. This cartel would then be required to follow the recycling and services standards established by the minister, and would be fined if in violation.

There’s also a section on blue boxes. Right now, under the Waste Diversion Act, municipalities and producers

split the cost of a blue box program 50-50. Bill 91 creates a new framework that the government could use to increase the amount industry must pay for this recycling. However, this transition, again, would be left to regulation. If the minister chooses to proceed, there are three ways to establish an amount that industry pays:

- (1) Municipalities and industry can strike an agreement.
- (2) The authority can create a funding formula.
- (3) Cabinet can set the amount.

Obviously, this presents some concerns for industry, which could be strong-armed into paying more.

I'd like to address the Liberals' eco tax scheme, which they now call "all-in pricing." The Liberals' shell game is to claim they're scrapping eco taxes, when all they're actually doing is moving the levy from consumers' receipts to price tags on the store shelf. That's all it is. It's a shell game.

What's worse is that eco taxes will undoubtedly rise as the size and power of the Waste Reduction Authority expands. To be very clear, every single Liberal eco tax program created since 2008—for electronics, for tires, for household hazardous materials—would be continued under Bill 91.

And now the ICI sector: The Liberals have allowed the recycling rate in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector, which accounts for 60% of Ontario's waste, to drop from 19% in 2002 to 12% currently. The Liberals claim that they will use Bill 91 to set recycling targets for paper and packaging in this sector, but ICI is only mentioned in the strategy, not in the act. This, again, would be left to regulation.

In my remaining two and a half minutes, I would offer a conclusion: that almost a year ago, we, the Ontario PC caucus, presented a better way forward to protect consumers, to clean up the environment and to treat recyclable materials as a valuable resource that we should recover and recycle into products, not into waste.

Our plan would make Ontario a leader on the environment once again. To do so, we would introduce reforms that would protect consumers, improve our environment, provide greater accountability and oversight, inject competition into the recycling marketplace, create good-paying jobs and ultimately lead to a higher rate of waste diversion.

We should start our reforms by scrapping each and every one of the Liberals' eco tax programs. We do not believe that government should hand over the monopoly control of an entire market to a private sector organization, and we do not believe that the government should impose taxes—and new taxes—on Ontario consumers through a labyrinth of bureaucracy and then claim it had nothing to do with it.

As the Ontario PC caucus has pointed out numerous times in this House, the environment minister and his sidekick at Waste Diversion Ontario sign off on each and every eco tax that consumers are forced to pay, so I think it's somewhat disappointing—and, quite frankly, insulting—that the Liberals actually believe that if they make

the bureaucracy complicated enough, they can always deny what they're actually doing. All this bill does is create job-killing taxes and more red tape. So if this is the Premier's job creation strategy, Ontario is in even more serious trouble than I believe.

We in the Ontario PC caucus have a different vision for this sector. We believe we should create the right conditions for economic growth and let the private sector manage job creation, not the government. This bill is so badly flawed that it can't possibly be recycled. It just needs to be thrown on the scrap heap, along with the tired government.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to spend 20 more minutes with you this week, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** First of all, I want to say welcome to the Ontario Waste Management Association, members of which are here and who did a very interesting briefing for us in the New Democratic Party earlier today at lunch.

My colleague is going to speak at length about this, but suffice to say that we are supporting this bill in the New Democratic Party, but—here's the but, and there are going to be a lot of buts—it comes after 10 years of incredible inaction on this file, and still there are some issues. Those issues need to be dealt with, and will be, I hope, at committee. We'll be talking about those issues over the course of the debate in the next number of days on this bill.

Suffice to say—this is a shocking statement—that 75% of our waste is landfilled still. That was news to me. That is shocking. We have one of the worst records of any jurisdiction in the developed world, certainly in Canada, and that has been under this government's watch. This is just one aspect of them dropping the ball on all environmental policy—probably the single most important issue for our generation and the generations to come, this being one aspect of it. I know that my colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo is going to speak to this at length, but much needs to be done. This is a small step in the right direction.

Ten years on, yes—that's what I'll agree with; that's probably the only thing I'll agree with the member from Nipissing on. It has taken 10 years to get here, and it's 10 years too long.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** We know that the Conservative model that we're using now is not working. We're not dealing with our waste, and we're still stuck around 25% of waste reduction. They're never very supportive of anything that supports the environment. This is very true.

Ontario needs a new framework, and I was happy with the critic for the third party that they generally were very supportive of this. Of course, there's going to be a lot of work at committee; I understand that. I've read the Coalition for Effective Waste Reduction in Ontario's submission to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment,

September 3, 2013. There's a lot of good stuff in there, and I think that's what we want to do. We want to work towards a solution to waste. We have to do something with it.

The nice thing about it is, it's going to decrease the need for landfills. It's going to help us recover a lot of products that cost more in their original production. We'll be able to use that. It's going to create jobs, and jobs are extremely important, so just from the jobs point of view, this is good. For those working in waste reduction now, if we can move that up from 25% to higher levels, it's going to mean more employment, more investment. That was pointed out when the minister presented this.

It's not perfect. There's a lot of work to do yet. There were meetings all summer with industry, and that's the road we are going, but I think we have to look at it as something that's a work in progress. We're going to get it as right as we can, and it's going to be good for the province, it's going to be good for the people and it's going to be good for the environment.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

1640

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** The problem with this bill is that it's going to tax small business people and consumers, and that's not what we should be doing.

I'm a farmer. I have a combine that I bought, and if I had known this was going to happen, I probably couldn't have afforded it. With this new bill, it's going to be \$823 to replace the tires on that combine; last year, it was \$24. If you look over in Quebec, it's zero. So we have a Local Food Act for Ontario and we're going to have to get that local food from Quebec. I think that's just not fair.

We tried a few weeks ago to pass a bill called Fairness is a Two-Way Street Act, where we would shut the door on Quebec. I think we need to open that door because we can't afford to eat our own food. These tires are just going to be too darned expensive. So it's not fair, it's not right. These are going to be the highest taxes in the country on small industry—or even bigger industry—and we shouldn't be doing that at all.

Also, this whole plan of setting up an agency at arm's length, the Waste Reduction Authority—we know from past history with other agencies that are at arm's length from government, there is no oversight or accountability, or at least not effective oversight and accountability. And when you get into a situation like that, bad things can happen.

Here we have a group that we're going to put at arm's length from government, so the minister will have no authority or power. They're going to be exempt from the freedom-of-information act, and we won't be able to call the Auditor General to do an audit unless the minister agrees to it. And yet these people have the right to charge taxes and raise fines. It's going to go badly like it has in other organizations like the OSPCA where all kinds of people are being hurt by a corrupt organization.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Once again, it's an honour to be able to rise in this House, and this is my first time to speak on Bill 91.

I think all parties can agree that we've done a pretty miserable job on waste reduction in this province—at least for the last 10 years. It's not that we didn't know this was coming, because we've been having problems with finding places to get rid of our waste for a long time in this province. Parts of this bill might be a step forward. We're starting from a pretty bad place, and parts of it might be a step forward.

One thing I would share with members on the right here, the Conservatives, is that we also have some doubts about creating an impartial, uncontrolled authority because we've run into troubles in the past. We've run into trouble when the Conservatives created such a thing, called the TSSA. So we know that there are problems with that. If this body goes ahead, it is going to have to be made accountable. You just can't throw a body out there and say, "Oh, yeah, they'll take care of it."

In our meeting with the Ontario Waste Management Association, they brought up a very good point. One of the fears about not creating a body is that you scale back government so much—and we have that with MNR now. Forget about endangered species; MNR can't even patrol just normal patrols. There's not enough COs to do a normal patrol. So one of the reasons they're giving is that we need a separate authority so we can actually keep enough people on the ground to do something. We have to pick the lesser of two evils, because there has to be enough inspection to make any of this stuff work. The way it's working now isn't working, and these independent bodies often don't work either, so we've got a long road ahead to make this one work.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Nipissing has two minutes.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you, Speaker. I want to thank the members from Parkdale–High Park, Ottawa–Orléans, Carleton–Mississippi Mills and Timiskaming–Cochrane.

I have to say that I absolutely agree with the member from Ottawa–Orléans that it's not working, but I would remind you that have been in government for 10 years and it's still not working.

We obviously want to keep all electronics, tires, paint cans and batteries out of landfills. As we all know, these materials contain chemicals that are harmful to our environment. But we in the Ontario PC caucus have a much more intelligent way of dealing with these materials, which we laid out in November last year. Rather than create a complicated bureaucracy and massive new costs for consumers—incidentally, Food and Consumer Products of Canada estimates that the Liberals' plans for the blue box and ICI sector will cost Ontarians between \$300 million and \$500 million each year.

Instead of that, we would simply create the right conditions for economic growth. Under our plan, that means the Ministry of the Environment would set measurable and achievable recycling targets for manufacturers and

importers of electronics, tires and household hazardous materials.

The ministry would then set environmental standards to ensure that these materials are actually recycled and are not sent overseas in a shipping container or dumped in a landfill. The ministry would then monitor outcomes to ensure that targets are being met; if anyone breaks any of the standards set by the government, it would then be the responsibility of the environment ministry to enforce the rules.

In short, we believe that government should set measurable and achievable targets, establish environmental standards, monitor outcomes and enforce the rules. That's it. It's time to return the environment ministry to its role as a tough regulator.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** It is a pleasure, actually, to stand in the House this afternoon to debate and discuss G91, the Waste Reduction Act, 2013. I'd like to preface my comments here today by quoting from the Ontario Waste Management Association, a document that they served up to us earlier today: "With the right policies, Ontario has the potential to become an environmental and economic leader in resource management."

That should be the guiding principle of this entire debate. I do think that it's also important for us to review why this issue is so urgent, and why we need to accelerate the policies, the legislation and the work of this committee as we go forward, because, obviously, the New Democrats will be supporting G91. It's long overdue, and we intend to make it stronger.

But that said, let's review why it is so important. The state of waste in the province of Ontario is quite dismal. Ontarians generate 12.5 million tonnes of waste per year, about one tonne per person. This is embarrassing. The waste we generate each year would fit in the Rogers Centre about 16 times.

We've had a long-standing discussion within our party about the best way to proceed. I think it's safe to say that G91 addresses some of the immediate concerns that we have, but there is a lot more to do.

There is also a missed opportunity, though, with this piece of legislation, which always leaves me wondering, when the government has the opportunity to craft legislation, why they just don't do it right the first time, because there is a considerable amount of work that is going to have to happen to ensure that G91 actually is effective.

I want to point out the fact that the act does not address diversion rates as it should. Yes, we are talking about reducing. Yes, we are talking about reusing. Yes, we are talking about recycling. We don't talk enough about recovering. Landfills in the province of Ontario—methane is the second-largest contributor to climate change. We have become quite complacent—and lazy, if you will—in the way that we address our waste, in our own lives and from a business perspective.

That said, the conversation around setting diversion targets and enforceable standards for producers to meet is laudable. We need to set standards. Those need to be

enforced. We do, of course, have concerns about creating another authority, the Waste Reduction Authority. I think that we are in agreement, in some regards, with our PC counterparts, primarily because we essentially just don't have the trust or the belief that this authority will (1) have the resources to do their job properly or (2) have the mandate to truly enforce the standards.

I think that that is primarily because this province has lost that vision. For a long time, the Liberal government was talking about moving towards a vision of zero waste. That is not prevalent in this bill whatsoever. We do have to set the bar high, because we don't often reach those standards that we set for ourselves. If you set the bar high, we might actually get someplace.

**1650**

I'd also like to say that we have some concerns around the authority. We would like to make sure that those staffing this authority are not getting paid exorbitant bonuses just for showing up for work, just for doing the job that they were paid to do in the first place. We want to make sure that the oversight for the authority is just as clear as the authority has for waste management.

I think that there needs to be progress on waste reduction and recycling because it has clearly stalled over the last 20 years. Ontario has the worst record in Canada. There are significant economic opportunities and environmental benefits from waste reduction, reuse and recycling. As the critic for economic development and infrastructure and also the critic for research and innovation—there are huge lost opportunities on this file to create local jobs, instead of shipping all of our waste somewhere else and giving jobs to other jurisdictions.

There is broad support for the individual producer responsibility approach, in which producers pay the full cost of end-of-life management of their products and packaging.

I'd also like to address the fact that effective waste reduction legislation requires finding new language around getting to that vision of zero waste. We're going to push the government to get to that place. A framework that recognizes the hierarchy of the three Rs, reducing, reusing and recycling—these three Rs came from many years back, when I was just in high school, just a baby, under the Bob Rae government. I do remember those days.

Clear targets and standards and enforcement by government—

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** He is a Liberal now. I always feel the need to point this out. He did end up where he was always meant to be.

Education and public awareness, convenience for the consumer, and companies—not municipalities and taxpayers—pay the full cost of dealing with their waste in an environmentally sound way. These are some basic principles which should guide the legislation.

The benefits of Bill 91 encourage a greater shift towards producer responsibility. I've already made that point. It has the potential to increase diversion rates by setting strong material-specific targets. Again, there is

some uncertainty, though, over what these targets will be and the timeline for their achievements.

There is an expansion to the industrial, commercial and institutional sector, which is welcome. They are part of the entire waste diversion issue. That is a sector marred by very low recycling rates. The current rate in this jurisdiction for the industrial, commercial and institutional sector is only 13%—I think that the overall rate for the province of Ontario is set at 23%—which is a tad embarrassing.

It is also good that there is a consideration of disposal bans in the bill. This has been used in places like BC and Nova Scotia. Disposal bans can be an effective tool for preventing recycling materials from going to landfills and for promoting innovation and investment in waste reduction—again, a lost opportunity over the last 10 years. It's also important that viable collection options exist for banned materials.

Finally, landfill fees should reflect the full cost of landfilling. It should not be cheaper to send waste to a landfill than it is to recycle. There is a lot of work to be done on this issue as well.

Some of you may have this issue in your ridings. In the region of Waterloo, there's a disturbing trend that's happening. For many years now—I think we're on the third year, but in the last year, glass has been collected in the blue boxes. People have rinsed out diligently. They feel good about putting those glass bottles in the blue box, and they are collected dutifully and well by the municipality. Then that glass is sent to the landfill and is crushed there, and it's used in the roads, in the landfill and around pipes. This is costing the municipality \$1 million a year, putting taxpayers in a bind, putting the municipality in a bind. This is essentially because markets out there for glass recycling are few to none. Municipalities are mandated, under the blue box program, to collect the materials; they have no choice. I think it's safe to say that for a long time the burden of recycling and waste diversion has fallen to the municipalities. We certainly need to find a way to make sure that this burden is shared. It's a shared responsibility, essentially.

There are also, though, a number of limitations in Bill 91, and I want to take this opportunity to make it clear to the government that our implicit support of 91 will come with strings, as has all of our support for everything that the government has brought forward in the last two years.

The bill seems to have lost the vision of zero waste. Bill 91 doesn't mention the aim of achieving zero waste and so it makes us nervous. When you leave things out that should be in the bill, obviously it causes us concern. As stated, there are some serious trust issues we're experiencing.

The longer-term goal of the—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Nepean–Carleton is holding court. I suggest that she gets back in her seat or goes out in the hallway with her friends to have a nice long discussion. In other words, keep it down. Thank you.

Continue.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I'll hold court too later on, somewhere; maybe in the backroom.

Just to go back to my line of thinking, the longer-term goal of the act should be to move to a province in which goods that are not safely recyclable are no longer sold. If you can't recycle them, let's give some consideration to not actually putting them into the recycling ecosystem.

Bill 91 also doesn't recognize the importance of the hierarchy of the three Rs. We're going to push that. It should have just been included at the onset. As such, it doesn't give—and this is a key piece for businesses—priority to waste reduction, nor does it encourage higher orders of recycling that promote the best use of a material. For example, recycling a glass bottle into a glass bottle should surely be given priority over a glass bottle being crushed to use as roadbed, as I just outlined.

I just want to give you an example. There is a local company, the Brick Brewing Co., in Kitchener-Waterloo—a great local business in environmental and corporate leadership. They have actually expended additional money—I think it's \$150,000—in investment into a new glass bottle that is more resilient than your average bottle. The Beer Store has a great reputation for recycling. The incentive for people to return their beer bottles for a refund—I think 98% are returned, which is good. There is an incentive for the consumer. Brick Brewing has made this investment in this bottle. There's no reward for that kind of corporate leadership—a small tax break; an acknowledgment. They've gone out on a limb, and they're having some trouble, actually, dealing with the Beer Store because they're not recognized and because this bottle is of higher quality. So there are great inconsistencies around the province in how institutions and corporations deal with recycling. I think that we as the Legislature, and certainly when it gets to committee, should be exploring ways to reward those corporate citizens who actually go above and beyond, and have done so for many years. When this comes into play, I'm sure the government is going to try to establish some sort of new standard. Those companies that have actually done nothing for years will be seen as taking a leadership role because they're doing a little bit now because they have to, versus the companies like Brick Brewing who for years have been leaders.

The bill also fails to encourage reuse—such as refillable deposit return container systems—over recycling. A look across the country shows that provinces with deposit return systems have higher rates than those without, as has been explained with the LCBO and the Beer Store. Those are also big job creators, the return and reusing of those products, so why not look at expanding that to wine bottles, as the BlueGreen Alliance has called for? It would create green jobs—I know that almost has a bad connotation around here these days—and reduce waste, and even give a marked advantage to the Ontario wine industry.

There's going to be a by-election in this province—I don't know if anybody heard—in Niagara, and that's a huge—

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I know. It should be soon, because they are without representation. I think that when members leave their ridings, for whatever reason—health reasons, or maybe they’ve just had it; I can see it happening one day—the riding by-election should get precedence and happen sooner rather than later. This whole business of waiting six months—

*Interjection.*

1700

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I know. I mean, come on. We’re ready to go; let’s get going.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Does the ground freeze in Niagara in November for pounding signs?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** No, the signs—we’ll figure something out with the signs.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It’s frozen where I come from.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Back to the conversation, though. The conversation is around supporting the Ontario wine industry. Niagara is a key area, obviously a leader with internationally renowned wine, and if we as lawmakers could actually create some conditions that were rewarding and positive towards those companies that, as I said, are more than willing to be leaders in the recycling and reusing of products, then we should be part of that conversation as well.

There is also widespread concern about the lack of specifics in the bill about monitoring and enforcing a high standard of waste management and recycling services, and there are those in this province who say it cannot be left to producers to both meet recycling obligations, and certify and inspect recycling facilities. We’re going to hear from this industry, I’m sure, when this gets to committee, and I think that it’s going to get to committee fairly soon. But if recycling standards are weak, or they’re unenforced, then batteries, for instance, might simply be shipped to the US to be smelted, reducing the jobs and the economic opportunities that we have here in the province of Ontario.

As groups like the Canadian Environmental Law Association indicate in their submissions to the act, regulations need to be set by the government of Ontario to outline operation standards and provide definitions of recycling. You know, we have to be working with a level playing field here in the province of Ontario. We haven’t been for a long time, and a lot of the producers and a lot of businesses just want to know the rules. They want to know the framework that they’re operating in, and they’re willing to come to the table with creative solutions.

The bill on the whole, though—and this is something that bugs everyone, especially around Christmas or birthdays—seems to do little to directly promote reduced packaging, such as through working towards stronger regulations and working with other provinces and the federal government to set a timetable to reduce packaging. My son recently bought an iPod. You wouldn’t believe getting into this thing, and you wouldn’t believe the waste—it’s a small product—it was exorbitant, and there’s just no need for it.

In jurisdictions like Germany, they’ve put strict guidelines on product packaging, because it just ends up in the landfill, and as I have already said, landfills emit millions of tonnes of methane annually, a greenhouse gas significantly more potent than carbon dioxide. It’s just not a sustainable model that we’re dealing with here.

There’s also concern about whether the bill does enough to ensure that producers are fully responsible for the end management of their products. This is a long-standing issue.

The bill doesn’t seem to address the challenge and lack of uniformity of recycling services across Ontario. That’s the level playing field that I was talking about. The government strategy calls for a four-year phase-in of organics collection. That’s just too slow. Look at some of the municipalities across this province. They’ve said, “We’re not going to wait for the provincial government to get its act together; we’re just going to do it.” And what they’ve found is that the people in those municipalities are willing to be part of the solution. Even the education system has come along, and so what we have really is quite an amazing exercise in social change. You have children learning about organics and composting, and they’re going home and they are changing the culture and the patterns of their parents. They are saying, “No, no, that doesn’t go in the garbage; that goes into the composter. Where’s our composter?” There is definitely a disconnect that today’s generation has with their natural environment, and having a four-year phase-in of organics is just too slow. We need to be part of the solution on this, for sure.

So groups like the Canadian Environmental Law Association have raised the concern also about transferring enforcement to the authority. This is my last point on the authority. We certainly have seen a pattern of this government creating arm’s-length organizations to take care of things, to do the oversight, and I think that we have seen a pattern of that oversight not being thorough enough. It certainly wasn’t thorough enough to make sure that those people who are working for the Pan Am Games—they were expensing 91-cent coffees. I mean, clearly this is unacceptable; clearly, it’s indefensible. I don’t know how you pair it with a \$780,000 bonus for doing your job—

**Mr. John Vanthof:** That’s a lot of coffees.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** That’s a lot of coffees. That’s actually a lot of jobs. It’s a lot of green jobs, and there are a lot of municipalities across the province that would welcome the support of this provincial government as they try to get into the 21st century on recycling, on reusing. This is important. It’s important for future generations. It’s important for us to show leadership on it.

The Conservatives have fallen into the same pattern, as they always do. You’re going to vote no instead of trying to make it stronger, even though the people of this province have sent a minority government to this place. I understand that some of it is distasteful. It certainly isn’t always easy; I’ll give you that. But what people expect us to do in this House is to create legislation which is going

to make this province stronger, create jobs and create a more just society. Making G91 a stronger piece of legislation will be one of our key acts in this Legislature.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Thank you to the member for Waterloo for her very thoughtful intervention.

Mr. Speaker, this will create revenue to support municipal blue box programs, and that's very important. It will, in the aftermath of the party opposite downloading health and social services, because their way of dealing with provincial financial challenges was to make it the municipality's problem. We're not doing that; we're uploading that.

But I want to deal with two issues, quickly, in the minute and a half I have. One is, this is not going onto a broad tax base. As a matter of fact, this entire problem that the member from Waterloo quite correctly analyzed, which is to force things out of government, was done by the Conservatives. This is not our agency, and we lost control of the agenda and the pricing.

What the Minister of the Environment is doing is bringing this in-house, putting controls in place. The difference between user pay: If I choose to create a whole bunch of garbage and throw it out, why should my friend Jeff Leal pay for it? Why should these things be on the broad tax? We don't own a car in my household because we know the environmental consequences. There are people who need to drive a car; we don't. So that impact on the environment is hugely positive.

We're facing an environmental crisis, and I would like to try and understand the position of the party opposite. One third of all species on this planet will disappear between now and the year 2050. There is no more serious legacy we are leaving our children than a loss of biodiversity. Our bee populations are collapsing by a third to two thirds because of toxins like nicotine. The average Canadian bee, essential to farming, has 127—if we allow televisions and this crap to get into the environment, it is creating a toxic soup that is destroying and infecting our food supply. These kinds of measures are important first steps to protecting our children and leaving them a better legacy than the one that they're about to inherit if we don't change our ways.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** It's a pleasure to stand here and comment on the speech that the member from Kitchener–Waterloo just gave.

I was reading some comments that the member from Durham had the other day. One of the comments was there are two sections that deal entirely with setting out regulations. We're really not sure what those regulations are going to be, which causes the member to worry. It causes me to worry, and we wonder what they're hiding.

I heard some criticism from the member from Kitchener–Waterloo that the PCs are going to vote against this and that we always vote against things. Well, how many times does the third party have to be led down

the garden path? They've done it for the last 10 years, and seen the scandals that this government has been involved with, and yet you want to trust them—

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Prop them up.

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** You prop them up all the time. I wonder if the member from Kitchener–Waterloo would maybe think about that a little bit.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** I think that's something that's—

*Interjections.*

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** Careful. Everybody around there knows what happened. Careful.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Yes, that's a good word, "careful." I would suggest that the member from Perth–Wellington stay to the script about Bill 91 and not get into the partisan exchanges here.

1710

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** Yes, Speaker, I'll get back to the subject. Thank you.

But anyways, I think that we have to, when we're looking at this bill—it's a bill that is very ambiguous. It doesn't set out goals. The people who are running this Waste Reduction Act, when they come to look at things, the government can just dream up a lot of stuff that—and it's not in this act, so it's very unsupportable.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Once again, it's an honour to be able to stand on behalf of the residents of Timiskaming–Cochrane and make some comments on the remarks from the member from Kitchener–Waterloo. She touched on a lot of issues regarding this bill—some could be good and some very troublesome—and I'd like to add to a few of her comments.

Sometimes we discuss bills here, and you wonder, "Could this really be a bill? It's, like, four sentences." Well, this one is much different. There's a lot of stuff in this. Some of it deserves some more attention, and we've had some questions. One of the questions—small municipalities now who aren't involved in the recycling system because, quite frankly, they're too small, where do they fit in this? It's a legitimate concern. It's something that I don't think has been addressed and something that has got to be addressed.

The one thing that my honoured colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo did talk about which I would like to echo and perhaps amplify is the idea of transferring authority to another authority. In the end, we have no way of regulating that authority, once again, like TSSA. Does TSSA serve a role? Yes, but we have an awful hard time dealing with TSSA, from my perspective as a legislator. We don't want the same thing to happen with this one. We all can do the partisan shots about Ornge, but there is a lack of accountability and a lack of ability to drill down to the facts. Are we creating the same thing here? That question hasn't been answered, and that question has to be answered. That's one of the things that we're going to drill down on as this bill goes to committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** I was delighted to be here for 95% of the member of Kitchener–Waterloo’s speech. It’s interesting; I happen to know her family very well in Peterborough. I was at the East City Coffee Shop there a week ago, and rumour has it that her wonderful mother will be running for Peterborough city council next year. I welcome her—Sheila Wood—if she puts her name in the hat. I know that she is concerned about environmental issues with the city of Peterborough, the dog park etc. I think she would be a very good candidate. That’s some news from Peterborough for you today.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** It doesn’t matter: She won’t be supporting you in the next provincial election.

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** Oh, no, she’s actually a very good supporter of mine. We get along surprisingly well.

Bill 91—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Do you not consider the vote to be a secret ballot? Are you revealing someone’s voting intentions here in the Legislature?

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** The member from—I just want to—I’ll keep going, Mr. Speaker.

Bill 91 is a very important piece of legislation. When I had the opportunity to be at AMO in August, municipal leaders from right across the province of Ontario were talking about the initiative that’s being brought forward by Minister Bradley. In fact, they want to see opportunities I think which will be inherent in this bill to lift some of the costs from municipalities in the province of Ontario that they’ve had the burden of, in terms of recycling.

I’ve got to use another Peterborough example. At the Bensfort landfill site in Peterborough, we now take that methane gas and turn it into electricity. The Peterborough Utilities Services, which is owned by the city of Peterborough—a publicly owned utility—is one of the best in Ontario today. Just about six months ago, it got the generation station up and running—take the methane gas and turn it to electricity to power homes in Peterborough. I think that’s something the member from Kitchener–Waterloo touched upon.

I remember—it seems like a short time ago—packaging for Christmas gifts. We’ve got to get rid of all that—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. The member from Kitchener–Waterloo has two minutes.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** It’s always interesting to follow up on some of the comments. The member from Peterborough mentions my mother. She could be running for municipal. I haven’t convinced her to run for the NDP yet.

But the member from Perth–Wellington—this is the same sort of rhetoric that comes from the PC Party every time. He says that we’re propping them up. He knows, as their leader knows, that there won’t be a confidence motion until the spring. Quite honestly, if they want to do nothing until the spring, that is their choice. They could run on doing nothing.

Although they did do one thing. They did support one company when they supported the Liberals on Bill 74 last week. If the interests of one company are your interests, then that’s fine. What we are interested in on this side of the House, under the leadership of Andrea Horwath, is making sure that Bill 91 is actually effective. We are interested in making sure that the Liberals are held to account. We are interested in making sure that gas plants don’t get moved around like chess pieces. We are interested in making sure that the energy policy in this province actually suits the economy and strengthens the economy. We are interested in making sure that education is part of this waste diversion piece. We are interested in ensuring that people have access to home care and that the youth in this province have a fighting chance to get a job. These are the things that we value.

With the help and the support of the Financial Accountability Officer, we will make sure that this scandal-prone government and any other governments that are happening in the future fall under the purview of that office, so that we make sure that we are representing the people’s interests in this House, not the political interests of the parties in this House.

We are holding ourselves to that same level of leadership. We are going to make Bill 91 stronger; people expect us to do so. For a long time now, we have showed up to work, and we are getting results. It feels good.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** It’s always a privilege to follow my good friend and colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo—who is celebrating her first anniversary with us in the House; congratulations to you—and to talk about a waste reduction framework for Ontario, an act called Bill 91.

All of us, when we go into our schools and we talk to kids, the kids aren’t talking to us about tax policy, and they’re not talking to us about regulatory frameworks, but one thing they are talking to us about is, “What are you doing to clean up the environment?” That’s one thing they do grasp, and that’s where this bill is going to start.

This bill has to start from what we’ve inherited, which was an act created in the 1990s. The act, created on the watch of the previous government—I’m not sure whether they were dragged into it, kicking and screaming, to actually do something, but we found that, whatever their intentions were at the time, and despite the government’s own best intentions to make this act work, it has kind of hit the wall. It can get up to a point where we can achieve some parts of waste diversion, but, very clearly, in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector, we’re not getting there, and the act is lacking some teeth.

That’s one of the things that this bill proposes. When we talk about teeth in an act, here’s one thought that I would share, actually, with both my colleague from Nipissing and my colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo: We are all leery about creating yet another arm’s-length bureaucracy, yet another agency that operates beyond our reach here in the Legislature and always seems to come



back and bite us. It's a proposal, and the member for Kitchener–Waterloo suggested that this is something that we should, in fact, thrash out in committee. On that part, I very much agree. There is a lot in here that I think has some merit and has some value but also a lot in here that is going to benefit not only from the exchange that happens in the House, but an exchange that happens in committee.

The proposed act would create a Waste Reduction Authority—that's the arm's-length agency that I talked about—that would see producers pay more for the blue box program. The functions of that arm's-length authority would be to monitor and enforce diversion among producers and businesses.

1720

To help consumers, one of the things we found is that what are intended to be fees designed to have producers of products ensure they are recycled are not designed to be flow-throughs, to be pass-throughs, to be add-ons. If you are a producer, you pay it. If you're a producer, the price that consumers see for your product in the store, on the shelf, in the marketplace is the price they pay. If there's an eco fee, that eco fee is absorbed by you before it gets to the consumer. That's something this bill is going to make very, very clear and is certainly going to correct. It's a flaw in the marketplace now that simply allows producers to take these fees, which are intended to be part of the cost of doing business, part of the price of the good by the time it hits the shelf. By the time it hits the shelf, no more eco fees, no more add-ons.

On average, Speaker, recycling generates about 10 times more jobs than disposal of products. For example, every 1,000 tonnes of recycled waste generates seven jobs. One of the areas here that Ontario needs to address is our waste diversion rate. It has been stalled for some years at about 25%. Elsewhere in the world, they've clearly made it work, and that's part of what this act is looking at: What are some of the business practices elsewhere in the world, and what do we have to do to up our game and to make it work?

To this end, the member for Kitchener–Waterloo has offered, I think, some very useful suggestions that, following this reading of the bill, should be taken into committee and form what comes back into the Legislature for debate and presumably final passage. This is the kind of bill that's going to give the government enough flexibility to keep parts of it as a work in process, because parts of it involve learning as you go.

Ontario has seen good progress made to increase recycling in the residential sector—in our homes. Almost half of household waste, 46%, is diverted from landfill. Not that long ago, that fraction was very, very much lower, and most of the stuff just got chucked in the garbage. Once it made it out to the curb, who cared? It was going somewhere. But now, nearly half of it gets recycled. Whether we're sorting out our bottles and cans and newspapers and plastics—whatever—we are managing, as households, to hit 50%. But when the same people who can manage to get half of their garbage recycled get

to work, it drops to around 13%. Instead of 50%, it's about one eighth. Very clearly, some of the practices we do at home and have learned to do instinctively, and teach our children to do, we just have to take to work with us.

There are some excellent actors out there. One of my occasional pleasures is to visit just a superb company in Meadowvale called Cyclone Manufacturing. Cyclone makes state-of-the-art airframe parts for all the leading aircraft makers. I was in Asia just before last Christmas for a signing between AIDC, of Taichung, in Taiwan, and Cyclone Manufacturing to do the tail assembly of the Bombardier Challenger series 300 jet. It makes Meadowvale one of Ontario's and North America's aerospace hubs.

One of the things you note about a lot of our leading-edge companies is that when they make the products, there's not much waste left over. The best companies have the best practices. Part of our challenge as a province is going to be to empower our proposed new agency to propagate those best practices from the firms that do it well to either the ones that don't do it at all or the ones that could do it a lot better.

What are we going to do with that 12 million tonnes of waste generated in the province each and every year? My colleague pointed out that 12 million tonnes is like filling up the Rogers Centre, the old SkyDome, three dozen times.

Waste reduction is actually not merely a job creator, but an investment attractor. It certainly worked in Europe. No one can call the products that come out of Germany, the world's leading export economy, uncompetitive. Germany has done this with some of the toughest environmental standards in the world. If the Germans can do it, so can we.

Companies that recycle, and recycle assiduously, use less energy. They produce fewer greenhouse gases. They have a lighter environmental impact than is caused by the extraction and use of raw materials, and of course, it greatly reduces the need for additional landfill capacity. As I said earlier, the single area where we've got the greatest potential to improve in Ontario is in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector, and that would be manufacturing businesses, offices, retail, hospitals, schools, police forces and municipalities. Surprisingly, where we get nearly half of our household waste recycled, only an eighth in that sector—just one eighth—and we know that they can do better.

Some of the proposed waste reduction framework would involve doing some of the following: increasing the recycling of waste and, in fact, stimulating the recycling of waste. One of the key ways to do that, that everywhere else in the world that has been successful with recycling has found, is to make individual producers responsible for the entire life cycle of their product, all the way through to when your product is used, consumed, returned, destroyed and recycled. That becomes your responsibility as the producer. As the producer, then you start to think to yourself, "Is my packaging appropriate?"

Is my packaging recyclable? How much stuff that I use goes into landfill?"

I'm going back to Cyclone Manufacturing. Using a very high-pressure jet of water, what they're able to do is produce airframe parts without a single weld or a single rivet. That high-pressure jet of water will take a block or a sheet of aluminum and cut it or shape it or etch it to precise tolerances so that that part can be incorporated into an airframe. They don't waste any aluminum. All of their water is recycled. All of their aluminum is recycled. All of their paper packaging and their wood is recycled, and their products leave the factory headed for Embraer in Brazil, AIDC in Taiwan, Bombardier in Montreal and so on and so forth. They're all packaged up in very recyclable wood and using recycled paper.

What we've got to do is to provide consumers convenient and accessible diversion services. We've got to keep raising that bar for consumers as well. We've got to get above the nearly half of waste that's recycled and get up more toward developed world standards.

In so doing, part of our challenge is to shift the costs of diversion away from the municipal tax base and away from municipal taxpayers to the producers of the product from which the waste is derived. To have the cost of waste disposal be borne by the property tax simply uses the property tax for something it was never designed to do. However, everywhere in the world, producers are required to deal with the by-products and the waste from the processes that they use to make their products, and nobody better than the producer knows how to take their product back, take it apart, if necessary, and recycle everything in it. Indeed, the producer can probably use nearly all of the raw materials of returned parts to be melted down, re-machined, ground up or whatever, in order to be able to produce new products.

**1730**

The other thing that this act seeks to do is to protect the consumers from the surprise when you get the eco fee at the cash register. The eco fee was never intended to be passed through to the consumer at the cash register. The eco fee is a cost of doing business for the producer. It isn't intended that the producer take the money and run, and flow the eco fee through to the poor buyer at the store. What this bill does is provide very strong oversight, and it provides compliance mechanisms to ensure that that outcome is met.

Let's talk about that waste reduction framework. It would have two components. Component number one is the Waste Reduction Act, which is what we're talking about, which replaces the old Waste Diversion Act. I almost feel sorry that my colleagues across in the Conservatives are being nostalgic about an act they may have written—and let's give them the benefit of the doubt. They may have written it in good faith, nearly 20 years ago, designed to do something that was applicable nearly 20 years ago, but the world has moved on. Now it's time to let go of an act that was written for the 1990s for a business climate in the 1990s and to embrace an act that was written in the 21st century for a business climate in the 21st century.

The second part is a waste reduction strategy that's going to provide a blueprint for increasing diversion and the economic and environmental benefits of diverting all of this material from landfill. The last thing that we want to keep doing is using perfectly good land in what is admittedly the second-largest land mass on earth—in Canada here—but we shouldn't be digging holes to pour in junk, to pour in things that could be recycled, to pour in things that contain valuable raw materials, just because nobody has got a structure to be able to extract the raw materials.

One of the problems that they're having in a lot of the developing world in Asia is that of the free rider, the people who say, "For a fee, don't worry about it. I'll pick up all of your waste material," particularly in electronics, where you've got, in addition to valuable materials—some silver; trace amounts of gold—some real nasties like lead and cadmium, which are terribly poisonous. They're often just dumped in rivers, and what they end up with is rivers that are devoid of fish, because the electronic waste that is just dumped in there is broken down by the water and ends up killing all the living things in that body of water. Sooner or later, many of those developing countries in Asia will be facing the cleanup bill for dredging their rivers, scooping all of this stuff out and fixing it up.

I can remember being in Havana a number of years ago and talking with the managers of Havana harbour. Cuba is not a wealthy country. Think of Cuba this way—and I'll explain it in a way that my constituents in western Mississauga can understand. Cuba, with a population of 11.5 million, compares favourably with Ontario, with a population of 13 million, but Cuba would be like running all of the province of Ontario on only the money generated by Mississauga and Brampton. When Cuba spends money, they do it very carefully, and one of their problems was, after centuries of neglect and pollution, cleaning up Havana harbour.

What Cuba decided to do was, instead of dredging Havana harbour, to take some of the contaminated areas and gently cover it over in layers and layers of silt, allowing relatively clean silt to push down the layers that were polluted over time. To their pleasant surprise, actually the strategy was working for them. They said, "It isn't because it's the best way or even the only way, but it was the way we can afford and it was a way that actually achieves our end result."

One of the lessons that we can draw from that is that not only are there best practices everywhere in the world that we can emulate and adapt but, as Canadians, we can think of ways that are all unique to us that we can take and teach the rest of the world.

Let's talk about this Waste Reduction Act in my final minutes. The intent is to transform Waste Diversion Ontario into the new Waste Reduction Authority, and this is the one that all three parties are looking at and thinking to themselves—including the government—"We want to be awfully careful if we create yet another arm's-length body, because it's those arm's-length bodies that come

back to bite us.” Even looking at this in the bill, I’m thinking to myself, “Okay, it’s in the bill. We’ll get the bill to committee, but convince me.”

Some of the things that this authority would do: It would provide for oversight and compliance with the proposed producer responsibility regime and integrated pricing provisions in the proposed Waste Reduction Act, and it would continue to oversee existing waste diversion programs until they get transitioned to the new framework. As well, this authority would engage in activities that are set out in an operating agreement with the minister. The authority would have a number of key functions, which include—but they’re not limited to this—receiving and storing information from producers and intermediaries. You cannot make an intelligent decision unless you’ve got good information. So one of the key things that this authority would do would be to capture, store and organize good information to make sure that you can make an intelligent decision out of good information.

The authority would assess the performance of producers’ actions. If you don’t know what the score is, how can you up your game? That’s what this would do. It would take graduated compliance and enforcement action against individual producers and intermediaries who perform poorly, known in the vernacular as the free riders: “I’ll gain an economic advantage over you, because you, who will faithfully comply with the regime and do your best to recycle your products—I’m just going to undercut you by simply surreptitiously chucking them.”

Now, that’s an overview of some of the things that this act can do, and I’m looking forward to hearing feedback in some of the questions and comments. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I concur with the member from Mississauga–Streetsville that we should be concerned about setting up an arm’s-length agency. He’s right. So is the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane concerned about setting up an agency at arm’s length, because in the past, when government has done this, it has come back to bite us, to quote the member from Mississauga–Streetsville. We have a history of having bad experiences with arm’s-length agencies that are not accountable, where there is not oversight, and this bill reinforces that there will be lack of oversight and accountability because, by definition, a minister can’t touch an arm’s-length agency. By definition, when the act says the freedom-of-information act will not apply to this Bill 91, that takes away an avenue of oversight and accountability, and when it says that even the Auditor General cannot be approached to do an audit unless the minister agrees to it, again, we have a whole bunch of red flags there that we are seeing, we are cautious about, leery about, and I think we should not do this.

This bill should be restructured so that it has a structure that provides the accountability and oversight that all three parties are concerned about, that’s been

expressed here this afternoon in a few short speeches. Of course, with the history of other organizations like the OSPCA, which I’ve mentioned before, where corruption has absolutely happened, where they can collect money, they’re at arm’s length, there is no oversight and no accountability, we just don’t want to go there again.

It’s very easily fixed. I think we just put the responsibility with the Ministry of the Environment, where the freedom-of-information act will apply, where the minister does have power and authority of oversight, and we can go to the Ombudsman or we can go to the Auditor General to have oversight if there are problems perceived there, and we have more direct control over what happens.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I just want to say, the member from Carleton–Mississippi Mills says that the member from Mississauga–Streetsville is right about admitting that with arm’s-length agencies, there’s not a good track record. But that’s good; it’s good that he’s admitting it, because when you understand that you have a problem, then you can go about fixing it. If we could just get those executives on the Pan Am committee to actually rein in their spending and maybe even just do the job that they were paid to do for \$400,000, that would be refreshing. That would rebuild trust.

To the comments, though, from the member from Mississauga–Streetsville: The one thing I just want to say that is sort of missed in the general comments is that we really are not talking about the economic benefits of this bill. Every thousand tonnes of materials diverted generates 7.3 full-time equivalent jobs, \$711,000 in GDP and \$360,000 in wages. The economic benefits are four times greater than the net cost to recycle.

**1740**

So we really do have to actually get this right, and that’s what our focus will be. Our focus in committee will be to make sure that the economic value is realized, to ensure that the environment truly is protected, to make sure that this agency that this government seems so dead set on bringing into play—we’re going to fight to actually have the government just do its job around oversight. Why create another agency? The track record is not good, right?

I think we have some solid arguments for the ministry responsible just to have those measures and those tools in place to do oversight in a responsible way. That’s where we’re going to focus our energy. We’re still willing to do the work because it’s an important issue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I’d just like to read a couple of sections from the Coalition for Effective Waste Reduction in Ontario. This is to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. It’s from the executive summary:

“Producers respect and value the critical work of our municipal partners in waste reduction, particularly through the development and operation of blue box col-

lection programs. Municipalities will continue to play important roles in waste reduction, and we look forward to renewed and robust partnerships. We believe strongly, however, that the flexibility to design these partnerships within an open and competitive market place is essential." I think we all agree on that. "The legitimate concerns of municipalities in areas such as continuity of services to residents and environmental protection can be addressed through standards and regulations."

It goes on further, "A more streamlined Waste Reduction Act, focused on principles of producer responsibility and addressing the concerns highlighted in our submission, could provide a legislative framework to enable the development of appropriate producer responsibility programs across Ontario. Bill 91 already anticipates that many critical issues such as targets and standards will be implemented through regulations. We share a concern along with other stakeholders regarding the critical need for fair, meaningful and transparent consultations as part of the process of drafting regulations."

The member for Mississauga–Streetsville, in his presentation, showed where we can go and the dollars we can save, and putting the producer responsibility is going to incent them to reduce waste and improve all of the 3Rs that we're looking to improve on.

I think we're going in the right direction. If the three parties work together, we can come out with a good solution for waste reduction in Ontario that we all seek. That is our objective, to make sure that we protect the environment and at a most reasonable cost.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** A pleasure to join the debate here for a couple of minutes on the comments of the member from Mississauga–Streetsville—although I agree more with the member for Kitchener–Waterloo and my colleague from Carleton–Mississippi Mills.

When I first heard the words that the Liberals had brought out a Waste Reduction Act, a new waste reduction bill, I was so hopeful it had something to do with the way they've governed this province in general over the past 10 years, where we've seen deficits climb to record levels and the debt of Ontario double under the term of this government. I thought, "Oh, my goodness, waste reduction, that's exactly what we need here in the province of Ontario." But then I found out, no. You know what it's about? It's a bill that is designed to deflect the critical eye away from the abject failure that they have been when it comes to reducing waste and diverting waste.

When they were elected in 2003, they promised, and they reiterated as government, that they would have a 60% diversion rate from landfills by 2010. Speaker, the diversion rate in Ontario has actually dropped to 26% under this government. That is how much they have failed, how poorly they have done. So they're desperate. They're coming out with an act—and by the way, the administration of this act, you have to get to page 20 of this bill before you get beyond the establishing of the

authority. This is how broad, the octopus of an agency that it's going to be. It's going to be a mess. Think about all of the government's arm's-length agencies that have been disasters. This will be another one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Mississauga–Streetsville has two minutes.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** It has been instructive to hear the comments of my colleagues.

To the member for Carleton–Mississippi Mills: I'm afraid he would dismiss out of hand what may be the only way to ensure that people do what they agree to do. So I can't agree with him on this. Voluntary standards mean no standards at all. Quite frankly, toothless enforcement records on non-compliance just give rise to non-compliance and anarchy.

To my colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo: Perhaps such an arm's-length agency simply needs good, old-fashioned political oversight. We've seen recently in our committee work that elected members can still terrify bureaucrats and arm's-length executives. I found that on the whole, her comments were very helpful and very constructive.

My colleague from Ottawa–Orléans, who is also celebrating 10 years as an elected member, has had a distinguished career as a professional engineer and joins our government caucus as one of a number of members with a background in science. For example, the Minister of Research and Innovation and I both have backgrounds in physics, and we have not one or two but three medical doctors in the caucus. I think one of the key things here is to have science minds providing input into a bill that's all about applying science to business.

Finally, my colleague and friend from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, who is also celebrating 10 years as an elected member, is a good man and a fine singer, but I have to respectfully disagree with him on this. I think he should just let go of a bill that dates back to the 1990s and step into the 21st century.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** When I saw that I would be debating the Waste Reduction Act, I was really excited: It was about time that we talk about reducing some of the waste around here. Sadly, this bill is not about getting rid of the McGuinty-Wynne Liberals, but that's another story for another time. Instead, this bill seeks to radically alter the landscape of waste reduction in this province. At the end of the day, they recycle a lot of tired Liberal ideas.

Bill 91 would technically repeal the Waste Diversion Act. However, it would continue every recycling program, agency and fee created under it in a section called "Existing Waste Diversion Programs and Existing Industry Funding Organizations." It would ignore the calls of ordinary Ontarians who are saying enough is enough when it comes to eco fees.

This bill leaves many important questions unanswered. To start, there are no cost estimates. There's no regulatory impact assessment. What we do have is a bill

that was perhaps hastily put together so that the government could at least appear to take action on the file. Without knowing how much it would end up costing the province or what potential impacts the legislation could have, it's difficult to give it our support.

Our critic rightly pointed out that it is not good enough to come into the Legislature with a bill that has less substance than a white paper and claim that it will dramatically change waste reduction in Ontario.

I'd like to commend our environment critic, the member from Kitchener–Conestoga, for bringing eco fees into the spotlight over the past year. The public got angry about the fees, and the issue received some attention in the media. It also received some local attention in the Chatham–Kent–Essex area as well, Mr. Speaker. His call to scrap eco fees has been heard around the province but has somehow not been heard by this Liberal government.

Given the reaction from the public and media toward eco fees, I was optimistic that the Minister of the Environment would take the opportunity to reduce or scrap these unpopular fees. We took the time to consult with stakeholders and Ontarians on this issue; Speaker, they don't like them.

**1750**

Who did the government consult with? Instead of listening to the public, who were rightly angered each time they looked at their receipts, they simply hid the eco fees even more. They swept them under the rug. The cost will be exactly the same to consumers at the end of the day. The Liberal government is still happy to take your money with a fee and then tax the higher amount; they just don't want you to know about it. Under the current scheme, at least people can see the eco fees right there on their receipt and voice their disagreement with them.

For the folks watching at home, I'd like to take a minute to read a list of products subject to eco fees into the record. I only have 20 minutes, so please understand that I won't be able to include them all, but here are a few of them: computer monitors—the eco fee charged, \$12.25; displays that are between 29 inches and 45 inches, \$39.50; desktop printing, copying and multi-function devices, \$10.35. And get this one, Speaker: floor-standing printing and copying devices, \$173.75. And the list goes on.

Each of these items is subject to a tax on a tax. The Liberals have quietly collected over \$100 million in the past five years since Dalton McGuinty initially dreamt up eco taxes.

Back in 2009, the Liberals introduced a new round of eco taxes, this time for their e-waste program that was established under another Liberal regulation for waste electrical and electronic equipment. With this plan, the Liberals not only introduced eco taxes on everything from iPods to TVs to computers and printers; they also set up a new unaccountable recycling cartel called the Ontario Electronic Stewardship, or OES. Under this system, OES takes money from consumers through mandatory eco fees and hands it out to a select group of

recycling companies that take the material away and process it.

What exactly are the criteria to be selected as one of those companies? How does one get to be hand-picked by the Liberals to get a monopoly on recycling in Ontario? Who knows? This regime completely stifles competition, all but guaranteeing a poor value on the dollar for taxpayers in Ontario. At the same time, it also reduces innovation.

Not surprisingly, the stewardship did not work. Just last year, the Ontario Electronic Stewardship was in a dire financial situation. Instead of taking immediate action to balance the books, eco taxes were raised to cover for yet another case of fiscal mismanagement.

If, at first, you don't succeed, tax, tax again. Under this government we've seen a troubling trend of simply reaching back into the pockets of taxpayers when a program does not get the job done. This reminds me of a bumper sticker I saw recently that said, "I Owe, I Owe, It's Off to Work I Go."

The Minister of the Environment has claimed that this bill will scrap the Ontario Tire Stewardship and the Ontario Electronic Stewardship. We feel that this claim is disingenuous. This bill would see every recycling program, every agency and every fee continue on. Perhaps some of the names would change, but that's it.

Bill 91 gives the minister the option to eventually get rid of eco fees if he wishes. However, the minister stated at a press conference in June that it could take five years to wind down the eco tax programs, if they decide to get rid of them at all.

The Ontario PCs have a better option. We say, scrap them today.

The one particular issue that hits close to home for the folks in this great riding of Chatham–Kent–Essex is the tire tax. This particular fee skyrocketed by 2,000% back in April, which wreaked havoc on local farmers. I spoke with the president of the Chatham-Kent Christian Farmers' Association. Jacques Tetreault and I were discussing the issues that were impacting farmers. One of the biggest issues, he told me back then, was that these tire taxes were going up and up and up. Just to give you an indication, we talked about the John Deere 9300 tractor tires. New total fees: \$729. The previous fee was only \$61. That's a 1,200% increase. Or how about John Deere 9770 Combine tires? New total fees: \$1,645. The previous fees were only \$91. That's an 1,800% increase. I guess this Liberal government, who claim to be friends of rural Ontario since they have a part-time Minister of Agriculture, have to once again find ways to pay for their boondoggle \$1.1-billion gas plant scandals on the backs of farmers; the ones who, in fact, feed cities.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, eco fees are incredibly unpopular in my riding, and I cannot support their continuation, and the people of Chatham–Kent–Essex won't stand for it.

Bill 91 does more than continue the Liberal eco tax scheme. The bill also seeks to get rid of Waste Diversion Ontario, which by all accounts is an unaccountable or-

ganization. This sounds great at first, but the government simply wants to rename it the Waste Reduction Authority and give it even more power.

How exactly would this new authority work? Well, similar to the College of Trades, this authority would have the power to set and collect fees or taxes to fund its operations. The agency would be headed up by a registrar, who would then appoint deputies to fine producers to fund the operation of the authority, through taxes. Are you still following? It gets even better. Then the registrar would assemble an army of inspectors to send across Ontario to round up fines and funnel them all back into the Waste Reduction Authority. All of this, by the way, would be going on with zero accountability to the public. The authority is disconnected from Parliament, not subject to the freedom-of-information act and can only be reviewed by the Auditor General, if the minister happens to feel it's necessary.

As the scandals surrounding the Liberal government begin to pile up, we cannot even begin to consider reducing accountability for an unnecessary agency. If there's one thing this Liberal government is good at—other than wasting billions of taxpayers' dollars in a laundry list of scandals—it's forming redundant agencies.

At the end of the day, this bill ignores two main demands of the PC Party for waste reduction policy. This bill does not remove eco taxes nor does it eliminate useless bureaucracy. In fact, the bill opens the door to increased costs, for both individuals and companies, in the form of new taxes or fees. Beyond that, it would actually increase bureaucracy—bigger government, with more taxing power and less accountability.

This is truly a scary time for the taxpayers of Ontario. Waste Diversion Ontario has time and time again broken the trust of taxpayers across the province. Their ongoing failure should not be rewarded with a significantly larger budget and increased power.

As I wrap up, I would like to highlight our party's major concerns with this piece of legislation. First, it is unacceptable to the members on this side of the House to increase the funding and authority of Waste Diversion Ontario. Slapping a new name on the sign on the door is not enough. We should be reducing the size and cost of government to ensure our vital services are there when we need them.

Secondly, intermediary sections of this bill form an unnecessary interference in the marketplace that will end up driving up costs. The minister stated in his remarks that this bill seeks to “unleash the innovative energies of competition in the marketplace.” Upon closer inspection, we see that this is not the case. These intermediary sections of the bill will hurt the market, limit competition and stifle innovation. They will do more harm than good, and should be removed from the bill.

**1800**

Thirdly, sections 44 and 45 will not be supported by our party. These sections pit municipalities against producers instead of bringing them to the table to find a

solution that works for all sides. As the bill reads today, the waste authority would be permitted to impose new taxes and determine how much business will have to pay for the blue box program. We are concerned that this will only serve to entrench companies and municipalities instead of promoting co-operation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** We will continue another time.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Pursuant to standing order 38, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made.

## ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

### ABORIGINAL LAND DISPUTE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member for Haldimand–Norfolk has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given on October 3, 2013, by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter, and the minister or the parliamentary assistant may reply for five minutes.

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** It was around July 11 or 12 of this year that it became known that the illegal burger shack on MTO property outside Caledonia was operating without approvals from the health unit, and was apparently operating without zoning, fire code and building code approvals from Haldimand county. It has been in the court, most recently last Thursday.

My first question is, who asked for the contempt of court charge to be dropped against the Minister of Infrastructure? How did that happen? The Ontario government has been involved with the illegal use of this provincial MTO property for a number of years now because of the illegal smoke shack—for example, attempts to construct a second entrance directly to provincial Highway 6.

My question is, has the Ontario government granted any approvals to these two illegal businesses, or does silence or turning a blind eye mean consent? Question: When will you dismantle and remove these two illegal structures? They shouldn't even be there.

Another question is, has there been federal government involvement? We know that the federal government has indicated, on a number of occasions, that there is no valid land claim on any of the property adjacent to Highway 6. Does the provincial government not agree with that statement, nor with similar findings in the courts?

Why are there different sets of rules for the owners and operators of the smoke shack and the burger shack compared to other businesses in town, businesses that have to compete with these tax-free enterprises? Do the rules vary depending on whether such businesses are on provincial land compared to private land, compared to reserve land, or do all of the rules apply but are not enforced because of perhaps intimidation, edicts from on high or the discretion of the officers? I know there may

not be time to answer all of these questions, so I formally request some written responses.

People do ask me, who gives the right for activists on MTO property to breach the law, including these public health codes and tobacco legislation? It's bad for business. It's bad for tourism. This whole mess is right at the southern entrance to town. It's bad for the credibility of government at the municipal, provincial and federal level. Why the abdication of responsibility?

Going back to July 12, the Haldimand-Norfolk Health Unit inspectors, accompanied by OPP, served a closure order on this burger shack. Haldimand county public works staff assisted in installing a sign at the driveway. After they left, the sign was removed by the occupiers. When nothing changed, the medical officer of health sought and was successful in receiving a cease and desist order on July 22. That order also names the Minister of Infrastructure, who, I note, did not step aside while this matter was before the court.

Need I remind anyone here of the standards for food handling? We know of the church groups and the new regulations that meant that they could no longer bake pies at home kitchens that weren't inspected. Also, there was no hesitation in shutting down food booths at the CNE. Why is Haldimand county any different?

Last Thursday, the matter went before a judge in Brantford. The contempt of court charge against the Minister of Infrastructure was put aside. The minister was also removed from the injunction. Again, who asked that the contempt charge be dropped? People are asking me, why was the minister removed from the injunction?

This doesn't mean the government is off the hook. Last Thursday, the government of Ontario was added to the list of respondents in this case, and it could be back before a court if the owner does not make improvements. Again, should the government not be responsible? Why is the government not responsible for what occurs on its own property?

If I had more time, I would talk a bit more about smoke shacks and so many other perceived injustices.

The bottom line, Speaker, is that people wonder why it has come to this: a number of illegal shacks, the burned-out tractor trailer, dismantled power towers. Public health rules, zoning and building permits are the issues at present. The bottom line is that these buildings should never have been built. The question is, when will this government remove them?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has five minutes.

**Hon. David Zimmer:** I note this is a late show, and the reason given is because the member opposite was dissatisfied with my answer to his question posed last Thursday. I have to say that after I received the notice that he was dissatisfied, I went and made arrangements to watch the exchange again, his question and my answer, and I have to say I was perfectly satisfied with the answer.

But anyway, be that as it may, let me say to the member again, as I did last Thursday, that the issue of the un-

licensed food stand is currently before the courts. It was before the court last Thursday, the Superior Court in Brantford.

I found out that what happened on Thursday in the court proceedings was that there was an indication from the parties to the presiding judge that they were making some progress in trying to resolve the issue. Accordingly, the judge, and rightly so, adjourned the matter to a later date some time at the end of this month, the end of October. So I'm not going to comment on that case; it is still before the courts.

I would, however, like to correct the record and make it quite clear that there is no contempt order being sought against the Minister of Infrastructure. I can tell you that, on September 27, 2013, on the consent of all the parties, the court set aside the Superior Court injunction against the minister—and I want to stress the consent of all of the parties to that proceedings.

Let me just say without commenting in any way on the case before the court, just to give you some other information on things that are happening over at Six Nations with regard to various issues over there, that it's clear that these issues and a host of other issues that the member has referenced run much deeper. Many of them are beyond Ontario's power to address alone.

Participation from the federal government is required in order to resolve a number of these issues underlying the Six Nations claims. Negotiations at the main table have been on pause since October 2009. However, our government remains hopeful that Canada will return to the negotiating table. It's the federal government that has been absent from the negotiations. The claims brought forward by the Six Nations can be resolved in a way that benefits the members of all communities involved if we can get all levels of government back at the table.

In the meantime, Ontario continues to work with Six Nations, the surrounding municipalities, Brantford and others, Haldimand and the development community to find some practical ways of moving forward with the unresolved claims by Six Nations. This includes strengthening working relationships and fostering community reconciliation.

In the midst of this, it's important that we do not lose sight of the significant progress Ontario is making in its relationship with First Nations. We are acting upon the recommendations of the Ipperwash inquiry in the policies and programs that we are developing.

We are continuing to resolve claims by First Nations across this province. We are fostering community reconciliation. We are investing in people and infrastructure, whether it's building consultation capacity through our New Relationship Fund or supporting community and business centre development through our Aboriginal Community Capital Grants Program.

We are investing in health care, education and other vital social programs, and we are taking a stand on social issues that are of critical importance to the aboriginal communities.

In conclusion, our government is committed to working with First Nations partners and all levels of government to overcome challenges and find new opportunities. We've created jobs, improved educational outcomes and promoted economic sustainability for First Nations. Our commitment to improving the quality of life of First Nations communities in Ontario is tireless.

I just want to circle back now to my first comment. The technical answer, the proper answer to the member's

question, is that the question that he raised and he asked about was dealing with matters that are before the Superior Court. They were before the Superior Court last Thursday. The matter has been adjourned. It's coming up in late October. It's still before the courts, and I'm not prepared to comment on that particular proceeding.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** This House stands adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

*The House adjourned at 1811.*



**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. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Tonia Grannum, Trevor Day, Anne Stokes

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport Minister Responsible for the 2015 Pan and Parapan American Games / Ministre responsable des Jeux panaméricains et parapanaméricains de 2015
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
<b>Coteau, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiles et de l'Immigration
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Del Duca, Steven (LIB)	Vaughan	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Kitchener–Waterloo	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hatfield, Percy (NDP)	Windsor–Tecumseh	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Holyday, Douglas C. (PC)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	
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 Economic Development, Trade and Employment / Ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et de l'Emploi
Hudak, Tim (PC)	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
Hunter, Mitzie (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Chair of Cabinet / Présidente du Conseil des ministres Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
<b>Leal, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (LIB)</b>	Peterborough	Minister of Rural Affairs / Ministre des Affaires rurales
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
<b>MacCharles, Hon. / L'hon. Tracy (LIB)</b>	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonnell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland–Quinte West	
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Moridi, Hon. / L'hon. Reza (LIB)</b>	Richmond Hill	Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation

<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	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
<b>Naqvi, Hon. / L'hon. Yasir (LIB)</b>	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham–Kent–Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
<b>Oraziotti, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)</b>	Sault Ste. Marie	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth–Wellington	
<b>Piruzza, Hon. / L'hon. Teresa (LIB)</b>	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	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
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches–East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
<b>Sandals, Hon. / L'hon. Liz (LIB)</b>	Guelph	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock	
<b>Sergio, Hon. / L'hon. Mario (LIB)</b>	York West / York-Ouest	Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea–Gore–Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward–Hastings	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto–Danforth	
Takhar, Harinder S. (LIB)	Mississauga–Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron–Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming–Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe–Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough–Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Agriculture and Food / Ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Première ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin–Middlesex–London	
<b>Zimmer, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)</b>	Willowdale	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Vacant	Niagara Falls	

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Mike Colle, Joe Dickson  
Michael Harris, Rob Leone  
Amrit Mangat, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Soo Wong  
Steven Del Duca, Victor Fedeli  
Catherine Fife, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Mitzie Hunter, Monte McNaughton  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Grant Crack  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Donna H. Cansfield  
Sarah Campbell, Donna H. Cansfield  
Grant Crack, Dipika Damerla  
John Fraser, Peggy Sattler  
Laurie Scott, Todd Smith  
Jeff Yurek  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Rick Bartolucci  
Laura Albanese, Rick Bartolucci  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Percy Hatfield  
Mitzie Hunter, Jim McDonell  
Randy Pettapiece, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qaadri  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Phil McNeely  
Teresa J. Armstrong, Steven Del Duca  
Bob Delaney, Frank Klees  
Jack MacLaren, Phil McNeely  
Rob E. Milligan, Shafiq Qaadri  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Bas Balkissoon, Steve Clark  
Grant Crack, Vic Dhillon  
Garfield Dunlop, Cindy Forster  
Lisa MacLeod, Amrit Mangat  
Michael Mantha  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett  
Toby Barrett, Lorenzo Berardinetti  
France Gélinas, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Phil McNeely  
Norm Miller, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Jagmeet Singh  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof  
Donna H. Cansfield, Dipika Damerla  
John Fraser, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Monte Kwinter  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Ted Chudleigh  
Bas Balkissoon, Ted Chudleigh  
Mike Colle, Vic Dhillon  
Cheri DiNovo, Ernie Hardeman  
Helena Jaczek, Jane McKenna  
Paul Miller  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Select Committee on Developmental Services / Comité spécial  
sur les services aux personnes ayant une déficience  
intellectuelle**

Chair / Président: Vacant

Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day



*Continued from back cover*

**Pan Am Games**

Mr. Rod Jackson .....	3602
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	3603

**Thunder Bay generating station**

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	3603
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	3603

**Air quality**

Ms. Mitzie Hunter .....	3604
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	3604

**Air ambulance service**

Mr. Frank Klees .....	3604
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	3604

**Services en français**

Mme France Gélinas .....	3605
L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	3605

**Visitors**

Hon. Jeff Leal .....	3605
Mr. Todd Smith .....	3605
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	3605

**Use of question period**

Mr. John Yakabuski .....	3605
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	3606

**DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS**

**Skin Cancer Prevention Act (Tanning Beds), 2013,  
Bill 30, Ms. Matthews / Loi de 2013 sur la  
prévention du cancer de la peau (lits de bronzage),  
projet de loi 30, Mme Matthews**

Third reading agreed to .....	3606
-------------------------------	------

**Great Lakes Protection Act, 2013, Bill 6,  
Mr. Bradley / Loi de 2013 sur la protection des  
Grands Lacs, projet de loi 6, M. Bradley**

Second reading agreed to .....	3607
--------------------------------	------

**INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS /  
PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Mr. Phil McNeely .....	3607
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	3607

**MEMBERS' STATEMENTS /  
DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS**

**Clarington Sports Hall of Fame**

Mr. John O'Toole .....	3607
------------------------	------

**Homelessness**

Ms. Peggy Sattler .....	3607
-------------------------	------

**South-East Ottawa Community Health Centre**

Mr. John Fraser .....	3607
-----------------------	------

**Community Living Kincardine and District**

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	3608
----------------------------	------

**Bicycle safety**

Mr. Jonah Schein .....	3608
------------------------	------

**École Notre-Dame-des-Champs**

M. Phil McNeely .....	3608
-----------------------	------

**Automobile show**

Mr. Bill Walker .....	3608
-----------------------	------

**Francophone shelter for women and children**

Ms. Mitzie Hunter .....	3609
-------------------------	------

**Brigden Fair**

Mr. Robert Bailey .....	3609
-------------------------	------

**Chris Lewis**

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	3610
-------------------------------	------

Mr. Steve Clark .....	3610
-----------------------	------

Ms. Peggy Sattler .....	3611
-------------------------	------

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	3611
-------------------------------------	------

**REPORTS BY COMMITTEES /  
RAPPORTS DES COMITÉS**

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly**

Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	3612
Report adopted .....	3612

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS /  
DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

**Lobbyists Registration Amendment Act, 2013, Bill  
115, Ms. Forster / Loi de 2013 modifiant la Loi sur  
l'enregistrement des lobbyistes, projet de loi 115,  
Mme Forster**

First reading agreed to .....	3612
-------------------------------	------

Ms. Cindy Forster .....	3612
-------------------------	------

**Manoranjana Kanagasabapathy Act (Hand-Held  
Devices Penalty), 2013, Bill 116, Mr. Balkissoon /  
Loi Manoranjana Kanagasabapathy de 2013 (peine  
pour conduite avec appareil portatif), projet de loi  
116, M. Balkissoon**

First reading agreed to .....	3612
-------------------------------	------

Mr. Bas Balkissoon .....	3612
--------------------------	------

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY  
AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS  
MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

**Ontario Agriculture Week / Semaine de  
l'agriculture en Ontario**

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	3613
------------------------------	------

**Fire Prevention Week / Semaine de la prévention des incendies**

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur ..... 3614

**Ontario Agriculture Week**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 3614

**Fire Prevention Week**

Mr. Steve Clark ..... 3615

**Ontario Agriculture Week**

Mr. John Vanthof ..... 3615

**Fire Prevention Week**

Ms. Peggy Sattler ..... 3615

**MOTIONS**

**Private members' public business**

Hon. John Milloy ..... 3616

Motion agreed to ..... 3616

**PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS**

**Youth mental health**

Mr. Frank Klees ..... 3616

**Air-rail link**

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 3617

**Public transit**

Mr. Shafiq Qadri ..... 3617

**Highway improvement**

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson ..... 3617

**Dog ownership**

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 3617

**Public transit**

Ms. Soo Wong ..... 3618

**Physiotherapy services**

Mr. Victor Fedeli ..... 3618

**Air-rail link**

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 3618

**Public transit**

Mr. Bas Balkissoon ..... 3618

**Tire disposal**

Mr. John Yakabuski ..... 3619

**Dog ownership**

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 3619

**ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR**

**Waste Reduction Act, 2013, Bill 91, Mr. Bradley /  
Loi de 2013 sur la réduction des déchets, projet de  
loi 91, M. Bradley**

Mr. Victor Fedeli ..... 3619

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 3622

Mr. Phil McNeely ..... 3622

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 3623

Mr. John Vanthof ..... 3623

Mr. Victor Fedeli ..... 3623

Ms. Catherine Fife ..... 3624

Hon. Glen R. Murray ..... 3627

Mr. Randy Pettapiece ..... 3627

Mr. John Vanthof ..... 3627

Hon. Jeff Leal ..... 3628

Ms. Catherine Fife ..... 3628

Mr. Bob Delaney ..... 3628

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 3631

Ms. Catherine Fife ..... 3631

Mr. Phil McNeely ..... 3631

Mr. John Yakabuski ..... 3632

Mr. Bob Delaney ..... 3632

Mr. Rick Nicholls ..... 3632

Second reading debate deemed adjourned ..... 3634

**ADJOURNMENT DEBATE / DÉBAT SUR  
LA MOTION D'AJOURNEMENT**

**Aboriginal land dispute**

Mr. Toby Barrett ..... 3634

Hon. David Zimmer ..... 3635

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 9 October 2013 / Mercredi 9 octobre 2013

### ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

#### Supporting Small Businesses Act, 2013, Bill 105, Mr. Sousa / Loi de 2013 visant à soutenir les petites entreprises, projet de loi 105, M. Sousa

Mr. John O'Toole.....	3583
Mr. Rosario Marchese.....	3584
Ms. Soo Wong.....	3584
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson.....	3585
Mr. Michael Prue.....	3585
Mr. John O'Toole.....	3585
Mr. Michael Prue.....	3586
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur.....	3592
Mr. Rick Nicholls.....	3592
Mr. Rosario Marchese.....	3592
Mrs. Laura Albanese.....	3593
Mr. Michael Prue.....	3593
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	3593

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Steve Clark.....	3593
Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	3593
Hon. Michael Coteau.....	3593
Ms. Lisa MacLeod.....	3593
Mr. John Vanthof.....	3593
Mr. Rick Bartolucci.....	3593
Mr. John Yakabuski.....	3594
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3594
Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	3594
Mr. Bill Mauro.....	3594
Mr. Frank Klees.....	3594
Hon. Deborah Matthews.....	3594
Mr. Garfield Dunlop.....	3594
Mr. Bob Delaney.....	3594
Mr. Rob E. Milligan.....	3594
Hon. John Milloy.....	3594
Mr. Todd Smith.....	3594
Hon. James J. Bradley.....	3594
Mr. Rick Nicholls.....	3594
Hon. John Gerretsen.....	3594
Mrs. Jane McKenna.....	3594
Ms. Dipika Damerla.....	3594
Mr. Rob Leone.....	3594
Hon. Brad Duguid.....	3594

Mr. Randy Pettapiece.....	3594
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	3594
Mr. Bill Walker.....	3594
Hon. Yasir Naqvi.....	3594
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	3594
Mme France Gélinas.....	3595
Ms. Soo Wong.....	3595
Hon. Teresa Piruzza.....	3595
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac).....	3595

### ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

#### Power plants

Mr. Tim Hudak.....	3595
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3595

#### Power plants

Mr. Tim Hudak.....	3596
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3596

#### Power plants

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	3597
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3597

#### Power plants

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	3598
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3598

#### Power plants

Ms. Lisa MacLeod.....	3599
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	3599
Hon. Bob Chiarelli.....	3599

#### Power plants

Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	3599
Hon. Bob Chiarelli.....	3599

#### Childhood obesity

Mr. Phil McNeely.....	3600
Hon. Deborah Matthews.....	3600

#### Power plants

Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	3600
Hon. John Milloy.....	3601

#### Power plants

Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	3601
Hon. Bob Chiarelli.....	3601

#### Infrastructure renewal

Mr. Bill Mauro.....	3602
Hon. Jeff Leal.....	3602

*Continued on inside back cover*