



Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

First Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

Première session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 22 November 2000**

**Mercredi 22 novembre 2000**

Speaker  
Honourable Gary Carr

Clerk  
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président  
L'honorable Gary Carr

Greffier  
Claude L. DesRosiers

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

### **Copies of Hansard**

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

### **Exemplaires du Journal**

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 22 November 2000

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 22 novembre 2000

*The House met at 1330.  
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** I want to register my growing concern with the actions of Mr John Baird, the Minister of Community and Social Services, and his constant attack on Ontario's most vulnerable people. For some time now, I have been increasingly disturbed by Mr Baird's actions as he plays to the public misunderstanding of social assistance and unfairly attacks the people least able to defend themselves. He does it for pure political gain. He knows that at least 98% of all people on social assistance are decent, honest people who are on social assistance as a last resort. He knows that social assistance provides a single parent with two children with only \$15,000 a year.

This minister deliberately plays to public misunderstanding to undermine public support for all people on social assistance. I'm disturbed by his ordering "Wanted" posters in public buildings. He waves a credit card around, implying that many people on social assistance have one. He orders mandatory drug testing for people on social assistance. Today's conference on welfare fraud announced 550 convictions, one tenth of 1% of all people on social assistance.

The auditor yesterday pointed out that 61,000 businesses had defaulted on paying their sales tax and 18 doctors convicted of criminal fraud against OHIP are still practising medicine, and yet he doesn't have "Wanted" posters in chambers of commerce and in doctors' offices. He doesn't order mandatory drug testing for those doctors and those fraudulent tax evaders. He attacks the most vulnerable in our society. He should be defending our most vulnerable instead of kicking them when they are most in need.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** In the same spirit, I was disgusted and horrified this morning to attend yet another government-organized press conference to demonize people in receipt of social assistance in this province yet once again.

You will remember some of us describing the attack on our most vulnerable and marginalized by taking away almost one quarter of their income, some 22%, in July 1995 as akin to the bully walking into the schoolyard,

picking out the smallest and the weakest, and laying a beating on them just to send a message to the rest about how tough and determined they are to wield power and control. Well, this morning they kicked them once again. Last week they booted them with the right foot; today they gave them the left. I suppose this kind of behaviour will continue until they get the message that this kind of abuse is totally unacceptable, disgusting and abhorrent.

First they take their money; then they cut their programs; next they make it illegal to panhandle; then they contract with the toughest motorcycle gang of them all, Andersen Consulting, to find new ways of putting the thumbscrews on; then they cut them off for life if they make a mistake in their reporting. Last week and today they continue kicking them while they are down, and Mr Baird is enjoying it so, so much.

When will it stop? How much blood is enough? What's next? Capital punishment for being poor? This is scapegoating, no more, no less, and it has to stop.

SID HORNE

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** I draw your attention today to a very special constituent in my riding. This month, Padre Sid Horne marks 50 years of ordination and his legacy of giving.

Padre Horne joined the Royal Canadian Army Chaplain Corps in 1953. He was transferred to the regular force chaplaincy in 1956 and his postings took him to all regions in Canada, including Alberta, Quebec, BC and Manitoba.

In 1971 he settled at CFB Trenton, where he remained until his retirement in 1980. While at Trenton he was posted to Egypt for six months with the Canadian contingent of the United Nations peacekeeping force. It was an experience that he calls a highlight of his military career.

As a strong believer in community service, Padre Horne has been involved in numerous organizations over the years, including the Military Chaplains Association of Trenton, Ladies Auxiliary and several legion branches.

However, Padre Horne calls the seven years that he spent with the Anglican parish of Tyendinaga Mohawk Territory the happiest of his life. Horne worked with the Mohawks from 1987 until 1994 and when he left was honoured by the nation and given his own name, Raw Wen Nen Haw Wee, which means Carrier of the Word.

His achievements are many. However, when questioned on his divine intervention on the quality of the

weather, his standard response is, "I'm in charge of sales, not management."

Please join with me in acknowledging Padre Sid Horne's 50 years of ordination.

#### WEARING OF RIBBONS

**Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd just ask unanimous consent to wear the red ribbon on behalf of the MADD campaign that's been launched.

#### SPECIALISTS' SERVICES

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** We continue to bring forward cases that show clearly that we have a lack of family doctors and specialists where I come from, the riding of Windsor West, along with numerous other communities across the province.

I want to tell you about Anne, a woman who lives in Windsor, who has a broken fusion at the base of her spine. This woman is living in agony. Her family doctor wants her to have treatment immediately. Instead she has a booked appointment with a neurosurgeon for November of 2002. We brought forward a similar case not long ago, and yes, again, we're applying for out-of-country OHIP coverage to get this consult done so that we can get on with some treatment.

At the same time as I tell you about Anne, who desperately needs to get to a neurosurgeon instead of waiting until the year 2002, I tell you about Jay, a Windsorite who's in a medical school out of country. Jay is trying to come back home to practise when he's done. Well, what Jay needs is a J-1 visa to do residency in the US. In order to do that when you're from Ontario, they only grant this J-1 visa under very strict criteria out of designated hospitals.

Specifically, we need the rules to change. We need a Windsor hospital to be able to sign on to fill out the forms for the J-1 visa. We know that there are solutions that can be had long-term to resolve our family doctor and specialist shortage. In the meantime, we don't have time to wait. People like Anne cannot wait two years for this kind of treatment. I implore the government to make rule changes to help us now.

#### CPI CANADA

**Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton):** I rise today to congratulate a company in my riding, Communications and Power Industries, known as CPI, of Palo Alto, California. I congratulate them on their move of their amplifier operation to their plant in Georgetown, Ontario, which rests in my riding.

CPI Canada has been operating in Georgetown since 1955 under the name of Varian Canada. Currently, the company employs about 250 people in Georgetown. Moving the amplifier operation will bring more than 100

new jobs to the facility—100 more high-tech jobs, 100 more good, paying jobs.

The Canadian division has been in the business of developing, manufacturing and marketing high technology used in satellite communications, radar and medical imaging. The company is the world's largest independent supplier of electronic systems used to provide power and control in medical X-ray systems.

The highly sophisticated electronic products convert signals for telephone, television, Internet and data transmission from earth stations to orbiting satellites. President Joe Caldarelli of CPI Canada tells me that more than 95% of the company's products are exported. Although the United States is one of the largest countries they export to, there is hardly a country in the world they haven't exported to over the period of time they've operated in Georgetown, since 1955.

I congratulate Joe Caldarelli and Communications and Power Industries for their move to that wonderful town in Georgetown.

1340

#### HAZARDOUS WASTE

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** My statement is in regard to the continued mismanagement and incompetence of the Minister of the Environment in dealing with hazardous waste landfills.

I've been repeatedly asking the Minister of the Environment, both Minister Clement and now Minister Newman, to put into place a full-time inspector at the largest toxic hazardous landfill in Canada, which is located in Moore township. I've also asked the minister to address the need for financial assurances from Safety-Kleen.

The information was provided to the minister that a smaller hazardous waste site in South Carolina had to put up \$70 million in American currency to deal with remedial environmental problems, yet in Ontario, Safety-Kleen needs \$2.5 million.

The hazardous waste landfill in Moore township was fast-tracked. It became the largest toxic hazardous landfill in Canada. The Harris government has been shown to be incompetent at managing its responsibilities in protecting the interests of the people of this province.

Dalton McGuinty and the provincial Liberals have been pointing out the incompetent management of Harris and the neo-Conservatives on environmental issues, and now the Provincial Auditor has brought down one of his most scathing reports, which reinforces, in this case, the request for better provincial management of hazardous waste landfills.

#### DRINKING AND DRIVING

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** On Friday, November 10, I attended the official launch of the new Durham region chapter of MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, which was held at Durham College in Oshawa. I was

encouraged to see so many young people show their support for MADD and the Project Red Ribbon—Tie One on for Safety campaign.

Now that the holiday season is approaching, I can't stress enough just how important it is for drivers to be aware of the irreversible results of accidents caused by drinking and driving. I would encourage people to tie a red ribbon on to their car's antenna to show support for the program.

This year alone there have been 19 alcohol-related traffic deaths in Durham region. This concerns many of my Durham constituents and is one that the province of Ontario does not take lightly.

Since 1995, our government has provided considerable support to the RIDE program and increased suspensions for drinking and driving, making them the toughest in Canada. Repeat offenders will now face a lifetime suspension of their licence, clearly conveying that this type of reckless behaviour is not tolerated in Ontario.

I'd like to wish the president of MADD's Durham chapter, Nancy Codlin, vice-president James Foster, and event organizer Geoff McCoombe well and thank them for their efforts. I also want to thank Connie Heron, whose daughter Amanda was killed by a drunk driver. I might say, her speech was the most moving event of the day.

Remember, arrive alive—don't drink and drive.

#### EYE CARE SERVICES

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** In the Niagara region, we have a drastic situation concerning people requiring eye care. First of all, we have per capita the oldest population in the province of Ontario. Elderly people require eye care more than others.

There's a long lineup of people now. Waiting lists are as long as they've ever been for the limited number of ophthalmologists we have in the Niagara region. Eye care, as we recognize, is not a frill; it's absolutely essential. If you do not deal with problems immediately, blindness can occur.

The Minister of Health says they should all go to Hamilton if there's a problem. Hamilton is backed up as well. I have letters from Dr James Martin, acting chief, department of eye medicine and eye surgery, St Joseph's Hospital in Hamilton, and Dr Jeffrey Sher, chief of the Hamilton Health Sciences Corp department of eye medicine and surgery. They're all saying there's no room in Hamilton because they're already at maximum. Many of the people who are listed as ophthalmologists are only part-time ophthalmologists. Many have retired, and some have gone out of practice. This is a crisis situation. We also have extra billing taking place at the present time, where seniors must pay for lenses which normally would be paid for by the Ontario hospital insurance plan.

It's time this government took action to address a crisis in the Niagara region by temporarily lifting the billing cap for ophthalmologists and then ensuring we have a sufficient number for the entire region.

#### HOME CARE

**Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** On October 11, 2000, the member from Beaches-East York asked the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care a question regarding putting patients first and ending the competitive bidding process for homemaking services. The member stated that the Sarnia-Lambton Victorian Order of Nurses homemakers had been directed to deduct travel time from the time they spent with patients. The member specifically talked about a homemaker who had to travel to Camlachie, which happens to be in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex.

Speaker, let me share with you and with the House what Lavinia Dickenson, executive director of the VON, said in a letter written on October 20, 2000: "I researched this issue and am contending that the allegation is false." I am sending a copy of the correspondence to the member from Beaches-East York. In all fairness, I am sure she will see to it that putting patients first is of the utmost importance and will send a letter of apology to the Sarnia-Lambton VON.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### MUNICIPALITY OF SIOUX LOOKOUT ACT, 2000

Mr Hampton moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr31, An Act to change the name of The Corporation of the Town of Sioux Lookout to The Corporation of the Municipality of Sioux Lookout.

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

#### VISITORS

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** With your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I'd like to introduce in the west gallery grade 5 students from Monsignor Leo Cleary school in my riding of Durham, along with their teachers, Mary Gibson and Dave Ashcroft. I'd like to welcome them to the Legislature today.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My first question today is for the Premier. It is about both your integrity and lack of commitment when it comes to standing up for our environment and for the health of Ontarians.

On May 29, while defending your cuts to the Ministry of the Environment after seven people had lost their lives in Walkerton, you stood in this Legislature and said the

following: "There has been no reduction in the number of enforcement officers, those people who go out and actually lay the charges and do those inspections ... to suggest that this has been responsible for fewer inspections—it's not true."

Yesterday the Provincial Auditor reported that you fired 25% of the Ministry of the Environment staff who perform inspections. He reported that those cuts have resulted in a 53% cut in inspections at our drinking water plants.

Why did you stand in this House and say that you didn't cut either the number of inspectors or the number of inspections, when the auditor says that is exactly what you did do?

1350

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** Certainly, the information I have is that there were no reductions in the front-line inspectors. There were a number of positions that were reduced, and we have acknowledged that. This is part of recommendations that we received to make government more efficient and more effective, that we not affect front-line services and that we try to streamline the bureaucracy so that we can do a better job.

The auditor has pointed out a number of areas where reductions have been made in the number of staff in the Ministry of the Environment. I'm not up to detail on inspections in which area or the other. I do know, and I can tell you this, that as I reviewed auditors' reports over the last number of years, there does not seem to be any improvement from when he slammed your government and the NDP government in the lack of inspection and follow-up.

**Mr McGuinty:** Premier, I want to ask you the same question again because you didn't answer it. You stood up in this Legislature and you said there were no cuts to inspectors and no cuts to the numbers of inspections. The Provincial Auditor tells us there has been a 25% cut in the number of our inspectors working out there on our behalf and this has resulted in a 53% cut in inspections at our drinking water plants.

The Premier may want to have some fun in comparing his record to the record of previous governments, but I would ask him to keep in mind that on his watch seven people died in the community of Walkerton.

I will ask you again, Premier: why did you stand up in this House and tell us there had been no cuts to inspectors or inspections, while the Provincial Auditor, a man in whom we have ultimate faith, tells us something completely different?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Let me repeat that, contrary to any allegations of reductions in inspection investigative staff, the reality is this: no reductions were made to the investigative staff, as I indicated before and as I now repeat to you today.

I can tell you as well that compliance funding makes up 49% of the ministry's workforce now, compared to only 40% during the regime of the government we took over from. Those are the facts.

Let me be clear. Nobody is suggesting that everything is hunky-dory and is perfect in the Ministry of the Environment. In fact, we have been the first to acknowledge that there have been problems there. There have been compliance problems there, and there have been challenges there. That's why we've got about four commissions now underway, including Val Gibbons, to give us advice on how we can restructure the Ministry of the Environment so we don't get the kind of auditor's report—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The Premier's time is up. Final supplementary.

**Mr McGuinty:** If the Premier is genuinely interested in the facts, then I would refer him to page 119 of the Provincial Auditor's report. There is a chart there. It tells us that, when it comes to the number of inspections, they're down.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** Dramatically.

**Mr McGuinty:** When it comes to the number of inspectors, they're also down dramatically.

Premier, you don't have any more credibility when it comes to the issue of the environment. The Provincial Auditor has confirmed that for us. Let's set that matter aside for the moment, and that is bad enough.

We need more inspectors on the job in Ontario. Your own Ministry of the Environment has recommended that you hire at least 130 full-time inspectors so they can be out there on the job and doing things like making sure our drinking water is safe for our families.

Setting aside your complete lack of credibility as to the record on this matter, Premier, why do you not proceed to hire those inspectors and, for the first time since you got the job of Premier, do something right when it comes to the Ministry of the Environment?

**Hon Mr Harris:** As you know, we have hired more inspectors already throughout the summer period and initiated a number of new initiatives since the very, very unfortunate situation in Walkerton.

But let me read to you from the auditor's report. It says "data submitted by the four largest contributors of acid rain in Ontario not being verified for compliance," "many pollution complaints received," "lacked adequate evidence of follow-up by the ministry." It says, "In our review of six districts covering two regions, we observed in four districts there were no control logs or summary records of complaints." "We selected 120 complaints, 15 incidents. No evidence exists that a complaint"—oh, I'm sorry. That was in 1987, when Mr Bradley was the minister.

This is the problem we have with the Ministry of the Environment. We have not had the kind of dramatic improvement with the Ministry of the Environment that we have had in many of the other ministries, so there is clearly more work to do.

## AGRICORP

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. You assured me, and in fact this Legislature, on October 2 of this year that at no time was any safety net money for our farmers gambled in the financial markets. My question for you today is, when did you or your officials first learn that, as the Provincial Auditor reported yesterday, \$2.9 million of safety net money was used inappropriately in a day-trading strategy?

**Hon Ernie Hardeman (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** I want to point out, as I've done a number of times in this House, that inappropriate things happened at Agricorp as they dealt with government money. That was brought to our attention in January or February by our ministry. They reported that the Provincial Auditor was doing a value-for-money audit at Agricorp and he was finding areas that were inappropriate. We immediately contacted the Provincial Auditor and met with him to discuss what needed to be done or what should be done in order to make sure this couldn't happen again and to address any of the things that had happened to make sure no government money was going to be consumed by this inappropriate action. That was completed.

As the Leader of the Opposition will know, he asked me whether—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. I'm afraid the minister's time is up.

**Mr McGuinty:** You didn't answer the question. When did you first learn that this money was used inappropriately, money that was set aside to meet the special needs of farmers who fall on hard times, special insurance monies? When did you first learn about that?

We know that the Provincial Auditor, as a rule, delivers a detailed copy of his findings to the involved minister months before he makes his final report public. I raised the question about inappropriate use of safety net money for farmers on October 2. When did you or your officials receive a copy of the Provincial Auditor's findings, findings which confirmed that money was in fact used inappropriately? When did you get that copy? Long before this Provincial Auditor's report was made public? When did you find out in writing from the Provincial Auditor that monies were being used inappropriately?

**Hon Mr Hardeman:** As the leader of the official opposition would be aware, the ministry does, on a regular basis following a value-for-money audit, receive the preliminary report as to the events that took place. I don't have the exact date here, but I suspect it was somewhere in July or August that the first report would have come forward. That report indicated that Agricorp had taken a number of millions of dollars and invested it into the markets and had lost some \$300,000 on that investment. It was not put back where it was taken from, and we immediately replaced that to make sure that none of the money the farmers had put in the program—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The minister's time is up. Final supplementary.

1400

**Mr McGuinty:** Minister, let's agree. We now understand that you in fact knew before October 2. You knew at the time that I raised this very question with you in this House that money had been used inappropriately. You knew that.

Now I'm asking you, why did you deliberately say that you didn't know when in fact you did? The Provincial Auditor had conveyed to you—either through a one-on-one meeting or through meetings with your officials or by way of documentation, he had provided to you sufficient information for you to know, when you stood up in this House on October 2 of this year, that money had in fact been used inappropriately. The money had been used by Agricorp officials in some kind of gambling scheme. They put farmers' hard-placed money at risk. Why did you stand up in this House and tell us something that you knew wasn't true?

**Hon Mr Hardeman:** I want to assure the member opposite that at no time did Agricorp, as inappropriate as the actions they took were, take crop insurance money into the market. They took other money invested, and when that went sour they in fact put the money into the crop insurance fund with the loss. Immediately upon finding that out, we put that money back. But at no time did Agricorp use the money that was the farmers' money in the crop insurance program to do the day trading. I don't think at the end of the day it matters whose money it was. The action was totally inappropriate and should not be condoned.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Premier. Yesterday, the auditor found yet more evidence of this government's gross neglect of Ontario's environment. The auditor makes it very clear that the inspection staff has been cut by 25% by this government in the Ministry of the Environment, and as a result the inspection of potential polluters is down by 34%. As a second result, the number of municipal water treatment inspections is down by 50%. As a third result, the number of inspections of hazardous waste sites is down by 40% even as hazardous waste dumping from the US has increased dramatically.

Premier, the auditor says that your government is no longer able to, no longer has the capacity to, enforce environmental laws in Ontario. What's your response to that kind of disgraceful situation?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I didn't read that in the auditor's report phrased quite the way you have phrased it. I read in the auditor's report concerns typical of what he had in reports in the 1980s. It's very typical of the reports in the early 1990s. It concerns me that with all the improvements we have made in all the ministries, and I think it's apparent in the auditor's report, we have not been able to make any substantial improvements in the

efficiency or the number of inspections that have come through the Ministry of the Environment.

We've made improvements in a number of areas. The number of convictions has just about doubled, part of enforcement information, from 1991 to 1999. Clearly we are on the job, but we're not doing as good a job as we could. I think that's the message the auditor is sending to us. It's a message we clearly acknowledge ourselves—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The Premier's time is up. Supplementary.

**Mr Hampton:** No, Premier. The auditor was on the radio this morning, and he said that this report and the report last year contain the worst situations he has ever seen. That is what the auditor is saying. As for your statement that you're out there doing more enforcement, the auditor also says that in situations where you are supposed to get financial guarantees from potential polluters so that the people of Ontario aren't left on the hook, in fact \$90 million in financial guarantees weren't gotten by your government, that you're letting these companies off the hook, that your government failed to obtain financial guarantees from some of these potential polluters in 710 of 1,100 applications last year, a 65% failure rate.

In another case, with a company that has experienced financial problems, you simply let them off the hook, leaving the people of Ontario on the hook for over \$2 million in liability for a polluter. You've let more than \$10 million in environmental fines go unpaid.

The question remains the same. It is perfectly obvious you're not enforcing the environmental laws. What are you going to do about that disgraceful situation?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Let me read from the auditor's report exactly what he said. He said, "Efforts to monitor the generation and disposal of wastes were found to be less than satisfactory." He said, "The ministry did not ensure that all wastes shipped were received at the intended disposal facilities." He said, "The ministry had not followed up discrepancies noted in over 70% of the exception reports sampled." He said, "Some generators were discharging waste into sewers."

Oh, I'm sorry, this was 1991, when Ruth Grier was the minister under your government.

You see, we have been having problems at the Ministry of the Environment. The difference between you and the Liberals and us is that we acknowledge it. There are problems. They need to be corrected. We have put measures into place. The first thing you have to do is acknowledge that there is a problem, something you refused to do, something the Liberals refused to do, a reason why we never got some of these problems solved. Yes, there is more to do. We acknowledge that.

**Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth):** Premier, you are a disgrace. Get your head out of the sand. Under your watch, seven people died. Under the NDP watch, we took 1,000 people and put them into the Ontario Clean Water Agency. Under your watch, you took 1,000 people and put them out into the street. That is the reality here. The staggering costs of your so-called Common Sense Revolution are becoming clearer every day. Pre-

mier, you have slashed 60% out of the combined budgets of the Ministry of the Environment and laid off 1,000 staff.

We started to see the results of your cutbacks when seven people died in Walkerton. Now you are creating the climate where more people can die in this province as the result of your cuts. I'm asking you now. The debate is over. You are not protecting the environment. Will you commit today to rehire 500 front-line staff to protect the health of Ontarians? Will you commit to that today?

**Hon Mr Harris:** I can tell you that we are not committed to going back to the way you utilized the 500 staff, which led the auditor to say this: "Over 700 closed landfill sites have been classified as most in need of priority reviews. Only 200 had been inspected. Only 10 sites had been subject to detailed investigation with the help of external consultants. The ministry had no formal plan to inspect and investigate any more sites."

You want us to go back to those kinds of auditors' reports, which were an absolute disgrace. The answer to that is no. Are we hiring more? Yes. As you know, we've brought in a number of initiatives. The minister has indicated that we have in fact brought in more inspectors, specialized teams, to get at some of these problems.

As a result, for example, in 1991, we had 382 convictions; in 1992, 363; in 1993, 297. You see the trend there. Then we went, in 1996, up to 366; in 1997, 414—

**The Speaker:** The Premier's time is up.

#### AMBULANCE SERVICES

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** The other area where the auditor is highly critical of your government is on the issue of ambulances. On Monday, 19 hospitals in the greater Toronto area were turning ambulances away. That's 80% of hospitals turning ambulances away. On average, that situation happened in September, October and November of this year. City councils across the province are living in fear of having to take over this underfunded ambulance system from your government. They're worried about having more Joshua Fleuelling situations happen. They know that the system is underfunded to the tune of at least \$100 million a year to bring it up to standard.

Premier, everybody in the province—the municipalities, the auditor—knows that the ambulance system is not in good shape and they know that forcing municipalities to take it over is not going to improve the system. Will you drop this dangerous scheme before more lives are put at risk? Will you take responsibility for the underfunded ambulance system you've created and stop forcing it on to municipalities?

1410

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** It's the same question you asked yesterday, and I will accept responsibility for increasing funding for ambulances by some 30% to date, an additional \$30 million on top of that, over and above what you have funded. So if it's inad-



equately funded today, you can imagine the disaster it was when you were in government.

We make no apologies for trying to get a system that is uniform across the province. We make no apologies for finally setting uniform standards in 1996. It was pretty easy for you to respond to meeting the needs when you had no standards to measure by. So we do set tough new standards. Our business planning exercise continues to challenge the bureaucracy and the government to do better and better. It is measurable, and we welcome the auditor's pointing out where we're not achieving greater compliance with those new standards, including ambulances, and it will help us do better in the future, as opposed to when you had no standards. Nobody knew how well you were doing. You had something—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The Premier's time is up. Final supplementary.

**Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-East York):** Premier, there's a lot that you say you won't apologize for. I wonder if you will apologize for the death of Joshua Fleuelling.

You say you've got measures and you've got standards. I've stood in this House and I've told your Minister of Health day after day: 18, 19 hospitals on redirect or critical care bypass. I've told her that ambulances are sitting in the parking lots waiting up to 45 minutes to be able to take their patients into the hospital emergency rooms. I've told her that while that's going on, calls are backing up on a dispatcher's desk.

The auditor now confirms that and the auditor says that they were informed that the Ministry of Health had not analyzed the impact of redirect consideration and critical care bypass on travel time, or the delays in reaching the next patient. I've brought those issues to this minister's attention.

You say you've got standards? You say they're measurable? You've done nothing to even collect the data to make sure we know how patients' lives are being affected by this fiasco.

Anyone who works in the area of addictions or alcoholism will tell you that the first step to recovery is to get out of denial, to admit the situation. When will you acknowledge you have created a crisis? The crisis is putting patients' lives at risk. When will you take steps—

**The Speaker:** Premier?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Thanks for the advice. I appreciate it.

#### AGRICORP

**Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. We now know that the Provincial Auditor met with you in January or February, and it is reasonable to assume that he would have conveyed to you the substance of his findings, within his Provincial Auditor's report, including the fact that Agricorp money had been used inappropriately.

We now know that you received detailed findings from the Provincial Auditor concerning this inappropriate

use of money at some time in July. So my question remains: why, on October 2, when I raised this matter with you in this House, did you deny, did you tell us that you had no knowledge, did you tell us that in fact no money had ever been used inappropriately?

**Hon Ernie Hardeman (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs):** In answer to the previous question from the Leader of the Opposition—he asked when we received the report—I did receive a copy of the report in August of this year that outlined the problems the Provincial Auditor was finding. That was following our meeting we had in January or early February to talk about the problems that were at Agricorp.

Also, in direct response to the question the member previously asked in October about the dollars, I want to assure the member that the money that was invested was taken out of the operating money that Agricorp had—inappropriately, I might add—and they used some of the money that was sent to them by the ministry to issue cheques for the whole farm relief program, again totally inappropriately. When that was pointed out, the government immediately put the money back—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The minister's time is up.

**Mr McGuinty:** Minister, you're confirming still further for us that you had both a meeting with the Provincial Auditor and that you received written documentation to the effect that there had been an inappropriate use of safety net money. But on October 2, when I asked you about that, you said no monies had been used inappropriately. So the question I've got for you is the one I've been asking several times over.

You know, Minister, the truth in this matter will set you free. You can relieve this terrible burden that you have on your shoulders right here and now by telling the truth. Why is it that on October 2, when I asked you about this matter, you said that no money had been used inappropriately, when on two prior occasions you had received information from the Provincial Auditor contrary to that?

**Hon Mr Hardeman:** Mr Speaker, I do have some concern with the suggestion that one is not telling the truth. I would think every honourable member in this House would do that all the time. I would expect no less from the Leader of the Opposition.

I want to say that in October, and in July and August when we received the report from the auditor, in fact Agricorp had inappropriately—and I said it then and I will say it now—invested money that they shouldn't have done. I just want to assure everyone, the member opposite and the farmers of Ontario, that there has been no loss to the farm safety net money and that farmers will get the amount of money they deserve and have a right to expect.

#### HIGHWAY 407

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** My question is to the Minister of Transportation. In my riding of Durham infrastructure is very important, infrastructure like High-

ways 401 and 407. In fact, if you look at the movie *Field of Dreams*, you would know the famous line, "Build it and they will come," and of course you can see the results of infrastructure for somewhere like Mississauga.

Could you inform the House and my constituents in the riding of Durham about the minister's plan for the extension of Highway 407 into Durham region?

**Hon David Turnbull (Minister of Transportation):** I appreciate the question from my colleague the member for Durham. Highway 407 has certainly been a great success in fulfilling its intended role of providing congestion relief. We now have up to 300,000 trips per day. People are voting with their wheels.

The Highway 407 east partial extension to Brock Road in Pickering is scheduled to be completed by December 31, 2001. It's being built at no additional cost to taxpayers, and the extensions are being built faster than if the public sector were involved in this.

The province is actively considering its options on when and how to reinstate the environmental assessment process for the Highway 407 east completion to Highways 35 and 115.

We are certainly committed to improving traffic flow through Durham and throughout Ontario.

**Mr O'Toole:** Thank you for that response, Minister. I find your information is critical.

As you know, Highway 401 through Durham represents an important link in the transportation corridors between Windsor and Quebec. I might add that there's not a nickel of federal money in this, despite the \$2 billion they collect in tax. However, to stay on topic, 130,000 vehicles per day, including over 14,000 trucks—and I might add I have two trips a day myself.

Minister, could you tell me what improvements this government is undertaking in this vital transportation corridor?

**Hon Mr Turnbull:** In early November, the government and the region of Durham, in partnership, launched construction of the first of three interchange projects to improve access to Highway 401. They are at Carruthers Creek, Lakeridge Road and Stevenson Road. The total value of this SuperBuild initiative is approximately \$59 million. When complete, three new interchanges will improve traffic flow and enhance road safety on Highway 401. The work includes safety improvements and replacement of the existing bridge at the Harwood Avenue-Highway 401 interchange. These initiatives are working to make the province's highways safer and more accessible to the people of Durham.

1420

#### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

**Mr Dave Levac (Brant):** My question is for the Minister of Correctional Services. I've stood in this House and in public many times and stated that the correctional system in Ontario has an excellent framework, a good foundation and exceptional correctional officers and

staff, but it is being mismanaged. That mismanagement begins at the top, Minister, with you.

It appears the Auditor General agrees with this. Earlier this week in the Legislature, you took great pride in privatized Camp Turnaround in Barrie, notwithstanding your fudged recidivism rates, the infamous first-day escape, and your cherry-picked best-behaved inmates. Yesterday we found out from the Auditor General that nearly half a million dollars over and above the agreed contract was paid to that facility to keep it afloat. In addition, \$24,000 was paid in overpayments because the invoices were simply not checked against the contract and delivery. Talk about mismanagement.

Minister, is this the kind of sound fiscal management we can expect when you push ahead with your ill-advised plans to privatize the new mega-jail in Penetanguishene?

**Hon Rob Sampson (Minister of Correctional Services):** I thank the member for Brant very much for his question. I very much welcomed the auditor's report yesterday, as I welcomed reviewing the auditor's report of this ministry in previous years. I welcome it because that report has been saying what I have been saying for some time, which is that the system is a very expensive system and one that is not delivering effective results for taxpayers.

As it relates to your comments, you're quite clear. You've said that this is a model correctional system for other jurisdictions to follow. I might point out that your leader yesterday in the scrum said there are some real problems with the existing prison system. So I would suggest that perhaps the two of you try to figure out which lane you want to drive in here. I wasn't aware that there was a leadership debate going on there, but if you can pick a position on the current correctional system in the province, whether it's good or bad, that would certainly be helpful.

**Mr Levac:** The position is very obvious and very clear. The leader of this party and I want it managed properly, unlike what you're doing. That's exactly what the problem is.

Let's talk about new mega-jail facilities for a minute. Yesterday, the Auditor General stated, "The ministry's decision to finance and construct two 1,200-bed correctional institutions that cost \$180 million was not supported by a sound business case assessing the risks, costs and benefits of all feasible alternatives": \$180 million spent without a business plan. Perhaps the napkin it was written on got lost.

This is a very serious issue. Nowhere in this report at all did the Auditor General endorse or support the privatization of corrections. You have spent \$180 million of taxpayers' money without a business plan. Your ill-advised privatization plans have been mismanaged. You couldn't do it with a small program. What's going to happen to the 130 municipalities that said no, the 70% of Penetanguishenes that said no? Why are you going down and mismanaging our correctional facilities and the safety of the people of Ontario?

**Hon Mr Sampson:** Again, as the member for Brant will know, we introduced a bill in the House on Monday that will give us the ability to better deal with the correctional system in the province, and his response was, "I want to take this opportunity to thank the minister for making the commitment to fix the infrastructure of the jails ... of our province, and as I have told him, I thought that was a very worthwhile thing to do." That was you on Monday. Now it's Wednesday; it's two days, I realize. You are taking a completely different view. I say to the member opposite that if he were to spend the time to read the auditor's report, he would very clearly see that he believes that the Penetang and Lindsay situations, since they are virtually identical facilities, would be a perfect place for a meaningful comparison of capital and operating costs and other performance measures. In fact, this is exactly what we are doing with—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. New question.

#### YOUNG OFFENDERS

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** My question is directed to the Attorney General. In a recent letter to the editor of the Campbellford Courier—Campbellford being in Northumberland county—a concerned citizen discussed the problems of youth gangs in Campbellford. The anonymous person who wrote the letter states that they have been verbally and physically threatened by youths in Campbellford's main streets. They say that this is because young people are too young to be properly punished by our legal system, partly because their parents don't care or have no authority, and partly because it takes forever for the police to respond to incidents in town.

After hearing this concern, what assurance do you have for this constituent of mine that your ministry is doing its part to combat youth crime?

**Hon Jim Flaherty (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** I thank the member for Northumberland for the question. This is a very serious concern for young people and their parents. There has been a 77% rise in the rate of violent youth crime in the past 10 years. Not only have we seen a rise in violent youth crime, but when it happens now, it tends to be more violent, more often involving gang activity and more often involving weapons. The usual victims of violent youth crime, regrettably, are other young people.

The federal Young Offenders Act, which has not been repealed by the federal Liberals, fails on the counts of recidivism, the number of young people who return to the youth justice system, and on escalation to the adult criminal justice system by these young people. The proposed Youth Criminal Justice Act, which did not get passed by the federal House, is a failure—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Supplementary?

**Mr Galt:** Thank you for the response. What our government is doing is certainly reassuring, but what the

federal Liberals are doing is very disappointing. Reforms to the Young Offenders Act are definitely needed, something our government has pleaded for for years. The Youth Criminal Justice Act of course died on the order paper when the federal Liberals called an unnecessary election.

As my constituent mentioned in the letter, there appears to be a large degree of criminal activity carried out by young offenders. What programs does our government offer to ensure that first-time offenders are being turned away from a potential life in crime?

**Hon Mr Flaherty:** The federal government needs to repeal the Young Offenders Act. It's a failure. It fails to protect young people in our society from violent youth crime. Provincially, within our area of jurisdiction, we have the strict discipline facility, which deals effectively with repeat violent young offenders.

However, there are a large number of young offenders who are non-violent first-time offenders. To address them, we have proceeded with the youth justice committees. In the May 2000 budget, the Minister of Finance provided \$3 million to triple the number of youth justice committees in Ontario. Those committees are very important in intervening with young people and asking them questions about what's going on in their life, why they're engaged in this activity that is anti-social and perhaps criminal in some cases, and turning around their lives in that way. There is a youth justice advisory committee to the Attorney General that met for the first time this week and I thank those—

**The Speaker:** Order. The Attorney General's time is up.

1430

#### FOREST MANAGEMENT

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** Premier, I want to draw your attention to page 232 of the auditor's report, where the auditor points out that the single biggest mistake your government has made has been to turn over inspection of forest practices to the forest companies themselves. In other words, the Ministry of Natural Resources isn't out there inspecting what the forest companies are doing any more. What's the result? When the forest companies inspect themselves, they find that only 3% of the companies are not complying with the law, but when the Ministry of Natural Resources goes out and inspects the same sites, they find that 20% aren't complying with the law.

As with the environment, your move toward privatization, your move to put companies in charge of inspecting their own operations, isn't working. What are you going to do about it, Premier, when so many forest companies aren't complying with the environmental and natural resource laws in our forests any longer?

**Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier):** I think I've heard a number of the Liberal members indicating that the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, which you brought in—I think you perhaps were minister at the time too—is the

legislation that allowed for companies to do a lot of this inspection and this work.

I am aware of the auditor's concern that he has expressed in there. I honestly have to tell you this, because we take the auditor very seriously: you indicated that in the auditor's opinion this is the biggest mistake we've made in the five years that we've been government. While I don't want to help you with your work, I don't think it is the biggest mistake we've made. We've made a number of mistakes. We acknowledge that. I just don't happen to think that this is the biggest or the most significant one. I have to be quite honest and upfront about that.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The Premier's time is up.

**Mr Hampton:** Premier, one of the first things your government did was, besides dramatically reducing the inspection staff at the Ministry of the Environment, you also dramatically reduced the inspection staff at the Ministry of Natural Resources so they don't have the people in the field any more to do forest inspections. You rely upon the companies to do it themselves, and that's why you've got so many situations where they're not complying with the law.

But you've done something else. The forest renewal trust fund was put in place to ensure that before companies harvested the forest, they had to have the money in place in the trust fund to renew the forest. The auditor finds now that in 20% of the cases, you're not requiring the companies to do that. In fact, you've got some companies out there that are completely in deficit. It's no longer a trust fund. The money isn't being put there to do the forest renewal.

Premier, what are you going to do about that, and what are you going to do about it before you start pushing into the far north of the province and you start poaching on the territory of First Nations? Are you going to fix the problem you've created there first?

**Hon Mr Harris:** Since we don't plan to poach on the territory owned by First Nations, the question really is irrelevant.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE DISABLED

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I have here a letter written by an official of your ministry on ministry letterhead. It's a draft letter that was intended to be sent to service organizations in my community. I repeat, this is a letter from your ministry on ministry letterhead intended to solicit funds to assist a local family with a disabled child, to make home renovations.

Minister, you know about this family because I've written to you and I've spoken to you about their situation. The young son, Steven, is 13 years old and he's a spastic quadriplegic. His mother is a sole-support parent and is Steven's primary caregiver. She needs to have the doorways of their home widened to admit Steven's

wheelchair as Steven is now too big for her to lift him in and out.

Steven's mother came to your ministry, and I came to you, seeking help so that she can help keep Steven at home, and your answer was to offer to go begging in our community on her behalf. Minister, I ask you, is that what your government has come to? Soliciting for the disabled instead of offering them support?

**Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs):** I haven't seen the letter in question. I'm not familiar with it. Obviously, it's difficult to talk about the circumstances of any particular case that is brought up here before the Legislature. I know the member opposite has brought a number of issues with respect to constituents in her community. I've certainly agreed to do the very best we can.

This is a new program we've set up, the home and vehicle modification program, to help deal with a whole host of issues and challenges. The former vocational rehabilitation service dealt primarily with just adults and dealt with only—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Take your seats, both of you. The last warning to the member for Toronto Centre-Rosedale, the member for Elgin-Middlesex-London and the member for Simcoe North. If you're going to yell, "Shut up," you're going to do it out of here. Last warning to all three of you. No more "Shut up" or you're out of here.

Sorry for the interruption.

**Hon Mr Baird:** The goal of the program, that was announced through the March of Dimes in London, was to provide independence for adults in the community. Children have not been covered by the program. There is a federal program, RRAP, operated at the federal level. We're certainly pleased to work with the member opposite on the issue.

**Mrs McLeod:** I sent you a copy of the letter on ministry letterhead with my constituent's name whited out because this is a letter which I, with her permission, have made public. You will know the constituent's name because you have a file that I have personally discussed with you in hand-delivering letters from my constituent. Because you've been dealing with this issue—at least I thought you were dealing with this issue—as has your ministry, you will know that none of the programs which you have just described are programs that Steven is eligible for or programs for which there are any more funds.

Minister, my constituent refused to sign the consent form to allow her personal situation to be discussed in our community through this letter. She was humiliated by the very thought of it. In fact, she had already approached local service clubs on her own behalf.

*Interjection.*

**Mrs McLeod:** Mr Speaker, I'm having difficulty with the Minister of Education's interjections, because as emotional as my constituent is about this issue—

*Interjections.*

**Mrs McLeod:** I can tell the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Minister of Education how emotional my constituent is about this. She wants the minister to know, she wants your government to know—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Would the member take her seat.

The Minister of Education, come to order, please.

Sorry for the interruption.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. We have a very serious situation here. I'd appreciate everybody's co-operation. The member is trying to place the question. The minister answered the first question. There's another supplementary. I'd appreciate everybody's co-operation.

Sorry for the interruption.

**Mrs McLeod:** Perhaps I should apologize for taking this issue so seriously, but I've been working with this constituent for some time. I know how desperate she is to get the very basic help that she needs.

She was humiliated that the Ministry of Community and Social Services would feel that it was appropriate to go soliciting funds in our community on her behalf. She wants the minister and this government to know that she can speak for herself and for her son, as she already has. She doesn't need or want your ministry to go begging for them. What she wants is one-time funding of \$15,000 to make the home renovations that will allow her to continue to care for her son. I don't think she's asking too much; neither does she.

Minister, there is a very simple way to retreat from what is surely an embarrassing spectacle of a government ministry going out and soliciting charitable funds. You simply have to provide the very basic help that Steven and his mother need.

I ask you, will you do that now?

**Hon Mr Baird:** This is a program about which the president of the Ontario March of Dimes has said, "The home and vehicle modifications program will be available to more Ontarians than the previous program. The criteria for this service expands eligibility from persons requiring assistance to pursue employment."

We are working very hard—

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Baird:** If the member opposite doesn't want to hear the answer, I won't bother.

#### FEDERAL HEALTH SPENDING

**Mr David Young (Willowdale):** My question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, I've been watching the federal election campaign with interest over the last little while. I watched the federal Liberal Party attempt to portray themselves as the saviour of health care in this country. To me, this is both bizarre and fanciful, given that it is the same federal Liberals, the very same, who dramatically cut health care payments to the provinces. What this means is that billions of dollars were repeatedly slashed from health care budgets across

this country, dollars that were intended for the most vulnerable.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that the federal Liberals still have not compensated all of the individuals who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The last warning for the member for Hamilton East. I'm not going to continue to get up all the time. Last warning. He's out of here the next time I stand up.

**Mr Young:** As I was saying, it is my understanding that the federal Liberals still have not fully compensated all of the individuals who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system.

Minister, I have two questions arising out of that. First, would you kindly confirm the federal Liberal record on this important issue; second, if my earlier assumption is correct, tell us how the federal Liberal government attempts to justify this unconscionable position.

1440

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I'd like to thank the member from Willowdale for his question. Certainly like my colleague, I am surprised and disappointed at the federal Liberal record on health care. First of all, as we all know, the Liberals started to cut health care transfers in 1994-95 and it is just recently that they made some commitment to partially give us back the money. It's not going to be available, unfortunately, in the form of transfers until April 1, 2001.

More importantly, time and time again we in this province have called on the federal government to join Ontario and Quebec in ensuring that we provide assistance to those people who were affected with hepatitis C through the blood system prior to 1986 and after 1990, and they steadfastly refused to do so. It appears there is a two-tier health system for those people—

**The Speaker:** Order. The minister's time is up. Supplementary.

**Mr Young:** That's just what I thought. I recently read a letter by Joey Hache, a victim of hepatitis C, who some of you will recall bicycled across the country in an attempt to raise awareness of the plight of hep-C victims.

In his letter, Mr Hache directs the following comments to the federal Liberals, and I quote, "We are not a special interest group; we were poisoned because the system broke. No money to do the right thing? Ha! Look at Mr Chrétien's pre-election giveaways: hotels and golf courses." Mr Hache continues by saying, "I really believed compassion was a truly Canadian value. Well, Mr Chrétien has shown, through his party's actions, that while compassion may be a Canadian value at the individual level, it is by no means a Canadian value at the national Liberal level."

Minister, while this may be true of the federal Liberals, I know the Mike Harris government has taken a very different position. Can you tell us what the government of Ontario has done for those deserving victims of hepatitis C?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** In the province of Ontario all victims received compensation, regardless of the time of infection. I'm pleased to say we have doubled the amount of compensation available for the individuals. We announced on May 9, 2000, that we would be increasing the amount from \$10,000 to \$25,000. I'm very pleased to say that this program has provided approximately 2,300 applicants with compensation totalling about \$57.5 million. We believe there are about 8,000 claimants in this province, and that will result in us providing \$200 million in compensation to all people, regardless of when they were infected with hepatitis C.

#### FORT HENRY

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Last Thursday, in answer to a question by the member from Peterborough, you stated that you've increased funding—I'm quoting directly from your answer from Hansard—to Fort Henry over the last five years. You and I know that is totally incorrect. I've got the budget here for Fort Henry over the last five years, their actual working document, and it clearly indicates that the amount of operating money the province is putting into Fort Henry on an annual basis has declined from a high of \$1.5 million to less than \$1 million currently. That is a fact.

You stated in your answer last week that you've put in over \$7 million. Will you not admit to me, Minister, that you were talking about money that was put in over a five-year period? Will you not do the right thing and put the operating money the province puts into the fort on an annual basis back to the level where it was in 1995, namely, the amount of \$1.6 million annually?

**Hon Cameron Jackson (Minister of Tourism):** First of all, I'm delighted that the critic for tourism, after a full year, has finally seen fit to raise an issue in this House about Fort Henry. The fact of the matter is that the member is selectively looking at the amount of money Ontario taxpayers have invested in this important heritage site. In fact, \$7 million of additional capital has gone into the St Lawrence Parks properties and the member opposite should be aware of that. For a small portion of this time, the member opposite was the former mayor of Kingston. He should understand the levels of commitment that this government has made to the fort. If anything, he should be spending some time trying to contact the federal government as to why they walked away from their commitment to this important national heritage site, which I remind the member is owned by the federal government.

**Mr Gerretsen:** Minister, I've got a letter in my hand here dated October 23, which was the response from you to a letter that I wrote you some time before that. The matter has also been raised in the House on a number of different occasions. But let me just read to you the agreement, under which the St Lawrence Parks Commission operates the fort, that you have with the federal government. It states explicitly—and this was an agreement that was signed in 1965 that is still effective today—that you,

the St Lawrence Parks Commission, which operates the fort, will “maintain the present state of restoration of Old Fort Henry,” as it existed in 1965, and “engage in such further restoration and maintenance of Old Fort Henry as ... is warranted.”

You and I know, Minister, that the federal government has put in \$5 million by way of an endowment fund last year. What I'm asking you, right here and now, is to do exactly the same thing. You are responsible for the fort. You have operated it for the last 60 years. Why don't you do exactly the same as what the federal government did and put in \$5 million so that this can truly be a partnership in which this national historic site can be operated for the benefit of all Canadians? Put up your \$5 million like the federal government did.

**Hon Mr Jackson:** First of all, the member has misquoted the document that exists between the province—

**Mr Gerretsen:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am perfectly willing to table with the minister the document from which I read—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** It's not a point of order, but if I could be helpful, if you want to send the document over it may be helpful. Minister?

**Hon Mr Jackson:** The document clearly states that maintenance at this fort will be undertaken by the province and that restorations to the fort, since this fort is crumbling, will be done by the federal government, and they further go on to suggest that any expenditure by the province of Ontario will be done within the means of the commission; in other words, if they have the financial means within their resources to do that.

I remind the member opposite, the federal government has admitted it owns the fort, it has put up the money in order to determine that the repairs would be in the order of \$35 million and that—

**The Speaker:** Order. The minister's time is up. Will the minister take his seat.

#### EDUCATION LABOUR DISPUTE

**Mr Brad Clark (Stoney Creek):** My question is for the Minister of Education. Yesterday our government passed back-to-work legislation putting 40,000 kids back where they belong—in school. Parents in my community, Minister, are a little bit confused because the member for Hamilton East told them that the Liberal Party would support back-to-work legislation if the ERC came in with a recommendation.

Madam Minister, why did we make the decision that we made?

**Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education):** Teachers have the right to collectively bargain—

**Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would ask you to ask the member from Stoney Creek to withdraw an inaccurate fact.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** It's not a point of order.

**Hon Frank Klees (Minister without Portfolio):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Take your seat. OK, folks, I start throwing people out starting right now. Any more, and you're out right now. Who wants to be first?

Chief government whip on a point of order, and I'm going to be very quick. If it's a smart aleck I will be up very fast.

1450

**Hon Mr Klees:** Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to give the member for Hamilton East an opportunity to fully explain his position on this matter.

**The Speaker:** All in favour?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** You're going to need to be clearer, then, of what you want to do. We're not just going to open this up. Be very clear what you'd like to do, and I'm going to listen very clearly to hear if there are any noes.

**Hon Mr Klees:** Speaker, I really do believe that it's important that the House have a full explanation from the member as to why he has two different positions on this issue, and we give him two minutes—

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent? I heard some noes.

It is now time for petitions. The member for Hamilton Mountain.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** I'm sorry; there was some time. In all of the—how shall we say?—excitement, I forgot where we were. The minister had I think about 30 seconds to wrap up. Sorry.

**Hon Mrs Ecker:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Despite the thousands of parents who were calling all of us saying they wanted their children back to school, despite the efforts of Mr Clark, despite the advice of the Education Relations Commission saying the school year for these kids was in jeopardy, you can imagine the shock and the betrayal of parents in Hamilton-Wentworth when the Liberals went back on what they told them they would do and voted against this bill.

**The Speaker:** The member for Don Valley East on a point of order.

**Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East):** Thank you, Speaker. I have a—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Member take his seat.

The member for Hamilton East is now named. I ask him to withdraw from the chamber. I warned him once; now it's time to leave.

*Mr Agostino was escorted from the chamber.*

#### STATUS OF BILL 119

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The member for Don Valley East on a point of order.

**Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East):** My point of order is in regard to Bill 119. The bill has been amended by the general government committee. It has been re-

printed and it appears for the first time today here in the Legislature.

In the reprint of the bill there are several pages which are not translated into French. I would quote to you standing order 33(d), which says, "No bill may be introduced in blank or imperfect form."

I want to refer to a ruling that you made back on December 22, 1999, in regard to Bill 46, introduced by my colleague from Scarborough-Agincourt. You said that that kind of format "is contrary to subsection 3(2) of the French Language Services Act. I must therefore advise the House that this bill contravenes standing order 33(d) and will be removed from the Orders and Notices paper."

Speaker, this is a very serious matter and I ask for your ruling.

**The Speaker:** For clarification, would it be possible for you to point out which sections, if the member could be so kind?

**Mr Caplan:** There are at least four pages, pages 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, and there may very well be more. I'm sorry; page 9 as well. There may very well be more, but they are not in French translation in this bill.

**The Speaker:** I thank the member for bringing it to our attention. We obviously will investigate and let him know. I appreciate his thoroughness in bringing that to our attention.

## PETITIONS

### PROPERTY TAXATION

**Mrs Marie Bountrogianni (Hamilton Mountain):** I have a petition entitled "Unfair Business Taxes in the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth."

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas independent business owners in the region of Hamilton-Wentworth are unfairly paying significantly higher commercial education taxes than other owners for similar properties in neighbouring municipalities; and

"Whereas the downloading of provincial services by the Harris government to the municipalities has increased local business taxes to an unacceptable level in the region of Hamilton-Wentworth; and

"Whereas the difference in business taxes is a disincentive for independent business owners to expand or maintain their business in the region of Hamilton-Wentworth; and

"Whereas the cost of such unfair taxes is inevitably passed along to the consumers on Hamilton Mountain and throughout the region of Hamilton-Wentworth,

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to call upon the government of Ontario, through the Minister of Finance, to immediately take the necessary steps to address the unfair rate of taxation facing the businesses on Hamilton Mountain and the region of Hamilton-Wentworth."

I sign this petition.

### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** I have a petition regarding this government's ongoing discrimination against northern cancer patients. It reads as follow.

"Whereas the northern health travel grant offers a reimbursement of partial travel costs at a rate of 30.4 cents per kilometre one way for northerners forced to travel for cancer care while travel policy for southerners who travel for cancer care features full reimbursement costs for travel, meals and accommodation;

"Whereas a cancer tumour knows no health travel policy or geographic location;

"Whereas northern Ontario residents pay the same amount of taxes and are entitled to the same access to health care and all government services and inherent civil rights as residents living elsewhere in the province;

"Whereas we support the efforts of the newly formed OSECC (Ontarians Seeking Equal Cancer Care), founded by Gerry Lougheed Jr, former chair of Cancer Care Ontario, Northeast Region, to correct this injustice against northerners travelling for cancer treatment;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to fund full travel expenses for northern Ontario cancer patients and eliminate the health care apartheid which exists presently in the province of Ontario."

I agree with the petitioners. I've affixed my signature to it and I'd like to thank Gerry Lougheed Jr for all of his efforts.

### DIABETES TREATMENT

**Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We are suggesting that all diabetic supplies as prescribed by an endocrinologist or a medical doctor be covered under the Ontario health insurance plan.

"Diabetes costs Canadian taxpayers a bundle. It is the leading cause of hospitalization in Canada. Some people with diabetes simply cannot afford the ongoing expense of managing diabetes. They cut corners to save money. They rip test strips in half, cut down on the number of times they test their blood and even reuse lancets and needles. These budget-saving measures can often have disastrous health care consequences;

"Persons with diabetes need and deserve financial assistance to cope with the escalating cost of managing diabetes. We think it is in all Ontarians' and the government's best interest to support people with diabetes with the supplies that each individual needs to obtain the best glucose control possible. As you all know, good control reduces or eliminates kidney failure by 50%, blindness by 76%, nerve damage by 60%, cardiac disease by 35% and even amputations. Just think how many dollars can be saved by the Ministry of Health if diabetics had a chance to gain optimum glucose control."

There are thousands and thousands of constituents in my riding who have put forth this petition.

### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury):** This petition is to the Ontario Legislature. It is regarding northerners demanding the Harris government eliminate the real health care apartheid and discrimination which is being practised in the province of Ontario right now.

"Whereas the northern health travel grant offers a reimbursement of partial travel costs at a rate of 30.4 cents per kilometre one way for northerners forced to travel for cancer care while travel policy for southerners who travel for cancer care features full reimbursement costs for travel, meals and accommodation;"—somehow that isn't fair.

"Whereas a cancer tumour knows no health travel policy or geographic location;

"Whereas a recently released Oracle research poll confirms that 92% of Ontarians support equal health travel funding;

"Whereas northern Ontario residents pay the same amount of taxes and are entitled to the same access to health care and all government services and inherent civil rights as residents living elsewhere in the province; and

"Whereas we support the efforts of the newly formed OSECC (Ontarians Seeking Equal Cancer Care), founded by Gerry Lougheed Jr, former chair of Cancer Care Ontario, Northeast Region, to correct this injustice against northerners travelling for cancer treatment;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to fund full travel expenses for northern Ontario cancer patients and eliminate the health care apartheid which exists presently in the province of Ontario."

I proudly affix my signature to this petition and give it to Tim March, one of our pages from Scarborough, to bring to the table.

### 1500

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** I have a petition with some 800 names on it. It's from northerners who demand that the Harris government eliminate health care apartheid.

"Whereas the northern health travel grant offers a reimbursement of partial travel costs at a rate of 30.4 cents per kilometre one way for northerners forced to travel for cancer care while travel policy for southerners who travel for cancer care features full reimbursement costs for travel, meals and accommodation; and

"Whereas a cancer tumour knows no health travel policy or geographic location;

"Whereas a recently released Oracle research poll confirms that 92% of Ontarians support equal health travel funding;

"Whereas northern Ontario residents pay the same amount of taxes and are entitled to the same access to



health care and all government services and inherent civil rights as residents living elsewhere in the province;

“Whereas we support the efforts of the newly formed OSECC (Ontarians Seeking Equal Cancer Care), founded by Gerry Loughheed Jr, former chair of Cancer Care Ontario, Northeast Region, to correct this injustice against northerners travelling for cancer treatment;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to fund full travel expenses for northern Ontario cancer patients and eliminate the health care apartheid which exists presently in the province of Ontario.”

I sign my signature and I'll send it down with Jessica from Toronto, a page here in the Legislature these days.

#### PROTECTION OF MINORS

**Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that reads as follows:

“Whereas children are exposed to sexually explicit material in variety stores and video rental outlets;

“Whereas bylaws vary from city to city and have failed to protect minors from unwanted exposure to sexually explicit material;

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

“To enact legislation which will:

“Create uniform standards in Ontario to prevent minors from being exposed to sexually explicit material in retail establishments;

“Make it illegal to sell, rent, or loan sexually explicit materials to minors.”

I'm pleased to attach my signature to this petition.

#### EDUCATION REFORM

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport):** I have a petition in regards to school reform in Ontario. It is addressed to the Parliament of Ontario. It reads as follows:

“We believe that the heart of education in our province is the relationship between student and teacher and that this human and relational dimension should be maintained and extended in any proposed reform. As Minister of Education and Training, you should know how strongly we oppose many of the secondary school reform recommendations being proposed by your ministry and by your government.

“We recognize and support the need to review secondary education in Ontario. The proposal for reform as put forward by your ministry, however, is substantially flawed in several key areas: (a) reduced instruction time, (b) reduction of instruction in English, (c) reduction of qualified teaching personnel, (d) academic work experience credit not linked to education curriculum, and (e) devaluation of formal education.

“We strongly urge your ministry to delay the implementation of secondary school reform so that all interested

stakeholders—parents, students, school councils, trustees and teachers—are able to participate in a more meaningful consultation process which would help to ensure that a high quality of publicly funded education is provided.”

“We, the undersigned, also are categorically opposed to the closure and consolidation of St Raymond Catholic school or any school in the city of Toronto.”

Since I agree with this sentiment, I am delighted to put my signature on it.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** I've been waiting all day for this. I have a petition presented to me respectfully by Joan Lonergan, who's from the St Joseph's worker council, Catholic Women's League. It's sent to me personally, John O'Toole, and to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas motor vehicle accidents are the leading cause of death in North America; and

“Whereas studies conducted in the city of Toronto, the United States and Great Britain have reported that drivers using cellular phones while operating a vehicle significantly increase the risk of collisions; and

“Whereas people talking on cellular phones while driving may cause a 34% higher risk of having an accident;”—this is unbelievable, really.

“We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to ban the use of hand-held cellular phones, portable computers and fax machines while operating a motor vehicle. We further respectfully request that Bill 102,”—that's John O'Toole's bill—“An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act to prohibit the use of phones and other equipment while driving on a highway, be passed unanimously by all members of the provincial Parliament of Ontario” immediately.

I'm pleased to sign this and also to present it to Geoff from Rockwood in Guelph-Wellington, Ms Elliott's riding. I'm presenting this to Geoff today in the House.

#### NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANT

**Mr Michael A. Brown (Algoma-Manitoulin):** I have a petition to the Ontario Legislature. It is signed by many northerners, most of whom appear to be from the fine city of Sault Ste Marie.

“Whereas the northern health travel grant offers a reimbursement of partial travel costs at a rate of 30.4 cents per kilometre one way for northerners forced to travel for cancer care while travel policy for southerners who travel for cancer care features full reimbursement costs for travel, meals and accommodation;

“Whereas a cancer tumour knows no health travel policy or geographic location;

“Whereas a recently released Oracle research poll confirms that 92% of Ontarians support equal health travel funding;

“Whereas northern Ontario residents pay the same amount of taxes and are entitled to the same access to

health care and all government services and inherent civil rights as residents living elsewhere in the province; and

“Whereas we support the efforts of the newly formed OSECC (Ontarians Seeking Equal Cancer Care), founded by Gerry Lougheed Jr, former chair of Cancer Care Ontario, Northeast Region, to correct this injustice against northerners travelling for cancer treatment;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to fund full travel expenses for northern Ontario cancer patients and eliminate the health care apartheid which presently exists in the province of Ontario.”

I’ll sign these petitions and I assure you there are many more to come.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson):** Further petitions? The Chair recognizes the member for Durham.

**Mr John O’Toole (Durham):** Mr Speaker, I’d like to default to the member from Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale.

*Interjections.*

**Mr O’Toole:** Pardon me. I’ll go ahead.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario”—

**The Acting Speaker:** I’m sorry; that isn’t your decision. Further petitions?

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** My petition reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas essential health care and educational programs have been deprived of government funding because the Conservative government of Mike Harris has diverted these funds to self-serving propaganda in the form of glossy pamphlets delivered to homes, newspaper advertisements and radio and TV commercials;

“Whereas the Harris government advertising blitz is a blatant abuse of public office and a shameful waste of taxpayers’ dollars;

“Whereas the Harris Conservatives ran on a platform of eliminating what they referred to as ‘government waste and unnecessary expenditures,’ while it squanders well over \$188 million on clearly partisan advertising;

“We, the undersigned, call upon the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to implore the Conservative government of Mike Harris to immediately end their abuse of public office and terminate any further expenditure on political advertising.”

I affix my signature, as I’m in complete agreement with this petition.

1510

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Labour):** I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 139, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act, when Bill 139 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment, and at such time, the bill shall be ordered to the standing committee on justice and social policy; and

That no deferral of the second reading vote pursuant to standing order 28(h) shall be permitted; and

That the standing committee on justice and social policy shall be authorized to meet during its regularly scheduled meeting times on one day for clause-by-clause consideration; and

That, pursuant to standing order 75(c), the Chair of the standing committee on justice and social policy shall establish a deadline for the tabling of amendments or for filing them with the clerk of the committee; and

That the committee be authorized to meet beyond its normal hour of adjournment on that day until the completion of clause-by-clause consideration; and

That, at 4:30 p.m. on the day designated by the committee for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, those amendments which have not been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill, and any amendments thereto. Any division required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put and taken in succession with one 20-minute waiting period allowed pursuant to standing order 127(a); and

That the committee shall report the bill to the House not later than the first sessional day that reports from committees may be received following the completion of clause-by-clause consideration, and not later than December 6, 2000. In the event that the committee does not fail to report the bill on the date provided, the bill shall be deemed to have been passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House;

That, upon receiving the report of the standing committee on justice and social policy, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading;

That, when the order for third reading is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, the debate time being divided equally among the three caucuses, after which the Speaker shall interrupt the

proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment;

That the vote on third reading may, pursuant to standing order 28(h), be deferred until the next sessional day during the routine proceeding "Deferred Votes"; and

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson):** Minister, you inserted the words "does not." It would otherwise read "the committee fails." What was said was "the committee does not fail."

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** That was clearly my mistake.

**The Acting Speaker:** The printed copy will sustain that.

Mr Stockwell has moved government notice of motion 73.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** I appreciate that heads-up work by the table. I appreciate their timeliness in jumping in there. I apologize to the House for that grievous error.

This bill, Bill 139, is the Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000. It does a series of things that seem to have upset certain members across the floor. I think it's an opportunity for me to offer an opinion that may be different than the ones across the floor, but equally valid and, I also think, arguably legitimate.

Let me talk about the salary disclosure of union officials. That seems to be a very accepted argument. There doesn't seem to be a lot of concern with respect to the salary disclosure argument for the \$100,000, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time on that. The unions have seemed to be OK with it, we're OK with it, and mostly I think on the other side. There hasn't been a lot of talk about it. In passing, it's the same disclosure required for publicly traded companies, for public servants, for us, and for a whole bunch of other people who are out there in the private sector.

I haven't heard a lot of discussion on the decertification changes, frankly, I think because basically they're not that unreasonable. The decertification changes we're asking for in this legislation are fairly fundamental, and I don't think dramatic. You understand, Mr Speaker, that you can only decertify a union during the last 60-day period of a collective agreement. We would all probably accept that most collective agreements run generally three years. Ultimately, three years would be 36 months, Tony. That would mean you'd only be able to decertify in the last two months of that 36-month agreement. We're expanding that, instead of the last 60 days, to make it the last 90 days. That, I don't think, is too draconian. It gives a better opportunity for employees who would like to decertify a union to simply decertify or decertify a union in order to move to a different union that presents them a better opportunity.

The argument is often made that people who belong to a union want to belong to the union because they voted the union into the place, but that's not true in a lot of instances. If you think in certain circumstances where a

union frankly has been at that workplace for 20 or 30 years, there's probably a significant number, if not maybe all, of the employees who work in that industry in that union who never really ever had an opportunity to vote that union into place. I'm not suggesting they may not want a union, but they may not want that union. Maybe they don't want a union at all. But this idea that seems to circulate out there, including in the opposition benches, that all unions are democratically elected into the workplace is, generally speaking, true at the time, but over time and with the retirement or leaving of individuals, there can be workplaces in this province where not a single soul who works in that particular operation ever voted to have that union represent them.

All this window period does is expand the 60 days to 90 days to do one of two things: to either change the union that represents you—and we've got a big kerfuffle out there with respect to the CAW and raiding and so on—or you may say, "Look, our company has reached the stage where the employees don't want a union any more." Frankly, that could very well happen. That's the kind of thing we need to discuss.

I will be sharing my time with the members for Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale, Brampton east and Scarborough Centre.

Those are the kinds of things that need to be disclosed in the decertification process.

Let's understand very clearly, simply giving an opportunity for a union to expand the decertification window doesn't necessarily mean they're going to decertify and not be a union any more. It may just mean they decertify to change unions. That's how the process works.

Certification procedure changes: this is another one where I have some difficulty in understanding the opposition's arguments. They seem to be prepared to accept that you can only decertify a union for three months out of a 36-month contract. Just do the math: 33 months you can't decertify. It doesn't matter what the employees want, it doesn't matter what the employees think they need, the law says you can't decertify. For 33 months of a 36-month contract, regardless of the tension, regardless of the intention of those employees, they can't decertify. We accept that as part of the act. That's part of legislation.

#### 1520

Having said that, when we're talking about certifications, we're not asking that a window, a ban, a bar, be placed for 33 months. We're not asking that a bar be placed for 24 months. We're not asking that a bar be placed for 18 months, which is virtually half of what you do under a decertification drive. We're asking that a ban be put in place for 12 months. There's a bit of a contrary nature to this argument on the other side. If you think it's OK not to decertify, to make it illegal to decertify a union for 33 months of a 36-month contract, why, after losing a certification drive would you not consider it reasonable that you can't have another certification drive for 12 months? It seems to me that is practically a third of what it is for decertification.

I have a difficult time getting the members opposite to square that circle. Why is it OK to decertify like that and have a ban in place, but it's not OK when you have a certification drive that fails to put a ban in place for 12 months? I've talked to a lot of people about this out there, and any unbiased third party I've spoken to doesn't think this is the least bit unreasonable.

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** This is driving me out of the House.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** I've finally discovered what will drive you out of the House and I'm putting that in my hip pocket, Mr Bradley.

Vote clarity: this is another issue that I think needs to happen. Let's be clear about this. This isn't about every vote the union takes to go on strike. For the lay people out there who don't know, what vote clarity talks to—what I mean by strikes, when unions go back to their membership, they usually frame a question of “Should you accept this offer that the company has put on the table? Yes or no.” Implicitly, the “no” answer also gives them direction to go on strike. Understand that. In reality, you're answering two questions with one ballot.

We're not saying they have to change that for the entire collective agreements negotiated out there in the private sector. We're not saying they have to change it for every mature bargaining unit and bargaining process that takes place in this province. But we are saying that during first-contract negotiations where the parties aren't sophisticated, it's the first time they've been through this process, they split that question. That's as controversial as this legislation gets—that they split the question. They give these employees, who are for the first time negotiating a collective agreement, the opportunity to have a vote on whether or not they want to have the collective agreement, and if they say, “No, we don't like the offer,” they give them a vote of, “Do you want to go on strike?” Not for every collective agreement, but for your first contract because the parties are not mature negotiators at this point and it's an opportunity for the employees to make a reasoned, rationale and thoughtful decision.

So far, that's how controversial this has gotten. Frankly, I don't think it's that controversial.

To move on, non-construction employers. My friend from Hamilton East was apoplectic the other day with his question on the non-construction employer provision. I've canvassed this one out there with my friends and colleagues and others and asked them—

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** Just explain the banks. Why the banks?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** The banks aren't even included, to be quite honest. That's the other thing. You get this little bit of evidence and you run with it. The banks are precluded from this provision. They won their preclusion at the Ontario Labour Relations Board. They're not included. It's so vitriolic in here and so vociferous, you can't even get that out.

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** So what?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** So vociferous. It gets so vitriolic. It gets so difficult to get a point across to the other side. The banks aren't even included. They're not included in this. The last one that was in this package, TD, ended up, I think, going to the Ontario Labour Relations Board and getting themselves removed from the provision.

You know how controversial this provision is that's created this feeding frenzy? It's this controversial: it says—and I can't believe Liberals are opposed to this; I just cannot believe it—when a publicly funded government, be it a school board or a municipality, wants to tender their work for construction, they be allowed to tender it to union or non-union companies. That's it. Presently in place we have a law that binds certain school boards and administrations to this: they cannot tender their work to non-union companies.

I'm not telling them they have to tender to unions. I'm not telling them they have to tender to non-unions. All I'm saying is everybody pays taxes—everybody—and if you pay taxes, there's one privilege that I think you should insist on having—and I can't believe anyone argues this—you should have the privilege to bid or get government work unfettered of restrictions or biases or discrimination.

I thought that's what the NDP stood for. I really did. They used to talk all the time about anti-discrimination law, but somehow in this twisted logic, this world that we've developed, some people seem to think it's OK to say, “Because you don't have a union card, you can't get work from my local government,” and make that a law enshrined at the provincial level. I'm not saying local councils can't make that decision. If in Windsor or Hamilton or Pembroke or Toronto they want to say, “We only tender to union companies,” then so be it. They are allowed to say that. I'm not even contemplating taking away that right or privilege. If they want to say in Richmond Hill or in Ottawa, “I only tender to non-union companies,” they could do that too. That's their decision. They're duly elected.

**Hon Al Palladini (Minister of Economic Development and Trade):** What about Vaughan?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Or Vaughan.

What I am saying is there never, ever should be an act in place at the provincial level that says hard-earned tax dollars are only available to card-carrying union members. That's wrong. Think of it. Let's put the shoe on the other foot, I say to my colleagues across the floor who find difficulty with this position. What if we had a law in place that said local municipalities cannot tender construction work to unionized companies? They'd be leaving the planet in droves, they'd be so upset. That would be reprehensible, unacceptable, discriminatory, barbaric, prehistoric. But the opposite—well, that's OK. Anyone find that passing strange? How do you square that circle? I just don't get it.

Are we telling municipalities what to do? No. Are we telling unions what to do? No. Are we telling non-unions what to do? No. We're just saying, “Guys, you elect your council. They should have the unfettered right to make

that decision on their own,” and somehow I’m setting labour relations back to the Stone Age, according to my new best friend, Sid Ryan. I’m taking labour relations back to the Stone Age because I should hold such a crazy and unbelievably hard doctrine decision like saying everybody should be allowed to work or bid for government work. I don’t get that one. I don’t get it.

I talk to a lot of people too with no bias, no axe to grind. You know what they say to me? “I don’t understand how that’s on the books. How did that get there? How could anyone think that’s fair? How could anyone argue against a guy who’s bringing in a piece of legislation that fixes that?” I say, “I don’t know. They’re just Liberals and NDP.” That’s where I’m at.

**Hon Mr Palladini:** Some Liberals are onside.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** No, they’re not. They’re voting against the bill. All the Liberals are voting against the bill, and all the NDP.

To my friends across the floor, that’s as controversial as the bill gets.

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Let’s talk about one other thing before I sit down, as I was so gracefully informed by the member from Simcoe. Let’s talk about one other thing—and quit moving my chair—before I sit down.

There has been some concern on the other side with respect to posting how to decertify in a workplace. Let me tell you how we got to that situation and how I got to the position I took.

1530

When I met with the labour leaders on a number of occasions, they all, to a person, to a man and woman, told me—and I heard the member from Renfrew speak about this—that they have very aggressive organizations that hire people specifically to go out there and unionize non-unionized workplaces. They told me they do that very aggressively. They think that somehow by passing legislation like this I’m going to make their job easier. So I say that’s good. If that’s what you want to do, that’s good. Those unions are offering that kind of advice out there to non-union workplaces, so all this information is available to those non-union workplaces. All those employees there get this information from all the unions. There are many unions in this province and there are many unions aggressively out there trying to organize non-union workplaces.

In a unionized workplace, the union doesn’t tell the employees, the membership—the brothers and sisters, in their vernacular—how to decertify. I don’t blame them for that. Why would they? Of course they’re not going to tell them how to decertify. I don’t think the union is going to go in there and say, “OK, guys, we’re your union representatives. I’m your executive and here’s how you kick me out of work.” Of course they’re not going to do that; I don’t think they should. But do you know what the law says today? It also says the employer can’t tell them. The employer is prohibited by law from discussing how to decertify with any of his or her employees. He or she can’t talk to them about it. So where do they get the

information? The unions won’t give it to them—and again, I don’t blame them—and the employer can’t give it to them.

We get calls all the time: “How do I decertify my union?” My good friend from Grey was on the radio up there in Owen Sound not long ago and he talked about the guy who phoned him and said, “I want to decertify my union. I don’t know how.” The member from Grey had to go to great lengths to try and get the explanation to him. Ultimately he got it to him and then the guy figured it out and they successfully decertified their union. All we’re saying is, “Post in the workplace how to decertify your union.” That’s all the bill says, because the unions won’t tell them and it’s against the law for the employer to tell them.

In a nutshell, and then I’ll sit down, that’s as controversial as Bill 139 gets: common, responsible, reasonable amendments to the Labour Relations Act. To suggest that they’re overreacting is an understatement. The charges are outrageous, of course, and that is an understatement. I say to you that this is the kind of good labour legislation this province needs to continue on in profiting, in creating investment, creating wealth, creating jobs, getting people off welfare, getting people off employment insurance—or unemployment insurance, whatever it’s called today—and getting them back to work. This is good legislation. It is not controversial legislation.

I want the members opposite, when they stand up, to explain to me exactly which one of these amendments they’re opposed to.

**The Acting Speaker:** It will go in rotation. I’ll just be a second because I wanted to introduce, in the members’ east gallery, Brigid Brown and her friend Amanda deBatistma. I wanted to tell you that Brigid is from the riding of Perth-Middlesex. She was a page here in 1994. Her brother, Rob, was a page here in 1998.

**Mrs Pupatello:** I’m very pleased to follow the minister on his comments regarding this bill.

The minister and his government claim that they have had unprecedented growth in the years since they took power. They’ve done that without this bill. Don’t come into the House today and tell me that you require this bill in order to have prosperity and growth in the economy in Ontario. You’ve been in power since 1995. All of the economic statements will tell us that we’ve had great growth in Ontario, and you’ve done it without the bill. That’s the point.

The minister comes into the House today—and quite frankly, he’s been entertaining. Even the people in Windsor West think this particular minister is entertaining. But we want to talk about the facts of the bill. You come in to propose that you’re here for workers’ rights, that you’re doing this for the workers of Ontario. Where in the entire process of bringing a bill to this table did this minister consult with the workers of Ontario? Workers from Windsor West, call my office and tell me that the minister came to Windsor and consulted on Bill 139. I would ask any representatives from labour, have you had any input on this bill that would allow the Minister of Labour

to come in and say, "We're doing this for the good of workers. We're here to create a democratic place to work"? It's like a stick in the eye for the members of the labour workforce. I remember when this particular minister was named minister. Upon my invitation, I brought him to my community to meet with labour leaders. He stood at the podium at the Caboto Club at that time—not all that long ago, as you recall—and he said, "We're going to make peace with labour. We need labour to be partners." If you insisted on having labour as partners, why would you not consult with these individuals on this bill?

Let's talk about your salary disclosure, Minister. Tell me, when have you not known how much Buzz Hargrove makes for a living? He announces it himself. What possible purpose could you have all of a sudden in the year 2000 to bring this forward in the bill? How many times does a union leader not tell his own workers what he makes? They do it all the time. They do it with more bravado, frankly, than the government members. They stand at their dais and they yell out, "I make over \$100,000," and they're proud of the work they do for their labour group. There's no shame in that. They stand up and talk about it themselves. What is the purpose then, other than to be a stick in the eye for labour?

Let's go on. Information to decertify: the minister stood in the House moments ago and said, "Oh, they don't know how to decertify." If the member from Grey received a phone call from any individual who wanted the information, I would only wish that MPP from Owen Sound did as much work for his constituents when they called about health care as when they called to decertify a union. You and I both know that is not the case, and your members on your side of the House are very selective about the kind of constituency work they choose to do on behalf of their community.

**Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member from Windsor is speaking about the member from Bruce-Grey and I don't think it's proper parliamentary procedure for the member to refer to the type of work the member from Bruce-Grey does in his own riding.

**The Acting Speaker:** That's a point of order, and I will remind the member for Windsor West that it would be better to address me and refer to the riding.

**Mrs Pupatello:** I am perfectly within my rights to suggest that members of the Conservative government do not represent their constituents well on the issues that matter to their constituents day to day, like health care matters, like education matters. Those individuals are not well represented by Conservative MPPs.

**Mr Beaubien:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Are we going to have a debate about members representing their constituents well? I will compare the way I represent my constituents in Lambton-Kent-Middlesex any time, anywhere, any place with the member from Windsor.

**The Acting Speaker:** That is not a point of order. If you would address your remarks through me, it will make the temperament a little bit better.

**Mrs Pupatello:** The minister comes in the House and pretends to do this for employees. There is not an employee who is a member of a union who is going to agree with this. That's as simple as it is. The minister could at minimum come clean and say, "I'm doing this in response to my business"—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Let me remind the member for Hamilton West and the member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex that I can't have that going on. I don't think it's necessary for me to get up and remind you of the rules you've asked me to enforce for you. If you like, I will; I'll have to. I don't want to. Please help me.

**Mrs Pupatello:** Clearly they don't like to hear the truth from this side of the House. That's all it comes down to. The minister cannot pretend for a moment to drop a bill in the House for discussion as though he were doing it on behalf of employees. Just say it like it is; say you're doing it for the business community.

I can honestly tell you that in Windsor, where I come from, we have a booming economy. Ontario is booming. All of us know that the Americans are buying our cars. As long as Americans are buying our cars, the Ontario economy is booming. We have a booming construction industry. Could there be a more inappropriate time to create more dispute between government and labour? This is the worst time. There is no reason why yesterday the gallery should have been filled with people from the construction trades, to watch their anger at a time when they have never had more contracts to build than they have now. There has never been a time when it has been more inappropriate to create more labour strife in Ontario. Since 1995, when Mike Harris became the Premier of Ontario, we have had more labour strife than any other government in the history of Ontario. That's what we can say about Mike Harris.

1540

He purports to do it today for employees. I encourage the minister, who sits in the House today, to listen. You would think he knew of economic development and trade, he would be interested in continuing a construction boom in Ontario. Did you not sit next to your colleague at the cabinet table and say, "Would you stop provoking labour at this key time? Would you stop? Would you kindly go forward and try to make peace in Ontario so that we can continue an Ontario economic boom?"

**Hon Mr Palladini:** That's what we're doing.

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. I'd ask the minister from Vaughan to come to order and I would ask the member from Windsor West to address her comments through the Chair, please.

The personal pronoun "you," I believe, is not addressing it to me. If you would address me, it would help the tone of the meeting a lot more for the better.

**Mrs Pupatello:** Let's talk about some real issues for the Minister of Labour. Since the day he became the

Minister of Labour I spoke with him on a repeated basis about the kinds of lengths of time injured workers have to go through in order to see any recompense from the system. They managed to rename their fancy workers' comp; they managed to do all kinds of fancy things and want to talk about all of the good things. I want to talk about how long an injured worker in my community has to wait to go through a simple appeal process. We beg this minister to add staff to make it happen for these people, that they could either train them, retrain them, get them through the process, and the Minister of Labour says he did.

I have not one injured worker who is moving any quicker through the system than they did five years ago when this government took office. But we do have a new fancy title for the workers' comp bureaucracy.

Let's talk about other major issues—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Member for Halton, come to order.

**Mrs Pupatello:** —that the Minister of Trade ought to be dealing with. We have a significant skills shortage in Ontario. None is more apparent. Nowhere is it more apparent than in the community that I come from, and if you ask employers what their most significant issue is today—the Minister of Economic Development and Trade knows the answer to this question—the biggest issue that faces these industries today is a skills shortage. I haven't heard a word from the Minister of Labour about the skilled trade shortage. How many businesses have to get together over how many meetings with the local universities and colleges, with everything they can do, to provide training for people in a skills area that is significantly lacking?

If either our Minister of Labour or Minister of Economic Development and Trade would care to come to my community, we can put these meetings together for you. That's what's called appropriate priorities for a government when they're in the middle of an economic boom. I asked the minister; instead, what does he do? He comes and he drops 139 in—a poke in the eye, a stick in the eye to labour, at a time when we're doing extraordinarily well, especially in my community. I just want him to come to the table and say, "I did this for business. I didn't do this for employees. I'm not trying to change the rules to help make it fair for employees."

The minister's got the gall to stand and say this is fair. Fair? Does this government want to talk about fair? Let's talk about fair. I ask the Minister of Labour to be the first to put his whatever appendage forward for a drug test. Let's do that. Do you know why? Because that's fair. That would be fair. We want to put the welfare cases forward for a drug test. Let's put the whole Ontario cabinet forward for a drug test, including the member from Scarborough, who continues to heckle on whatever it is we have to say on this side of the House. Let's have her launch the drug-testing for the Conservative MPPs. That would be fair for Ontario.

Ontario Liberals want to talk about fairness. This bill is not about fair. This bill is about more harassment for labour at the time that it needs it the least.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to speak on this time allocation motion where Bill 139 is concerned. It affords me the opportunity to share with this House some of the work I've been doing recently, looking at other jurisdictions, the success they're having, why they're having that success and how it relates to Ontario; and some of the things this government is doing on behalf of the people, and how they are, for the most part, in almost everything they're doing, dividing and conquering and creating a polarity that in the long haul I believe will not be in the best interests of everybody who calls Ontario home.

In this instance, again we have the government attacking very directly the labour movement of this province, bringing in a piece of legislation that in many significant ways attacks and takes away things people have fought for, negotiated, worked around, studied and, actually in some instances at great personal sacrifice, got put in place in their workplaces.

Whether it was remuneration, benefits, pension plans or issues of health and safety, they went to the wall. They saw, by way of what was happening to their neighbours and family members who went to work, that there was a need to make sure that work that was done was adequately compensated for, that there were benefit packages that helped people when their family or children got sick and needed to be taken care of, and that in their old age they had a way of looking after their needs and participating in the community and the society in which they lived in a meaningful, positive and constructive way, bringing their experience and wisdom to the fore and presenting it and having it respected and included in the decision-making that went on.

Alas, what we see now in Ontario is a diminishing, a devaluing of that contribution in many serious and significant ways. I believe, when you look at this in an overall strategy to improve the lot of the province and make it competitive where the global economy is concerned, that this will not be good. This will not support and improve and enhance our ability to compete. It will in the long haul make us a jurisdiction that is very narrow in understanding and different from the rest of the world as they move forward. I believe it will hurt very seriously and significantly some of those vehicles we have put in place, such as our health care system, our education system and our social safety net in a way that will not serve us well.

I'm not going to get into this in any significant way in the short time I have this afternoon because of the time allocation motion and again the limiting of debate on such important issues in this place and across the province, which happens so often, driven by this government.

We all know that the Minister of Labour is very articulate and eloquent in the way that he speaks and can make the arguments well and will convince a whole lot

of people that his positioning is correct in this instance. We have equally articulate and eloquent people on this side of the House who will make the counter argument. We will go back and forth and, at the end of the day, I guess the people will ultimately decide.

There will be an election in this province probably in about three years and then we'll find out. By then, what this government has done by way of alienating and polarizing some of the more important elements of society, particularly where the economy is concerned, will begin to be more obvious and the chickens will come home to roost. We thought maybe that would have happened in the last provincial election, but alas it didn't.

But I think that as time rolls on and the impact of legislation and initiatives such as the one we're time-allocating here today, where the labour movement is concerned and where our economy is concerned, becomes more and more obvious, people will become more learned and aware of the impact, of the lack of leadership and the very focused and limited leadership that has been given by this government, particularly where it involves attacking people.

We will hopefully begin then to correct some of the mistakes that have been made and get back on track, bringing us more in line with what other people are doing, where developing an economy that works for everybody is concerned, and giving us an ability to compete in a way that enhances our being able to continue to have an economy and a jurisdiction that is the envy of the world.

In the short time I have today, I want to speak very briefly about my experience of what's happening in Ireland. I've been looking at this for quite some time now. Some people in this place will know that's the place of my birth. I emigrated to Canada in 1960. I've watched, in the last 40 years, an evolution over there that has been quite extraordinary, to the point now where its economy leads the world in many significant ways. The question that needs to be asked is, why?

**1550**

I've gone over there to meet with some folks. I've led a trade mission from my own community over there to see if there wasn't some partnering that could be done so that we could support each other in our effort to recover our economy. Some of you will know that in northern Ontario, the new economy that we're looking at right now has not taken hold in any significant way, and we continue to struggle. So we're looking at other jurisdictions as to some lessons we might learn.

I have to tell you that the most interesting and exciting lesson that is to be learned in Ireland is not the reality that they have put in place this very competitive corporate tax structure, although that's part of it—that has been something they have used to attract some of the new economy investment into their country—but it is in fact a couple of other things, one of them being the partnership they've been able to forge between the major players in society in that country. They took the government, which is not afraid to give leadership, which is not afraid to live up to the challenge that it was presented by being elected

to lead in that country, and put it together at a table with business, which this government is wont to do and very good at doing, but also at a table where organized labour and the labour movement sits.

Over there, they believe that everybody has something to contribute, because at the end of the day, if we all contribute in a positive and constructive way, if we don't just shoot at each other and be contradictory and critical of each other, if we recognize the contribution that each can make, we all win.

That is quite different from the agenda of this government, which is not to include people, not to be inclusive of people, not to recognize the contribution that various groups of people have made to the fabric of the society of Ontario over a long period of time now, but to set them apart, to vilify them, to demonize them, to make them look as bad as is possible in the eyes of the general public so that they can then get on with the very narrow agenda of their government, which is to improve the lot of the bigger business entities that contribute very handsomely to their campaigns and their electoral prowess in this province so that they might make more profit. We all know the trickle-down theory, that some of that may trickle down and the rest of us might be somewhat better off. But we know, from jurisdictions that we can look at across this world, that what really happens is not that most people are better off under that kind of system. In fact, as Tommy Douglas was wont to say, in a trickle-down economic reality most people over time get really tired of being trickled on. I suggest that's what will happen in this province as well.

I think there are some lessons to be learned over in Ireland, where that government, taking the leadership that they've been given, the mandate that they've been given by the people, very seriously, looked around and identified those groups of people who had something of value to contribute and who had a vested interest—probably more of a vested interest than some of the more multinational corporate entities that now are very much present in Ireland where the long-term future of that country is concerned. They brought to the table some of the groups that this government has chosen to push away and to target and to name and to vilify and to demonize, because they felt they had something to offer.

In case you think that's just me talking, me wishfully thinking that this is something that should be happening over there, that I'm making this up perhaps, or using it to my own political advantage here this afternoon, I want to share with you some of the thoughts of Ireland's Deputy Prime Minister, Mary Harney, the deputy Taoiseach of that country, who spoke at a business group gathering in Vancouver just a week ago and shared with them the broader picture that they need to look at and that we need to look at if we are going to put in place an economy in this province and in this country that's sustainable over the long term, that includes all the resources that are out there, particularly the human resource that workers bring to their place of work every day when they go to work.



That's going to be good for all of us in the long run, because anybody who's looking at the economy today knows that it's a difficult and complicated thing to get their head around. But nobody will disagree with you when you tell them that to compete and be successful, we have to bring to the table everything we have, every bit of resource, every bit of intelligence, every piece of human potential that's out there, every person who has something to offer in whatever way.

Every person I know of whom I come in contact with in my community has something they've been given by way of their birth that is valuable, that they contribute. The question, though, so often is, how do we value it? That's what I think Ireland has got a bit of a handle on here and we should be taking a close look at and emulating that in so many ways. We're quick to rush to adopt very competitive, and in some instances attractive tax policies of some of those countries, particularly where taxes are allowed to go down, not understanding that there's a balance that needs to be struck, that you need tax dollars to keep in place some of the vehicles that are so important and that Mary Harney speaks of here as she addresses this group in Vancouver:

"Ireland's Deputy Prime Minister Mary Harney says massive tax reductions have played a vital role in an economic transformation that has made her country the world's leading exporter of software products.

"But if Canadians in general and British Columbia in particular"—and I suggest here this afternoon Ontario in particular—"have anything to learn from Ireland's success, it is that tax cuts alone are not sufficient to guarantee survival in a rapidly changing global economy, she said.

"In an interview in Vancouver yesterday, Ms Harney said Ireland has turned itself into a high-tech powerhouse through a consensus process that involves not just government, but unions and business leaders as well."

Interesting, certainly, the juxtaposition with what this government has chosen to do. This government has chosen not only to shut out the unions where developing the economy is concerned, but they've turned their guns on them by way of bills such as this Bill 139 we're looking at here this afternoon, which has been rammed through this House by way of time allocation, and they've said to unions, "You're not only not welcome at the table, but we're going to go out there and find you wherever you are and we're going to shut you down because you are an obstacle to any progress we will make where the economy of this province is concerned."

I'm saying to you here this afternoon that they're dead wrong and that other jurisdictions that are experiencing significant and important success in the economy, where they compete with Europe and the rest of the world, are doing it differently. They're including the unions and are including other groups in the country as well: women's groups, environmentalists, people concerned about health care and education.

It goes beyond that. That's not really what I want to leave first and foremost in people's minds this afternoon

re what's happened in Ireland. It's this social partnership they've been able to develop, but there's also a piece that's connected, and that's that they're willing to invest as well in those things that are fundamental to any good economy, which are health care and education.

You can't invest in health care and education if you don't have the tax dollars to do it and if you don't have the political backbone to put significant dollars into those programs, to support people no matter where they work or where they live in your jurisdiction or country, so that they can access the health care they need when they get sick, so they can do those preventive and educational type of things that are necessary so they don't get sick in the first place, and so that they can participate in the education system in a way that allows them then to participate to their full in the economy and the workplaces that are setting up shop in Ireland these days.

Yes, they're setting up shop in a very interesting way in this province as well, but not in an organized and inclusive and fulsome way. My own part of this province, northern Ontario, and, I suggest to you, rural Ontario—the things that we've done for a long period of time now which have supported the economy of this province, the resource-based economy that we represent, that we've spent our lifeblood developing and working in, are being undervalued today in the economy we live in.

#### 1600

That's the place where our union brothers and sisters have participated so effectively to make sure the wealth created in those workplaces is shared equitably among those who work there, among the people who build up an economy around that particular entity, so that everybody in those communities can do well. But the economy that's out there today, that is multinational in nature, that is global in nature, really has no interest in places like Sudbury and Sault Ste Marie and Chapleau and Hornepayne, and so we as government have to make sure they understand that in anything they do by way of generating wealth for their corporations, there has to be an investment, a contribution, a return of that to the communities in which we all live and work and make some of our more significant investments. People who invest in homes need to know the government understands that investment is important in terms of the future of that community and in terms of the future of the people who live there.

So I say to you that we should pay attention and listen to people like Ms Harney, the Deputy Prime Minister of Ireland.

"In an interview..., Ms Harney said Ireland has turned itself into a high-tech powerhouse through a consensus process that involves not just government, but unions and business leaders as well.

"She said this 'social partnership' has enabled a ruling coalition comprised of Ms Harney's Progressive Democrats and" the governing "Fianna Fail party to introduce dramatic tax cuts, while increasing spending on health and education."

The point I'm making here is the balance that needs to be arrived at. There have to be investments in education and health and other infrastructure projects. There has to be a bringing together of all the partners. I tell you that the introduction of bills such as Bill 139, which we're looking at today, doesn't take us down that road. As a matter of fact, it sets up a circumstance that is the extreme opposite of that approach, and I suggest to you that it will not serve us well in the long haul. I would urge the government to rethink their approach where this is concerned and where their attack over such a period of time now, five or six years, on the union movement is concerned. There is another way of doing it, and that's to include, to bring people in, to sit down and talk and develop a co-operative and comprehensive approach that recognizes the contribution we all make, values it, and in the end makes everybody a winner.

**Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale):** I am very pleased to speak in support of Bill 139, the Labour Relations Amendment Act. This bill is an important piece of workplace legislation for our province. This bill is intended to strengthen individual workers' freedom in Ontario. It is important to remember that our commitments to the people of this province are not commitments to groups in society, but to each individual Ontarian. When citizens cast their ballots in an election, they are not voting as union members or business people or members of any group, but instead they are voting as individual citizens. Our government, in fact any government, must always keep in mind that what matters are not the wishes of union bosses, but of individual union members and all other citizens.

I would like to commend my colleague the Honourable Chris Stockwell, Minister of Labour and member for Etobicoke Centre, for introducing this bill. I am proud to support a piece of legislation which expands individual freedom.

During the last election campaign we made a commitment to workplace democracy. It is our belief that employees need more options and choices on the range of issues that go with belonging to a trade union.

Let me quote from our 1999 Blueprint. It's what we ran on and it's the plan the people of Ontario chose over the plan of the Liberals and over the plan of the NDP. On page 14 of the PC Party's outline of its commitment: "We've already boosted workplace democracy by giving workers secret ballot votes on certifying and decertifying unions as well as on strike votes. We'll strengthen the right of workers to decide, by secret ballot vote, whether they want to continue to be represented by a union. We'll also require that ballot questions be clear and easily understood."

On the same page, we also outline our promise, "We'll create a 'sunshine law' for union bosses, requiring top executives to disclose their salaries, benefits and expenses to union members."

This bill fulfills the promises that the PC government made to Ontarians in the 1999 election. I was proud to

stand for these commitments then and I'm very pleased to see them being introduced in this House now.

Last year we pledged to strengthen the rights of individual workers to decide whether they want to be represented by a union. Bill 139 keeps that pledge. It will help promote workplace stability and encourage investment in Ontario's construction industry.

Our previous amendments to the Labour Relations Act restored the balance between employers and unions in the workplace. We believe greater workplace democracy is necessary to restore the balance between individual workers and the unions.

Critics of Bill 139 have been quite vocal since its introduction. They say the government has changed the rules and stacked the deck against organized labour. They say these changes are targeted at vulnerable workers who might be interested in joining a union. Let's look at the facts.

Bill 139 does not change the threshold at which certification votes can be held. Bill 139 does not change the 50-plus-one majority required to certify the union in the workplace, nor does Bill 139 propose different rules for different workers. Employees who desire a union will follow the same steps as before, regardless of Bill 139.

So what has really changed? The answer is two words: democracy and accountability. Democracy is the foundation of all our institutions. Governments rise and fall on their popular support. It is no different for trade unions. They must continually be accountable and answerable to their members' wishes. Democracy and accountability are at the heart of Bill 139. They are the two words, the two themes, that knit the various pieces of the bill together. Let's look at the bill now to show you what I mean.

Union members pay dues and deserve to know where their money is being spent. Our proposal would require disclosure of the salaries and benefits of all union officials earning in excess of \$100,000 annually. This information would be submitted to the Minister of Labour by April 1 of the year following the year in which the salary and benefits were paid. The minister could make the information public or employees could request the information directly from their union. The whole idea behind this sunshine law is to make unions more accountable to their members. Public disclosure of salaries in excess of \$100,000 is required in public sector organizations and publicly traded firms. It is information that will give individual workers an understanding of where their money goes and the relative value they receive.

The next item in our Blueprint package is enabling employees' wishes to be heard in crucial first-contract situations. This is a very important and long-overdue change. First-contract negotiations can be difficult and awkward. Employers and employees are entering a new phase of their relationship. Many first-contract situations ultimately end up at the Ontario Labour Relations Board. We want to change the rules at this important point of a collective bargaining relationship to give employees the

time, information and choice they deserve when making such a major decision.

**1610**

If Bill 139 is passed, two things would change. The first involves completing arbitration and decertification applications. In a first contract, if agreement can't be reached, either party can apply to the labour board for arbitration. If one year passes and no contract has been reached, employees may apply to the Ontario Labour Relations Board to have their union decertified. Current board practice would deal with the applications in the order in which they were received. In future, the board would be required to hear the decertification case first. If the workforce decides on decertification, the matter is settled. If the decertification application fails, then the board would proceed with first-contract arbitration. This change would put the decision in the hands of the employees.

The second major reform concerns the issue of ratification and strike votes at first contract. Currently, unions are permitted to combine a vote to ratify a proposed collective agreement with a strike vote. But many workers feel they should be able to reject a first contract offer without going on strike. As the Minister of Labour said, many workers feel that a "no" vote should lead back to the bargaining table, not out to the picket line. By requiring separate questions for ratification and strike votes, the decision is again left in the hands of the employees. The true wishes of employees will be heard. Again, democracy and accountability are the driving forces here.

Our Blueprint reforms would also help employees looking for information on how to decertify their union. Information on decertification is hard to come by in Ontario workplaces. Unions do not provide this information. Employers are not permitted to do so. The result? Many workers have absolutely no idea how to go about decertifying their union. Our proposals would make it mandatory for neutral, factual information on decertification to be posted in every unionized Ontario workplace. The information would include who may make an application for decertification, when the application may be made and any applicable Ontario Labour Relations Board rules regarding the decertification procedure.

Our proposals would also expand the time period when decertification applications can be made from 60 to 90 days at the end of a collective agreement. Expanding the decertification window is essential if workers are to make better decisions by better understanding and exercising their options.

Bill 139 also works to promote workplace stability. Some employers are telling us that the productivity of their workplaces is affected by repeated unsuccessful union drives. Currently, if one union attempts to unionize a workplace and fails, another union may apply for certification the next day. This can be very disruptive. To aid workplace stability, our proposals would introduce a one-year cooling-off period between failed certification drives by any union.

Those are the highlights of our workplace democracy package. As I said earlier, the bill is not about weakening unions or showing them the door in this province. Unions need not lose one dues-paying member—

**The Acting Speaker:** Order.

**Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt):** On a point of order, Speaker: My apologies for interrupting the speaker, but we have in the Legislature today one of Canada's most famous people. The father of Wayne Gretzky, Walter Gretzky, is in the gallery.

**The Acting Speaker:** We are pleased that you could be with us today. I assume you're with the delegation from Brantford and we'll see more of you a little bit later.

The Chair recognizes the member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale.

**Mr Gill:** As I was saying, the bill is not about weakening the unions or showing them the door in this province. Unions need not lose one dues-paying member or one certified workplace under this legislation. Union leaders may find, interestingly enough, that empowered members make better union members, period, because they are more active and involved in the organization.

I want to speak briefly on the construction provisions contained in this bill. Improving competitiveness in Ontario's construction sector is an important issue for the government and the current Minister of Labour. Many parts of the sector are booming right now, but there are underlying structural issues that need addressing. We must remain competitive on the cost side if our province is to maintain its fair share of new construction.

We made a commitment in the throne speech to modernize labour relations in the construction sector. Bill 139 is an important part of that commitment. The other part is Bill 69. These two bills, proceeding in tandem in the House, constitute a total modernization of an antiquated and archaic labour relations regime which hopefully will be consigned to history.

Today's legislation will put the finishing touches on our commitment to make this sector more competitive. We are proposing to make three fundamental changes to ensure the continued health and vitality of this sector. If passed, they would allow employers who do not sell construction services, such as municipalities and school boards, to remove themselves from the construction provisions of the act. This would enable them to tender projects to both union and non-union contractors. It'll permit project agreements to apply to multiple and future projects developed within the term of the agreement, thereby eliminating the need to negotiate a new project agreement for each specific construction project. It also protects non-union employers hiring unionized non-construction employees on the project from certification.

Ontario needs more project agreements. They are a tremendous way for the parties to design an agreement that may better reflect local business conditions than the provincial ICI agreement. We've got one in Sarnia, and the steel companies and unions are working towards one in Hamilton, which would be a big economic boost for

that community. Passing Bill 139 would help that process along.

Bill 139 is yet another example of our incremental, step-by-step process to ensure that the Labour Relations Act reflects Ontario's current economic needs and realities. We promised to give individual workers more choices and opportunities to express and carry through on their desires regarding union representation. We are keeping that promise. We promised to bring order to the pell-mell system of labour relations that prevailed in the construction sector, and we are doing so. Our reforms would stimulate that sector, make it more attractive to investors and create employment for workers, both union and non-union.

Bill 139 is a vital part in the expansion of workers' freedoms in Ontario. It allows individual union members greater freedom in deciding on whether they wish to be represented by a union. It increases their freedom on information, shining a light on union leadership.

To the two parties opposite, I issue this challenge: Show Ontarians that you stand for the freedom of individual workers, not the privilege of union bosses. Show that what matters to you is workplace democracy, fair labour laws and the accountability of union leaders to their members. On the basis of democracy, accountability, economic growth, job creation and renewed investment, I urge all members of this House to give Bill 139 a speedy passage.

**Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence):** This is a debate over another attempt by this government, as its habit is, to invoke closure; that is, to stop debate and rush a bill through. As you know, that has been a pattern of this government since it came to power. It has changed the rules to make the shutdown of debate much easier, and it has developed certainly a habit of doing that.

I think people have to be reminded of that fact. This government doesn't like debate, especially due to the fact they're in a great hurry. They have a tendency to be always reckless, always going down the highway at 150 kilometres an hour, stopping for nobody. This is another example, never mind the bill itself, of another motion to stop debate.

As you know, the Provincial Auditor yesterday talked about the recklessness of this government, talked about how reckless this government was in managing a very essential service like ambulances. People in this province are now in some cases waiting 45 minutes for an ambulance. That is no longer an ambulance.

1620

**Mr Gill:** Bill 139, please.

**Mr Colle:** We're talking about the motion to invoke closure by your government. That's what it's all about, invoking closure. I'm talking about your reckless haste to invoke closure and stop debate, and I have the right to debate that. Are you denying me the right to debate that? Would you stand up and deny me the right to debate? Is that what you're trying to do? Do you want to stand up and I'll let you speak to deny my right to debate? Is that

what the member is saying, that he doesn't want me to speak to the bill?

If they think democracy's a tantrum, if they think democracy is not something to feel emotional or strongly about, I feel very strongly about the right that many people in Ontario have given us in this Legislature to debate bills. This government feels they have the right to deny the debating of bills. Here is a bill which, again, is rushed through, closure is invoked. They pretend that this is just an innocuous little bill that changes some rules, and in fact they even have the gall to call this improving workplace democracy.

I tell the people of Ontario that they should stop to reflect about how reckless this government is. Even the Provincial Auditor said that when you're reckless and you rush ahead, you sometimes do irreparable damage to the people of this province. The Provincial Auditor was unequivocal in saying they are doing irrevocable damage to the health care system of this province.

I know that in my own community they have closed 10 hospitals and six emergency departments. They close in the middle of the night. Then they wonder why there isn't emergency care. Without public notice, they closed these hospitals in the middle of the night. They left people stranded in hallways. They're still stranded in hallways in our emergency departments because they had this reckless approach to what they called "hospital restructuring."

They went through our hospitals like a bulldozer goes through a building. They didn't care who was in the building, they just bulldozed 10 of our hospitals here in Toronto and closed about another 30 hospitals in this province, in a reckless fashion. That's why you need debate in this House, to slow down, to get sober second opinions, to have the public engaged in the passage of laws.

The reason we're here is to allow the public of Ontario to understand the complexity of these bills so they can become part of this. This government thinks it's their God-given right basically to hand down legislation from some mountain. It isn't the Canadian way, to hand down legislation. The Canadian way, the Ontario way, traditionally is to have give and take, to inform the public, to engage the public in debate so that the public can see the impact of legislation on their lives, but this government has a pattern, over and over again, of invoking closure and shutting down debate.

What this government is intent on doing, it's very obvious, is there is a pattern here of essentially eroding the rights of workers in this province. They are obviously on one side and that is the employers' side, so they fear they have to do something to appease one side and not respect the other side.

I come from a riding where in 1960 there was a horrific, tragic accident because workers didn't have protection. In 1960, on March 17, five workers succumbed to an industrial construction accident because there were no safeguards, there were no proper ventilation systems, there were no first-aid attendants. Five young men died

in an underground tunnel in Hogg's Hollow on March 17, 1960.

This is the type of thing this government forgets. It forgets that the rights of workers have been built up over the decades to protect them from these accidents. These bills are an attempt to erode those rights. I will remind the public of Ontario that these rights and protections for workers did not come automatically. People gave their lives for these rights. In the case of the Hogg's Hollow disaster which occurred at Yonge and Wilson Avenue, five young men died because there was no workers' protection. But because of that disaster, we did achieve some breakthroughs. Protections were put in place, and people unionized and organized because of that disaster.

A lot of the legislation we have before us which this government is trying to repudiate and get rid of and alter and amend, is this government's attempt to forget the protections and deny the protections of those workers. This bill, although it's probably not caught the eye of the public, it certainly has caught the eye of the workers in this province. The public doesn't realize that these rights, once taken away, are very, very hard to regain.

I should mention again, in the Hogg's Hollow disaster these five young men were underground on Yonge Street building a tunnel to build the subway. They were doing a public service, working and sacrificing their lives. I will read these five young men's names to you so I will again remind this government that when you rush through things you forget the lessons that history teaches you. History teaches you that if you don't pay attention, you will make the same mistakes again.

The five young men who, while digging underground in horrible conditions, gave up their lives: Pasquale Allegranza, Gianbatista Carriglio and brothers Alessandro and Guido Mantella all gave up their lives in a simple attempt to do a day's work, and also Giovanni Fusillo, whose niece is fighting to remind people in Ontario. Grace Fusillo-Lombardi is trying to tell people, "Don't forget the rights you achieved through the sacrifices of the people who came before you and don't go along with these flavour-of-the-month pieces of legislation this government comes up with."

I tell the young people of this province, Mr Speaker. I know you do a lot of good work with young people out your way in beautiful Listowel. Young people should be reminded that they should learn history, that the rights of workers did not come automatically. They had to sacrifice. Some, as I said in the case of the Hogg's Hollow disaster, lost their lives. We cannot do our jobs as adults and legislators unless we remind the public, and especially the young, that many of these workers' rights were achieved at great risk and at great sacrifice. These five young men gave up their lives in that great tragedy.

I say to you who try to deny me the right to speak on this bill and don't want to debate the bill but to close it down, you may disagree, but how dare you try to stop me from speaking up on behalf of what I think is right for my residents and for the people of Ontario? How dare you try to deny me the right to speak?

**Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West):** At the outset, let me say that I want to take up the minister's challenge. He said, "Somebody stand up in the opposition benches and tell me where these things are unfair and unreasonable," and he did his whole little entertaining routine, "and I will take a portion of those and then when half our time has gone by in the next rotation, my colleague Shelley Martel will pick up the other details and continue to take the minister up on his challenge.

First of all, let's remember where all this came from. This came from a news conference just a couple of weeks ago at the Toronto Convention Centre, at a private function where you had to be a paid delegate to attend and the minister was the invited guest. There were representatives of the Ontario federation and the construction industry waiting outside, who asked for an opportunity to at least stand at the back of the room and listen to the Minister of labour outline what his changes were going to be, given the fact that they were likely to have a significant impact on the members they represent. They were denied.

I got in, as the labour critic for the NDP. So did my colleague from Hamilton East, who was a freshly appointed labour critic for the Liberals. We were allowed to stand very nicely and politely at the back of the room and listen. But the labour people were not even let in the room.

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** So much for workplace democracy.

**Mr Christopherson:** My colleague says, "So much for workplace democracy." Obviously, right at the get-go.

Then we go outside—it's not done yet, Speaker. We go outside the luncheon where the minister made his announcement—and by the way, it was all employers. The media reported labour lawyers were there. They were labour lawyers like Mulroney was a labour lawyer. They were not labour lawyers in the way most people think of labour lawyers when you say that. They interrupted the minister's speech a number of times with a very warm, enthusiastic round of applause and gave him a standing ovation at the end of it. Afterwards, outside in the scrum—and I was standing right there, not two feet from the minister—he was asked, "What in this bill is in here because labour asked for it?" The minister constantly talks about "fairness," "reasonableness," "balance" and "equality." When asked in the scrum how much in here represented what labour wanted, he said, "Nothing." When followed up with a question, "So you're saying, Minister, that everything in here is what the employers asked for," he said, "Yes."

**1630**

The reason I start there is because it's so relevant to where we are today in terms of the time allocation motion. The time allocation motion, as presented by the Minister of Labour, denies the entire population of Ontario any opportunity to say word one about this bill. Why? Because there are no public hearings. There are no committee hearings. None. That means the labour lead-

ers, the elected representatives in Ontario, were not consulted. The minister likes to say, "Yes, I talked to people." Well, I talked to some of those labour leaders and the best the minister can be referring to is offhanded conversations or snippets of these issues in the context of other discussions, but never—not once—did this minister say to the labour movement, "Here's what I'm proposing. Come in and give me your thoughts because I've done that with the employers. I at least want to give you the same opportunity to influence the kind of bill I might table as a result of what I'm told." That didn't happen. Not one representative of the hundreds of thousands of people who are affected by this bill was given an opportunity to say anything beforehand. They couldn't be in the room when he made the announcement, and they're not being allowed any opportunity during this parliamentary process to even have word one. And you want to talk to me about workplace democracy?

Let's get into some of the specifics. The minister uses much the same words for almost all his arguments, so they're interchangeable. He talked about the one-year ban. "Why is that so horrible that there be a one-year ban from an organizing drive if there's already been one?" Then he used the argument about how many months anyone is denied an opportunity to do a decent, so why should they be allowed to continue having organizing drives? I'm paraphrasing, but I think that's the essence. I see the minister basically acknowledging that's the core of his argument.

Let me say, first of all, that death by a thousand cuts is still death, and if you deal with all of those cuts in one lump sum, it's pretty easy to see what's happened to someone. There's a reason that expression has been given to us over time. But if you took each and every individual little cut, one thousand of them, it wouldn't seem like an awful lot. That's what's going on here. The minister is saying, "Well, there's nothing in here that's really overly dramatic. We're not lowering the boom. It's not that big an issue." Every one of these items is another one of those thousand cuts. Goodness knows, we've already seen how many of them—I could list the bills. I could use the balance of my time doing nothing but listing bills that this government has brought in that have taken on workers' rights and their rights vis-à-vis the collective bargaining process.

Right now, the law says that if union A comes in and attempts to organize and, for whatever reason, fails, and it may be something as simple as it's just not a good fit, that the union that made application maybe was attempting to branch into new areas, but the workers there didn't feel this union really had the expertise they wanted, it just wasn't the right fit, it doesn't mean they don't want a union. It just means they don't want that union. Under the existing law, before we get this thing jammed down our throats, that union is banned for a year. But union B, assuming those workers have already expressed that they want to join a union, at least there's an interest in that workplace, they now want to exercise their rights because

they said no to union A and they may very well want to say yes to union B.

Now, under Bill 139, that can't happen and here's where the worry is. We know there are American strike-breaker firms that are doing really well here in Canada since Mike Harris became the government. It's one of the growth industries they're probably so proud of. Of course what started that was your bringing in legislation that made scabs legal again, which my colleague is going to speak to in more detail. But that's why these firms are here. All they have to do now under Bill 139 is, you just have to arrange for some kind of a "sham," is the word I use, a "sham" employee association where if you get a small minority of the workers there who are adamant they don't want a union but they meet the legal requirements of an association or union, they make an attempt and of course it fails, which would be the intent, then every other union in the entire province is banned for a year from making application.

The minister across the way of course makes the mocking gestures that he does, trying to suggest this is really no big deal. Let me tell you, there are sharpies out there whose sole purpose is to find their way around laws like this, and those kinds of people and firms are growing and proliferating in your Ontario, in Mike Harris's Ontario, so don't tell me that can't happen. Money will take care of that. If it means an employer who is bound and determined they're not going to have a union, if it costs them some money to prevent any union under the law from coming into that workplace for one year, I've got to believe that's something you could market in this province.

There are two reasons why this is not fair, and it's not meant to be. No matter how much the Minister of Labour tries to spin it, the fact of the matter is that there are very good reasons why the law is the way it is and there are very good reasons why they're making these changes, and they are not in the best interests of workers, otherwise we'd be taking this bill out and prancing around the province if it's so good for workers. Why aren't we? Because he knows the avalanche of criticism he would receive, and he knows he can't get enough backbenchers together to sit on the committee and go out and take that kind of abuse. Under workplace democracy, they run roughshod through democracy.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Christopherson:** I see one of the other ministers hollering across the way. I'd like you to tell me what is democratic about a bill that affects people and no one who's affected by it had any opportunity for input at the beginning, at the middle or at the end of the process. How's that democratic? I didn't think so. Death by a thousand cuts, union-busting by stealth, call it whatever you want, but step by step that's what this is all about. Let me take another issue.

First contract: again, the minister used very similar "it's reasonable," "it's fair" and "how can anybody across the way possibly be opposed?" the whole little routine he did on all the issues. Again, as a stand-alone

item is it the end of the world? No, but it's definitely movement in the same direction that you started since 1995 and it's union-busting by stealth, one step at a time.

Now what does this say? This says that the separation of a strike vote versus acceptance or denial of a contract will now be two separate votes, and of course he says, "What's unfair about that? You've got one vote for this and one vote for that." But the key here is in words that, if he didn't use them, his parliamentary assistant certainly did, where they talked about "the maturity of the negotiators." These are, by their own admission, government members. These are, as a rule, workers who haven't belonged to a union before; they're green. They don't understand the terminology. In a lot of places, for many of them English is not their first language. They are at a very distinct disadvantage. On that much we probably agree. Where we part ways is that the minister is saying that this lack of experience in negotiating means the separation of the vote is better for them. I argue the opposite, because let's remember the importance of the first contract. A lot of people are scared. They're worried that they are going to lose their job.

1640

**Ms Martel:** They took a big risk to join the union.

**Mr Christopherson:** My colleague reminds me they took a big risk to join a union.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** They're worried about going on strike.

**Mr Christopherson:** They're worried about going on strike. Fair enough. They're worried about saying yes or no to a contract. They're not 100% sure.

Now, if they're offered an opportunity—and let's remember that the regulations and laws that used to be in place to stop and prohibit employers from intimidating workers and affecting what they do and what they say have been watered down under another one of their previous bills. So we've probably got some coercion going on in the background, because the threat of getting caught is less and if they do get caught the penalties aren't as strong. It used to be that there could be a collective agreement imposed if the employer was found to be putting pressure on or coercing or intimidating their employees as to whether they should join a union or support a contract. That's gone. So in the background in a lot of these places we're going to have employers who are intimidating their workers, and for all the reasons I've said above, a lot of them will be susceptible to the argument, "Vote no on the contract and vote no on strike."

That effectively squashes anything the union can do. How do you go in and negotiate an improvement to an offer that's been turned down when by the same token the membership, without fully understanding the implications for the same reasons we've already articulated, do not understand fully that what it means is, without a strike vote, you've got nothing to bargain with? You've got nothing to bargain with. You've got cap in hand, down on bended knee, "Please, sir, more porridge."

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** They're not smart enough?

**Mr Christopherson:** You made the argument, Minister, that the maturity of the negotiators—

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** I said they were smart enough to vote. You don't think they are.

**Mr Christopherson:** You see, Minister, that's the difference between us.

*Interjection.*

**Mr Christopherson:** Absolutely. Let's move on to the third item, because you asked for—and if you want to listen, I will respond to the minister's challenge; I'm trying to, over the heckling of at least two ministers—three, I guess. Want to get some more? I've given you what I believe is the ulterior motive here under that clause. Obviously you don't agree, but I do believe that's what's going on.

Third, what I'm going to lead to is the fair wage policy, but there's the whole issue about school boards and municipalities—and I've only got a couple of minutes on this—no longer being required to either go to union shops or, in the place of that, have a fair wage agreement, which we have in the city of Hamilton. All that says is that if you're going to bid, you don't have to be union, you don't have to be non-union, but no one can come in with a bid that undermines the standard benefits and wages across the industry in the community. That's fair, because if you've got electricians who have exercised their democratic right to join a union, to bargain, and they've got increased benefits and increased levels of wages because of the work and the productivity and the profits they've been a part of creating, then they're obviously going to be higher than someone who hires a non-experienced tradesperson. So when the bids come in, who's going to get it 10 times out of 10? The non-union.

At this point, the government doesn't have a problem with that. They just stand back and say, "That's just the way the system works. The lowest bidder gets it all." What it means for workers, however, and let's keep in mind that you didn't even have the decency to ask them their opinion and you're not asking their opinion today, is that the workers involved in this are either going to be denied work because they have a union card, because the bidding will be higher in the absence of a fair wage policy, or they're going to be exploited or people will be hired only based on who will work for the least amount of money. Because if you're an electrician or a bricklayer and you'll work for less than anybody else, then I can make a bid that's obviously going to win. At the end of the day, your little system wins and that contractor may win, but the workers—the electricians and the bricklayers and the sheet metal workers and the carpenters—lose, and their families lose, and when their families lose, our community loses.

That's what you do with this bill. That's the impact, and that's me responding to the minister's challenge to talk about why these changes hurt workers. You know they hurt workers. It's by design and it's yet one more step in your constant attack on workers and their right to exercise their democratic rights through a union.

**Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):** I'm very pleased to join in the debate with respect to Bill 139. There has been a lot said about this bill. From a practical standpoint, I certainly think the listening public have an appreciation of this bill—if they've listened to the government side, of course—because we're dealing with facts.

Dealing with the labour relations aspect of it, Ministers of Labour have a daunting task, as everybody knows, in terms of dealing with the mandate that has been put upon them with respect to labour relations in this province. It's not an easy task to balance all the interests of all the players. The players are the employees who work in the workplaces, whether they're unionized or non-unionized in this province; you have employers; and you have the unions, wherever they're organized.

This bill deals with a lot of aspects of labour relations. It deals with where unionized labour can be used in construction projects, it deals with the decertification process, and there are a lot of aspects of fairness in labour relations that it covers off.

Dealing with strikes and lockouts is an area. We had an example yesterday in terms of the ministry's involvement in bringing labour peace and balance into the workplace. The Hamilton-Wentworth school board legislation that was passed yesterday is an example of the role that the Ministry of Labour plays. I think what is missing here is an understanding of the role of the Ministry of Labour. It's not there for unions, as the opposition party and the NDP would have you believe, that the Labour Relations Act or the Ministry of Labour is solely there to serve the rights and interests of unions. It's not. It's there to serve everybody in this province, be it a worker, non-union or union, be it a trade union or be it an employer.

We know there are different views on the back-to-work legislation. Certainly what we had was a 26-day walkout. The Education Relations Commission took a very firm view that the school year for that particular school board, the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, dealing with the elementary teachers, was at risk. It was interesting yesterday in terms of the perspective that's taken on labour relations in this province. The government went forward with a piece of back-to-work legislation for the school board which had been supported by both parties opposite, but when it came to vote, they didn't stand up and support education continuing in this province. What they did was basically flip-flop on their position, and I think the public should know the extent of the flip-flop.

The Leader of the Opposition had put forth legislation called Bill 14, An Act to amend the School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Act, which received first reading on April 23, 1992. Everybody here knows that the legislation brought forth by this government took the labour relations for the education sector out of the School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Act and into the Labour Relations Act—that's why the minister came forth with legislation yesterday—and

some aspects of the relationships covered under the Education Act.

**1650**

But the Leader of the Opposition, back in 1992—this is very interesting—put forth a bill to prohibit a strike from commencing after the 31st day of October in the year in which the collective agreement expires. He also came forth a little bit stronger. He said, "The bill prohibits a strike or lockout from lasting more than 20 school days and deems the board and the branch affiliate to have agreed to refer any matters remaining in dispute between them at the end of the 20 school days to a selector for determination as set out in the act."

Now, what we had yesterday was the Minister of Labour taking the position of back-to-work legislation after 26 school days, the Education Relations Commission having indicated that the school year was in jeopardy, and the opposition party and the NDP voting against this: the flip-flop. But the threshold in their own leader's proposed legislation, in a private member's bill back in 1992, was far exceeded when the Minister of Labour put this legislation for back to work, and with a situation in November of a school year in jeopardy. So the Minister of Labour basically implements what the Leader of the Opposition said would be good policy back in 1992, and that leader doesn't even support it. You talk about a massive flip-flop catering to unions, caving into teachers' unions. That's basically what happened yesterday.

They don't know where they stand on labour relations in this province. That's why the Minister of Labour is clearly putting forth a piece of legislation that is designed to balance all the interests of the parties, and the other side will say, "You have the audacity to include workers in that equation."

I'm going to conclude my remarks, because I know the member for Scarborough Centre is going to add a lot to this debate.

**Mr Mario Sergio (York West):** I will try and use my few minutes to just address a couple of the remarks that I wish to make on some of the points on the bill.

Two things: first of all, it is unfortunate that on such an important piece of legislation, the government has decided again to cut off the debate and ram it through. Again, they want to go ahead and bully another bill which is very, very important. Why it's so is that whatever progress has been made in the labour movement, within the labour force, within the strength of our economic situation, again, the government has seen fit to tip the balance of power completely toward one side only. What does this do? It leaves the workers in Ontario, especially the construction workers, without any protection whatsoever.

I have to say, and I'm glad the Minister of Labour is in the House, that in a perfect world, this bill would have done ominous sense. In a world in which we would have seen every employer provide respect, protection, safety, a good, paying job, it would make sense, but we have to think that there are still conditions out there that are not



so attractive for our construction workers. I wonder if the minister has had a chance to spend half a day or one hour on a construction site. I wonder, because if he did, he would see that when construction workers leave home to go to work, they don't know if they're going to come back alive or with some injuries. There must be a reason if 250% more accidents are happening on non-unionized sites. There must be a reason this is happening. Do you know why? It is because those infrastructures must be in place, those standards, those safety conditions that say to workers, "It's safe to go and work in there," or, "If you want to work, you've got to wear a hard hat."

What about benefits? What about pay conditions? Of course, if we were to take everything into consideration and say, "You know what? We don't need any unions whatsoever because the employment conditions are so good out there, the employers are all perfect"—but they are not. So why would the government, in the situation we are in today where the economy is booming, need this piece of legislation to create turmoil, where it didn't exist and where it's not needed?

I would invite the Minister of Labour to travel north of Steeles Avenue, north of Highway 7, and see the construction, especially the residential portion, booming. Do you know what, Mr Minister? You and your government are opening up a can of worms, and in the future, you are going to create a very serious, terrible situation for the construction industry and the workers in Ontario.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** What are you opposed to in the bill?

**Mr Sergio:** We are opposed to the bill, and I think the minister should know. I think he knows more than that.

They have two bills, actually. On the one we are debating today, Bill 139, they said, "We are invoking closure. That's it. No more debate. We're going to do it." The other one is still to come. It's Bill 69, which also deals with employment standards and conditions, stuff like that. I won't dwell on that, because I hope to get another chance to speak on Bill 69. But let me say that the two are so related that I think they should have put them together, because they want to get rid of two things: the unions and whatever protection we have now for workers in Ontario.

Don't tell me, Minister, that it's not so, because it's your own bill. It is your own bill.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** I don't know what to tell you.

**Mr Sergio:** If it is not so, I challenge the minister and the Premier and the government side to allow public hearings and hear directly from the workers in the province.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask for unanimous consent to find somebody to read the bill to him.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Tony Martin):** Agreed? No. The member for York West.

**Mr Sergio:** That shows the arrogance, not only of this minister, of the Premier, that he has allowed this minister, this member, to bring this bill into the House without public debate. I think it is an affront, the ultimate affront

to the construction workers in the province of Ontario, to have the gall to say, "Have you read the bills?"

I'll tell you what: You pull back closure, allow us enough debate, and I will give to you clause-by-clause. They won't do that. Do you know why? This shows you the respect that they have for the workers of Ontario. Isn't that nice?

I wonder what they're going to say when one worker comes home who has been injured—the pain, not only to himself, but to his mother or his wife or his children. God forbid we will have another accident. Is it really worth it?

**1700**

I would ask the minister. It is his fault since he has introduced this particular bill which takes away every right for which the workers have fought over the last 40 years. What is the cost of pain? What is the cost of injuries? We are sending, on a daily basis, injured workers a lot of tribulation; appeals, counter appeals, tribunals. At the end, who is responsible when somebody gets injured? They should be responsible. According to the minister, they don't give a darn because they only want to listen to what the big employers are saying. It is totally unfair.

If the minister cares so much, pull back this bill, bring it into the open, allow the workers and the unions—be fair, be balanced—the opportunity to tell the minister, to tell the government, to tell us what's in the bill, what they want and what you're proposing. Then bring it back here to this House. The minister and the Premier are refusing to listen to the workers of Ontario. It is a shame, because this shows the arrogance of this government when they say, "We are going to do it. We do what we want. We don't care about the consequences." How unfair.

Would I be able to look a mother or a wife in her eyes when an accident has happened on the job site because of the deregulation of this particular government? It is totally unfair. It is totally unacceptable.

I do hope that on the next bill they will do the right thing and bring it to public hearings so we can have a fair discussion, since on this bill, as it has been introduced, there has not even been consultation with those labour forces.

It is unfair for the minister to come into the House today and say, "What's in the bill?" The workers out there know what's in the bill. That's the most important thing. Let me tell you, there is nothing that offers them protection, that offers them fairness, that gives them equity on the job site.

I hope the minister will reconsider and make it fair for the people who really provide our economic situation today, the economic situation that they are enjoying today. If it weren't for those workers, we wouldn't have the economic situation we have today. Why would we have a minister, a government, that would create this chaos instead of bringing harmony? Why would they do that at this particular time when we are enjoying monetary prosperity, harmony? You know what? They enjoy creating crises. This is one crisis that is going to be there for many years to come. Unfortunately, workers are paying the price. This government hopefully will be paying the price

as well. I do thank you for the time that I have been allotted.

**Ms Martel:** We are here today again shutting down debate on an important issue. It must be Wednesday because just about every Wednesday you and I are here doing the same thing; that is, trying to ask this government why it is that on a bill that has important ramifications, in this case, for workers in the province—one week it was probably health care; the week after that it was probably education—the government doesn't want to hear what elected representatives have to say about this bill? It is clear they don't. The time allocation here today shuts this all down.

It is also clear that not only do they not want to hear from elected representatives, but they don't want to hear from the public about this bill. As has been clearly articulated in the time allocation motion, there will be no public hearings with respect to the bill, despite the demonstration we had in the gallery yesterday from numbers of construction workers—

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm having trouble hearing. Would it take unanimous consent for her to move to the next seat to speak?

**The Acting Speaker:** Agreed.

**Ms Martel:** Thanks, Minister. I won't start again from the top, Speaker.

It's also clear the government is not very interested in having the public have its say, because despite a demonstration that occurred here in the gallery yesterday, from a number of construction workers in this province who are immediately impacted by this bill, the government allows no room for public debate in the time allocation motion.

The motion clearly states, "That the standing committee on justice and social policy shall be authorized to meet during its regularly scheduled meeting times on one day for clause-by-clause consideration"—no public hearings, no input from the public, no input from the people who are directly affected and impacted by this bill, but just a move to clause-by-clause so we don't have to hear from people about how this is going to impact them and how concerned they are about it.

I suppose we shouldn't be surprised that we're not going to have any public debate, because the Minister of Labour has made it abundantly clear from the beginning of this bill that this is all about a payback for his employer and corporate friends. This bill has nothing to do with hearing from workers about how they may be impacted. It certainly has nothing to do with increasing their rights. This bill is all about how we pay back all those employers in the province, particularly those from the construction trades, for the enormous amounts of contributions they have made; in the construction trade in the order of \$12 million.

I think that's even more clearly noted if you go to the government press release on the day the government introduced the bill. It's interesting that while the bill talks about fulfilling the government's commitment to workplace democracy, the only people who are quoted outside

of the minister are three employer representatives. We've got no word here from trade union leaders who represent many of the members who are being affected. Frankly, they were barred from the meeting where the minister made his announcement about his proposed changes. They weren't allowed to participate. They weren't allowed to attend. The minister said very clearly, "There is nothing for labour in this bill. It's all about how I pay back some of my corporate friends for their contributions."

The minister asked us to tell him what we're opposed to. My colleague from Hamilton West clearly articulated three of the sections of the bill we are opposed to and I'm going to deal with two more. The first is the new section 63, which deals with the posting of the decertification documents. Under the bill, the minister is now going to be obliged to produce and publish a document that outlines how members of a union can decertify from that union. The minister is further obliged under the bill to change that document any time there is a change to the Ontario Labour Relations Act or its regulations or when there is a change that comes from the Ontario Labour Relations Board that might impact upon trade union certification. The minister is obliged to prepare this document within one year of this bill passing.

The employer, under this bill, now has a number of new obligations. An employer who represents, say, workers in a trade union now has an obligation "to post and keep posted a copy of a document published"—that is, the decertification document—in the workplace "in a conspicuous place" where employees work on behalf of that employer.

The employer is also obliged, under clause (b), "to post and keep posted with that copy" of how to decertify from the union "a notice that any employee represented by the trade union may request a copy of" that same document. Clause (c) says that "once in each calendar year" that employer also has "to provide a copy of the document to all employees ... who are represented by the trade union." Again, that's the decertification document. Finally, under clause (d), "upon the request of an employee of the employer who is represented by the trade union," that employer has "to provide a copy of the document" again even if the employee has got his annual copy.

These are all the obligations that an employer in a unionized shop has to undertake with respect to the rules around decertification from that same union.

If the minister, as he has been wont to do during this debate, wants to talk about workplace democracy, fairness and equity, then surely an employer in a non-unionized workplace would be obliged to post rules around certification, so that employees in that non-unionized workplace would know what their rights are and would know how they can go about certification so they can come under the protection of a trade union.

**1710**

If the minister were interested in fairness and balance, surely he would do that in non-unionized workplaces,

and surely the legislation would be printed so that there would be a similar obligation on the employer to do the same. So I searched high and low through all the provisions of Bill 139, looking to see where this might be, because of course if the minister's concerned about fairness and justice he would have done that, wouldn't he? Guess what? Nowhere in this bill is the employer in a non-unionized shop obliged to post the rules about how to get certified.

There is no obligation for an employer to post in a conspicuous place in the workplace the rules about how to join a union. There is no obligation on the part of the employer in that non-unionized workplace to post a notice informing the employees that they are entitled to have a copy of the rules about how to join a trade union. Nowhere in this bill is the employer obliged to send to each of his or her employees those rules about how to become certified with a trade union. Finally, nowhere does it say that even if that employee has received that annual notification of how to join a trade union, the employer would still provide, upon request by the employee, another copy of the same.

Why am I opposed? Because it's very clear that this bill has everything to do with how to get people to decertify, how to break the unions and has nothing to do with workplace democracy, because if the minister were truly interested in workplace democracy, he would have a similar obligation on employers in non-unionized shops, and that obligation would be to post the rules about how people can form trade unions. It's not in this bill and the reason it's not is because this bill caters to all of the government's corporate and business friends and the government is not interested in having fairness in the workplace, certainly isn't interested in seeing more people form a trade union.

This leads to my second concern with the bill, and that has to do with the change in the bill that extends the time period for decertification of a union from 60 days to 90 days at the end of a three-year collective agreement.

I'm really concerned about this because of the opportunity it provides to an employer to intimidate and coerce employees in that workplace. I go at it this way: most people don't join a trade union if there's nothing wrong in their workplace. They're not motivated to do so. If they've got good health and safety, good wages, good working conditions, they have no reason to want to form a trade union. People form trade unions, they form an association with each other and they look for protections because something is going wrong in that workplace. It's usually something that has to do with the health and safety conditions or the lack of them, or the employer trying to get out from under his obligations with respect to health and safety, or there's a problem around working hours, a problem around pay, a problem around benefits, or lack of all those things. That's why people join trade unions.

In Mike Harris's Ontario, people have to think even further now about joining a union, have to take that more seriously, because of the changes the government made

at the Ontario Labour Relations Board, where you now can't get an expedited, fair hearing if you believe you have been fired because you've been part of a movement to try and have a union in your workplace.

People only have to look to the experience of 10 electricians at Drycore who have no doubt been fired because they were part of a movement to join a trade union, to form a trade union in that workplace. They're going to wait a full year, because of changes this government made, to try and get a hearing before the OLRB, to try and get their case heard and have some justice. People have to think long and hard now about joining a trade union. They don't do it for frivolous reasons.

What's going to happen under this section is this is going to allow that employer even more opportunity, more time to intimidate, to coerce, to put pressure on those employees to disband from the union, to try and decertify. It is happening in workplaces every day. I'll give you an example. It's a little bit different from the one employed in the bill, but the point is still the same.

CAW workers in my community started out to bargain with Falconbridge. The first thing Falconbridge said was, "We're going to shut down six years from now. We don't have enough ore left in the ground to operate past six years." That's where they started, in terms of the negotiations, to hang that threat over the heads of their employees when they might come to talk about pensions or wages.

Do you know what? That's the same thing Falconbridge has been saying since I've been elected. The first meeting I, and the other MPPs in the area, had with Falconbridge when I was elected in September 1987, Falconbridge was saying, "We've got six more years and that's it." So every time there's a contract negotiation Falconbridge hauls out that bit of garbage and tells all of their workers at the table, through their negotiating team, that they only have six more years left, "So don't ask for too much or maybe we'll be out of here even sooner." Regrettably, there are other employers like Falconbridge that use the same kind of tactics, the same kind of schemes, the same kind of pressure, to coerce and intimidate employees. By making the change that the government wants to, we're going to allow those employers—not all of them, but some of those less reputable employers—that don't want the union, never wanted it in the first place, to have an even longer period of time to have a go at their employees, to tell them that they're not going to get another contract in the workplace, they're going to lose their jobs if they continue to be part of a union and enjoy some of those benefits. That's why I'm opposed to that section too.

Between the two of us, my colleague from Hamilton West and I have now articulated at least five areas in the bill that we are opposed to. I think our concerns are legitimate, because I think, regrettably, especially under the labour changes that have been made by this government, more and more workers and workplaces in this province are facing intimidation and coercion and threats. And with this bill this is doing everything it can to make

sure that those same employees don't have an opportunity to form a union, or that if they have one it becomes that much more difficult for them to retain that union.

I go back again to the fact of the great hypocrisy in the government's scheme that's put before us: on the one hand, forcing an employer in a unionized shop to post rules for decertification, but on the other hand, no obligation whatsoever for an employer in a non-unionized shop to post rules regarding certification. What a contradiction. What hypocrisy. How more clearly does it get to show that this government is only interested in union-busting, not in ensuring that people continue to have a legitimate right to associate, have a legitimate right to have a union to protect them?

In the final moments I want to say this to the minister: if he wanted to do something to protect people he would ban scab labour in this province. Today is day 114 since workers from Mine Mill/CAW in my riding have been on strike against Falconbridge—day 114. Why? Because from day one, Falconbridge was allowed to bring in scab labour, and that's exactly what they did. As a result of bringing in scab labour, they've been able to continue production at the smelter, meet some of their contracts and continue to make some money, albeit not as much as they were making before. If you want to do something, you should ban scabs in this province again.

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** I'm pleased to rise on this time allocation motion. I'm particularly pleased to be able to follow the member for Nickel Belt, who at the beginning of her speech was talking about time allocation, how terrible it was that it was bringing it to a close. I'm rather surprised that a member of the cabinet of the NDP government would be on to a topic such as this when they had such a terrible track record in the quantity of time that was spent discussing various bills. I thought she wouldn't have even mentioned it, would be embarrassed to bring it up. I look at the record—I have the facts here—and in this particular bill we've had three sessional days, over seven hours, and then again today it will be two-plus hours. So when we get finished it will be well in excess of 10 hours of debate on this particular bill on second reading.

1720

Let's have a look at what had been going on over previous governments. In the 35th Parliament, Mr Speaker, which I'm sure you will remember, the NDP government spent one hour and 28 minutes, on average, on second reading in the first session. That's something like a fifth of the time that's being spent on this particular bill. And she has the audacity to stand up here and criticize us for a time allocation motion. In all fairness, they did improve in the second session. They got all the way up to three hours and 55 minutes. That was second reading during their second session, but still an awful long way from 10 hours.

If you look at our government in the 36th Parliament, we averaged four hours and 50 minutes on second readings in our first session, and in the second session six

hours and 10 minutes, considerably more than did her government.

Then, if you look at the Liberals, if you want to feel comfortable as the NDP, in the 34th Parliament, the first session, one hour and eight minutes was the average. That was the average. In the second session they got all the way up to an hour and 38 minutes.

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** Everybody agreed to those bills. Those was no closure.

**Mr Galt:** I hear them across the House here yipping away. The member for Kingston and the Islands says there was a lot of agreement. We had an opposition then that recognized good things in a bill.

Here we were yesterday on time allocation, wasting time. We spent two days debating something where we knew what the conclusion was going to be—agreed by all parties, except for one individual who held it up and kept kids out of school for another two, three, four days, totally unnecessarily—the member for Niagara Centre, the only one who said no. All his seatmates wanted to get on with it. But, lo and behold, after two days of debate the Liberals voted against it, the NDP voted against it. Why?

**Mr Gerretsen:** Speak to the bill.

**Mr Galt:** I'm talking about the bill and time allocation and wasting of time. That's exactly what was going on here for two days. We could have used those two days and debated something like this and this bill. No, they wanted to do the back-to-work legislation for the teachers so that some 40,000 students would have an opportunity to go back to school.

I think it's interesting if you look at Dalton McGuinty's Bill 14. He once would have limited teachers' strikes through legislation. Well, golly. Just a couple of quotes from the Hansard: on May 7 this is what your leader had to say: "I don't think there's anybody in this House who would not argue that our future, the future of this province, lies in our youth. Surely we have every responsibility to address a problem whereby we are keeping our students out of school." Then he went on to say, "It is my distinct impression that it is not in the public interest for this province to hold 50,000 of our students outside class as a result of a dispute between other parties." We're talking about union strikes, and that's dead on the topic of what we're dealing with here.

Mr McGuinty, leader of the official opposition and the Liberals, in the Ottawa Citizen on April 24: "Somewhere along the line, in attempting to ensure that teachers and boards have full rights to negotiate wages and benefits, the system has failed the very group for whose best interests our education system has supposedly been created." Talk about a flip-flop. We have seen so many flip-flops. We are assured in this House that if the leader of the official opposition takes a stand today, next week it will be the opposite stand. It has been so consistent: the consistency of the Liberals' inconsistency is absolutely phenomenal.

A colleague of mine was telling me about a very strong unionist who came into their riding office. He did

not want to have his name used, or even the riding office he came to, and I can understand why: because of the retribution that might occur. But he was very anxious that this bill go through.

Page 14—and this is one we missed a little while ago, because we are up around page 40 in the Blueprint now. Back on page 14, the bottom half—“Expanding Workers’ Rights.” That’s what we campaigned on, that’s what we won on, and now we’re bringing it in. Doing what we said we’d do is the hallmark of this government. Lo and behold, here we are: “We’ve already boosted workplace democracy by giving workers secret ballot votes on certifying and decertifying unions.” I thought that would have been there a long time ago. “We’ll strengthen the right of workers to decide, by secret ballot vote, whether they want to continue to be represented by a union. We’ll also require that ballot questions be clear and easily understood.” Even Mr Ryan ran and lost, but this came through and the member in that riding won. “We’ll give workers and employers more flexibility in designing work arrangements to meet their needs....” It goes on to say, “We’ll create a ‘sunshine law’ for union bosses requiring top executives to disclose their salaries, benefits and expenses to the union members.”

That indeed is accountability. We’ve brought in accountability for those who are paid from the public purse who make over \$100,000. I didn’t see any problem with that. I know the opposition voted against it, but they would of course vote against any responsible bill we might bring in to bring accountability to this House and to the province of Ontario. They voted against accountability in education, accountability for teachers, accountability for security, and accountability in the operation of this Legislature. It’s quite disappointing that they consistently oppose that kind of thing, but then I was telling you about Dalton McGuinty and his bill and the flip-flop—the clearest flip-flop I’ve ever seen. Sometimes they’re able to hide it, but on this particular occasion it’s just over and over again, in Hansard and the Ottawa Citizen.

It would be so good in this Legislature if we could operate and have some idea where the Liberals were going to be coming from next, but lo and behold, that certainly isn’t possible. I feel sorry for the members opposite who are sitting here today. I don’t know when they make up their minds, or if they do, or if it’s just Dalton who makes up his mind to tell them what to do, and obviously they’re pretty obedient. But I’m certainly proud to say that, unlike previous governments, we’re not just eddying and enjoying our prosperity. We’re working to strengthen workers’ rights, increase democracy in the workplace and enhance investment.

Like our first Prime Minister, who encouraged his associates to look ahead for Canada, we’re making significant changes that look ahead for the future of Ontario. This bill, along with many other policies, will contribute to the stimulation of the economic growth and ensure our prosperity continues for years to come.

**The Acting Speaker:** I just wanted to let the House know that there are a couple of visitors in the gallery: John and Frieda Jansen-In-Del-Wal, Marilyn Shaver, and Bill and Patricia Klaas, who are here with the head-injured association to speak to the members of Parliament. Welcome to the House.

Further debate?

**Mr Phillips:** Before I begin my remarks, a member of the Conservative Party indicated earlier today in his remarks that the teachers’ dispute in Hamilton-Wentworth went on for 26 days. I believe it’s 16 days. We asked the member if he would correct the record, but Mr Tascona refused, so I wanted to indicate to the people of Ontario it was 16 days.

I want to begin my remarks on the closure motion on Bill 139 by saying that this is quite typical of the Harris government. They will take an area of our society that is working well and decide they are going to get their hands on it to put the Mike Harris stamp of incompetence on it.

**Interjection:** Just like education.

**Mr Phillips:** Education and health. For the public, I will just say that here is a government document that outlines for businesses why they should invest in Ontario. I gather it’s a document the government prints, so I gather the government believes this. I gather this is what they are telling businesses in terms of why they should come to Ontario, and I gather this reflects the beliefs of Mike Harris.

Here is what he says about the labour-management environment here in Ontario: “The labour-management legal framework is streamlined and balanced.” This is what Mike Harris says. He goes on to say, “Labour-management relations are constructive and stable. Bargaining is rooted in realism and a clear understanding of the competitive nature of the global economy.”

This document talks at length about the healthy labour relations environment here in the province of Ontario. Indeed, Ontario’s economy has been driven over the last few years by our ability to attract industry to locate here to compete with the US. Our auto sector, as you know, Mr Speaker, and as the members know, is very much attracted to investing in Ontario. First and foremost, it is because of the quality of the workforce and the labour relations.

**1730**

I say to Ontarians, that’s not the opposition, not the NDP or the Liberals saying this; it is the government’s own document saying, “Come to Ontario. There is a”—I use the word carefully—“balanced framework.” So you would expect that if we are being asked to amend the Labour Relations Act, it would be to in some way keep the balance. The Minister of Labour has the responsibility to set the framework for balanced labour relations. That’s his responsibility. He’s not the minister for unions; he’s not the minister for employers; he’s the labour minister to set the framework.

I would say to him that there is nothing in this bill, not one single thing in this bill, that represents something our

organized employees in this province have requested and believe is an advance for them. Every single thing—

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Wrong.

**Mr Phillips:** The Minister of Labour says, “Wrong.” When he has his remarks later in this debate, he can tell me where I’m wrong. He has a chance to make those remarks later on. Here in the bill, there is not one single advance for organized labour.

You can understand their anger. They say, “Listen, I understand if you want to update the Labour Relations Act. We understand that. But if the current labour relations environment is balanced, tell us why you are going to introduce a bill that is win-win-win-win-win for the employers and nothing for the employees.”

**Mr Gerretsen:** He admitted that.

**Mr Phillips:** My colleague said he admitted it. He may like, in his closing remarks, to indicate where there are wins for labour.

The reason this debate is timely is that it was just yesterday that the Provincial Auditor in his report—he had a press conference afterwards, and the media will confirm this. The auditor was unusually candid. He is always straightforward, but does his best to avoid getting embroiled in any hint of a political environment. He was candid in saying, “Listen, this is a government that does not take the advice of its bureaucracy which says, ‘Let’s try and do these things with pilot studies and small steps forward.’” He says they ignore that advice and simply implement broad-scale change against the advice of the bureaucracy. That’s what the independent Provincial Auditor said.

He went on, by the way, to say that this interest in privatizing things—he said he recently participated in a conference on private-public sector partnerships from around North America. Government and industry representatives came together to talk about this rush to privatize. Here’s what the auditor said yesterday: “Without exception, when you talk to the public jurisdictions that have moved to privatize, they have said that if they could back the clock up, they would not go as fast and as far as they went.” He said that was without exception.

We know what Harris is all about, and that is privatizing. There’s absolutely nothing wrong with the private sector, but there are many things our public sector can do as well as or better than the private sector.

Last year he pointed out the extra costs the taxpayers are paying because we privatized plowing our roads. He pointed out in this report that because of ideology we have downloaded ambulances onto municipalities and he said the service is getting worse and the costs are going up and it is a mistake. He said that rather than have a seamless ambulance service, we’ve now got one that cannot go beyond the borders.

He pointed out, by the way, that in the rush to privatize jails, the correctional services is a mess. There was a huge jail being built in Barrie without even a business plan.

The reason I mention these is that here we have the government in the one area of Ontario that has been

functioning well—r economy has been doing very well, thank goodness. I would say without fear of contradiction that every major economist would tell you that the number one reason is because of the driving force of the US. Ten years ago in Ontario, exports to the United States represented roughly 28% of our gross domestic product; today it’s 56%. It’s gone from 28% of our gross domestic product to 56%. Why? Because we can compete with the US and the government itself says that’s heavily because of the labour relations environment, the skilled work force we have and the work environment.

Here we are, Premier Harris has taken a good health care system and it is now in some shambles. He’s taken a good environmental environment in Ontario and we’ve seen the results of that. Without a doubt in our education system, I don’t think I’ve ever—in fact I know this for a fact—I have never seen our teachers in a more demoralized state than they are today.

Education is the one that perhaps irritates me the most because what will make education work well is a motivated teacher in front of a group of students. Education is very simple. It hasn’t changed in a thousand years, and that is, you get a qualified, competent, motivated teacher in front of a group of students and that’s education. That’s the magic of it. Why you would ever take the most important part of successful education, and that is a motivated teacher, and demotivate them is a gross mistake. Any successful business person would say, “Listen, you are undermining the very core of your business.” All of us have been in schools recently. You have clearly demoralized the most important part of education, and for what? Just so Mike Harris can win an election? Just so he can get control of it?

The reason I raise this is, systematically, the health care system, our environment, our education system and now you’re choosing to let Mike Harris get in and mess up our labour relations system. Surely the last thing Ontario wants to do is let Mike Harris get his hands on another important part of our successful society. So I go back. People say, “Don’t we need to change the labour relations?” We need to constantly modernize it, but the government itself said that right now the climate is balanced. So this bill, any labour relations bill, should be balanced, and it’s not balanced.

The province wrecker has now decided to turn his full attention to his next thing to wreck. He’s done it to health care, he’s done it to education, he’s done it to the environment, and now, for whatever reason, he wants to get in and mess up labour relations. Why we would allow him to proceed with that is beyond me. Why we would let Harris do this is beyond me.

**Mr Gerretsen:** Let me just begin again at the point where my colleagues left off. In this latest government publication about doing business in Ontario, it states quite equivocally, and I quote—this is the government’s own document, “The labour-management legal framework is streamlined and balanced. Labour-management relations are constructive and stable. Bargaining is rooted

in realism and a clear understanding of the competitive nature of the global economy.” That is the government speaking.

1740

Why then would they bring in a law like this? First of all, at the minister’s press conference he made it quite clear that all of the changes were made at the request of the employers and there was absolutely nothing in this bill that was going to benefit the employees of this province. You want some proof? I’ll give you some proof.

What did the Labourers’ International Union of North America have to say about this particular bill? It said, “Why would your government”—Minister, this is in a letter directly addressed to you—“introduce draconian, anti-labour, anti-worker legislation when Ontario is experiencing a highly buoyant construction industry in desperate need of skilled trained workers and a stable environment to bring all construction projects to fruition?” Why would you do that, Minister?

What did the Building and Construction Trades Council of Ontario have to say? Patrick Dillon, a man well known to all of us around this chamber, the business manager and secretary-treasurer of the trades council—and I’m sure the minister of higher education, of universities and colleges, would be interested in this as well—states in his letter—and this letter is only a week old, again to the minister—“I must be blunt with the minister.”

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Which minister?

**Mr Gerretsen:** To you. You’re the minister. This is a letter you received seven days ago. You are the Honourable Chris Stockwell, are you not? He states:

“I must be blunt with the minister, in all my time in the construction industry, I have never seen the kind of resentment and anger directed at a government of any stripe as I witnessed last Friday.... I fear that these continued attacks on unions and working people will lead to instability in the workplace and will eventually wreak havoc on Ontario’s booming economy. I would venture to say the labour relations climate in Ontario is at a critical juncture and in danger of erupting. These attacks on working people have to stop now!”

Why don’t you stop it, Minister? Why don’t you withdraw the bill and say it’s been a mistake? I really do believe in a balanced approach and the approach we have right now is balanced, although you’ve done an awful lot to wreck that as well with Bill 7 some four or five years ago. Here are the people who will be directly affected by your bill, and they’re saying what you’re proposing here is draconian, anti-labour, anti-union, anti-everything.

The other point is that the minister wants to know, “What is wrong with the bill? Give me a couple of examples.” I’ll just give you one example, if none other, and it’s been mentioned here once or twice before. Why would you require an employer to, in effect, have to post in his workplace how individuals who work for that employer in a unionized environment can decertify? If you want to be balanced about it, why wouldn’t you require, in a non-unionized environment, the posting of a

notice as to how people get organized and how they get certified? If you want to be balanced about it, that to me is a balanced approach. There’s absolutely nothing about that in this bill.

Minister, you said it so well yourself when you held that press conference when you announced this bill. You were asked a question as to how much is in this bill that employees want and how much is in this bill that employers want. You stated categorically that everything that’s in the bill is what employers want. That is not a balanced approach. That is simply not a balanced approach. Let’s take a look at some of the other provisions in this bill.

*Interjections.*

**Mr Gerretsen:** The minister is just squawking on and on. He knows we’ve hit a sore point. Even I believe that this minister, maybe in his deepest of deepest hearts, wants to do something in a balanced fashion, but he’s not allowed to by the Premier. We know who calls the shots here. It’s all the henchmen in the Premier’s office who said, “We’ve got to reward the employers out there and we’ve got to bring in legislation that is anti-union.” He has been the unfortunate victim who has had to bring this kind of legislation in to make it work.

The other issue that has been raised here as well—we know we’re dealing with a time allocation motion, and I know that perhaps the people of Ontario don’t really care all that much about it, but it means that there’s closure, that once again this government has said, “No, there shall be no further debate on the bill. We’re going to vote on it and, whether you like it or not, it’s going to be the law of this province.” But what’s even worse than that is that there will not have been one day of public hearings on this bill. The individuals, the union leaders, the other people, the employers in the province—no person at all will have an opportunity to make any comments on the bill, to make any kind of representations before a committee of the House.

I am a great believer that when we get these representations during committee hearings we all can learn something from them, regardless of where we stand on these issues. There may even have been some amendments proposed by employers, by unions, by whatever individuals want to come before the committee, that would improve this bill, although we still believe fundamentally that the best thing this minister and this government could do is to withdraw this bill, because this bill speaks directly against the propaganda that the government itself is putting out when it tries to get investment and it tries to get people from outside of this country to invest in this country. They talk about the fact that we have a balanced approach to labour relations in this province. This bill, together with Bill 69, together with Bill 7, which was passed two or three years ago, and much of the other anti-union legislation that this government has passed, is anything but a balanced approach.

I implore the minister. It is not too late yet. Do the right thing. Withdraw the bill. Have some hearings on it so that we can find out how all Ontarians, whether

they're employees or employers, feel about this bill. Do the right thing. Withdraw the bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr Stockwell has moved government notice of motion number 73. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1748 to 1758.*

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

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Baird, John R.	Harris, Michael D.	Sampson, Rob
Barrett, Toby	Hodgson, Chris	Snobelen, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Spina, Joseph
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Sterling, Norman W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Stewart, R. Gary
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Marland, Margaret	Tilson, David
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Flaherty, Jim	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim

Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John	Young, David
Guzzo, Garry J.	Ouellette, Jerry J.	

**The Acting Speaker:** Those opposed will stand one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Bartolucci, Rick	Dombrowsky, Leona	Martel, Shelley
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Boyer, Claudette	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Bradley, James J.	Kormos, Peter	Parsons, Ernie
Caplan, David	Kwinter, Monte	Peters, Steve
Christopherson, David	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Phillips, Gerry
Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David	Ruprecht, Tony
Curling, Alvin	Marchese, Rosario	Sergio, Mario

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 50; the nays are 24.

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

It being past 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45 of the clock this evening.

*The House adjourned at 1800.*

*Evening meeting reported in volume B.*



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon / L'hon Hilary M. Weston  
Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr  
Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers  
Clerk Assistant / Greffière adjointe: Deborah Deller  
Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman  
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A. (L)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Marie (L)
Ancaster-Dundas- Flamborough-Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	Christopherson, David (ND)
Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Hastings-Frontenac- Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Leona (L)
Beaches-East York	Lankin, Frances (ND)	Huron-Bruce	<b>Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen</b> (PC) Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, minister responsible for seniors and women / ministre des Affaires civiques, de la Culture et des Loisirs, ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées et à la Condition féminine
Bramalea-Gore-Malton- Springdale	Gill, Raminder (PC)	Kenora-Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Brampton Centre / -Centre	Spina, Joseph (PC)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, John (L)
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	<b>Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony</b> (PC) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	Wettlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kitchener-Waterloo	<b>Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth</b> (PC) Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Beaubien, Marcel (PC)
Burlington	<b>Jackson, Hon / L'hon Cameron</b> (PC) Minister of Tourism / ministre du Tourisme	Lanark-Carleton	<b>Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W.</b> (PC) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, government House leader / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Leeds-Grenville	<b>Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W.</b> (PC) Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations / ministre de la Consommation et du Commerce
Chatham-Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	<b>Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne</b> (PC) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	London West / -Ouest	Wood, Bob (PC)
Don Valley East / -Est	Caplan, David (L)	London-Fanshawe	Mazzilli, Frank (PC)
Don Valley West / -Ouest	<b>Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David</b> (PC) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports	Markham	<b>Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H.</b> (PC) Solicitor General / solliciteur général
Dufferin-Peel- Wellington-Grey	Tilson, David (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	<b>Sampson, Hon / L'hon Rob</b> (PC) Minister of Correctional Services / ministre des Services correctionnels
Durham	O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Mississauga East / -Est	DeFaria, Carl (PC)
Eglinton-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)	Mississauga South / -Sud	<b>Marland, Hon / L'hon Margaret</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio (Children) / ministre sans portefeuille (Enfance)
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Steve (L)	Mississauga West / -Ouest	<b>Snobelen, Hon / L'hon John</b> (PC) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles
Erie-Lincoln	<b>Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim</b> (PC) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines		
Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L)		
Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	<b>Stockwell, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail		
Etobicoke North / -Nord	Hastings, John (PC)		
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Kells, Morley (PC)		
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)		
Guelph-Wellington	Elliott, Brenda (PC)		
Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)		
Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	<b>Hodgson, Hon / L'hon Chris</b> (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / président du Conseil de gestion		
Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)		
Hamilton East / -Est	Agostino, Dominic (L)		

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Nepean-Carleton	<b>Baird, Hon / L'hon John R.</b> (PC) Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones	Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)
Niagara Centre / -Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	<b>Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan</b> (PC) Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement
Niagara Falls	Maves, Bart (PC)	Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry (L)
Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)	Scarborough-Rouge River	Curling, Alvin (L)
Nipissing	<b>Harris, Hon / L'hon Michael D.</b> (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif	Simcoe North / -Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)
Northumberland	Galt, Doug (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	<b>Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Minister of Energy, Science and Technology / ministre de l'Énergie, des Sciences et de la Technologie
Oak Ridges	<b>Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank</b> (PC) Minister without Portfolio / ministre sans portefeuille	St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)
Oakville	<b>Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary</b> (PC) Speaker / Président	St Paul's	Bryant, Michael (L)
Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Stoney Creek	Clark, Brad (PC)
Ottawa Centre / -Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	Cleary, John C. (L)
Ottawa-Orléans	Coburn, Brian (PC)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Rick (L)
Ottawa South / -Sud	McGuinty, Dalton (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	Thornhill	Molinari, Tina R. (PC)
Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	McLeod, Lyn (L)
Ottawa-Vanier	Boyer, Claudette (L)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Oxford	<b>Hardeman, Hon / L'hon Ernie</b> (PC) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales	Timiskaming-Cochrane	Ramsay, David (L)
Parkdale-High Park	Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Parry Sound-Muskoka	<b>Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie L.</b> (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	Smitherman, George (L)
Perth-Middlesex	Johnson, Bert (PC)	Toronto-Danforth	Churley, Marilyn (ND)
Peterborough	Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Trinity-Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	<b>Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet</b> (PC) Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation	Vaughan-King-Aurora	<b>Palladini, Hon / L'hon Al</b> (PC) Minister of Economic Development and Trade / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC)
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Whitby-Ajax	<b>Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim</b> (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Willowdale	Young, David (PC)
Sault Ste Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	Windsor West / -Ouest	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Dwight (L)
		York Centre / -Centre	Kwinter, Monte (L)
		York North / -Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
		York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
		York West / -Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)

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

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

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Estimates / Budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Alvin Curling  
Gilles Bisson, Alvin Curling, Gerard Kennedy,  
Frank Mazzilli, John R. O'Toole, Steve Peters,  
R. Gary Stewart, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

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

Chair / Président: Marcel Beaubien  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Doug Galt  
Ted Arnott, Marcel Beaubien, David Christopherson,  
Doug Galt, Monte Kwinter, Tina R. Molinari,  
Gerry Phillips, David Young  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**General government / Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Julia Munro  
Toby Barrett, Marie Bountrogianni, Ted Chudleigh,  
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,  
Rosario Marchese, Julia Munro  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: James J. Bradley  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier  
James J. Bradley, Bruce Crozier, Leona Dombrowsky,  
Bert Johnson, Morley Kells, Tony Martin,  
Joseph Spina, Bob Wood  
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales**

Chair / Présidente: Marilyn Mushinski  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Carl DeFaria  
Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant, Carl DeFaria,  
Brenda Elliott, Garry J. Guzzo, Peter Kormos,  
Lyn McLeod, Marilyn Mushinski  
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

**Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: R. Gary Stewart  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Brad Clark  
Marilyn Churley, Brad Clark, Caroline Di Cocco,  
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Jerry J. Ouellette, R. Gary Stewart, Joseph N.  
Tasca, Wayne Wettlaufer  
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

**Public accounts / Comptes publics**

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: John C. Cleary  
John C. Cleary, John Gerretsen, John Hastings,  
Shelley Martel, Bart Maves, Julia Munro,  
Marilyn Mushinski, Richard Patten  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Regulations and private bills /  
Règlements et projets de loi privés**

Chair / Présidente: Frances Lankin  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Gilles Bisson, Claudette Boyer, Brian Coburn,  
Garfield Dunlop, Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy,  
Frances Lankin, Bill Murdoch  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

# CONTENTS

Wednesday 22 November 2000

<b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b>	
<b>Social assistance</b>	
Mr Phillips.....	5677
Mr Martin.....	5677
<b>Sid Horne</b>	
Mr Galt.....	5677
<b>Wearing of ribbons</b>	
Mr Mazzilli.....	5678
<b>Specialists' services</b>	
Mrs Papatello.....	5678
<b>CPI Canada</b>	
Mr Chudleigh.....	5678
<b>Hazardous waste</b>	
Ms Di Cocco.....	5678
<b>Drinking and driving</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	5678
<b>Eye care services</b>	
Mr Bradley.....	5679
<b>Home care</b>	
Mr Beaubien.....	5679
<b>FIRST READINGS</b>	
<b>Municipality of Sioux Lookout Act, 2000, Bill Pr31, Mr Hampton</b>	
Agreed to.....	5679
<b>ORAL QUESTIONS</b>	
<b>Environmental protection</b>	
Mr McGuinty.....	5679
Mr Harris.....	5680, 5681, 5682
Mr Hampton.....	5681
Ms Churley.....	5682
<b>Agricorp</b>	
Mr McGuinty.....	5681, 5683
Mr Hardeman.....	5681, 5683
<b>Ambulance services</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	5682
Mr Harris.....	5682, 5683
Ms Lankin.....	5683
<b>Highway 407</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	5683
Mr Turnbull.....	5684
<b>Correctional services</b>	
Mr Levac.....	5684
Mr Sampson.....	5684
<b>Young offenders</b>	
Mr Galt.....	5685
Mr Flaherty.....	5685
<b>Forest management</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	5685
Mr Harris.....	5685
<b>Support for the disabled</b>	
Mrs McLeod.....	5686
Mr Baird.....	5686
<b>Federal health spending</b>	
Mr Young.....	5687
Mrs Witmer.....	5687
<b>Fort Henry</b>	
Mr Gerretsen.....	5688
Mr Jackson.....	5688
<b>Education labour dispute</b>	
Mr Clark.....	5688
Mrs Ecker.....	5688
<b>PETITIONS</b>	
<b>Property taxation</b>	
Mrs Bountrogianni.....	5689
<b>Northern health travel grant</b>	
Ms Martel.....	5690
Mr Bartolucci.....	5690
Mr Martin.....	5690
Mr Brown.....	5691
<b>Diabetes treatment</b>	
Mr Tascona.....	5690
<b>Protection of minors</b>	
Ms Mushinski.....	5691
<b>Education reform</b>	
Mr Ruprecht.....	5691
<b>Highway safety</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	5691
<b>Government advertising</b>	
Mr Bradley.....	5692
<b>GOVERNMENT MOTIONS</b>	
<b>Time allocation, government notice of motion 73, Mr Sterling</b>	
Mr Stockwell.....	5692
Mrs Papatello.....	5695
Mr Martin.....	5697
Mr Gill.....	5700
Mr Colle.....	5702
Mr Christopherson.....	5703
Mr Tascona.....	5706
Mr Sergio.....	5706
Ms Martel.....	5708
Mr Galt.....	5710
Mr Phillips.....	5711
Mr Gerretsen.....	5712
Agreed to.....	5714
<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
<b>Visitors</b>	
Mr O'Toole.....	5679
<b>Status of Bill 119</b>	
Mr Caplan.....	5689