



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

First Session, 41st Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 7 October 2015

Mercredi 7 octobre 2015

Speaker
Honourable Dave Levac

Président
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk
Deborah Deller

Greffière
Deborah Deller

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 416-325-3708.

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 416-325-3708.

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 7 October 2015

**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO**

Mercredi 7 octobre 2015

The House met at 0900.

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

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

**PROTECTING CONDOMINIUM
OWNERS ACT, 2015**

**LOI DE 2015 SUR LA PROTECTION
DES PROPRIÉTAIRES
DE CONDOMINIUMS**

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 6, 2015, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 106, An Act to amend the Condominium Act, 1998, to enact the Condominium Management Services Act, 2015 and to amend other Acts with respect to condominiums / Projet de loi 106, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur les condominiums, édictant la Loi de 2015 sur les services de gestion de condominiums et modifiant d'autres lois en ce qui concerne les condominiums.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): When we last discussed this bill, the member from Algoma–Manitoulin had completed his speech. We are now on questions and comments.

Mr. Chris Ballard: It gives me great pleasure to respond to our friend from Algoma–Manitoulin with regard to this bill. He made a number of very important points. It was interesting to hear his comments about his community and there not being too many condominiums.

I come from north of Toronto, a small community called Newmarket and Aurora, and over the past 10, 15 years we've seen a tremendous growth in condominiums, especially as our communities have filled the remaining green space with more typical homes that you would find in an urban setting.

Really, the only way to grow in our communities is up, so over the last 10, 15 years we've seen a number of mid-rise condominiums go in—six, eight stories. In Newmarket, they're looking at going even higher. It's a somewhat new built form in our community and it's one that, coming from a municipal background, we've had to adjust to.

As a municipal councillor, I was always one of the first who new condo owners would call when they had issues with their developer or with their condo board or whatever. The tools that we had to help them with their

issues oftentimes were limited, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to see that this bill will be addressing some very important facts like licensing condo managers, improving governance and oversight of condo boards, and providing a relatively inexpensive way for owners and boards to resolve some of the disputes they have without going a more expensive way, that of going to court.

I look forward to seeing this bill move into committee and listening to what the parties opposite can bring forward in ways of improving it. I thank everyone for their support.

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

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I do want to speak about the perspective of the member from Algoma–Manitoulin. Of course, he and I are both northern boys and we do take a different look at this. While we look forward, as you just said, to having this bill come to committee, one of the things we'll talk about, in terms of this condo act, are the differences in the requirements of heavily populated urban centres versus the north.

We do have condominiums in the north. Some are small, and some just won't be able to quite match up with the new rules and regulations that are contemplated in this, such as the designing of a website to have access. There are a lot of places in northern Ontario, quite frankly, where we don't even have dial-up website and access. It's just the reality. When I drive in my riding from North Bay to Mattawa, there's a good chunk of the area where we don't have service. It's just the reality of living in two-thirds the size of the population.

So there are certain respects, I've said quite frequently in this Legislature, where it cannot be cookie-cutter, one-size-fits-all. As long as the acknowledgment is there that we really do need a separate set of guidelines that pertain to northern Ontario—you can't always have a Toronto-centric solution to a Toronto problem, because it does spill over and ties in the rest of the province with these issues.

So with respect to the condo owners in my community of North Bay and some of the smaller communities—I have 10 mayors that I serve in my area, 10 different municipalities. Some are as small as 200 or 300 people; they have a mayor. When you look at the rules that are set up for condos, they cannot be that onerous on these smaller communities.

Thank you, Speaker, for the opportunity.

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I was really delighted to be in the House yesterday, listening to the member from Algoma–Manitoulin. I wanted to compliment him on his rendition of Rosario Marchese. It was very entertaining to watch a Frenchman channel an Italian. I have to say it was very good.

The member talked about how there are not a lot of condo complexes in northern Ontario; people purchase single-family homes. I compared that to maybe what's happening in Toronto and what's happening in London, because we do have a lot of condo buildings: We have high-rises, and we have townhomes. As people are aging, they look for alternative dwellings. A lot of seniors may not be able to cut the lawn and shovel the driveway or do those repairs outside that maybe they could do when they were younger. Having a condo option really alleviates some of that.

I'd be interested to see, as the years progress, if the northern areas of Ontario accommodate some of those needs for seniors. Seniors usually want to stay in the neighbourhood or the area they raised their kids in; they don't want to move far away from family, and I understand that northern ridings are huge and vast. So, talking about regional differences, this bill should acknowledge that there are regional differences in Ontario, and when bills are developed, we should keep in mind that other parts of Ontario have needs as well.

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

Mr. Mike Colle: It's sad to hear someone say that this is a Toronto problem. I mean, there are 1.3 million Ontarians who live in condos. Condos are in every riding of this province. The people who live in condos come from all over Ontario. They are people from all walks of life and from every community. They come to work and live in different cities of Ontario. And 300,000 people are employed in this industry building condos.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Barrie.

Mr. Mike Colle: Three hundred thousand people work in this industry. It's critically important that we take this on and not say it's a Toronto problem. It's an Ontario situation that needs addressing. It needs some new legislation to protect the 1.3 million Ontarians who call these condos home. How basic can you get? It's our job. We can't let these 1.3 million people live in a situation where there's obviously—and there have been many suggestions. There has been all kinds of important input from Rosario Marchese, from Tracy MacCharles—18 months of consultations.

0910

Everybody agrees that we've got to do things for the betterment of the people of Ontario who call these condos home. That's the reality. They're not just in Toronto. That's why we need to do something to help these people who are asking for dispute resolution. They're asking for rules; they're asking to protect their lifetime investment.

To ignore that lifetime investment is just stupid, as far as I'm concerned.

We have a duty to do this. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation we'll probably do, I think, in this term—1.3 million people. We've got to get the job done and not say it's a Toronto problem—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Thank you. The member from Algoma–Manitoulin has two minutes.

Mr. Michael Mantha: I want to thank the members from Newmarket–Aurora, Nipissing, London–Fanshawe and, the last speaker, Eglinton–Lawrence. It's unfortunate; I thought you were here when I delivered my comments yesterday, because the points that you just raised are exactly the points that I had spoken about. It's not just a home; it's the dream of having that home: That's where I'm going to live. That's where I'm going to be raising my family. So when I'm putting my hopes and my dreams into a goal that I'm looking forward to, I want to make sure that those are there and that the mechanisms to address those problems are actually there.

The member from Nipissing brought up a really interesting point. We're not saying that northern Ontario is different. We're not saying that it's better; we're not saying that it's worse. We're asking the government to recognize the challenges that are there, and they are unique. There are different issues. I always use this example when I'm talking to my constituents back home. When we see policy coming from this government, I refer to it as the white paintbrush syndrome. You cannot paint the entire province with a white paintbrush and think that it's going to fix everything. You have to recognize that there are dynamics, there are different areas, there are different challenges throughout this province. My comments that I made during the time that I spoke yesterday were that I look forward to having the opportunity to explain those when this goes to committee.

I give a lot of credit to the individual who is quite knowledgeable about this, who has been speaking about this for the last eight or 10 years, one named Rosario Marchese. I'm sure my friend from Eglinton–Lawrence was here, just across the way from him, as he spoke so passionately about this issue. To you, my friend, as Rosie would say, we'll do it together. We'll do it together. And to you, Mr. Speaker, God bless.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Thank you. And to you, the member from Algoma–Manitoulin, you will talk to me, not the other member.

Further debate?

Mr. Mike Colle: I was here in 1998 when the first condo act was brought forward. I know that at that time, a lot of work went into it. It was over two years of work that was brought in by the previous government. I'm quite aware of how complex and important this legislation is. At that time, we tried to do the best we could to protect Ontarians who invest in these homes. The number of deputations we had, the experts, the citizens who came forward trying to improve the legislation—it was quite commendable.

That's why, going forward now, I think we all have to appreciate how incredibly complex the condo act is. It really takes incredibly convoluted legal matters, real estate issues, property standards issues, municipal issues—and it affects so many people. That is why it's so critical that we take time to do this right.

It is very important to look at the long range here. This act will have to undergo all kinds of tests, because it is going to be very, very difficult to solve all of these problems. As the member from Newmarket–Aurora was telling me, his elderly aunt, who bought a condo years ago on the shore of the Humber River, has a great penthouse condo, but now that condo is under mortgage watch. The reason for that, like a number of condos that may be under mortgage watch, is because of the fact that a lot of people who buy condos really abhor the condo fees.

They get assessed certain fees if the parking garage deteriorates, the swimming pool has to be fixed, the roof leaks. What happens is that it's a natural tendency for people to say, "Well, I don't want to pay more this month and have this increased assessment." So they kept on putting off these repairs. Subsequently, you get in a situation where now there are major, major repairs, to the point that some condos cannot be sold because people can't get a mortgage for them. So it is very serious.

I had a condo on Dufferin Street in my area just last year. It was one of the first condos in Ontario. The people living there have been living there since the 1970s, when it was built. Because they're elderly and they're living on fixed incomes, they've tended to put off maintenance. So this year they got hit with a huge maintenance fee: upkeep, the garage, the front entranceway, the roof. So a lot of them came to me, saying, "We can't afford to pay this huge new assessment. Would you talk with the property manager?"

In fact, the property manager happens to be an old football player of mine, Tony Seljak, who happens to be in the property management business. He said, "Listen, I'll do what I can. We'll work out a payment system. But the roof and the garage have got to be fixed." That's the reality of what happens, and that's just one small part of this act.

There are so many parts that affect—as I said, the city of Toronto, for instance, or the city of Mississauga or the city of Brampton all come into play with this. Right now there is a major lawsuit against the city of Toronto over the Condominium Act, and that is the result of the fact that people living in condominiums pay very high taxes. They say, "Why should we be paying more taxes than, or as many taxes as, people living in a detached home and then we don't get snow clearance, we don't get these potholes filled in our parking lot? Therefore, the city should also come and clear our snow on private property because we're paying taxes for that equal to the other people." It's a very interesting case. It's before the courts right now. It will be interesting what the decision is, because it could affect people and municipalities right across this province in terms of the relationship with

condominiums. So there's another example of the complexity of all of these.

The bill itself tries to deal with 2,200 recommendations. She's not here right now, but the Minister of Children and Youth Services and women's issues spent a couple of years trying to listen to people and work with various groups, trying to come up with this act. As I said, it has been going on for years, trying to get the fundamentals of this act together. She should be given an award for patience and for the good work that she did. She is never mentioned, but she did a lot of work, as she does in a lot of areas. So there are a lot of people who have shown an interest in this.

It is critical that we understand that there is no silver bullet in fixing this form of home ownership. It is extremely, as I said, legalistic. Most lawyers who deal with real estate have no idea about the condo act.

Interjection: Here she is.

Mr. Mike Colle: Speaking of the minister, she is here now.

Anyway, when you buy a condo, there are so many things to be aware of. You're going to be living with a couple hundred, 300, 400 people.

There is a new building going up on Yonge Street in Toronto that has 99 storeys. Can you imagine living in that building and all agreeing on paying assessment fees, on paying condo fees? It's pretty challenging getting everybody to agree. But I think we all agree that we've got a good foundation here. Everybody has come up with some good suggestions.

I think we've got to go forward, and it is important at this time that we bring in all of the experts, all of the stakeholders to bring forward their ideas on how to improve this bill. We've got to open up to the public this discussion on making this act a good one. We've got to bring the public in as soon as we can.

Therefore, at this time, Mr. Speaker, we need to refer this to committee as soon as possible. Bring in the public. As a result, I move that the question be now put.

0920

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Mr. Mike Colle: Point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Point of order.

Mr. Mike Colle: Mr. Speaker, in case you didn't hear me: I move that the question be now put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Eglinton–Lawrence has moved that the question now be put. I'm personally satisfied that there has been sufficient debate to allow the question to be put to the House. Shall the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This vote will be taken during deferred votes.

Vote deferred.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVING
GOVERNMENT ACT, 2015
LOI DE 2015 SUR LE RENFORCEMENT
ET L'AMÉLIORATION
DE LA GESTION PUBLIQUE

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 1, 2015, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 85, An Act to strengthen and improve government by amending or repealing various Acts / Projet de loi 85, Loi visant à renforcer et à améliorer la gestion publique en modifiant ou en abrogeant diverses lois.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Jeff Leal: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker, and good morning to you. I will be sharing my time this morning with the distinguished members from York South–Weston, Barrie and Ottawa–Orléans.

Mr. Todd Smith: Sounds like a roll call.

Hon. Jeff Leal: It is a roll call, I heard my friend from Prince Edward–Hastings telling me. But it's interesting, there will be no more roll calls for the Belleville Bulls this season since they've moved to your very distinguished city of Hamilton, Mr. Speaker.

In the members' east gallery today I'd like to welcome some distinguished leaders from Glengarry, Prescott and Russell, because this is Glengarry–Prescott–Russell day here at Queen's Park. Please stand up. There we go.

I want to say good morning to everybody in the great riding of Peterborough. I know they're waking up and tuning in to Cogeco station 95. I welcome them this morning.

Mr. John Yakabuski: They've been awake for hours. People in Peterborough don't sleep in until 9:30.

Hon. Jeff Leal: They've already got half their day in, so they're just switching to 95.

Interjection.

Hon. Jeff Leal: They are. They're enjoying their Egg McMuffins.

Mr. Speaker, I've to get going here on Bill 85. One of the most important aspects of Bill 85—I'm sure this is shared in common for members of all sides—are the changes we're going to make to the family responsibility act.

Mr. Speaker, you and I both know that many of us at our offices have individuals who come in on a very frequent basis to talk about the challenges that they have under the family responsibility act, or with the Family Responsibility Office, particularly when it comes to support payments for individuals. It's always a very sad situation when you have a matrimonial breakup. It's very difficult on all parties involved, particularly for children. So there are significant provisions in this act today, Bill 85, that will allow us to handle the FRO payments in a much more efficient way. It will allow for much better tracking of the FRO process. It will also make sure that when Family Court judges make decisions in terms of support for children, those decisions are indeed enacted

to provide that vital support that is needed by families when they find themselves in very difficult positions.

Mr. Speaker, there are also amendments to the City of Toronto Act, 2006. These amendments were asked for particularly by the Toronto Transit Commission to allow them to expand service to York region and neighbouring municipalities by adjusting provisions of the act.

This is a very important amendment today to allow us to facilitate the Big Move forward, which is a very ambitious plan in the greater Toronto–Hamilton area to provide that transit in a wide variety of means, whether it's subways, whether it's buses or whether it's light rail, to make sure that various areas are solved. These amendments here today will allow us to facilitate the important planning that needs to be done by Metrolinx into areas outside of the city of Toronto border. So this is a very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, something that you'll also be very interested in, as a former city councillor in Hamilton: It's about to improve the administration of the Provincial Offences Act. You well know, as a former municipal leader in Hamilton, part of the Who Does What exercise at the end of the 1990s—I know we, in Peterborough, gave that a new name; it was the “who got done in” committee. I know my municipal leaders from every part of Ontario certainly reflected on that new name that we gave to that exercise, the “who got done in” committee. There was universal support of how we renamed the famous Who Does What committee of the late 1990s.

To give credit where credit is due—and I'm a very fair individual—under the Provincial Offences Act, part of that exercise was to make sure that municipalities were given the revenue that would be generated under the Provincial Offences Act, namely, quite commonly, our parking tickets. I know I've received my share of parking tickets in the city of Peterborough and went to the POA office in Peterborough to pay the appropriate fine. One of the provisions of Bill 85 is to allow more technology to be used in processing these tickets. Ultimately, that will allow us and municipalities to get that revenue that was part of that agreement that was negotiated between the then government in power, AMO and the municipalities right across the province of Ontario.

This act also has a number of other provisions that I think are very important. I know many of us who had the privilege of serving in municipal government, particularly with EMS services—these operators that have non-emergency stretcher transportation, some of those vehicles that were used for this particular activity were not in very good shape. So we're bringing in new requirements to make sure that they have the same standards that EMS vehicles have right across the province of Ontario.

With that, I will cede the floor to my other colleagues.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from York South–Weston.

Mrs. Laura Albanese: Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to speak to the Strengthening and Improving Government Act, an act that aims to make government more efficient and more effective, I

would say. If passed, this bill will strengthen and update existing legislation—15 different pieces of legislation, to be exact. These changes will make it easier for families and for businesses by improving and modernizing some government processes.

I've been following much of the debate that has been taking place on Bill 85. Many of my colleagues have highlighted the most important items contained in this bill; for example, proposed amendments to the Family Law Act, which would require every person whose income is used as part of a child support order to provide the other parent with updated financial and contact information on an annual basis. In other words, this would make sure that children get what they need, what they're entitled to, in terms of child support.

Ms. Soo Wong: That's right. It's a good thing.

Mrs. Laura Albanese: Yes, it's a very good thing. Many families have issues with that. It just streamlines it for people who are in that situation.

Other amendments that are contained in this bill: the amendments to the Highway Traffic Act on stretcher transportation services. This aims to improve the safety and reliability of private sector non-emergency stretcher transportation services in Ontario. I know that many of my colleagues have spoken about this initiative that is part of the bill. In other words, these amendments will make sure that vehicles would need to meet specific requirements, contain prescribed equipment, and meet inspection and maintenance standards. Drivers and attendants would also be required to meet these minimum standards. This is really important because it would regulate the sector that, right now, is not safe enough and needs more oversight.

Another initiative contained in this bill are the amendments to the City of Toronto Act. This will help make it easier for the Toronto Transit Commission to expand service to York region and other neighbouring municipalities by adjusting provisions in the act. This will allow for greater transit collaboration between transit agencies across the greater Toronto and Hamilton area.

0930

Why is that important? Because I think that few people today have the fortune of working close to their home. In the riding that I have the privilege to represent, York South–Weston, for example, through the years industry has been disappearing. This has been happening in all the major urban centres, so people's jobs are farther away. I have residents who work in the city of Vaughan. They work in Richmond Hill. They work in Mississauga. They work in Brampton.

Industries that at one time were a vital part of the riding—I can name Kodak; I can name CCM, which used to manufacture bicycles; the Moffat stove factory—they are all gone. Some have stayed, such as Irving Tissue, which is still one of the main employers in my area, but the majority of them have moved away.

So people need to go to where the jobs are, and therefore need better transit. That's why our government

is investing in transit, but that's why we also need to make it easier for municipalities.

Because of the number of amendments that are included in this bill and because it does aim at modernizing what we do here in government, I will be supporting this bill, and I hope that everyone else will; I think I've heard consensus amongst all our colleagues. We want to get this bill passed, so that we can help individuals, families and businesses in our province.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Barrie.

Ms. Ann Hoggarth: Thank you, Speaker. Good morning. I believe that this bill, the Strengthening and Improving Government Act, is very important. It covers a lot of issues. In particular, the one that I hear constantly in my constituency office is about the Family Responsibility Office and the difficulty with young families, whether it be a single mother or a single father, trying to get the money that has been set aside every month for their children's upbringing. I think that this bill hopefully will help get that done much more quickly. I think that is the good thing to do. Children should not suffer because mom and dad are having difficulty dealing with each other. They shouldn't be hurt in this whole situation. It's bad enough that they are now in a broken family.

The Strengthening and Improving Government Act includes a number of small but important measures that will improve the efficiency and the responsiveness of government. We are looking at many aspects of government, trying to modernize processes and make systems easier to manage. To meet the needs of Ontarians, these public services require a solid foundation. We are taking action through this act to strengthen and update existing legislation.

There are amendments to the Highway Traffic Act, particularly about stretcher transportation services. The government is taking action to improve the safety and reliability of private sector non-emergency stretcher transportation services in Ontario.

As I said, proposed changes to the Family Law Act will help ensure that the new administrative child support service is as effective as possible in assisting children to receive appropriate levels of financial support from their parents. Quite frankly, as parents, we should be looking after our children.

Amendments to the Courts of Justice Act: These proposed changes will help to effectively implement new federal family legislation in Ontario.

Amendments to the City of Toronto Act: The proposed change will help make it easier for the Toronto Transit Commission to expand service to York region. I know my colleague from Newmarket–Aurora is happy for that, and other neighbouring municipalities will benefit from adjusting provisions in this act. This will allow for greater transit collaboration between transit agencies across the greater Toronto and Hamilton area. I know, Speaker, you'll like that.

Why are we making these changes now? We're always looking at the many aspects of government, trying

to modernize processes and make systems easier to navigate. While some of these proposed amendments were part of the previous strengthening-and-improving-government bill, we also found new ways to make improvements through our ongoing review processes.

Our goal is to meet the needs of Ontarians, and public services require a solid foundation. We're taking action through this act to strengthen and update, as I said, existing legislation. This is not new legislation; it's improving previous legislation. I really think that all of the aspects of this bill, including the amendment about making provincial offences documents electronic—these amendments do not have cost implications. They clear the way legally for Provincial Offences Act courts to manage cases more efficiently. We all want that to happen; we know how those things can get dragged down. Municipalities run most of the Provincial Offences Act courts and so would bear any costs of additional modernization they choose to implement.

It will be necessary to make minor amendments to regulations to align this section of the Provincial Offences Act numbering, ensuring consistent language and making other minor housekeeping amendments in consultation with the municipal stakeholders. The six-month time period will allow these steps to occur.

I urge you to support this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Ottawa–Orléans.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: It's interesting that some of the members from the opposition are somewhat shocked that we, as members, are happy to stand up and speak on this wonderful bill.

I would like to start by maybe giving a little bit of history about the background as to what happened, because some people may say, "What happened on December 11, 2013?" The Minister of Government Services introduced Bill 151, the Strengthening and Improving Government Act. That bill included changes to five pieces of legislation. In May 2014, as most Ontarians know, the bill died on the order paper.

Before we introduced this very important piece of legislation, ministries were asked to submit additional items that were non-contentious but did require policy approval and that would have a most positive impact for stakeholders by improving the efficiencies and the responsiveness of our government.

I'm very happy, actually, to share my voice with my colleagues this morning in talking about the Strengthening and Improving Government Act. I would like to say that I know some of my colleagues have talked about what happened with our new families, the reality of our society. Sometimes, in my office in Ottawa–Orléans—and one of my staff members always, every Friday, when I come back to the office, says, "You know, Marie-France, we need to look at FRO. This is a situation where it has to be dealt with." I'm very happy that one of the components of this bill is actually about this, right?

When you look at the change and structure of family members, a child should not be penalized for a decision

that parents make. Certainly I think it's an important aspect of our bill and a much-needed aspect of what can make a real difference for the people and the children who are going through those realities.

0940

By updating and amending the Family Law Act, like I said, it helps the situation that these children are going through. This is an important piece that I wanted to highlight. I'm sure that Nathalie, who is in my office, will be happy that, if passed, this bill will help those children and those families in Ottawa–Orléans, in my neck of the woods, but I'm sure in some other ridings of my colleagues here in the House.

Another component—I'm not sure if people have talked about it, but I just want to highlight it. As a former business owner, something we take very seriously is the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Seriously, the worst thing for an employer is when their workers get injured. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is something that the government is taking very seriously. This particular bill will actually help improve workers' health and safety. Employers and workers will have access to a broader range of information about hazardous workplace chemicals. Everything that is currently in place will not change, but I want to highlight, and I only have a few seconds, that what will be most important is that there will be a portion where the employer will be required to identify chemicals and that the safety data sheet shows the chemicals in the workplace. But now the education component will have to be part of the employer's work.

Mr. Speaker, I need to end, and I wish I had a little bit more time, but certainly this is an important piece of legislation, and I hope that all members will agree with me.

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

Mr. Todd Smith: I would blame the member for Peterborough; he took your time. That's why you didn't have enough time to continue speaking this morning.

Do you know what? The name of this bill is like putting it on a tee for the opposition parties. What is it called again? It's called the Strengthening and Improving Government Act. If there is one thing we know, this government needs to improve. That's for sure. It's like putting it on a tee. You don't need a pitcher and a catcher when you're talking about strengthening and improving the things that this government is doing.

Every summer I go to this event called the Sand Lake Summit. We have a great bunch of guys who go up there every August to Ted and Ron Reid's cottage on Sand Lake. It's a beautiful lake in Frontenac township. John, Darrell, Chuck, Chris, Mike, Todd and Trevor are all there. We sit down and discuss all the problems that are going on in Ontario and the problems that are going on in the world. This is just a beautiful setting. There are cottages all around us. All the bigwigs have cottages. I can't afford a cottage, but I go up to Sand Lake and enjoy looking at the cottages. Gaylord Hardwood Flooring has

a beautiful cottage there. They, of course, specialize in hardwood and click flooring and tongue-and-groove.

We talk about all of the things that are wrong in the province of Ontario right now, and we sort out some of the ways we can fix it. The biggest problem facing Ontario: Electricity rates are through the roof, making us a less desirable place for people to come and set up their company and do business. This is the red tape capital of Canada. It's the red tape capital of North America. They're driving people out of the province because of the cumbersome bureaucracy you face when you come here. Taxation: Every time this government has an opportunity to raise taxes and make it more difficult to locate and expand and build jobs, these guys are doing it.

Let's fix electricity. Let's fix red tape. Let's fix the taxation in Ontario and get it right.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Essex.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I'm inclined to agree with my colleague.

Interjections.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Yes, really; that comes as a surprise to you guys. That you would take time in this Legislature to present a bill that essentially is house-keeping, that could have been done through regulation—why are you dragging your feet on some of the most important issues that our communities face? Lobby your own government, lobby your ministers and lobby your caucus to get to the table with issues and policies that actually affect our communities. Skyrocketing hydro rates: If your phones aren't burning up in your constituency offices, or melting, then you're not listening to the people out there. They are having an incredible time making ends meet—just on the hydro file alone, let alone the fact that people can't find good-paying jobs in this country, and in this province especially. You have done absolutely nothing. But what do we get? We get an omnibus, innocuous bill that does nothing, that could have been taken care of through a budget bill, but you decided to just pad some sort of, you know—whatever it is. I haven't really seen anything like this in a long time. It begs the question: What are you doing? Have you run out of steam? Do you not have any new ideas? Do you not have any inclination to support the communities that we represent? What does this do? What does it do? You have to give your heads a shake. My goodness.

The Clerks at the table must be thinking, "Is this the best they can come up with? Do we not have other priorities to deal with in this House?"

Interjections.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: It's nice to see the government so lively now. You have got so many words you want to shout at me and heckle me with, but put them into some legislation. If you've got so much passion, do something substantive and make a difference in this province. This is nothing. You know it. You'll stand up and you'll read your lines that have been written for you but, really, realistically, there's not much coming out of that government.

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

Mr. Grant Crack: It's certainly a pleasure to be able to make some comments regarding those that were just previously made by the member from Essex and the member from Prince Edward–Hastings, but I would be remiss if I didn't follow up on the Minister of Agriculture's—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Okay. The yelling stops. The cross-discussion stops. It goes to the Chair. I'm almost at my limit. I've let a lot go this morning.

Continue.

Mr. Grant Crack: Thank you very much, Speaker.

Again, I would be remiss if I didn't welcome members from Glengarry–Prescott–Russell here. From the United Counties of Prescott and Russell, I have Mayor François St. Amour from the municipality of The Nation. We've got the mayor of Russell township, Pierre Leroux; we've got Jean Leduc, the CAO of Russell township; and Dominique Tremblay, who is the chief planner. Welcome to Queen's Park. I'm sure they're very entertained.

I want to go back to what the member from Prince Edward–Hastings had talked about. He said this is a bill about improving, or not improving. Well, we just spent two and a half years in a minority government prior to June 12 of last year and we couldn't get anything done in this House. The bells rang constantly.

Anyway, we went to the polls, the people of Ontario actually made a decision and they chose our government again, in a majority. We're going to improve some of the legislation. I think it's incumbent upon us as a government to take a look at pieces of legislation that are outdated, probably put in by the Conservative Party when they were in power for too long.

The member from Essex, he's talking about regulation as opposed to legislation. These are bills and they have to be amended through the legislative process, so I'm very pleased that this bill has come forward. I think it's necessary. It's going to make it easier for families across the province and in my riding of Glengarry–Prescott–Russell. It's going to amend 15 acts. One of them in particular which is of concern to me is the Family Law Act, through the Ministry of the Attorney General. It's going to help to determine child support payments in the future, so I think that's a good step forward. Thank you very much for the time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry.

Mr. Jim McDonell: I have to agree with my colleague here, the member of the third party. Have they not got anything better to do? You look at this bill, and it's a caretaker at best. Things could have been done through regulation. I look at the bill—and we're going to committee this afternoon—to stop using coal in hydroelectric plants. The bill was introduced after we quit using coal in all plants in Ontario. I mean, this government is—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Barrie and the member from Scarborough–Agin-court.

Mr. Jim McDonell:—having a hard time coming up with any more ideas.

Meanwhile, the phone in my office is ringing off the hook with problems in this province. Hydro bills: Did they not notice, when they went to rural Ontario, people were turning their backs on their float? They were being polite, they weren't booing. That's what people in this province are thinking.

The member opposite talked about the minority government. The minority government allowed us to get at some of the scandals this government has put upon itself. Ornge, the gas plants; all of that would never come out if it wasn't for the minority government, and they quickly squashed everything they could afterward.

This is a government that talks transparency but does not want to see transparency because it's embarrassing for them. There are people that literally should be in jail, but they have the power of the majority, the power of this government, to squash those, and they've done that. We see in committees where questions come up trying to get information, and those questions are squashed.

0950

Really, writing about better government—it's far too long. This government should start looking at itself and try to figure out how they can actually improve this system, get our taxes down, get our hydro rates reasonable and stop wondering why business is leaving. It's very obvious: regulation. The cost of doing business in this province is no longer competitive. We're somewhat worried about the new trade agreement because we're not competitive.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from York South–Weston has two minutes.

Mrs. Laura Albanese: I want to thank all the members who have contributed and added their comments to the Strengthening and Improving Government Act: the members for Prince Edward–Hastings, Essex, Glengarry–Prescott–Russell and Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry.

We're the number one province for foreign direct investment, and that should mean something. The bill is about small changes, but sometimes small changes are the ones that make the most difference in a person's life. Legislation needs to be updated. Sometimes we complain that things are not brought forward to the Legislature. Well, we are bringing amendments to 15 different bills with Bill 85. Members should be welcoming that. I want to say that we have to respect the legislative process, and this is what we're doing.

To the member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry I want to say that I went this year, as I do every year, to the International Plowing Match in Finch. We had a great reception—such warm people, very welcoming. It was great to speak to everyone who was there. I really enjoyed it, and so did many of my colleagues who were there—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Stop the clock. I'm not going to point out anyone in particular, but there are a couple of loud discussions going on. If you want to have a debate, go outside and have a debate. Thank you.

Mrs. Laura Albanese: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the changes that are in this bill will help individuals, will help families, will help businesses in our province.

This is a great province. It is very diverse. It's great that we are so different, and yet we have so much in common. That's what we have to highlight: the things that we have in common and how to improve, how to strengthen the province of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Mr. John Yakabuski: It's a pleasure to join the debate this morning. I came in here this morning fully prepared. I had painstakingly prepared a speech on Bill 106, the condo act. I went to a great deal of effort to research the facts and have my comments written and prepared, and of course, I was unable to deliver my address on Bill 106, because the first thing that happened this morning was that as soon as the government had the opportunity, they had their designated guillotine operator here come and lower the boom—the hammer, the guillotine—and crush debate on Bill 106. Because in the government's mind, well, they've talked about it enough. But there are 107 members in this Legislature, and I think that when our forefathers conceived the parliamentary system here in Ontario that is modelled after the British system, they believed that all members should have the opportunity to speak to legislation. Well, in this Parliament, apparently that's not the case.

Anyway, I will move on. I will adapt. I will adapt and I will speak to—well, I will speak to Bill 85, in a manner of speaking, because what I can't understand is the gall of this government to even title a bill an “act to strengthen and improve government.”

They were parsing this out. Originally—it isn't in the title of the bill—they were colloquially calling it the good governance bill. I'll tell you that when I talk to people in my riding and when I travel across this province, the best thing these people could do to serve good governance would be to tender a group resignation. That would be about the best thing they could do. Since they won their majority, which they crow about all the time, somehow they think that their whole program has been accepted—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Stop the clock. I hope I don't have to say anything, because I'm going to go to warnings.

Mr. John Yakabuski:—and embraced by the public. Nothing could be further from the truth. We all know that the results of the 2014 election were anything but an endorsement of the Liberals—anything but an endorsement of the Liberals. Since then, everything has gone downhill from there for them. They know it, so they're trying to cloud the air and muddy the waters with bills that they'd like to call the good governance bill.

The tradition in this House is that you have the opportunity to speak to a bill, and we're told, "You can speak to what's in the bill." But the nice thing about the other side of the convention here is that you can speak to what the bill doesn't talk about and maybe it should in order to justify the title "improving government."

Let me start with hydro rates in this province. They are killing this economy because of hydro rates. I'm sitting in estimates this week—my partner from Prince Edward-Hastings as well as I—and we've been asking questions of the Minister of Energy. My God, the answers—we don't get answers; we get a diatribe about how wonderful it is under the Liberals, but never a direct answer to the question, questions that I ask like, "What are you supposed to say to Mr. and Mrs. John Doe who can't afford to heat their homes because they've got electric heat?" They're in their late seventies, maybe their early eighties. They built a home in the 1970s when the world was telling them to heat with hydro, and they can't afford the hydro bills anymore. On top of that, they installed air conditioning because their physician has said both of them have respiratory issues—and we want to keep them at home. "We want to keep them at home"—this is what the government says. They want to keep everybody at home as long as they can, which is the best place for them. They want to keep them at home, so the doctor has told them, "You must have air conditioning in the summertime. You will not be able to live in that home under the heat and humidity of Ontario."

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Point of order. Minister?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: I would like to hear about my beautiful bill that is before the House, and the people from Glengarry-Prescott-Russell would like to hear about my good governance bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Thank you about your lovely bill, but the member is talking about good governance, and that's part of your bill.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Thank you very much, Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence on that, because they don't want to talk about what's not in this bill. They've made such a mess of this province that they want the cone of silence to descend across the province so nobody can talk about what they're not doing—what they're not doing to help those senior citizens who are going broke, who are making choices between heating and eating because of the hydro rates in this province. No, the Attorney General doesn't want to talk about that. You know what? We're going to talk about that. If you won't defend the people of Ontario, this party will.

So when we talk about that couple who can't afford hydro, we're talking about one example of 13 million Ontarians who can't afford hydro in this province. What does the government do? It doubles down on its failed energy policies. I asked the minister, "What can we expect on November 1?" He and the deputy just fudged all around it. I said, "What can we expect on November 1 when we've seen what has happened already this year?"

The global adjustment cost Ontarians \$7.7 billion in 2013 and roughly the same in 2014.

The global adjustment, which is that part of the hydro bill that pays for all of those fancy contracts they've made with these wind developers and the like, in 2015 to the end of August had already cost Ontario ratepayers \$6.4 billion. I asked the minister, "Where are we going with hydro rates on November 1?" No answer. The deputy says, "Well, the Ontario Energy Board will set those rates." Do you not think that the Ministry of Energy has access to all of the data that goes into that decision as to what the rates are going to be?

1000

You can rest assured, ladies and gentlemen, that that announcement about what hydro rates are going to be on November 1—do you know when it will be made? It will be made during the constituency week, probably in the seventh inning of a Blue Jays game when nobody could care less about what's going on in this Legislature.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Point of order.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I ask the member to at least refer to our bill. We have 15 points; he likes to say everything else. I think there's enough to discuss this morning.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I think I've given the member a little latitude, to say the least. I think if you could at least mention the bill occasionally, and some of the things in the bill, that would be appropriate.

Mr. John Yakabuski: I will certainly do that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The government should stand up and say, "This is what the rates are going to be," and not try and hide it through the announcement when the news cycle isn't paying any attention to that. That's good governance, when you tell the people what they can expect. People need to budget for the future.

The other thing about good governance—and I really do believe that this is all part of this bill because it says, "to improve government." Well, government, as we know it in a democracy, Speaker, is a representation of what the people are asking for. Everybody, 13 million Ontarians, can't come to Queen's Park and run the government. So individually, in their constituencies, they send a member, and the members are collectively supposed to do what is best for those 13 million Ontarians. That is government. In the essence, it is a representation of what the people expect.

Do you know what the people expect? They expect transparency and they expect accountability from their government, and they expect their government to accept responsibility.

I'll give you another example of good governance. Good governance would be that—and it has been shown in the past—when a minister or a senior official is under investigation and under a cloud, until that investigation has cleared the books that minister or that senior official will step down. Until the air is cleared, they will step

down. We've got a situation here in Ontario where the Premier has the power. She has a senior Liberal—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Point of order, the member from Ottawa–Orléans.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I think we've been trying, on this side of the House, to very nicely ask the member, through the Speaker, to refer to our bill. If I may say, it's contrary to standing order 23(b)(i). The member should come back to this wonderful bill that we have about strengthening Ontario, a key factor that we collectively have heard put forward by Minister Meilleur.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I have mentioned to the member, as you know, about the latitude I gave him, to try to get back to the bill. I read it. I believe the bill says there are 15 acts that are affected by this bill. That's a lot of acts and a lot of governance involved there.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I'm talking and I don't need other people interjecting.

I think the bottom line is the member could come a little further towards talking about the act as opposed to going off on some tangents. But, I might add, while the member was off on his tangents, there were some comments from the government side in reference to a certain highway.

Thank you very much. Go.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Isn't it amazing, Speaker—you've sat in this chair for some time now, not some time today but some time over the years—how upset they get when someone wants to talk about what they want to bury and they want to hide and they don't want to talk about. But the people of Ontario need to hear this.

The Attorney General is the one who brought forth this bill. The Attorney General is the one who looks after the court system in this province. The Attorney General knows better.

In the past—and I'm talking about records now—we have had cabinet ministers in the previous government. The minute there was a sniff of an investigation, they stepped aside. Here we have a Premier who won't have a staff member step aside who is under suspicion, under investigation—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): This is your fourth point of order. Go ahead.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know what? If you look at standing order 23(b)(i), I can realize that this member is definitely not speaking about this bill. I would ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to ask this particular member to come back to our wonderful bill that we have moving forward.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I appreciate the member from Ottawa–Orléans bringing it to my attention for the fourth time. I'm well aware of what the boundaries are. If I feel that they step over the boundaries, they'll hear from me. At this point, he has heard

from me twice and I've tried to ring him in, so to speak. He will go back to the bill right now, won't he?

Mr. John Yakabuski: Absolutely, Speaker. I hope that you will not recognize the member on a point of order again. It's the same thing; we're going to hear it over and over again. It's my time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Well, it's my time right now, and it's my job to recognize points of order. I don't think you are in the position to limit how many or how I handle that situation. That's my job. You do your job; I'll do my job. Continue.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Very good, Speaker. I was distinctly told here last week that I wouldn't be recognized on a further point of order, but that's—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): That was a different Speaker.

Mr. John Yakabuski: No, actually, it was you, Speaker. It was during the oppo day. So I had that discussion with the member from Mississauga–Streetsville, and I was told I would not be recognized on a further point of order. We can check the Hansard.

Anyway, I'm going to speak on what I believe is necessary to speak on in this House. If someone chooses to interrupt me or if the Speaker chooses to shut me down, I suppose that's his prerogative. But I'm going to stand here in this House, as the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke and a member of this caucus, and I'm going to speak to what I believe is necessary for the people of Ontario. If it is my fate that I am shut down in this chamber of debate, so be it. But until that happens, I'm here for the reasons that I was elected. If someone wants to shoot me down, well, load 'em up boys. Load 'em up. I'm a big target.

Let's talk about the Sudbury bribery scandal. You want to talk about good governance?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Okay, my turn. You're shut down.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Mr. Speaker, I came here this morning to listen to the opposition speak about my bill. I would have been very interested to hear my dear friend from—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke is now warned.

Pursuant to standing order 47(c), I'm now required to interrupt the proceedings and announce that there has been more than six and one-half hours of debate on the motion for second reading of this bill. This debate will therefore be deemed adjourned unless the government House leader specifies otherwise.

Hon. Tracy MacCharles: Speaker, we wish to continue the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): You can't speak again. You've spoken on this, Minister.

Further debate?

Mr. Jim McDonell: I guess I'm a little disillusioned. We had some good debate going here, and I guess the government is a little disappointed with hearing some of the things that are being brought up today.

But I come from a riding where people are disappointed with the governance in this province. I never hear talk about the good governance going on with this Liberal government. It's unfortunate, because Ontario has a lot to be proud of. We've come through a lot of hard times, if you go back through our great history. We're sitting now, a province that really led the country for decades, probably centuries, in a situation where the other provinces are giving back to us because we're a have-not province. Who would ever have thought that? When they took over, things were booming here in Ontario.

1010

When I graduated from school after 17 years of school, friends of mine had wanted to get a little time off, but at that time, if you chose to, you were capable of getting unemployment when you finished university. People were being found jobs and couldn't go on unemployment. What a change we've seen under this government, where now our youth unemployment is double the regular unemployment, which is stubbornly high.

My son had come back to Toronto after a couple of years working in Alberta to find some of his classmates, civil engineers—a good job, good education—still looking for jobs, working in restaurants as waiters. He went out to Alberta and within two days had a job. That used to be Ontario. But I hear small electrical contractors talking about being afraid to hire somebody young in this province because of the labour laws that have been put in place by this government, labour laws that really aren't set up to help young people get a job.

We had a round table with our then-leader Tim Hudak. It's interesting, because I talked to one of our small businesses and I said, "You know, you're going to have to tell people in the community what's going on here." Do you know what his comment was? He said, "You don't understand. We can't talk about this, because under this government's legislation and regulation, we get attacked." It's hard to believe that we've got people in this province who are afraid to say anything because of a situation that they've set up.

We had a round table, and we were going to have the press there—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: It's a culture of fear.

Mr. Jim McDonell: It's a culture of fear. We had a round table with Jim Wilson last fall where we had a number of small agencies in, talking about not having had an increase in funding in five years from this government, who say they do a great job and talk about great governance. They had not received an increase in five years. Jim Wilson said, "How could that be? I hear about all of these great programs—money coming out here, money there." They said, "Yes, we get \$10,000 here; we

lose it over here. We get \$20,000 here; we lose it over here. We just constantly lay off people to cover the costs of energy going up and property taxes."

I asked a question, knowing the answer: "Why aren't we hearing anything? Are you intimidated?" They said, "Absolutely. We're told that if there's a bad story out, we better hear the day before, or else." That's the governance of fear, and that's not good governance. I don't see anything in this bill that talks about that. It's a lot of little things, asking around the ministries if there are any caretaking issues and making a big deal of this.

I talked just a few minutes ago about the bill introduced to stop burning coal in hydroelectricity stations in this province. The bill was issued after we stopped. What is this? Have we nothing else in this province to deal with? Could we not have a bill that actually attacks high energy rates? Where is your bill saying let's do a better job at reducing new regulation?

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Ottawa–Orléans was complaining.

Mr. Jim McDonell: This is a bill that adds more regulation. Where is the bill that gets rid of some of it?

They have an art of issuing bills with great titles. We sat here and they had a bill to reduce regulation in Ontario. The minister of the day stood up saying, "We're doing such a great job," and my colleague on this side stood up with two books, one from 2003 and one from 2014. The first one was 2,000 pages, the second one was 3,600 pages, and they call that reducing regulation?

But it's that saying one thing and doing another that has been very clear from this government. "We will not raise taxes," and within a month, the biggest health tax this province has ever seen. "We will not raise taxes," and the GST comes in, a big increase.

People are getting fed up. I was very proud of the residents of Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry because they were polite. Last year, when we went to the plowing match, there were loud boos at this government. It was embarrassing. The Premier even talked about it on stage. We didn't do that. But there were people turning their backs, people who are very disappointed with what's going on in this province. It's embarrassing when we used to have a province of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Sorry to interrupt, but the time has elapsed. The member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry will continue at a later time with this.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): This House stands recessed until 10:30 this morning.

The House recessed from 1015 to 1030.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: It's my pleasure today to introduce Joseph Brant and Matan Volach from the polycystic kidney foundation of Canada board of directors. I want to

welcome them to the Ontario Legislature and all guests to the Ontario Legislature today.

Mr. John Vanthof: I'd like to congratulate our page captain today, Matthew Keon Hartford, and welcome his mother, Dr. Yun Yee Chow; his father, Martin Hartford; and his brother Luke Hartford. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Mr. Chris Ballard: I'm delighted to welcome a constituent of mine from Newmarket, Jeff Robertson, to Queen's Park today. Jeff is the executive director of the Polycystic Kidney Disease Foundation of Canada. I met with that group today and I was very impressed by all of them. Thank you very much for being here today, Jeff.

Mr. John Yakubuski: On behalf of the PC party, I'd like to welcome our friends at the Ontario Energy Association here with us today. Please join me in welcoming president and CEO Bob Huggard and his team from the OEA.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: I ask all members of the House to join me in welcoming Karyn Greenwood-Graham and the Affected Families of Police Homicide, who are in the public gallery today. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I would like to welcome the grade 5 students and staff from St. Barbara elementary school in my great riding of Mississauga-Brampton South. They are in the west public gallery. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn: In the west members' gallery today, we have the grade 5 class from MacLachlan College in Oakville and their teacher, Martha Bonner. Please give them a warm Queen's Park welcome.

Hon. James J. Bradley: I'd like to introduce Mary De Sousa, executive vice-president of marketing at FirstOntario Credit Union, in the west members' gallery.

Hon. Glen R. Murray: We have a number of guests in the gallery today who are here for the third reading of Bill 66. We have, from the Earth Rangers, who will be here shortly, a group of children: Tovah Barocas, Amy Cross, Lisa Martin, Metta Martin, Tammara Tucker, Emily Tucker, Darlena Green, Catherine MacLean and Elizabeth MacLean; Mark Mattson from Lake Ontario Waterkeeper; Hilda Swirsky from the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario; Kevin Rich and Jim Pimblett from Ducks Unlimited; Bob Duncanson from the Georgian Bay Association; Mark Fisher from the Council of the Great Lakes Region; Tim Gray and Natalija Fisher from Environmental Defence; and finally, Nancy Goucher from Freshwater Future.

M. Grant Crack: C'est un grand plaisir pour moi de présenter tous mes amis et mes collègues de Glengarry-Prescott-Russell qui sont ici avec nous ce matin pour Glengarry-Prescott-Russell day.

I'd like to welcome all the members who are here today from Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. Glengarry-Prescott-Russell day is in room 248 from 11:30 to 1. I hope everybody comes.

Mr. Harinder S. Takhar: I'd like to introduce Dalbir Singh Sidhu and Satinder Kaur Sidhu. Dalbir is a good friend and a great supporter as well.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'd like to introduce Mary De Sousa from FirstOntario Credit Union in the Hamilton area.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I just wanted to welcome our friends from the Polycystic Kidney Disease Foundation of Canada. They're doing wonderful work, raising awareness and finding funds to find a cure. We've got Joseph Brant, who's the chair; Jeff Robertson, the executive director; and Matan Volach. Welcome, all.

WEARING OF RIBBONS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Point of order, the member from Nepean-Carleton.

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: It's my pleasure today to rise, with the unanimous consent I believe we have from all parties to wear PKD awareness—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Before we get into a shouting match, can I please hear the point of order?

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: I believed that there had been unanimous consent to wear the green ribbon for PKD awareness. Perhaps the government didn't get the memo, but now I think they do, so we'll all wear this beautiful green ribbon.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Nepean-Carleton is seeking unanimous consent to wear the pins. Do we agree? Agreed.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Patrick Brown: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. Doctors and patients are outraged by the Liberal cuts to health care. We've heard many stories across the province of how this is affecting patient care. I'll share another today. We heard from Dr. Verbora, a recent graduate who, with his MBA degree, invested 11 years of his life and \$250,000 to become a family doctor. He is frustrated with the Liberal government's attempt to limit the number of doctors who can join family health teams. Does the minister believe this is the right message to send to Ontario's new doctors?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: I appreciate the question from the leader of the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we've made changes to our primary health care system, including focusing on those underserved areas—places in the north, rural and small-town Ontario—that are lacking family physicians or in particular are lacking the family health team approach to providing health care, which is an approach—I think we all agree; the comprehensive nature of that care is very amenable to quality of care, and it's a kind of service that patients really appreciate.

What we've done is we've actually encouraged and incentivized our new grads, as well as existing family doctors that aren't currently part of a family health team, to go to those rural and small-town parts of this province,

to go to northern Ontario to open up those family health teams. I would hope that that's something the leader of the opposition could support.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Patrick Brown: Again for the Minister of Health: Only this Liberal government could try to sell an \$800-million cut to health care as a good thing.

Let's go back to the story of that new doctor, Dr. Verbora. This new doctor must see an average of six to seven patients per hour just to pay the overhead expenses, including rent, fees and insurance. After completing paperwork, Dr. Verbora will be left with three to four minutes of face-to-face time with each patient.

Mr. Speaker, a four-minute visit with a patient isn't adequate for quality health care in Ontario. Why does this minister seem to think it's okay to justify these cuts with more and more spin?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: I would agree that a three- to four-minute visit isn't sufficient. I, in fact, would argue that this particular methodology of practising medicine isn't the norm in this province. Our family health doctors, our family medicine practitioners—our nurse practitioners, for that matter, and the other front-line health care professionals—do provide the highest quality of service, and in the case of our physicians that's why they're the best paid in Canada. On average, they're remunerated \$368,000. I understand that there are expenses associated with that that range from as low as 0% overhead—for example, our ER docs or those that practise in hospitals—to a higher amount that may be 30% or so in terms of those overhead costs. But our doctors remain and will remain the highest paid in this country—I would say probably in North America, in fact. That's part of the reason why so many new doctors are coming here. We have 700 new doctors that practise—net new doctors—each year in this province.

1040

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

Mr. Patrick Brown: Mr. Speaker, back to the health minister: It may be little stories like the one we just shared with Dr. Verbora, but the Ontario PC caucus will continue to tell the stories of Ontario doctors because the stories of Ontario doctors are the stories of Ontario patients. These are patients who, because of the Liberal government, will have to wait longer for their emerg visit. They'll have to wait longer for their first appointment with an oncologist after learning they have cancer. Why? Because it's more important for this Liberal government to spend \$1 billion on eHealth than on quality health care. It's more important for this government to waste \$1 billion on Ornge than investing and making sure Ontarians have access to a doctor.

Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister is: What counts for this government? Doesn't it matter that Ontarians deserve to have access to health care, and can't you accept the fact that an \$800-million cut is wrong?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: The only cut to health care in this province has come from the federal government, a gov-

ernment that that member was part of. That \$800 million he's talking about is the annual cut in health care to this province from the federal Conservative government each year for the next 10 years.

We continue to invest in health care. Our health care budget goes up from year to year, and I—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Finish, please.

Hon. Eric Hoskins: Mr. Speaker, I'd like the member opposite to explain, with our doctors being the best paid in this country, how that could possibly affect—and this is only about compensation—quality of care or access to care. We'll continue to pay our physicians for every service they provide. That won't change. They're the best paid in the country.

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

Mr. Patrick Brown: My question is for the Minister of Energy. This Liberal government is the only government in the history of Ontario that's had to sell one of its best crown assets in order to pay for infrastructure. This Liberal government isn't being straight with Ontario when they say this is required to pay for infrastructure.

On the energy file alone, if you look at the misspending, if you look at the mismanagement—\$1.1 billion on the gas plant scandal, \$1.1 billion exporting power to other jurisdictions this year alone, \$2 billion on smart meters, \$83 million on misbillings because of Hydro One errors. That's \$4.3 billion on the energy file alone because of your own mismanagement.

Will the Minister of Energy accept that if it wasn't for their own incompetence, you wouldn't need to do this fire sale?

Interjections.

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

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Leeds-Grenville.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: The member opposite is indicating a number of expenditures that we have made. We have made very significant expenditures in the electricity sector, starting—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Having that advice is not helpful, either.

The member from Nipissing, come to order.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Oh, I have a long memory.

Carry on.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: It was scandalous what we found when we took over government, the state of the electricity system. There had been a decline in generation. There had been a decline in transmission. We were in a deficit of supply. We were importing \$1 billion a year from the US and rates were skyrocketing. It was a dirty system—25%—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Member from Simcoe–Grey, come to order.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: —and we had to rebuild the system.

In the supplementary, I will tell the new member to the provincial chamber of the investments that we've been making in the last nine years to make the system reliable.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Patrick Brown: Again to the energy minister: Soaring energy rates aren't just because of these endless scandals. It's the government's day-to-day mismanagement of the energy file. In the last three years alone, we have lost roughly \$3.5 billion exporting power to other jurisdictions. That's almost as much as they'll make on the fire sale of Hydro One. They've already charged Ontario taxpayers \$6 billion this year alone for global adjustment taxes, and, by the way, that global adjustment tax the Auditor General said is there just to pay for this government's expensive renewable energy contracts.

Anyone who mismanages a company this badly would be fired.

So my question is: Will the minister finally admit that this decision to fire-sale Hydro One is because of their own incompetence?

Interjections.

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

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke, come to order. I'm inches away from moving to warnings, so take that under advisement. It'll happen.

Minister of Energy.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: I appreciate the question on the global adjustment. It's been raised in estimates as well by colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, before the global adjustment, wholesale market prices were insufficient to cover the costs of contract payments to certain electricity generators, leading the former PC government to accumulate billions of dollars in debt. This contributed to the stranded debt that consumers continue to pay off through the debt retirement charge.

That government bankrupted the old Ontario Hydro. They had to create the debt retirement—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Oxford is warned. Anyone else?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: They kept prices artificially low because they did not include all the costs to the system.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Stormont is warned.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: The global adjustment reflects costs associated with contracted and regulated generation such as nuclear, natural gas and renewables, as well as the cost of conservation programs.

In the next supplementary, I want to talk about their statements about Ontario having the most expensive electricity in North America, which is wrong—

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

Interjections.

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

Mr. Patrick Brown: Mr. Speaker, again to the—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I'm standing. I haven't acknowledged you yet.

Final supplementary.

Mr. Patrick Brown: Mr. Speaker, again to the energy minister: We already know that the minister personally objects to the sale of Hydro One—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Barrie is warned.

Mr. Patrick Brown: —along with the Attorney General, along with the minister for seniors and the deputy House leader. This minister has the opportunity to do the right thing. This is his chance; this is his file. The minister is responsible for the people's Hydro One—well, it's still the people's for now. We know the minister thinks this is a bad deal. He said so unequivocally when he was mayor of Ottawa.

My question is, will the Minister of Energy show he has some integrity, show he has the courage of his convictions—go to your Premier and say what you believe in your heart and what you've said on the public record: that this is a bad deal for Ontario?

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: I'm going to present an impartial opinion—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Nepean–Carleton is warned.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: —of the Hydro One initiative. It's from the Globe and Mail. It says:

“At a media briefing ... the IPO's top financial and legal advisers addressed the press gallery, allotting time afterward to address substantive concerns about the country's largest privatization in years.

“Despite filing a 322-page prospectus chock full of colour on strategy and the market's appetite for utilities, they fielded incessant, angry questions about executive pay....

“Premier Kathleen Wynne was re-elected last fall with a mandate to reinvest in the province, particularly through transit and infrastructure projects that are expected to fuel growth....

“Much respect to the Premier for embracing such a difficult choice.

“The Liberals—advised by Mr. Clark” and other experts—have “persuaded Bay Street to accept some of the lowest IPO”—

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

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Prince Edward–Hastings is warned.
New question.

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My question is for the Acting Premier. The Liberal government is desperately trying to justify their sell-off of Hydro One to Ontarians. They want us all to believe that they had no choice but to privatize our hydro. The truth is, they had better and smarter choices, like asking our biggest corporations to pay just a little bit more to help tackle the cost of congestion by investing in transit and roads. But they refused to make a better decision for Ontario.

When will the Liberals admit that they prefer privatization over every single smart and progressive option to fund the infrastructure that we need?

1050

Hon. Charles Sousa: I read intently the nine-page platform put forward by the NDP during their election.

Interjection: Nine pages?

Hon. Charles Sousa: Nine pages. It was very thorough. Of course, they assumed every fiscal assumption that we put in our budget and in our platform. I recall when she said this on Newstalk 1010: “There’s no doubt we did talk in our platform about looking at some of the ... assets that the province owns,” and looking also at ways to provide the funding necessary to support infrastructure and investments in our province. That’s what we said we would do. That’s what we’re doing.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: The Premier’s sell-off of our most important public asset would only provide the equivalent of \$400 million per year. The Golden report shows that a 1% increase in corporate taxes will yield \$700 million per year. More than 80% of Ontarians oppose the sell-off of Hydro One—

Interjection.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: —but a significant majority of Ontarians are in favour of modest corporate tax increases.

This Premier and this finance minister think they know better than Ontarians. When will the Liberals admit that they are rejecting better choices in favour of privatization?

Hon. Charles Sousa: The member opposite obviously doesn’t wish to broaden the ownership of our assets to reinvest in other assets to provide greater prosperity and economic stimulus. I get that. She doesn’t want investment in infrastructure and she wants to raise taxes to our businesses, which are struggling to rebound as well.

Part of our platform is to invest in our skills and training, invest in infrastructure over the next 10 years to bring Ontario to a place where it can be more competitive and also be very competitive for our businesses so that they can attract greater investment. That is why we have become the top destination in all of North America for

foreign direct investment. It is why businesses in Ontario are surpassing businesses elsewhere in North America by investing in the things that matter, that create real jobs, jobs that are sustainable, jobs that will help families support their families and their children.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: There’s no need for the province of Ontario to have a corporate tax rate lower than that of Alabama—no need. The Premier and the Liberals have simply run out of excuses. They have no way to defend the sale of Hydro One and maintain any credibility whatsoever.

The fact is that they had a choice. The Premier had a choice. This finance minister had a choice. They could have chosen to ask the most profitable corporations to pay just a little bit more to build the transit and infrastructure that we so desperately need. But instead, they deliberately chose to hand Hydro One to their powerful friends on Bay Street.

When will the Liberals finally admit that they chose privatization over every other option available and that Ontarians will pay the price for this bad choice for generations to come?

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is warned.

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Charles Sousa: Yes, indeed, there are choices to be made—some difficult choices. But by far the most important choice of all is the creation of more jobs. More than 100,000 new jobs were created last year because of our supports to businesses.

The member opposite talks about supporting those most in need. What we put in this plan was also an increase to the minimum wage, which—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Kitchener–Waterloo is warned.

Hon. Charles Sousa: —has an effect on business. She voted against that. She’s voting against trying to create more support for business, voting against those who are looking for better wages, and supporting those who want to invest in our economy. That’s what we support. That’s what’s going to create a much greater, stronger economy for Ontario and ultimately for Canada as well.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENT

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My next question is also for the Acting Premier. The Trans-Pacific Partnership makes it much easier for foreign producers to import vehicles and parts, while reducing incentives for companies like Toyota and Honda to make products here in Canada. The TPP could kill a quarter of Canada’s existing—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Transportation is warned.

Ms. Andrea Horwath: —auto manufacturing jobs. That's nearly 25,000 Ontario families that will be affected. But aside from "figuring out where there needs to be compensatory action," the Premier is happy to let this deal plow ahead.

Will this Liberal government stand up for Ontario's automotive sector and the good-paying jobs that it actually provides and refuse to endorse this deal until it is fixed?

Hon. Charles Sousa: This is the only government that stood up for auto. This is the government that was there when auto needed us most. We stood there alongside, the only subnational jurisdiction in the world to support the auto industry.

I appreciate the members opposite for asking the Mulcair question; right? They don't even know what's in the deal. We want to make certain that we review it, assess it and ensure that we protect the interests of Ontarians

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: The Premier of this province has taken every opportunity to pick fights with Stephen Harper. But suddenly, she's willing to go along with a massive secret trade deal that he has cooked up behind closed doors so that she can march in lockstep with her federal leader. The Sierra Club says that, if passed, the TPP would "undermine decades of environmental progress and threaten our climate."

Why do Liberals and the Premier suddenly trust Stephen Harper's leadership on trade when the TPP could undermine efforts to address climate change here in Ontario and across Canada?

Hon. Charles Sousa: We want to seize opportunities, the greatest amount of opportunities that exist in the province of Ontario, with trade around the world. I think we all recognize how important that is for ourselves to be able to take advantage of the markets elsewhere. We certainly can't rely on our market alone.

Now, the member opposite may want to stick her head in the sand and put walls around the country and avoid looking over the pond, but we must look at what's happening elsewhere. We also must recognize that the United States—and she may want to hide behind the United States—is making a tremendous amount of negotiations that will proceed with or without Ontario and without Canada. We must protect Ontarians, protect our dairy, protect our auto, and we will do so—

Mr. John Yakubuski: Just say you're endorsing Stephen Harper.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Renfrew is warned.

Hon. Charles Sousa: —after we review and assess the details as they move forward. We're not going to make decisions when neither the NDP nor anybody else in this Legislature knows the full extent of what has happened.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Well, it's kind of odd not knowing the full extent of what's in that deal and the Premier blindly supporting it in order to support her federal leader. Ontario has already lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs to low-wage jurisdictions like Mexico and the southern US, and now, with the TPP, there will be even more downward pressure on middle-class incomes.

The former US Secretary of Labor called the TPP "a Trojan Horse in a global race to the bottom." No one is denying the need for trade, but this secret Conservative plan is badly flawed. The livelihoods of middle-class Ontarians, which we should be protecting, are at stake.

Will the Liberals and the Premier blindly join Harper's race to the bottom or will they stand up for good-paying jobs for Ontario families?

Hon. Charles Sousa: Who is blind is the member of the third party and Mr. Mulcair, because they don't know the details of the TPP. None of us do. So they're asking us now to make a decision, being blinded. We don't want to be blind. We want to make certain we understand what's in it and then make the appropriate decision.

WINTER HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

Mr. Michael Harris: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Speaker, this minister likes to say that motorist safety is one of his top priorities. Yet, one year after we saw the QEW transform into a treacherous, unplowed ice rink, he has still yet to actually deal with the situation. In fact, while the minister boasts of \$500,000 in fines for the November nightmare, those fines are still under negotiation a year later.

Now the minister spins and spins, rewarding contractors with new equipment that government failed to ensure was on hand when they awarded the substandard contracts in the first place. In the meantime, the cost-cutting winter maintenance contracts government introduced in 2009 continue to place lives at risk.

Will the minister tell us why it has taken an entire year to deal with this situation?

Hon. Steven Del Duca: I appreciate the question coming from the member opposite. That member would know, as I've said repeatedly in this House, he is 100% right. In fact, ensuring that Ontario's roads and highways remain as safe as they have been for the last 13 years is one of my top priorities. In fact, as was noted in the auditor's report earlier this year, Ontario's roads and highways have been ranked first or second across all North American jurisdictions over those last 13 years.

1100

That doesn't mean we rest on our laurels. Of course, the auditor did have eight recommendations with respect to the winter maintenance program, and we've accepted all eight of those recommendations. We have a plan to go forward for the upcoming winter season, which is what I'm focused on, to make sure that we provide an outcome for the people of Ontario that they expect and that they deserve.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Michael Harris: Speaker, back to the minister: One year later, as the minister ignored substandard winter maintenance contracts that led to tragic fatalities, he continues to spin fine announcements that aren't even worth the paper that they're written on. No amount of fines can make up for the tragic toll this government's compromised contracting has taken.

But yesterday, the minister didn't even know if the contractor would actually be paying the penalties he's levied. It seems, when the government watered down contract standards in 2009 to save a few bucks, they included a bizarre dispute process that renders the fine system virtually useless. In fact, according to the auditor, that process led to 80% of the fines levied in 2013 not even being collected.

Will the minister tell us today the amount of fines levied last winter and how much did he actually collect?

Hon. Steven Del Duca: As I've said on many occasions, any time there is a fatality or an injury on Ontario's highways, my heart goes out to the friends and family of those affected.

This member opposite will know that over the course of the last number of months, the ministry has worked very hard to come forward with a plan that will provide that outcome that I referenced in answer to the first question, including, for the upcoming winter season and for future winter seasons, a strongly improved Ontario 511 website. We're launching a new program known as Track My Plow as pilots, both in the Owen Sound and Simcoe areas, with plans for further expansion. We're increasing the use of anti-icing liquids before winter storms. We're adding more equipment in key—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): In case the members didn't catch on, interjections will get you a warning.

Hon. Steven Del Duca: Thank you, Speaker. We continue to work with contractors to ensure that they have both reliable equipment and trained operators.

My responsibility as the minister is to make sure that our highways remain safe, and I'm focused on this coming winter season and those to come in the future.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Wayne Gates: My question today is to the Acting Premier. This week, it was announced that the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement was signed. The agreement is going to be bad for rural communities, bad for manufacturing, bad for our health care costs and very bad for the auto sector. It's good to see at least one federal leader is standing up and opposing the deal, and hopefully your party will have the courage—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Please put the question.

Mr. Wayne Gates: Thank you. Acting Premier, with this deal looming on the horizon, what is this government going to do to protect good jobs in manufacturing and the

auto sector that so many people in Niagara, Oshawa, the GTA, Brampton and Windsor rely on?

Hon. Charles Sousa: What is courageous is for people to make a decision with information in hand. What is discouraging is when people, for political reasons, are making decisions without information. What we don't want to do is put Ontario at risk.

We have concerns. We've made that very clear when it comes to dairy farmers, especially when it comes to auto. We recognize that we must take mitigation and steps to ensure a sustainable industry in our province. We will continue to fight for Ontario, as we did when the auto industry required us. We were there. We'll continue to be there. We must do everything possible to support our workers and support our economy.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Wayne Gates: The Acting Premier can talk all he wants about an auto strategy and about helping manufacturers, but actions speak louder than words, and we haven't seen that action.

The government won't accept the job creator's tax credit we put forward, and your reckless privatization of Hydro One is only going to add more pressure on these companies and the jobs they provide.

Jerry Dias, the president of Unifor, who I believe would know what's most important, has said that more than 20,000 Canadians will lose their jobs because of this. Niagara, Oshawa and Windsor are going to be some of the hardest-hit communities.

What will this government do to help people from manufacturing plants in Niagara and right across the province get back to work after this trade agreement is done?

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Beaches–East York is warned.

Hon. Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, the province of Ontario—the only subnational government in the world—participated in a support for the auto sector. We have provided economic development funds to attract greater investments in the auto sector in the province of Ontario. We put forward in a budget \$2.5 billion in a Jobs and Prosperity Fund to support business investment, especially in the auto industry. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? That party turned its back on the province of Ontario and voted against those very measures to support the auto industry. And now they have the audacity to suggest that they should make a blind decision without review? That, sir, is what is inappropriate.

NORTHERN HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Mr. Glenn Thibeault: My question this morning is for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. Our government's 2015 budget is one that I am particularly proud of. We are delivering on our commitment to follow the path to balance. In the 2014 budget, we introduced the province's economic plan, and now, in the

2015 budget, we have demonstrated the significant progress that has been made on our plan to date.

Job creation and economic development is a key part of our plan for building Ontario up. Just last week, I was proud to announce \$69 million in funding for highways in northeastern Ontario, including rehabilitation on Highway 69 and expansion of Highway 17.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, can the minister please explain how we are investing in northern infrastructure?

Hon. Michael Gravelle: I thank the member for Sudbury, one of the strongest advocates for infrastructure work, all across the province, but certainly in northern Ontario.

As referenced, in our 2015 budget, our government made the largest investment commitment in infrastructure in the province's history: \$130 billion over 10 years. In 2015, our planned investments of \$11.9 billion are driving extraordinarily important infrastructure projects, including continuing very important highway work in northern Ontario. Through the northern highways program, which comes to our ministry, we are committing over \$560 million this year: \$387 million for rehabilitation and \$173 million for expansion projects. That, of course, maintains our very strong commitment and priority on four-laning major highway corridors in northern Ontario, including Highway 11/17 between Thunder Bay and Nipigon, which we will complete, and also Highway 69 between Parry Sound and Sudbury. They're very important projects.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Glenn Thibeault: I would like to thank the Minister of Northern Development and Mines for that answer.

We believe that when we are investing, we are building, and when we are building, we are growing. Our government is supporting a dynamic and innovative business climate across the province, Mr. Speaker, while the federal government is certainly not investing to the extent that Ontarians expect and need, particularly in small, rural and northern communities.

Just last month, I was proud to join the minister in announcing that nine kilometres of four-laning of Highway 69 is now in service between Highway 64 and the Murdock River. Since 2003, the province has invested more than \$770 million to expand and improve a total of 59 kilometres of Highway 69. This ambitious highway expansion is vital to promote future economic growth in northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister please explain some of the progress we have made this summer in northern Ontario?

Hon. Michael Gravelle: Thanks again to the member for Sudbury. Certainly, it is about economic development and how important these projects are, but it's also about safety. We understand, as northerners, how important it is to have a safe driving experience, and these improved roads mean exactly that.

One of the great stories over the last 10 years is the amount of investment we've actually put through the northern highways program into northern highways, which is more than \$5 billion over the last 10 years. It references projects such as the one the member has referenced, as well as many others we've been very happy to make.

When you look at the Thunder Bay to Nipigon story, a project that really started in 2010, hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in that four-laning project, which will indeed be an economic boon to the area, and will also very much improve driver safety. In terms of that project, more than half of that particular stretch between Thunder Bay and Nipigon is now absolutely complete or it's under way, and we're going to make sure we drive through to the end, so—

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

1110

STUDENT SAFETY

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: My question is to the Minister of Education. For the past 48 hours, my inbox and the phone calls to my office have been very much focused on the lack of security systems in place at the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board elementary schools. More than anything, though, I'm concerned about the children, not only their safety but how they're reacting to this. In fact, my own 10-year-old daughter this morning told me she was having lockdown practice today in a school that no longer locks. This is ongoing not only in Ottawa but, as you know, also in Halton.

When the former Liberal leader—and when you were a parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education, you increased the school safety supports in 2012 in the wake of the Sandy Hook shooting. It was also during labour strife, but it had widespread support. Now, three years later, student safety has been reduced to a bargaining chip.

I want to know, are you going to fix this before Thanksgiving weekend?

Hon. Liz Sandals: Speaker, we obviously share their concern about the safety of the children in the schools. Certainly we agree that it has been a big concern for parents to make sure that their children are safe in their schools.

I did call on the president of OSSTF to rethink that part of the strike action that they are taking, with respect to the monitoring of the buzzers and the screens and making sure that we have safe access to schools and safe entry to schools. We are absolutely working on that.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: Minister, that's not enough. Yesterday, in a neighbouring community to mine, in Kemptville, where the member for Leeds-Grenville is the MPP, there was a man wielding a knife outside of three schools, which went into lockdown. Their school board isn't

affected; the kids that I represent are. They're expecting more from our government.

These kids in elementary schools in eastern Ontario and the rest of Ontario have been going through labour strife since 2012 with Bill 115. This is ongoing for three years, and now they are fearing for their basic safety in the nation's capital.

I am asking the government to take this seriously. I would ask the government to ensure that before the kids in my constituency and elsewhere in this province go back to school tomorrow and for the Thanksgiving weekend, you resolve this issue.

I do understand that you've called upon the president of OSSTF. I actually went one step further and had the conversation and asked directly. You need to do the same. Will you do it?

Interjections.

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

Minister.

Hon. Liz Sandals: We have certainly been in touch with the directors each day in terms of how they are handling this situation, what protocols they have put in place, and obviously, the directors are reporting back to us on the steps that they are taking to secure the schools.

But I must challenge some of what the member opposite is saying. What she has reported accurately during her questions is (1) that lockdown drills are continuing, as they always do at this time of the school year, and (2) that when there was an actual threat to safety, the lockdown procedures were immediately implemented by the schools in question to ensure the safety of the children. So I think she needs to actually listen to her own question that when there is an imminent threat, that threat is dealt with—

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

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: We should just scare children? That's what we should do? Just frighten them; that's what they're doing. But you don't have a kid in school, so you wouldn't know.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Excuse me. Order. The member for Nepean–Carleton is named.

Ms. MacLeod was escorted from the chamber.

Mr. Todd Smith: Wow, that's pretty sad. Double standard, Speaker; come on. That's pretty sad.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member is seeking himself to be removed?

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Education is warned.

New question.

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

Ms. Peggy Sattler: My question is to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. When it comes to post-secondary education, this government has no problem allowing tuition fees to skyrocket, no problem with

poverty wages for teaching assistants and no problem replacing full-time jobs with contract staff, but it is not willing to hold the line on executive compensation.

Earlier, I raised the issue of the million-dollar salary legally paid to the president of Western University. Now we are learning about a 50% salary increase for a University of Ottawa VP over the two years since the public-sector wage freeze took effect. Allan Rock, the university president and former Liberal cabinet minister, is defending the increase, saying that it is compliant with provincial law.

Why is this government refusing to take real action to rein in the salaries of senior university administrators?

Hon. Reza Moridi: I want to thank the member opposite for the question. I understand why people are frustrated. Ontarians deserve to know why executives are paid and what they are paid. That's why we brought in the Broader Public Sector Accountability Act. Based on that act, we are going to put caps on the salaries; we're also going to prohibit pay in lieu of leave.

I recently wrote a letter to the chair of the board of governors and executive heads of all universities and colleges across the province of Ontario letting them know that we will be collecting information about the salaries, health benefits and other benefits which executives receive from the institutions.

We are going to look at the work that people in other jurisdictions do, as well as putting a cap on the salaries of executives. We are not going to do this on an individual basis; we are going to take a very close look at what's happening in other jurisdictions and make sure that—

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

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Ontario university students pay the highest tuition fees in Canada; they have seen tuition more than triple over the past 20 years. Post-secondary students are among the fastest-growing group of food bank users—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Member from Trinity–Spadina is warned.

Ms. Peggy Sattler:—while student tuition dollars are being used to subsidize out-of-control executive salaries. The government talks about compensation frameworks, but what we need are hard caps that work.

When will the minister close the loopholes, remove the wiggle room and finally put a hard cap on salaries for senior university administrators?

Hon. Reza Moridi: Again, I want to thank the member opposite for that question. As I said, Ontarians deserve to know why executives are paid and how much they are paid. We are aware of the situation at the University of Ottawa. I've been in touch with the university. It's not uncommon for the university administrators, those who are working in research and education, to get raises in their respective work, and we are actually encouraging the administration to continue their academic activities as well.

With regard to student tuition fees, Ontario is one of the lowest in the country when it comes to student tuition fees. The student debt has been decreased for over a number years. Some 70% of the fees which students pay are grants—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Answer.

Hon. Reza Moridi: —non-payable grants.

We are so proud of our academic institutions. Two of our university professors won the Nobel prize yesterday and—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Thank you. I will remind the minister, when I stand, you sit.

New question.

CONDOMINIUM LEGISLATION

Mr. Han Dong: My question is to the Minister of Government and Consumer Services. In the past weeks, members of this Legislative Assembly have debated the proposed Bill 106, the Protecting Condominium Owners Act. They have brought forward important priorities from their constituents like transparent board governance, accountable use of fees, extensive warranty coverage, professionally certified management and timely, cost-effective, dispute resolution.

Right now, 1.3 million Ontarians live in condos. In my riding, vibrant communities such as CityPlace, Fort York and Liberty Village are home to many young professionals and condo owners. As the existing Condominium Act has not been updated for nearly 20 years, it is these communities that need these changes the most. This proposed legislation has the potential to modernize condo law in these areas and provide condo owners with the protection they need.

Minister, could you please inform this House why it is so important for us to pass this bill?

1120

Hon. David Oraziotti: First of all, I want to thank the member from Trinity–Spadina for his question and for his tireless advocacy on behalf of the thousands of condo owners in his riding.

Our government understands the need for condominium owners to have important protections. Our party was the only one that spoke to this issue during the last election campaign. The proposed legislation reflects 18 months of consultations directed toward ensuring that this proposal meets the new standards that we're aiming to put in place.

In the 18-month consultation period, we received over 2,200 submissions from residents, developers, property managers, agents and other members of the public, as well as advocacy associations to protect condo owners. We reiterated this commitment to modernizing the Condominium Act in our 2015 budget by introducing Bill 106 last spring. The bill was significantly influenced by condo owner organizations, and I hope that all members will support this legislation.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Han Dong: I would like to thank the minister for this informative response, and his ministry for its hard work on this very important issue.

I personally know that it is a crucial issue in Trinity–Spadina. Downtown living is at a premium, and it is important that we protect the rights and investments of our condo owners.

One of the benefits of this proposed legislation is that it will enable the creation of two new delegated administrative authorities. One will license condo managers and the other will provide a modern, cost-effective dispute resolution system. These are both very important functions for condominium owners. For them to best meet the needs of Ontarians, it is important that these organizations are accountable.

Speaker, through you to the minister: Can the minister explain what mechanisms have been proposed in this legislation to ensure that these DAAs are subject to proper oversight?

Hon. David Oraziotti: Again to the member from Trinity–Spadina: The creation of two new delegated administrative authorities will be critical to adding accountability to the sector. As the member stated, these organizations will have added accountability and oversight. That's why, for the first time, the proposed authorities will be subject to salary disclosure, accountability agreements and Auditor General oversight. As organizations outside government, we're also taking steps to make them compliant with a process similar to FIPPA inside government.

Speaker, the administrative authority's model has a foundation of providing consumer protection in Ontario for over 15 years, and its continued use was a key recommendation put forth in the 2013 Drummond report.

We'll continue to work to ensure that these proposed administrative authorities and other authorities are overseen by our ministry and meet the high standard of consumer protection that this government is setting in Ontario.

I look forward to seeing this bill hopefully move to committee, and I want to thank the member for his efforts.

WATER EXTRACTION

Mr. Ted Arnott: My question is for the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change. Will the minister explain the process that the ministry uses to consider applications for permits to take water on a large scale? What assurances can he offer this House that the process adequately ensures the long-term protection of the quality and quantity of the groundwater in adjacent areas?

Hon. Glen R. Murray: First of all, I do want to recognize the member for Wellington–Halton Hills because we've been working very closely together on some matters that are not just particular to his constituents and some municipalities but concerns across that. I do say that he has taken such a very non-partisan and statesman-like role in this, and I greatly respect the honourable member.

As the member knows and I think members in this House know, we have some constitutional differences in Canada. In western Canada, provinces own the water, which allows them to manage and control and price water, unlike Ontario and the eastern provinces, where the water is held and lent by people on the land, which means that protecting municipal water supplies is much more complex here. Our water-permitting process works on the volume of water being extracted, which provides some protection but not sufficient. That's the limitation we're working on and trying to find better solutions to.

In the supplementary, I'll continue the conversation with the honourable member.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Ted Arnott: Mr. Speaker, Nestlé Waters, a water-bottling company, says it's considering the purchase of a property in the township of Centre Wellington, with a plan to draw large quantities of water as a backup to its existing wells near Aberfoyle and Hillsburgh. The township council and local residents have expressed interest and concern, and township representatives and I met with the minister last week to discuss the relevant issues.

Will the minister assure my constituents that any permit to take water applications by Nestlé Waters will be subject to a thorough scientific, hydrogeological review, with an open process for public comment by interested residents, taking into account the planned population growth in Centre Wellington because of the government's Places to Grow policy, recognizing the water needs of agriculture, and guaranteeing the protection and preservation of the quality and quantity of groundwater in our communities for present and future generations?

Hon. Glen R. Murray: We share, I know, with the honourable member some serious concerns, particularly in Aberfoyle, where we have 27 monitored wells. When water tables have dropped, when the water levels have dropped, we've actually had to shut some of them down. So we're being particularly mindful about the Nestlé situation, as to what it would mean to the protection of local water supply. I want to thank the member opposite.

I also want to thank the Minister of Education, the member for Guelph, who keeps me abreast of these as well as you do.

We have been meeting, and we met together with the honourable member and municipal leaders, and I think we've crafted a reasonable plan going forward, which I know the member has been supportive of, and I will be accountable to him and to the community to ensure that that is fully realized. We want to protect jobs in the community, but not at the expense of our environment, and in this case, with the honourable member's leadership and the co-operation and support of, I also want to recognize, the member for Guelph, I think we're going to do this and get an economic win and an environmental win, which I think is the desire of the honourable member.

PENSION PLANS

Mr. Paul Miller: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Premier. Today, the court overseeing the creditor

protection process is expected to grant US Steel its demand—and it is a demand—to stop paying post-employment benefits to 20,000 pensioners and their families. That's health benefits, medical benefits, dental benefits and life insurance. These are not handouts. These are deferred wages, gone just like that, to line pocketbooks in Pittsburgh.

These pensioners gave 30 to 40 years to the Stelco plants, bought by US Steel on a promise that they would not do this. This work takes a toll on the people who undertake it. It's hard, hot work that breaks down your body. For many of these retirees, US Steel's callous cuts may be a death sentence.

US Steel is washing its hands of the thousands of pensioners whose health was ruined by these steel plants, and there's no safety net to protect them. What will this government do to hold US Steel accountable?

Hon. Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question. The member from Hamilton East—Stoney Creek has long advocated—and I give him credit for standing up for the people of Hamilton and those workers.

We have before us a number of motions being put before the courts that will put in jeopardy the livelihood and the going concern of US Steel Canada, which will affect over 12,000 retirees, 4,000 workers, and puts them at risk. We have been at the table, and we'll continue to do so, recognizing that more needs to be done to support them.

I know that it's before the courts; I know things are fluid and they're ongoing, but I've been disappointed in terms of what has happened thus far, and we will work hard to ensure we protect the interests of our retirees and our workers.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm glad you said that, Minister, because there are 150 steelworkers in this building, as we speak.

It's hard to believe, but it only gets worse. US Steel is also expected to succeed in their demand to no longer pay municipal taxes to the city of Hamilton. That's \$6 million a year to local coffers that goes to pay for schools, paved roads and other things. It's hard to think how this won't end up being a provincial problem, with a provincial price tag—and a large one.

Speaker, everything has been too little, too late, and the federal Conservative government has done absolutely nothing to help these people. They sold out. They knuckled under. They are a disgrace.

Will this government stand up for the pensioners, stand up to this corporation and hold US Steel accountable for what it's doing to my city of Hamilton and to the people of this province? We must do something now.

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Charles Sousa: Mr. Speaker, and to all those watching who are being affected, we wholeheartedly agree that things must be done to support them.

1130

But let me remind the NDP, it was they who actually passed legislation to suggest that they're too big to fail, when it comes to certain corporations. We eliminated that protection. We know that every company, every corporation, must be accountable to the people who work for them. We will do everything, working across time—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Order, please. My resolve has not changed.

Carry on.

Hon. Charles Sousa: We will do everything we can to stand with those who are affected: the retirees as well as the employees.

I'm disappointed by the lack of leadership from the federal level, which has hidden behind all of these initiatives. We will stand with them. We'll work together with the member from Stoney Creek, who has been doing an admirable job in fighting for his brothers and sisters. He is a member of the union as well. We recognize that that is important. We are there with you as well.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Ms. Harinder Malhi: My question is for the minister responsible for seniors' affairs. October 1 is recognized in Canada as National Seniors Day, and by the United Nations as the International Day of Older Persons.

This year, in celebration of National Seniors Day, I had the great pleasure of hosting the minister in my community to discuss and observe ways in which the Ontario government is helping Brampton seniors stay active and connected.

On this occasion, the Free For All Foundation from my riding of Brampton–Springdale launched their Seniors Steps program. This program strives to increase healthy outcomes and social involvement while decreasing isolation for hundreds of seniors in Brampton. This beneficial program is being made possible in my community because of funding through the Seniors Community Grant Program.

As we mark another National Seniors Day, can the minister provide us with an update of this grant and on how we are helping seniors remain engaged in their communities?

Hon. Mario Sergio: Thanks to the member for the question. I want to thank her for her very deep passion with respect to the seniors whom she represents in Brampton–Springdale.

I was very proud to start National Seniors Day at the opening of our province's new Humber River Hospital. It is North America's first fully digital hospital, and I know it will serve a vast number of seniors in Ontario.

Continuing with the celebration of National Seniors Day, I thoroughly enjoyed visiting the riding of Brampton–Springdale, the member's riding there, and I could see first-hand the impact that the seniors community grant is having on seniors' communities.

Speaker, I walked into the room, I joined the seniors there in Zumba exercises, and I had a lovely cooking class as well.

I have to say that in the last two years, we invested over \$3 million supporting 116,000 seniors across the province.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Harinder Malhi: Thank you, Minister, for the answer.

With over 75 seniors in Brampton on National Seniors Day, I experienced the tremendous success of Seniors Community Grant Program funding in action. I saw the energy the seniors displayed and how happy they were in sharing and enjoying activities with the minister and me, including a Zumba fitness demonstration, a discussion of seniors' safety and a healthy cooking class.

It is clear that as a government, we are aware that keeping seniors connected, active and engaged contributes to their overall health and well-being.

Last week, data released by Stats Canada confirmed that for the first time in our nation's history, there are now more Canadians over the age of 65 than there are children under the age of 14. These numbers highlight a trend seen around the world. Older adults, particularly those in Ontario, are living longer than before. Can the minister elaborate on how Ontario is addressing this change?

Hon. Mario Sergio: Again, thanks to the member. To help meet the challenges posed by an aging population, in 2010 we launched Ontario's Action Plan for Seniors. National Seniors Day is a time to honour seniors for their lifetime of contribution, but also it's to reflect on how we can ensure they remain healthy, safe and supported.

In 2015, the Global AgeWatch Index named Canada the fifth best place in the world to age in. Our goal is to do even better and to make Ontario the best place to grow old, indeed. And we have started. Ontario is the first province to introduce strategies to combat elder abuse, the first province to introduce a grant designed specifically to combat social isolation and it's the first province to introduce mandatory sprinklers in retirement homes.

We always think of our seniors first.

BY-ELECTION IN SUDBURY

Mr. Steve Clark: My question is to the Acting Premier. When questioned about the corruption scandal coming from the Premier's corner office, the Premier's new habit seems to be passing the buck to the government House leader. It appears the Premier has given him new talking points and tells him to answer every question by either citing a Supreme Court convention or a parliamentary convention that he can't comment on the case before the courts.

If it was so important for the government to follow this convention, why did the Premier hold a press conference to proclaim Pat Sorbara's innocence in February?

Interjections.

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

Deputy Premier?

Hon. Charles Sousa: The House leader.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I know the member from Leeds–Grenville is really disappointed that he has to hear the answer again, where I'm going to remind him yet again of the Supreme Court constitutional convention, which he acknowledged for the first time—and I thank him for acknowledging that convention, which is important. It's not a joking matter that when a matter is before the courts, it is advised constitutionally that we, as members, don't intervene in those proceedings. The standing orders speak to it as well.

I would just encourage the members opposite again that we should refrain from engaging in conversation about an issue that is before a court, before a judge. As they teach us in law school, the judge is the trier of fact, the members of the Legislature are not. I will leave the matter to the judge.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Steve Clark: Once again, my question is back to the Acting Premier. The government House leader's exact words were "there is a constitutional convention" and "even the Supreme Court has indicated" that "it should not be discussed within Parliament." Yet, the Premier stood in this House and said she didn't expect charges against Pat Sorbara. She answered over 100 questions on the topic. I don't understand why the Premier is now avoiding answering an easy question about testifying in the trial.

Why won't the Premier tell us if she will testify? Why is she hiding behind this convention?

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Again, I just want to remind the member opposite—and I think he acknowledged the fact that the Premier has been very transparent in this House. The Premier has now answered over 110 questions from members opposite on this particular issue and she has done so in a manner that is respectful of the independent investigative function that exists in our province and within our constitutional scope of things, and in a way that has been open and clear and transparent and truthful to the people of Ontario as well.

I just ask the member opposite to respect those important conventions that have been cited by the Supreme Court. I refer back to him his own advice that he gave us back in February of this year, that we should not interfere in any ongoing investigation—

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

DEFERRED VOTES

GREAT LAKES PROTECTION ACT, 2015

LOI DE 2015 SUR LA PROTECTION DES GRANDS LACS

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

Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence River Basin / Projet de loi 66, 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 1138 to 1143.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): On Tuesday, October 6, 2015, Mr. Murray moved third reading of Bill 66. All those in favour, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gates, Wayne	Moridi, Reza
Anderson, Granville	Gélinas, France	Murray, Glen R.
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gravelle, Michael	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Baker, Yvan	Gretzky, Lisa	Naqvi, Yasir
Balkissoon, Bas	Hatfield, Percy	Natyshak, Taras
Ballard, Chris	Hoggarth, Ann	Oraziotti, David
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Horwath, Andrea	Potts, Arthur
Bradley, James J.	Hoskins, Eric	Qadri, Shafiq
Chiarelli, Bob	Hunter, Mitzie	Rinaldi, Lou
Colle, Mike	Jaczek, Helena	Sandals, Liz
Crack, Grant	Kiwala, Sophie	Sattler, Peggy
Damerla, Dipika	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Del Duca, Steven	Lalonde, Marie-France	Singh, Jagmeet
Delaney, Bob	Leal, Jeff	Souza, Charles
Dhillon, Vic	MacCharles, Tracy	Tabuns, Peter
Dickson, Joe	Malhi, Harinder	Takhar, Harinder S.
DiNovo, Cheri	Mangat, Amrit	Taylor, Monique
Dong, Han	Mantha, Michael	Thibeault, Glenn
Fife, Catherine	Martins, Cristina	Vanthof, John
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Forster, Cindy	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Fraser, John	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David
French, Jennifer K.	Meilleur, Madeleine	

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

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Pettapiece, Randy
Bailey, Robert	Jones, Sylvia	Scott, Laurie
Barrett, Toby	MacLaren, Jack	Smith, Todd
Clark, Steve	Martow, Gila	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	McDonnell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia	Yakabuski, John
Harris, Michael	Nicholls, Rick	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 68; the nays are 20.

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

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

Third reading agreed to.

PROTECTING CONDOMINIUM OWNERS ACT, 2015

LOI DE 2015 SUR LA PROTECTION DES PROPRIÉTAIRES DE CONDOMINIUMS

Deferred vote on the motion that the question now be put on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 106, An Act to amend the Condominium Act, 1998, to enact the Condominium Management Services Act, 2015 and to amend other Acts with respect to condominiums / *Projet de loi 106, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur les condominiums, édictant la Loi de 2015 sur les services de gestion de condominiums et modifiant d'autres lois en ce qui concerne les condominiums.*

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

The division bells rang from 1147 to 1148.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): On September 15, 2015, Mr. Orazietti moved second reading of Bill 106, An Act to amend the Condominium Act, 1998, to enact the Condominium Management Services Act, 2015 and to amend other Acts with respect to condominiums.

Mr. Colle has moved that the question be now put. All those in favour of Mr. Colle's motion, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Fraser, John	Meilleur, Madeleine
Anderson, Granville	Gravelle, Michael	Moridi, Reza
Baker, Yvan	Hoggarth, Ann	Murray, Glen R.
Balkissoon, Bas	Hoskins, Eric	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Ballard, Chris	Hunter, Mitzie	Naqvi, Yasir
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Jaczek, Helena	Orazietti, David
Bradley, James J.	Kiwala, Sophie	Potts, Arthur
Chiarelli, Bob	Kwinter, Monte	Qaadri, Shafiq
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Marie-France	Rinaldi, Lou
Crack, Grant	Leal, Jeff	Sandals, Liz
Damerla, Dipika	MacCharles, Tracy	Sergio, Mario
Del Duca, Steven	Malhi, Harinder	Sousa, Charles
Delaney, Bob	Mangat, Amrit	Takhar, Harinder S.
Dhillon, Vic	Martins, Cristina	Thibeault, Glenn
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Dong, Han	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David

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

Nays

Armstrong, Teresa J.	Hardeman, Ernie	Pettapiece, Randy
Arnott, Ted	Harris, Michael	Sattler, Peggy
Bailey, Robert	Hatfield, Percy	Scott, Laurie
Barrett, Toby	Horwath, Andrea	Singh, Jagmeet
Clark, Steve	Hudak, Tim	Smith, Todd
DiNovo, Cheri	Jones, Sylvia	Tabuns, Peter
Fedeli, Victor	MacLaren, Jack	Taylor, Monique
Fife, Catherine	Mantha, Michael	Thompson, Lisa M.
Forster, Cindy	Martow, Gila	Vanthof, John
French, Jennifer K.	McDonnell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Gates, Wayne	Munro, Julia	Yakabuski, John
Gélinas, France	Natyshak, Taras	
Gretzky, Lisa	Nicholls, Rick	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 51; the nays are 37.

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

Mr. Orazietti has moved second reading of Bill 106, An Act to amend the Condominium Act, 1998, to enact the Condominium Management Services Act, 2015 and to amend other Acts with respect to condominiums. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1151 to 1152.

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

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gravelle, Michael	Murray, Glen R.
Anderson, Granville	Gretzky, Lisa	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Hardeman, Ernie	Naqvi, Yasir
Arnott, Ted	Harris, Michael	Natyshak, Taras
Bailey, Robert	Hatfield, Percy	Nicholls, Rick
Baker, Yvan	Hoggarth, Ann	Orazietti, David
Balkissoon, Bas	Horwath, Andrea	Pettapiece, Randy
Ballard, Chris	Hoskins, Eric	Potts, Arthur
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Qaadri, Shafiq
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hunter, Mitzie	Rinaldi, Lou
Bradley, James J.	Jaczek, Helena	Sandals, Liz
Chiarelli, Bob	Jones, Sylvia	Sattler, Peggy
Clark, Steve	Kiwala, Sophie	Scott, Laurie
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Crack, Grant	Lalonde, Marie-France	Singh, Jagmeet
Damerla, Dipika	Leal, Jeff	Smith, Todd
Del Duca, Steven	MacCharles, Tracy	Sousa, Charles
Delaney, Bob	MacLaren, Jack	Tabuns, Peter
Dhillon, Vic	Malhi, Harinder	Takhar, Harinder S.
Dickson, Joe	Mangat, Amrit	Taylor, Monique
DiNovo, Cheri	Mantha, Michael	Thibeault, Glenn
Dong, Han	Martins, Cristina	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	Martow, Gila	Vanthof, John
Fife, Catherine	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McDonnell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Forster, Cindy	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Fraser, John	McMeekin, Ted	Yakabuski, John
French, Jennifer K.	Meilleur, Madeleine	Zimmer, David
Gates, Wayne	Moridi, Reza	
Gélinas, France	Munro, Julia	

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

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 88; the nays are 0.

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?

Hon. David Orazietti: I refer the bill to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): There are no further deferred votes. This House stands—

Interjection.

VISITOR

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I'm halfway through, so I will acknowledge the member for Beaches—East York on a point of order.

Mr. Arthur Potts: Thank you very much, Speaker, for that indulgence. I want to introduce a good friend of mine, Maria Saras-Voutsinas, who's in the House. She's mother of page Angelica.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on a point of order.

Mr. Grant Crack: Just a reminder: room 247-248, Glengarry–Prescott–Russell day. Mr. Hudak, come on over.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): There are no further deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m.

The House recessed from 1156 to 1500.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd just like to introduce my staff—my EA, Sinead Anderson, and my LA, Aashish Oberoi—who have been working very hard on my private member's bill. I wanted to welcome them to the House today.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I ask the members here, did you brush your teeth today? Did you take any prescription pills? Are you wearing a rayon shirt or blouse? You may ask, Speaker, what do these have in common? I can tell you that all of those products contain wood pulp.

Does your car have an airbag? If so, the detonator has wood fibre. Was there shredded cheese on your lunch? If so, the cellulose gum that stops it from sticking is wood pulp. Are there paper clips in your desk? Wood fibre stops those from rusting. Did you get flowers in a cellophane wrap or candy in a crinkly package? That's all wood pulp, cellulose from wood chips.

Tomorrow, members at the Standing Committee on Justice Policy will be asked to stand up for the forestry sector and for northern Ontario. There are amendments to Bill 52 to ensure the legislation isn't manipulated to the detriment of the north. The bill is meant to protect the voices of the people who are unable to protect themselves, not the multi-million dollar anti-forestry special-interest groups. I urge the government to support the amendments and stand up for the people of northern Ontario.

COMMUNITY LIVING ELGIN

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I'd like to talk about the ongoing concerns about layoff notices at Community Living Elgin in the London area. My colleague the member from Hamilton Mountain has written a letter to the Minister of Community and Social Services about the seriousness of these layoff notices and their impact on our region.

This government has already slashed programming and services for some of our province's most vulnerable people, and non-profits and transfer payment agencies like Community Living are left picking up the slack. To add further injury, they government has not supported

pay equity obligations with funding that allows these organizations to make ends meet.

The government has promised to reduce wait-lists for services like those offered by Community Living Elgin, and yet we are seeing unprecedented workforce cuts and more damage to an already precarious system. This says nothing of the ripple effect of the impact of the resultant job losses.

Southwestern Ontario is suffering from serious unemployment and continues, time and time again, to be the victim of this government's inability to manage the economy. The minister has said that she and her ministry are monitoring the situation at Community Living Elgin extremely closely. We'd be very interested to know what this extremely close monitoring has revealed.

The minister also stated, on September 17 in a response to a question, that the review would take a number of weeks. It has been nearly a month and I would like to know when we can expect to see the results of this review.

BOWMANVILLE APPLEFEST

Mr. Granville Anderson: Another great festival in downtown Bowmanville: Saturday, October 17, is historic downtown Bowmanville's Applefest. This is the 25th year for this incredibly popular event, and if you know Durham, you know the importance of apples to our local agricultural sector and economy.

For the day, four blocks in the downtown of Bowmanville will be closed to vehicular traffic to become an apple-related showcase. My plan is to get there early; there's always a lineup for fresh, hot apple fritters, but it's always worth the wait.

I know how hard our local apple producers have worked to ensure the best crop possible under some tough spring conditions this year.

I also know that historic downtown Bowmanville's BIA puts in a huge effort to ensure events like this go ahead and are a wonderful success. I would like to thank them for all they do in advance of this year's event, which I'm sure, as always, will be fantastic.

If you don't have plans for October 17, I would invite you to join us in Bowmanville. It's well worth the trip. I'll even share some of my fritters with you. Please come and join us on October 17.

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

Mrs. Julia Munro: Today I rise to speak about the province-wide opposition to the Premier's fire sale of Hydro One, and specifically to the overwhelming opposition in my own riding of York–Simcoe.

This summer, the Simcoe county council supported a resolution from the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus, which cautioned that "privatization, partial or whole, of electricity has led to higher rates and less control." In their resolution, they called on the provincial government to both stop the sale of any part of Hydro One and

maintain Hydro One as a wholly public asset for the benefit of all Ontarians, and as well, to respect the autonomy and local decision-making powers of local distribution companies by not forcing these companies into mergers or sales.

They argue that the government has no mandate to sell any part of Hydro One, and I agree. They are worried that Hydro One will no longer be subject to scrutiny by the Auditor General, the Ombudsman or the Integrity Commissioner. Further, they will no longer have to respond to freedom-of-information requests.

Voters know that this government is ignoring their voices on this matter, and are rallying to other levels of government in the hope of being heard.

This resolution must sound familiar to the Premier, as it was sent to her in a letter from the county of Simcoe on August 11. It may also sound familiar to the Minister of Energy and the Minister of Finance.

BEAR CONTROL

Mr. John Vanthof: On Wednesday evening, September 23, Mr. Sam Bryand was doing something we commonly do in northern Ontario. He was out bird hunting—partridge hunting—just outside of Latchford, something a lot of us do. But the hunter became the hunted when a fairly large black bear came out on the trail.

Sam did what we are told to do and tried to stand off the bear, but the bear wasn't in the mood to do what he was supposed to do. So Sam did what I think every person in this House would do. When the bear started coming, Sam ran, and I don't blame Sam a bit. Sam had a .22. He turned and shot the .22 in hopes of scaring the bear. And when Sam reached town, thankfully, the bear wasn't there.

That is not an isolated incident in northern Ontario. People have to deal with bears all the time. Although, according to the minister, we spend more educating people with Bear Wise than any other jurisdiction, no one in the MNR is actually protecting people from nuisance bears. It shouldn't be up to the municipalities. It shouldn't be up to the police, because they're not trained to protect against bears. It's up to the MNR. People shouldn't have to risk their lives doing the things they enjoy in northern Ontario.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Yvan Baker: We have world-class post-secondary institutions in Ontario. The choice a student makes about their program of study and the institution at which they will study is one of the most pivotal and important decisions a person will make in their life. It is one of the largest financial investments we make in our early lives, and the choice of post-secondary study shapes the path we follow in our careers. That is why it is so important that students are able to access the information they need to make an informed decision about their post-secondary studies.

After being elected, I met with student groups, businesses, colleges, universities and others. Some spoke about the struggles of choosing a post-secondary path. It is not an easy decision to make, and many students and their families sometimes struggle to find the information they need to make an informed decision.

Today I'll be introducing a private member's bill that tasks the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario with the creation of an online resource that would help students make more informed decisions as they decide on which university or college to attend and which program of study to pursue. The resource would do this by providing a more comprehensive picture for students about access, student experience and graduate outcomes for each program offered at each of Ontario's post-secondary institutions.

I'd like to thank the Canadian Federation of Students, the College Student Alliance, the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance and the Ontario Graduate Students' Alliance for their advice in the drafting of this bill and their subsequent endorsement.

This bill would, if passed, help students and families make more informed decisions, leading to more satisfied students and stronger outcomes. I humbly request my fellow members here in the Legislature for their support as it works its way through the House.

1510

CARP FARMERS' MARKET

Mr. Jack MacLaren: This year is the 25th anniversary of the Carp Farmers' Market. The Carp Farmers' Market was founded in 1990 by Hildegard Anderson. She was a farm girl from Saskatchewan who had a vision of a producer-based farmers' market in the village of Carp. She found a location, she found the people, she established a board of directors, she found vendors, and the Carp Farmers' Market began.

The main guiding principle that she insisted on was that all the vendors be producers of what they sold; in other words, a producer-based farmers market. That principle has been the guiding light and strength of the market to this day. The Carp Farmers' Market has flourished and today is the most successful producer-based farmers' market in Ontario.

Delicious foods and wonderful handmade products are available in Carp every Saturday. The number of vendors and customers continues to grow each year.

The Carp Farmers' Market celebrated their 25th anniversary on July 4 of this year. Hildegard Anderson died in a car crash in 1993, but her legacy lives on. She would be proud of the Carp Farmer's Market if she were here with us today.

COMMUNITY POLICING

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: On September 16, I had the opportunity to attend the Community Policing Dinner hosted by the Mississauga Chinese Business Association

in the great riding of Mississauga–Brampton South. The association advocates for community development through private business and support for local partners, such as Peel Regional Police.

At the dinner, the association paid tribute to the local police officer whose career best represents the qualities of community policing. This year, Constable Tom McKay, with Peel Regional Police, was chosen to receive their prestigious award for his community engagement and years of work in crime prevention. Constable McKay has an impressive resumé as a 30-year veteran of Peel Regional Police, an author, lecturer and leader in the field of crime prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Constable McKay for his commitment and also the Mississauga Chinese Business Association for building a safer, more dynamic and vibrant community.

THREADS OF LIFE

Ms. Ann Hoggarth: Imagine this: You're rushing around in the morning. You shout goodbye as your husband, son or daughter heads out the door to work. Sounds pretty normal. However, that loved one never makes it home or has a horrible accident that changes everyone's life forever. Although workplace deaths and accidents have been reduced considerably, one death is still too many.

Over the weekend, I had the honour of speaking at the Threads of Life event on behalf of the Minister of Labour. Threads of Life helps families of workplace tragedies along their journey of healing by providing unique family support programs and services.

Threads of Life is supported by a network of volunteers from across Canada who have been personally impacted by workplace tragedy. They assist families by providing a family support program which offers one-on-one peer support to family members and friends who have suffered from a tragedy such as this. They are matched with a volunteer family guide. They also have regional family forums and bring families together in a community of support to benefit from coping skills, active listening and healing.

Speaker, I want to commend Threads of Life for the amazing work they do for families impacted by these terrible workplace tragedies.

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

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris: I beg leave to present a report from the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills and move its adoption.

The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Tonia Grannum): Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr24, An Act to revive The Gage Research Institute.

Bill Pr25, An Act to revive Zara H.S.L.C.C Inc.

Bill Pr28, An Act to revive Bayview Farms and Enterprises Limited.

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

Report adopted.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

PATHWAYS TO POST-SECONDARY EXCELLENCE ACT (POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL REPORT), 2015

LOI DE 2015 SUR LES VOIES DE L'EXCELLENCE AU NIVEAU POSTSECONDAIRE (RAPPORT SUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT POSTSECONDAIRE)

Mr. Baker moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 127, An Act to amend the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario Act, 2005 to require the Council to collect and publish information in respect of certain educational institutions / Projet de loi 127, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2005 sur le Conseil ontarien de la qualité de l'enseignement supérieur pour exiger que le Conseil recueille et publie des renseignements concernant certains établissements d'enseignement.

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. Yvan Baker: This bill would create an online resource that expands on information available about post-secondary education by providing a more comprehensive picture about access, student experience and graduate outcomes at the program level. Using an online tool, students and families will find it easier to make informed choices about post-secondary education options.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT (MEETINGS OF SHAREHOLDERS AND EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION), 2015

LOI DE 2015 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES SOCIÉTÉS PAR ACTIONS (ASSEMBLÉES DES ACTIONNAIRES ET RÉTRIBUTION DES MEMBRES DE LA DIRECTION)

Mr. Takhar moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 128, An Act to amend the Business Corporations Act with respect to meetings of shareholders and the adoption of an executive compensation policy / Projet de loi 128, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les sociétés par actions en ce qui concerne les assemblées des actionnaires et l'adoption d'une politique relative à la rétribution des membres de la direction.

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. Harinder S. Takhar: Mr. Speaker, this bill makes various amendments to the Business Corporations Act with respect to meetings of shareholders and the election of directors. Shareholders are given the ability to choose the chair of every meeting of shareholders. In addition, directors can only be elected with a plurality of votes, despite anything in the articles or bylaws of the corporation.

MOTIONS

ESTIMATES

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Speaker, I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice with respect to the Standing Committee on Estimates.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The House leader is seeking unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice. Do we agree? Agreed.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I move that, notwithstanding standing order 60 and the order of the House dated September 14, 2015, the Standing Committee on Estimates shall consider the 2015-16 estimates of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care before the 2015-16 estimates of the Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure and the Ministry of Research and Innovation.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The government House leader moves that, notwithstanding standing order 60 and the order of the House—

Interjection: Dispense.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Dispense? Dispense.

Agreed? Carried.

Motion agreed to.

1520

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice. Do we agree? Agreed.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I move that, notwithstanding standing order 98(g), notice for ballot item 74 and 77 be waived.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Do we agree? Carried.

Motion agreed to.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL RUN

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Mr. Speaker, before I present my statement, I was hoping I can get unanimous consent from the members so that I can wear my Run to Remember T-shirt that I'll be speaking about.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Did you wash it?

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I did.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): There's two that I'll let slide for sure because they were good.

The government House leader seeks unanimous consent to wear the T-shirt that he ran all that time in. Do we agree? Agreed.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Thank you, Speaker. I can assure the members that this T-shirt has been washed a couple of times since I wore it for three days.

Speaker, it's my honour to speak in recognition of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Run, which took place from September 24 to September 26. Each year for the past 11 years, runners have set off from the police memorial at Queen's Park to embark on the 460-kilometre, three-day relay run to Parliament Hill in Ottawa.

This relay run was created to raise awareness of the annual Canadian Police and Peace Officers' Memorial Service in honour of fallen peace officers, held in Ottawa on the last Sunday of September. The run also helps raise funds to help support surviving spouses and children of those fallen officers.

I was proud to join our Premier, the leaders of the opposition, Canadian icon Don Cherry and almost 300 runners to help kick off this year's run. Runners included representatives of police services from across Ontario; members of the Canadian Military Police; the Ontario Provincial Police; the RCMP; the Canadian Border Services Agency; Ontario correctional services; and Survivors of Law Enforcement, also known as SOLE, who are the spouses and loved ones of fallen officers. SOLE was an inspiration to the runners throughout the run, and their spirit and strength helped make every mile seem shorter.

I was honoured to run alongside almost 300 runners, Ontario's finest police and peace officers. I was part of an 11-member Ottawa police team. I would like to thank them for their participation, their camaraderie and for welcoming me within their ranks over the three days. It was truly an honour to run with them.

I want to give a special thanks to the members of the Ottawa police team: Acting Staff Sergeant Alison Cookson, Constable Cindy Cybulski, Clint Eastop, Constable Danielle Gammon, Constable Lisa Grison, Constable Lisa King, Constable Peter Koch, Constable Amanda Larche, Sergeant Debbie Palmer, Constable Cathy Wood and Renee Viel.

I also want to acknowledge the team members from Ontario correctional services for participating in the run. I want to thank Paul Chmurzynski, Scott Willey, Dana Falconi, Derek Huisman, Stephen Laidlaw, Joe D'Andrea, Tijana Lakovic, Aleasha Shorts, Carol Povse, Raj Toor, Kimberley Ridgers, Scott Jones, Larry Shorts, Andrew Boden, Derek Morgan, Martin O'Grady, Zdenka Mijatovic, Suzanne Gadoury, Matthew Berti, Rose Beauchamp, Sherry Loiselle, Lisa O'Brien, Jesse Barrette, Kellie Walker and Kristy Baynton. Not to mention, Speaker, huge gratitude to the 25 OPP officers from detachments across the province, along with uniformed and civilian members of police services from all corners of Ontario.

Speaker, this run was started in 2005 by a Peel Regional Police running team called the Pacers. Twenty-four runners took part in the inaugural run. This run reminds us of the important job that police, correctional services personnel, and all peace officers do every day to help keep our communities safe. It acknowledges the sacrifices they make on our behalf. It is our assurance to their surviving family members, their former colleagues and to all peace officers that we will never forget their service as they undertake this dangerous yet noble task.

The run has generated more than \$215,000 in contributions to the Ontario and Canadian police memorials to date.

Over the course of the run, I was honoured to have the opportunity to speak at the Chris Garrett Park in Cobourg, where a memorial pays tribute to one of Cobourg's finest, killed in the line of duty. We also had the opportunity to stop in Brockville to pay respect to RCMP Constable Douglas Scott, whose funeral I attended in late 2007. It was a great pleasure also to see the member from Leeds–Grenville, and the former member from Leeds–Grenville, now Senator Runciman, also attend the ceremony.

The run took us across some of the most beautiful and picturesque vistas in Ontario and, indeed, anywhere in Canada. Imagine leaving Brockville early in the morning, running along the St. Lawrence River. As we get close to the nine-kilometre mark, the only thing you hear, besides the footsteps of runners running along the road, is a bagpipe in the distance—yes, Speaker, a bagpipe in the distance early in the morning as you're running. As you get close to the nine-kilometre mark, you see Mr. Stewart Nimmo who, year after year, has been playing the bagpipes to welcome the runners and pay homage to those who are fallen. A big gratitude to Mr. Nimmo for participating in the run in a very special way every year.

Hundreds of Ontarians come to wish us well along the route and to show their shared commitment to honour the

memory of our fallen peace officers. A special thanks to many of the ministry's staff and their friends who joined the runners for part of the route to show their support.

None of this would be possible without the hard work and dedication of the organizers. From Peel Regional Police comes the core organizing team made up of Staff Superintendent Randy Patrick, who is the founder of the run and chair of the committee; Inspector Brian Smithson; Inspector Magdi Younan; Sergeant Matt Small; and detective Rob Hackenbrook. All these individuals are instrumental, not only in organizing the run but throughout the run, in making sure that everything runs smoothly and we pay due respect to our fallen police and peace officers.

In addition, teams of organizers in Toronto and Ottawa worked on the logistics of the kickoff and closing ceremonies. In Toronto, a special thanks to Detective Jon Ling and Sergeant Darren Laing. In Ottawa, huge gratitude to Staff Sergeant Gina Rosa and Acting Staff Sergeant Alison Cookson.

I also want to salute Erin Ochakovsky, the president of Survivors of Law Enforcement, also known as SOLE, herself the widow of a fallen police officer, and all the members of the organization of SOLE, including all the surviving family members of fallen police officers, for their tireless efforts in keeping alive the memory of the fallen. They were truly an inspiration throughout the Run to Remember.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to all those police and peace officers from Ontario who participated in the Canadian Police and Peace Officers' Memorial Service also that Sunday.

I got the opportunity to run 89 kilometres over the three days, and I must say that every step I took was worth it. It was a reminder of the risks our police officers and peace officers take to keep us safe, and we will forever honour the memory of our fallen peace officers.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): The leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition?

Mr. Patrick Brown: Thank you for the opportunity to rise in recognition of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Run, the Run to Remember. If I could acknowledge the great work that the member for Ottawa Centre did in participating in the run, side by side with the police officers. Congratulations for that effort.

It was an honour to be there for the opening ceremonies, to address the runners, the police officers and all the supporters for this 11th annual three-day run. I have had the chance to address this venue before, when I was in the federal House, on behalf of the federal government, and participated in the run myself in past years.

1530

I wanted to recognize the incredible work, as the member for Ottawa Centre did, of Randy Patrick, who is the founder and the driving force behind this incredible success over the last 11 years. Randy is a Peel Regional Police staff superintendent and has certainly made this his passion. The memorial run is a wonderful way to raise awareness and focus attention on the annual police

and peace officers' memorial service. It serves the community extremely well to recognize these fallen heroes.

In 1998, a federal proclamation declared that the last Sunday in September each year be Police and Peace Officers' National Memorial Day, and holding this run preceding that observance has only built more recognition for this important date. I applaud all the participants who have participated in all the legs of the run.

I'd also like to take a moment to acknowledge some of the fallen heroes who I had the opportunity to encounter during my service in Simcoe county. I'd like to acknowledge our fallen heroes 41-year-old South Simcoe Police Constable Alan Kuzmich; 43-year-old father of three Detective Constable Rob Plunkett from Midhurst; and Peel Regional Police Constable James Ochakovsky, 36, who lived in Barrie. His wife, Erin, as the member for Ottawa Centre mentioned, has made it a personal mission to continue to support the families of these fallen heroes.

I was very proud to run last year with Gloria Kovach. Gloria was a long-time city councillor in Guelph and lost her own daughter. I've certainly heard from Gloria about the incredible sacrifice and the never-ending impact that this tragedy has on the family, the community and the neighbourhood.

I want to especially recognize the fact that over \$215,000 has been raised over 11 years for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Run.

The reason I wanted to speak to this item myself today is because, as you know, on my first day in this Legislature as the new MPP for Simcoe North, I mentioned that we need to do more to honour our fallen heroes. It's one thing to have this run, but I think we can do more as parliamentarians from every side in recognizing these fallen heroes. With the Canadian Forces, we have compensation for the families, a small benefit to help them after this tragedy. I think it's only appropriate that we do that in Canada. I said on my first day in the Legislature as the MPP for Simcoe North, and I repeat it today, that I think it's entirely appropriate for us to have an Ontario heroes' fund to recognize these fallen heroes.

Today, I want to say that the run is wonderful and an important recognition, a deserved recognition. I would hope we can all work together to move the yardstick forward and actually have something similar to what the Canadian Forces have. And I wanted to say, on behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus: Let us never forget our fallen heroes and the incredible and immeasurable sacrifice they have made for our safety and for our security in our communities.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: It is my honour to stand in this Legislature and make comments as the NDP critic for community safety and correctional services. I appreciate having the opportunity to respond to the minister's statement and speak on the topic of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Run to Remember.

The annual Run to Remember, as we've heard, is to raise awareness and focus attention on the police and peace officers' memorial service held every year on the last Sunday of September. Many are unable to attend the

memorial service in Ottawa, and the run gives peace officers and citizens along the route the chance to participate and reflect on the sacrifices of the officers whose names are etched on the memorial wall in Ottawa. It is a chance for those who run to think about the families and communities of those lost in the line of duty.

The first unified police and peace officers' memorial was held in Ottawa on Sunday September 29, 1996. Now, every year on the last Sunday in September, a memorial service is held on Parliament Hill honouring both fallen peace and police officers.

The Run to Remember started in 2005 and has grown ever since. The run starts at the Ontario Police Memorial in Toronto and ends at the national monument in Ottawa. The core group of runners who participate in the full three-day relay—including some people in this room—has grown to over 250 and includes supporters and surviving families of fallen officers. Many others join the run for part of the journey, sharing in the journey of remembrance.

This is engraved on one of the three stones at the memorial in Ottawa: "The Canadian Police and Peace Officers' memorial honour roll pays tribute to the sacrifice of these brave men and women killed in the performance of their duties."

We have a police monument in Ontario. We don't have a monument, however, to our fallen correctional officers or peace officers. It was my privilege to speak at our corrections memorial service last fall, but we are missing a place, a monument, a permanent tribute to those who have given the ultimate sacrifice: those killed in the performance of their duties. I know the government recognizes this and I hope that they will help to speed the bureaucratic process along.

We must recognize and remember those who have been killed in the line of duty, but we have to start talking about those who are no longer able to perform their duties but are still with us. We have to recognize the very real sacrifice being made every day by officers when it comes to their own mental health and wellness. We have officers damaged, struggling and tormented by the trauma and threat faced in their work environments. We have peace and police officers, first responders, constant responders—those who answer the call—who can be forever changed, and some forever damaged, during the performance of their duties. We must recognize their sacrifice and honour it with a strategy to help them through. We in this Legislature must acknowledge that post-traumatic stress disorder is a devastating reality for many and must be supported and treated.

We have passed Bill 2 through second reading, and now it is stuck in the government channels. My colleague from Parkdale-High Park has started this conversation, but what say you, government? Will we commit to our first responders, our police officers, peace officers, correctional officers, firefighters, paramedics, 911 operators, Ministry of Labour investigators and more? So many more need to be part of the conversation and final strategy and solution. Will we put our money where our

mouth is and take action? People who keep us safe are struggling, suffering and dying by suicide. Will we remember them? Will we defend the health and well-being of those who keep us safe and secure, and pledge to support them now with preventative and appropriate services and support?

We know PTSD is real, but so is the struggle leading to that diagnosis. We must commit to supporting our officers, our friends, neighbours and family members so that they can continue to perform their duties and keep us safe and secure.

As it is engraved on one of the stones of the memorial, "They are our heroes. We shall not forget them." Speaker, we shall never forget them but that isn't enough. We must protect and support them so that they can healthily protect and support us.

PETITIONS

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr. Norm Miller: I have 1,593 signatures from the Bracebridge area with regard to health care in Muskoka. It reads:

"In Support of a Full Range of Core Hospital Services at Both the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital in Bracebridge and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital.

"Whereas the provision of a full range of core hospital services, including acute care in-patient, emergency, diagnostic and surgical services, at both the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital in Bracebridge and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital by Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare (MAHC) is vital for all of the communities in the Muskoka region; and

"Whereas the continued delivery of those core hospital services at both the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital in Bracebridge and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital is crucial to the long-term sustainability and economic vitality of the two communities and the entire Muskoka region; and

"Whereas the residents of Bracebridge, Huntsville and the other communities in Muskoka have strongly supported multi-site delivery of a full range of core hospital services, including acute care in-patient, emergency, diagnostic and surgical services, at both the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital in Bracebridge and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital; and

"Whereas, contrary to the wishes of the people of Muskoka, the board of directors of Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare has approved the 'one-hospital model' as the preferred model for hospital service delivery in the future;

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

"(1) That the province of Ontario ensure that a full range of core hospital services, including acute care in-patient, emergency, diagnostic and surgical services, are

maintained on a multi-site basis at both the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital in Bracebridge and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital;

"(2) That the province of Ontario ensure that the changes to Ontario's health care delivery system currently being implemented do not negatively impact access to services and the quality of care in Bracebridge, Huntsville and the entire Muskoka region;

"(3) That the province of Ontario ensure that the changes to Ontario's health care delivery system currently being implemented recognize the unique and important role that smaller hospitals, such as the South Muskoka Memorial Hospital and the Huntsville District Memorial Hospital, have in promoting economic development and creating sustainable communities in Ontario."

I support this and will give it to Krishaj.

1540

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Privatizing Hydro One: Another Wrong Choice.

"Whereas once you privatize hydro, there's no return; and

"We'll lose billions in reliable annual revenues for schools and hospitals; and

"We'll lose our biggest economic asset and control over our energy future; and

"We'll pay higher and higher hydro bills just like what's happened elsewhere;

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

"To stop the sale of Hydro One and make sure Ontario families benefit from owning Hydro One now and for generations to come."

I sign this petition and give it to page Kelly to deliver.

LUNG HEALTH

Mr. Arthur Potts: I have a petition also to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas lung disease affects more than 2.4 million people in the province of Ontario, more than 570,000 of whom are children. Of the four chronic diseases responsible for 79% of deaths (cancers, cardiovascular diseases, lung disease and diabetes) lung disease is the only one without a dedicated province-wide strategy;

"In the Ontario Lung Association report *Your Lungs, Your Life*, it is estimated that lung disease currently costs the Ontario taxpayers more than \$4 billion a year in direct and indirect health care costs, and this figure is estimated to rise to more than \$80 billion seven short years from now;

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

"To allow for deputations on MPP Kathryn McGarry's private member's bill, Bill 41, Lung Health Act, 2014,

which establishes a Lung Health Advisory Council to make recommendations to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care on lung health issues and requires the minister to develop and implement an Ontario Lung Health Action Plan with respect to research, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of lung disease; and

“Once debated at committee, to expedite Bill 41, Lung Health Act, 2014, through the committee stage and back to the Legislature for third and final reading; and to immediately call for a vote on Bill 41 and to seek royal assent immediately upon its passage.”

I agree with this petition.

VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. Robert Bailey: It’s a pleasure today to rise and present over 7,000 signatures from the local community of Plympton-Wyoming in regard to the fire department there.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas there is a lack of evidence to support the charge of careless driving against Neil Bain, volunteer firefighter for the town of Plympton-Wyoming, after the fire truck he was driving while responding to an accident in whiteout conditions was part of a multi-vehicle accident on Highway 402, March 25, 2014;

“Whereas Bain was the only person charged in the accident involving 15 vehicles including transports;

“Whereas volunteer firefighters will be hesitant to volunteer if they fear repercussions that could affect their personal insurance and/or employment;

“Whereas the Wyoming volunteer fire department and other fire departments that respond to the 402 Highway and other 400-series highway events in the province of Ontario may opt to decline services to said routes leaving travellers unprotected;

“We, the undersigned, call upon the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to demand that the crown attorney immediately withdraw all charges made against Neil Bain, volunteer firefighter for the town of Plympton-Wyoming.”

I agree with this petition and affix my signature to it.

DENTAL CARE

M^{me} France Gélinas: I have this petition that was brought to me by Michelle Ellery from Hanmer in my riding. It reads as follows:

“Whereas thousands of Ontarians live with pain and infection because they cannot afford dental care;

“Whereas the promised \$45-million dental fund under the Poverty Reduction Strategy excluded impoverished adults;

“Whereas the program was designed with rigid criteria so that most of the people in need do not qualify; and

“Whereas desperately needed dental care money went unspent and was diverted to other areas even though people are still suffering without access to dental care;”

They “petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“To do all in its power to stop the dental fund from being diverted to support other programs; and

“To fully utilize the commissioned funding to provide dental care to those in need.”

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

SOINS PALLIATIFS

M. Victor Fedeli: « À l’Assemblée législative de l’Ontario :

« Nous, les soussignés, pétitionnons l’Assemblée législative de l’Ontario comme suit :

« Nous, les soussignés, appuyons le conseil d’administration de la Maison Sérénité du Nipissing dans sa mission de construire une maison de soins palliatifs autonome, un foyer où les mourants de tous les âges, cultures et langues seront traités avec compassion et dignité, un autre chez-soi qui donnera confort et paix dans un milieu serein plutôt que dans un milieu bruyant d’un hôpital de soins aigus.

« Nous reconnaissons le besoin urgent d’une maison de soins palliatifs pour desservir les patients en phase terminale de la région de Nipissing et Parry Sound Est. »

J’y signe mon nom et je donne cette pétition à la page législative Kelly.

TENANT PROTECTION

Ms. Catherine Fife: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas escalating rental costs are making Ontario less affordable and exposing many tenants to further financial insecurity;

“Whereas tenants living in residential apartments and condominiums built after 1991 are not protected within the Residential Tenancies Act by rent control guidelines, nor are they protected from other arbitrary changes to their rent which currently cannot be appealed to the Landlord and Tenant Board;

“Whereas this has created an unfair, two-tier system of tenant protection in Ontario where some tenants have no protection from large and arbitrary increases;

“Whereas fixing these simple exemption loopholes will help protect tenants and help make housing more affordable for thousands of Ontarians;

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

“That the province of Ontario acts to protect all tenants in Ontario and immediately move to ensure that all Ontario tenants living in buildings, mobile home parks and land-lease communities are covered by the rent guidelines in the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006.”

It’s my pleasure to share this petition with the assembly. I affix my signature and give it to page Calvin.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. Arthur Potts: I'm hoping to get more applause from the members of the third party on this one as well.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas some establishments have instituted unfair tipping practices in which a portion of tips and gratuities are being deducted and kept by owners;

"Whereas employees in establishments where tipping is a standard practice, such as restaurants, bars and hair salons, supplement their income with tips and gratuities and depend on those to maintain an adequate standard of living;

"Whereas customers expect that when they leave a tip or gratuity that the benefit will be going to the employees who directly contributed to their positive experience;

"Whereas most establishments do respect their employees and do not collect their tips and gratuities unfairly and thus are left at a disadvantage compared to those owners who use tips and gratuities to pad their margins;

"Whereas other jurisdictions in North America such as Quebec, New Brunswick and New York City have passed legislation to protect employees' tips;

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

"That all members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario support Bill 12, the Protecting Employees' Tips Act, 2014, and help shield Ontario employees and businesses from operators with improper tipping practices while protecting accepted and standard practices such as tip pooling among employees."

I absolutely agree with this petition and leave it with Jacob.

ENERGY POLICIES

Mr. Victor Fedeli: "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Auditor General of Ontario defines the global adjustment charge on hydro bills as 'an extra payment covered by ratepayers over and above the actual market price of electricity'; and

"Whereas wind power is simply unreliable, blows mostly at night when we don't need power, creating a surplus Ontario then has to get rid of by paying Quebec and the United States to take it, and the total cost of producing the exported power was about \$2.6 billion more than the revenue Ontario received from exporting that power between 2006 and 2013; and

"Whereas the Auditor General says the global adjustment has risen from \$700 million prior to the Green Energy Act to \$7.7 billion by 2013, and over the past decade, the cumulated amount is about \$50 billion; and

"Whereas Ontario now has the highest industrial rates in North America, and residential hydro bills are forecast to increase 42% by 2018 after peak hydro rates have already more than tripled since 2003; and

"Whereas local First Nations, property owners and aviation and aerospace industry stakeholders have voiced concerns about wind farm installations proposed by Innergex ... in the riding of Nipissing;

"We, the undersigned, do hereby petition the government of Ontario to reverse course on these proposed wind projects and the government's expensive energy policy by cancelling feed-in-tariff (FIT) subsidies, implementing an immediate moratorium on wind power development, and giving municipalities veto authority over wind projects in their communities."

I agree with this, sign my name and give it to page Duha.

1550

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

Mr. Wayne Gates: "Privatizing Hydro One: Another wrong choice.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas once you privatize hydro, there's no return; and

"We'll lose billions in reliable annual revenues for schools and hospitals; and

"We'll lose our biggest economic asset and control over our energy future; and

"We'll pay higher and higher hydro bills just like what's happened elsewhere;

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

"To stop the sale of Hydro One and make sure Ontario families benefit from owning Hydro One now and for generations to come."

I agree with this petition. I'll sign my name and give it to Sydney.

WATER FLUORIDATION

Mr. Arthur Potts: I guess I'm looking for a three-peat here.

"Petition to the Ontario Legislative Assembly:

"Fluoridate All Ontario Drinking Water.

"Whereas fluoride is a mineral that exists naturally in virtually all water supplies, even the ocean; and

"Whereas scientific studies conducted during the past 70 years have consistently shown that the fluoridation of community water supplies is a safe and effective means of preventing dental decay....; and

"Whereas dental decay is the second-most frequent condition suffered by children, and is one of the leading causes of absences from school; and

"Whereas Health Canada has determined that the optimal concentration of fluoride in municipal drinking water for dental health is 0.7 mg/L, providing optimal dental health benefits, and well below the maximum acceptable concentrations; and

"Whereas the decision to add fluoride to municipal drinking water is a patchwork of individual choices across Ontario, with municipal councils often vulnerable

to the influence of misinformation, and studies of questionable or no scientific merit;

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

“That the ministries of the government of Ontario adopt the number one recommendation made by the Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health in a 2012 report on oral health in Ontario, and amend all applicable legislation and regulations to make the fluoridation of municipal drinking water mandatory in all municipal water systems across the province of Ontario.”

It’s a great idea. I’ll leave it with our page Alexander and sign my name.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

POLICE RECORD CHECKS REFORM ACT, 2015

LOI DE 2015 SUR LA RÉFORME DES VÉRIFICATIONS DE DOSSIERS DE POLICE

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 1, 2015, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 113, An Act respecting police record checks /
Projet de loi 113, Loi concernant les vérifications de
dossiers de police.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The last time we finished—it’s now the government’s turn.

Minister of Transportation.

Hon. Steven Del Duca: I’m very happy to have the opportunity this afternoon to speak on Bill 113. I will be sharing my time with my colleagues on this side: the Minister of Community and Social Services, the member from Etobicoke Centre and the member from Scarborough Southwest.

I’ve had the chance, over the last few days, at various times, while being here in the chamber to hear some of the other debate that has taken place with respect to Bill 113. Obviously, as was mentioned, it’s at second reading.

This is one of those bills that I find—in listening to the debate in this House, it is, in many respects, encouraging. Of course, from time to time in this place there can be a bit of a partisan cut and thrust, which is perfectly appropriate. Some would argue that I have occasionally practised that myself, but on this particular legislation, I’ve been impressed so far that the level of discourse and debate has actually been quite sincere and quite genuine, which is heartening to see, of course.

I want to begin with my time to congratulate the minister who has brought this forward, someone who has spoken on our side of this House in the past, and certainly amongst all stakeholders, very passionately about the importance of making sure that we do proceed with legislation in this regard that strikes the right balance, and make sure that we get it right.

I believe this has probably been referenced at various times in debate, and I’m sure it will be again, but I had the opportunity to read over a joint statement that was produced by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the John Howard Society of Ontario, the Ontario Non-profit Network and the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police—the comment or the statement that they made with respect to this legislation around police record checks: “Good news for Ontario workers, volunteers, students, non-profits and businesses that will now see more consistent information released in police record checks.”

I think that actually goes right to the heart of the importance of this legislation; in fact, in particular, the word “consistent” that is in that quote from those four organizations that I think would have universal respect amongst all members of this Legislature. When you take into account what Bill 113 will be doing, it is that word “consistent” that I think is the most appropriate way to describe the outcome that will be achieved with this legislation.

Of course, we are very proud as a government to have tabled Bill 113 last spring. If passed, this legislation would develop the province’s first-ever clear, consistent and comprehensive framework for how police record checks are conducted here in the province of Ontario. It builds on a number of guidelines that have been developed by law enforcement, policing, civil liberties’ organizations, mental health, community safety, non-profit and business partners. Again, I think that goes right to the heart of why this is important legislation and also will be effective legislation, because the consultation has been comprehensive, because it’s taken into account that there are a number of important stakeholders and partners that have very strong feelings about making sure that we as a government and that we as a Legislature get something that’s so important to people right—and that’s why the consultation has been comprehensive.

It’s also important to note that this kind of approach is already being followed by approximately 70% of the police forces across the province of Ontario. This bill, if passed, will ensure a consistent approach across the province, from the Ontario Provincial Police right down to the smallest police force. Again, this is one of those bills that will give us, if passed, the opportunity to apply that consistent standard across the entire province of Ontario. Most importantly, from the perspective of the people that I represent, it is legislation that will ensure that we get the balance right, so that we produce that consistency that is so important to the people we represent, but we also get the balance right with respect to public safety and the respecting of privacy.

When I think of the people that I represent in Vaughan, and I’m sure that this will be the case for the other three speakers on our side of the House that are to follow—in fact, I know the Minister of Community and Social Services, given that she represents the neighbouring riding to mine in Vaughan, will feel just as passionately about making sure that we strike that right

balance. I look forward to hearing her remarks following mine.

I can say, again, with respect to the minister who has brought forward this bill and the ministry and the hard work that they have done and the consultation that they have done, I'm very, very happy to support Bill 113. I look forward to it continuing through debate at second reading, getting to committee, seeing the work that will come from the committee process itself and having it back here for third reading.

I am very happy to have had the chance this afternoon to speak strongly in support of Bill 113.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The Minister of Community and Social Services.

Hon. Helena Jaczek: I'm certainly delighted to join in the second reading debate, following my colleague the Minister of Transportation, on Bill 113. As he mentioned, of course, what we have done here is strike an excellent balance between human rights, privacy and public safety.

I was very much struck by what Ruth Goba, the Interim Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, had to say on the subject of Bill 113: "We are delighted that the proposed legislation will address so many of our concerns. The" OHRC "has long advocated for a record check system that respects human rights, privacy and public safety. We are glad that individuals will be able to see their records and ask for reconsideration—two very important steps forward."

What does this legislation propose to do? I think it's very important—my colleague made the comment regarding consistency. What we're doing here is standardizing three types of police record checks to be offered in Ontario so that there is going to be clear direction on the types of information that must be released or withheld for each type of police record check. There will be direction that an individual can only consent to the release of his or her record checks results to a third party after he or she has reviewed the results. There will also be standards set to ensure that the individual can request reconsideration of the release of certain records. There will be a provision that, five years after passage, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services will review the legislation and evaluate its implementation—some very strong measures, obviously, in this particular bill.

1600

What are the three levels of record check?

The least intrusive level of record check would disclose basic criminal records, which include criminal convictions.

The next level of check would include the same records, plus certain additional judicial findings such as discharges and judicial orders, as well as outstanding matters such as pending charges and warrants.

The most intrusive level of check—this is where public safety is so important—would be limited to employment and volunteer positions of trust or authority over vulnerable persons; we're talking about children, seniors and those with developmental disabilities. In this type of record check, there would be some additional

records included, but these are some that I think are essential in terms of public safety:

—There would be the release of cases of not criminally responsible by reason of mental disorder. This isn't just incidents involving a mental health contact; this is where someone has been found not criminally responsible by reason of a mental disorder.

—There would also be records such as suspended records of sexually based offences, formerly called pardons.

—Only in exceptional circumstances, when they show a pattern of issues with vulnerable people, would certain additional non-conviction records be included.

At all times, there will be the decision that certain types of records could not be disclosed. This will apply across the province; all police services will abide by these. The types of records that will not be disclosed are things like diversions, convictions under provincial statutes, Ministry of Transportation information, Family Court restraining orders, local police contact information: as I said before, mental health contact, references to contagious diseases—that sounds quite archaic. These things will not be included.

I think it's especially important, for those who simply suffer from an illness related to mental health, that we have ensured that this type of information is irrelevant in the types of reasons why people will require record checks. It is something that I know a great deal of consultation has occurred on with individuals involved with the mental health community, stakeholders and so on.

This is an excellent step forward. As my colleague has said, I think we have heard that there is wide support for this legislation, and I urge all members of the House to support it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Etobicoke Centre.

Mr. Yvan Baker: It's an honour to join this debate. Like the Minister of Transportation alluded, I think this is a debate that has been relatively substantive. One of the things I think, when I think about this bill, is the fundamental rights we are trying to defend. Let me share with you what I mean by that.

When I think about our role here, one of the components of our role as members, as MPPs, as representatives, is to defend the fundamental human rights of Canadians. There are several, what I would consider, fundamental human rights that this bill seeks to defend, which are the right to privacy and the presumption of innocence, but also public safety. I think this bill strikes an effective and pragmatic balance.

What does the bill do?

If the bill were passed, this legislation would develop the first-ever clear, consistent and comprehensive framework for how record checks are conducted in our province. It builds on the LEARN Guideline that was developed by policing, civil liberties, mental health, community safety, non-profit and business partners. It's always great to see a piece of legislation put forward that has been put together where a range of stakeholders have

weighed in and where we have taken that thinking and brought it to bear in a piece of legislation. So it's an excellent collaboration.

This has already been followed by approximately 70% of the police forces across the province. One of the factors we have to consider here is that this is about ensuring consistency in terms of how we administer and how we defend those fundamental rights across our province. This will touch everyone, from the OPP to the smallest police force.

Like I said, I think it draws a balance between public safety, but also respecting privacy. There are people who have unfortunately faced unnecessary barriers due to inappropriate non-conviction and non-criminal information such as mental health records—the minister referred to that just a few moments ago—that were disclosed during routine police record checks. There are people who have had their schooling and their careers placed in jeopardy because of this. Literally about a half an hour ago, maybe an hour ago, I introduced a private member's bill that I think will help young people in selecting a post-secondary path and help students to select the post-secondary path that will help further their objectives and their goals. Here we have a situation where there are people who have had their careers and their goals subverted and potentially damaged because information was released that shouldn't have been released, and it influenced a decision that did harm to that individual. This bill seeks to address that. Like I said, people have lost out on employment. They've lost out on career opportunities unnecessarily. We need to limit those cases where that is unnecessary and where that shouldn't have happened.

This legislation would help to remove those unnecessary barriers and therefore increase employment, volunteer and educational opportunities for a lot of people. How it works is that it prohibits the release of non-criminal information such as mental health records, and strictly limits the release of non-conviction records. When we think about the presumption of innocence, when we think about privacy, what this bill is doing is ensuring that non-conviction records—situations where there are records pertaining to somebody who has not been convicted of a crime—not get misused, not used to harm a person. It's important that we respect that presumption of innocence that each of us enjoys and should enjoy. We should enjoy it not only in theory but in practice, and that's what this bill is trying to ensure that we implement.

The bill is also establishing a specific test to ensure that all necessary information is provided in vulnerable sector checks so that those who need it most, those like our children and seniors, continue to be protected. Earlier, I was referring to the fact that this bill draws a pragmatic balance. One of the things that we do need to do is make sure that those who are working with our children, with our seniors, with those who are vulnerable in our population—that the appropriate level of scrutiny is applied to their hiring and their engagement with

children and seniors, because we need to make sure that those vulnerable populations and others are protected. What this ensures is that information can still be accessed where needed in those specific instances.

The bill ensures that individuals will have a chance to review their non-conviction records and seek a reconsideration of the information contained in their check. I think it's a really important thing to consider. If there's information out there pertaining to an individual, and that information could be harmful, but also could be inaccurate or could be misrepresentative, the individuals to whom it pertains will have an opportunity to review their non-conviction records and seek reconsideration of the information. Obviously, that has to be based on merit, and there's a process for that. That's an important thing, to ensure that, again, people's presumption of innocence is protected, that their privacy is protected, and that future opportunities are not unduly limited as a result. These changes in the bill will make Ontario a leader in Canada, with a clear, consistent and comprehensive framework to remove the unnecessary barriers to success for individuals while making sure that our communities are safe.

What I wanted to do for those of my constituents who are watching and who may not be familiar with record checks and what I'm referring to—a record check is a search of police-held records related to an individual. Currently, these records could include things like criminal convictions, judicial orders, charges, acquittals, and apprehensions under the Mental Health Act. Most often a record check is requested by an individual who is seeking employment or to volunteer with an organization. The organization is the one who actually requests the check. Record checks can also be used, among other things, as part of a screening process in education, to approve rental housing, to obtain insurance, or to adopt or gain custody of a child.

1610

As I mentioned earlier, there are obviously instances where people are going to be dealing with vulnerable populations and additional information and scrutiny are appropriate, but in many cases that additional level of scrutiny is not required and unduly can limit someone's opportunities in life. It's important to make sure that we find that pragmatic balance, and I think this bill certainly attempts to do that.

One of the things that I wanted to mention—and I think my colleagues who were speaking earlier were referring to some of the voices who had supported this—is that there's a joint statement from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the John Howard Society of Ontario, the Ontario Nonprofit Network and the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. They had a joint statement, and I think that speaks to the collaborative nature of how this bill that I was speaking about earlier was developed, how it engages all stakeholders. I just want to read that to you, Speaker: "Good news for Ontario workers, volunteers, students, non-profits and businesses that will now see more consistent information released in police record checks."

I think that's really good news. They talk about the consistency there. The consistency is important, to ensure that people know what they can expect, and what's been done here is that this is going to apply to jurisdictions across Ontario, which is really critical.

One of the things I also wanted to speak to was the specifics of what the bill does. I've talked about it at a high level, but the specifics are built in here.

I think I'm going to pass on my time to the member for Scarborough Southwest, to finish off the time I have.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Scarborough Southwest.

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to stand up and have a few words to say on this bill.

I want to say one quick thing: My experience was that when I was a city councillor at the city of Toronto, there was quite a bit of hostility between certain groups and the police. There was a concern that the police were keeping records of everything, and that they would last forever and could be released at any time.

This legislation basically standardizes the procedure, not just in Toronto but in all of Ontario, which is only fair. People sometimes look at the police with—they're afraid, or they don't like the police, and they are afraid that records or information will be released: for example, carding, or also that people will be arrested but not convicted. We have to protect that fact, to make sure that if someone is arrested, it doesn't come out automatically to anyone who wants that information. An arrest is very different from a conviction.

If I have more time to speak later, I will talk about other aspects of this bill.

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

Mr. Victor Fedeli: First of all, this bill changes the name from "criminal reference check" to "police record check." That's the start of what this is really all about, our volunteers throughout the province and throughout the country who give of their time. This is an opportunity for their organizations to have a police record check done on them.

Our party supports the rights of all Ontarians to be treated fairly and equally. This brings consistency to police record checks and follows the recommendation of the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the Ontario Human Rights Commission and other groups. The bill specifies that individuals have the opportunity to review their police record check before deciding to release that information to the requester, as well.

There are three types: the criminal record check, the criminal record and judicial matters check, and the vulnerable sector check. Outside of the vulnerable sector check, the act will prohibit the release of non-conviction records for criminal record checks or for criminal record and judicial matter checks. This will also help with the screening of individuals for certain purposes. This does not interfere with the collection and the sharing of information by police services across other law enforcement agencies.

Speaker, again, we do support the rights of all Ontarians to be treated fairly and equally.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: This is an important debate. This legislation is needed, and it has been a long time coming. We're going to be supportive of it getting to committee, but we do think there is room for improvement in the legislation.

I found it interesting that the member from Etobicoke Centre mentioned the John Howard Society. The John Howard Society has some outstanding concerns with regard to this legislation going forward, primarily around those records of conviction and then the non-conviction records.

Non-conviction, of course, refers to all contact with police where a record is taken, which does happen, including criminal matters before the courts that result in acquittal, or are diverted; and where a conviction is to be expunged, including being a witness to an event, or even instances where someone may be in mental health distress that results in police contact and that does not result in a conviction or even charges.

We can't ignore the fact that information recorded from the equally controversial practice of police carding, or what some people regard as street checks, would fall into this as well. It shouldn't be factored into police non-conviction record checks to employers, universities, governments and volunteer organizations.

We need to give credit where credit is due. The Toronto Star broke this story back in May 2014, where the abuse of records was happening. Personal information was being collected. In some instances, a person's name would be attributed to a criminal activity even when they were just a witness to that activity. That's particularly worrisome for youth in our society today.

It's noted that school boards across the province would definitely like to be part of the guidelines going forward. I think they're an important resource to reach out to. They have the youth voice first and foremost, so let's make sure they're part of the consultation process.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Scarborough—Rouge River.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I'm pleased to add a few comments. Let me say that the government is introducing this legislation for a significant purpose, and the purpose is—currently, municipal police forces, provincial police forces and other organizations that release record checks are inconsistent in what they release. That has caused a lot of problems. We've had public consultation, and we've heard the problems they've caused numerous people, many in terms of seeking employment, volunteering or even trying to obtain entry to an educational institution. It has caused a lot of difficulty for the public. This is an important piece of legislation for the government, because we will standardize the process across the province: what can be released in a criminal record check, a criminal record and judicial matters check, and a vulnerable sector check.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that in my own riding, I've heard from many young people. I'm sure every member of this House has probably had the same experience over the years that they've been in office, where a young person has graduated from university as a social worker and they're attempting to obtain employment, and a record released by the institution to an employer had information where they've had contact with police just for questioning or been brought in as part of an investigation because they had information that helped the police. For that to affect someone getting employment—none of us pictured that that would have happened, but it was happening.

I think this is something that the public will embrace, and they're looking forward to us implementing it as soon as possible.

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

Mr. Jack MacLaren: It's a pleasure to speak to this bill. This bill is very worthy and well intentioned in that it tries to balance the need to reveal important information to employers, especially in the area of looking after young children, mentally ill people, senior citizens, vulnerable people, people that do need help—but we don't want them to suffer abuses from the wrong kind of people.

1620

The police checks—or they're now going to be called police record checks instead of criminal reference checks or record checks—they've retitled it as a more sensitive, appropriate title, which is a reflection of the intent of what we're trying to do in this bill: trying to be considerate of the people that might have a bit of a record, or not, but if there is a record and it's a non-conviction, that it not interfere with their ability to obtain employment or to do volunteer work. Volunteers are the heart and core of our communities and do an awful lot of the work of looking after the needy citizens in our communities, and we don't want to discourage that. We don't want to embarrass people and therefore discourage them.

Sometimes a little indiscretion in somebody's life in the past that is no true reflection on their true character can be destroying to them in the case of where it's revealed to an employer looking after needy people, and it becomes something that's totally unacceptable. Word like that can get out in the community and can be very destructive to a person's reputation, and that needs to be stopped. We have to be very careful with what information gets released. It's good to see that a person seeking employment, whether it's volunteer or paid employment, can see the records that are going to be released. This is a most worthy bill, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Etobicoke Centre has two minutes.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate the comments from the members opposite on this. It sounds like there's a lot of support for what's trying to be achieved through this piece of legislation.

The bill, first of all, tries to defend some key rights and key principles that, really, we need to uphold in our society around public safety, making sure that people are safe, particularly our vulnerable populations, while at the same time protecting people's right to privacy and protecting the presumption of innocence, which is really important.

I think the bill is pragmatic in how it approaches things in that it tries to allow for more of a release of information when appropriate, under very limited circumstances, when vulnerable populations are concerned. In cases like when we have children involved or seniors involved and a person is going to be working with children or seniors, it's important that that person undergo additional scrutiny. But in many cases, that additional scrutiny is not necessary. As the member for Mississippi Mills mentioned, it's important that a moment of indiscretion that's not reflective, and frankly not material to a person's employment or a person's capacity to pursue a post-secondary education or whatever the case may be, not be used against them for the rest of their lives.

One of the things that we value in our society is the fact that we put public safety first, but we do so while respecting the rights of people, and we treat privacy and the presumption of innocence seriously. I think this bill attempts to strike that balance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Mr. Robert Bailey: It's a privilege and a pleasure to rise in the House today and speak to this bill, Bill 113, the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015. As the honourable member from Ottawa Centre noted when he introduced this bill, the intent of the police record check is to create a province-wide standard for police record checks and eliminate the practice of disclosing non-criminal records.

Rather than keep the members in this House in suspense this afternoon, I'll tell you off the get-go that we will be supporting this bill when it's called for second reading vote.

I certainly believe, as do my colleagues in the official opposition, that it is our duty in this Legislature to put forward legislation that supports the rights of all Ontarians to be treated fairly and equally.

Bill 113 has been drafted with the intent of ending the unnecessary sharing of non-conviction information that is stored in the ever-growing information databases of our police and security services. It is my understanding that once this bill is passed, only information pertaining to convictions under the Criminal Code of Canada or information that can be justified as relevant for those individuals who will be interacting with the vulnerable sector will be accessible through police checks.

Further, this legislation is based upon recommendations by the Ontario police chiefs, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Mental Health Association, the John Howard Society, Legal Aid Ontario and many others too numerous to mention. My office hasn't been contacted by any of these groups, or others, to voice

their opposition to this act. I would hope this means that these groups are satisfied that they were listened to during the consultation process, which I would note is the exception rather than the rule with most of the bills that this government has put forward.

However, during my eight years as member of provincial Parliament for Sarnia–Lambton, my office has heard from many constituents, on a number of occasions, who have had difficulty with the police check system.

The requirement for job applicants and volunteers to have a police check completed before they can move forward in the selection process is becoming more and more commonplace in Ontario. Many organizations seem to be requiring police checks from applicants as a way to mitigate the risk when taking on a new employee or volunteer. Mr. Speaker, I think that many organizations have put this policy in place with good intentions, but the application itself may be leading to the best candidates for positions not always being selected. However, this practice will most certainly continue, and will likely grow in the future.

It probably won't be long before organizations are asking for some sort of social media background checks, and if we've followed the news in recent weeks, we'd understand why.

That aside, it is important that the provincial government take the time now to make sure that police record checks are being handled appropriately, that an individual's personal information is being carefully protected, and that only the relevant details are being shared by police agencies with employers and organizations.

I had the chance to make a few comments on Bill 113 when it was debated in the Legislature recently. I want to reiterate what I said then, like many others: that this legislation could be strengthened even further by adopting, as an amendment, the private member's bill put forward by my colleague the member for Dufferin–Caledon. This member has done a lot of great work on the issue of police checks for those wishing to volunteer. Her bill, Bill 79, the Helping Volunteers Give Back Act, states:

“An organization that retains the services of a volunteer is prohibited from requiring a criminal record check for the volunteer, as a condition for the volunteer's starting work with the organization, if the organization receives a criminal record check for the volunteer that is dated within the year before the day on which the volunteer starts work with the organization and that is the most recent criminal record check that the volunteer has obtained. The criminal record check must meet the authenticity requirements specified by the regulations made under the act. The organization can also require the volunteer to provide notice of all pending criminal proceedings and the final disposition of those proceedings.

“After a volunteer starts work with an organization, the organization can require a new criminal record check from the volunteer dated at yearly intervals. In addition, the organization can require a criminal record check for a volunteer at any time if the organization has actual notice

or reasonable grounds to believe that a conviction for an offence has been added to the volunteer's criminal record since the date of the most recent criminal record check for the volunteer that the organization has received.

“When a police force releases a criminal record check for a volunteer, whether to an organization or to the volunteer, the police force is required to release a maximum of five additional originals of the check to the volunteer at no additional charge if the volunteer so requests.”

It's my understanding that these record checks can cost upwards of \$40 and \$50, and you have to have an original. If someone was doing a job search, it could be quite expensive for them to get these original police checks. I think there has to be some leeway there.

I know that the Helping Volunteers Give Back Act is not what we're debating today, but I believe that if its principles were added as an amendment to this bill, Bill 113, during committee, the resulting piece of legislation would better serve the residents of Ontario. At the end of the day, that's why we're all here.

Right now, a regular police check in my community of Sarnia–Lambton, by the Sarnia Police Service, costs an applicant \$43, and you're only given one copy of that police check for your use. For individuals who may want to volunteer with multiple organizations, or if they are job-hunting and are lucky enough to get multiple interviews, having to pay for multiple police checks will quickly become an expensive proposition.

1630

In his comments during the introduction of this bill, the honourable member from Ottawa Centre indicated that this bill would increase employment and volunteer opportunities. For that truly to happen, I think that something needs to be done to reduce the financial burden that is associated right now with police checks.

I would also like to point out that there is a history of members from this side of the House putting forward great ideas to strengthen government bills. I was fortunate enough to put forward an amendment, during committee work on the Local Food Act, to create a tax credit for farmers who donate to local food banks. The government, the third party and the official opposition debated that, voted on it and that amendment was adopted. As a result, I understand it is making a dramatic impact in communities across the province.

In my own riding of Sarnia–Lambton, the local food bank has indicated to me that this year alone they have agreements with six local farmers who now are providing fresh produce to the food bank and its mobile market, which makes many stops throughout Sarnia–Lambton. In addition, there have been very generous donations by the local pork producers, chicken farmers and dairy farmers, so clients now have access to healthy protein as well. That was a result of that amendment being adopted by the government from my private member's bill.

Back to the Police Record Checks Reform Act: As it stands, Bill 113 seeks to establish a framework around police checks for the first time, after years of calls for

legislation from police and civil liberties groups. Hopefully, by creating a standard framework for all police forces to follow, we will see a reduction in the time it takes to complete a police check.

I had my staff look into the calls we received in our office about police check issues. The majority of concerns had to do with the amount of time it takes to receive a police check once an application is submitted. Some constituents are facing waits of up to six weeks or more for their police checks. This could certainly be detrimental for those who have a standing job offer, for whom wait times of over a month and a half or more are certainly not helpful. In fact, that would likely produce a lot of anxiety for both the applicant and the potential employer.

The spouse of one of my staff members actually went through one of these extended wait periods a few years ago. After securing a job offer at a local children's treatment centre in Sarnia-Lambton, the spouse of my staff member contacted the Toronto Police Service, where they were living at the time, to obtain a police check. It took over four months for the Toronto Police Service to complete the check and return it. When the organization that was waiting on the police check called the Toronto Police Service to find out why the process was taking so long, the desk officer told the human resources manager—get this, Mr. Speaker—that they found it suspicious that someone would actually move from Toronto to Sarnia, so a more thorough check was being conducted.

For those of us who spend most of the week here, Toronto is a great place. But I find it hard that someone would suspect someone wanting to move from this great city to a great place like Sarnia-Lambton or some other great community like Hamilton or Ottawa.

I hope this story illustrates just one of the frustrating aspects of the current police check system. Right now, there is no guide for police departments to follow. Each department decides what it wants to do, and citizens who are forced to go through the process are left to wait and wonder what is going on. By establishing a clear framework for police services of what to include in a police record check, I am hopeful that the processing time for police checks can be reduced.

Back to the points on Bill 113, the government is proposing three types of checks through this legislation. These checks would include the following information:

(1) The criminal record check itself: criminal convictions and findings of guilt under the Youth Criminal Justice Act. That's a criminal records check.

(2) Criminal record and judicial matters check: a criminal record check plus outstanding charges, arrest warrants, certain judicial orders, absolute discharges, conditional discharges, and other records as authorized by the Criminal Records Act.

(3) A vulnerable sector check: a criminal record and judicial matters check, plus findings of not criminally responsible due to a mental disorder, record suspensions or pardons related to sexually based offences and non-

conviction information related to the predation of a child or other vulnerable person—that is to say, charges that were withdrawn, dismissed or stayed, or that resulted in acquittals.

The definition of a vulnerable person:

“a person who, because of his or her age, a disability or other circumstances, whether temporary or permanent,

“(a) is in a position of dependency on others, or

“(b) is otherwise at a greater risk than the general population of being harmed by a person in a position of trust or authority towards them.”

A vulnerable sector check is performed in cases where an individual would be in an employment or volunteer position of trust or authority over children or other vulnerable persons.

This bill would also put into place rules for how police record checks are released. My colleague the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex touched on this aspect of the bill earlier this week in his remarks, and I believe it bears repeating. There have been numerous stories in the Toronto newspapers and happenings in my riding regarding non-conviction records being placed on an individual's file in various police databases. These records may include charges that were laid against an individual but were later dropped or could not be proven in court. It was noted in a previous debate on this bill that as of 2005, there were more than 420,000 people—almost a half a million people—listed in the RCMP's Canadian Police Information Centre, otherwise known as CPIC, but there being no conviction on their record.

We have also learned through media reports of situations where a person has received attention for mental health issues and they now find themselves with notations on their file—notations that can and are negatively impacting their lives.

By and large, I believe the general reaction of Ontarians when they learn of these sorts of non-conviction police records—they are concerned. Most individuals would assume that if an individual has not committed a crime or if they were cleared of any wrongdoing, their record would be wiped clean. That, unfortunately, is not the case in Ontario.

As part of this bill, an individual will have the opportunity to review their police record check for information before deciding to release it. This would certainly be helpful for those interested in finding out what is on their record. Most people would not be aware that they had a non-conviction police record until it's too late. For example, one may find out when they are rejected for an employment opportunity or turned away at the American border. As I come from a border community, again, this is an issue that we have heard about in my constituency office.

I told this story the other day during a hit, but it's relevant to this point, so I'll tell it again. A number of years ago, my wife and I and a number of other couples went for a vacation in the Caribbean—long before I got elected, because now we don't have time to do anything like that, my wife would say. On the way back, we

crossed the border at Sarnia with a number of individuals in a van. We cleared customs quite easily. It was only after we got home—and I'm glad I didn't know beforehand, because it might have made me a little nervous—I found out from a now-retired border patrol officer, who I actually went to school with—I won't say any more about that—that someone had made an anonymous call to the bridge and said that a number of individuals were returning from a trip. I was one of them and they named some of the other people—I won't go into their names—and that we were probably smuggling something back.

This person, who knew me very well, said, “Look, I know Bob Bailey and he wouldn't be doing anything like that,” and they threw it aside. I was fortunate that that happened—

Interjection.

Mr. Robert Bailey: Somebody said, “Wrong guy.” I think they're heckling me, Mr. Speaker.

They threw it aside, but I was fortunate that the person knew me and made a decision that they didn't think that was right. That might have been written up. I don't know what the process is at border crossings, but I assume that if we had been pulled in and run through the gamut of whatever they do there, that could be on someone's file, right?

I never knew that for at least a year or so after that. Researching this and going through this made me think about that again. I hadn't thought about it for probably 15 years or more. But that's how someone could make mischief anonymously, on some people who were very innocent. Thank God that they didn't follow through on that.

It's troubling to learn that it's simple for someone to have a suspicious note like that added to your personal file, so that every time you go through Canadian customs, it gives the officer a reason to pull you in for an inspection.

1640

I would certainly be interested to know if that is on my police record, and I think I'll check it when I get this done. I think it's probably not on there, because I held a number of different positions, prior to being elected, where you had to have an RCMP check. So I don't think it's probably on there, because I had some order-in-council appointment positions that I have filled, and I don't think I would have got them if that was on my file.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who is watching today should be asking themselves what could possibly be on their file that they don't know about. Imagine the shock of being rejected on the basis of your police record if you have never been convicted of a crime, or if you have paid for a trip with your family and you're prepared to go across the border, and all of a sudden you're turned back. We've heard about that in the media lots of times recently. This is an issue that concerns a number of Ontarians right now under the current system. There's often no way to know if you have a record until one day you find out with such a rejection.

A record with a non-conviction could impact your ability to find a better job, volunteer, obtain higher education or even rent an apartment. That is why I am encouraged to see, as part of this bill, that section 10 includes a provision that will allow an individual to file for reconsideration of a decision to release non-conviction information that may be set to be released to the public.

Subsection 10(4) states: “If the individual submits a request for reconsideration in accordance with the regulations, the provider shall, within 30 days after receiving the reconsideration request, reconsider its determination in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the minister.”

The bill goes on to say, at subsection 15(1): “Every police record check provider shall create and implement a process to respond to a request from an individual to correct information in respect of the individual if the individual believes there is an error or omission in the information.”

Mr. Speaker, these avenues of appeal are a good thing. However, the bill does leave the matter of how the reconsideration process is handled to the individual police departments. That could create a greater degree of variance between the different departments in the province, and of course the intent of this bill is to standardize the process of obtaining a police check for the individual, but also for the police departments, so that unnecessary and irrelevant personal information is not released.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I will be supporting this bill at second reading. I believe there has been great work done in listening to the various police services and civil liberties groups to address their concerns with this legislation. I think that when we get it to committee, we can probably make even more improvements to it. It should remove the guesswork and reduce the frustration associated with a police record check. More importantly, it will do a better job of protecting the very personal non-conviction information of individuals that is housed on these various police service databases.

All that being said, I still believe there is room for improvement in this bill. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the government will allow that discussion to take place at committee, and that they will be open to some of the opposition members' suggestions.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence.

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: This is a very important bill, and it sounds like we have the same line of thought, between members, that privacy is important, and that the kind of information that is being collected under police record checks is affecting people in different opportunities—we talked about employment and educational opportunities, as well as rental housing opportunities. Sometimes people need police checks for that as well. Insurance—that can impact you as well. So there are various parts of people's lives where you might think it is incidental, but it really will change the outcome of some things you enter into.

Speaker, the other part of that: Different police forces in different cities, perhaps, have different procedures, and there are inconsistencies, maybe, in what one force would put on a police check compared to another. The same thing with the Ontario Nonprofit Network: They talked about their organization receiving this information, how it's interpreted and how it's stored in their facilities. When they get this information, what do they do with it, once you know there's something on someone's police record check?

The Ontario Nonprofit Network talked about it, and we touched on this. It's definitely a privacy issue, it's definitely a human rights issue and it also can be extended to a community safety issue. When it's not a Criminal Code conviction, Speaker, I think this is a bill that really is a good idea and addresses that part of people's lives. Things can happen: 15 years ago, we've used the mental health issues; we've used people who are falsely accused and acquitted. Those things should not be revealed. They're not criminal and they shouldn't have to be passed on after years and years of being buried. A lot of people who find out that they are on there are completely surprised.

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

Hon. Bill Mauro: I want to thank the member for his comments.

The bill is about trying to achieve balance. I would say that would be one of the components of the legislation that we're trying to achieve. It's not an easy thing to do on an issue as sensitive as this, but it sounds like perhaps the minister has struck the right balance on this.

I'm listening carefully here this afternoon and hearing good and broad support from all speakers on all sides of the House. The official opposition and the third party, as well, are speaking in support of the bill. I think that's good and speaks to the fact that perhaps the minister has struck the right balance here.

The short quote that's here, a joint statement from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the John Howard Society, the Ontario Nonprofit Network and the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police: It's a very brief and short statement. I think we could say that it is reflective of other organizations. Again I say: Perhaps we are achieving the right balance.

We are, of course, trying to balance the rights of the individual to privacy and security of their information and also the rights of individuals who potentially could be victims and fall prey to the people who are the subject of the record check. I think we are all likely aware of some very high-profile cases. We can all think of examples of National Hockey League players who have expressed their personal stories. I can remember, Speaker, meeting Sheldon Kennedy quite some time ago on his cross-country tour, when he spoke very publicly, very courageously, about his personal experiences. I think he was an individual who came forward and perhaps was one of the first that led to more light being shone on examples like this.

Again, it's about trying to achieve balance, recognizing the harm that can fall upon people who can potentially become victims of people who are put in their care and control. It's about balance and the consistency of the records and information released by police forces. It sounds like we're getting there.

It's a good piece, and I thank the members for their support.

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

Mr. Norm Miller: It's my pleasure to have an opportunity to speak briefly to Bill 113, An Act respecting police record checks, and comment on the speech from the member from Sarnia–Lambton. Certainly, he put a lot of thought into his speech and brought up some interesting issues on this bill.

I think probably the issue that I've heard more about in my constituency office with regard to police checks is the time limit issue. That's one that was brought up by the member from Sarnia–Lambton. You have situations where people perhaps just want to volunteer for minor hockey or Scouts, Cubs, Girl Guides, and part of the requirement is to have a record check. It just takes a long time, in many cases.

More importantly, he brought up that the issue is when it's a requirement for getting a job that they have a check done. As he mentioned, it can sometimes take up to six weeks, which, really, I think, is far too long. It's problematic if someone is waiting around to get that check done in order to get their job.

The other issue he brought up was cost. He says that, in Sarnia, it's \$43 for each check. If you have to get a bunch of checks done for various positions, it can get pretty expensive. I think the timeliness is one that I hope is improved upon by this bill. I'm not sure that is the case.

As has been stated, the PC caucus does support the bill, and the PC caucus supports the rights of all Ontarians to be treated fairly and equally. It does not support the release of non-criminal information, such as mental-health-related information. These matters are personal and private and should not be disclosed when no charges have been laid against an individual.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have time for now. Thank you to the member for his comments.

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

Mr. John Vanthof: It's always an honour to stand in the House and, today, to follow the member from Sarnia–Lambton on his remarks on the Police Record Checks Reform Act. He did bring up a lot of good points.

1650

I know in my constituency office where it comes to pass most is with the volunteers. It's hard to get volunteers in my part of the country, I think as it is in most of the province, perhaps all of the province. And when you get people who want to volunteer, and the record check system is very lengthy, is sufficiently costly—because many volunteers do volunteer at two or three or four

organizations. People who like to volunteer, they volunteer a lot. They are pillars in their community, and they end up paying quite a bit of money.

A complaint I've had come to my office a few times is that with some of these checks, fingerprints are involved and they're asked to re-fingerprint after three years, I believe, for some of the checks. The question is, why? Did the people's fingerprints change? It's a good question, because where I live, you have to go a fair ways to get this done. It's a good question: Do they really need to be re-fingerprinted after three years for a routine check for a volunteer organization?

It's a fine balance. We want to make sure that with people who volunteer, there are no bad apples and everything is safe. But we also want to make sure that people who really want to do good in their community aren't overburdened by things that don't really make it safer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Sarnia–Lambton has two minutes.

Mr. Robert Bailey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was thinking that there was one more hit coming. I'm prepared anyway.

I want to thank the member for London–Fanshawe, the Minister of Natural Resources, the member from Parry Sound–Muskoka and also the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane.

It was interesting reading this and doing the research that took place on the bill. I looked forward to it. As the one member said, it's hard to get volunteers anymore, anyway, and with liability, it gets people thinking about risk, when you have to go through these police record checks. You might think that some issue from your misspent youth might come back to haunt you—you know, that you forgot about, yourself. So I think it's good that we're able to access these now, if this bill comes to fruition. People will actually have the ability to see what's in their record, have it corrected if it's wrong—work some way of forgiveness, somehow to get it corrected; and if it's wrong, look to have it removed, have it corrected. Because we do need volunteers. We couldn't run the province without them.

I got thinking about that \$43 cost—whatever it is, \$43 or \$50—for a record check. That's another thing. Imagine how much that's being subsidized by the taxpayers, because there is no earthly way that those OPP officers, in the case of Sarnia–Lambton—or whether it's the metro police or whatever—could do that, because I know how long they take to do those things. I have family members who are involved, and I never really thought about it before, but I know \$43 or \$50 wouldn't touch it. It's probably three times that for their time, because they don't get it all done on the first day; they might be doing a half a dozen.

Anyway, thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to the bill. I look forward to the rest of the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate?

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'd like to rise on Bill 113, the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015—I'm proud to

stand here today and speak to this very important bill, the Police Record Checks Reform Act.

I'd like to start by thanking the government for bringing this bill forward. It's not often that I feel the need to do that, but this is a very important bill. I'm very happy to see it coming forward. The government has done good work by introducing this bill, and I would like to acknowledge that.

I'd also like to mention the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton, who has done a lot of great work around this issue as well.

This bill seeks to right a wrong that has been going on in our province for too long. This bill will ensure that when the Canadian Police Information Centre does a record check, in most cases, only conviction records will be passed on in our communities.

That's a good thing. Too many people have been denied opportunities because of interaction with police that did not result in a conviction, when a non-conviction record wound up on a criminal record check. People have been denied opportunities for housing, for employment, for volunteering and opportunities to simply try to better themselves.

What is a non-conviction record, and why is it important to keep them off of criminal record checks? A conviction record is pretty straightforward: Any time someone is convicted of a crime through the due process provided by our court system, a record of that conviction is put on file under that name. That makes sense. If you have your due process and a judge or a jury has decided that, on balance, there is evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that you committed a crime, you should be convicted. We should keep that on record.

According to a report by the John Howard Society entitled Reducing Barriers for Ontario's Youth with Police Records—this is kind of staggering; I was surprised at this number myself—over 4.1 million Canadians have a record of criminal conviction that is on their record. That's a pretty staggering number, which raises a whole host of other issues, but it makes sense to record who those people are and what they've been convicted of.

On the other hand, non-conviction records are not so straightforward. The same report by the John Howard Society notes that each year in Ontario, our criminal court system processes more than half a million charges. Think about that: half a million charges. But of the half-million charges that are processed annually, close to 43% of them result in stayed or withdrawn charges.

That's important, because it's the first type of non-conviction record that we think about. If you are charged with a crime, then have those charges stayed or withdrawn in the courts, a record of that is still created. That means that each year in Ontario, more than 200,000 people are having non-conviction records put on their files. I believe that that creates a problem, and I'm proud to stand here today to speak on a bill that will help address the problem that it creates.

If it were just 200,000 Ontarians every year who were having non-conviction records attached to their file, this

would still be an issue. Unfortunately, it's bigger than that. There are more ways that someone can have a non-conviction record put on their file.

I'll refer again to the John Howard Society here, who have given us a short list of what we are talking about when we talk about non-conviction records. Those records can be from a 911 call for assistance, from the fact that you are a victim of a crime, from a mental health crisis that involved contacting the police, from being questioned by the police in relation to a crime or, as I already mentioned, from arrests or charges that did not result in a conviction.

1700

Now, it is currently the last three issues I mentioned that are causing the most concern for civil liberties groups, community organizations, police chiefs and not-for-profit organizations: the issues of police contact in a mental health crisis, being questioned by police not in relation to a crime and arrest or a charge, again, that didn't result in a conviction. Let's not kid ourselves about who that is impacting. In the majority of cases, those street checks are done on young people living in poor areas of Toronto. Often, those young men are first- or second-generation Canadians whose parents work multiple jobs and still struggle to keep food on the table and a roof over their heads. I think we can all agree that those hard-working Canadians face enough barriers in trying to build a better life for themselves and their children already. It is the least we can do to stop adding barriers in their lives, and I really do mean it's the least we can do.

Now that we know what non-conviction records are, I think it's time we talk a little about why their disclosure on police record checks is such a problem and why this bill is so necessary.

First, the disclosure of non-conviction records seems to violate one of the fundamental pillars of our justice system. In Canada, we all have the right to presumption of innocence. It is very clearly laid out and protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Section 11(d) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states, "Any person charged with an offence has the right ... to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal...." I want to draw your attention to the fact that this clause relates to someone charged with an offence. Someone who has been charged with an offence must be presumed innocent until proven guilty. The problem we are facing here today is that the people who have not even been charged with a crime are facing barriers in their lives because of it. We all understand that, for those who are listening. We all understand that, Mr. Speaker, about the barriers to their lives.

They are facing barriers to get jobs. We've heard this a lot here this afternoon, from the Conservatives, from the Liberals and from every speaker who has spoken on this issue—barriers to jobs but also to accepting volunteer positions and going to school, not because they have been charged, let alone convicted of a crime, but

because the police had stopped them. I believe, and I believe most MPPs think the same way, that that is such a blatant disregard for section 11(d) of the charter that it's almost astonishing.

I don't want to give the impression that I think the police or employers or schools are purposely disregarding the charter; quite frankly, far from it. All those people do great work and help a lot of people, and we certainly shouldn't take that away from them. But what is now common practice, the disclosure of non-conviction records as part of police checks, is a serious problem, and partially because it conflicts with the charter. It really and truly is something that we need to address now.

If you are someone whose life experiences taught you not to trust the police, if you live in a community where a police presence seems threatening rather than seeming to increase your safety, and you have issues, is that going to help you trust the police? Is that going to make you more likely to call police officers if you need them? Think about that. If you have a mental health issue and you call the police to get help, it's then going to be put on your file, so when you go to volunteer or you go to coach a hockey team or you go across the border, that's going to show up. So you end up not calling the police and getting the help you need.

Of course, those are all somewhat abstract concepts when what this issue is really about is the human impact of this policy. The impact of disclosure of non-conviction records is what this is all about. The barriers that have been created that stop hard-working Ontarians, especially young people, from pursuing their dreams of a new job, a better education, or even the opportunity to volunteer and help out in their communities—something that is very rewarding, that most of us in this room probably do. That is the human impact of the disclosure of non-conviction records on police checks, and that is what needs to be stopped from happening in our great province of Ontario.

Applause.

Mr. Wayne Gates: Thank you. I was kind of hoping one of the Liberals would clap, but I'm not sure they're paying attention to me. But it is what it is.

Applause.

Mr. Wayne Gates: All right. Thank you. There you go.

My colleagues the members from Bramalea–Gore–Malton and Oshawa have already shared with you a number of stories about what the human impact is. I won't share any more with you today, but I ask you all to look back and remember the stories of Gord, Robin, Lana and Chris as we move ahead with this debate. Remember those stories—because that is what this bill is working to fix. It's going to put a stop to the disclosure of non-conviction records on police checks. That is going to help eliminate barriers for employment, for volunteer opportunities and for education that are faced far too often by the people of this province.

This bill gets a good number of things right. It prohibits the disclosure of non-conviction records in most cases, while recognizing that in some cases, those records

could be disclosed as an exceptional disclosure. It governs three types of record checks: criminal record checks, criminal record and judicial matters checks, and vulnerable sector checks. It sets out a framework for police non-conviction record checks, though it leaves much of the substance of that to regulations. And it sets time limits, which is equally important, on the non-conviction information released.

1710

These are all good things, and I'm happy to see the government finally bringing them forward. It's clear that the intense public and stakeholder scrutiny for years around this issue has finally paid off. The government is listening to the people of this province and taking action to right a wrong. I only wish that they would do the same on some other files and listen to the more than 80% of the people of Ontario who oppose the reckless privatization of Hydro One.

Hon. Steven Del Duca: Zing!

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'm glad you're here. I thought for sure you'd say something, so that's good.

While there are a number of good things in the bill, there is also some room for improvement, as there is with most bills. I would like to use my last few minutes to discuss one of the areas where that improvement would be most beneficial. The area that I want to draw your attention to is around the exceptional disclosure provision for the release of non-conviction records. This provision provides that in some circumstances, records that would otherwise not be allowed to be released can be released.

I understand why this is necessary, and I don't believe that the provision needs to be entirely removed. In fact, I was glad to see that the bill already provides for time limitations on how the provision can be applied. However, this provision still does present an issue that is twofold: First, there is an issue of transparency and accountability in the decision-making process about when those records can be released. As it stands currently, those records are created by the police, stored by the police and would be evaluated and released by the police. Unfortunately, that practice is plagued by a lack of transparency and accountability. There is no independent body that can say, "Hold on a second. Something isn't quite right here."

Now, that is not to speak ill of our police services. The police in this province are some of the best in the world. They do incredible work every single day and are some of the bravest and hardest-working women and men I know. But through no fault of their own, they are being put in a situation that, as I said, lacks transparency and accountability.

The other side of this issue around the provision for exceptional disclosure relates to what records are released as part of that disclosure. The issue here is that there might be some cases where an exceptional disclosure is looked at and the records that are then disclosed have nothing to do with the position being applied for.

Let me give you an example. Let's say someone is applying to work with a senior—I see my time is going to

run out. I'll maybe have to finish that little bit of a story up in my two minutes.

Thank you very much for giving me a few minutes to speak on the issue, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): Questions and comments?

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I'm happy to provide a few comments based on the member on the opposite side speaking. I want to commend him because I think he covered just about every major section of Bill 113. Most of his comments were all positive, that the government is doing the right thing with this particular bill. I've sat in the House and listened to several people, across the way and in my own party, and they're all complimentary of the bill. I think the public is also complimentary of this bill, so I hope that we will move forward and approve this bill as quickly as possible.

But let me say something that's very important in this bill, which was not quite covered clearly: Currently, when you apply for a record check—or a criminal record check or a police check, as many people will call it—it's issued to the body that requested it. The person whose record is being checked may not get a copy of it and may not be aware of what has been released. The legislation in front of you ensures that the person whose record is being compiled receives that record first, gets an opportunity to review it and also has an opportunity to request a review from the issuing body. Then there's an appeal process if they're not happy.

I think this particular legislation goes quite a ways to correct something that was out there that affected the young people, especially, in our community, and some adults, but I would say mostly the young people who were trying to volunteer or get a job or enter an educational institution. They would have had problems in the past and they will no longer have that, so I think it's a good thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): The member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound.

Mr. Bill Walker: It's quite the delight to see you in the chair today, Mr. Speaker. You're doing a fine job, I might say.

It's a pleasure to bring comments on my colleague from Niagara Falls. I echo what the last speaker just said. I think he did a very good job of covering most of the points in there. I'm actually going to spend a few minutes bringing the ideas and thoughts of my constituents to the floor shortly, but I just wanted to state that I think this is a good piece of legislation. It is something that we all need.

Volunteers are truly the backbone of everything we do in our communities. We could not function as a province the way we do without our volunteers. Most of this, I believe, is really for the intended purpose of protecting our children and our youth. A lot of us in our volunteer capacities have interaction with our youth and with our next generation. I think the whole intent of all police checks at one point was probably for making sure that we have people who are appropriately there to be governing them.

What I hear in my community is that there are needs to amend some of those. Some of the things that I'm going to talk about are the duplication of efforts, the duplication if you happen to volunteer for a lot of activities. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you were very involved over your years in your community; you have played a lot of key roles. One of the things we want to do is not unduly burden the system with a lot of repetitious checks. We don't want to have to go back 15 times if you happen to be a volunteer for 15 different organizations. We want to streamline that, so that obviously there is due diligence, to ensure that there's a proper check done, but we don't want to overburden the police services and all of their employees, whether they be civilian personnel or actual police officers. A lot of time and energy can be spent doing these types of checks.

The one thing I'm going to talk about a fair bit in there is the non-conviction records. People don't even realize what's in a check or what could be part of a check, and that could have the unintended consequence of creating some negative challenges.

I applaud the speaker. I applaud everyone in here today. It's been pretty positive. I look forward to adding my two cents in a few more minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): The member from Kitchener–Waterloo.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I'd just like to commend the member from Niagara Falls. I think he raised the issue, first and foremost, of why this legislation is needed and then couched it within the risk that we need to be cognizant of going forward. I appreciate the fact that he gave a shout-out to the member from Bramalea-Gore-Malton, who has been a leader in this.

It's important for us to recap: There have been nearly 2,500 with no convictions registered who had a notation for attempted suicide, and another 2,200 had a notation for mental instability with no convictions. Those are actually current on the record right now. I think having a mental instability should not qualify you as being a criminal. This is an illness, and we all know that in this day and age.

It's also worth noting that innocent victims of police disclosures, along with lawyers, academics, social justice advocates and privacy experts, are calling for legislation that would bring clarity to what information can and can't be released by police in background checks, so this legislation is timely.

Ann Cavoukian, Ontario's privacy commissioner, said that when that breach of privacy happens through a non-conviction order, "This ruins lives." She is supportive of "new laws or amendments to current legislation that clearly instructs police forces on what they can release to employers, volunteer organizations and governments."

It's very rare that we are all in this House on an afternoon and we all agree that something should happen and that this legislation is timely and that it is needed.

Finally, from the same article that was in the Toronto Star—this is one of the stories that broke this issue and raised awareness—I'm sure we all agree that, "There

should be no information about non-convicted people in CPIC. CPIC is supposed to be and should be and ought to be a Canadian police information database for the purposes of identifying your criminal history."

That is the issue that needs to be clarified going forward with this piece of legislation.

1720

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): The member for Davenport.

Mrs. Cristina Martins: I'm pleased to rise today to speak on this bill, Bill 113, police record checks. We are proud to have tabled the Police Record Checks Reform Act last spring.

In a joint statement—I believe it's been referred to here, but I thought it was worthy to mention it again—from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the John Howard Society of Ontario, the Ontario Nonprofit Network and the Association of Chiefs of Police: This bill is, "Good news for Ontario workers, volunteers, students, non-profits and businesses that will now see more consistent information released in police record checks."

It builds on the LEARN guidelines, which were developed by policing, civil liberties, mental health, community safety, non-profit and business partners and are already being followed by approximately 70% of police forces across the province.

This legislation ensures public safety while respecting privacy. We have heard from many Ontarians. Myself, I actually heard from a constituent on this exact issue who wants to volunteer and remain engaged in their community but has had some mental health issues. She raised this with me during the 2014 debate time.

People like this constituent of mine have faced unnecessary barriers due to inappropriate non-conviction and non-criminal information, such as mental health records, being disclosed during routine police record checks. Many of these individuals had schooling and careers placed in jeopardy because of this, and, in some cases, lost out on other employment opportunities.

If passed, this legislation would help remove those unnecessary barriers and increase employment and volunteering, like for my constituents in Davenport, and education opportunities. We are also establishing a specific test to ensure all information is provided in vulnerable sector checks to ensure that those who need it most, like our children and our seniors, continue to be protected.

I'm very happy with the discussion that we've had this afternoon in the House, that we are all on the same page with regard to the importance of this important bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): The member for Niagara Falls has two minutes.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I want to thank my colleagues from the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, and my own members. We come here a lot of times, and we're sent here to do the best work we can. Sometimes it works, and I think today is the perfect example of where it works. We are elected to do a job. We see a wrong here. We put a bill together to make sure we can correct

it. I think we should give ourselves a hand, because that's exactly how it should work here.

I want to tell you a story. As most know, I'm from Niagara Falls. Niagara Falls has Niagara-on-the-Lake, Niagara Falls and Fort Erie, but we also have the bridges that go over to the border. Here is a perfect example of what transpires on a non-conviction record. Somebody is going across the border—they don't know. When I read this, it says a "non-conviction record." Well, how did I get a record if I wasn't convicted? That's kind of interesting to me.

So you go across the border. I've got my family. I'm going out maybe either to a Sabres game or a Bills game, or just going to buy dinner, and I get stopped at the border. Now they're asking those types of questions because it comes up, and I get turned back. This is what we've got to fix. The embarrassment is incredible.

I just want to say, once again, thanks very much for all of your comments. And congratulate yourselves for, actually, a pretty pleasant half-hour here, listening to us all talk about the importance of doing something right so that more people can volunteer in our communities, so they can do something right. We all know volunteers are what make our communities happen.

We really have an issue—I have 15 seconds left. I'm going to put a quick 15 seconds out: We need more volunteers. We need more young people at the Lions, at the Legion—it doesn't matter what it is. Get out and volunteer. It's the best thing you can do—it makes you feel good—for your communities. Thank you very much.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim McDonell): Further debate.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: I am very, very happy to be in the House this afternoon to listen to this very constructive, positive conversation. I think I might just keep this Hansard close to me, because it's a special afternoon when all of us are so in tune with one another.

Hon. Steven Del Duca: It's a rare treat.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: It is, in fact, a rare treat.

I just want to speak, because I think that my colleagues on all sides of the House have spoken so eloquently about the merits of this and the importance of this; to actually follow from the member from Niagara Falls talking about, really, why we are doing this. We are doing it because we want to encourage volunteers to volunteer. I think everybody in this Legislature has a strong history in volunteerism. I can't imagine any of us would have been elected to this place had we not been active members of our community.

I know I've been involved in many organizations, but the one I had the strongest relationship with was Big Sisters of London, now Big Brothers Big Sisters of London. I was on the board several years ago; in fact, I was president of the board. One thing we really struggled with, as an organization that matches young girls with women, was the whole issue of safety. It's one thing to have a group activity where several people can keep an eye on the safety of the interactions; it's another thing altogether when a woman and a girl go off and do

whatever activities, often at each other's homes. We really needed to work hard to have confidence that the volunteers we were matching with these young girls would keep them out of harm's way, would keep them safe.

So we did institute the practice, which is now pretty well universal, I think, of doing the police checks. It's not something we've always done; it is something that is relatively recent, that we would do police checks. But that gave us a certain comfort that the young girls would be safe with the volunteer Big Sisters. Sometimes, though, those police checks did put in place a barrier to volunteering.

Now we will have consistent police checks across the province based on the evidence, based on the work of the LEARN guidelines, the law enforcement and records managers network—work that's been done, developed by policing, civil liberties activists, mental health stakeholders, community safety, non-profit, business partners. They all got together and said, "What should a police check include and what should a police check not include?"

I'm delighted, and I think all of us agree—it's a unanimous and enthusiastic agreement—that this is the direction to go. So let's get this job done. But, again, to follow from the member from Niagara Falls, this is a really good opportunity to encourage people to volunteer. My very best friends are friends I made through volunteering, many of them actually stemming back to my time with Big Sisters. When people joined as a—

Interjection.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: Speaker, please excuse me. I just got a note. I ought to have started by saying—I hope you'll show some kindness to me—that I am sharing my time with the member from Barrie and the member from Sudbury. You don't have to listen to me drone on for 20 minutes.

I think encouraging people to volunteer is an important thing that we as leaders in our communities can do. It is absolutely the truth that the more you give, the more you get. The more you volunteer, the more you want to volunteer. So whether it's—whatever organization in your community—visiting at a long-term-care home, whether it's engaging with kids at Big Brothers Big Sisters, the Boys and Girls Club, there are so many opportunities to volunteer and to actually learn more about yourself and learn more about your community. The thing that I always loved about volunteering is you met people who you might not otherwise meet through your work or your neighbourhood. It exposes you to other kinds of people facing other kinds of challenges. We do want to encourage that.

I know that one of the highlights of my year is going to the Volunteer Service Awards that happen across the province where we get to acknowledge those volunteers who cross the stage and accept their pins in recognition of their volunteering. I tell you, every time I go to that event with my colleague members from London and area, it's just inspiring to see how those long-service volunteers have contributed to the community.

1730

I always say, if you don't think volunteering is important, just imagine if we had no volunteers. Imagine that our hospitals were operated without those volunteers who help us as we enter the hospital, who work in the gift shop to help fund things in the hospital that otherwise would not be covered. Imagine if our kids weren't able to go to Scouts or Girl Guides. Imagine if our schools didn't have the volunteers in them to help kids learn, to support the Student Nutrition Program—whatever it is. Ontario would be a far sadder place if we didn't have volunteers really enriching the community and enriching our environment.

This is a good piece of legislation. It's so great to hear members from all sides of the House supportive of it. It is, as I say, a rare treat of unity. Soon, we'll break out in Kumbaya, maybe.

Interjections.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: Maybe that's going too far. Okay, no Kumbaya this afternoon.

Interjection.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: Yes, we'll save that spirit until question period tomorrow and see if we can carry on this great spirit of love and harmony in the Legislature tomorrow at 10:30 in the morning.

With that, I will hand off to my colleague the member from Barrie.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member for Barrie.

Ms. Ann Hoggarth: Thank you, Speaker, and thank you, Minister Matthews.

As a former teacher, I'd like to tell you how important it is that police record checks be done on all volunteers who come into the schools. Unfortunately, sometimes people who wish to do harm to children gravitate towards them, and you cannot tell by looking at them or talking to them that they are this kind of criminal, so it is very important that we do keep criminal record checks in place.

However, we have heard from our partners, stakeholders, police services, businesses and volunteer organizations that there's a need for consistent practices and policies across this province. For instance, I know a young woman who was applying for part-time employment in two different school boards in the same area. So she applied for a police record check for the one board and got it, and then took it to the other school board and showed it—it was still timely—and was told, "No, no. You have to apply for another police record check." So she had to put out the money and apply to the same police service for another record check. That isn't fair. First of all, the person had a good police record check. There was no reason to have to apply, particularly from the same police service—although it is important, as I said, that we get people in the schools who have gone through the record checks.

The other thing that happened when I was president of the teachers' federation and this procedure first came in place is I had, I would say, a middle-aged teacher call me

almost in tears. He had done something in another province when he was a juvenile, and he was petrified. Here he was, 20 years into his teaching career, and he was worried that he was going to get fired because of that conviction. It had nothing to do with his job as a teacher. We were able to make sure that his record had been expunged. He is one of the very special teachers who works with special-needs children and helps children who are having difficulty in society and perhaps having some issues with discipline. Thank heavens, the good news was that yes, it was expunged, and he got to keep his job.

The other thing was that back then, teachers would call—there were a few of them, and there are probably some people in here, who, in their younger days, had perhaps been driving when they shouldn't have—those kinds of things. Very clearly, that has no bearing on volunteering or working in the school system, and those are the kinds of things that need to be consistent across the province.

If passed, this legislation would help remove those unnecessary barriers and increase employment, volunteers and education opportunities. It does this by prohibiting the release of non-criminal information such as mental health records and strictly limiting the release of non-conviction records. As the member from Niagara said, there are certain times when records such as those need to be divulged—I'm not going to go into any examples—in order to keep children in schools safe.

I urge everyone to support this bill; I think we need it to be consistent. I hope this means there will be consistent prices and that if you have one police record check, you will be able to use it when you're volunteering in several different places.

We are ensuring that individuals will have a chance to review their non-conviction records and seek a reconsideration of the information contained in the check. I think that's only fair, too.

These changes will make Ontario a leader in Canada—with a clear, consistent and comprehensive framework to remove unnecessary barriers to success for individuals, while making sure that our communities are safe.

In the schools, we have parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts—people who come in and read with the children, people who help out with crafts, special activities, going on field trips, all of those kinds of things. We would have a hard time doing all the wonderful things that happen in the schools without those volunteers, so I urge everyone to support this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Sudbury.

Mr. Glenn Thibeault: I'd like to thank my colleague from Barrie and, of course, the President of the Treasury Board for their debates.

If the Chair will give me a little bit of leeway, since we're talking about police record checks and police came up, I think it's important for all of us to put in our thoughts today the family of Constable Joe MacDonald,

who was killed 22 years ago today in Sudbury. His wife and two kids, his mother and father, and his sisters are in our thoughts, I know, in Sudbury, and here at Queen's Park as well.

Applause.

Mr. Glenn Thibeault: Thank you. We've talked a lot about Constable MacDonald in Sudbury, and one of the great things about Constable MacDonald was that he also gave back to our community as a volunteer. He volunteered with youth; he volunteered in many other aspects. To really acknowledge Constable MacDonald, Sudbury created a youth football league in memory of him: the Joe MacDonald Youth Football League. If you think about that league today, there are so many volunteers who are needed to make it run. I can think of Dr. Mike Staffen, who I played football with way back in the day, who has been instrumental in keeping that organization going. But there are so many volunteers who keep that organization going.

The President of the Treasury Board spoke about it earlier: I know many of us get the opportunity to go to the Volunteer Service Awards. Just this past year, I was able to attend. I believe we had about 200 volunteers from my great riding of Sudbury there to receive an award. As the President of the Treasury Board was talking about, if we just imagined those 200 people not being there, who would be affected? It's the seniors in our community, who actually rely on great organizations like Meals on Wheels, and many other organizations in my riding that I could talk about that relate to volunteer service and provide service to seniors.

Boards: We forget about volunteer boards, Mr. Speaker. There are so many great boards within my community, within I know all of our communities, that do great work. They sit and have to go through Robert's Rules and learn all of those processes, but they stick through it, and they make decisions that truly benefit all of our communities.

1740

For five years prior to being elected in politics, I was involved with the United Way as the executive director and the campaign director. I can truly speak to how, if it wasn't for volunteers, the money that we raised in Sudbury or as any other United Way across this great province or our great country—we wouldn't be able to do that. So today, for us to be able to stand in this House and speak to the importance of this legislation, and make the changes necessary to ensure that we can help all of these charitable organizations, not-for-profit organizations, I think is commendable for all of us. Truly, I've had the experience, as being an executive director or working in a charitable organization, where we've had people come forward and want to volunteer. They really wanted to. But the process for them to get their police record checks in on time to meet a deadline, to meet an opportunity or whatever that charity or organization was doing, would pass because that timeline was so long.

I know we're talking about more and more police record checks coming forward. I believe—just the OPP,

if I've got the statistic here down correctly, does more than 200,000 checks annually. Although there is no accurate data on the total checks province-wide, anecdotal evidence suggests demand for record checks is increasing. So we've got the OPP having to do 200,000. I don't know how many the Greater Sudbury Police Service needs to do, but if we went through every police service across the province, I'm sure those are significant numbers. If we can compile all of this and streamline this to make it easier for those who are being affected by trying to get their police record check, I think we're doing the right thing, not only as a government, but as a Parliament in general.

I know our stakeholders—police, businesses, volunteer organizations—are talking also about consistent practices and policies across the province. This legislation will do just that. Also, prior, I think it's important to recognize that before my days at the United Way, I was also a manager within the residential field in terms of providing services to individuals with developmental handicaps. Once again, lots of people with great big hearts wanting to volunteer, and I was always so honoured and humbled to see so many people wanting to come out and work in some difficult areas.

This legislation still addresses the area in which we need to protect some of our most vulnerable citizens. I know my colleague from Barrie was speaking earlier about the importance of getting police record checks in school systems. There are also many in vulnerable situations who still need to have the kind of police checks that would require specific information for them to ensure that they can do their job effectively, but at the same time, make sure that they fit the criteria of what type of person needs to be working in those sectors.

I'm very happy, again, to be able to say that we're moving forward with this legislation. I was very happy to hear that all parties are in support of this legislation to ensure that we can continue to think about all of those volunteers who come to those service awards, but also think about all of the volunteers who are in our province who actually make our province what it is, both economically and socially. They do a fantastic job, and I think all of us here acknowledge the great work of our volunteers, thank all of our volunteers.

It truly was my honour to be able to speak to this this afternoon. Thank you very much.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate? Oh, sorry; questions and comments.

Mr. Jim McDonell: How quickly you forget the routine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I'm glad you're here to bail me out.

Mr. Jim McDonell: I acknowledge the notes from the Deputy Premier, the member from Barrie and the member from Sudbury. I think it really talks about the importance of volunteers in our communities. We really couldn't function without them. It is disheartening when you see people apply for different positions, whether it be employment or volunteering, and we beat them up with these police checks.

I would also like to make sure that—generally when people retire, they get involved with two or three or more different organizations. A police check could be used for more than one organization or employment. I have a couple of daughters applying for teaching positions, and every board they apply for requires a separate police check, which can be expensive, especially for someone who's seeking employment—so some time frame where a police check is good for a period of time, maybe a year, so that it can be reused.

As I say, volunteers do so much, and we want to make sure we make it as easy as possible and as cheap as possible, because they're also on the hook for paying for these police checks. It's tough, when you're asking somebody to give freely of their time, their efforts and all the other expenses that go along with volunteering, that we would turn around and actually ask them to contribute to the cost of the police checks—or the charity that would be reimbursed for it.

I think we have all-party support for this bill, so we're looking forward to see it going through, just to make life a little bit easier, and as a thank you to all the hours—literally millions of hours—put into this province by volunteers as they work through the essentials of making our communities work.

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I had to rise and give my comments because everybody seems to be getting along today. In the spirit of Thanksgiving, I want to thank this government for bringing this bill forward that we can actually all agree on, and say that it is a good thing that's happening here in the Legislature.

I want to point out, though, because I do have a passion about the bill that I brought forward, Bill 95, the mental health and addictions bill, that that bill has addressed a need in a wide range of communities across Ontario. When I was researching that bill, it came up in discussion that a lot of people who suffer with mental health and addictions issues reach a crisis point, and the only resource they have left is to call 911 and they get the police. Sometimes that isn't always the most appropriate response to what they're going through.

This is the scenario that I'm trying to portray here, Speaker. Someone has a mental health issue; there may not be the timely access to the resources they may need in the community or in the health care system—because of doctor shortages, wait times—and then they're in crisis and they call the police. That's their only thought in an emergency situation.

It's good to see that the police record checks bill is now going to look after some of those mental health issues, because sometimes it's a result of the gaps in our system, where people didn't access that mental health and then they're left at a stage where they reached out to the wrong organization and find themselves perhaps with a police check that, really, was unnecessary. I'm glad to see that that is going to happen, because people get ill, and if that's who they call for help, it shouldn't affect

them for 20 years if they want to become a volunteer in an organization.

So it's good to see that this bill is here. Happy Thanksgiving to all of my colleagues.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further comments?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to speak on Bill 113 and to thank many people who were involved: first of all, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, who brought this matter to my attention when I was the Minister of Public Safety. This one item, among others, we brought to the round table on civil liberties, and included at the table were different, very important stakeholders, like the John Howard Society, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the police union, the not-for-profit organizations, defence lawyers and the crown.

When they brought this to our attention, there was a bit of resistance, I should say, about entering into that type of work. But, at the same time, we realized that different police forces had different approaches to this, so there was no consistency.

1750

I was so pleased when the minister of public safety and corrections brought this Police Record Checks Reform Act last spring. It is very important. It's important that we support this because when there is no process in Ontario—everybody has a different process—then people depend on the area in which they live, and the outcome of the police record check would be different. This will bring stability and consistency, and I ask everyone to support it.

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

Mr. Bill Walker: It's a pleasure to bring a few comments to this. I was supposed to have 20 minutes. I'm not certain I'm going to get that in, so I'm going to try to get through as much as I can in my two minutes.

I'd like to commend the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services for bringing this piece of legislation through. Certainly we support, and I support, the rights of volunteers to be treated fairly. On that note, I'm going to be bringing my PMB tomorrow about election advertising spending. I hope we can have the same collegial, committed support there to be able to talk about it and find the legislation that's going to help everyone.

I support this legislation because it brings consistency and transparency to police record checks, and I support this because as I said in my earlier comments, our volunteers are the heart and soul of our great communities, our great province and our great country. What we want to make sure that we have, however, is a balance of diligence. I have two young men, my sons Zach and Ben, who have participated in a lot of activities, and we want to ensure that those people providing leadership to them are there for the right reasons and have the proper training and background.

What I hear from a lot of people in my riding is how many of them—and many of them are multiple, multiple volunteers. I attend the Volunteer Service Awards on behalf of the province every year. We have 300 to 400 people go through there; one person last year had 72 years of volunteerism. Many of them carry multiple volunteer hats. The concern they are saying is, “I have to go out and get these record checks done over and over.” There’s a lot of cost, there’s a lot of effort, there’s a lot of duplication.

The other thing I don’t want it to do is be prohibitive. Some people may not be able to afford to do this, even though they want to go out and help their communities.

So I commend this legislation. I think there are a lot of good things there, but I think there are certainly a few things we can amend. The non-conviction records is one. I think people unknowingly don’t offer that information, thinking it will stay with them for life even if they’ve never been convicted. I don’t think they want it to stay there. I certainly don’t want it to stay there.

I think we can have some more friendly amendments and make this truly a great piece of legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Somebody over there has two minutes. Deputy Premier.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: I really, as I say, have enjoyed this afternoon. It has just been wonderful. I want to say thank you to the member for Barrie, the member from Sudbury, the members from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry and from London–Fanshawe, the Attorney General and the member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound. I think that what we’ve heard this afternoon is very strong support to get this past second reading, into committee and back to the Legislature and passed. It’s a

good bill. It’s an important bill. It will remove barriers to volunteering. It will protect safety.

All in all, Speaker, I think we’ve had a great afternoon. I commend you in the Chair for bringing this kind of harmony to this place, because I think we all need a little bit of that good cheer. This isn’t always the place, but Speaker, you have managed to make this place—as is your wont, I know—a place simply of positive energy.

Mr. Bill Walker: We’re on the porch together.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: What’s that?

Mr. Bill Walker: We’re on the porch together.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: We are on the porch together. We’re not quite singing Kumbaya, but we’re going to get out the guitar pretty soon and enjoy this time together.

Speaker, we are united that volunteers are, as the member from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound said, the heart and soul of our communities. We would not have the kind of communities that we have without those extraordinary volunteers, so if we can make something a little bit easier, a little bit better for those volunteers, I think that’s exactly what we want to be doing.

So again, thank you to all of the people who have participated in this debate. I look forward to hearing thoughts from other members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Thanks to the Deputy Premier, and I hope that this companionship continues at 10:30 tomorrow morning. I’ll be waiting to see.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Since it is now five to 6, this House stands adjourned until 9 tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1755.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, OC, OOnt.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Tonia Grannum, Trevor Day, William Short

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	
Anderson, Granville (LIB)	Durham	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	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	
Baker, Yvan (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Ballard, Chris (LIB)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Brown, Patrick (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade / Ministre des Affaires civiques, de l'Immigration et du Commerce international
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	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
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Damerla, Hon. / L'hon. Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care (Long-Term Care and Wellness) / Ministre associée de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée (Soins de longue durée et Promotion du mieux-être) Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille
Del Duca, Hon. / L'hon. Steven (LIB)	Vaughan	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Dong, Han (LIB)	Trinity–Spadina	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure / Ministre du Développement économique, de l'Emploi et de l'Infrastructure
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Kitchener–Waterloo	
Flynn, Hon. / L'hon. Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hatfield, Percy (NDP)	Windsor–Tecumseh	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Hoggarth, Ann (LIB)	Barrie	
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
Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)	St. Paul's	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara- Ouest–Glanbrook	
Hunter, Hon. / L'hon. Mitzie (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Associate Minister of Finance (Ontario Retirement Pension Plan) / Ministre associée des Finances (Régime de retraite de la province de l'Ontario) Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille
Jaczek, Hon. / L'hon. Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Kiwala, Sophie (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Lalonde, Marie-France (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
Leal, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Hon. / L'hon. Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	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
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Malhi, Harinder (LIB)	Brampton–Springdale	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Martins, Cristina (LIB)	Davenport	
Martow, Gila (PC)	Thornhill	
Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)	London North Centre / London- Centre-Nord	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister Responsible for the Poverty Reduction Strategy / Ministre responsable de la Stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté President of the Treasury Board / Présidente du Conseil du Trésor
Mauro, Hon. / L'hon. Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
McDonnell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
McGarry, Kathryn (LIB)	Cambridge	
McMahon, Eleanor (LIB)	Burlington	
McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough– Westdale	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)	Ottawa–Vanier	Attorney General / Procureure générale Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Milczyn, Peter Z. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Miller, Norm (PC) Miller, Paul (NDP)	Parry Sound–Muskoka 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
Moridi, Hon. / L'hon. Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Munro, Julia (PC) Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)	York–Simcoe Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of the Environment and Climate Change / Ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Action en matière de changement climatique
Naidoo-Harris, Indira (LIB) Naqvi, Hon. / L'hon. Yasir (LIB)	Halton Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Natyshak, Taras (NDP) Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Essex Chatham–Kent–Essex	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Orazietti, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	Minister of Government and Consumer Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux et des Services aux consommateurs
Pettapiece, Randy (PC) Potts, Arthur (LIB) Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB) Rinaldi, Lou (LIB) Sandals, Hon. / L'hon. Liz (LIB) Sattler, Peggy (NDP) Scott, Laurie (PC)	Perth–Wellington Beaches–East York Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord Northumberland–Quinte West Guelph London West / London-Ouest Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Sergio, Hon. / L'hon. Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	Minister Responsible for Seniors Affairs Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Leader, Recognized Party / Chef adjoint du gouvernement
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP) Smith, Todd (PC) Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB) Tabuns, Peter (NDP) Takhar, Harinder S. (LIB) Taylor, Monique (NDP) Thibeault, Glenn (LIB) Thompson, Lisa M. (PC) Vanthof, John (NDP) Vernile, Daiene (LIB) Walker, Bill (PC) Wilson, Jim (PC)	Bramalea–Gore–Malton Prince Edward–Hastings Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud Toronto–Danforth Mississauga–Erindale Hamilton Mountain Sudbury Huron–Bruce Timiskaming–Cochrane Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound Simcoe–Grey	Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Wong, Soo (LIB) Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)	Scarborough–Agincourt Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Première ministre Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
Yakabuski, John (PC) Yurek, Jeff (PC) Zimmer, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB) Vacant	Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke Elgin–Middlesex–London Willowdale Whitby–Oshawa	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones

**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 / Présidente: Cheri DiNovo
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Monique Taylor
Bas Balkissoon, Chris Ballard
Grant Crack, Cheri DiNovo
Han Dong, Michael Harris
Sophie Kiwala, Todd Smith
Monique Taylor
Committee Clerk / Greffier / Greffière: Christopher Tyrell

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Présidente: Soo Wong
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Peter Z. Milczyn
Laura Albanese, Yvan Baker
Toby Barrett, Victor Fedeli
Catherine Fife, Ann Hoggarth
Peter Z. Milczyn, Daiene Vernile
Soo Wong
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Grant Crack
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Joe Dickson
Mike Colle, Grant Crack
Joe Dickson, Lisa Gretzky
Ann Hoggarth, Sophie Kiwala
Jim McDonnell, Eleanor McMahon
Lisa M. Thompson
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: John Fraser
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Cristina Martins
Robert Bailey, Vic Dhillon
John Fraser, Wayne Gates
Marie-France Lalonde, Harinder Malhi
Cristina Martins, Randy Pettapiece
Lou Rinaldi
Clerk / Greffier: Vacant

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de
la justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qadri
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Lorenzo Berardinetti
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Bob Delaney
Randy Hillier, Michael Mantha
Cristina Martins, Indira Naidoo-Harris
Arthur Potts, Shafiq Qadri
Laurie Scott
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Monte McNaughton
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jack MacLaren
Granville Anderson, Bas Balkissoon
Chris Ballard, Steve Clark
Jack MacLaren, Michael Mantha
Eleanor McMahon, Monte McNaughton
Soo Wong
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod
Han Dong, John Fraser
Ernie Hardeman, Percy Hatfield
Lisa MacLeod, Harinder Malhi
Julia Munro, Arthur Potts
Lou Rinaldi
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Présidente: Indira Naidoo-Harris
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Kathryn McGarry
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Jennifer K. French
Monte Kwinter, Amrit Mangat
Kathryn McGarry, Indira Naidoo-Harris
Daiene Vernile, Bill Walker
Jeff Yurek
Committee Clerk / Greffier / Greffière: Christopher Tyrell

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jagmeet Singh
Granville Anderson, Vic Dhillon
Amrit Mangat, Gila Martow
Kathryn McGarry, Norm Miller
Jagmeet Singh, Peter Tabuns
Glenn Thibeault
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Select Committee on Sexual Violence and Harassment /
Comité spécial de la violence et du harcèlement à caractère
sexuel**

Chair / Présidente: Daiene Vernile
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Laurie Scott
Han Dong, Sylvia Jones
Marie-France Lalonde, Harinder Malhi
Kathryn McGarry, Eleanor McMahon
Taras Natyshak, Peggy Sattler
Laurie Scott, Daiene Vernile
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

Continued from back cover

By-election in Sudbury

Mr. Steve Clark	5676
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	5677

DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

Great Lakes Protection Act, 2015, Bill 66, Mr. Murray / Loi de 2015 sur la protection des Grands Lacs, projet de loi 66, M. Murray	
Third reading agreed to	5677
Protecting Condominium Owners Act, 2015, Bill 106, Mr. Oraziotti / Loi de 2015 sur la protection des propriétaires de condominiums, projet de loi 106, M. Oraziotti	
Second reading agreed to	5678
Visitor	
Mr. Arthur Potts	5678

**INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS /
PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Mr. Yvan Baker.....	5679
---------------------	------

**MEMBERS' STATEMENTS /
DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS**

Forest industry	
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	5679
Community Living Elgin	
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	5679
Bowmanville Applefest	
Mr. Granville Anderson	5679
Privatization of public assets	
Mrs. Julia Munro.....	5679
Bear control	
Mr. John Vanthof	5680
Post-secondary education	
Mr. Yvan Baker.....	5680
Carp Farmers' Market	
Mr. Jack MacLaren	5680
Community policing	
Mrs. Amrit Mangat	5680
Threads of Life	
Ms. Ann Hoggarth.....	5681

**REPORTS BY COMMITTEES /
RAPPORTS DES COMITÉS**

Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills	
Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris	5681
Report adopted	5681

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS /
DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

Pathways to Post-secondary Excellence Act (Post- secondary Educational Report), 2015, Bill 127, Mr. Baker / Loi de 2015 sur les voies de l'excellence au niveau postsecondaire (rapport sur l'enseignement postsecondaire), projet de loi 127, M. Baker	
First reading agreed to.....	5681
Mr. Yvan Baker.....	5681
Business Corporations Amendment Act (Meetings of Shareholders and Executive Compensation), 2015, Bill 128, Mr. Takhar / Loi de 2015 modifiant la Loi sur les sociétés par actions (assemblées des actionnaires et rétribution des membres de la direction), projet de loi 128, M. Takhar	
First reading agreed to.....	5682
Mr. Harinder S. Takhar	5682

MOTIONS

Estimates	
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	5682
Motion agreed to	5682
Private members' public business	
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	5682
Motion agreed to	5682

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY
AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS
MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

National Peace Officers' Memorial Run	
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	5682
Mr. Patrick Brown.....	5683
Ms. Jennifer K. French.....	5684

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Hospital services	
Mr. Norm Miller.....	5685
Privatization of public assets	
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	5685
Lung health	
Mr. Arthur Potts	5685
Volunteer firefighters	
Mr. Robert Bailey.....	5686
Dental care	
Mme France Gélinas	5686
Soins palliatifs	
M. Victor Fedeli	5686

Tenant protection	
Ms. Catherine Fife	5686
Employment practices	
Mr. Arthur Potts.....	5687
Energy policies	
Mr. Victor Fedeli	5687
Privatization of public assets	
Mr. Wayne Gates	5687
Water fluoridation	
Mr. Arthur Potts.....	5687

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015, Bill 113, Mr. Naqvi / Loi de 2015 sur la réforme des vérifications de dossiers de police, projet de loi 113, M. Naqvi	
Hon. Steven Del Duca	5688
Hon. Helena Jaczek	5689
Mr. Yvan Baker	5689
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti	5691
Mr. Victor Fedeli	5691
Ms. Catherine Fife	5691
Mr. Bas Balkissoon.....	5691
Mr. Jack MacLaren.....	5692
Mr. Yvan Baker	5692
Mr. Robert Bailey	5692
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	5695
Hon. Bill Mauro.....	5696
Mr. Norm Miller	5696
Mr. John Vanthof.....	5696
Mr. Robert Bailey	5697
Mr. Wayne Gates	5697
Mr. Bas Balkissoon.....	5699
Mr. Bill Walker.....	5699
Ms. Catherine Fife	5700
Mrs. Cristina Martins.....	5700
Mr. Wayne Gates	5700
Hon. Deborah Matthews.....	5701
Ms. Ann Hoggarth	5702
Mr. Glenn Thibeault	5702
Mr. Jim McDonell	5703
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	5704
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur.....	5704
Mr. Bill Walker.....	5704
Hon. Deborah Matthews.....	5705
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	5705

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 7 October 2015 / Mercredi 7 octobre 2015

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Protecting Condominium Owners Act, 2015, Bill 106, Mr. Orazietti / Loi de 2015 sur la protection des propriétaires de condominiums, projet de loi 106, M. Orazietti

Mr. Chris Ballard	5655
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	5655
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	5656
Mr. Mike Colle.....	5656
Mr. Michael Mantha	5656
Mr. Mike Colle.....	5656
Vote deferred.....	5657

Strengthening and Improving Government Act, 2015, Bill 85, Mme Meilleur / Loi de 2015 sur le renforcement et l'amélioration de la gestion publique, projet de loi 85, Mme Meilleur

Hon. Jeff Leal.....	5658
Mrs. Laura Albanese	5658
Ms. Ann Hoggarth.....	5659
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde	5660
Mr. Todd Smith.....	5660
Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	5661
Mr. Grant Crack	5661
Mr. Jim McDonell.....	5661
Mrs. Laura Albanese	5662
Mr. John Yakabuski	5662
Mr. Jim McDonell.....	5665
Second reading debate deemed adjourned	5665

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Lisa MacLeod	5665
Mr. John Vanthof	5666
Mr. Chris Ballard	5666
Mr. John Yakabuski	5666
Mr. Jagmeet Singh	5666
Mrs. Amrit Mangat	5666
Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn	5666
Hon. James J. Bradley	5666
Hon. Glen R. Murray	5666
M. Grant Crack	5666
Mr. Harinder S. Takhar	5666
Mr. Paul Miller.....	5666
Mr. Yvan Baker.....	5666

Wearing of ribbons

Ms. Lisa MacLeod.....	5666
-----------------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

Health care

Mr. Patrick Brown.....	5666
Hon. Eric Hoskins	5666

Privatization of public assets

Mr. Patrick Brown.....	5667
Hon. Bob Chiarelli	5667

Privatization of public assets

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	5669
Hon. Charles Sousa	5669

International trade agreement

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	5669
Hon. Charles Sousa	5670

Winter highway maintenance

Mr. Michael Harris.....	5670
Hon. Steven Del Duca.....	5670

International trade agreement

Mr. Wayne Gates	5671
Hon. Charles Sousa	5671

Northern highway improvement

Mr. Glenn Thibeault.....	5671
Hon. Michael Gravelle	5672

Student safety

Ms. Lisa MacLeod.....	5672
Hon. Liz Sandals	5672

Executive compensation

Ms. Peggy Sattler	5673
Hon. Reza Moridi.....	5673

Condominium legislation

Mr. Han Dong	5674
Hon. David Orazietti	5674

Water extraction

Mr. Ted Arnott	5674
Hon. Glen R. Murray.....	5674

Pension plans

Mr. Paul Miller.....	5675
Hon. Charles Sousa	5675

Senior citizens

Ms. Harinder Malhi.....	5676
Hon. Mario Sergio.....	5676

Continued on inside back cover