



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 26 June 2001

Mardi 26 juin 2001

Speaker
Honourable Gary Carr

Président
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Copies of Hansard

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

Tuesday 26 June 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 26 juin 2001

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): Last night the Ottawa public school board made a very brave decision to reject this government's funding formula, to reject the defunding of education, the same defunding which has taken over \$1,000 per student away from this board since 1997. Last Friday, and then again at 1:30 this morning, the board voted to reject its own amended budget because of the fiscal straitjacket in which it has been placed by this government. The board chair has been directed to write to the Minister of Education and explain the circumstances of the board's decision and invite her to Ottawa to investigate, something I've requested of the minister many times.

By doing what you're doing, Minister, you have placed school boards like Ottawa, Hamilton, Toronto, Sudbury and Windsor—where we had a rebellion last year—in the position where they are now forced to break your own imposed balanced-budget law. In other words, this government has taken significant amounts of money out of the system by using a tricky funding formula. Then you turn around and ask those who have been defunded to keep the system stable and balanced. To that, they have said a resounding no.

I believe this is just the beginning of a trend where school boards and Ontarians in general are saying to this government that enough is enough. I take this opportunity to advise the Minister of Education that other school boards, likewise in defence of education and students and their learning and special education, need to be supported in their pursuit of learning.

PAPAL VISIT TO UKRAINE

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): This week, Pope John Paul II is in Ukraine. Tomorrow the Pope will bestow sainthood on a number of Ukrainian martyrs.

Among these are two Ukrainian Canadians. Bishop Nikita Budka was the first Ukrainian Catholic bishop in Canada whose early work and struggles laid the foundation for the church in the prairies and throughout

Canada. Upon his return home, the bishop was arrested by the communists and sent to Siberia, where he was martyred outside his camp in 1953. Bishop Basil Velichkovsky was a missionary sentenced to Siberia, from where he was released in 1972. Before his release, his captors injected him with a slow-acting poison that eventually killed him during his visit to Canada, in Winnipeg, where he is buried.

These two heroic individuals represent Canada's first saints of its multicultural community. Their public recognition is also an acknowledgement of the many ongoing contributions to this province and country of Canadians of Ukrainian and many other origins.

On behalf of all members of this House, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of our Ukrainian-Canadian community on this most happy occasion. It is an event which Canadians of all backgrounds can be very proud of.

REMARKS BY MAYOR LASTMAN

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): In expressing my concern, let me state how deeply hurt and disturbed I am by the mayor's racist remarks made in Barcelona. The remarks fly in the face of what we stand for in Canada. They insult the people of Mombassa, Kenya, and also go against the principles of the Canadian Charter of Rights, which secures the rights of all to live in this country without fear of discrimination and hatred.

Similarly, the Ontario Human Rights Code gives protection to each and every Ontarian, and the right to be free from discrimination in all forms, including racial slurs. The city of Toronto has also been active in the fight against racism. Visible signs with the city's logo at bus stops and subways state, "Hate: It's taught." I hope the mayor would be committed to this cause. The cavalier attitude and the frivolous manner in which he has behaved tell a different story. Words are a prelude to deeds. The mayor's remarks are an affront to all those fighting racism and prove that he has not come to understand the severity of his actions. He has hurt millions of people. He has inflicted damage on the city, the province and our country. His act feeds into the bigotry that already exists in our society. These actions represent "the banality of evil." It is a deplorable act.

We cannot tolerate such behaviour. We must be vigilant in our efforts to stamp out racism in whatever form it is dressed. Charters, codes, signs are not sufficient in this

battle unless we are prepared to identify the causes and act upon them.

COMMUNITY CARE ACCESS CENTRES

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Two days ago, during question period, I raised the plight of Community Care Access Centre Niagara. The Harris government has defunded CCAC Niagara to the tune of in excess of \$9 million. The net result is that people are going to be laid off from this CCAC; that seniors are not going to receive baths; that seniors aren't going to be fed, literally; that seniors are going to be forced to sit in their own waste while they're waiting for the reduced level of services that CCAC Niagara is forced to impose as a result of this government's defunding of Community Care Access Centre Niagara.

This government has got to understand that these are senior citizens, along with post-operative patients, who are trying to live in their homes. They can only do so with the assistance provided by those nursing staff and others through the CCACs. It's far less expensive to fund a CCAC home care program than it is to put a senior citizen into an institution, and, quite frankly, the senior citizen enjoys that dignity of life in their own home that is not going to be available to them in Mike Harris's seniors' homes.

We call upon this government to address the defunding of CCAC Niagara and similar CCACs across Niagara. Our parents and our grandparents deserve far more than what Mike Harris is delivering to them. They aren't blessed by being in Mike Harris's Ontario; they're cursed by being in Mike Harris's Ontario.

ERMELINDO AGOSTINI

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill): My member's statement is about a York region resident's proven historic actions on the road. His name is Mr Ermelindo Agostini. He has spent 18 years of his life driving a truck and has seen the devastating toll highway vehicle accidents can take.

However, when the unfortunate time came for Mr Agostini to be involved in an accident on Highway 407, his quick thinking, swift reflexes and heroic actions helped save the lives of the Collettes, a family from New Brunswick visiting Ontario on vacation. Mr Agostini saw that the vacationing family's car had caught on fire. He quickly jumped from his truck and pulled both children from the car's back seat before it was engulfed in flames. I'm happy to let you know that because of Mr Agostini's brave actions, all parties involved in the accident escaped with only minor scrapes and bruises. While Mr Agostini will be the first to tell you that his actions were far from being heroic, if it were not for his bravery, the accident could have been far worse.

While traffic accidents are an unfortunate part of life, it makes me proud when out of such a disastrous event, the bravery and heroic actions of the affected parties have

helped to save such precious lives. I ask the members of this House to join me in congratulating Ermelindo Agostini for his heroism.

CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): On a day when members will be asked to vote on public funds to private schools, I rise today to make members aware of a vital feature of Ontario's education system for which we in this House have a special obligation. I refer to our children with special needs.

Our obligation as elected officials is to ensure they receive the same dignity and respect and chance to learn as other kids. These are kids with frail health, with attention deficit disorders, with other challenges that every parent in this House can relate to the immensity of. But they can learn and they belong in our classrooms. They can't learn when the basic assistance they require for a level playing field is taken away.

Today in the gallery are parents of children who have lost or are threatened with the loss of that opportunity. Their kids will not be in school next year, thanks to the cuts of this government, unless something is made to change.

There's Linda Carey from Hamilton on behalf of Emily; Karen Dunbar from Hamilton; Donna Cooper from Kawartha on behalf of Steven; Wendy Johansen, Kathy Payne-Mercer and Mark Jeppeson. They are being turned down by this government. They are caught in budget cuts and lost in a demeaning avalanche of paper by a government that won't trust the teachers and the parents to do the best for their kids.

I enjoin any member of this House who has doubts about their needs to come to the estimates committee this afternoon, where the Minister of Education will be asked to be brought to account. I would ask every member to look carefully at the answers of the Minister of Education to say why the needs of these kids, of these parents' children, should be put ahead of putting public funds into private schools.

1340

SCHOOL BUS OPERATORS

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I rise in the Legislature today to speak about a transportation problem that many schoolchildren in my Durham riding, as well as those in the ridings of Northumberland and Peterborough, could be facing this coming September.

The familiar sight of school buses delivering children safely to and from school becomes less viable if school bus funding difficulties are not resolved. Despite the fact that the Ministry of Education has provided the Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board with interim relief for busing amounting to \$726,000 last year as well as \$4 million in flexible funding this school year, the drivers in the Peterborough Victoria Northumberland and Claring-

ton Catholic District School Board will continue to be the lowest paid in the GTA.

This week my colleagues and I met with local school bus operators like Archie Groth and Ron Gerow, who is the co-chair of the Kawartha Pine Ridge Separate School Bus Association, along with Rick Donaldson as well as drivers and representatives from both school boards.

I think we all agree that making sure our children have a safe means of transportation is an important element of our education system. Many often take this service for granted, not thinking of the costs involved for the drivers. In addition to high gas prices, repair costs and emissions testing, the drivers who work for those boards have not had a pay increase in nine years.

I am committed to working with the school bus operators and drivers from my riding of Durham, like Tammy Jones, and with representatives from the Ministry, Nancy Naylor, and the school board, Bob Allison.

There needs to be a comprehensive agreement between coterminous boards to really address the efficiencies in the system and the safety of our children.

BY-ELECTION IN VAUGHAN-KING-AURORA

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): On February 20 of this year I wrote to Mr John Hollins, the chief electoral officer of Ontario, as follows:

“With the writ having now been issued for the by-election in the provincial constituency of Parry Sound-Muskoka, I am writing to request that you, in your capacity of chief election officer, closely monitor print and electronic media outlets for any partisan political advertising by the government of Ontario intended to influence the outcome of this by-election using taxpayers’ dollars.

“As I know you are aware, there are strict limitations placed upon the expenditure of funds by political parties and clearly defined ‘blackout periods’ during which advertising is forbidden in either general elections or by-elections. This practice was established in the interest of fairness and is intended to restrict the ability of a political party to ‘buy’ an election by spending excessive amounts of money during a campaign.

“During its tenure, the Harris government has now squandered approximately \$200 million on blatantly partisan political advertising in the form of television and radio campaigns and on glossy brochures mailed to every household in the province. This unfair and costly practice continued during last year’s by-election in Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot even after I requested that your predecessor intervene and order the government to immediately end their advertising blitz.

“Since last year’s by-election, the Harris government has demonstrated continued zeal in their use of partisan political advertising, even going so far as to use what are supposed to be non-partisan government of Ontario Web

sites as vehicles to disseminate politically partisan views.”

Obviously, the government ignored this particular avenue on my part, because in the Parry Sound by-election, they had ads in the newspaper on election day. Now in Vaughan-King-Aurora—and I have not had the full time—the government is running ads once again, is cheating in this election campaign.

EVENTS IN HALDIMAND- NORFOLK-BRANT

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): The evening of June 9 was an exciting one for residents of my riding of Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant, most specifically in Norfolk county. June 9 marked the final game of the Stanley Cup playoffs as the Colorado Avalanche defeated the New Jersey Devils, 3-1.

Simcoe area native Rob Blake was the third Avalanche player to hoist the cup over his head on June 9, and then he told CBC reporter Ron MacLean that he couldn’t wait to bring the cup to Simcoe. Keeping his promise, Rob will arrive in Simcoe July 14 along with the Stanley Cup.

Every little hockey player dreams of the day of being able to take the Stanley Cup to their hometown, and very few earn the opportunity to do so in their career.

I’d also like to add that this talented young man is my first cousin. Although still young, Robbie Blake has already been an Olympian and has won a world championship and now the Stanley Cup.

Championship hockey players are not unique in my riding. Locals Red Kelly, Rick Wamsley and Chico Maki have also had their names engraved on the cup, but they’ve never had the chance to parade it around our home area.

Although I look forward to viewing the Stanley Cup up close, I’m sure the most memorable part of July 14 will be to witness the pride not only on Rob’s face, but also on the faces of his parents, Bob and Sandy, and also on the faces of area fans.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF THE INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I beg to inform the House that today I have laid upon the table the annual report of the office of the Integrity Commissioner for the period of April 1, 2000, to March 31, 2001.

I further beg to inform the House that today I have laid upon the table the second annual report of the lobbyists’ registration office, office of the Integrity Commissioner, with respect to the administration of the Lobbyists Registration Act, 1998, for the period of April 1, 2000, to March 31, 2001.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr Steve Gilchrist (Scarborough East): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on general government and move its adoption.

Clerk at the Table (Ms Lisa Freedman): Your committee recommends that Bill 27, An Act to protect the families of police officers and others involved in the criminal justice system / Projet de loi 27, Loi visant à protéger les familles des agents de police et d'autres personnes oeuvrant dans le système de justice criminelle, be not reported.

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

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on justice and social policy and move its adoption.

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

Bill 12, An Act to increase the safety of equestrian riders / Projet de loi 12, Loi visant à accroître la sécurité des cavaliers.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

WASTE DIVERSION ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LE RÉACHEMINEMENT DES DÉCHETS

Mrs Witmer moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 90, An Act to promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste / Projet de loi 90, Loi visant à promouvoir la réduction, la réutilisation et le recyclage des déchets.

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

The minister for a short statement?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of the Environment): It is my pleasure to introduce the Waste Diversion Act for first reading. This important piece of legislation would establish a permanent, non-profit organization run by industry and municipal representatives to develop, implement and fund waste diversion programs in Ontario. This legislation firmly establishes a partnership between industry and the municipalities and

lays out the framework for a recycling system that will serve this province for years to come.

It will require the WDO to develop initiatives for used oil, organics such as kitchen waste, household special waste like paints and solvents, scrap tires and other materials. It will build on the blue box and it will be funded 50-50 by industry and municipalities.

I urge support of this very significant piece of legislation.

1350

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT (INTERCOUNTRY ADOPTION TAX CREDIT), 2001

LOI DE 2001 MODIFIANT LA LOI DE L'IMPÔT SUR LE REVENU (CRÉDIT D'IMPÔT AU TITRE DE L'ADOPTION INTERNATIONALE)

Mr Cordiano moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 91, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Intercountry Adoption Act, 1998 / Projet de loi 91, Loi modifiant la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu et la Loi de 1998 sur l'adoption internationale.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Joseph Cordiano (York South-Weston): Before I speak to the bill, I would like to recognize the presence of two very special people, my two daughters, Lara and Natalie Cordiano, who are here with us today. Thank you.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): I remember when they were born.

Mr Cordiano: I had no grey hair then.

Mr Speaker, the amendments in this bill provide tax relief for families being charged intercountry adoption fees. The bill ensures fair and equitable treatment of all adoptions, regardless of a child's place of birth.

I would also ask for unanimous consent to have this bill immediately ordered for second and third readings.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

SIOUX LOOKOUT MENO-YA-WIN HEALTH CENTRE ACT, 2001

Mr Hampton moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr15, An Act to establish the Sioux Lookout Meno-Ya-Win Health Centre.

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

Pursuant to standing order 86(a), this bill stands referred to the Commissioners of Estate Bills.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wouldn't mind making a brief statement on the bill.

The Speaker: You can't on a private bill. I'm sorry. It's a private bill.

MOTORCYCLE AWARENESS WEEK
ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LA SEMAINE
DE SENSIBILISATION À LA
MOTOCYCLETTE

Mr Stewart moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 92, An Act to designate Motorcycle Awareness Week / Projet de loi 92, Loi désignant la Semaine de sensibilisation à la motocyclette.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough): The bill designates the week beginning on the first Monday in May of each year as Motorcycle Awareness Week. I believe the motorcycle is a very important part of recreation and transportation in Canada. There are some 95,000 officially licensed motorcycles for road use.

In the interests of safety—and I want to emphasize that—it is necessary to develop skills and awareness of proper habits to handle motorcycles on Ontario's highways. It is most important for the citizens of Ontario to be aware of motorcycles on highways and the vulnerability of motorcyclists, and to recognize the importance of sharing the roadway.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY
AND RESPONSES

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): On April 19, we outlined to this Legislature our plan to protect jobs, to keep families financially secure and to maintain the strength of all communities.

Our 21-step plan to move Ontario into the 21st century is bold, it is clear, and it is measurable. Our plan has three priorities: growth, fiscal responsibility and accountability. It contains the new ideas and decisive steps that are needed to strengthen the economy and protect the high quality of life the people of Ontario expect and indeed deserve.

I am proud to announce that we have taken action on each of the 21 steps, and we will continue to take action in the days and months ahead to help improve the lives of the people of Ontario even more.

This spring, for the third year in a row, we presented a balanced budget, and we took action on step 2 of our fiscally responsible plan and we paid \$3 billion toward the provincial debt, the largest reduction in our province's history.

We have always believed that Ontario taxpayers deserve to keep more of their hard-earned money. Since 1995 we've cut personal income tax rates by more than 30%. A typical Ontario family with a total income of \$60,000 will have close to \$2,000 more to spend, save or invest as they see fit than they would have had without our tax cuts. We're not stopping there. We've introduced legislation that would complete our additional 20% tax cut to personal income taxes by the year 2003. We also announced a full range of corporate income tax cuts that by 2005 would make Ontario's general combined corporate income tax rate lower—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Sorry to interrupt the Premier. The member for Windsor-St Clair, come to order, please. Sorry for the interruption, Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

We also announced, as I was saying, a full range of corporate income tax cuts that by 2005 would make Ontario's general combined corporate income tax rate lower than any of the US states.

Last year more than 80 cents of every dollar the government spent on programs and capital went to the broader public sector. Hospitals, school boards, municipalities, social service agencies, colleges and universities must be accountable to the taxpayers of Ontario.

This is step 8 of our accountability-based plan. On May 9 we introduced the Public Sector Accountability Act to improve accountability across the whole sector. Tax dollars must be used efficiently in areas where government should be involved, areas, for example, like health care or education, but tax dollars should not be used at all in areas that are better left to the private sector, like banking. So as a first step in our review of the appropriate role of government, we are selling the Province of Ontario Savings Office, and to improve customer service for Ontario drivers we have proposed that driver testing be transferred to the private sector as well.

One of the government's most important roles is to ensure that tax dollars are invested wisely. We must also strengthen the economy and we must attract jobs and investments. This is the only way we will achieve the ambitious goal we set for our province in our 21-step action plan.

Our goal is that Ontario will enjoy not only the best performing economy, but also the highest quality of life in North America within 10 years. A high quality of life means more than economic success. Our vision for Smart Growth recognizes that a high quality of life also means giving people choices about how and where to live.

1400

Ours is a vision that promotes and manages growth to sustain a strong economy, strong communities and a healthy environment. As part of the Smart Growth step of our plan, we have frozen development on the Oak Ridges moraine for six months while a longer-term action plan is developed.

On May 17 we also introduced legislation to promote the cleanup and revitalization of contaminated sites known as brownfields, and on June 13 we introduced legislation that outlines better farming practices to protect Ontario's supply of clean drinking water. As well as using land wisely and protecting natural resources—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please. Order. I need to be able to hear.

Sorry for the interruption again, Premier.

Hon Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

As well as using land wisely and protecting natural resources, including our water, we must ensure Ontario is ready to compete and we must ensure we're ready to win in this 21st century.

A modern transportation system is an important part of our pro-growth plan. We're hiring an independent financial adviser to help with the planned extension of Highway 407 east to Highways 35 and 115. We're reducing delays at the Windsor-Detroit border with the help of federal and US partners. Yesterday we announced the next step toward a highway for the Niagara region.

There are approximately 850,000 children in Ontario aged 6 and under, and they are at a critical point in their development. On May 10 we announced we will invest \$30 million this year to create Ontario early years centres that will support parents in their critical role and help them get their children off to the best possible start in life.

As these children grow, they will need access to a quality education, step 11 of our plan. Later this week, we hope to vote on our Stability and Excellence in Education Act that would minimize labour disruptions in our schools, provide for the restoration of co-instructional activities and implement the next steps in our teacher testing program to begin this fall.

Our government has done its part to end the disputes that rob children of a full educational experience. Now we're asking the unions to do the same, to work with us and to put our children first.

On June 21 we took action on step 19 of our plan. We introduced legislation that would rescue children from prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation. It would give police and children's aid society workers greater power to help these children. It would allow the province to sue people who profit from the sexual exploitation of children and recover the cost of treatment and services required by victims. It would make it easier to gain access to businesses where these children are being victimized and to remove children under the age of 18.

As well as protecting children, we have taken action to make all neighbourhoods safer. We are keeping tighter controls on inmates through the introduction of our Victim Empowerment Act. This legislation would also let victims participate in the parole hearings of those who have wronged them. We have improved services to victims of crime across the province. On June 11 we created Canada's first permanent Office for Victims of

Crime. On July 16 new legislation will take effect to protect law-abiding tenants and make it easier for landlords to evict tenants who have been convicted of dealing drugs.

More than 586,000 people have escaped the welfare trap since 1995. Their success makes me and our party and everybody on this side of the House very proud. But there are still too many people relying on the system. We're determined to do everything we can to help them get their lives back on track.

As we promised in step 18, we'll begin phasing in mandatory literacy testing and training for all Ontario Works participants on October 1. We're also introducing mandatory drug treatment so that even more welfare recipients can find the dignity that comes with a job. Our welfare reforms are working. Over the last year, we created more than 69,600 Ontario Works placements, doubling last year's achievement.

In addition to the actions I have just described, we have also kept another promise made in our 21-step action plan. We have both invested in our province's health care system and we've taken a leadership role on the sustainability of our nation's health care system. We've invested in Ontario's health care system at record levels and taken action to ensure all families have access to professional medical care that they need closer to home. So far this year, for example, Telehealth Ontario has received more than 115,000 calls from people needing medical advice and information. On July 3, residents of Huronia, Simcoe, Muskoka and Kawartha will also have full access to this important service.

On May 17, we announced we're expanding medical school enrolment by 30%. On June 14, we announced we're more than doubling the number of foreign doctors being assessed and trained each year to practise here in Ontario. Also on May 17, we announced the location of a northern medical school, the first new medical school in Ontario in 30 years.

Health care costs are skyrocketing, and our government, like those in all other provinces, cannot in future years sustain current levels of growth on our own. The federal government currently pays less than 14 cents of every dollar that we spend on Ontario's health care system. Today we again call on the federal government to pay its fair share.

Growth, fiscal responsibility and accountability: these are the priorities that will continue to guide our work in the days and the weeks and the months ahead as we move forward with our 21-step action plan, because today's constantly changing global economy doesn't break for the summer, and neither does our government's responsibility to the people of Ontario.

In the near future, we'll announce the members of the new independent task force, led by Roger Martin, to measure and monitor Ontario's productivity, our competitiveness and our economic progress compared to the other provinces and to the United States. Over the summer, members of the public will also have the opportunity to comment on our No More Free Ride for

Young Offenders Act. It contains 100 amendments to Ottawa's inadequate Youth Criminal Justice Act, including insisting on adult time for an adult crime, mandatory jail time for weapons offences and public identification of young offenders who are found guilty of a serious offence or who receive an adult sentence.

Also this summer, we'll expand our Drive Clean program. After only two years, Ontario's Drive Clean has cut smog-causing emissions from cars by 11.5% in the Toronto and Hamilton areas. This is a very important achievement, but as we all know, we must and we can do better.

On education, we'll be working over the summer to prepare for another initiative that will help increase accountability and help improve the system. Starting November 1, our new parent surveys will make it easier for parents to tell us what they do and what they do not like about the education system.

Our 21-step plan is an ambitious one. It's an ambitious plan with ambitious goals. But the hard-working people of Ontario deserve our best ideas and they deserve our very best efforts. By making tough choices, by staying focused on our priorities—growth, fiscal responsibility and accountability—we will help Ontario meet the challenges of the 21st century and we will help offer people in every corner of our province the promise of a better life.

1410

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): I can tell you that we on this side of the House have spent this session fighting on behalf of Ontario's working families. We've been fighting for their access to quality health care; we've been fighting to improve their children's public education; and we've been fighting to ensure that they can enjoy clean air and safe drinking water. I am proud to say we are fighting for our working families. This government has been doing the exact opposite. The government has spent this session fighting with working families.

When our seniors told this government that they can't get home care, that they can't find long-term-care beds in their communities, that they can't get the community care they need and deserve and, frankly, that they have earned, Mike Harris told them that they should thank God for what they're getting. The Minister of Health said that they should be grateful because they are the wealthiest generation in the history of the world, when we know that one half of Ontario's seniors make less than \$16,000 a year. In fact, the Premier and the health minister went even further. They threatened to take something away from our seniors. They threatened to take away their drug coverage. We've been fighting for seniors. We've been fighting for our parents and grandparents. This government has been fighting with them.

When parents and students told this government that public education is in a crisis, that classes are too large and textbooks are too scarce, that special education can't be found and that morale is at an all-time low, Mike Harris turned around and he came up with \$500 million

for private schools. This was a huge reversal for this government, which had already told the world, literally, at the United Nations that such a move would destroy public education. The government's budget slammed the government's own policy into reverse so suddenly that we've heard the gears grinding for six weeks now.

We on this side of the House, on behalf of working families, fought for their public education. Our families' children deserve better. They deserve real reform and real improvement. We're for choice within the public system; we're for smaller class sizes so our kids get more individual attention; we're for turnaround teams so that we can lend a hand to our struggling schools; and we're for lighthouse schools that can better share our best practices and some of the good things that are happening inside public education. We've been fighting for parents and students. This government continues to fight with them.

When it comes to the environment, on behalf of working families we have fought for clean air and safe drinking water. The government, on the other hand, has fought with anyone who wants to clean things up. It sides with polluters, not working families. When we proposed converting Nanticoke to cleaner-burning natural gas, for example, the government said that it preferred smog days to smog abatement. When we urged the government to accept responsibility for our drinking water, this government preferred to pass the buck. Just yesterday, the medical officer of health for the province told the world: "The Premier was warned," he said, "and he turned his back on public safety."

When we brought forward important legislation to close the Keele Valley dump, the government broke its promise, and said, "No." It will be interesting to see just how quickly the government's freeze on development on the Oak Ridges moraine survives Thursday's by-election. We suspect that the freeze is already beginning to thaw.

I can tell you that we have fought on behalf of working families who want a clean environment. This government on the other side has continued to look after its friends. We have fought on behalf of working families for prosperity that lasts, that's built on quality education, accessible health care and taxes that are competitive. This government would jeopardize our families' future and our province's future with its one-trick-pony approach that suggests that all we need is the lowest corporate taxes and what the heck if that means for our families the lowest standards for health care, the lowest standards for education and the lowest levels of environmental protection.

This session may be winding down, but I can tell you we are just warming up and we will continue to fight for our working families and everything that they need.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): It is interesting, to say the least, that the Premier starts off his statement and ends his statement with the one-word, one-line message: tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. It is equally interesting that through the Premier's whole statement he makes not one word of mention of something called the

Walkerton inquiry—Walkerton, where his government cut over \$200 million from the budget of the Ministry of the Environment, laid off the inspectors, did away with government testing of drinking water, and as a result seven people died and 2,000 people were rendered seriously ill. The Premier talks about accountability. I wonder who will be held accountable for the deaths of those seven people and the illnesses of 2,000 more while your government took the money away from the Ministry of the Environment and turned it into tax cuts for your well-off friends. That's the accountability we are interested in.

We're interested in the accountability that will finally happen for the death of an unarmed man, Dudley George, and how it is that you, Premier—and this is documented now—could say, "Get the Indians out of the park," and a short while later an unarmed man lies dead. That's the accountability we want to have.

We want to have accountability for the fact that if you factor in inflation and you factor in the increase in enrolment in our public schools, they are now being underfunded to the tune of \$2.3 billion a year. That's how much money you've taken out of the public school system by not factoring in inflation and by not increasing the funding according to the enrolment growth. Yet at the same time this is a government that says it's got money for private schools; a \$2.3-billion-a-year shortfall in the public system, but you have money for private schools.

Then there's your boast in terms of family centres for early child development and education, your boast that you're going to commit \$30 million for 850,000 children. Premier, it works out to \$35 per child.

Is that all you're prepared to invest in the young children of this province, \$35, while this year the government boasts that you're going to give \$2.5 billion in bloated corporate tax cuts to corporations that don't need them? That is the accountability that we want to know about.

But I believe your statement illustrates exactly where your government is headed. When corporations want tax cuts, you're there. When high-income individuals want tax cuts, you're there. But when it comes to clean drinking water for the majority of people across Ontario, it's at risk. When it comes to public health for the majority of people across Ontario, it's at risk. When it comes to home care for seniors across Ontario, it's being cut and it's at risk. When it comes to having the kind of environment that our communities need, it's at risk.

When it comes to affordable housing across Ontario, the government has no answer. The government has no priority for something as elementary, as basic, as affordable housing.

The government is silent on all of the things that matter to the vast majority of people across this province: housing, decent education for their children, access to health care, clean drinking water and freedom from smog and air pollution. On all of those issues this government is seemingly missing in action.

Then there is accountability on something else. Ontario has enjoyed some of the most reasonable hydroelectric prices in North America and a predictable and stable supply of hydroelectricity. Has this government learned from California and the debacle there? Have you learned from the higher prices for electricity in Alberta?

No, you're going to repeat the same mistake. You're going to sell off our hydroelectric system to your corporate friends, who will in turn export it to the United States and force up prices here in Ontario.

No accountability on the things that matter to the majority of people in Ontario.

VISITORS

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We have visiting with us in the gallery Andrea Rosenberg, Anna Germaine and Linda Bernofski. They are parents of special-needs children.

Together with the six others who were introduced earlier, I'm sure the House will want to acknowledge their presence, as they're here on important business.

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With us in the gallery today we have two community activists from Burlington: Carol Watts and Marilyn Heinz. They are here today because they want to support my call for unanimous consent to have O Canada sung in the Legislature once a week. I seek unanimous consent.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In light of the Premier's comments that there's much work to be done over the summer, I seek unanimous consent for the House to meet for the first two weeks of July.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? I'm afraid I heard some noes.

DEFERRED VOTES

PUBLIC SERVICE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI A TRAIT À LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Public Service Act and the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1993 / Projet de loi 25, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la fonction publique et la Loi de 1993 sur la négociation collective des employés de la Couronne.

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

The division bells rang from 1424 to 1429.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hastings, John	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Hodgson, Chris	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Beaubien, Marcel	Johns, Helen	Snobelen, John
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Kells, Morley	Sterling, Norman W.
Cunningham, Dianne	Marland, Margaret	Stewart, R. Gary
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stockwell, Chris
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Tascaona, Joseph N.
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Tilson, David
Flaherty, Jim	Miller, Norm	Tsubouchi, David H.
Galt, Doug	Molinari, Tina R.	Turnbull, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Munro, Julia	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Gill, Raminder	Murdoch, Bill	Witmer, Elizabeth
Guzzo, Garry J.	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Hardeman, Ernie	Newman, Dan	Young, David
Harris, Michael D.		

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	McGuinty, Dalton
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Brown, Michael A.	Hampton, Howard	Parsons, Ernie
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Patten, Richard
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Peters, Steve
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Phillips, Gerry
Cleary, John C.	Kwinter, Monte	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Lankin, Frances	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	Smitherman, George

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The eyes are 49; the nays are 42.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR L'EFFICIENCE
DU GOUVERNEMENT

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of Bill 57, An Act to promote government efficiency and to improve services to taxpayers by amending or repealing certain Acts / Projet de loi 57, Loi visant à favoriser l'efficience du gouvernement et à améliorer les services aux contribuables en modifiant ou en abrogeant certaines lois.

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

The division bells rang from 1433 to 1438.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hastings, John	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Hodgson, Chris	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Beaubien, Marcel	Johns, Helen	Snobelen, John
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Kells, Morley	Sterling, Norman W.
Cunningham, Dianne	Marland, Margaret	Stewart, R. Gary
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stockwell, Chris

Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Tascaona, Joseph N.
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Tilson, David
Flaherty, Jim	Miller, Norm	Tsubouchi, David H.
Galt, Doug	Molinari, Tina R.	Turnbull, David
Gilchrist, Steve	Munro, Julia	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Gill, Raminder	Murdoch, Bill	Witmer, Elizabeth
Guzzo, Garry J.	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wood, Bob
Hardeman, Ernie	Newman, Dan	Young, David
Harris, Michael D.		

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Crozier, Bruce	Marchese, Rosario
Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martin, Tony
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	McGuinty, Dalton
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Brown, Michael A.	Hampton, Howard	Parsons, Ernie
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Patten, Richard
Caplan, David	Kennedy, Gerard	Peters, Steve
Christopherson, David	Kormos, Peter	Phillips, Gerry
Cleary, John C.	Kwinter, Monte	Pupatello, Sandra
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Lankin, Frances	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	Smitherman, George

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The eyes are 49; the nays are 42.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 20, 2001, this bill is ordered referred to the standing committee on general government.

APPOINTMENT OF INTEGRITY
COMMISSIONER

Deferred vote on the motion for an humble address to the Lieutenant Governor in Council requesting the appointment of the Honourable Coulter Osborne as Integrity Commissioner.

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

The division bells rang from 1440 to 1445.

The Speaker:

All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Galt, Doug	Murdoch, Bill
Arnott, Ted	Gerretsen, John	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Gilchrist, Steve	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Gill, Raminder	O'Toole, John
Bartolucci, Rick	Guzzo, Garry J.	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hardeman, Ernie	Parsons, Ernie
Bountrogianni, Marie	Harris, Michael D.	Patten, Richard
Boyer, Claudette	Hastings, John	Peters, Steve
Bradley, James J.	Hodgson, Chris	Phillips, Gerry
Brown, Michael A.	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Bryant, Michael	Hudak, Tim	Ramsay, David
Caplan, David	Johns, Helen	Ruprecht, Tony
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Sampson, Rob
Cleary, John C.	Kells, Morley	Smitherman, George
Clement, Tony	Kennedy, Gerard	Snobelen, John
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Spina, Joseph
Conway, Sean G.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sterling, Norman W.
Cordiano, Joseph	Levac, David	Stewart, R. Gary
Crozier, Bruce	Marland, Margaret	Stockwell, Chris
Cunningham, Dianne	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascaona, Joseph N.

Curling, Alvin	Maves, Bart	Tilson, David
DeFaria, Carl	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton	Turnbull, David
Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted	Witmer, Elizabeth
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Ecker, Janet	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Kormos, Peter	Martel, Shelley
Hampton, Howard	Marchese, Rosario	Martin, Tony

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 83; the nays are 6.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

1450

ORAL QUESTIONS

WALKERTON TRAGEDY

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is for the Premier. The people of Walkerton and indeed the people of Ontario are looking to you specifically this week. They're looking to you to do two things: (1) stop denying the facts; (2) start accepting responsibility for your government's role in the Walkerton tragedy. Today, Premier, you have a chance to do those two things. Yesterday the chief medical officer of health for Ontario told us that you had him sent out of the room when he tried to warn you that public safety was at risk in Ontario. He said that you literally turned your back on public safety. Will you now and for the first time apologize for turning your back on public safety?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I think you would acknowledge that we appointed Mr Justice O'Connor, that we appointed the inquiry, because we too want to make sure that we get all the facts out on the table, that we get to the bottom of what happened in Walkerton. We support the process. We want answers to the tragic events at Walkerton. We said from the beginning we would fully co-operate.

Your question deals with the context of testimony at Walkerton this week. As you know, I met with the lawyers for the commission of inquiry on Friday. I've indicated I will be there this Friday. I think you would agree with me that in regard to anything that arises at the inquiry, to show respect for the inquiry and the process I ought to respond there. I am fully co-operating. I'm looking forward to being there on Friday and being of whatever assistance I can to the inquiry. In the right context, I'll be responding, I'm sure, to those questions.

Mr McGuinty: I would remind the Premier that we had to drag him kicking and screaming into sponsoring a public inquiry. The reason we wanted the public inquiry had everything to do with public safety. We must ensure

this never happens again. The first step is to admit what went wrong and then you have to take responsibility for what went wrong. Here today you can stop the damage control and start repairing the damage. But when you were asked about Dr Schabas's testimony yesterday, do you know what you said, Premier? You said, "Nothing could be further from the truth." That's what you said about the chief medical officer of health's testimony delivered yesterday before the Walkerton inquiry.

Premier, people want the truth, but you're stuck on a simple strategy: deny, deny, deny. Why did you turn your back on public health in the province of Ontario?

Hon Mr Harris: As I indicated, that is a question that arises from testimony at the inquiry, an inquiry we supported. I might remind the leader of the official opposition that we offered to send the matter to a legislative committee. We offered to allow you and your members to be doing the questioning. We offered that as one of the vehicles, I think an appropriate vehicle, to get all the facts out on the table. You rejected that. You said you didn't want to be involved: "Politicians don't want to be involved. We'd rather have an independent third party judge." So we went that route. That is the process we have. I would ask you, as I think you would expect of me, to respect that process. I have agreed to fully co-operate. I'm looking forward to providing whatever information I can to help the inquiry this Friday.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, I appreciate the dance; I really do. But I repeat, the people of Walkerton and the people of Ontario are looking to you now. Ever since seven people died in Walkerton, they've been looking to you to do two things in particular: (1) stop denying the facts; (2) start accepting responsibility. Today you can continue with damage control or you can start to repair the damage.

Premier, here's another chance. Dr Schabas wasn't alone. The Environmental Commissioner warned you, the Provincial Auditor warned you, your own Minister of Health warned you, and these warnings were clear and unequivocal. There weren't enough inspectors, there weren't enough safeguards and there was no simple requirement that people on the ground be told their water was poisoned. Premier, will you finally admit today and for the first time that you ignored all those warnings and seven people died in Walkerton?

Hon Mr Harris: Once again I remind the member that my first offer to get to the bottom, to get all the facts on the table, was a legislative committee with power to subpoena, with power to compel everybody to give evidence, including myself, including our ministers and including all the staff and whoever wished to be available. You said, "No, we don't want a legislative committee. We don't want politicians involved. We don't want political answers. We'd like a judicial inquiry." So I've set that in place. We have agreed that this vehicle is the one you preferred over the legislative committee, so you can't have it both ways. You're asking me to comment on evidence that is before the Walkerton inquiry. As I've indicated, I met with the lawyers last Friday. I'm

looking forward to being there this Friday, and I'm looking forward to getting all the information out and making sure that the facts are on the table and the truth is known and everything is a matter of public record. That's why we appointed, with your agreement, Justice O'Connor.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): New question.

Mr McGuinty: This is to the Premier, Speaker. It's interesting, Premier. You tell us that you can't comment in here, but yesterday you were very, very forthcoming in terms of castigating Dr Schabas. You said that nothing could be further from the truth when it came to Dr Schabas's testimony.

Premier, the real big concern that I have here today is that you continue to refuse to accept responsibility, and as long as you do that, you fail to ensure this tragedy isn't repeated. Consider this: one year after the Walkerton tragedy, half the wells directly under your control are still poisoned. Seven of the 37 health units only have a part-time officer of health. Factory farm legislation won't kick in for five long years. You still haven't hired the inspectors that we need to stop polluters and protect lives.

The first step in repairing the damage is to stop self-indulging in damage control. Premier, will you finally now, and for the first time, accept responsibility for your government's role in Walkerton?

Hon Mr Harris: Let me say that this government has taken a number of actions, contrary to all the allegations in your question. On ORC property, I think over 100 new wells have been drilled; considerable dollars have been expended there. A groundwater strategy, as you know, has been looked at, introduced into the Legislature. A number of new drinking water regulatory changes have been made, now making us one of the leading jurisdictions in North America. Others are starting to look at some of the changes that we have proposed.

So contrary to the assertion in your preamble, in fact this government treats water—water quality, water quantity, groundwater, all of those areas before and brought about as a result of Walkerton and post—very, very seriously, and we're taking action on them.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, you still don't understand. This is bigger than politics. It always has been. People died. Somebody's two-year-old little girl died. A community was devastated and a province was shaken. Now the people of Walkerton are looking to you. The last time that you went to Walkerton, you passed the buck and you tried to blame the previous government. This time you've got a chance, here and now, to look at the people of Walkerton, look them in the eye, and apologize.

Premier, I'm asking you here and now, on behalf of the people of Walkerton and on behalf of the people of Ontario, will you now and for the first time apologize?

Hon Mr Harris: I would remind the Leader of the Opposition again of the number of initiatives that we've taken. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment's new regulation will help restore the public's confidence in the province's drinking water. The professional engineers of

Ontario applaud the move, so obviously we've taken a number of steps there. There's a Quebec government press release following the example of the United States and Ontario, the new Quebec regulation. We also had Ken Ogilvie, environmental watchdog, Pollution Probe, call the new law a good piece of work. So obviously we have taken action already and, as you know, we've called the judicial inquiry.

I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that playing politics is calling for a legislative committee and, when I offer that, saying, "No, I don't want a legislative committee. We don't want politicians involved." That's fine. You flip-flopped on that, you don't want politicians involved, so I have agreed to attend the judicial inquiry on Friday to talk about those very matters.

Mr McGuinty: Premier, when it comes to your government's record on the environment, there is one fact that stands head and shoulders above the rest. You have made of our province the second-worst polluter in North America. That is your legacy.

You and I couldn't even begin to understand what it must be like to lose someone you love because they were killed by tap water. Imagine what it must be like to live through that and then look to your government for answers, look to the head of the government for answers, and instead hear denials and excuses.

You can remain defiant and you can deny, deny and deny for as long as you want, or you can do the right thing and send a strong signal today to the people who lost loved ones in Walkerton.

When you take the stand, will you take a stand and, for the first time ever, accept responsibility for your role and your government's role in Walkerton?

1500

Hon Mr Harris: Let me say that we have had a most compassionate response to the tragedy at Walkerton. We have expressed, as you know, our sympathies. We have responded quickly with funds to assist the people of Walkerton to deal with the situation. We have taken a number of initiatives, including Operation Clean Water, to protect Ontarians' drinking water, and we called the judicial inquiry to get to the bottom of what happened in this tragic situation in Walkerton.

I appreciate the member's advice to me, and I'll take it under advisement when I appear before the commission on Friday.

The Speaker: New question.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. Today at the Walkerton inquiry, Brenda Elliott, your former Minister of the Environment, said the entire Conservative caucus was given an uncensored briefing, including the warnings that there were risks to human health posed by your government's substantial cuts to the budget and staff of the Ministry of the Environment. In fact, the inquiry has learned that you were given no less than 10 warnings about the threat to human health. Brenda Elliott further said that it wasn't her decision to take these warnings out. She said the

decision to take the warnings out was made by central agencies higher up in the government.

Premier, you are the focal point of those central agencies. Can you tell us who made the decision to take those warnings out so the public wouldn't see them?

Hon Mr Harris: I'm not aware of any testimony that took place today, but I'd be happy to review that. As I indicated to the leader of the official opposition, we set up the judicial inquiry. You're asking me about testimony that's taken place at the judicial inquiry. I've made myself available on Friday to respond to that in the same context that any other testimony has been raised, and that is now the absolute appropriate forum for that.

I'm prepared to do that. This was the wish of the Legislature, unanimously supported by all members of the Legislature. I think it behooves us now to let the process unfold. I personally look forward to providing any assistance I can to Justice O'Connor and the inquiry.

Mr Hampton: You were very quick yesterday, after Dr Schabas testified at the inquiry, to get into the media and say he was all wrong. So I'm a bit puzzled why you won't answer the questions today.

You should know that it has come out at the Walkerton inquiry that the first draft of the Ministry of the Environment business plan included warnings about the adverse health impacts from your cuts to the ministry. But you chose to hide that from the public. You replaced those words with the sentence, "We will not compromise environmental protection."

Today at the inquiry, the commission counsel said that this was misleading—these are his words, not mine. That's what he said. I would say you were turning your back on public health concerns in Ontario. The question is, how can you justify keeping those warnings away from the public?

Hon Mr Harris: I appreciate the question and the interest and I appreciate that you have supported the judicial inquiry process. We're fully complying: all our ministers and all our senior staff, including the Premier of the province of Ontario.

Quite frankly, I'm a little surprised that for some reason or other you now don't support that process. As I indicated to the leader of the official opposition, when his first request was for a legislative committee, we said, "Fine, that's a good vehicle to do that." Then, when he flip-flopped and said he would like a judicial inquiry, we said, "Fine, that too will be public and will have the ability to compel witnesses to testify," and that's the process we've followed. I don't think it's reasonable for you now to say, "No, forget that. Let's get back to the politicians being involved." We are fully co-operative. As you know, we very deeply regret what happened in Walkerton.

The Speaker: Order. I'm afraid the Premier's time is up.

Mr Hampton: Premier, you keep saying we should let the inquiry unfold and that that's where the answers should be given. But in today's testimony at the inquiry, something very strange happened. Every time the com-

mission counsel tried to ask Brenda Elliott, "Who was ultimately responsible and accountable for what happened at Walkerton?" the government lawyer would get on his feet and demand that the commissioner not allow the question to be put. He didn't want that question answered. He didn't want to know who is accountable and who is responsible.

I want a guarantee from you, Premier, that when you go before the commission on Friday, the government lawyer won't be standing up and opposing the questions about accountability and responsibility, that the government lawyer will allow those questions to be put and there will be no attempt to avoid giving the testimony. Will you give us that guarantee, Premier?

Hon Mr Harris: I would be happy to pass on your advice to the government lawyers. I'm sure they will treat it with a great deal of respect. If that's your advice, being an outstanding litigator of renown throughout the province of Ontario, I'm sure that is advice they might like to receive.

I can't comment on what took place today or what lawyers say or what they don't say. All I can do is tell you that we responded quickly to the people of Walkerton. We responded quickly to their needs. We have undertaken significant remedial action. We have restored water to the people of Walkerton. We've restored confidence. We've offered and worked with the insurance companies to provide compensation. We have also called this public inquiry with Justice O'Connor to get the facts out on the table in the manner that Justice O'Connor and the lawyers for the commission would like, and we're fully complying with that. Surely you can't ask us to do any more than that.

IPPERWASH PROVINCIAL PARK

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. This is about another issue where accountability is due. It's about the death of Dudley George. The George family has asked over and over again for a public inquiry into the death of an unarmed man. Your government has refused. Now in the civil trial there is documentation which indicates there is a memo that says you gave the order to the Attorney General to "Get the Indians out of the park today." Premier, do you deny the existence of such a memo?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I think the Attorney General can respond.

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): The memo the member opposite refers to is one of thousands of documents that have been produced as part of the proceedings. It is, and has been for some time, a document of public record. On its face, if one is to look at it, it is a document that seems to say this government did apply for an injunction. It goes on to say or suggest that the government did so in an effort to resolve the dispute. That's consistent with what has been said by representatives of this government from day one.

Mr Hampton: It is interesting that the government's position here seems to be that it is prepared to answer questions that are before the court. So let me follow that up with another question.

The documents from the civil trial indicate that the memo is very specific. Instruction from the Premier to the Attorney General: "Get the Indians out of the park now." Do you admit that that memo says exactly those specific words, and if it doesn't, please tell us how you interpret the meaning of that memo.

1510

Hon Mr Young: This is a really fine example of why this Legislative Assembly shouldn't be reviewing the matter that is in front of the court. We have an independent judiciary with an impartial judge who in due course will look at all of the documents, including the single document referenced by the member opposite, and ultimately will come to a conclusion. I have a great deal of confidence in the judiciary, the same place that we send our constituents each and every day to resolve outstanding disputes. I would ask the members opposite to place their trust in the same judiciary.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): New question.

Mr Gerry Phillips (Scarborough-Agincourt): My question is to the Premier. Premier, I believe you are in a serious conflict-of-interest situation and you must remove yourself from that conflict of interest. I refer to the Ipperwash Provincial Park issue. On the one hand, there is considerable evidence that you were deeply and personally involved in the events surrounding the shooting death. Yesterday, evidence was made public that you—I'm quoting—"[desire] removal within 24 hours." On the other hand, it is you who controls whether or not there is a public inquiry into the events. So you have a serious conflict of interest. You are personally deeply involved in it, but it is you who controls whether there is a public inquiry that will look into your actions.

Will you agree, Premier, to remove yourself from this conflict by referring the matter to the Chief Justice of Ontario so he can make a recommendation on whether or not there should be a public inquiry?

Hon Mr Harris: Mr Speaker, I'd be pleased to refer the question to the Attorney General.

Hon Mr Young: First of all, this is yet another example of why it is dangerous for members of this Legislative Assembly to pretend that we're not in a Legislative Assembly but in some sort of Star Chamber. When you read half a quote, when you read half a document, it does not serve the cause of justice, with the greatest respect.

As for the idea that there should be a public inquiry, I say to you again what we've said on many occasions, and that is that the issues that are being examined, the very issues that are being examined by the impartial court, the very same issues, are the issues that would be examined in any public inquiry. I would encourage the members opposite to allow the defendants to have their day in court.

Mr Phillips: This would be the same as you've seen in Walkerton. The only inquiry we will have is if some victim of one of the dead people launched a civil case against you.

I return to the central issue, Premier. There is considerable evidence that you were personally involved, deeply involved and inappropriately involved. I will quote two other documents: "Deputy minister said—can't interfere with police decision," but the Premier and Hodgson "came out strong." I'll repeat the other statement: "The Attorney General was instructed by the Premier that he desires removal within 24 hours."

You, Premier, were deeply involved in this situation. On the other hand, it is you who personally is stopping the public inquiry. There is a direct analogy here with Walkerton, where we are finding the value of the public inquiry and finding that the civil case was not the route to go.

I will return to you, Premier. Will you do the appropriate thing, the decent thing? Will you refer this issue to the Chief Justice of Ontario and let him make this decision? Remove yourself from that conflict, that direct, obvious and important conflict. Will you do that today, Premier: refer this to the Chief Justice of Ontario and let him make a decision independently on behalf of the people of Ontario?

Hon Mr Young: If the member opposite had any interest in getting to the bottom of things, if he had any interest in fairness, he would have read the conclusion of that quote.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Attorney General, take his seat.

Come to order. The member for Eglinton-Lawrence, come to order. The member for Hamilton East as well.

Sorry, Attorney General.

Hon Mr Young: As I was saying, if the member was anxious to get to the bottom of this, if he had any interest in fairness, he would have read the rest of that quote.

Mr Phillips: I will happily read it out in the hall, and I will read it all.

Hon Mr Young: He chose not to, and that is the problem with members—

The Speaker: Will the member please take his seat. Sorry again, Attorney General.

Hon Mr Young: That's the problem with members in this legislative chamber pretending as though this is a Star Chamber. There is a matter in front of the court. It is a court that in due course will consider all of the evidence, that will consider all of the documents, and will ultimately render a decision, a decision that will potentially attribute blame and might assess damages. Surely the members opposite have enough confidence in the judiciary of this province to allow that to occur.

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant): My question is for the Minister of Transportation. Minister, yesterday I had the privilege of joining you, Minister

Hudak and the Premier in Grimsby when you announced the Niagara Peninsula transportation needs assessment study.

As I said yesterday, it's obviously a win-win to build this highway south and away from the Niagara fruit belt and the Niagara Escarpment. Secondly, because the study area parallels the northern boundary of Haldimand and Brant, construction of this highway can only boost the local economy in my riding to the south.

Minister, I understand that you, the Premier and a number of our colleagues are participating in the New York-Ontario economic summit held in Buffalo, New York, and Niagara Falls, Ontario. I'm sure that a wealth of ideas were exchanged at this summit, ideas that will help form future business dealings with our great trading partner, New York state. I'm wondering if the minister could share with the House some of the ideas he has brought back.

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Transportation): The last couple of days have been very exciting for the province of Ontario and the state of New York.

One of the main things that struck me was the role of the United States federal government in funding transportation infrastructure. Here in Ontario, I'm proud to say that by the end of this fiscal year, our government will have invested \$6 billion in our highways. Over the same period, the federal government of Canada has contributed \$129.3 million. That's only 2%. Meanwhile, from 1995 to the end of the 2000 fiscal year, New York state made a total capital investment in highways of US\$12.2 billion. The US federal government's contribution for the same period of time was US\$5.6 billion. That's 46% of what the state put in.

There is a glaring contrast in federal commitments to transportation infrastructure funding. I'd urge the federal government to take appropriate action to address this inequity.

Mr Barrett: Obviously from that response the honourable member makes a hard-hitting argument. As you said, Minister, the Canadian government contributes only 2% of Ontario's highway bills versus the US federal government's 46% investment in New York state. It points to some basic flaws in the federal government's thinking when it comes to transportation funding.

I would ask the minister if he has any further information about US versus Canadian federal transportation funding.

Hon Mr Clark: I'd like to point out that the United States government is investing over US\$200 billion in transportation through its Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century. In contrast, the government of Canada introduced the strategic highways infrastructure program in its last budget. It committed \$600 million over five years for all of Canada. Ontario's share of the highway component will be restricted to \$168 million. Federal funding levels need to reflect that Ontario's highways are important trade corridors. Ontario should receive its fair share of any federal monies allocated for transportation, and it's not just our government that thinks this way.

Yesterday, when I announced the Niagara needs assessment study, David Leonhardt, spokesperson for the CAA, said the absence of the federal government was worrisome. He called on the federal government to allocate some of its revenues to the mid-Peninsula highway project. I agree; we hope the opposition does. I don't think so.

1520

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):

My question is for the Minister of Education. Madam Minister, it's not too late when it comes to your private school voucher plan. We're going to have a final vote either tomorrow or the day following.

I'm asking now, recognizing that you have been unable to produce any reports, any evidence whatsoever that would support this massive flip-flop your government has undertaken here, understanding that you didn't campaign on this in 1995 and 1999, that you yourself said this was a bad idea, that you argued against this before the United Nations, knowing that we've now got 37,000 kids who are on waiting lists for psychological assessments, special ed kids, and that at half of our schools our parents are devoting themselves to fundraising for textbooks and basic school supplies, understanding all of that and knowing how dreadfully wrong it would be to take \$500 million from our public schools and invest that in private schools, Madam Minister, will you now come to your senses, come to the aid of public education and scrap your voucher plan?

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): This government agrees that the submissions of parents, that the choice of parents, is something that should be respected, whether it is within the public education system or outside the public education system. This particular proposal by the government respects that parental choice. I know the Liberal Party does not respect parental choice. On this side of the House, we do.

Mr McGuinty: Madam Minister, you may choose to abandon public education, but I want you to know, I want viewers to know and I want all Ontarians to know, that we choose to support it. I want them to know as well that we will never invest public dollars in private schools. We will repeal your private school voucher plan. We've got a positive plan to help public education for our working families. It starts with smaller classes. It involves turnaround teams to help our schools that are struggling. It involves lighthouse schools so that we can share best practices among all our schools. By so doing, our plan will help lift all schools up. It seems to me that's the kind of plan you should be putting forward. Having the opportunity now to reconsider this, one more time, will you now agree that our positive plan of support for public education is much better and much stronger than your plan, which is to abandon it? Once again, I ask you to scrap your voucher plan.

Hon Mrs Ecker: To the honourable member, on one day his members say that funding to independent schools is OK and they're not opposed; now he's saying that funding to independent schools is something he's opposed to. His candidate in Vaughan-King-Aurora, Sorbara, has been talking about, "Sometimes we're opposed; sometimes we're in favour." I guess it depends on which day of the week the honourable member is talking about it. It's a matter of when, how, if, that, and not at this time. "We can't figure out which side of the fence we're on on this issue."

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The members take their seats. Come to order, please.

Hon Mrs Ecker: The honourable member says he's going to scrap the tax credit proposal we have in this legislation to respect parental choice, but it's interesting that he hasn't said he's not going to fund independent schools. He says that maybe he will. He won't do it through a tax credit. Maybe he'll do it some other way. He hasn't ruled it out. Yet again, here we go. This government remains committed to the public education system. It is a priority. We've put more money in it. We will continue to invest in public education because it is important to the parents—

The Speaker: The minister's time is up.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Doug Galt (Northumberland): My question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. Earlier today you introduced a waste diversion bill in the Legislature. In my riding, constituents have been asking for deposit return to be brought back for soft drink containers. There is a concern throughout Ontario for the blue box program. It has been a very well-accepted program. In my riding we've had a wet-dry collection system since 1995. The county of Northumberland needs some assistance with this program. Minister, how will support be provided for the blue box program and the wet-dry collection program, and how will this legislation affect waste diversion in Ontario?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Minister of the Environment): Yes, I know that in the member's community they have a good program. What this initiative today will do, which I will tell you is a very bold, innovative step, is undertake to establish a very unique voluntary partnership between businesses and municipalities in this province. It will be funded 50-50 by both industry and municipalities. That will ensure the sustainability of the blue box program. It will also have as its goal to reduce waste diversion by 50%. Certainly this initiative will do a great deal to ensure that those targets are met and that we can continue to respond to the need to ensure our environment and our health are protected.

Mr Galt: Thank you, Minister, for that very informative answer. Consultation with stakeholders has become a hallmark of our government. We're one of the most consultative governments in the history of Ontario.

We've had extensive consultations on various issues and pre-introduction of bills. In the 36th Parliament, we had more hours and more days of hearings than either of the previous governments.

Minister, I know you and your ministry have also been consulting on this legislation for a long time. Would you share with us what the various stakeholders had to say about the Waste Diversion Act?

Hon Mrs Witmer: There has been incredible consultation on this waste diversion organization. In fact, there will be further opportunity for consultation this summer. But let me just share with you the quote by Ann Mulvale, president of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. She indicated, "We are pleased to have been part of this innovative solution to accelerate waste diversion in Ontario. We congratulate the government for adopting the WDO recommendations. AMO and municipalities will continue to support this process and the work of the Waste Diversion Ontario.... We are particularly pleased that the 50-50 cost sharing arrangement between industry and municipalities in support of municipal blue box programs will be enshrined in law."

The quotes and support from municipalities and industry go on and on and on.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. Yesterday your Minister of Health and Long-Term Care attended a celebration of the completion of a new wing at Toronto East General Hospital. While he was there, both the retiring president and the new president of the hospital told your Minister of Health that they won't be able to open the new wing and operate it because you haven't come up with the operating funding.

The people of East York raised \$4 million to build the new wing, but they won't be able to use the new wing because your government hasn't provided the operating funding. Premier, will you now observe your responsibility and ensure that the \$9 million in operating funding is made available so the people can use their hospital?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I'm sure the Minister can respond.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I would like to thank the leader of the third party for highlighting to this House that this government put \$17 million of the taxpayers' money into Toronto East General for the new J wing, and we are proud of that fact.

Thank you to the honourable member for allowing me to highlight that that is part of an unprecedented \$29-million package of capital spending for Toronto East General by this government. So I can say to the honourable member that we have been there for Toronto East General a darned sight better than his government did in their day, a darned sight better for the residents of east Toronto than in his day, and we are proud of that fact too.

Ms Frances Lankin (Beaches-East York): Minister, it is a really beautiful new wing, but it's empty. There are no patients, there are no doctors, there are no nurses, there are no ward clerks, there's no one in it.

The people of my community—this is my community, Beaches-East York. I was out there with them in the Buy a Brick campaign. We raised the money we needed to make that a reality. It's part of the overall restructuring of all of Toronto. We've got more people coming there because of hospital restructuring decisions. Because of home care cuts that have happened in my community, an average of 100 discharges a month won't be able to go into the community. They're going to be in that hospital.

We expected a full range of services to be open this summer. The hospital has made it very clear to you that that wing, including the 40-bed continuing complex care unit, will not open without the \$9 million for operating costs.

Minister, I'm asking you, please, this is a personal request for a commitment to the people of my community that you won't leave the shiny, new wing sitting open and that you will tell us today you're going to commit the operating dollars so those services can be there for my community this summer.

Hon Mr Clement: Who said we were going to build an entire new wing and then leave it empty? Who said that? No one on this side of the House said that.

I can assure this House that we will deliver the best care for east Toronto residents, including the J wing of Toronto East General. Who on this side of the House said we were not going to do that? We have put our money where our mouth is: \$29 million in new capital funding for that wing, for complex continuing care, for surgical operations, for neonatal. We will be there for the people of east Toronto. Never before has this investment been seen in east Toronto. We on this side of the House are proud of our reinvestment.

1530

WALKERTON TRAGEDY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a question for the Premier. It appears in some quarters that you're going to hang Norm Sterling out to dry when he appears before the commission, just because he did nothing, and yet everybody knows that the buck stops in your office. In fact, people from the commission of inquiry know the buck stops in your office. Even though they've heard you say you're prepared to co-operate to the utmost, that you had nothing to hide, that everything was going to be forthcoming, on at least two different occasions, the RCMP had to raid your office to get the information they wanted.

If you had nothing to hide, why, on two different occasions, did the RCMP have to go to your office to raid it to get documentation they obviously couldn't otherwise get?

Hon Michael D. Harris (Premier): I don't know where you get your information. The RCMP were invited to my office to get whatever information they wanted.

Mr Bradley: Perhaps they were looking for information related to what Dr Schabas had to say on Monday. Let's look at the kind of individual we're talking about. Dr Charles Hollenberg, a former director of the cancer care agency, said of him, "Dr Schabas is an intelligent, principled man who should not be ignored. He is one of the most able public health officers Canada has ever had."

Dr Schabas gave you a warning. In retrospect, given the tragedy that happened in Walkerton, where seven people died and over 2,000 became seriously ill, if you had the chance to do it over again, would you have turned away from Dr Schabas and refused to listen to his warnings?

Hon Mr Harris: The premise of the question is part of testimony to the inquiry. I'll be pleased to respond to that on Friday.

On the first part of the question, I think it needs to be restated that we have fully co-operated with the commission of inquiry. We've made all the information available.

Mr Bradley: I understand that.

Hon Mr Harris: If you understand that, then, by way of your third supplementary, you wouldn't have phrased the question with information that was inaccurate. I think it's important now that the record show you understand that the question you asked first was inaccurate too.

FAMILY HEALTH NETWORKS

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): My question today is to the Minister of Health. As you would know, our government has been consistent with the message that providing quality health care to the people of Ontario is our top priority. For this reason, I was very pleased, of course, when Premier Harris once again reaffirmed our government's commitment by announcing the formation of a new organization, one designed to provide the people of Ontario with steady health care through local family health networks called the Ontario Family Health Network.

This month you announced the board of directors for the Ontario Family Health Network. One of those individuals, I'm pleased to say, is from the riding of Durham, Ms Betty Penny. Can you outline for my constituents and for all the people of Ontario what the main functions of this organization are expected to be?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): Indeed, our government is proud to be supporting the Ontario Family Health Network, a network that is going to encourage family doctors and other health providers such as nurse practitioners to work together in a primary health care network to provide more enhanced, 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week accessible care for people who wish to have access to family physicians.

We're expecting to see 80% of our family physicians join the family health networks, 600 of them over the next three years. I'm proud to say that since November of last year, an additional 40 groups representing as many as 550 doctors have requested a meeting as the next stage to get to establishing a family health network as well.

I should say for the record that we have committed \$250 million to the effort, including \$100 million of financial incentives for doctors who join family health networks.

Mr O'Toole: Minister, that answer clearly outlines your commitment. I know you're continually working on forming partnerships with doctors, nurse practitioners and other health care providers. I hear that in caucus. I have every confidence in your commitment. In your last answer, you indicated \$250 million to help with the expansion of primary care networks across Ontario over the next three years. Could you explain to my constituents in Durham and all the people of Ontario how this program will help, specifically, areas like mine, the rural parts of Ontario?

Hon Mr Clement: We are quite confident this will have a major impact in both our rural and northern areas in particular. We're trying to find better health care for our citizens in these areas, indeed in all areas of Ontario, through extended office hours and weekend and holiday service, at no extra charge to the patients, I might add; as well, a system for the doctors to share information about patient medical history and medications and treatment with the professionals of the network. For instance, if a patient is treated at night, the very next morning the family physician will know what follow-up is necessary immediately for that patient.

We think it's a better system for family physicians, a better system for patients, a better system for nurse practitioners and other health professionals, to finally work together outside of the hospital setting and thereby give us better health care for all Ontario.

DIALYSIS

Mr John C. Cleary (Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh): My question is to the same minister, the Minister of Health. Thelma Poitras of Long Sault is one of 18 plus residents of our part of eastern Ontario who have to receive dialysis treatment. Right now Thelma must travel three times a week to Ottawa, Kingston or Brockville to receive this treatment. She leaves at 10:30 in the morning and returns at 7 at night. The Red Cross provides transportation, but they charge an additional \$300. As well, she must wait, exhausted after her treatment, until everyone else has had their treatment and they return home.

Because of your failure to provide sufficient access to dialysis treatment in Cornwall, Thelma and 17 other individuals travel to Ottawa or Brockville three times a week. Now that might not seem like a long time to you, Minister, but I can tell you it's a heck of a long time after three hours of treatment. The amazing thing is the

facilities are already there in the community for these patients who want to receive treatment locally, and the funding is there as well. The only problem seems to be government red tape.

Minister, I have been writing to you and the former minister about this. I even spoke to you in the Legislature and you told me you would get back to me. To date, you have failed to reply. How much longer do I have to wait and how much longer do my dialysis patients have to wait?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I have been having a conversation with the honourable member and I will continue to seek his input and advice. I can tell this House what I'd be happy to tell the honourable member directly, that indeed there will be an expansion of kidney dialysis in Cornwall in the near future. We are funding it, we are approving it, just as we have been approving the expansion of kidney dialysis in many of our rural settings and many other communities across this province.

We have seen an unprecedented expansion of kidney dialysis to provide better health care at home for our communities, for people in our less populated areas, so they can have the kind of health care the honourable member requests. Cornwall will be no exception. We intend to approve the program for Cornwall as well.

Mr Cleary: That sounds like a lot of rhetoric. We've been getting the runaround for a long time.

I have a letter here from the Cornwall General Hospital. It says they won't be able to have dialysis treatment there until mid-winter of 2002. That's not good enough. This means patients will still have to travel under winter conditions to Ottawa, Toronto or Brockville. It means Mrs Poitras will still have to pay her \$300 a month. Thelma and these other patients have no choice if they want to live. Minister, you have to expand the dialysis service for Cornwall and area. It won't cost the government one extra penny. How much longer are these patients going to have to wait because they want to have dialysis in their own community? I would like an answer.

Hon Mr Clement: The answer is yes. The answer has been yes since October 2000, when we committed another \$37.9 million for kidney dialysis services, which includes the expansion and establishment of new dialysis units in Fort Frances, Cornwall, Hawkesbury, Peterborough, Toronto, Winchester, Picton, Bancroft, Barry's Bay and Goderich.

We are moving ahead with this. We are working with the local hospital authorities to see dialysis available in the honourable member's catchment area and constituency. This is a commitment we made in October 2000. It's the right thing to do. We have found the money to do it. We are expanding health care services in this area, just as we are expanding as a result of another \$1.2-billion budget increase for health care in the 2001 budget.

We will be there for the citizens of Cornwall, and the honourable member can be part of our team. If he wants to be helpful, he should contact his local MP to make sure the federal Liberals understand how important health

care is in Cornwall so they can be part of the solution as well. That would be helpful.

1540

SERVICES FOR THE DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED

Mr David Tilson (Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey): I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The member is interfering with the member trying to ask the question. I would appreciate allowing the member for Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey to ask it. Sorry for the interruption.

Mr Tilson: To the Minister of Community and Social Services: I've been approached by a number of residents in my riding of Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey with respect to looking after individuals with a developmental disability. They've been educating me on the need to continue to offer day programs and respite services to the families who live with developmental disabilities on a daily basis. The need seems to be greatest with young adults who are over the age of 21 and out of the school system.

Minister, you recently announced additional funding for individuals with a developmental disability and their families. This of course is good news for all Ontarians. Would the minister be able to give my constituents more details on how this new money will be distributed?

Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for children, minister responsible for francophone affairs): Let me acknowledge at the outset the commitment my colleague from Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey has brought to this issue, as have a good number of members from all sides of the House.

This government recognizes we can do more to support people with a developmental disability in their community. I can tell you that in this member's riding we're going to do a lot to try to address the quality of care. We're going to do a lot to help revitalize agencies. He mentioned respite care. Obviously that's tremendously important to supporting families and communities. Day programs can be a really big input, not just for the person with a developmental disability but their family in terms of being able to provide a place for them in the world and in terms of providing respite care during the day. I think agencies in his constituency will be able to benefit from these initiatives.

We have made a commitment to the Ontario Association for Community Living and the OASIS group, the two principal groups that lobby on behalf of people with a developmental disability. We want to get this funding flowing within 100 days of the announcement we made in late May, and we're on track to do that, and in the member's constituency.

Mr Tilson: I'm hopeful families in my constituency will benefit from this funding. My colleague Mr Spina,

the member from Brampton Centre, and I have been working with Brampton-Caledon Community Living to ensure that students who are currently enrolled in a program with the Ministry of Education's after-21 pilot project have a similar program available to them in September, because at that time it ends. It's important for both the students and their families that these young adults have community-based programs to access in the coming months. Can the minister assure me today that he is planning now as to the best way to serve these families?

Hon Mr Baird: I can certainly give that commitment to my colleague for his part of the province. Providing supports for those young people leaving the school system is something that's incredibly important. There is a pilot project that has been going on in which people are still in school, the pilot project the member mentioned. That will be continued in the next year.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Baird: The member opposite from Kingston says we're not doing anything. We announced a new program last year providing \$6 million. Some people were disappointed there was no specific mention in the budget about continuing this program. I'm pleased to commit that we will not only continue the program, but we will provide a 100% increase in the budget to be able to provide supports for people in the member opposite's riding.

I know he and our colleague from Brampton have worked and lobbied very hard on this effort and I want to congratulate him and his colleague for their work on this behalf. We're very excited that the foundations initiative will be able to double and expand right across Ontario.

FIRST NATIONS

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. He was here.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Any help from anyone on whether he's left for the day? No, his books are here. There he is, down at the end. Sorry, I didn't recognize him. Wait until he gets to his seat.

Continue, leader of the third party.

Mr Hampton: Minister, for four years now the NAN First Nation in northern Ontario have asked your government for a meaningful consultation process before you try to push more logging and mining developments in their territory. During the so-called Lands for Life process, you refused. De Beers diamonds, which is interested in diamond exploration, has written to your government and advocated that you begin a consultation process. You've refused again. Now the NAN First Nation has taken the unprecedented step of going to the United States Department of Commerce and asking them to investigate whether or not Ontario is subsidizing the softwood lumber industry on the backs of First Nations. It's unprecedented, Minister, but they've had to do it to get your attention. Will you commit to meaningful

consultations with NAN First Nations before you try to push more mining and logging developments in their territory?

Hon John Snobelen (Minister of Natural Resources): The leader of the third party will know from his experience in government that there are a series of regular meetings with First Nation groups, including NAN, across the province to talk about these very serious issues and about the development and economic prosperities of their communities. We take that very seriously.

We met as early as two weeks ago. I know that the Minister of Northern Development was involved in that meeting, as was the Minister of Energy and the Attorney General. So we had quite a gathering. We have ongoing meetings to meet these concerns and to try to plan a future together, because we think that's the way to do it.

The Speaker: Supplementary, member for Timmins-James Bay.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): One quick meeting with the NAN First Nation is not going to do it. You're not doing meaningful consultation as is required under term 49 of the EA. The First Nations communities are being very clear to you. They're saying, "If you don't take the time and consult with us, we will take action ourselves." If that happens it means jobs in northern Ontario could be at risk when it comes to the development of both mining and forestry north of 50.

Minister, we are asking you very simply to do your job. Stop hiding behind your desk. Get out and consultate with the First Nations communities. Do that for the good of not only the First Nations community but for the betterment of Ontario.

Hon Mr Snobelen: I'd like the member opposite to know that I give good consultate. In fact—it's a serious subject—at the meeting that I mentioned earlier, two weeks ago, we committed to a series of meetings from this date forward. We are planning those right now so we can have serious discussions, because we take the economic development of our First Nations communities very seriously and we know the way to do that is through partnership. We have a proven track record on that. That's why we have 378 new parks and protected areas in this province. That's why we've been able to preserve more than six million additional acres for future generations and why we have a healthy and prosperous forest industry in this province by an accord. That's our record and we're going to build on it.

HOME CARE

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): My question is to the Minister of Health. Minister, with your typical cavalier attitude you stepped in yesterday and you fired the board of the CCAC in Hamilton that runs home care. That's typical of this government, as you simply continue to blame others. Clearly, the report that you chose to ignore sections of also blamed your government for lack of direction for boards in the province of Ontario.

Since 1997, you have set up these boards without any clear guidelines, without any clear directions. You've underfunded home care in Hamilton. Instead of dealing with those real, deep-rooted issues that have denied proper access to home care, you took the easy way out; you took the cheap way out. You stepped in, you fired the board, and you're going to step in and save us again. You did this with the Hamilton Health Sciences Corp and then you bailed them out and acknowledged you were wrong.

Minister, will you acknowledge that you are as responsible for the problems in home care in Hamilton as the board that you just fired? Give us the proper funding. Fix the problem. Give us some clear guidelines. Stop pointing fingers and start pointing directions to boards across Ontario.

1550

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I thought I had heard everything in this House, but now I have heard everything in this House. Here is an honourable member, who, if he read the report today—it would have shown serious managerial deficiencies, serious governance deficiencies that were affecting the health of his own constituents. He has the gall, the audacity, to stand in his place and to say that we should not act to save the health of—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Will the minister take his seat. I fight to give to the member the last question and we end up yelling and screaming at each other. Sorry for the interruption. Minister of Health.

Hon Mr Clement: He is a member of a caucus that defines itself by saying no to common sense. When we come in here and we want tax cuts to create jobs, they vote no. When we come in here and we want to reduce red tape to create more jobs and more economic opportunity, they say no. When we want to reform the welfare system to ensure that people on welfare have a decent chance for a job, they say no. They know how to say no; they have no idea how to govern.

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Notwithstanding standing order 30(b), I'd like to seek unanimous consent to allow the full 15-minute allotment for the presentation of petitions.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Interjection: No.

The Speaker: I'm afraid I heard some noes.

The member for Windsor-St Clair has given me a point of privilege and he may proceed.

CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I wrote to you earlier today pursuant to standing order 21(c), serving notice that I intended to raise this point of privilege this afternoon regarding the Provincial Auditor, whose role it is to ensure the accountability of the government of Ontario.

It is my submission that the government of Ontario has perpetrated a contempt of this Legislature by impeding and obstructing an officer of this House, the Provincial Auditor.

What is it to be in contempt of Parliament? Let me quickly cite two references from the 22nd edition of Erskine May. Quoting from page 108 on contempt, "Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as a contempt even though there's no precedent of the offence."

On page 125 of Erskine May, 22nd edition, under the subtitle "Obstructing Officers of Either House," I read, "It is a contempt to obstruct or molest those employed by or entrusted with the execution of the orders of either House while in the execution of their duty."

Further on it is indicated, "Both Houses will treat as contempts, not only acts directly tending to obstruct their officers in the execution of their duty, but also any conduct which may tend to deter them from doing their duty...."

In a recently published House of Commons Procedure and Practice by Marleau and Montpetit, it is similarly affirmed that it is such a contempt of Parliament to stand in the way of an officer of Parliament who's doing his or her duty. Let me cite one reference from Marleau and Montpetit on page 67 that refers to the ruling of Madam Sauvé, who was Speaker in 1980. She wrote, "While our privileges are defined, contempt of the House has no limits. When new ways are found to interfere with our proceedings, so too will the House, in appropriate cases, be able to find that a contempt of the House has occurred."

The case of privilege that I rise upon today stems from a letter that was sent from the Provincial Auditor to my colleague, Mr John Gerretsen, Chair of the standing committee on public accounts. You, sir, were copied on that letter. Among other things, the letter states, "The board's reduction by \$608,800 of the funds requested to perform my responsibilities under the Audit Act must be considered in light of the fact that my office is by far the most underfunded legislative office in Canada."

It is the mandate of the Provincial Auditor to assist the Legislative Assembly of Ontario in holding the government and its administrators accountable for the quality of the administration's stewardship of public funds and for the achievement of value for money in government operations.

The Provincial Auditor goes on in his letter to say, "As a servant of the Legislative Assembly and the public accounts committee, I consider the inadequate funding provided as interfering with my office's ability to fulfill its responsibilities under the Audit Act in a timely manner and is counterproductive to good accountability." The auditor's word is "interfering."

Mr Speaker, earlier this session we heard from the Information and Privacy Commissioner with respect to the difficulty she was having in getting information from the government. The Ombudsman has reported on his concerns respecting the government's lack of willingness to co-operate. Last week, the Environmental Commissioner took the extraordinary step of issuing a special report to criticize the government for disregarding and discounting the authority of his office.

We now have a letter from the Provincial Auditor clearly stating that he cannot fulfill his responsibilities due to government interference. The government controls the Board of Internal Economy. The Minister of Labour has stated openly his views at those meetings with respect to not providing the auditor with the funds requested. Such interference with an officer of the Legislature, it is our contention, is nothing less than contempt.

Earlier today, Brenda Elliott, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and a former Minister of the Environment, testified at the Walkerton inquiry with respect to government business plans, that in fact there were two different business plans for the Ministry of the Environment in existence in 1996. One, an internal document, included some of the potential risks that could result from cuts to the ministry. The other, a document for public consumption, did not contain the risks. That document was tabled in this Legislature in May 1996.

The document states in part, "Central to this approach is the principle of accountability." The document goes on to note, "As recommended by the Ontario Financial Review Commission and by the Provincial Auditor, the government will work with the Legislature to integrate business planning and performance measurement into ministers' accountability in the Legislature."

It's interesting to note, by the way, sir, that in the ministry's core business plan in 1996, it states that "safe drinking water is a right."

Mr Speaker, I believe that Minister Elliott's testimony today, in addition to the letter from the Provincial Auditor, serves as an important example of a lack of willingness on the part of the government to co-operate with you as Speaker or with the officers of your assembly.

Mr Speaker, in the last three weeks, four officers of this assembly have reported on varying degrees of government lack of willingness to participate in their statutory obligations and hence have deprived members of this assembly, but more importantly the people of Ontario, of the right to have oversight of their government and to have truly open, accessible government.

It is my submission that this type of activity should be uncovered by the Provincial Auditor, yet today in the clearest of terms he has alleged interference in the performance of his duties. We believe, Mr Speaker, that there is a systemic campaign designed to prevent true accountability to this House.

We have as examples the Information and Privacy Commissioner, the Ombudsman, the Environment

Commissioner and today, the Provincial Auditor. We are told under sworn testimony today that with government business plans in 1996, there was one set for the public and one set for the government. It's our allegation, sir, and we call upon you to defend the interests of this Legislature and defend the interests of the people of Ontario from a government that is systematically keeping information from the public.

We have seen the use of time allocation and closure in this House more than ever before. Everything points to a systematic determination to undermine our ability as members to hold to account the government, but most importantly, sir, when we witness the kinds of consequences we've seen, such as Walkerton, we understand full well the importance of not having two sets of documents, but one, so we can understand them all. Most importantly, no government should use its majority at the Board of Internal Economy to interfere with the Provincial Auditor, a Provincial Auditor who is funded less than any other auditor in any Legislature in the country.

1600

Mr Speaker, we ask you to consider this point of privilege in light of that, the letter and other evidence I've provided you with, and we anxiously await your response.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): On the same point of privilege, the Minister of Labour.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Labour): Thank you, Mr Speaker. If there was a point of privilege there, I haven't heard it. It's a house of cards—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I haven't heard it. We have an opportunity of listening to them as well. I don't know what privilege he's standing on.

Mr Duncan: Contempt.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Contempt? Now it's contempt.

Mr Speaker, luckily you were at the meeting, which may bring some light into this situation. There is a process that's put in place. This house of cards that was built by the opposition House leader is so bogus and so completely full of holes that the abuse is the amount of time this Legislative Assembly is taking to discuss it.

First, the process for the Board of Internal Economy is to set the budgets for the officers of this Legislative Assembly. Had he talked to any members of that—and he has a member on it; the member for Hamilton East, I believe. He knows full well the process is that the budgets are submitted, debated, passed, and they can be appealed. The Provincial Auditor exercised his right to appeal under the process adopted by the Board of Internal Economy. In that appeal process, the auditor outlined his position to the committee yesterday, also citing in that letter, which I don't have a copy of—I wish I had thought to bring it today; it would have been very helpful to know this was being brought up by the member opposite. I would outline that the Provincial Auditor made a significant number of assertions at that meeting. Those

assertions had nothing to do with contempt. Those assertions had nothing to do with contempt by this House.

Also, if the member knew the Audit Act, he would know that the auditor has a provision to get to this House if he believes there is interference or any kind of process that any member of this House is using to impede his ability to do the job.

Now, Mr Speaker, the crux of this issue comes down to, what did the Board of Internal Economy decide to do yesterday with that appeal? The Board of Internal Economy decided, as the members of the government said they would like to do some discussing of this with their members of caucus, checking out the facts as submitted by the auditor—which I don't think is unreasonable at all, doing some simple due diligence on the information brought to the committee by the auditor to determine whether or not it is truly reflective of the assertions that were being made. In essence, Mr Speaker—and you were there—they asked to defer the decision for two weeks. They didn't decide not to do what the auditor requested. They didn't decide to pass the budget that was passed at the Board of Internal Economy. They simply decided—and if this is contempt, it's unbelievable—to take two weeks to investigate the information, talk to the members of their own caucus and ask them what they think of this particular approach.

This is ridiculous, to outline in this House that somehow taking two weeks before making a decision to talk to your members is contempt. The member obviously has become House leader and he's built this house of cards overnight, with the help, I guess, of the member for Hamilton East and the member for Kingston, who was there as Chair of the public accounts committee.

This is disgraceful, that he would even intimate that there was any contempt, any thought of contempt, any thought by this government to railroad some decision down the auditor's throat, when the simple request at the Board of Internal Economy was, "Maybe we should talk to our caucus mates. Maybe we should investigate this information and we should decide to make a decision in two weeks." Contempt? That's piffle.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): Mr Speaker, on the same point: as briefly as possible, I want the Speaker to know that the New Democrats share the concerns raised by the Liberal House leader. It's understood that the vote on the matter has been deferred for two weeks, but that's precisely the problem, that is, in two weeks' time one has to assume there will be no Legislature sitting, no Speaker sitting to which an appeal can be made for relief.

I can't quarrel with the fact that the decision hasn't been made yet and that to some extent you're being asked to rule upon something in an anticipatory way. But the appeal to you, Speaker, I submit, is at the very least at this point, in view of the fact that it is anticipatory, to clearly express, in response to the point of privilege raised, some direction and guidance as to what constitutes and what does not constitute contempt in this context.

Last evening, the Speaker is well aware, we talked about the nature of the special servants of the House, the officers of this assembly, when we were debating another motion. Clearly one does not want to entrust them with responsibilities and obligations; the special responsibilities and obligations of the auditor being to hold the government accountable, as the auditor and the auditor's office have done for successive governments, inevitably at the displeasure of the government of the day. That's acknowledged. The auditor is in a very difficult position in that regard.

We're talking here about the auditor's independence. It's one thing to create independence by virtue, let's say, of the appointment process, but then if a government does through the back door what it dared not do through the front door, that is to say, by controlling the resources available to that auditor, I put it to you that is a direct attack, among other things, on the independence of the auditor. You can have the most independent auditor in the world, but if the resources aren't adequate then you reduce that independence to mere lip service, to a mere label, without any content or meaning.

I trust you will have access to the letter of June 7, 2001, from the auditor to Mr Gerretsen, the Chair of the committee. I ask you to make special reference on page 2 to the two issues the auditor has been called upon to investigate: (1) the motion made by Ms Martel with respect to the OPG and Bruce partnership leasing agreement; and (2) in the case of the CCO special assignment, two very legitimate—you see, the committee has the power to direct the auditor to do these investigations, to conduct these audits, but the government, by virtue of its majority on the Board of Internal Economy, has the power to short-circuit the will of the committee and also to obstruct the role of the auditor.

Once again, I submit to you that clearly the BOIE has a legitimate role in scrutinizing the auditor's request for funds. An outrageous and frivolous request for funding to, let's say, upholster furniture is one thing, but when the auditor has, as he has in his submissions to the Board of Internal Economy, indicated that specific funding is needed, for staffing particularly, to comply with the will of that committee, it places it in a far different scenario.

I submit that the Board of Internal Economy's ability to review and control the auditor's budget should become very limited at that point. The ability of the BOIE to control the auditor's budget should be limited to what are clearly frivolous or maybe non-essential expenditures which could be discretionary but aren't related to the auditor's function of his responsibilities as they apply to his broader role as auditor or to the directions he receives from the public accounts committee.

I leave it at that, sir. I think you understand that argument, but I want to reiterate. Granted, this is an anticipatory issue, but you're not here, so to speak, sitting in that chair in two weeks' time. It will be several months, then, before there will be any recourse to the Speaker in the event of the worst-case scenario.

It's clear that the auditor, in his second-to-last paragraph, anticipates, realistically or unrealistically, being obstructed by the denial of funding or at least the prospect of it.

1610

I think, sir, the Speaker, in response to this point of privilege, has to deal, or should deal, with the auditor being fearful of being obstructed, with the committee members being fearful of the auditor being obstructed. I submit that one of your responses to this point of privilege can be direction or clear definition as to the scope of the BOIE and the limitations of that scope when they're reviewing the auditor's budget, that that scope should not, must not, cannot extend to interfering with budget requests that would directly interfere concurrently with the auditor exercising his duties.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): On the same point of privilege, Speaker, and I will be brief: I've raised the issue with you informally as well as having previously raised it in the House, and you have undertaken to investigate the situation and report back at least to me informally. But I believe it obviously ties very directly into the point of privilege that's been raised. The specific point, of course, Mr Speaker, is the fact that I moved a resolution in the public accounts committee, which is one of the privileges that we enjoy as members. I was fortunate in being able to secure support of a majority of the committee to have a value-for-money audit done on the private cancer care clinic that had been set up.

The auditor has indicated at public accounts committee in public session on more than one occasion now that if there is not some additional funding, that audit may not be carried out and will certainly not be able to be carried out until at least the end of the year. The purpose of the value-for-money audit was to look at whether in fact there is a cost saving, as the government claims there is, to the private clinic, or what the cost of it may be prior to the renewal of the contract for that private clinic, which comes at the end of the year.

The Minister of Labour suggested that the delay in dealing with the auditor's budget proposal is just a two-week delay. As our colleagues have pointed out, that does coincide with the fact that you are no longer in the chair and able to rule on these issues, which causes me a great deal of concern. It also causes me concern that any delay at all is going to mean that that particular value-for-money audit of the private cancer clinic cannot be carried out in time to be of effect prior to a reconsideration of the contract for the subsequent year.

Mr Speaker, my only recourse, my only privilege as a member of the Legislative Assembly to get an issue which I believe is really of significant public interest evaluated by the auditor, by that officer of the assembly, is to secure majority support for a resolution in the public accounts committee. I took that route. I was successful in securing that support. My ability as a member, and indeed of all the members of the public accounts committee, the majority of whom supported the

resolution, is in fact being interfered with not only by a refusal to grant the funds, but the delay in considering the auditor's proposal for the funds necessary to carry out that audit.

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): I appreciate the games the opposition is trying to play with this and the political spin that they're trying to put on this, but I think for them to suggest that when any officer of this Legislature, when any ministry, when any deputy minister comes before the government and says, "We want X per cent increase in our budget," it should automatically be granted without members of the appropriate committee doing due diligence is absolutely outrageous.

That is our job, to do that due diligence, to make sure, with requests that are being asked for, that the facts have been verified, that we have been able to satisfy ourselves that requests are legitimate or not legitimate, as the case may be. As the honourable members well know and as you yourself, Mr Speaker, are well aware, there is a process.

The auditor did raise concerns about lack of funding. He put his case forward. The Board of Internal Economy is considering that. We have asked for additional time, two weeks, to do that. That doesn't mean the decision won't be made, but I do think, when someone is requesting additional taxpayers' dollars, justified as requests may well be from time to time from different agencies or organizations or ministries, that time to make sure that due diligence is done is an appropriate thing for members of this Legislature to do.

There will be a decision made. The decision will certainly be done according to appropriate processes and procedures. I think that no one has had their privileges or any other thing abused here, other than the abuse of process we've heard from the honourable members who are sitting here asking you to make some ruling in advance of decisions that haven't even been made yet, Mr Speaker, which I think is putting you in a very difficult position, with all due respect.

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): On the same point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I concur with the member from Windsor-St Clair. The Provincial Auditor is yet the latest legislative officer who is alleging that there has been interference, there has been obstruction, there has been difficulty in being able to obtain information, information as it relates to government oversight. I can tell you, Speaker, that I have risen twice on points of order in relation to questions, legitimate questions, as under our standing orders, that have been placed to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. You have twice ruled that it is a valid and legitimate point of order, yet after both of those rulings there has still been no reply, there has been a deafening silence from the ministry.

I submit to you, Speaker, that there is distinct evidence and a pattern of behaviour that clearly demonstrate that the government, under the guise of whatever it wishes to call it, is working to interfere with the rights of members

individually, the rights of members collectively through its legislative officers. I hope that you will take this all into account in your deliberations.

The Speaker: I thank the member for Windsor-St Clair for his very thorough point of privilege and presenting it to me. I thank the Minister of Labour, the government House leader, the member for Niagara Centre and the members for Don Valley East and Thunder Bay-Atikokan for their input. I definitely will review all of the documentation and reserve my judgment until then.

It is now time for petitions. Oh, I'm sorry, it's not. It is past 4 o'clock.

NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Just before we begin, pursuant to standing order 37(a), the member for Hamilton East has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Health concerning home care in Hamilton. This matter will be debated today at 6 o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I move that pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 82, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act to provide an arm's length process to determine members' compensation, the standing committee on justice and social policy shall be authorized to meet at 9 am on Wednesday, June 27, 2001 for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill;

That, at 9 am on this day, the Chair shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That any divisions 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);

That the committee shall report the bill to the House not later than June 27, 2001 at the time set out during routine proceedings for reports by committees. In the event that the committee fails to report the bill at that time, the bill shall be deemed to be 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 the order for third reading may be called on that day, and when the order for third reading is called, the

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

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

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

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): The member for Northumberland.

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): Here we go again: the hallmark in this government of obstruction from the opposition, forcing the government to bring in a time allocation motion. It's been a hallmark of this government to have extensive consultation. I heard some jeering earlier when I mentioned that when asking a question of the Minister of the Environment. There's just no question, and if I have time, I will go through some of the times that we've had on various bills.

We're really talking about the MPP compensation bill, Bill 82, and the time allocation for that. It's rather unique that a group of people would be put in a position to be able to vote on their own salary. This happens in very, very few instances in professions that I'm aware of.

1620

I don't think there's any question a lot of people would agree that maybe it's time there were some salary adjustments for MPPs. I'm not saying which way those particular adjustments should go; that would be in the hands of a third party, in this case the Integrity Commissioner. I think that's an excellent choice. My position always has been that it should be in the hands of either a third party or you vote on the salary that the elected people would receive in the following term, whether municipal or provincial. Voting on your own I believe is a bit of a conflict of interest.

I look at a lot of things that MPPs do, including the opposition. I have the greatest respect for the kind of work they put forward, their reason for being here. I disagree on occasion with some of the positions that they take, but all of us tend to work seven days a week, put in 80- to 100-hour weeks. Certainly as politicians we didn't particularly take on the job to get rich; it was more for the purpose of public service.

When I look at what's happened federally, I'm a little horrified to see some of the things that our federal politicians did in Ottawa. They went from \$68,000 plus a tax-free allowance to \$131,000 and somehow or other they call that a 20% increase. Yet the press says that if we go from approximately \$78,000 to \$131,000, that's a 70% increase. There's something seriously wrong here with the way the feds have managed to calculate that out. But I congratulate the federal members, the MPs, that they did get rid of the tax-free allowance. It's straightforward. The only ones left now in the province of Ontario with a tax-free allowance are the municipal politicians, and I think it's high time they too got rid of the tax-free allowance. But unfortunately for the taxpayers of Canada, the federal MPs have kept their gold-

plated pension plans. It's my understanding that it was costing about \$35,000 for each MP per year to support a gold-plated pension for them at \$68,000 or \$69,000, in that neighbourhood. Guess what it may be costing today, when their salary's at \$131,000. It must be in the neighbourhood of \$60,000 per year per MP to produce that.

I think as adjustments are made the third party would be looking at cost of living, things like inflation, things like workload—and it's well known that the issues and the number of people that come to MPPs' offices are far greater than those that come to MPs' offices. There's certainly a lot more responsibility and they're a lot busier.

Our government has stood for pay for performance since back in 1995, and we've worked to that end, whether it be for cabinet ministers or whether it be for senior administration in the respective ministries. As a result of that, we've seen a tremendous amount of economic recovery that's happened here in the province of Ontario. We believe in the principle of hard work and dedication, and as a result it has indeed paid off. As we committed prior to 1995, we got rid of the MPP gold-plated pension program, we got rid of the tax-free allowance, and it's a straightforward salary, the way it should be for any politician in any role.

If you go back in history you'll find that back in 1993, with the social contract that broke absolutely every public service collective agreement in the province of Ontario, the MPPs also took a 5% cut. That has not been recovered. There was also another 5% cut taken in the 1995 adjustment.

There's been a large number of unique initiatives taken by this government to jumpstart the economy. The Premier said that once we get a balanced budget and we've worked hard and it has been recovered, there should be adjustments to the salaries.

Our government has helped well over a half-million people off welfare, most into sound, well-paying jobs in the province of Ontario. A few were found to be in jail and they're no longer receiving those kinds of welfare payments—thanks to our Minister of Correctional Services for identifying that. I think in the neighbourhood of 2,000 were on welfare and being housed in our provincial institutions.

We've seen a tremendous drop in the unemployment rate in Ontario. Also, we've seen the employment of a net almost one million people. Within a few months, I'm sure we will beat that figure of one million net new jobs. With a Harris government giving good direction, making tax cuts, we've ended up with the third consecutive balanced budget in the province of Ontario. So I think it's logical, it's not surprising, that a review of and an adjustment in the compensation of MPPs is in order.

I look at some of the things that have happened in Ontario, like the bottom line, for example. We're now taking in \$15 billion more in revenue than back in 1995. In 1995, the superhighways, particularly around Toronto, were almost vacant. You could cruise into Toronto at any

time of the day, not run into any kind of traffic jams because there were so few people going to work and there were so few goods being moved out around the province for people to buy. In 2001, with the stimulation of the economy and this almost one million people working, more people having tax dollars in their pockets to spend, we've ended up with a gridlock. It's not surprising at all, with those numbers of people on the road going to work, that this has happened. I think the members in the opposition parties experience the same thing coming into Toronto. They know that back in 1995, you could drive into Toronto at any time and not have stop-and-go traffic. Not so today. They look more like a parking lot. The reason for it? All these people going to work.

Mr Speaker, I think you'll remember the all-party agreement on a bill that was passed back in 1996 that once the budget was balanced, we would have the Speaker address the compensation issue for MPPs and come forward with a recommendation. We all agreed to that but, lo and behold, what happened when it was really brought forward? A flip-flop. The leader of the official opposition flip-flopped. He was the first to come out and yell and scream, "It's not right, it's not fair," when in fact that's exactly what he had agreed to only a few years before, approximately four years, maybe as much as five years. Maybe in that short period of time, he had forgotten what he had really committed to. I think it's unfortunate that he would forget that quickly but, lo and behold, obviously that did happen. But it's good to know that the official opposition and the leader are agreeing to this third party review that would be required. The end result would be in the hands of the Integrity Commissioner. I can't think of a better person to look after the compensation of MPPs.

All in all, I certainly can support this bill and look forward to a speedy passage before the end of this session.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate?

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Mr Speaker, as you know, I have been consistent in opposing time allocation motions which come before the House. I think there would have to be extreme circumstances before an opposition party or an opposition person would vote for a time allocation motion. I well remember some of the more senior members on the government side, when they were in opposition, spoke vociferously and, I thought, compellingly against time allocation motions which were applied to them by, at that particular time, the NDP government, but if it was a previous Liberal government, I'm sure they would have spoken against it on that occasion.

This particular motion is very tight in the amount of time that it allocates when you talk about time allocation motions. What a time allocation motion means is shortening or choking off debate, ending debate on a particular subject. This bill has not received a lot of time in this House, compared to many other pieces of legislation. I think there should be opportunity for members on any

piece of legislation of any significance to be able to speak on it. That is why I am opposed to this particular time allocation motion.

I would have preferred this afternoon that we were talking about other issues, that we wouldn't talk about a time allocation motion; that we would talk about the fact that probably days after this Legislature shuts down, there will be an announcement in St Catharines that they will be closing the Hotel Dieu emergency department and that the final decision will be made to move the kidney dialysis unit somewhere else and to move the oncology department somewhere else. I would like to see us instead debate that kind of issue, because I would be speaking against that happening in my community. Instead, we spend an inordinate amount of time dealing with time allocation motions of the kind we have before us this afternoon.

1630

Governments are in a special position. They have special powers. They have virtually unlimited staff to advise them. They have both the ministry staff and the political staff, and because the government is in a majority, they have even more staff available to the members of the Legislature. We know that the ministerial staff and the Premier's staff received a raise of up to 30% or more this year, while everyone else was being asked to take 2%. The individual members of this Legislature who have executive assistants or legislative assistants—those individuals did not get a raise, while the Premier's staff and the ministers' political staff received substantial increases. That tends, I think justifiably, to have people concerned and disgruntled about that particular fact. I think we should be treating people with fairness in that regard. If we were talking about that this afternoon, that would be a reasonable subject to be talking about.

But governments do have special powers, and time allocation is one that I think is very insidious. When this rule change was made under the Harris government, I opposed it very much, because it took away from anyone who sits in the chair as the Speaker of the House the opportunity to rule on when debate had gone along far enough. Sometimes I was happy with the decision of the Speaker, and sometimes I was unhappy with the decision of the Speaker. I understand that. Speakers are like referees. They have to make a decision. I've been unhappy with some decisions the present Speaker in the chair has made from time to time. That doesn't mean I dislike the Speaker; it doesn't mean I'm going to call for his removal or anything of that nature. But that's the nature of it. I respect the fact, however, that whoever sits in the chair is neutral in making those decisions.

What a time allocation rule does is allow a minister to determine how long the debate will be on her or his bill. Of course, a minister always wants to rush legislation through as quickly as possible with as little debate as possible. I may not like what I hear in debate from time to time, but it's important that I hear it. Whether it's from the government side, the third party or some of my own colleagues, I might hear something in this Legislature

that I don't particularly agree with. I still think it's good to air those points of view in the Legislature. That's why I worry all the time when a time allocation motion is put in.

Governments, as I said, have this as one procedure. Many other changes have been made to the procedural rules in this Legislature which really in essence defang the opposition, take away the chips they could play at a table when they're bargaining. That's the way it has happened in the past. When governments wanted to get legislation through, they might concede to have a couple of weeks of hearings, as one instance, or agree to certain amendments, as another instance, so that the bill could go through the House. When you have time allocation, that opportunity for the opposition to modify or slow down or perhaps cause the government to withdraw legislation is virtually gone. So when people out there say, "Why don't you people in the opposition stop the government" from doing something, we cannot do so. Whatever the government wants to do, it's going to do and it's going to get it through the House. I think that's unhealthy, whether it's the Conservative, Liberal, New Democratic or any other party in power.

I also want to talk about how that's part of a pattern with government. I have seen this government make other changes that I think are unhealthy for our democratic system. We have a by-election going on in Vaughan-King-Aurora at the present time. The government of Ontario is advertising. I was listening to AM 740—Margaret probably listens to this channel from time to time.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): It's a golden oldies station.

Mr Bradley: It's an oldies station, I'm told. I was listening to it last night. I was at the graduation ceremonies at Lockview school, and I was trying to make my way back for the final hour of the Legislature, because I had House duty at that time. Now, they went and closed the place down on me. I was deeply disappointed when I walked in and the place was dark. But I turned on the station, and what did I hear? What did I hear when I turned on the station? I heard a government ad.

I wrote a letter to Warren Bailie when he was the chief electoral officer of Ontario. There was an election going on in the riding of Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Aldershot, a four-name riding. The Conservative government of Mike Harris was advertising. Are they allowed to do political advertising as a party within the rules and limitations of the Ontario Elections Act? Certainly. That's certainly acceptable. But it was government advertising, paid for out of David Christopherson's pocket and my pocket and the pockets of members of the government. In other words, everyone in Ontario had to contribute to this government advertising.

So I wrote to him and he wrote back and said, "It doesn't influence me, so it shouldn't influence anyone." I didn't think that was a particularly satisfactory answer, so I wrote to the new chief electoral officer, Mr Hollins,

when the Parry Sound-Muskoka election was on. I thought the government perhaps learned its lesson or, in a pang of conscience, decided it wasn't going to proceed with government advertising. I was wrong. On election day in newspapers across Ontario, there was a major ad—a half-page, a quarter-page or a third of a page depending on which newspaper—saying, "This is what the export division of your government does," and guess where they had chosen the company from? None other than the Parry Sound-Muskoka riding. That was, of course, what I refer to as cheating in an election campaign.

This time we have the government doing the same thing.

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: Well, if you are breaking the spirit of the law—if the government wants to spend money on Tory ads, there's nothing wrong with that. That's out of their coffers, and heaven knows you people have coffers that are overflowing. This government has raised more money than any federal party has raised, and that's understandable. You have catered your policies and your budgets and your regulatory regime to the wealthiest people in the province. You've had the Red Tape Commission doing the work for those people, going in and saying, "If you have a problem with this Ministry of the Environment regulation, hey, we'll fix it up. We'll get rid of that." If those people don't show up at a fundraiser, I'd be very surprised.

I think that's unhealthy for the system, as I believe time allocation motions are. I hope this chief electoral officer will listen to the ad that's on the radio and say, "Yes, we have the government in effect violating, if not the letter, then certainly the spirit of the election advertising laws in the province of Ontario." Once again, it's always the smart guys in the backrooms who advise the Premier and his people on that. They say, "Hey, we can just push to the edge."

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: I know my friend from Perth wouldn't do anything like this. But the people in the backrooms of the Premier's office, the whiz kids, the smart people, say, "Hey, I've got a way I figured out to get around this law. Won't this be clever?" Well, it might be clever in a political sense, but it's not healthy for the democratic system.

We have a change in elections now which limits the number of days in the campaign to 28. Who does that benefit most? The party with the most money benefits most from that. That's because those parties which rely on people going door-to-door, which rely on public debate and on getting out and meeting the people in the campaign, have a difficult time doing it in the new and larger ridings within the time limit of 28 days.

They also raised the limit on the amount of money a person, corporation or union may contribute to (a) a political party or (b) a candidate, and they raised the limit on expenditures during an election campaign. In addition to that, and probably far more ominous, they removed a

limit on such things as polling. If you're phoning people to ask them how they're going to vote and then trying to get a lawn sign or perhaps line them up for election day, that is polling, in essence. They've removed that. So the Tories can hire an expensive call centre somewhere and they don't have to show that at all as an expenditure. I don't think that's healthy.

If everybody is playing by the same rules, if it's fair ball out there, I can certainly say you then accept the view of the electorate and that's the way the democratic system functions best. We don't have that in Ontario, because the Harris government has rigged the operations of Ontario—I don't say that in an illegal way; I say slanted or rigged the electoral process in this province—to favour the governing party, in this case a party which caters its policies to the wealthiest and most powerful people in the province, and in great numbers they return the funding to them.

1640

When we reach a situation where we have a time allocation motion or the government employs its other tactics to limit debate, I cannot be in favour of that. Whether our party happens to be in favour of a bill or against a bill, I don't think, on a time allocation motion, that in all good conscience, unless there were some extreme circumstances somewhere, an opposition party could possibly agree to vote for or speak in favour of a time allocation motion.

We've fought too hard for these rules in our Legislature over the years. If we remove that opportunity, what it encourages is extra-parliamentary activity on the part of the MPPs. In other words, the filibuster, as it was called south of the border, or lengthy debate was there to indicate disapproval or to engage people out there in the public in the debate by watching what is happening on television.

The member for then Welland-Thorold, today Niagara Centre, conducted a 17-hour filibuster, I believe it was, against a bill which a Liberal government brought in on no-fault insurance. It annoyed the government House leader of the day, it annoyed some of the government caucus of the day, but it was a way of expressing genuine opposition to it. I know he shares my view that it was unfortunate that when his government was in power they didn't bring in a different kind of insurance, government insurance. I know my friend from Niagara Centre, who is a good friend, fought hard within his caucus for government insurance, and his leader of the day said, "No, you won't have it."

The point I want to make is that no matter how annoying it was, he used the 17 hours to indicate clearly his opposition to a piece of legislation and thereby engendered a rather significant debate in the province over it. I think that was positive. I think that was healthy. I don't think time allocation motions are healthy or positive and I intend to vote against this time allocation motion.

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): It's not even Wednesday and we're dealing with a time allocation motion.

That's been happening the last four weeks. But here we are again, as the government, on another piece of legislation, wants to shut down debate.

I'm not particularly surprised about this motion here today. There wasn't much of an extensive debate on this bill, in truth. All New Democrat members spoke against Bill 82, the pay bill. There were a few people who participated after that, but I'm not surprised that the government is moving as quickly as they now can to shut down this debate and to get this bill through. We certainly anticipated that would happen when the bill was first introduced.

I want to continue to reiterate my opposition to what the government is doing in this regard. There are three areas I want to focus on.

The first is that I am opposed to the notion of this government off-loading what is a collective responsibility of all of us and, frankly, speaks to the heart of what accountability is all about: to vote for our own pay increases. That is a responsibility that, as legislators, we should assume. That is clearly what accountability is all about. Cabinet, for example, and only cabinet, has the power to deal with pay bills and issues of pay and taxation powers. Now this same government wants to off-load that responsibility for voting for pay to a third party, in this case the Integrity Commissioner, who will have not only the power to determine what our pay is going to be but will set that in place and there will be no vote on that matter in this assembly.

When we put ourselves forward for election and come to this place, we do that on the understanding that day in, day out we will be asked—in fact, expected—by our constituents to vote on matters of public importance, and those votes will cover a broad range of issues that affect all people in the province. Surely part and parcel of the responsibility to do that is also a responsibility to deal with the thorny and very controversial issue of our pay.

I admit, pay increases and dealing with them are very controversial, but that's what we're here to do. We assume responsibility to vote on every other issue. Why won't we assume responsibility to vote on the issue of pay?

I am very opposed to where the government is taking us, which is to a point and a position where we off-load that responsibility to someone else. I assume the government does that so at the end of the day the government can point and say, "It wasn't my decision to have a 30% or 40% or 50% or," if we move to the federal level of pay, "a 70% increase in pay. That was done by the Integrity Commissioner. He put it in place. We had no choice. We had no vote. And that's the end of it."

I regret that the government chooses to move in that way, especially given the government's use of the term "accountability," certainly through the throne speech and then the budget and all through this term. But when it comes to a very critical matter of accountability—that is, MPPs' pay and our voting on that and our being responsible about that and our explaining to our constituents our

vote on that matter—well, the government doesn't want to be accountable any more.

Secondly, I very much oppose—and I said this last week with respect to this debate—that this government is going to add this responsibility to the Integrity Commissioner. That will be the third party who will determine our pay and who will put it into place and who can in fact make that pay retroactive. I want to remind people who are watching this debate that the Integrity Commissioner is an officer of this assembly, and as an officer of this assembly, he is responsible back to MPPs. Further to that, as an officer of the assembly, we, the 103 of us, have the responsibility for determining the terms and conditions of his work as Integrity Commissioner and for determining his pay and benefits and all the other things associated with that position. To my mind, that sets up an incredible opportunity for a perception of conflict of interest. It's that perception of conflict of interest, real or otherwise, that I don't want to be tainted with.

If the government was really interested in at least having an outside party where it could never be said there was a conflict of interest or the perception of it, then that decision should be made by an independent body or an independent individual who has no relationship back to this assembly and no relationship to us as MPPs. We should not be asking an officer of this assembly, whose employment and whose pay is directly related to us, to then make determinations about our pay. That smacks of a conflict of interest. It must be seen by the public to be a conflict of interest, and we should be moving as far away from that perception as we possibly can. The government is wrong to have the Integrity Commissioner be given the responsibility to do just that.

It's probably the first and only time that I will ever make reference to Walter Robinson of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, but I noted he said the very same, that the Integrity Commissioner should only have a role as adviser. He said, "They are giving a servant of the Legislature the power to make binding spending decisions. That's not right. There is an accountability issue.... It would compromise the integrity of the integrity commission."

I am even more opposed in light of the motion that was just passed in this assembly about two hours ago, and that is the motion to appoint Coulter Osborne as the Integrity Commissioner. I said last night and I'll say it again this afternoon that the process to appoint him was not an open, transparent, public process. It was essentially a deal that was arrived at between the Liberals and the Conservatives to appoint a particular person, and he will now assume this role. There was no reason for us to have had to make the choice of Justice Osborne in that way. I'm not making a comment about Justice Osborne, because I don't know him and I have no reason here today, as I didn't last night, to question his capabilities, his abilities, his integrity etc. But I question the process. In fact, I am opposed to the process that was used to get us to the appointment of him as the Integrity Commissioner.

We could well have gone the route that we have with the selection of the last three officers of this House, namely, the Chief Election Officer, the Ombudsman and the Environmental Commissioner, which was to select an all-party committee with representation from all three parties in this assembly, where there was an open process, where it was advertised publicly that we were seeking candidates, where those candidates had to submit CVs and express their interest in this role, where the committee was charged with the responsibility of shortlisting potential candidates for the jobs, where the shortlisted candidates had to come before the all-party committee and answer questions about what their view of the job was and how they intended to do that job, and where the committee was then seized of making a final selection from among many qualified, capable candidates about who in fact would then finally have that position.

1650

We could have done that in the case of the Integrity Commissioner, and the Liberals and the Tories chose not to go that route. I'm even more concerned now that an individual who was not selected by all of the members of this assembly in an open, transparent, public way is now also the very same individual who is going to deal with our pay. I think that is wrong, and I don't know why the Liberals and the Tories want us to go down this road.

In conclusion, I'll say that the other reason why I oppose Bill 82 and I oppose this motion today which effectively cuts off debate is because the government brings forward a bill which I have no doubt, and I'm sure the 103 of us have no doubt, is going to lead to an increase in pay, against the backdrop of many other people in our society who have not seen an increase in their pay in many years: minimum-wage earners who have been frozen by this government for the last six years; social assistance recipients who had their benefits cut 21% by this government; and people on ODSP who have had their benefits frozen. Against that backdrop the government has nothing to say to these people about what it's going to do for their pay and for their benefits, and I regret that the government didn't do that.

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): I'm very pleased to join in the debate with respect to this resolution dealing with Bill 82, which is called the MPP Compensation Reform Act.

We're dealing with an issue that is difficult for the House. Certainly you're looking at different views of what the process is versus what each party has set out. We heard a lot during the process of the federal government when they were dealing with setting what they considered to be transparent and fair compensation for MPs. What they were struggling with was trying to bring about a transparent process that will have a formula so they don't have to deal with the process in the future, because it can become a little bit of a ball to kick around. I think the press actually enjoys it to a great degree, in terms of the issue.

When I was a member on city council in the city of Barrie, there was no increase given to the members

during the time I was there, but the previous council to this one did go through a process in terms of an outside review of what they felt was fair compensation and then they voted on it themselves. They made the determination, despite the hue and cry of the media, of what was fair and transparent for them, but that was a process where they dealt with it. They didn't come up with a future approach, like the federal government did, to deal with the process of fair and transparent compensation.

This legislation is even more hands-off in terms of a third party—an impartial third party, I may add—ensuring that the salary for MPPs, whatever level that may be, is determined by an impartial third party rather than the MPPs themselves. MPPs' salaries will be reviewed by the Integrity Commissioner, who is an independent officer of the assembly—that is the fact. For the member across the way to say there is a blatant conflict of interest I think is a stretch. The conflict of interest, if you want to look at it, is if we're voting on our compensation directly. Arguably that could be viewed as a conflict of interest, but if you don't have any other formula to determine members' compensation, how do you determine it?

What we have here is a process that is transparent, and I would submit it's a process that's fair to MPPs and to taxpayers. Any changes to MPPs' salaries will be public and transparent.

In terms of the federal government and how they determine their formula, tying it to the judiciary, if one wanted to have a leap of faith and have a stretch, one would say, "There must be a conflict of interest there too, because those people they're tying their compensation to will in the future obviously be eyeing their own compensation. They will want to have an increase, so they will increase it for the federal members. Everything will be in order, so the federal government will go along." I don't think that's really the case. I think what they wanted to do at the federal level was to put an end to this. I think there was a lot of nonsense going on in terms of how the issue was being dealt with by the media.

The process we're proposing here is that if the Integrity Commissioner determines a review should be done—that's the initial step; that's the pretext—then he or she would prepare a report containing any salary changes. The report will then be submitted to the Speaker who will table the report in the assembly and have it published in the Ontario Gazette so that the public is aware. If the report calls for any salary change, the new salary will take effect on the day the report is submitted.

When you look at the process currently in the municipal sector where the municipal councillors vote directly on their compensation, when you look at the process in the federal government where the members voted on their compensation but have found a way to anchor it futuristically in a formula so they don't have to do it again, and then you look at what we're trying to do here provincially, which is to have an impartial third party, an independent officer of the assembly, decide it, there is no perception, no basis for saying there's a

conflict of interest for the Integrity Commissioner. That is totally outlandish.

It allows this House to function on what we're here for, and it allows an independent person to focus of what they are to deal with when they feel they should deal with it. It's very clear: it's if the Integrity Commissioner determines a review should be done. There is no time frame, there is no criterion other than it's at their discretion if they decide it should be done. That is the pretext, that is where the independence comes in, and then there is the process we follow next in terms of the role of the Speaker and publishing it to make this process totally transparent.

We're going to hear some other comments with respect to this legislation, but once and for all I think the public expects its members to set up a process that is fair and transparent. I can't think of any other way of doing this and I certainly haven't heard anything different from the members on the NDP side. In fact, they're quite willing to take whatever comes out of this report. At the same time, they don't offer any solution. I think their late leader, the Honourable Bob Rae, said it very clearly, that the process should be independent and keep the members out of it. That was back in 1988. It's 13 years later and perhaps we'll put this issue to rest.

Mr Gerretsen: I just want to say a few words about this motion. I want to deal with the time allocation motion, because that's really what we're dealing with here today, not the subject matter at hand. On the subject matter at hand, there can be just as many good arguments to be made for having the Legislative Assembly set the salary, or the Integrity Commissioner. I really don't think we're going to get anywhere by arguing that issue, because I think good arguments can be made on both sides of the issue.

1700

But here we have another time allocation motion. Now, we did a little bit of research as to how often time allocation motions have been used in this House over the last, let's say, 20 years. I think the people of Ontario should understand that time allocation is closure. It's when the government, the majority here, basically says, "We don't want to hear any more; we're going to make a decision." You and I know, Speaker, that traditionally within our parliamentary system of government, time allocation, up until about the 1950s and 1960s and early 1970s, was very, very infrequently used. As a matter of fact, from my childhood I remember one famous election back in the mid-1950s, the famous pipeline debate that took place then, when I think time allocation or closure was invoked and a government in effect lost the confidence of the people as a result of that in the next election. Time allocation, closure—call it what you like—has traditionally been very, very infrequently used. So we did a little bit of research to give you some flavour, Speaker, as to how this current government favours time allocation or closure motions, compared to governments in the past.

The first government that we took a look at was a true Conservative government that was led by compassionate leaders back in the early 1980s, from 1981 to 1985, the Davis-Miller government. Speaker, you would be surprised to know that during the four years that that Parliament sat between 1981 and 1985, time allocations were used a total of three times during the entire four-year period. I'm sure the member for Simcoe North would be interested in that. During that period of time, during that four-year Parliament, there were 292 government bills passed. That basically means that in 289 bills, time allocation was not used, the debate came to an end, a vote was taken and the measure was passed. Three times was time allocation used in a four-year time period.

We then go on to the next government, the Peterson government that sat from May 1985 to September 1987. It passed during that two-year period of minority government—they were supported by the NDP at that time—129 bills. You know how often time allocation was used, Speaker? Once.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Not during the minority Parliament.

Mr Gerretsen: Yes, there was one time allocation that was moved. It could very well be, the member for Timmins-James Bay, that it was time-allocated as a result of the consent of all parties. I don't know how it happened, but there was one time allocation motion passed. The research we have done has been very meticulously undertaken.

We go now to the Peterson majority government of 1987 to 1990 when, during a three-year period of time, 183 government bills were passed and time allocation was used on three occasions. So during a 10-year period of time, from 1981 to 1990, time allocation by governments of two different political stripes was used a total of seven times—seven times in 10 years.

Now we go to the Bob Rae government of 1990 to June 1995: 163 government bills were passed during that five-year period of time, and time allocation or closure was used 21 times, so a sevenfold increase. It was used 21 times for 163 government bills.

Now we come to the Harris, the Canadian Alliance, term in office, because these people really aren't Conservatives. I've been telling my people in Kingston and the Islands that for the last five or six years. I tell them, "If you think we've got Conservatives in power here of the Bill Davis-John Robarts mode, you couldn't be further from the truth."

This is not a Conservative government. This is a government that wants to take. Listen to what Dr Schabas said yesterday. These people basically want to do away with our public institutions at all levels, whether we're talking about health care, education, garbage, and you can just go on and on and on. Basically, that's what you're all about.

Anyway, during that first Harris term, from June 1995 to June 1999, 118 bills were passed in a four-year time period, and time allocation or closure, where you shut off debate, was used 41 times. That is roughly a third of the

time during the first term of the Harris government, a third of the time on 118 government bills; 41 times the government said, "We've had enough. Democracy's coming to an end. We're invoking closure on this Parliament and that's the end of it."

Now, in the second Harris term, from June 1999 until June 2001, so over the last two years, there has been a total of 48 government bills passed in two years. By comparison, it's been quite a bit less than what happened with the other governments, and I realize we're only halfway through it. But do you realize how many times time allocation has been used to pass those 48 government bills? Twenty-nine times. More than 50% of the time this government has basically said to the opposition, "We don't want to hear from you people any more. We're going to invoke closure. We are shutting off the democratic process in this province, the parliamentary traditions we all hold so dear, and we're not going to listen to you any more. We're invoking time allocation. We're invoking closure. We don't want to hear any more."

The statistics are quite clear. No matter what time you look at over the last five or six years, this government that has been in power since June 1995 has used time allocation a total of 70 times, more collectively than all the other governments we've had in this province from 1867 to 1995. That will be part of the legacy this Harris government is leaving with the people of Ontario.

But it gets worse than that. Not only is there time allocation, not only has closure been invoked, but I would request and suggest to each member here, take a look at the actual motion. Read the motion. It is the most bizarre, even of time allocation motions, that I have ever seen in my life.

What does it say? It says, "The standing committee on justice and social policy shall be authorized to meet at 9 am on Wednesday, June 27," which is tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock, "for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill." So we meet at 9 o'clock. I will be there as part of the Liberal members on that committee. You would think, with respect to any other bill, there'd be some discussion about it in committee. But do you know what the time allocation motion actually says? It says, "At 9 am"—so the moment we get there and the moment the committee meeting starts, not at 9:10, not at 9:15—"at 9 am on this day, the Chair shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment." So we're meeting to vote on a bill immediately. There will be absolutely no discussion at all.

Then it goes on to say, "That, the committee shall report this bill to the House not later than June 27, 2001, at the time set out during routine proceedings." In other words, the bill has been referred to committee for about one minute of time at 9 am so it can be reported back to this House in the afternoon.

1710

It is taking even time allocation to its most ridiculous extreme. Not only are we saying, "No, the bill shall be

referred to the committee and then come back,” but we’re telling the committee exactly what they should do, and if they don’t do it—it gets even better. Let me read one other clause. It says if we don’t do it, it will be deemed to have been passed.

“In the event that the committee fails to report the bill at that time”—so let’s say the committee does not report the bill back to the House tomorrow afternoon at 1:30 during routine proceedings—“the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee.” I ask you, does that make any sense at all? You’re sending it to a committee and what this is saying is that if the committee wants to discuss it or doesn’t deal with it, it “shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House.”

I suggest that is an abuse of process. What we have here is abuse of process in that time allocation is being used once again, for I guess the 30th time of this Parliament, for the 71st time since the Harris Tories, the Harris Alliance party has been in power. Not only that, but the time allocation motion itself is so restrictive that in effect it does not allow the committee to do any work on the report at all.

I think that’s an abuse of process. The people of Ontario should understand quite clearly what’s going on here. As was so ably pointed out by my colleague from St Catharines, we could be talking about so many other meaningful issues here. We could be talking about, for example, the proper funding of the community care access centres, which across this province are running a deficit or have a lack of funds of somewhere between \$2 million to \$3 million to \$4 million apiece.

The government is very cute when it deals with home care services and nursing care services. It’s basically saying, “We are giving each of the community care access centres the same amount of money as was budgeted for by them last year.” But what they will not tell you is that each one of the community care access centres received, in addition to the budgeted amount last year, anywhere between \$2 million to \$5 million more to deal with the actual needs of the seniors and the people who needed the community care services.

Hon Helen Johns (Minister without Portfolio [Health and Long-Term Care]): Wrong.

Mr Gerretsen: The associate minister says it’s wrong. Minister, I want you to get up, then, the moment I’m finished or the next time you come around, and tell me that these community care access centres are getting exactly the same money they got last year. We’re not talking about budgeted amounts. We are talking about the actual amounts spent last year in those community care access centres to take care of the much-needed home care and nursing and personal care services required.

Interjection.

Mr Gerretsen: They keep saying it’s up 70%. It may be up 70% from five or 10 years ago when home care basically didn’t exist in a large part of this province. We all know that people are being released from hospitals quicker and sicker so they can recuperate at home, but

they can only do that if they have the right kind of nursing and personal care and homemaking services available for them.

The minister is basically suggesting that all the CCACs are wrong and all the people who are not getting the care in the various communities are wrong. I’m telling you that they are not wrong. I’m telling you that we are getting more and more calls from people who need the necessary home supports when they are released from hospitals and they are simply not getting them.

We could be talking about that, but no, we’re talking about another closure motion dealing with the incompetence of this government.

I strongly suggest that the people of Ontario should understand that we in this province are rapidly losing our democratic traditions. I suggest to this government that if they truly were interested in what the people of this province need and want, they would listen more to the opposition.

Mr Bisson: I thought that was a most interesting discourse in this Legislature in regard to talking about where the Liberals are at with this one, because I’m a little bit confused. I remember there was a first reading vote, I remember there was a second reading vote, and I remember on both of those votes the Liberals voted with the government to pass this bill, and in fact not only wanted to pass the bill by voting for it but tried to do everything they could to allow this vote to go through the House without any debate, tried to get it by way of unanimous consent. They were just salivating, hoping that this bill would pass as quickly as possible. So I just think it’s passing strange that all of a sudden the Liberals get up—

Interjection.

Mr Bisson: Oh, yes. This is the point; that’s where I’m going. I just think this is awfully interesting: the Liberals are trying to have it both ways. They’re trying to pretend, “Oh, we’re opposed to the time allocation, because time allocation is a bad thing.” I agree. I think we have time-allocated far too many bills, and for another debate I have some suggestions how you get around that, by changing the rules of this Legislature and by changing the rules of how we elect members to a system that’s more proportional.

But the thing that I find is just so amazing and has so much moxie and so much gall is that they can stand in this House and make that kind of a speech on this bill. I think it’s interesting, because the Liberal Party of Ontario, along with Dalton McGuinty, have tried to do everything they can to pass this bill as quickly as they can with the co-operation of the government. For them to get up now and rail against a time allocation motion—I’ve got to say, my Lord, that takes a lot of chutzpah, as they say; lots of chutzpah, I’ve got to say. Wow. We have a saying in northern Ontario and places like Hearst, Cochrane and Kapuskasing: “Quel culot.” Quel culot, indeed.

I want to put on the record—

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): On the farm they've got a phrase for that.

Mr Bisson: "On the farm they've got a phrase for that." We won't go there.

I have to ask myself a couple of other questions in regard to what's going to happen today. Now, I take it the Liberals—are they going to get up and vote in opposition to the time allocation motion today?

Mr Gerretsen: Absolutely.

Mr Bisson: Oh, now I'm hearing absolutely, they're going to be voting against the time allocation motion. Wink, wink, nudge, nudge, "Mr Speaker, we're against this time allocation motion. We really don't want to vote for you." Come on. We had to force a divided vote on first reading because you guys tried to rush this thing through. We forced you to vote, at which point you voted with the Tories; then the Liberals get up and do everything they can by asking unanimous consent, by trying to make deals with the government House leader to stop the NDP from opposing this bill. They had their members come over here and swarm us and say, "Come on guys, aren't you with us?" No, we're not. We really aren't.

So now they're going to come in the House today and they're going to vote against the time allocation motion? Man, don't run on the fence, you're going to get hurt. Don't run; walk very softly. You might fall and hurt yourselves.

It's going to be more interesting tomorrow, when this bill goes to committee at 9 o'clock. I want to see what these Liberal members are going to do when this bill ends up at the committee.

Ms Martel: On recorded votes.

Mr Bisson: On recorded votes are they going to be siding with the NDP, as they say they're going to be doing today, in opposition to what the government is doing? Are they going to oppose the bill at the committee level and do everything they can to support the NDP to stop this bill? Hmm. I think it's going to be interesting what they do.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): More steps than Arthur Murray.

Mr Bisson: "More steps than Arthur Murray," is one way to put it.

It's really, really interesting how the Liberals can take two positions on the same issue. At least the Tories, I know where you're coming from. You guys want the money. I understand that. It's really simple: "Give me the money, and if I can have it, I'll take it," say the Tories. I understand. No, listen. It's fair enough. I have no argument with the Conservatives. You believe in what you believe in. You got rid of the pensions, and you finally realized six years later, "Oops, that wasn't a very good idea. We've got to find some way to fix that." So now you're coming to the House and you're saying, "How do I make up for now having no pension?" As you realize you're here for a second term, you say, "Oh, if I had a little bit more money on my paycheque, I could buy RRSPs or investments to try to make up what I've lost in

the way of my pension." I understand what you're doing. I don't agree with it, but I respect the conviction that you have in going forward with this particular vote. I don't agree, but I accept—

Mr Kormos: In some of their cases, outright convictions.

Mr Bisson: My friend says, "In some cases, outright convictions." For sure.

But the point is I understand where the Tories are coming from. You introduced the bill; you voted for the bill on first and second readings. You want it so bad that you—actually, what was funny was how they messed it up after second reading and they didn't know what they were doing, so the minister gets up, and rather than allowing the Speaker to say, "Any further debate?"—"Oh, no, one of us should get up and do something. We don't know what, but what do we do? Let's order it to a committee, committee of the whole." And then they got that wrong. They needed the help of the Speaker to extricate them from that particular problem, so they referred it to another committee.

1720

Mr Kormos: That was an extraction.

Mr Bisson: An extraction. It was rather bizarre, what happened. I've got to say, though, for the Speaker, I have a bit of a problem on how he handled that because I thought—

Mr Kormos: Oh, no, no, no.

Mr Bisson: I know you're not supposed to say that—

Mr Kormos: No, no, the Speaker did a fine job.

Mr Bisson: OK, the Speaker did a fine job, I've been told. OK. All right. I've got it. OK, fine. But the point is, there was an error made on the part of the government and they had to now bring a time allocation motion to fix the mess that they'd created by not allowing the Speaker to get up and say, "Any further debate?" at which point you'd have won your second reading vote and you would have moved on because you had the support of the Liberals—

Ms Martel: A day later.

Mr Bisson: —a day later, and they wouldn't be in the position they are now.

So now we're in a position where today we're going to see the Liberals vote two ways on the same bill, supposedly. They tell us they're going to vote against time allocation. Tomorrow they're going to go to committee at 9 o'clock. It's going to be interesting to see. I know my good friend Peter Kormos is going to be there and he's going to make sure they're all recorded votes, and I'm going to be very interested to see how the Liberals vote tomorrow morning at committee. Then, when it finally comes back to the House, it's going to be interesting to see how they vote.

But I want the voters to know there is only one caucus who have been consistent in opposition to this bill, and that is the NDP caucus who have been consistent in saying it is not right to do this, for two reasons. One, I don't have a problem with trying to get an outside opinion about what the salary of an MPP should be. I support

that. I haven't got a problem with that issue, be it the Integrity Commissioner or anybody else. The problem I have is, I think it's incumbent upon us to then vote on the recommendation. I don't think it's right for us to all of a sudden say, "Hang on a second. How much is the Integrity Commissioner going to give us: 30%, 50%, 70%?" and then accept whatever he says. I don't think that's right. I think it's incumbent upon us as members to stand on our feet and vote either for or against a particular bill.

The second point is that I really have a difficulty in light of what's happened across the province: no increases in minimum wage. It hasn't happened under your government; it happened under ours. There's been a decrease for people on social services. There have been no real increases to the public service, other than the lawyers, who got 30%. It seems to me that you like lawyers and you like doctors, because they all got good raises, but everybody else didn't. And the private sector hasn't done so well. So I have a bit of a problem with where you're going on that one.

The other thing I've got to wonder, because the Liberals goaded me this way: I remember Dalton McGuinty getting up and saying, "I think 2% is fair."

Mr Gerretsen: That's right.

Mr Bisson: I just hear now the member for Kingston and the Islands say, "That's right." Does that mean to say that if there's a recommendation that comes up above 2%, the Liberals are not going to accept anything after 2% or 3%? Is that what I'm hearing the position to be?

Interjection.

Mr Bisson: "Oh, no," he says. Well, why is Dalton saying it? Be consistent. Either you're for or you're against this particular idea. You can't have it both ways and then say, "I think 2% would be fair. Oh yeah, I think it would be fair." We all know the Integrity Commissioner is going to come back with more than 2%.

Mr Gerretsen: How do you know that?

Mr Bisson: Because any time this issue's been referred out—last time it was 40%. We wouldn't be passing this bill. The point is, why do I know the Integrity Commissioner's going to come back? This bill would not be debated in regards to the Integrity Commissioner if it wasn't the case. So to the Liberal caucus, those who run to the fence and are on two different sides at the same time, does this now mean to say that if you get more than 2% or 3%, as recommended by Dalton McGuinty, you're not going to accept anything past that?

Mrs Julia Munro (York North): Mr Speaker, I'm pleased to rise on this motion that we have before us today. I think it's important to concentrate on two particular processes that we're looking at in this debate.

The first one is obviously dealing with the time allocation. A few moments ago we heard some ideas presented by other members with regard to the allocation process. I think it's important to set the record straight when we talk about time allocation, recognizing first of all that in 1992 the NDP government changed the standing orders to establish a procedure for the use of

time allocation motions. In the two and a half years following the change to the standing orders, the NDP used time allocation 16 times.

Time allocation has been used in accordance with our standing orders to ensure the speedy and efficient passage of legislation through both the debate process and the committee process.

I think it's important to recognize the importance of being able to establish the kind of time limits that have been done. We have used time allocation motions in accordance with the standing orders 62 times since 1995, which is rather interesting when it's compared to the federal government, where the Liberals have used time allocation motions at least 70 times. When we look at the reason that we're here, which is to debate and pass legislation, we can look at the 169 bills that have become law since 1995, and about a third of those have been passed using time allocation. But that also has to be set in the context of the time that is spent. In the 36th Parliament, which is 1995 to 1999, we sat for 443 sessional days. We passed 118 bills using 35 time allocation motions, which of course works out to be just under 30%.

When we compare this to the previous records, the NDP sat for only a total of 385 days in the 35th Parliament, that is, the time between 1990 and 1995. During that period of time, the NDP passed 163 bills, using time allocation 18 times, approximately 11%. The Liberals sat in total for 297 days in the 33rd Parliament and 230 days in the 34th Parliament. The Liberals passed 312 bills in total and used time allocation only four times. During the 36th Parliament, that is, 1995 to 1999, we sat for 2,353 hours.

When you look at some of these statistics, you can see that time allocation, then, has been used with care. When you look at the number of hours that we have sat, when you look at the number of sessional days, when you look at the number of bills that have been passed, you can see that this process has been used carefully and judiciously.

If you look at standing order 46(a), it states, "The government House leader may move a motion with notice providing for the allocation of time to any proceeding on a government bill or substantive government motion." This is what this motion does for the subsequent stages of Bill 82. The intent of the motion is clear and is worded in such a manner that notwithstanding any other standing orders or special orders relating to Bill 82, the order laid out in the motion takes precedence.

The motion being presented here today is similar in scope to other motions considered and passed previously in this House. It was in order then, and we trust it is still in order today.

Mr Kormos: This is the most peculiar of time allocation motions and it's entirely inappropriate to suggest that it's consistent with any other. First of all, the vast majority of time allocation motions are brought when there is, oh, some failure to get second reading achieved in a timely manner. Well, remarkable, because the only people standing up and speaking to this bill were

New Democrats, other than the modest leadoff speeches of 10, 15, 16 minutes by the government and by the official opposition. The respective members of the government and official opposition stood mute but for the two-minute questions and answers, where they participated, but oh so occasionally and irregularly. It was New Democrats who spoke to the bill, in opposition to Bill 82, and Bill 82 passed second reading.

1730

It's incredible that there would be a time allocation motion when the bill passed second reading. There's no argument to be made. It's impossible to argue that it was delayed in the course of second reading. How could it be delayed? It passed second reading. It was the government who stood up in the Legislature. We were all here. The government said, "Send the bill to the justice committee." The government was given a chance, because the Speaker was being excessively cautious, as Speakers are wont to be; I never met a reckless Speaker. The Speaker for all intents and purposes said, "Are you sure?" It was like one of those TV game shows where you pick that curtain or that curtain or that curtain and Bob Barker says, "Whoa, are you sure?" It was like Regis Philbin on that TV show, where you answer a question and Regis says, "Now, are you sure?"

The Speaker said, "Are you sure?" The government said, "We want this bill to go to the justice committee," and I said, "So be it," because the justice committee sits on Monday and Tuesday. On Friday of last week, I wrote a letter to the Chair of the justice committee and prevailed upon the Chair to call a subcommittee as promptly as possible so that we could start to organize the committee process for Monday and Tuesday. I indicated in that correspondence that I was sure that public hearings would be contemplated by the committee and indicated, or at least suggested, the prospect of there being amendments put forward that would be entertained or could be entertained by the committee.

Amendments to what effect? Amendments to the effect that maybe the salary increase determined by the Integrity Commissioner ought not to kick in until after the next election. You heard from New Democrats that proposition, that that would add an element of fairness; the proposition that by way of amendment, maybe the Integrity Commissioner shouldn't sit alone in judgment, that maybe there ought to be a panel of people, of citizenry. Heck, if you want the Integrity Commissioner to set your salary, why not a senior citizen, a retiree? Why not a teacher? Why not a nurse? Why not a student? Why not a mother on a social assistance allowance? Why not a disabled person, a person with disabilities whose allowance hasn't increased in six years now?

I find it remarkable and very disturbing. I don't know what the appropriate salary is. People work hard here; I acknowledge that. But a whole lot of people work hard in a whole lot of other places. Tell a working mum who works one or two or sometimes three jobs and then still takes care of her kids and her household, that she doesn't work hard, that we somehow work harder than she does.

Please, the incredible speed and haste with which this bill has been accelerated through this Legislature is truly remarkable, and New Democrats have done everything we could to slow it down. We've witnessed a collaborative effort on the part of the government and the Liberal Party to accelerate the speed with which this is rammed through. I understand the arguments being advanced by the supporters of the bill but, my goodness, the accelerated pace at which this bill is being rammed through, not a single voice in support from the other opposition party to the New Democrats' efforts to slow this down.

Yes, I'll be at the committee tomorrow, you see, because this refers the bill to a committee, but it's not really a committee because the committee meets at 9 o'clock and, bingo, every question is put, not a second of debate. Not a single amendment is permitted. Then it's returned to the House the same day, deemed to be reported and put forward for third reading. Again not a second, not one nanosecond of debate is going to be permitted.

Please, friends, when will we show or demonstrate such zeal when it comes to increasing the minimum wage of the poorest people in this province, the poorest workers? Why can't we demonstrate the same enthusiasm when it comes to increasing the disability pensions of persons with disabilities? Why can't we accelerate legislation through this House that addresses the 22% cut in social assistance rates for women and kids on welfare, whose rates were cut six years ago and who haven't seen a penny in increase, notwithstanding those arguments of cost of living and inflation? Please, nobody here is bothering to apply those arguments to people on social assistance or disability pensions or to minimum wage workers, the numbers of which are growing in this province.

Shame. Quite frankly, shame on all of us, not because there's an interest in MPPs' salaries but because there's no interest in the welfare and the income of so many other good, hard-working, dedicated people. Shame on all of us, not because we dare to consider a scheme that would set MPPs' salaries—New Democrats are opposed to the bill and New Democrats have a variety of reasons that have been expressed by the members of this caucus. Some of those reasons—the one I adhere to is no, it's an abdication of responsibility to delegate that out. I accept the fact that we can receive counsel on what an appropriate salary will be, but at the end of the day I believe that since we have the power to set our salaries, we have the obligation to do that, just like we have the power to determine the minimum wage in this province, which has stagnated at \$6.85 an hour for over six years now, and just like we have the power to improve the lot of persons with disabilities who live on subpoverty incomes and who continue to live and struggle and barely survive on subpoverty incomes without even the acknowledgement of an Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

To hear members of the opposition say, "Oh, we're going to oppose the time allocation," when they were as

much a party and as much a sponsor of the speeded acceleration of this bill through this Legislature as the government was, I find particularly upsetting. I will be at the committee on behalf of New Democrats tomorrow morning. I will be calling for recorded votes. I will be looking to my Liberal counterparts on that committee to join me in those recorded votes to demonstrate their opposition to this bill, not to the substance of the bill but to the fact that the bill has been sped through this place so quickly and with such enthusiasm and zeal. Conflict of interest? What a display of conflict of interest when you can ram a bill through in such short order with such a despicable time allocation motion but you ignore the poorest and, yes, the hardest-working and the ones who deserve our attention.

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): I'm pleased to take part today in the debate on Bill 82, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act to establish an arm's length process to determine members' compensation.

I'd like to start off by thanking my colleagues the members for Northumberland, Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford and York North for their comments, as well as the New Democrats who have made some very colourful remarks this afternoon.

This proposed legislation would ensure that in future years salaries paid to members of this assembly will be determined by an impartial third party: Ontario's Integrity Commissioner.

1740

The process is that if the Integrity Commissioner determines a review should be done of MPPs' salaries, then he or she will prepare a report containing the salary changes. The report will be submitted to the Speaker, who will table the report in the assembly and have it published in the Ontario Gazette.

If the report calls for a salary change, the new salary will take effect on the day the report is submitted. This process will ensure that any changes in MPPs' salaries will now be public and transparent, if this bill does in fact pass. The process will be fair to MPPs and, more importantly, fair to the taxpayers of our province.

As most members know, the Integrity Commissioner is widely regarded as the most independent of all the officers of our assembly. The Integrity Commissioner understands the role of MPPs and, when requested, provides advice on how members should conduct themselves in order to avoid any conflict of interest.

I've been so pleased, over my first two years here, to work with Commissioner Rutherford. I found him a very honourable person, and I felt he did a great job as Integrity Commissioner.

Many of my constituents were shocked and appalled at the way our federal counterparts increased their salaries just a couple of weeks ago. I remember seeing headline after headline in the area denouncing the way the federal government put their increases through. Clearly the public feels there is a conflict of interest when politicians set their own salaries. I believe this bill will end that conflict for Ontario MPPs once and for all.

I know this point has been brought up before, but I feel it is important to remind everyone in this House that it was under the leadership of this government that we eliminated what were considered the gold-plated pension plan and tax-free allowances that would have been basically illegal in the private sector. In 1996, our government eliminated these hidden allowances and cut MPPs' compensation.

We did that for a reason: we inherited a disaster and we had to set an example. I think the Harris government and Premier Harris set some great rules when he eliminated the pension and cut salaries at that time. He did not want to see any increases occur until the books were balanced. As you know, we have now balanced the books three years in a row—the first government in almost 100 years to have done that.

This new bill will ensure that any future changes are made by an impartial third party rather than by ourselves, MPPs elected to this House.

In 1980, I ran for public office for the first time as a councillor in my hometown village of Coldwater. There were about 1,200 people in that municipality, and for the next 12 years, from 1982 to 1994, I was the reeve of that particular community, and right through to 1999 as a member of the county of Simcoe and also as the deputy mayor of the township of Severn. I have to tell you that every time the salaries of council members—the reeve, the warden, county councillors—were discussed, it was embarrassing. It was very difficult for members to look at their own salary increases. At that point, I for one would have liked to see an independent body establish and maybe report what we actually deserved. I know we didn't earn a lot of money, and in a lot of cases we did it for the benefit of the communities we lived in. I certainly enjoyed doing that, but we did have costs and expenses. Even today there are a lot of municipal council members who don't earn a lot of money, and I know how difficult it is for those people to actually discuss their own salaries.

There has been a lot of talk during this debate about salary increases: how much should we get, how much do we deserve, how much is going to be handed out, should it be based on MPs' salaries, should it be based on what the public service is offered? Like many of us here in this House, I didn't enter public life to get a better compensation package. I knew exactly what I was to earn when I ran. I checked into that. But I do understand that a lot of people have made a lot of sacrifices in their personal lives to be here, and I commend them for that.

This bill is about changing the process that compensation is based on—raising their own packages—to a system where a truly independent person can decide instead.

I would urge all members to support this bill, and I would ask them to support the time allocation as well. The bill is an important step in making the decisions on members' compensation packages fair and more independent compared to the current process where we decide our own packages. I feel very uncomfortable

about deciding my own pay increase in the future. I understand it's difficult for most people in this House.

Based on that, I'd like to wrap up by saying that I support this piece of legislation and I support the time allocation. It's a pleasure, Mr Speaker, to be able to say a few words this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker: Mr Young has moved government notice of motion number 45. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1747 to 1757.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Hastings, John	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Hodgson, Chris	O'Toole, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sampson, Rob
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Snobelen, John
Cunningham, Dianne	Kells, Morley	Spina, Joseph
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Sterling, Norman W.
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stewart, R. Gary
Ecker, Janet	Maves, Bart	Tasca, Joseph N.
Flaherty, Jim	Mazzilli, Frank	Tilson, David
Galt, Doug	Miller, Norm	Tsubouchi, David H.
Gilchrist, Steve	Molinari, Tina R.	Turnbull, David
Gill, Raminder	Munro, Julia	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Guzzo, Garry J.	Murdoch, Bill	Young, David

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Dombrowsky, Leona	Martin, Tony
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Gerretsen, John	McMeekin, Ted
Boyer, Claudette	Hampton, Howard	Phillips, Gerry
Bradley, James J.	Kennedy, Gerard	Ramsay, David
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Ruprecht, Tony
Christopherson, David	Kwinter, Monte	Smitherman, George
Cleary, John C.	Marchese, Rosario	
Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 48; the nays are 25.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to standing order 37, the question that this House now adjourn is deemed to have been made. The member for Hamilton East has given notice of his dissatisfaction with an answer to a question given by the Minister of Health. The member has up to five minutes to make his presentation.

HOME CARE

Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East): I'm pleased to rise on this late show tonight as a result of the fact that the minister today failed to answer a question in regard to the situation with home care in Hamilton.

To put it in perspective, this government ordered a review of the situation with the CCAC, the organization that provides home care for seniors, the disabled and residents of Hamilton who need home care. This government received this report in the first week of April of this year. This government released a report today, some two and a half months, almost three months, later, and the excuse has been, "We're studying this. We're looking at it. We're putting together an action plan. We want to address the needs that this report has identified."

So what do we get as a result of this study, this looking into it, this process of identifying the problem and dealing with it? We get this government simply doing what it always does best: pointing the finger. "It's someone else's fault. We're going to fire them." All of this studying and consultation, reviewing and fixing the problem, all it led to was simply saying, "We're going to fire the board." This is a board appointed by this government, a board that has been working since 1997 without any clear directions from the government, without any clear standards, without any clear guidelines across Ontario. Let me predict today that what happened to the CCAC in Hamilton is going to be repeated time and time again across the province.

We saw the report released two weeks ago, commissioned by this government, that clearly spoke of the funding problem, that clearly spoke of a lack of guidelines, that clearly asked the government to fix this problem, not to simply fire boards. Granted, there were problems with the running of the operation in Hamilton, but this move today does not do anything to help this. It is not going to mean any help for the more than 600 people who are currently waiting for home care in Hamilton. It's not going to mean any higher level of care for the folks who are not getting adequate care in Hamilton.

Let's go back and look at it. We have 650 people on a waiting list. The reason that waiting list is there is because this government has underfunded home care in the city of Hamilton.

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): Everywhere.

Mr Agostino: Across the province, as my colleague from Kingston said. It should be no surprise that we had those difficulties. There was a report prepared by the CCAC in September 2000 warning the government of the fact that it can't keep up with the demand that is there, of the morale problems because of wage disparities that are occurring, of the lack of standards, the lack of guidelines and the lack of acceptable province-wide assessments of how to deal with clients. They were warned about this, and what have they done? Absolutely nothing. They fail to understand, particularly in our situation in Hamilton,

as across Ontario, that 66% of the clients are seniors and over 2,000 individuals are over the age of 85. That is a hard-to-serve clientele group that needs a lot of time, care and attention from home care in Hamilton, attention they're not getting because this government frankly has failed to live up to its commitment.

When they first started in Hamilton in 1997, they were servicing 17,822 people. By last year that number had swollen to 27,033. When you compare the increase in the number of people they're serving and the increase in the money, there's a gap of 32%. That means that since the CCACs were formed in Hamilton to deal with home care, there's 32% less funding based on the number of clients we have.

If this government is serious about fixing this problem, it has to invest an adequate amount of money to deal with the situation in Hamilton and across Ontario. It has to ensure there are guidelines for boards. It has to ensure that boards are given clear standards across Ontario. Instead, it has simply said to these volunteers who work hard trying to solve a problem, "You're gone," just like they did to the hospital board. Remember, they came in and they fired the Hamilton Health Sciences Corp board. They fired the administrator. Months later, they bailed them out. They came clean and acknowledged they had made a mistake, and there was vindication for the board and the administration. The same thing will happen here. The same thing's going to happen across Ontario.

Folks, you should be aware of what the government's agenda is with this. They're going to do this in Hamilton. They're going to do it in Ottawa, in Toronto, in Kingston, in Sudbury, in Thunder Bay. Everywhere across the province where we have problems because of a lack of funding from the provincial government, let me tell you, they're going to turn around and blame the board. They're going to fire boards, they're going to fire administrations, and then they're going to come out a year later and acknowledge they were wrong, but unfortunately it does not help one single additional client get the care level needed. It is disgusting. What they have done is disgraceful.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): The parliamentary assistant?

Mr Bart Maves (Niagara Falls): We have a vernacular in this House where we say that someone has given someone a lob ball question. Most of the time a lob ball question comes from a government member to a minister of the government. It is quite remarkable that in this instance the member for Hamilton East has asked a lob ball question to the Minister of Health.

On June 19 in this very Legislature, this very same member from Hamilton East said to the Minister of Health, "You've had a report you've been sitting on since April.... You've hidden this report from the public; you have failed to act."

"The report clearly has a number of recommendations that are marked 'urgent'....

"...you have been irresponsible in not acting.

"Will you commit today to release the report and take the necessary steps to deal with the situation and fix the situation...?"

Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation): That was April.

Mr Maves: No, that was June 19; that was only seven days ago. Today, after the minister releases the report, as the member asked him to do, and after the minister takes steps to fix the situation, as the member asked him to do, this member gets up in the Legislature and complains that indeed the minister released the report and decided to step in and fix the situation.

Here is the operational review on the Hamilton-Wentworth Community Care Access Centre. I want to quote a few pieces from this review, from the executive summary.

"The Hamilton-Wentworth Community Care Access Centre ... is an organization experiencing considerable difficulty in its attempt to fulfill its mandate ... the effectiveness of the organization has deteriorated in its three years of existence....

"2. The board, as investigated and stated in this report, is generally naive about its public accountability, arrogant in its modus operandi, largely oblivious to the need for proactive communications with its primary stakeholders, and lax in not acting more quickly on a worsening fiscal crisis when it confesses to have known about its own service delivery deficiencies.

"3. The board provided inadequate strategic direction and leadership, was ineffective in communicating with stakeholders including its staff, failed to ensure accountability and transparency in its operation....

"4. A CCAC is a big business but the HWCCAC has a critical shortage of people with business skills or experience among both the board and senior management....

"7. There is no effective monitoring or management of service utilization and caseload, the greatest drivers of CCAC costs....

"8. The system for assessing which clients should be the highest priority for services is inadequate."

The operational review goes on and calls for the outright board renewal.

What does the minister do? The minister does the responsible thing. He lets the board know. He signals his intention to send in a supervisor to assume control of the Hamilton-Wentworth CCAC. Why? Because the report called for it and it was very obvious to anybody who looked at that CCAC, to anybody who read the operational review, that indeed he should send in a supervisor. And I repeat, it is what the member opposite asked for one week ago.

This Hamilton-Wentworth CCAC has had a budget increase of \$35 million in 1995 to \$53 million in the year 2000. The minister now, after doing his due diligence, after doing an operational review, has decided to act on the review; not leaving it on the shelf and doing nothing. He is acting on the review. He is protecting taxpayers' dollars. You don't leave \$53 million in the hands of a

board and senior staff when a report like this lands on your desk.

He is protecting Hamiltonian taxpayers' dollars. He is protecting the people of Hamilton who really need those services, who can't put up with waste because they need every scarce dollar there is out there in the health care sector. They need to put every dollar into care, into patient care, and that's why the minister is acting today and that's what the minister is doing.

Quite frankly, the member for Hamilton East should stick to where he was on this issue last week, and then support the minister for protecting taxpayers' dollars and protecting the seniors of Hamilton East.

The Deputy Speaker: There being no further matter to debate, I deem the motion to adjourn to have carried. This House stands adjourned until 6:45 of the clock.

The House adjourned at 1810.

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

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

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

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

continued from overleaf

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 26 juin 2001

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2001 sur le réacheminement des déchets, projet de loi 90, <i>M^{me} Witmer</i> Adoptée	1882
Loi de 2001 modifiant la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu (crédit d'impôt au titre de l'adoption internationale), projet de loi 91, <i>M. Cordiano</i> Adoptée	1882
Loi de 2001 sur la Semaine de sensibilisation à la motocyclette, projet de loi 92, <i>M. Stewart</i> Adoptée	1883

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2001 modifiant des lois en ce qui a trait à la fonction publique, projet de loi 25, <i>M. Tsubouchi</i> Adoptée	1887
---	-------------

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2001 sur l'efficience du gouvernement, projet de loi 57, <i>M. Sterling</i> Adoptée	1887
---	-------------

CONTENTS

Tuesday 26 June 2001

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Education funding	
Mr Patten	1879
Papal visit to Ukraine	
Mr Gill	1879
Remarks by Mayor Lastman	
Mr Curling	1879
Community care access centres	
Mr Kormos	1880
Ermelindo Agostini	
Mrs Molinari	1880
Children with special needs	
Mr Kennedy	1880
School bus operators	
Mr O'Toole	1880
By-election in Vaughan-King-Aurora	
Mr Bradley	1881
Events in Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	
Mr Barrett	1881

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on general government	
Mr Gilchrist	1882
Report adopted	1882
Standing committee on justice and social policy	
Mr Barrett	1882
Report adopted	1882

FIRST READINGS

Waste Diversion Act, 2001, <i>Bill 90, Mrs Witmer</i>	
Agreed to	1882
Mrs Witmer	1882
Income Tax Amendment Act (Intercountry Adoption Tax Credit), 2001, Bill 91, <i>Mr Cordiano</i>	
Agreed to	1882
Mr Cordiano	1882
Sioux Lookout Meno-Ya-Win Health Centre Act, 2001, <i>Bill Pr15, Mr Hampton</i>	
Agreed to	1882
Motorcycle Awareness Week Act, 2001, Bill 92, Mr Stewart	
Agreed to	1883
Mr Stewart	1883

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

Government accountability	
Mr Harris	1883
Mr McGuinty	1885
Mr Hampton	1885

THIRD READINGS

Public Service Statute Law Amendment Act, 2001, Bill 25, <i>Mr Tsubouchi</i>	
Agreed to	1887

SECOND READINGS

Government Efficiency Act, 2001, <i>Bill 57, Mr Sterling</i>	
Agreed to	1887

ORAL QUESTIONS

Walkerton tragedy	
Mr McGuinty	1888
Mr Harris	1888, 1890, 1894
Mr Hampton	1889
Mr Bradley	1894
Ipperwash Provincial Park	
Mr Hampton	1890
Mr Young	1890, 1891
Mr Phillips	1891
Transportation infrastructure	
Mr Barrett	1892
Mr Clark	1892
Education funding	
Mr McGuinty	1892
Mrs Ecker	1892
Waste management	
Mr Galt	1893
Mrs Witmer	1893
Hospital funding	
Mr Hampton	1893
Mr Clement	1893, 1894
Ms Lankin	1894
Family health networks	
Mr O'Toole	1894
Mr Clement	1895
Dialysis	
Mr Cleary	1895
Mr Clement	1895

Services for the developmentally disabled

Mr Tilson	1896
Mr Baird	1896

First Nations

Mr Hampton	1896
Mr Snobelen	1897
Mr Bisson	1897

Home care

Mr Agostino	1897
Mr Clement	1897

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Appointment of the Integrity Commissioner

Agreed to	1888
-----------------	------

Time allocation, government notice of motion number 45, Mrs Ecker

Mr Galt	1902
Mr Bradley	1903
Ms Martel	1905
Mr Tascona	1906
Mr Gerretsen	1907
Mr Bisson	1909
Mrs Munro	1911
Mr Kormos	1912
Mr Dunlop	1913
Agreed to	1914

OTHER BUSINESS

Annual report, Office of the Integrity Commissioner

The Speaker	1881
-------------------	------

Visitors

Mr Kennedy	1886
Mr Colle	1886

Contempt of Parliament

Mr Duncan	1898
Mr Stockwell	1899
Mr Kormos	1899
Mrs McLeod	1900
Mrs Ecker	1901
Mr Caplan	1901
The Speaker	1901

Notice of dissatisfaction

The Speaker	1901
-------------------	------

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

Home care

Mr Agostino	1914
Mr Maves	1915

continued overleaf