



No. 54A

N° 54A

ISSN 1180-2987

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)**

Monday 22 October 2001

Lundi 22 octobre 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

Monday 22 October 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 22 octobre 2001

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):

Today I would like to address the issue of the Sherbourne Health Centre Corp. I start by saying the government has a mantra, which is "Promises made, promises kept." But when it comes to health care, from the beginning, when Mike Harris said in debate, "It is not my intention to close hospitals," my riding of Toronto Centre-Rosedale has been the ground zero of failure on the part of this government to deliver on its health care commitments.

The decision was made to close the Wellesley hospital and force its merger with St Mike's. In response to that, the Health Services Restructuring Commission, on June 23, 1997, made a commitment to the people of Toronto Centre-Rosedale that their primary health care needs would be met through the opening of an ambulatory care centre to be located on the Wellesley Central Hospital site.

Here we stand, more than four years later, and the government has yet to deliver on this commitment. Communities have been forced to try to access health services which are in too short supply. The government is being forced to spend dollars that it need not spend because people are seeking access in emergency wards.

In request after request after request to successive Ministers of Health on that side, all we see is stalling; some dollars here and there to support administrative costs, but nothing to the bottom line responsibility of providing the necessary supports in health care to the people of Toronto Centre-Rosedale, many of whom are from immigrant communities and who are poor. I say to this government and to that minister in particular that it is time to put your money where your promises were.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East): I rise today to salute the entrepreneurs of my riding of Mississauga East. Today marks the first day of Small Business Week in Ontario, and I'd like to share with the House the contributions made by small business in my community.

Small business creates more than half of all new jobs in Ontario. Fifty-three per cent of net new jobs are created by small businesses with less than 50 employees.

In Mississauga alone there are over 9,000 small businesses employing over 90,000 employees. Since first being elected in 1995, I have seen the business development of my riding expand, thanks to the initiative of local entrepreneurs and the support programs available through our government.

I'm proud to be part of a government that has helped foster this growth and development. Through tax cuts, a balanced budget, the elimination of red tape and the removal of barriers, we have laid a solid foundation for both existing and new small businesses.

We have done a lot of work in this area. We have established support resources such as the small business enterprise centres. For new Canadians, the business immigration services helps immigrants involved in business with investment and business establishment decisions. We have also established the young entrepreneurs strategy, helping young people with loans up to \$15,000.

Today, I applaud Mississauga's business owners and employees for their contribution to the economic success and quality of life in Ontario. I salute their success over the years and wish them continued prosperity.

TRANSIT SERVICES

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): For quite a few years now, many of us in public life have been debating how to manage the urban problems that arise from growth and the sprawl that comes with it. This dialogue has come to be called smart growth. Far too often, the solution proposed has only exacerbated the problems we were trying to remedy, and we know what the ensuing results are: endless traffic gridlock, a drastic increase in air pollution and its negative effects on our health, and ongoing political battles over who should get money to build bigger roads on which to put more cars.

It's in this context that I am pleased to tell the House today about the great progress that is being made in the Ottawa area. Last week, residents of that great city were introduced to a light-rail transit option, courtesy of a pilot project being run by Ottawa's public transportation system. The project will run over the next year and links the south end of the city with the east-west transitway at a junction less than a mile from Parliament Hill.

I had the opportunity to take one of the first trips aboard what has become known as the O-Train. This

marks a significant new chapter in public transportation in the national capital area. Along with the recent announcements by the provincial government to fund further municipal transportation, I hope this marks the beginning of a new era.

Congratulations are in order to everyone in Ottawa, and particularly to the transit group and Mayor Bob Chiarelli, who worked tirelessly to bring about this project from the drawing board to reality. To everyone else, I invite you to come and experience, free of charge, a new light rail transit system.

OPTOMETRISTS

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): This government should be moving promptly with amendments to Ontario's Optometry Act to give optometrists in Ontario the legal power to prescribe and administer certain therapeutic pharmaceutical agents.

Optometrists are incredibly well trained and perfectly qualified to prescribe, as a result of their diagnosis, certain of these drugs for any number of very common eye ailments, but the restrictive legislation here in Ontario doesn't give them that power. Indeed, down in Niagara, like in most of Ontario with its incredible shortage of ophthalmologists, people suffering from any number of eye diseases—including these diseases and disorders that optometrists are eager to treat as well as diagnose—are increasingly being denied access because of the shortage of ophthalmologists and this government's artificial cap on their billing capacity.

We know that these optometrists are trained and qualified to do it. Indeed, six jurisdictions in Canada already give them this power and capacity. Extending that authority, that power, to optometrists will improve the access that people in all our communities have to effective and speedy eye care and will start to address, in a very cost-effective way, the significant shortage of physicians and other health care services that this government has played no small part in creating. This government can now be part of the solution.

FIREFIGHTERS' MEMORIAL

Mr Bob Wood (London West): Last week, I introduced a bill to establish a memorial at Queen's Park to honour the Ontario firefighters who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

One important function of this building and its environs is to show people the possibilities of the future, and they have performed that function well over the past century. Honouring those who have made contributions in the past is an essential way of inspiring people for the future. We do that here now for people who have served in elected office, the military and the police.

We are, of course, all well aware of the skill, dedication and courage that firefighters bring to their work. There are now a number of firefighter memorials across the province, and all are fitting and appropriate. It is,

however, at Queen's Park that the elected representatives of the people meet to do the people's business, and Queen's Park is necessarily at the centre of the public life of Ontario. Queen's Park is indeed a place for all the people of Ontario to do public business.

It is for that reason that I propose a firefighters' memorial now at Queen's Park, so that all Ontarians may pay homage to those who have sacrificed for us in the past and so that we may be inspired by their example to build a better future.

I ask all members of the House to support this bill.

1340

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): The 108th Annual Conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police will take place in Toronto October 27 to 31. Along with thousands of police chiefs, other law enforcement personnel and special guests from around the world will be in attendance.

Founded in 1893, the IACP is the world's largest and oldest non-profit organization of police executives and has over 18,000 members in 99 countries, including Canada. The association's goals are to advance the science and art of police services; to develop and disseminate improved administrative, technical and operational practices and promote their use in police work; to foster police co-operation and the exchange of information and experience among police administrators throughout the world; to bring about recruitment and training in the police profession of qualified persons; and to encourage adherence of all police officers to high professional standards of performance and conduct.

At the conference the law enforcement executives will have the opportunity to attend workshops in over 90 topics, including: Every Chief has a Role in Winning the War against Terrorism; Effective Recruiting for Smaller Police Departments; and also, Reducing Police Use of Deadly Force through Proactive Management.

I am absolutely sure I speak for all of us in this Legislature when I welcome the members of IACP to Canada, Ontario and Toronto and wish you great success in the hard work you do to create a safer world in which we all can live.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill): I would like to take this opportunity during Small Business Week to highlight two very exciting business ventures that have been launched by high school students in my beautiful riding of Thornhill.

Two local Westmount Collegiate students are getting the jump on their journalism careers and hanging out with some of the music industry's biggest pop stars.

Senior students Adam Gonshor and Mike Levine never dreamed of the success they would have when they

first created their music Web site www.andpop.com. Some of the bands they have met and interviewed include NSYNC, Dream, Sugar Jones, O'Town and soulDecision.

Adam and Mike started the site dedicated to pop music news, pictures and biographies for big stars and lesser-known artists from the US and Canada in August 2000. As a result of the success of their Web site, the two students, Adam and Mike, have enjoyed being guests of major record labels at events, including the Canadian Juno Awards, and have been hosting contests sponsored by major labels and their artists.

Thornlea Secondary School students Laurie Rose, Josh Sookman and John Carbrey are on a mission to accommodate the 1.5 million Canadians who shop online. These young computer whizzes taught themselves the basics of computer programming, and after seven months their www.shopstix.com site was up and running. Today the site contains a directory of products from 725 Canadian stores, grouped into categories ranging from health and fitness to parenting.

Congratulations to the young Thornhill entrepreneurs and the best of luck to them all in their exciting adventures.

CANADIAN FORCES

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): With Remembrance Day fast approaching, which this year will be on Sunday, November 11, less than three weeks away, let us all stop and reflect. Especially this year, after the catastrophe of September 11, let us reflect on the enormous sacrifices made by so many in days gone by to defend and protect the rights and freedoms we enjoy as Canadians.

Let us remember the bravery and the courage of so many war veterans who gave so much, and now we see a new generation of men and women in the war against terrorism. These brave Canadians are defending not only us, but also the civilized world against the unprecedented threat of worldwide terrorism.

Let us hope and pray that the evil and the destructive force known as terrorism will be eradicated from this earth. Let us hope that our brave young men and women from all parts of Canada will return safely, and let us hope that they are not taken for granted and forgotten.

So on November 11, let us make sure we take time to stop and say thanks and pray for our brave sons and daughters who have again gone off to a distant shore to defend this great country and our cherished Canadian values and freedoms.

EVENTS IN DURHAM

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I rise in the House to tell the members about the success of the Bowmanville Legion Pipe Band and the celebration of its latest milestone.

The band was founded in 1951 with the assistance of the members of the General Motors Pipe Band, who taught some of the original members. The band marked its 50th anniversary Saturday, September 15 with a dinner and dance at Branch 178 of the Bowmanville Royal Canadian Legion.

The Bowmanville Legion Pipe Band captured the Canadian championship for grade 4 pipe bands in Fort Erie this summer, and placed first three times in competitions this year alone. Currently it has approximately 20 pipers and drummers of all ages. Students as young as seven are learning to play the pipes under the direction of Don Brooks, the band's instructor and most senior member. Mr Brooks has been named lifetime honorary pipe major.

I'd like to extend congratulations to Pipe Major Jim Scott, the leader of the Bowmanville Legion Pipe Band, as well as pipers Don Brooks, Gord Adams, Kevin Wilson, Bill Colville, Ruth Ann Doiron, Joe Doiron, Mark Foster, George Findlay Sr, Rick Patterson, Jerry Taylor; and drummers Ted Berlinghoff, Doug Delaney, Greg Findlay, John Findlay, George Findlay Jr—there are three Findlays in the band—John Westover, Mike Lavery, Tom Hughes, Erica Watson and Ursula Loch.

I'd like to extend my congratulations to them for their dedication and hard work for providing entertainment and music and tradition for all the people of Ontario.

VISITORS

Mrs Claudette Boyer (Ottawa-Vanier): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to acknowledge the presence of the proud parents of Benoît Poirier, page from Ottawa-Vanier. So, Monsieur et Madame Poirier, et félicitations, Benoît.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

PROPAGANDA

ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2001

LOI DE 2001 SUR LA RESPONSABILITÉ EN MATIÈRE DE PROPAGANDE

Mr Kormos moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 115, An Act to amend the Audit Act to require the Provincial Auditor to evaluate and report on the extent to which government advertising complies with guidelines /
Projet de loi 115, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la vérification des comptes publics de façon à exiger du Vérificateur provincial qu'il évalue la mesure selon laquelle la publicité gouvernementale est conforme aux lignes directrices et qu'il en fasse rapport.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): This bill is in response to a number of concerns raised over several

years. It amends the Audit Act to assign to the Provincial Auditor the function of evaluating the extent to which government advertising complies with stated guidelines, those guidelines expressed in this bill. If the auditor is of the opinion that government advertising is designed to promote or has the effect of promoting the interests of the party forming the government, he or she may recommend that the consolidated revenue fund be reimbursed for the cost. The evaluations and any recommendations are dealt with in the auditor's annual report.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): I move that, pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Monday, October 22, Tuesday, October 23, Wednesday, October 24, Monday, October 29, Tuesday, October 30, and Wednesday, October 31, 2001, for the purpose of considering government business.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Mrs Ecker moves that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Monday, October 22, Tuesday, October 23, Wednesday, October—dispense? No? OK—Wednesday, October 24, Monday, October 29, Tuesday, October 30, Wednesday, October 31, 2001, for the purpose of considering government business.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1350 to 1355.

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	Gill, Raminder	Parsons, Ernie
Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Patten, Richard
Baird, John R.	Hastings, John	Peters, Steve
Bartolucci, Rick	Hodgson, Chris	Phillips, Gerry
Beaubien, Marcel	Hoy, Pat	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Hudak, Tim	Ramsay, David
Boyer, Claudette	Johns, Helen	Runciman, Robert W.
Bradley, James J.	Klees, Frank	Sampson, Rob
Bryant, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Caplan, David	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Smitherman, George
Clement, Tony	Levac, David	Snobelen, John
Coburn, Brian	Marland, Margaret	Spina, Joseph
Colle, Mike	Martiniuk, Gerry	Sterling, Norman W.
Conway, Sean G.	Mazzilli, Frank	Stewart, R. Gary
Cordiano, Joseph	McGuinty, Dalton	Stockwell, Chris
Crozier, Bruce	McLeod, Lyn	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	McMeekin, Ted	Tilson, David
Curling, Alvin	Miller, Norm	Tsubouchi, David H.
DeFaria, Carl	Molinari, Tina R.	Turnbull, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	Munro, Julia	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Dombrowsky, Leona	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wilson, Jim
Duncan, Dwight	Newman, Dan	Witmer, Elizabeth

Ecker, Janet
Elliott, Brenda
Flaherty, Jim

O'Toole, John
Ouellette, Jerry J.

Wood, Bob
Young, David

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles
Hampton, Howard

Kormos, Peter
Marchese, Rosario

Martel, Shelley
Prue, Michael

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 73; the nays are 6.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

1400

ORAL QUESTIONS

CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Health. Last week—Thursday, in fact—I visited with parents, doctors and nurses in connection with your decision to make cuts to the pediatric programs at the London Health Sciences Centre, and I can tell you that those people are feeling angry and betrayed. Just before calling the 1999 provincial election, at a time when your government was fully aware that parents in southwestern Ontario had special concerns about cuts that might be made to specialized pediatric programs, your government made a very specific promise. Not only did you promise that there would be no cuts to those specialized pediatric programs, but your predecessor actually said she would consider additional resources to support those existing programs.

The question I have for you on behalf of those people in southwestern Ontario, but especially the families, is, why have you betrayed the people of southwestern Ontario?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): Mr Speaker, let me make a series of assurances through you to the members of this House. First of all, the base funding for this particular hospital has increased 26% from the last fiscal year alone. Indeed, from 1997-98 to the present, their funding has increased by 36.7%. That is our commitment to that particular hospital.

The scoping exercise that was undertaken by the hospital board is estimated to impact approximately 1% of all patient activity at the hospital. I can tell this House that when it comes to clinical outcomes, that is what we are focused on. If the experts and the trustees made the decision that they cannot do these types of procedures in a way that accentuates and ensures the best clinical outcomes, then changes have to be made, and I would support them on that.

Mr McGuinty: I can understand why the minister doesn't want to deal with the question directly; it's very embarrassing.

Here's a copy of the newspaper article which recounted the promise. The headline reads, "Children's Hospital Won't Lose Cardiac Transplant Services." Your predecessor is specifically quoted as saying there was a review and that there has been a recognition of the fact that these programs have been delivered with a long history of innovation and excellence in London.

That was what you said prior to the election. I've got to hand it to you, Minister: you and your government were very effective at fooling the people. You even had the pediatric cardiac surgeon, Dr Lee, fooled. Dr Lee was so relieved that you were keeping those programs in his community and at his hospital that he appeared in one of your campaign ads.

This is what he says now, and I quote: "I feel that I was lied to and used, and I can tell you that those sentiments are shared by other parents and doctors in the community."

I ask you again, why did you promise to keep those programs open? Wasn't it the fact that you were really playing politics with people's lives?

Hon Mr Clement: I can assure this House that that is absolutely not the case. Our main concern has been, and will be that patients receive the best possible clinical care, the best quality of care imaginable in the province of Ontario. That is what we are focused in on, and in this case the recommendations came back that that simply was not possible in the programs to which he refers. The president and CEO of the hospital has said the hospital cannot be all things to all people and sustain itself as a centre of excellence.

That point of view has been backed up by an editorial in the London Free Press on October 4 that said it is a plan to boost core medical services locally and pass off others that lacked a critical mass of patients and doctors. That is in fact what it is. The best clinical outcomes mean that sometimes others who have more experience and more clinical practice do those procedures, and we support that.

Mr McGuinty: Your government made a specific promise. When London area seats were on the line, when parents said, "We're very concerned about cuts to our programs," your government said, "Don't worry; it's going to go away. We're going to make sure that we don't make any cuts to those programs." Your predecessor specifically said there had been a review and there has been a recognition of the fact that these programs have been delivered with a long history of innovation and excellence in London. People believed you then. They counted on you keeping your promises made at that time, but, as they say, that was then and this is now. The question I put to you on behalf of the parents and children of southwestern Ontario is, why have you betrayed them?

Hon Mr Clement: Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, we are absolutely focused in on making

sure patients receive the best clinical care, the best quality care.

If the honourable member is skeptical about our commitment to that, I would refer the honourable member to what the deputy chief coroner for Ontario said about London pediatric programs. He said that his recommendations that those programs be wound down are consistent with what extensive research around the world has shown: that the success of pediatric cardiac surgeries increased significantly when the programs were consolidated, ensuring high case volumes.

The deputy chief coroner is saying that practice makes perfect. When you want quality of care, it occurs where you have the majority of those clinical practices taking place. In this case, it is not at the London hospital. We support the best possible clinical care for our kids and our patients.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition):

My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Every year, Ontario exports \$200 billion worth of goods and, as you know, 93% of those exports go south of the border to the US. Some 1.5 million Ontario jobs depend directly on trade with the US.

Minister, I think you also understand that despite the importance of trade to our economy, the Canadian-American border is stuck in the Dark Ages. It seems ridiculous to me that in this, the information age, in this, the era of information technology, by and large what happens at the border, as you well know, is that somebody shows up in a rig. They are then seen for the very first time, and people ask them questions like, "Who are you? What are you carrying in terms of cargo? Where are you coming from, and where are you going to?"

I think what we need is a new system of pre-inspections. We need greater use of transponders. We need to find some way to pre-register these people. We should be looking at ID cards and other options that would help us better stream and facilitate the free flow of traffic across the border.

My question is, what are you doing to help relieve congestion at our border?

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Economic Development and Trade): I think the leader of the official opposition is aware that this is a concern for all of us, not just in Ontario but nationally, with respect to congestion and the importance of cross-border traffic, not just for the Ontario and Canadian economies but for many US states as well.

That's one of the reasons we held a New York-Ontario summit in June, where we had participants from both sides of the border. Certainly cross-border traffic was an important part of that two-day conference. We will be having recommendations coming out of that report, I would hope, by mid-November.

Mr McGuinty: Minister, I was in Windsor on Thursday, and I held a fact-finding meeting with some

local business leaders. I met with the past president of the chamber of commerce and with some representatives of the NAFTA superhighway effort, I met with some of the staff from the consul general's office in Detroit and I met with representatives of the bridge and tunnel organizations.

What they impressed upon me was the need for urgent action by all levels of government. While the federal government must assume some responsibility in this regard, I would ask you to consider taking some responsibility to reverse the downloading of the Huron Church Road. When you consider the traffic that is moving through Windsor and along that road, I would argue that this road is of economic significance to the entire province.

What I am asking you to do now is consider reversing the downloading of the Huron Church Road and then proceed with infrastructure improvements. You have committed \$1 billion; you have only allocated \$14 million. Understanding that this road is of provincial economic interest, will you agree to upload that road and then begin infrastructure improvements?

Hon Mr Runciman: We are indeed concerned about infrastructure. In terms of improving traffic flow, that's a critical component; there's no question about it. But there are a number of other factors as well. We've talked about pre-clearance zones. We've had discussions with our friends in both Michigan and New York states with respect to seeing if we can improve that situation.

The difficulty we've bumped into on a number of occasions has been the intransigence of the federal Liberal government to move in a number of these areas to expedite traffic flow.

I stand to be corrected, but with respect to Windsor and looking at improvement of traffic flow, I do not believe Windsor has made an application in terms of prioritization of traffic flow across the international border. In the programs they have applied for to the province, that has not been a priority in the city of Windsor.

1410

Mr McGuinty: I can tell you on the basis of my visit and the information that I've received, it is at the top of the list in terms of ensuring that we have improvements to the Huron Church Road at the earliest possible opportunity. You are quite right, Minister. I will agree with you on this: the federal government must assume some responsibility to facilitate the free flow of goods, services and people along the border. But I think it's important that we here in Ontario at the provincial government level also assume our responsibilities.

The Huron Church Road is not just a road in Windsor. It is the busiest border crossing in North America. It moves a tremendous amount of truck traffic through each and every day. We need a trade corridor. It needs to be free-flowing. Somewhere between Montreal and Florida there are some 14 traffic lights. Do you know where all those traffic lights are? I think you know the answer. They're on the Huron Church Road.

I think what we need to do is to begin to invest in improving that road so it better expedites the free flow of traffic. As you know, in a just-in-time world, congestion is a job-killer. This is a matter of urgency; it's a matter of interest to the entire province. I ask you, Minister, will you commit to uploading the Huron Church Road, making it a provincial responsibility, and then begin to improve it?

Hon Mr Runciman: I've said this before and I'll say it again: the irony of this question is that it's coming from the Liberal Party of Ontario, which very vigorously opposed free trade between Canada and the United States. Now we've seen what a positive impact it's had on the economy of this province, let alone this country.

Our government is very much committed to ensuring that these borders not only improve but in fact that we do not jeopardize the free flow of traffic across these borders. We need the co-operation of the federal Liberal government. We are, as a government, sponsoring a round table on border crossings on November 2, where we're bringing 50 to 60 of the top CEOs in this province to talk about solutions in terms of improving and looking 15, 20 years down the road.

I'm advised that MTO, the Michigan Department of Transportation, Transport Canada and the US Federal Highway Administration are working together to develop a single integrated planning process to provide additional capacity at the Windsor-Detroit gateway. All alternatives, including the Huron Church Road, will be considered as part of that planning process.

TAXATION

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is for the Minister of Finance and it concerns how many jobs will have to be lost in Ontario before the Minister of Finance shows some leadership and announces a sales tax holiday for the province.

Every day more working people lose their jobs and every lost job is more evidence that your tired agenda of cutting corporate taxes is a failure. Stelco has just announced 435 layoffs in Hamilton and Welland. The restaurant industry has warned you of thousands of layoffs to come in that industry. I was just at the Jacuzzi Canada factory, where 116 workers are facing the loss of their jobs from a shutdown of that plant.

Leadership is needed now, before Ontario loses more jobs. Will you give the economy a boost, will you give consumer confidence a boost and announce a sales tax holiday now?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): I appreciate the leader of the third party's suggestions with respect to tax cuts. I'm pleased, of course, as finance minister, that he now supports tax cuts in the province of Ontario, having voted against our proposals with respect to tax cuts for years now, since 1995, in this Legislature. So the conversion is welcomed.

Now we have to look at what tax cuts work most effectively in our economy. Our view on this side of the

House, based on the experience we've had, led by Premier Harris since 1995, is that reductions in personal income tax in particular have the most beneficial effect for sustainable, long-term job creation in the province. It is for that reason that the Premier announced that the reductions in personal income tax that were scheduled to come into effect on January 1, 2002, have been accelerated to October 1, 2001.

Mr Hampton: The question was about extending a sales tax holiday for the 11 million consumers across the province.

Since you've become finance minister, Ontario has lost 26,000 jobs, and your only response is to come out with your tired old one-trick story of another corporate tax cut.

Minister, it's consumer confidence that's in question. Consumer confidence in the United States is already suffering. Consumer confidence here is also on the wane. When are you going to do the right thing to address consumer confidence? Forget about giving another tax cut to your corporate buddies. Declare a sales tax holiday for the hard-pressed consumers of the province.

Hon Mr Flaherty: I appreciate the member opposite's views, and if he has other suggestions, I welcome them as well. Certainly all policy options are considered.

We are in the midst of a building boom in Ontario that's funded, to a significant extent, by in excess of \$8 billion in SuperBuild spending. This is the third fiscal year of that spending. All the spending that people see around their communities in Ontario—hospitals being built, additions going on hospitals, brand new schools throughout the province, expansion of highways—all of that is that more than \$8 billion of spending which, due to preplanning, is now having its stimulant effect in the economy of Ontario.

In context, yes, we are in an economic slowdown; yes, we have the effects of September 11. But a total of 836,000 net new jobs have been created in Ontario since the throne speech in 1995. That's the record of the Mike Harris government in Ontario.

Mr Hampton: Minister, we're talking about now. We're talking about the thousands of people who have lost their jobs in the last three or four months and the hundreds who face announcements this week. The only response we've heard from you was a phony, bogus announcement last week that you were going to reduce the PST for performers at benefit concerts.

You know as well as I that in fact that's already covered in the regulations. Your announcement was completely phony. That's always been the case where performers perform for free.

Minister, instead of issuing phony announcements, instead of talking about your corporate tax cuts, which only go to those corporations that have a profit, how about doing something to benefit the consumers across this province? Announce a sales tax holiday now, and announce it on the things that people need: winter clothing, school supplies, things that people need, and if they

purchase them, they'll help restore consumer confidence. How about it, Minister?

Hon Mr Flaherty: Speaker, we are in favour of benefit concerts like the ones performed recently in Ontario. They show dedication by those performers who do that. The memorandum that was issued from my ministry dealt with confirmation that there is no PST charged on those matters, which is appropriate.

I welcome the suggestions from the member opposite. If he has more, I look forward to hearing them.

Today we announced that the fall economic statement will be made in the Legislature on November 6, following the tradition established in Ontario by my predecessor Ernie Eves. I look forward at that time to dealing with economic matters in this place. If the member opposite has suggestions, or any members opposite have suggestions that they think ought to be considered in the fall economic statement, I welcome them.

1420

AUDIOLOGY SERVICES

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): I have a question to the Minister of Health. Thousands of people across Ontario are asking you to reverse your decision to delist the work of audiologists. You've received thousands of names on petitions, and recently you will have received correspondence from the chiefs of ear, nose and throat specialty for the largest teaching hospitals in Ontario, telling you to reverse your decision, to not delist from OHIP the services of audiologists, because if you continue to do that, you are going to chase thousands of audiologists from their practices in Ontario.

What is your response to all of those citizens who've sent you petitions and letters, and what is your response to the chiefs of ear, nose and throat specialty from the largest teaching hospitals in Ontario?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I assume the honourable member is not reading verbatim what the letter would say, because in fact there aren't thousands of audiologists affected. There are 300 audiologists affected, and we did not delist services. Those services are still listed via OHIP. They are available by either ear, nose and throat specialists or audiologists working with ENT doctors. They are available through hospitals; they are available through clinics; they are available through doctors' offices. I want to assure the people of Ontario that those particular functions and the clinical work are still available via OHIP to the public at large. I'm not sure how the honourable member is reading the letter, but I would make those corrections to the record.

Mr Hampton: Minister, you will know that the chiefs of ear, nose and throat specialty at Sunnybrook and Women's College hospital, the chief at St Mike's, the chief at Sick Kids, the chief at Toronto General Hospital and the chief at Mount Sinai have all said to you that if you continue with this ill-advised policy, audiologists will leave this province.

They have also said to you that this will put especially children and families who have modest and low incomes at risk.

Your government was very successful at chasing thousands of nurses out of the province. Is it now your intention to do the same thing with audiologists? Please listen to these specialists from the largest teaching hospitals in the province who are trying to tell you that you're going to do the same thing to audiologists that you did to nurses: that you will chase them out of the hospital, and it will be poorest people in Ontario, and especially children, who will suffer the most from your ill-advised policy.

Hon Mr Clement: The honourable member is making reference to medical specialists and their points of view. I wish to share with the House that the recommendations involving this particular issue were made by the diagnostic hearing test subcommittee of what is called the Physician Services Committee. By its very title it obviously has practising physicians who advise this government, as well as the Ontario Medical Association, on how to ensure that we abide by the terms and conditions of the government and OMA contractual arrangement with respect to fees. This does come from physicians; it does come from experts. It in no way diminishes the ability to acquire these kinds of hearing tests and other procedures through OHIP and it certainly is our intention to ensure that this is available through OHIP in the future as well.

HEALTH CARE

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): My question is for the Minister of Health. It seems that you and your federal leader, Stockwell Day, think alike when it comes to the future of health care. Maybe it's appropriate that your new communications assistant comes straight from Mr Day's office, because your speeches are starting to sound pretty similar.

Mr Day was talking this weekend about the value of bringing competition into health care and opening up the system to more private clinics. He was also talking about the role of user fees: charging people for the care they receive when they're sick.

Minister, we know that you like private clinics. You set up the private cancer clinic. You talk about setting up private clinics for MRIs. We know that you would rather fund private clinics than properly fund hospitals. So my question today is, how far are you going to go down Mr Day's road? You clearly support the establishment of private clinics. Do you also agree with Mr Day that patients are costing the health care system too much and we should start charging people for care when they're sick?

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): Let me just state for the record that we've always had a mixture of public-private delivery of publicly funded physicians' services and other health services in Ontario. The honourable member's doctor would

be a private sector provider of health care. Diagnostics are sometimes provided by the private sector, as well as nursing home services. It's not unusual to have a mix of that, and we continue to support an appropriate mix.

The honourable member brings into focus some of the federal issues involving this issue, and I agree with Prime Minister Jean Chrétien when he says that the current system is unsustainable and we need to have new and innovative ways to look at our health care system. He has gone further than that and talked about user fees. That certainly would be contrary to the Canada Health Act. His Minister of Health, the Honourable Allan Rock, has said that the current system is unsustainable, and certainly it is, given the level of federal funding. He has asked for new and creative ideas, and that is what we're looking for. We certainly haven't heard it from the other side of the House.

Mrs McLeod: I was hoping that we would get from you today a categorical denial that you would consider expanding user fees for health care in the province of Ontario, despite the fact that you're after the federal government to give you more flexibility to keep the doors open, despite the fact that we know that one of the doors that you want to keep open is the idea of a medical savings account.

Minister, I say to you today what everybody should understand: a medical savings account is a private health care voucher, nothing less. Medical savings accounts are a camouflage for charging huge user fees to the people who can least afford them. The sicker you are, the more you pay out of your own pocket for health care, and sick seniors get hit the hardest.

Minister, I ask you today to give us an absolute assurance, to give an absolute assurance to the people of this province, that you will never consider bringing this voucher for private health care into the province of Ontario.

Hon Mr Clement: The honourable member is referring to some things that are not permissible under the current Canada Health Act. She knows that her Prime Minister, my Prime Minister, Jean Chrétien, has launched a royal commission which has as its head the former NDP Premier of Saskatchewan, Roy Romanow, who incidentally has said that the current system is unsustainable and needs some creative thinking. They are charged with the responsibility of looking at all possible ways to reform our health care system to ensure that it provides excellent, quality care, not only for us but for our children and our grandchildren. I support that process. If the honourable member has a problem with the Prime Minister of Canada or her health minister in Ottawa, that's her problem. It certainly isn't my problem.

Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa): I'd like to ask all to join me in welcoming the students and the hard-working faculty of Monsignor John Pereyma, who have joined—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. Stop the clock. I appreciate the members and I don't get mad when it's done outside of question period. I would appreciate it if we don't do it during question period. It

does take away time if somebody is going to miss some questions for it. We're sorry to see them leave, but please don't do it during question period. It is also very confusing. I see somebody stand up; I don't even know who's supposed to be asking the question.

WATER QUALITY

Mr Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. My riding of Waterloo-Wellington includes a very large rural component but also a significant urban component in the city of Kitchener. My residents are concerned about a safe and secure supply of drinking water.

Can the minister inform the House what his ministry is doing to help protect our water supplies?

Hon Brian Coburn (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs): I thank the member from Waterloo-Wellington for the question. Certainly a clean, secure supply of water is extremely important to all of us. That is one of the key objectives in the Ontario healthy futures program. That particular program also encompasses our municipal and rural partners, that we work toward improving service in groundwater in a number of rural areas across the province.

As we all know, this member's riding is one of the richest agricultural communities in Ontario and it's one of the fastest-growing urban centres. That's why our government has recently announced \$740,000 in a \$1-million initiative which is a joint partnership with municipalities, the conservation authority, the county, and local residents in the city of Guelph, who are pitching in to protect their water supply.

Another example in that particular area is a commitment to rural water quality that involves the county of Huron, where through the healthy futures program we've provided half the funding in a \$5-million project aimed at helping landowners in implementing best—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Supplementary?

Mr Arnott: I want to thank the minister for his answer and for his work in this area.

I know that he is also aware that the issues of water quality and supply in Waterloo-Wellington also encompass the need to repair the gates in the Conestoga dam. The Conestoga dam is responsible for low-flow augmentation to enhance water quality in the Grand River. This means that when water levels are low at certain times of the year, the gates of the dam are opened wider to allow more water into the river. This is vitally important because, at times, the Conestoga dam is responsible for up to 60% of the drinking water in the city of Kitchener.

As I've stated a number of times in this House, three out of four of the gates in the Conestoga dam are broken and need to be fixed. The Grand River Conservation Authority has approached the government, requesting financial assistance to help defray the \$1.2- to \$1.5-million cost of these necessary repairs. I have supported the position taken by the GRCA, that being that the provincial

government should be a major funding partner in the costs of these repairs. If the minister agrees with me that the government should be a major partner, can he tell this House how and when this will happen?

1430

Hon Brian Coburn: Certainly, as the member knows, we have a number of programs available to address these various situations that we're confronted with. From my understanding, our staff are meeting with members of the Grand River Conservation Authority in the hope of partnering with them to resolve this particular issue and repair the dam. At present, we're considering all of the programs that are available to us and all of the avenues.

I can assure members of this House that our government is committed to helping Ontario's rural communities. The Ontario small town and rural development initiative, better known as OSTAR, is an example of this government's commitment to ensuring that rural Ontario has the resources to meet the infrastructure needs of today and tomorrow. We are examining the options available to us under that particular program and others.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): My question is for the Minister of Finance. Five biohazard scientists have been fired; London, Ontario, has lost a specialized pediatric section at the London Health Sciences Centre; and in Sarnia-Lambton, the St Clair Child and Youth Services was denied \$150,000 by your government for an intervention program for families and children—all of these cuts in the name of keeping costs down.

Here is the contradiction that I would like you to explain. Your figures show that in 1995, your Cabinet Offices were \$7,858,000. At year end 2000, they were \$15,816,000. I checked the year 2001, and they have yet increased to \$18,250,000. I'd like you to explain how come you approve of such a double standard.

Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): I gather the figures that the member opposite was using relate to Cabinet Office. I wasn't sure—

Ms Di Cocco: Cabinet Office.

Hon Mr Flaherty: Cabinet Office is part of the public service, as you know. It's the deputy minister's office to the Premier, and substantial responsibilities are carried on by that office in service to the people of Ontario. If the concern is to have more detail with respect to the line-by-line budgeting of Cabinet Office, that can be obtained.

Ms Di Cocco: Minister, this is a matter of finances. It's a matter of keeping operational costs down, which you have done across the board in this province except in the Cabinet Office. You've increased your cabinet operational costs and they've skyrocketed by 116% since 1995.

You explain this increase to those scientists who were just fired, to the pediatric specialists in London, Ontario, and to the families affected in Sarnia-Lambton by the

closure of the Family Solutions program. Could you please explain that?

Hon Mr Flaherty: As the member will know, in the Common Sense Revolution and under the leadership of Premier Harris, the size of the Ontario public service has been reduced dramatically since 1995. Not only that, but since 1995 the Ontario public service has been called upon to perform quite a significant restructuring. All of that is supervised in the Ontario public service through Cabinet Office, which I'm sure accounts for a great deal of the growth in the work of that office over the course of the past six years.

The point—and I'm sure the honourable member is concerned about saving money in government—is that there has been substantial downsizing of the Ontario public service, but the level of performance—the standards as performed by the Ontario public service—has gone up. You should be proud of the public service in Ontario.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): My question is to the Minister of Energy, Science and Technology. You well know that my Durham riding includes the Oak Ridges moraine, plus extensive forests and farmlands. We also have important wetlands and lakes and streams—just a great place to live and work and raise a family. You can well appreciate the commitment Durham riding residents have toward the stewardship of our environment. I can hardly stop and think for a moment of John Thomson, who is chair of the Orono Crown Lands Trust, a newly formed committee; Reverend Frank Lockhart from Valleys 2000; and Protect the Ridges group, as well as the Scugog Shores Millennium Project. All of these people demand the highest regard to sustainable environmental attitude.

Minister, can you advise us today what's occurring in Ontario to promote leaner, more sustainable energy forms such as wind forms?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): A sustainable and clean environment is a very important part of our electricity restructuring plans in the province of Ontario.

The member will know that we plan to open a competitive market by May of next year in the electricity sector, and that's opening up for the first time opportunities for green energy suppliers.

In August, Ontario Power Generation erected, for example, North America's largest new wind turbine at the Pickering nuclear power station. At full power, this turbine could supply enough electricity for some 1,800 homes. The Pickering wind turbine project is part of OPG's \$50-million commitment to expand its green power holdings by May 2005.

In the past, these wind power projects or sustainable energy electricity projects were not permitted by previous governments. The opening up of the electricity market to

competition allows us to move forward on these projects for the first time.

Mr O'Toole: Thank you very much for that detailed response, Minister. I know you know that Durham is the home to two nuclear facilities as well as the future concept of sustainable energy, the ITER project. I know you've talked about it. You visited my riding. It's good to see that alternative forms of energy sources are being considered seriously, and I thank you for your strong leadership in that category.

Will there be any other wind project or energy developments in Ontario besides the OPG-British Energy project in the future?

Hon Mr Wilson: Well, the OPG-British Energy project is the second wind power project that is designed to be installed near Kincardine, Ontario. There will be a series of new windmills there, and it will supply power for quite a few hundred homes also.

The Toronto Renewable Energy Co-operative: other governments have talked about this but it never really got off the ground. It's a community-based wind energy developer. It's partnering with Toronto Hydro Energy Services to construct two to three large wind turbines on Toronto's waterfront in the next year.

There are several other private sector projects expected to be built around the province. We know, having done a study across the province recently, sort of an overview of the potential for wind energy in particular, there are some very good sites. You will find, if you look at those sites, that there are private sector bidders right now trying to acquire the land in many sites across the province.

Again, none of this was possible without the restructuring of the electricity sector, and I'm very proud that something will be—

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The minister's time is up. New question.

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): My question is to the Minister of Labour. Under your labour laws in the province of Ontario, does an employer's dissatisfaction with a union bargaining proposal constitute sufficient grounds to dismiss an entire workforce?

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Labour): Having spent some time in this place, I think I'm prepared to wait for the supplementary. So let me just hedge that with: I don't know. What are you talking about?

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Supplementary?

Mr Bisson: Mr Speaker, supplementary to the minister, he knows very well what I'm talking about because I've spoken to him on this issue a number of times last week.

You'll know that there are some 20 workers in Timmins at the St Mary's Manor who now have been served termination notices by their employer because the employer refuses to go to the bargaining table. For three years, that employer has stalled bargaining, has not

shown up at the table, and now, because the employees have been successful in forcing that employer to the table November 7, the employer showed up with termination notices, saying, "You're all fired as of November 4. See you later."

My question to you is fairly simple. You're sending a message, first of all, to the seniors. They're scared about what's going to happen to their service. But what's even more troubling is, you're saying to employers across Ontario, "If you don't like what the union puts on the bargaining table, just fire them."

So my question to you is simply this: Minister, the workers have filed a complaint with the labour board. Will you ask the board to hear their case before these men and women who take care of our seniors get fired by their employer on November 4?

Hon Mr Stockwell: I think it's fair to suggest that any time a Minister of Labour gets involved in an issue, you want to make sure it's not before the Ontario Labour Relations Board. The fact of the matter is, if there was something before the Ontario Labour Relations Board and you found out subsequently that I'd got involved, you'd be standing in your place suggesting, "We should fire this guy because he got involved in a quasi-judicial process and tried to influence a decision of the Ontario Labour Relations Board," and you'd be right.

That's why Ministers of Labour don't get involved in situations that are before the Ontario Labour Relations Board. So my answer would be as you expect: if there's a dispute between a union and management and that dispute can't be settled and they believe they're bargaining in bad faith, the place to go is the Ontario Labour Relations Board. When you were in office, when the Liberals were in office, when we're in office, that's where you settle disputes. I can't get involved. It's a quasi-judicial process. I shouldn't get involved. If I were to get involved, you'd be off the map complaining about the fact that I was involved. So I think the Ontario Labour Relations Board, stocked with a bunch of good, hard-working, intelligent people, is capable of sorting this one out, and I suggest you wait to hear their decision.

1440

TAX CREDIT

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): I have a question to the Minister of Finance. Earlier this year the leader of our party outlined an education policy that would improve the teacher-classroom ratio, would take a number of steps to improve education in this province at the elementary, the secondary and the post-secondary levels—a leader with a clear idea on the education file. You will understand how members on this side of the House were just astounded on Friday when we heard you say, referencing the education tax credit, "It was brought forward by others this year, not by me." You appeared to be disowning what was at the very heart of your own budget. Minister, who did bring this idea forward, then,

and why won't you defend it more strongly publicly now that the debate is over?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): The education tax credit issue was raised during the pre-budget consultations by various groups of parents, educators and students, who felt that the government of the day, our government, ought to give consideration to an issue which quite frankly has been raised for many years in the province of Ontario. The situation in Canada on the issue is that in excess of 50% of students in Canada had access to this type of assistance for private education—all of the provinces west of Ontario, and Quebec. With the Ontario law having been changed now in the June budget bill, we're at a point where the vast majority of people in Canada have access to some assistance, after paying their taxes, for education in private schools. That's the situation in Canada today.

Mr Duncan: My question related more to the situation in cabinet, because your Minister of Education, your colleague from Durham, in a letter dated January 13, 2000, in responding to the federal government, said:

"The government of Ontario is not prepared to adopt the alternative suggested by the United Nations for complying with the decision, namely (1) to provide direct funding to private religious schools, (2) to eliminate funding separate schools or (3) to provide religious instruction. We believe that our commitment and resources must continue to focus on preserving and improving the quality of our publicly funded system."

What did the Premier say in 2000? "As our provincial Minister of Education has made clear, our government is committed to preserving and improving public education, and we don't support the extension of tax credits to private schools."

Since you're denying ownership of it, since the Minister of Education denied it less than two years ago, since your own Premier denied it less than two years ago, who in cabinet is putting this forward, and why does it appear that all of a sudden you're backing off from your very own budget centrepiece of only four months ago?

Hon Mr Flaherty: I can assure the member opposite that no one is backing off anything. When I was asked the question the other day, "Who was this brought forward by?" I said it was brought forward by others. It was, in the pre-budget consultations. If the member doesn't understand that, then he ought to have a look at what we do in pre-budget consultations. Many suggestions are brought forward from all sectors of our economy. It became a matter of government policy in the budget and in the budget bill. That bill was passed by this House toward the end of June.

But I emphasize to the member that he is in a minority position, that the majority of students in Canada who attend private schools have access to some degree of government assistance. The province of Ontario has now joined the majority in this country. You would deny to our students who attend private schools any assistance from government. That's your choice; you'll have to live with that.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr Norm Miller (Parry Sound-Muskoka): My question today is for the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. Mining is a very important industry in Ontario and in particular across northern Ontario. Minister, can you tell this House about some initiatives this government has taken since 1995, and can you tell us in particular about the recent initiatives you've been up to?

Hon Dan Newman (Minister of Northern Development and Mines): I thank the member for Parry Sound-Muskoka for his question. When it comes to the mining sector, our government has worked hard to make Ontario an attractive place to mine. That's why Ontario was recently ranked the top mining jurisdiction in Canada and the third in the world by the Fraser Institute.

Some of the actions our government has taken to support the minerals industry include freezing taxes and fees on mining, reducing the mining tax and implementing a 10-year tax holiday for new remote mines. We've actively promoted Ontario's mineral industry internationally through Market Ontario. We've also made significant investments to stimulate this industry. For example, we've allocated \$29 million for airborne and regional surveys for Operation Treasure Hunt, to stimulate mineral exploration. Right now, we're implementing a \$27-million provincial program to restore former mining lands to productive use as crown land.

We recognize there is still more to do, and we will not rest on our accomplishments. We will not rest until we are ranked not only number one in Canada but also number one in the world.

Mr Miller: Minister, I know the people of northern Ontario will be pleased to hear about some of these recent actions of yours. I had the opportunity to be at the opening of the North American palladium mine up in Thunder Bay. That's certainly showing that your work is benefiting the people of Ontario.

I'm especially interested in what you've been doing recently and what recent actions you've taken to support the minerals industry in Ontario.

Hon Mr Newman: On October 18, I was pleased to announce that the Mike Harris government is supporting the efforts of the mining equipment industry on their trade mission to Mexico.

Expo Minería 2001 was held in Mexico from October 17 to 20. Ontario Exports Inc and my ministry took part in supporting the eight northern companies by assisting in securing local agents and distributors with Mexican buyers. This trade effort will contribute to future economic growth and job creation in the province by helping Ontario's mining machinery manufacturers seize the opportunity and increase their export sales.

It is opportunities like Expo Minería 2001 that allow Ontario's mineral sector to demonstrate the importance of mining, not only to the northern Ontario communities but also to the global community, as we aggressively market our products to the world.

AIR QUALITY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a question for the Minister of Energy. We have a major problem in this province with air pollution, with coal-fired plants belching out all kinds of contaminants that are causing great problems for the people of the whole province in terms of air quality. There is an opportunity for you, as the chief shareholder of Ontario Power Generation, to make a positive move, and that would be to ensure that Ontario Power Generation proceeds immediately with the Sir Adam Beck 3 generating station, which would produce air-pollution-free electricity in this province and would be a major boost to the economy of Ontario through the investment in that particular project. As well, you would gain energy for the grid in the province of Ontario.

Minister, will you now agree, as the chief shareholder in Ontario Power Generation, to proceed immediately with that project, which is a winner for both the economy and the environment?

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): The honourable member makes some good points. Certainly we've looked at the business case for Beck 3 on many, many occasions. I myself have toured down there on several occasions. If the business case can be found that it can be justified, that we find the environmental offsets to be a part of that business case and help justify the case, then we'll move forward with Beck 3; it's certainly not off the map. But his government and the NDP left us with a \$38-billion debt, and guess what? No bank will lend us a penny to develop Beck 3. You should be ashamed of the record you guys left on electricity in this province.

Mr Bradley: I can tell the minister that they're borrowing a lot of money to expand their retail projects right now in Ontario, they're buying up all the local utilities, but you're telling me they don't have money for Sir Adam Beck 3.

It's not as though this project has to be dreamed up. The plans are in place to proceed with it. There's a will in the construction industry in Ontario to move forward, with an investment on your part of some \$500 million. It will generate a lot of jobs and generate tax revenue for you. It will improve the environment immensely. You have to take into account in the business case what the Ontario Medical Association said, that it's a \$10-billion-a-year cost to the province of Ontario in terms of air pollution, particularly from the largest polluter in the province which, as you know, Mr Speaker, is the Nanticoke generating station, which produces all kinds of contaminants.

Minister, will you today, as the chief shareholder of Ontario Power Generation, order the immediate development and construction of the Sir Adam Beck generating station? I will be the first to praise you, I assure you, for benefiting both the economy and the environment of this province.

1450

Hon Mr Wilson: I wish things were as the honourable member thinks they are, but they just don't get it across the way.

The fact of the matter is, we have no choice. We don't want to become a California or an Alberta and not have enough supply in this province in the next few years. We have to deal with the \$38-billion debt. We can't just build government projects willy-nilly all over the place with no business case like they did in the past. The fact of the matter is, nobody will lend us the money to do Beck 3. You left us bankrupt. You did nothing during your time in office to deal with the debt of the old Ontario Hydro monopoly.

We're more responsible. We're moving forward, paying down that debt and building projects that make sense, not only for the environment—and that's why we spent \$2 billion on the environment during my time as Minister of Energy—but also moving forward in a sensible manner so that the people of Ontario, our children and our grandchildren aren't saddled with the irresponsible debts and the approach you took to Ontario Hydro. No more bad management, no more mismanagement. We will do projects that make sense, and we'll do projects that are paid for.

FORT HENRY

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): My question is directed to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation. For many years, my family and I and many of my constituents have enjoyed trips to Old Fort Henry in Kingston. As a matter of fact, this fort is of particular interest to me since I grew up just west of Kingston and have taken significant interest in that particular fort. Lately, however, we've noticed the fort is undergoing some renovation work and that some areas are closed off by scaffolding.

This weekend, I was concerned to hear that the Kingston-Whig Standard reported that as the owner of the fort the federal government has yet to commit any new funding to help preserve this important national treasure. What is our government doing to support the repair of Old Fort Henry, which is owned by the federal government?

Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Tourism, Culture and Recreation): I thank the member for the question. Obviously it's a very important issue in the Kingston area and along the St Lawrence Seaway. The member makes a great point: the federal government is the owner, the landlord of Fort Henry; we're simply the tenant. For a dollar a year we rent the fort from the federal government, and yet, despite that dollar, we cross-subsidize the fort by about \$1.2 million a year.

The fort is in a condition of disrepair in many areas. It's an old fort, and it needs a significant injection to help maintain jobs in that area—the economic spinoffs from tourism in the Kingston area—and to help support the award-winning provincial programming at the fort. I

have come to the table, through the Mike Harris government, with a \$5-million contribution for that fort, to help restore its grandeur. The member asked what the federal government is doing. Sadly, nothing but fiddling while the fort crumbles.

Mr Galt: Let me clarify this. The Ontario government is paying to repair federal property. The federal government has a surplus in excess of \$10 billion. The federal surplus is there due to the province of Ontario's economic policies, and yet they expect us to repair it. It seems as though the federal Liberals in Ottawa are confusing things once again. I'm pleased to see that our government has once again demonstrated to the federal government what leadership is indeed all about. In the article, Minister Copps states that she is waiting for the province to make a SuperBuild commitment to the fort. Once this is done, she says she will release matching federal funds to repair federal property.

Minister, could you clarify the SuperBuild process as it relates to funding repairs such as to Old Fort Henry?

Hon Mr Hudak: The member again makes a very good point. In fact, there is no SuperBuild application from Kingston; they have another project they put forward. So either Minister Copps is trying to confuse the issue or is simply confused about the issue.

The facts are clear. The province has come forward with \$5 million to support what is federal property, because we believe in the jobs, we believe in the tourism component and we believe in the economic spinoffs for eastern Ontario. Certainly local member Bob Runciman has been a strong supporter of the tourism benefits from the fort. I don't understand why the federal government continues to fiddle while the fort crumbles. They have not come to the table. It's extremely unfortunate.

Even the federal MP for the area, in fact, the very Speaker of the House, the Honourable Peter Milliken, has said that the federal government should be involved in getting the fort fixed and is urging them to do that. Unfortunately, there is no response to his actions.

I'll call on Minister Copps again today. Perhaps if the fort were in Shawinigan it would get some funding, but the federal government has completely abandoned its responsibilities to Fort Henry.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): My question is to the Minister of Finance. It is about the 84 swimming pools located in Toronto schools that are earmarked to be shut down at the end of this year. There are 62,000 people who use those pools every year: men, women, children; adults who belong to swim teams.

The city of Toronto has indicated it will give up to \$3 million to the school board to help keep them open. However, the school board still requires an additional \$7 million in order to make sure that the people of Toronto have somewhere to swim next year.

When will you provide the additional \$7 million in funding to the Toronto District School Board, or when

will you change the funding formula which will allow those pools to stay open?

Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): To the Minister of Education.

Hon Janet Ecker (Minister of Education, Government House Leader): If I could beg the member's indulgence, I didn't hear all of the question. My apologies for that, but if he'd repeat it I'd be quite pleased to try to answer it.

Mr Prue: I'll ask the last part again. Madam Minister, when will you provide the additional funding of \$7 million to the Toronto District School Board to keep the pools open, or when will you change the funding formula, which will allow them to spend sufficient monies to keep those schools open so the people have somewhere to swim next year?

Hon Mrs Ecker: Thank you to the member for repeating the part of the question. As he knows, the province has never funded swimming pools in schools. That is not something that has been provided through education funding. Some boards have chosen to provide the service in various ways. Some have paid for it out of their own resources and some have made arrangements with the community so that the pool might well be located in a school, but the costs are defrayed with community support. Others use community services to provide this to their children. Some schools do not provide swimming at all.

It's not part of core curriculum and it's never been funded by the Ministry of Education. It is certainly something that I know the parents see very much as a benefit for their children. I know the Toronto board is trying to work out an arrangement with the municipality, as other boards have always provided this service; that's the way they've always provided it. I hope that the municipality and the board are able to work that out for the kids.

Mr Prue: Madam Minister, I want to remind you that in January of this year your ministry stated in a news release: "Sports are an important part of students' educational experience. The government is seeking to ensure that all students in the province have continued access to a full range of activities necessary for a balanced educational experience."

I also quote from another document. The advisory group concluded in April this year, "Our goal in this report is to serve students first. Students deserve opportunities to expand their minds and develop new skills by playing sports."

When will you live up to the statements in your own government reports and ensure that funding is provided for swimming programs in all of our schools?

Hon Mrs Ecker: With all due respect to the honourable member, we have never funded swimming pools. That has never been part of the core education funding. I think it would be highly inappropriate for us to now start funding swimming pools in one school board and not be prepared to offer that to all other school boards. Or what about all the children who don't want to do swimming, who do skating, for example, or field hockey or any of

the other ranges of sports and activities that are available to our kids in our schools across the province?

Of course, recreational activities are exceedingly important for our kids and many, many schools offer a range of activities for our children. I encourage the Toronto school board to continue to work with the municipality to find a solution, as other school boards have, to make sure that swimming is also part of the services that would be available to the kids.

1500

Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to ask the member for London-Fanshawe to withdraw some remarks and heckles that he made while the Leader of the Opposition, Dalton McGuinty, was advancing his question to the Minister of Health, specifically regarding Dr John Lee. The member for London-Fanshawe at that time suggested that my leader ought to listen to someone other than a doctor who makes more than \$500,000 a year.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Order. The member can at any time withdraw anything and I'm sure the member will if he's interested in doing it.

PETITIONS

PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICES

Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East): I have a petition that was originally given to the member from Don Valley West, who refused to bring it on behalf of his constituents, so it is here today. It reads:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the provincial government has seen fit to award a contract to Canadian Radiation Oncology Services Ltd, a private, for-profit company, to perform after-hours services at Sunnybrook Hospital,

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

"To rescind and/or do whatever is necessary to bring these services under the jurisdiction of the public health system; and

"Furthermore, we believe that no profit should be made on the seriously ill, particularly since there is a public system already in place that can, with proper management, handle it effectively."

I concur with this petition wholeheartedly and I am honoured to add my signature to it.

OHIP SERVICES

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): I have petitions here which read:

"It's time to listen: petition to the Ontario Legislature:

"Whereas the Harris government's decision to delist hearing aid evaluation and re-evaluation from OHIP coverage will lead to untreated hearing loss; and

“Whereas these restrictions will cut off access to diagnostic hearing tests, especially in geographic regions of the province already experiencing difficulties due to shortages of specialty physicians; and

“Whereas OHIP will no longer cover the cost of miscellaneous therapeutic procedures, including physical therapy and therapeutic exercise; and

“Whereas services no longer covered by OHIP may include thermal therapy, ultrasound therapy, hydrotherapy, massage therapy, electrotherapy, magnetotherapy, transcutaneous nerve therapy stimulation and biofeedback; and

“Whereas one of the few publicly covered alternatives includes hospital outpatient clinics where waiting lists for such services are up to six months long; and

“Whereas delisting these services will have a detrimental effect on the health of all Ontarians, especially seniors, children, hearing-impaired people and industrial workers; and

“Whereas the government has already delisted \$100 million worth of OHIP services,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately restore OHIP coverage for these delisted services.”

I will affix my signature to this petition.

Hon David Turnbull (Solicitor General): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Don Valley East, I believe, has just made the allegation that I refused to present a petition. He and his mother before him have been members of this House for some length of time and would know perfectly well that a minister of the crown cannot present any petition. I would ask him to withdraw his remarks.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The minister is correct. Ministers are not allowed to do petitions. The member for Durham may, though.

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I won't be part of this. I'm above that.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): “Whereas the provincial Durham region, including Clarington, Scugog township and portions of north and east Oshawa”—it's my riding—“comprise one of the fastest-growing communities in Canada; and,

“Whereas the residents of Durham riding are experiencing difficulty locating family physicians who are willing to accept new patients; and

“Whereas the good health of Durham residents depends on a long-term relationship with a family physician who can provide ongoing care; and

“Whereas the lack of family physicians puts unnecessary demands and strains on walk-in clinics and emergency departments;

“We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows: that the government of Ontario will:

“Do everything within its power to immediately assess the needs of Durham riding and the Durham region and work with the Ontario Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, local health care providers and elected officials to ensure that there are enough family physicians available to serve this community;

“Make every effort to recruit doctors to set up practice in underserved areas and provide suitable incentives that will encourage them to stay in these communities;”

“Continue its efforts to increase the number of physicians being trained in Ontario medical schools and also continue its programs to enable foreign-trained doctors to qualify in Ontario.”

I'm pleased to support this petition and my constituents who brought it to my attention.

AUDIOLOGY SERVICES

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is entitled “Listen: Our hearing is important,” and it's presented to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It says:

“Whereas services delisted by the Harris government now exceed \$100 million in total; and

“Whereas Ontarians depend on audiologists for the provision of qualified hearing assessments and hearing aid prescriptions; and

“Whereas the new Harris government policy will virtually eliminate access to publicly funded audiology assessments across vast regions of Ontario; and

“Whereas this new Harris government policy is virtually impossible to implement in underserved areas like northern Ontario; and

“Whereas this policy will lengthen waiting lists for patients and therefore have a detrimental effect on the health of these Ontarians;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand the Mike Harris government move immediately to permanently fund audiologists directly for the provision of audiology services.”

I agree with this petition. I affix my signature, and I ask Cherie to bring it to the table.

OHIP SERVICES

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly. It reads as follows:

“Whereas the Harris government's decision to delist hearing aid evaluation and re-evaluation from OHIP coverage will lead to untreated hearing loss; and

“Whereas these restrictions will cut off access to diagnostic hearing tests, especially in geographic regions of the province already experiencing difficulties due to shortages of specialty physicians; and

“Whereas OHIP will no longer cover the cost of miscellaneous therapeutic procedures, including physical therapy and therapeutic exercise; and

“Whereas services no longer covered by OHIP may include thermal therapy, ultrasound therapy, hydrotherapy, massage therapy, electrotherapy, magnetotherapy, nerve stimulation therapy and biofeedback; and

“Whereas one of the few publicly covered alternatives includes hospital outpatient clinics where waiting lists for such services are up to six months long; and

“Whereas delisting these services will have a detrimental effect on the health of all Ontarians, especially seniors, children, hearing-impaired people and industrial workers; and

“Whereas the government has already delisted \$100 million worth of OHIP services,

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately restore OHIP coverage for these delisted services.”

I agree with the petitioners and I’ve affixed my signature to this.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr John Hastings (Etobicoke North): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario dealing with Saving for Our Children’s Future Act.

“Whereas post-secondary education is very important in the development of young adults, to the betterment of society and the economic future of our province; and

“Whereas the continuing challenge and cost of education facing families in Ontario in the 21st century is ever increasing; and

“Whereas the cost of post-secondary education in Ontario requires a combination of government and individual financial support; and

“Whereas the tax credit proposed in Bill 4, Saving for Our Children’s Future, 2001, will effectively and beneficially encourage families to save for their children’s education; and

“Whereas the large majority of children and families with a registered education savings plan do not apply for OSAP”—Ontario student awards program—“thereby freeing millions of dollars for other OSAP students;

“Therefore, we, the undersigned, hereby respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to act quickly to pass Bill 4, Saving for Our Children’s Future, 2001, and thereby extend the opportunity of post-secondary education to thousands of children.”

I affix my signature to this petition.

1510

LONDON HEALTH SCIENCES CENTRE

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): Thousands of names are coming in to constituency offices, concerned over the health care issue in southwestern Ontario.

“Whereas the London Health Sciences Centre is a world-class academic health sciences centre serving people throughout southwestern Ontario; and

“Whereas the Ministry of Health has forced the London Health Sciences Centre to find \$17 million in annual savings by 2005; and

“Whereas the London Health Sciences Centre has agreed to cut 18 programs in order to satisfy directions from the provincial Ministry of Health; and

“Whereas these cuts will put the health of the people of southwestern Ontario, and particularly the children of southwestern Ontario, at risk; and

“Whereas these cuts will diminish the London Health Sciences Centre’s standing as a regional health care resource; and

“Whereas these cuts will worsen the continuing physician shortages in the region;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to demand that the Mike Harris government take immediate action to ensure that these important health services are maintained so that the health and safety of people throughout southwestern Ontario are not put at risk.”

I will add my name to those of the 220 people who have signed this.

OHIP SERVICES

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly. It reads as follows:

“Whereas the decision has been made by the Ministry of Health to delist audiology services from OHIP;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

“We are petitioning the recent decision of the Ministry of Health to delist audiology services covered by OHIP. We who are deaf, deafened, hard of hearing and concerned citizens express strong objection to the recent changes to the funding of OHIP for hearing aid evaluations. The delisting will lead to unmanaged hearing loss, as many people are on limited incomes and cannot afford to pay for these services. The Ministry of Health should not be able to unilaterally decide to delist services without the input from consumers about what we consider to be medically necessary.

“In addition, requiring supervision and delegation of some tasks by an on-site ear, nose and throat specialist is unnecessary and will seriously restrict access to audiology services. Hearing loss has a significant impact on communication ability and quality of life, as well as the ability of people who have hearing loss to live safely and independently. We urge you to reconsider these changes and ensure that the public has universal access to funded, medically necessary services, as is our right.”

I have affixed my signature to it. I agree with the petitioners.

HIGHWAY 407

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): Respectfully, in the interest of saving time, I want to present a petition to the

House on behalf of the Kedron Dells golf course. The membership there are just outraged, and I'm going to read this petition to make it clear why they're outraged.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the province of Ontario has proposed the extension of Highway 407 into the Durham region and the proposed route, designated as the technically preferred route, will dissect the property of Kedron Dells Golf Course Ltd Oshawa," which is part of my riding,

"Whereas such routing will destroy completely five holes, and severely impact two additional holes effectively destroying the golf course as a viable and vibrant public golf course,

"We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to change this routing to one of the other identified alternate routes, thus preserving this highly regarded, public facility patronized annually by thousands of residents" not just in my riding of Durham but Durham region and the entire GTA.

I've got thousands of names here from constituents from all over, not just Durham riding, Durham region and the GTA. I'm pleased to sign and support this petition and to draw it to the attention of the Minister of Transportation, Brad Clark.

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex): "Whereas the November 2000 announcement of massive privatization of Ministry of Transportation services will have a significant detrimental effect on citizen road safety, confidentiality of citizens' information and on the economy of Ontario; and

"Whereas the employees of the Ministry of Transportation are recognized in writing by the provincial government to have provided excellent service on the government's behalf; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario is taking away the livelihood and decreasing the standard of living of thousands of employees and families by its actions both directly and indirectly through spinoff effects; and

"Whereas citizens of Ontario are entitled to safe roads, consistency in driver testing, and competent inspection of trucks, school buses and vehicles carrying dangerous goods; and

"Whereas communities continue to need to retain decent-paying jobs if they are to maintain viability and vibrancy; and

"Whereas we taxpayers have entrusted the provincial government with the maintenance of public safety with an apolitical and efficient public service, a service free of profiteering and protected from conflicts of interests; and

"Whereas privatization is an abdication of such public trust;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to place a moratorium on any further privatization and to restore and promote public service as being of significant value in our society."

I have signed this petition.

OHIP SERVICES

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have another petition regarding audiology. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the Harris government's decision to delist hearing aid evaluation and re-evaluation from OHIP coverage will lead to untreated hearing loss; and

"Whereas these restrictions will cut off access to diagnostic hearing tests, especially in geographic regions of the province already experiencing difficulties due to shortages of specialty physicians; and

"Whereas OHIP will no longer cover the cost of miscellaneous therapeutic procedures, including physical therapy and therapeutic exercise; and

"Whereas services no longer covered by OHIP may include thermal therapy, ultrasound therapy, hydrotherapy, massage therapy, electrotherapy, magnetotherapy, nerve stimulation therapy and biofeedback; and

"Whereas one of the few publicly covered alternatives includes hospital outpatient clinics where waiting lists for such services are up to six months long; and

"Whereas delisting these services will have a detrimental effect on the health of all Ontarians, especially seniors, children, hearing-impaired people and industrial workers; and

"Whereas the government has already delisted \$100 million worth of OHIP services,

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately restore OHIP coverage for these delisted services."

I agree with the petitioners. I've affixed my signature to it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon Jim Flaherty (Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance): I move that the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing November 1, 2001, and ending April 30, 2002, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The member for Oxford.

Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford): I am pleased to support the motion for interim supply. The motion will authorize the government to make payments after the authorization granted by a motion that expires on October 31, 2001. Without this authority, government payments for such things as civil servants, hospitals, municipalities and other transfer payments cannot be made. As a responsible government, we have an obligation to meet that deadline, just as we have an obligation to the principles of fiscal responsibility, accountability and growth, as announced in this year's budget.

The events of the last month have shocked us all. They have caused us to focus on our priorities. Regardless of our differences, I think we all share a few basic desires. We all want a safe place to raise our children. We all want access to a dependable health care system where and when we need it. We all want the best education possible for our children. A strong economy is the only way to ensure that the people of Ontario are protected and the services they need are available when they need them.

Our government is committed to ensuring a strong and prosperous Ontario. There are things a government must do to achieve those goals. The government must be both responsive and responsible, and the government must also be efficient and effective. Now more than ever, the people of Ontario need us to think ahead and exercise discipline through strong leadership and prudent management of their money.

Every day, families across Ontario make responsible choices in managing their own budgets. They expect government to do the same thing. Taxpayers expect and demand that government deliver high-quality services at the lowest possible cost. They expect to receive value for their money, the money authorized by the interim supply motion before us here today.

When this government was first elected in 1995, ministries did not produce business plans. I'm sure that many members in the House, like myself, have been involved in business at one time or another and understand the importance of business planning to the success of that business. Imagine running an approximately \$50-billion-a-year business or corporation without a business plan. There's no reason that government shouldn't be held to the same high standards as well-managed businesses in our province. It is our government that created the business planning process, and we are following it closely.

A well-managed business is also accountable to its shareholders. In this instance our shareholders are Ontario's taxpayers. We must be accountable in the same way that organizations and their workers must take responsibility for their performance and answer to those who pay for and use their services.

1520

Since being elected, this government has taken many important steps to improve both the services it delivers to the public directly and reporting on those it is accountable for. Providing a plan is one part of the accountability process. At the end of the year, the government must report on what it accomplished with the resources entrusted to it. It must state whether it has met the goals it set. The province's annual report and the audited financial statements meet this objective, but much more can be done to improve accountability to the taxpayer.

The process of improving accountability started in 1995 and continues to this day. We are not about to give up now. We must continue to be responsive to the needs of the people of Ontario. We must continue to make responsible choices on their behalf. That is why we need

to account for every dime we spend. In order to do that, we also need to ensure that all scheduled payments are met by passing the motion for interim supply. That's just common sense.

This year, we have introduced measures that will show Ontarians that their government is a responsible manager. The government has improved and will continue to improve its own ability to deliver value-for-money services directly to the public. It is with this goal in mind that we'll be undertaking a value-for-money review of government spending. This review will draw on private sector expertise to ensure that government services and activities are delivered in a cost-effective manner. The value-for-money review of government services and activities will ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of its programs. This review also ensures that programs provide benefits and are consistent with the priorities of the government and the people of Ontario.

The Ontario government must be responsible and accountable to its taxpayers. We need to ensure our partners in the broader public service, who deliver many government programs, do the same.

Our transfer partners play a central role in providing public services. The provincial government sets policy directions, establishes legislation and provides funding for services, such as health care, education and social programs. However, it is the transfer partner that delivers the service. These partners include our schools, hospitals, colleges and universities, and municipalities, which deliver services that are essential to the people of this province.

These bodies often have deep roots in the communities in which they are located. They are in an excellent position to leverage knowledge and expertise, prompt innovation and tailored solutions and access additional sources of funding beyond provincial transfer payments. However, the provincial government still cares about the financial and organizational efficiencies of its transfer partners and how well they provide their services.

We owe it to the people of Ontario to care. In fact, more than 80% of the funds we're talking about in this interim supply motion are in the form of transfer payments, payments which go to these organizations and individuals. That's more than \$45 billion a year. Ontarians have a right to know that they are getting value for the money they entrust to their government. They have a right to know that not a penny is being used unwisely.

This year we are proposing amendments to the Audit Act to allow the Provincial Auditor to conduct broader audits on publicly funded institutions. The proposed amendments would empower the Provincial Auditor to ensure that institutions that receive taxpayers' money spend it prudently, effectively and as intended.

Our shareholders, the people of Ontario, are entitled to have a clear idea of how their money is being spent. This legislation will add a higher level of transparency within publicly funded institutions. It will help the Provincial Auditor do his job in ensuring accountability and responsibility within these institutions. It will help estab-

lish a good accountability framework for government ministries to manage their transfer payments to their transfer partners, and it will help government improve the mechanisms that are in place in order to obtain value for money for taxpayer dollars.

But our responsibility to the people of Ontario does not end there. The Ontario Financial Review Commission was set up in 1995 and again in the year 2000. Each time, the OFRC recommended better planning and accountability within the public sector. The Provincial Auditor has also provided the same advice to the government in his recent annual report. And we listened to them. The proposed Public Sector Accountability Act would require all significant public sector institutions funded by the Ontario taxpayer to balance their budgets and report their business plans to the public every year. This will allow the public to evaluate directly how their hard-earned tax dollars are being used.

They deserve to easily access publicly funded organizations' plans and results through one simple document—an annual report. Taxpayers should be able to assess the performance of their local organizations against similar ones elsewhere in the province.

It must be emphasized that accountability does not end when the books are balanced. True accountability goes beyond the numbers. This proposed legislation guarantees a strong and consistent accountability framework for our publicly funded bodies, one that focuses on the value to the community. We challenge our transfer partners to show courage, to focus on services that are the most valuable to the people of Ontario, to eliminate programs that are outdated and that no longer serve their original purpose, to budget and to live within their means.

I want to make it clear that many efficient, well-run public sector organizations are already producing the materials the proposed act requires and I commend them for their achievements. At the very least, we must provide minimum accountability requirements across the broader public sector.

We believe that organizations funded with taxpayers' money should also be held responsible to carry out their operations in a fiscally prudent manner, in the same way that the government is held responsible. It is in this context that we are asking for all-members' support for the interim supply motion. We owe this to the future of this great province. If we are not accountable now, then our children will have a heavy debt to manage.

We want to continue to grow and thrive in this great province, but in a responsible manner. We want our children to grow up in a province that's full of promise and opportunity. We want to ensure that Ontario remains the best place to live, work and raise a family.

Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for allowing me this time to speak to the interim supply motion.

Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex): It's my pleasure to rise today to speak to the interim supply motion that's before us. I want to pick up where my friend from Oxford just left off. He spoke of accountability and responsibility,

and he wants to assure the taxpayers of the province of Ontario that not a penny is being used unwisely.

I'd like to give an example of where I don't think they're following their own words. I want to bring to your attention an article that was printed in the Windsor Star on October 6 of this year. It's headed "Disabled Aides Cut by Schools." There's a third-grader, Candice Faerber, who attends Notre Dame elementary school with the help of a full-time educational assistant.

"The eight-year-old girl has spina bifida, a congenital defect of the spine that leaves her unable to walk and a condition in which excess spinal fluid puts pressure on her brain. An aide helps here get around in her wheelchair and writes out some of her homework so she can keep up with her class."

But in the week following this article, I want the folks in the province of Ontario to know, Candice will by now have lost the full-time support because of a Catholic school board decision to transfer Notre Dame assistants to other schools where they're needed, and I'll tell you why.

Her mother says, "She's going to fall between the cracks."

"Why should my daughter's education be disrupted?" she asks.

The Windsor-Essex Catholic District School Board, like the other district school boards in this province, has had to make some tough decisions. These decisions are the result of having their provincial funding for children needing intensive support frozen.

1530

The board gets \$15.8 million from the province for special education—not a small sum. It's the same amount that it got two years ago, when the board had 366 special-needs kids. Now there are 436 special-needs kids.

I want to tell you about Marisa Borrelli, a fourth-grader with cerebral palsy and a learning disability. A classmate will be assigned to help her do her work, and the prospect scares her mom because she's afraid that parents will think their kids are being held back and they won't want to help these kids out.

The same stands true for the Greater Essex County District School Board. They're faced with about 800 special-needs pupils, but get provincial grants for only 580 of them. They have to overspend their budget in this area by \$1.5 million and make up for it elsewhere.

When it comes to not spending a penny unwisely, I want to put this in some context. We were told today by my colleague the member for Lambton that the cost of cabinet, the cost of running the political offices in this government, has increased from \$7,858,000 in 1994-95 to \$18,250,000 in the year 2000-01. That's an increase of almost \$11 million. Wouldn't that go a long way to help with the \$1.5 million that the Greater Essex County District School Board finds itself short and the \$750,000 the Catholic school board finds itself short?

In this cabinet spending, the annual salaries paid to ministers and parliamentary assistants have gone from \$751,000 in 1995 to \$1,103,000 in 2001. The cost of

running the government's cabinet offices, its political offices, has more than doubled since 1995, and yet what we read in this article is that the funding for our most vulnerable—our disabled children—in this province has been frozen while the need goes up.

The operating costs for cabinet office, as I've said, totalled \$18.3 million for the fiscal year ending in 2001. I think, when you compare the needs of disabled children in our province, those particularly in the school boards in my riding, to this increase in spending in the cabinet office for the political arm of this government, it's unconscionable. There are monetary perks for the Premier, cabinet ministers and parliamentary assistants that have jumped to \$1.1 million this year.

Since in 1995, of course, we know that Mike Harris and the Mike Harris government and the cabinet have ordered all ministries to streamline their budgets because of a slowing economy. Yet in light of this, they've taken our special-needs kids and what they need in this province and said, "I'm sorry, even though the numbers have increased, even though your need has increased, we don't have the money for it."

I don't think it's fair to the kids involved, I don't think it's fair to the families involved, and I certainly don't agree with the member for Oxford that this is spending every penny wisely.

We can say the same for our community care access centres, which serve the most vulnerable elderly and frail in our province. There too, because of an aging population, the need has grown. There too, because this government has closed hospital beds—critical care and long-term-care hospital beds—the need has increased, and yet while they can more than double the spending in Cabinet Office, they say to these elderly, frail, vulnerable citizens, "I'm sorry. We don't have the money for you." We have waiting lines now, if we can believe it, for care from our community care access centres. We have staff in community care access centres—nurses, nurses' aides, housekeeping staff—who probably aren't paid the wages that should be paid to them so that they can give aid to our elderly and our frail, and yet this government, apparently without any shame—because the Minister of Finance stood here this afternoon and attempted to defend that position—doubles the kind of spending they've done in the political arm of the government and says, "We can't afford to help you," in these other areas.

I know the need is great. In fact, what they spend on their political offices wouldn't come close to meeting the needs in the two areas that I've pointed out this afternoon. But that's not the point. It's the attitude of this government. It's when they go to these frail elderly citizens, it's when they go to our children who need our support, and to that increasing number who need our support say, "Well, we just can't afford to help you out." In fact, it would appear as though they can't afford to help any of them out.

Community care access centre staff do their best. Boards of education do their best. In fact, as we've seen, some boards of education find it necessary to cut back in

other areas just to try to meet the needs of those who need it most. They're not asking a lot. They're just asking for help so that they can have a fair shake in this world. It's a tough world; we know that. But all they're asking for is their fair share, for what they need to support them.

The increase is there in the numbers that need assistance, the increase is there in the need for quality assistance, and yet what does this government say? "We don't have enough money for you. I'm sorry. We have to increase spending in the political arm of our government." I think that's a shame.

The Acting Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Thank you. The Chair recognizes the member for Timmins-James Bay.

Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. First of all, let me congratulate you on your recent appointment to the chair of the House. I look forward, as all members do, to the work that you will do in that chair, because we know that you will be an impartial and very fair Speaker. I'm trying to ingratiate myself with you before I even start.

I want to say upfront that I'll be splitting our time, as we are allowed to do under the rules, with some of my colleagues. So I would put that on the record first of all.

I also want to say that interim supply is one of those very few times that you get a chance in the House to speak overall about a number of issues that the government is responsible for, because by the rules of the House, interim supply allows you that latitude.

It is interesting now that the economy is going into a recession. The provincial government at this point, as we can see—they have been arguing for the past number of years now, since 1995 and the inception of their first income tax cuts, that the only reason the economy of Ontario has been able to accelerate, pick up and create the kinds of jobs that it has over the last number of years, is because of the tax cuts that the provincial government has created when it comes to the income tax side. I have listened intently to the debate of the members across the way and I have listened very carefully to what the Premier has said. He has been very clear. He has said from the beginning, along with members of the House, that if it had not been for the Mike Harris income tax cuts and cuts in tax to the corporations in the province, the economy of Ontario would not have benefited to the degree that it has today.

1540

I find it interesting that now when we find ourselves in a time of economic decline, the government still makes the same argument around tax cuts. The point I want to make upfront is that they can't have it both ways. They can't come into this House, take credit for the rebound in the economy—which actually started in 1993—say it's because of their tax cuts and then, when the economy goes down, say it has nothing to do with their tax cuts. I want to say upfront that it's a really inconsistent argument on the issue of the income tax cuts and the corporate income tax cuts, for them to be able to move

forward, saying that is the only reason the economy picked up. I think the economic decline we have now goes to show that in fact the income tax cuts were not what was greatly responsible for the rebound in the economy.

I would argue that one of the reasons, and not the only reason, the Ontario economy did pick up and has done well over the past number of years since 1993—and, by the way, it was an NDP government in power in 1993, 1994 and 1995 when the economy actually did start to turn around and the number of jobs increased in Ontario—is because of the reality that we trade with the United States. Over 90% of the goods that are produced in Ontario are exported to the United States market, and when there's a huge demand in the United States, such as there has been since 1993, the Ontario economy tends to do well. We are directly related to the economic situation as it unfolds in the United States. I always found it interesting when the government would make their tax cut argument. I used to joke and say, "You know, their tax cuts are so good that it managed to rebound the American economy as well. Imagine what would have happened if they had accelerated it even more."

The point again is that as the American economy went up in 1993, so did the Ontario economy, and now, since their economy has started to slide last summer—even before September 11—so has the Ontario economy. I want to talk about the kinds of things that we need to do as legislators in the province of Ontario—as a New Democrat—and what the response should be in order to try to stimulate activity in the economy.

The first matter I want to deal with is the issue of the tax cuts. I want to say here, as I said before, that I'm not going to stand here and say, "Tax cuts in themselves, even on the income tax side, have absolutely no effect." Of course they'll have some effect. But the argument I would have is that if we have a choice of which taxes we need to cut, there are some that are more effective than others when it comes to giving that shot to the economy. If I go to income tax and I say, "I will reduce the rate of taxes paid on income for the provincial share of income tax," and I give X percentage of reduction, the amount of money that you get in your pocket as a consumer is very little. In fact, the recent accelerated cuts in income tax that the provincial government announced some three or four weeks ago, we now know are basically going to amount to about \$16 of tax savings to the average consumer from September to December, inclusive. What are you going to stimulate with \$16 if that \$16 is spread over a three-month period? The reality is that nobody's really going to notice. Is it going to have any kind of psychological effect, and will it have any real effect on stimulating the economy? I argue, not. I say if you're going to have any kind of a tax cut, you've got to do it somewhere where people see it.

What's the tax that we all see? It's the PST. So I would argue, as my leader Howard Hampton does—that's why Howard Hampton has proposed this, along with our finance critic, the now Speaker in the chair, Mr

Christopherson—that if we want to stimulate the economy by way of tax cuts we need to do it on the PST side. When consumers walk into the store and want to buy an item, especially a big-ticket item, and they can get extra savings by way of PST cuts, there's a bigger and bigger enticement to purchase.

For example, I would have noticed, Mr Speaker, as I think you did, that on the weekend a federal Liberal in Ottawa was calling on the federal government to remove GST on all car sales between now and the month of January. Of course, this member represents a riding in Oshawa that is heavily represented by the Canadian Auto Workers in that area. He argues—and I think a good argument—that if you were to eliminate the PST on auto sales from the month of October until the beginning of January or mid-January, it would be a stimulus for those people who want to buy a car to go out and do so.

Imagine if Ontario was to follow Howard Hampton's suggestion. He was the first to come up with the idea; I'm glad to see that at least the federal Liberals are listening to the suggestions made by Howard Hampton, our leader. If we were to do that as well in Ontario, that would be a 15% saving for the consumer trying to buy an automobile. Imagine the incentive that the dealers across Ontario would be able to promote when it comes to car sales. Anybody looking at buying a car would be running to the car lot, saying, "I can save 15%," and then car dealers would jump in on top of that and say, "Hey, never mind that you save 15% between PST and GST cuts, but I'm prepared, as a dealer"—and I imagine Ford, GM, Chrysler, Mazda and the rest of them would be jumping out and saying, "Here, we've got savings as well." You'd really see a boon to the number of automobiles sold in the economy of Ontario. That would have a direct effect.

That's why our leader, Howard Hampton, and our finance critic, Mr Christopherson, along with all New Democrats, have been calling on the provincial government to move on the issue of PST. If we were to do a PST holiday, either partial or full, we're open to where that line should be drawn—it might be a 3% reduction on PST on all goods across the economy or maybe we want to be specific and say on certain big-ticket items, children's clothes or whatever it might be; we're prepared to move when it comes to that—it would be a direct incentive for the retailers in Ontario to go out there and aggressively go after sales in the pre-Christmas run-up to the month of January. That would do a lot, in my view and in the view of other New Democrats, to help stimulate the economy.

I say to the government, it's a question of choices where you do tax cuts. Your argument is, give tax cuts on the capital side to corporations. I say that's wrong. Who's going to benefit? Who benefits out of the capital tax reduction in Ontario? Is it Mr and Mrs Worker who make \$50,000, \$60,000 a year? Capital taxes will hardly affect them. Is it the small business person who is struggling to make ends meet? I would argue it's not them. Who's going to benefit? It will be those large corporations who move cash out of the province and out of the country and

banks across this province who will greatly benefit by way of capital taxes.

What Harris has decided to do, and the Conservative government generally, is to say, "We want to give corporations a huge tax incentive and not give that to the people at the other end of the economy, those people making \$60,000 a year and under." They're going to put all their eggs into corporate tax cuts. I argue that's not where you need to put it. You need to put it on the consumer, where people can see it in order to help stimulate the economy.

It's clear the economy is starting to slow down. If you read the analyses that are out there in financial papers, on the Internet and wherever else you get your information, how long and how deep that recession is anybody's guess. I hope, as many do, that we don't end up in a recession, that things rebound and we find ourselves back where we need to be when it comes to economic growth. I think all members of this assembly, as well as the working people across the province, the small business sector and everyone, don't want to see us slide into a recession, but there are some predictions out there that this recession could be deep and it could be long. Before it starts to slide, we need to pick up the economy and give it a bit of a boost so that we don't end up sliding the way we did in 1989 and 1990.

What are some other things this government can do to stimulate the economy? I would argue one of the things we're able to do, and this is in the field of regional economic development, is to assist those people, those individual entrepreneurs and existing businesses across the province who are trying to get themselves organized or trying to reorganize themselves as businesses with access to capital. We all know how difficult it is to get money from a bank when you're trying to start off a business idea.

I gave a speech on Saturday night in the community of Hearst at an economic development conference. In that particular speech I said if you take a look at banks, it is just as easy for them to process a financial application from a corporation for a \$2-million loan as it is for somebody coming in with an application for a \$100,000 loan. For that reason, they tend to want to lend money to larger and larger organizations or businesses, because in that way it's the same amount of paperwork and for the same amount of work they're able to make more money. So the whole area of loans to individuals and small businesses that are \$200,000 and down are very difficult to get. The banks really don't want to be in that business.

1550

So I argue, why not put in place a program that we can administer through our credit unions and our caisses populaires that would be simply an incentive program in order to assist the credit unions and the caisses populaires to lend money to people who come through the door, who have good ideas to start up or to restructure an existing business for a loan that's \$200,000 and down?

So what you could have is a type of loan guarantee where you say the following: Presently, if I walk into the

bank and I want to borrow \$200,000 to start up a business, I have to come up with 20% of the money, either by way of security or by way of cash. Often the person has the idea, and he may only have 5% or 10%; he doesn't have the full 20% worth of equity in his home, or cash or bonds or whatever it is that he might have.

The bank says, "We're prepared to take a risk if the person comes in with 20%, but for us, as a bank or a credit union, to be exposed to the risk of the business and the individual to have only 5% or 10% is a risk we're not willing to take." Would you, Mr Speaker, lend out money without some sort of assurance that, if something happens, you have a bit of a guarantee?

I argue, why not look at the type of program that would be a financial incentive program that basically says if a person walks into a credit union or *caisse populaire*—and you may expand this to banks, but at this point I talk about credit unions and *caisses populaires* for a specific reason—and says, "I've got a great business idea. Here's my business plan," the credit union or *caisse populaire* manager looks at it and says, "Yes, this is really good." The economic development officers who work with it through organizations such as Nord-Aski or North Claybelt and other economic development associations, say, "Yes, this is a sound business plan, but the person has only got 5% equity"—that the provincial government guarantee part of that loan in order to make the credit union or *caisse populaire* comfortable enough to lend the money to the individual. The province says, "The credit union will be responsible for 50% of the debt should the business opportunity go under. The individual coming forward with the idea has to put forward a minimum of 5% or 10%, and the province will secure the rest of that loan."

My guess is, that would go a long way to stimulate development in the local regions across Ontario. If we don't do that, I argue, economic development, by and large, will happen in the major centres, such as Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Oshawa and Peterborough, because those communities are big enough and those economies are large enough that they basically tend to take care of themselves to a large extent.

But in local economies and rural and northern Ontario, it is very difficult for those economies to grow and prosper if you don't have the kind of tools that they need at the local level to be able to assist those particular entrepreneurs to get their businesses going.

Let me give you something else that I think we could do, and that is the whole issue of a certain amount of risk equity that needs to be out there in the market place. I was talking the other day to a credit union manager up in Kapuskasing, a Mr Fillion, who attended one of my community clinics on Saturday. We talked about this very issue, and Mr Fillion, who is the manager at the local credit union in Kapuskasing, said, "I have people come into my credit union who basically are people who have proven themselves in business. They've been around for awhile, sometimes 15 or 20 years, they've got a proven track record, they're committed to the

businesses they operate, they're good at what they do, but because of whatever has happened to the economy or whatever has happened to the local economy or to their businesses, they find themselves in a tough spot."

He gave me an example: A particular individual has a whole bunch of repair costs on vehicles that he has for his business. The costs of those repairs over the last year have put him into debt for about \$25,000, but now he needs to replace his vehicle in order to continue doing the business that he wants. As a result, you would have to go to the bank and try to get a loan for probably a total of around \$50,000.

The credit union was very uneasy in doing that, because this individual doesn't have the kind of equity they need to be able to secure that kind of loan, so they had to turn that individual down. Mr Fillion said to me, "Why don't we put in place a program where credit union managers are able to approve loans that are somewhat more risky than others in limited situations?" He suggested, for example, if a credit union has \$2 million in their portfolio of business loans, maybe 10% of that loan portfolio could be allowed into a risk financing type of program, long term, in order to assist those kinds of businesses. In other words, you wouldn't do it all the time. The credit union manager, he or she, would have to be very strategic about who they give it to, because on a \$2-million portfolio they may only have \$100,000 to access in this higher-risk financial guarantee. In cases like that, where there really is somebody there deserving of a break but it's a question where they need to do this in order to reorganize their businesses to get on with making money and paying off their bills, the credit union or *caisse populaire* manager would be allowed to approve that type of loan, with the province taking on part of the risk.

What would be wrong with such an idea? As a New Democrat, I know we've had these discussions within our caucus and are looking at some of these issues as possibilities of what can be done to assist local economic development in regions across the province.

Another thing I think we could be looking at is the whole issue of what can be done when it comes to apprenticeship training. In the province of Ontario, apprenticeship training is almost non-existent when it comes to the type of apprenticeships that you and I, Speaker, would be familiar with. As do I, you come out of the workplaces, the factory floors across Ontario.

There was a time in this province when a worker who may have had only a grade 10 or 11 and who went to work in a car plant, went to work in auto manufacturing, or in construction or mining or lumber, whatever it might be, had an opportunity to get into an apprenticeship and a trade somewhere in the province in order to get the skills to become a skilled tradesperson. The way the apprenticeship training used to work, the province would pay part of the apprentice's costs at the beginning of the apprenticeship. For example, where I worked, at today's wages an apprentice would be paid, as an electrician, about \$18 to \$19 an hour. The employer doesn't want to

pay \$18 or \$19 an hour for a brand new apprentice, because he or she doesn't know anything and is not valuable enough for the employer to pay those kinds of dollars. So the province, once upon a time, used to say, "All right. We'll pick up 40% of the wages for the time the apprentice is in their apprenticeship for the first year. Then we'll send them off to school and we'll give them three terms in school over a period of three or four years to get the technical skills." And as the apprentice got more and more experience, the amount of money that the province used to subsidize the employer went down until finally you had a trained, skilled tradesperson who was capable of doing the job and was worth the money to the employer.

Employers across this province used those apprenticeship training programs. You would know, member for Oshawa, because you know a lot about what happens in the auto plants in your area. Thousands and thousands of men and women, tens of thousands, across the area were trained by way of apprenticeship training programs.

We have now moved to an apprenticeship training program that no longer has economic subsidies to the employer. In other words, if I'm Ford, GM, Mallette, Tembec, whatever the company might be, the entire cost of the apprenticeship training program, by and large, is borne by the employer. What incentive is there for the employer to train apprentices? Absolutely none.

So I say that not only in the skilled trades—I'll explain outside the skilled trades, but specifically for this debate in the skilled trades—we should be returning to a real system of apprenticeship training in this province. We should be saying as a province that rather than utilizing welfare money to prop up a stupid work-for-welfare scheme that the Tories have put in place—it really is not an effective use of money. You know as well as I do, Speaker. What are they doing with the work-for-welfare thing? They're not putting anybody back to work. It all looks good on paper, but at the end of the day it's a scam. It doesn't really do anything to get people back to work.

What you need to do is to put those dollars into real training and to say to the employers across the province—and for this debate I'll talk about skilled trades—"If you're an employer and you have need of a skilled tradesperson, we will assist by way of real apprenticeship training within your employ. We as a province will pick up the cost of training, such as we do at the community college system. The federal government will pay by way of employment insurance the wages of the apprentice when the apprentice has gone to school, he or she, and we the province of Ontario will pay part of the wage of the apprentice as they train through the apprenticeship training system for the employer." So maybe in the first year the employer only pays 30% of the actual wage; in the second year 60%, and onwards, until finally the employer is paying the entire wage at his or her cost because at that point they have a skilled tradesperson.

1600

I would argue that you can do that not only in skilled trades, but you can also broaden the apprenticeship

training system to look at other areas. This might sound very far-fetched, but for example I'm going to raise a local paper in my community which has hired a couple of reporters who have never been reporters, have never gone off to journalism school, don't have a degree in English, basically have no professional training to be reporters. But the employer, for whatever reason, rightly or wrongly—I'm not going to debate that—has hired these reporters on to their particular paper. I would argue, why not give those kinds of employers an opportunity to actually have an apprenticeship training system, where through the community college system and, yes, even across the university system we tie those types of apprenticeships to our community college and university system; that they not be just holus-bolus and an employer can hire somebody and get some money, and God knows what they're going to do with the training, but have real training tied to the community college system or the university system, if need be, in order to make sure that those apprenticeship trainings are structured, that they're set up in such a way that at the end of the day both the employer and the employee who is being apprenticed gets something positive back and we are able to give opportunities to people in the workforce to upgrade their skills.

That would be very useful for a number of reasons, Mr Speaker. You represent an industrial riding, as part of my riding is. Your particular end is steel; in ours we take out of the ground. Not the steel, but we're into copper, zinc and gold, and lumber manufacturing as far as paper and wood products. Unfortunately, there are cycles in those industries and people lose their jobs as the cycle goes downward. You know as well as I do, Mr Speaker—how many friends and family and neighbours do you know in your community who are 40 years old, or even 50, who have lost their jobs after working for a large industrial employer for a period of 15 or 20 years?

For example, I'm just going to pick one out of the air, a good friend of mine, Mr Gilbert Morissette, who was a mechanic at the mine where I used to work. He was laid off because the mine closed down after, I think, more than 20 years of service. Gilbert is about my age, in his mid-40s. What kind of training do we offer people like Gilbert to move on to some other job that may be available in the economy? What is wrong with having a real apprenticeship training program for people like Gilbert, where we say, "Go out and look around. See what you can find. If there's something that interests you and you're able to convince an employer that you would be of value to him or her, we will provide an apprenticeship training program for you to start with that employer," so that there's an incentive for the employer to hire that new individual? There's an advantage because, if they're able to train that individual from the very beginning, it gives them an opportunity to train according to their own needs. It would give the kind of tools—I'll use the government's language—to the employee so that they are able to market themselves within workplaces across Ontario and give something to em-

ployers that is of value. That would be a positive way of using taxpayers' dollars to assist people to get jobs.

Another thing I would suggest that the government could do, for example, is turn around and say, "We will give you a tax break when you create new jobs on your payroll taxes." If an employer in the province of Ontario hires new employees—and you would have to have some sort of mechanism that they don't fire employees and rehire them the next day—there is a tax cut of some type for employers who hire new employees. What would be wrong in suggesting that? That's one of the suggestions we make as the New Democratic caucus to the province of Ontario to assist provincial employers to hire new people and give them an incentive. What would be wrong in saying we will give some sort of a tax cut on money spent to improve your plant or to build a plant or to remodel your plant that will create the new jobs? The issue is that we create incentives and not disincentives for employers to create work in the province of Ontario. Those are just some of the things that you can do.

One of the other things I think we need to do, because we have been very bad at this as a province—and this is just not the Conservatives—is the whole issue of whom we do business with. I have always been worried about our approach in Ontario of putting all our eggs in one basket. Why is it that when we talk about trade in the province we look only to the south? We look at our trading partners in the United States and say, "Man, are we lucky to have you as a brother and sister south of the border." We allow ourselves to have over 90% of our exports into the United States. It virtually means we are captives of that economy. I would argue that what we need to do in the province of Ontario—and this is a longer-term issue—is to start promoting trade with countries other than the United States. I'm not saying to stop trading with the States. It would be nuts to do that. That's not the argument. But we should be looking at expanding our markets by trying to make the kinds of connections that we can east-west across Canada, but again, further east and further west to Europe and the Pacific Rim so that we're able to better situate the economy of Ontario as a real exporters' economy.

I've had this conversation with people at various times here in the House, and they say, "Oh, that can't be done," and "It would be too much trouble," and "We couldn't be competitive selling widgets that are produced in Oakville, Ontario, to some place in Finland or China or Thailand or wherever it might be. How do you compete with that?" they say.

Let me ask you this: how could it be that Finland and Norway and Denmark, which are pretty progressive economies—a big part of Finland's trade, we'll admit, is with the Soviet Union, but they don't trade 95% of their produced goods to the Soviet Union, now Russia. They're trading with other European nations but, more importantly, they're trading into Canada and the United States. If you look at manufacturing equipment in the mining sector, one of Finland's major customers when it comes to mining equipment is here in Canada. They

produce it in Finland. Once they've built it, they market it and they sell it into Canada. I don't understand why we as an economy can't do the same. They're a high-wage economy. They're heavily unionized, more so than the province of Ontario. Their wage structure is higher than ours. They are extremely well organized as a labour movement in Finland, with a higher degree of unionization. They have better social programs than we do here, to a large extent. They have a better transportation and public transportation system than we do in Canada. They are a more regulated economy. And they can afford to trade with countries halfway around the world better than Ontario can? It tells me that we didn't try.

So I argue as a New Democrat, and I'll argue along with our finance critic, Mr Christopherson, and with our leader, Howard Hampton, that Ontario has to start resituating itself and rethinking itself as to where it plays in the world economy. We cannot just look at the United States and say, "Oh, boy, are we lucky to have you as big brother and sister," and all of a sudden come back and say, "We can't find ways to trade with the Pacific Rim and with Europe and other nations across the world."

Those are some of the things that I think this government could be doing when it comes to promoting economic development in the province of Ontario; those are some of the things that I think we should be doing to try to prevent or slow the recession that is starting to happen in the province. I call on the Minister of Finance and the government members, if they do anything, to at least support the PST cut that my leader, Howard Hampton, and our finance critic, Mr Christopherson, have been advocating for a number of weeks now. If you want to get the economy going and you want to give it a good shot in the arm, one of the things you can do is to listen to what both Howard Hampton and David Christopherson are saying, and I can guarantee you that will help get the economy going.

With that, Mr Speaker, I want to thank you for having the time to put that on the floor today.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): It's my pleasure to rise this afternoon. Minister Flaherty earlier today rose and addressed the House with respect to government motion number 61, to authorize the paying of "salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing November 1, 2001, and ending April 30, 2002, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply."

Clearly, it's to pay the bills. As such, members are given the task of responding, and in our sense certainly it's supportive of this initiative.

It's important to start out with having the broader view. This government's policy to this point in time has really been predicated on having a strong economy so that you're able to provide the quality of life that every Ontario citizen needs. I can say that to establish that policy and drive it down further into the culture of the organization is a team activity. In that, we're very much

dependent to work co-operatively with the civil servants who are outlined or addressed in this government notice of motion.

But it starts even further away from that, I think. It's the ability to set about having a strong leadership team—that would be Premier Harris and cabinet, and caucus as well—and then having the ability to make strong fiscal decisions appropriate for the economics of the time. Clearly, that all takes strong leadership.

I'll just take a moment to recognize the strong leadership we've been fortunate to have. Premier Harris wasn't daunted in his task of making those difficult decisions. When it comes down to Premier Harris and the cabinet, I think I can say, as we enter this time when there will be a change in leadership, that we're fortunate to be blessed with very, very deep and very rich ranks of talent within cabinet.

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): Name names.
1610

Mr O'Toole: Throughout my remarks today I'll try to stay away from mentioning specific names, as the member from St Catharines is drawing me into it.

But I think one of the closer views I've had of how important the civil service is in supporting government in achieving its goals and policies—it's appropriate for me to recognize that as a member of the estimates committee. I find it quite informative and educational to be able to pull upon the civil servants who are usually in attendance at those meetings to respond informatively to members. There is great richness of depth in the civil servants, so they do need to be paid, if that's what this notice is about. Ontario is in a good position, and I think it's because of government policy and initiatives and the leadership that I've outlined.

I do want to veer off here a little bit. I want to follow up, Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, and address the importance of the estimates committee process that I've been part of.

The first one was the Ministry of Health, led by the Honourable Tony Clement. They appeared before the estimates committee, as you would know, several times. I was quite impressed with the members of the ministry who were there to respond to specific questions that I had. You might know that the questions I had related to my riding of Durham. In more specific terms, they related to the challenges facing Lakeridge Health, which comprises a number of hospitals: the Oshawa General site, the north Durham or Port Perry site, the Bowmanville site, the Whitby site, and then there's Ajax-Pickering, which are part of the Rouge Valley group. They've had some challenging times, and I placed some important questions before the committee on October 9.

Mr Clement had the staff resources there to respond. I just want to acknowledge, with appreciation, John King, the ADM for health care programs, as well as Paul Clarry, who responded specifically to my inquiry, and I might say quite knowledgeably, about the currency of the issue facing the Lakeridge board in their capital program;

in fact, how some of the programs for patients could be affected.

I am confident that the minister has intervened and is making sure that we, the citizens of Durham, will have a cancer treatment centre by the year 2003. Everyone who lives in Durham or anywhere near Durham knows how critical that is to our future.

There was also David Stolte, director of the health reform implementation team.

I just want to refer members to the very specific questions I raised at that time through Minister Clement and had clear responses from Mr King and Mr Clarry. They reassured me that the government isn't interfering, that the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care staff are there to make sure we deliver on our commitments.

Part of what I want to achieve this afternoon is to recognize that the estimates process is very, very beneficial, and I encourage members of the public to log on to the government's Web sites and find out the record of civil servants' participation in those processes.

As you probably know, the estimates committee meets on Tuesday and Wednesday afternoons. Right now we're in the midst of doing the Ministry of the Environment. These are program-by-program expenditure reviews. They're actually looking at the entire ministry, whether it's health, with \$24 billion, or the environment, with increased budgets as well this year.

Again, I have been very impressed with Elizabeth Witmer's leadership, but more specifically with some of the supportive staff and the information they've provided during those sessions. I've asked a number of very pointed questions with respect to the Oak Ridges moraine, the issue of biosolids and sludge, and Sound-Sorb and paper fibre and other issues that have been important to my constituents. The Protect the Ridges group has done an excellent job of research to make sure that what goes on our soil and on our land is indeed not going to have adverse effects.

I just want to thank—first of all, the Val Gibbons report set a new cornerstone for public service in environment, and that was referred to several times. A number of people there spoke with authority on such things as the Drive Clean program and the spill response teams; also the SWAT team, which is a team of qualified individuals from the ministry who intervene in emergencies, respond and issue orders or whatever is necessary. In fact, the record is clear that the number of orders and charges on violators are up. I might make it clear that, in my view, most of the conforming businesses, whether it's small-town Ontario or corporates, try to conform, and you do need to have oversight.

In this respect, I was quite impressed when questions were asked with respect to the government's initiatives on brownfields and what steps are being taken on smart growth. The ministry was there with the expertise at all levels to respond under Deputy Minister Jan Rush, Dana Richardson, the assistant deputy minister of corporate management, as well as a number of other important civil servants.

The point of what I'm trying to do here today is to at least take a moment to recognize that it's a team. There's the government, which sets policy. It absolutely has to have leadership and vision, and as such it is very dependant on having a strong, effective, committed civil service. Part of this interim supply bill is indeed to recognize that we need to have the resources to pay them appropriately.

The third ministry that I'm looking forward to over the next week or so—we start a new ministry after we're finished with environment; I think it will likely be next week—is the Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology, under Minister Jim Wilson. I had the occasion today to ask Minister Wilson a question about sustainable energy.

As you would know, I am a member of the alternative energy committee—a fascinating process. But there again, there are a number of staff, both on the research side for the committee as well as within the ministries—whether it's environment or finance—who are able to provide very compelling resources and research. For that I am very pleased as well, that this government has the commitment of the civil service, I believe, to do the job that's necessary to respond. Minister Wilson will be supported by Bryne Purchase, the deputy minister. I'm sure there will be a lot of questions about clean air and sustainable energy forms as we move toward the market opening in 2001.

Mr Bradley: And Beck 3.

Mr O'Toole: What the member from St Catharines just said is important. Beck 3 will be one of those things the alternative energy committee will certainly be examining. I can tell you that I've been there on my own on a weekend drive. I had heard and seen some of the business plans for that project and wanted to see it physically and was quite impressed. There is a resource there. It's a sustainable resource in the form of water power generation.

I also want to urge all members of this House to support this motion of interim supply. All members should join me, as part of that vote of confidence. It's a vote of confidence in our civil servants as much as it is a vote of confidence in this government. The House can support this motion with confidence that the spending authority will be employed responsibly. This government has a record of spending wisely in the best of times. It is even more important, of course, to spend wisely in times of less certainty and, some would say, slower growth.

Minister Flaherty brought in a budget that I thought challenged each of us to be more responsible, to respond and be accountable. That's the key. Since 1995, the Harris government has worked hard, I believe, to build a fiscally sustainable economy for the people of Ontario. Let's go back to the premise I started with: the strong economy; having the right place to invest, to live, to work, to educate your children; to have confidence in that economy looking into the future, that effort is rewarded, that you're not just going to be taxed to death for the rest of your life.

We set about three basic principles, which were: cutting unnecessary spending, especially when you consider

the deficit. We were running close to a \$12-billion annual deficit. With all respect to the third party, the NDP government of the day was in difficult times but made very uncomfortable—I would say wrong-headed—decisions. But they were difficult times, and the minister of the day, Floyd Laughren, did his best. I remember chatting with him one day, and he told me that at one time they opened up the books and it was close to \$18 billion in deficit, and the revenue was going into the tank; nothing they had done that precipitated that essentially, except that the expenditure side kept going—there was a bigger and bigger gap. That's a problem that perhaps we, as a government, could find ourselves in as well as the revenue sources start to dry up a little bit. But we committed to cutting red tape, or at least balancing the budget, and I might say we balanced the budget for the third straight time—a record in the last 100 years, it's my understanding.

1620

I think that comes back to fiscal responsibility, as I mentioned before, and accountability. There are governments out there that will promise anything to get elected, but when they get elected they don't do as they promised. So the hallmark of Premier Harris was certainly keeping his promises.

Leadership is not defined in what some would think is the glorious role. It is a very difficult decision. I think of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien: difficult decisions. Good thing he's got John Manley beside him. The other one would be President George Bush: very difficult decisions. Six months ago people were dismissing him as incompetent. But those decision-makers surround themselves with good talent, so it's a team thing. Anyone who thinks they're individually responsible for outcomes has got the whole game wrong. You're only as good as the people who are with you, and you've got to be focused clearly; you can't have people going off in multiple directions. Perhaps that might explain some of the lack of response federally. The only one who has come out very clearly there, of course, is John Manley. Paul Martin: never to be seen, never a budget heard from him.

Minister Flaherty said today there will be an economic statement in early November. I'm confident the minister will be working diligently with staff to develop those numbers that are real, and he will be listening to chief economists like Don Drummond, an economist with the TD Bank, one guy who I think is a formidable expert in those areas, who looks at the big picture of economics. I'm sure Minister Flaherty will be meeting with those economists to get the right number to give the economic statement in early November.

Because of our prudent approach to the economy, we are in a better position today, as has been said by many, to withstand the slower economic growth.

We propose to accelerate the tax cuts. Again, that goes back to the leadership of Premier Harris. We brought those tax cuts ahead. An earlier speaker, Mr Bisson from Timmins-James Bay, made the comment that Howard Hampton, to his credit, has come forward suggesting that

there should be further tax cuts. He's suggesting it on the retail sales tax side. I can't, quite honestly, disagree totally with the theory, because each one of us has a certain amount of income, and the lower your income, the more non-discretionary that income expenditure is. In other words, you're buying groceries, paying the rent, getting the car fixed. It's all taxed. It's taxed when you make it; it's taxed when you spend it. So we really can agree on the theme that taxes are too high. That's the general theme that I would agree with.

More specifically, lower-income people's tax—because all of their expenditures are non-discretionary, whether they're buying an ice cream or a dozen doughnuts or whatever they're buying, or gas or clothes or winter boots. I'm a parent of five children. I know that a lot of my wife's income and my income is spent to—and it's taxed when it's spent. So we agree on that accord.

But I think right now it's clear that the evidence so far—there have been over 850,000 net new jobs created in Ontario since 1995, and the experience was to reduce taxes. There's an old theory, as you know, that was referred to as the Laffer curve, which said it's a regression, that if you reduce taxes, you'll increase revenue. In fact, we did reduce taxes, and that cost the government. It cost us in lost revenue to the tune of about \$4 billion. But the lost revenue on the tax side was picked up on the other side with increased revenue on the personal income tax—more people working, more people paying.

Mr Bradley: It didn't happen.

Mr O'Toole: It's clear; it's in the public accounts. The member for St Catharines can refute it, but the record is clear. As matter of fact, many other jurisdictions, the member would know, have followed the principle of the Taxfighter, Premier Harris, and his cabinet, making the tough decisions that tax reductions are a way to signal investment and confidence and to make effort and work worthwhile.

If I thought of an economist sitting down with a little model, watching everyone who made between \$38,000 and \$78,000, and they modelled that little group and they taxed them to death—that middle-income group, they tax them when they make it and they tax them when they spend it. All their RSP contributions eventually will be clawed back by federal legislation. It's almost sickening that most of those people won't qualify for Canada pension because it'll be clawed back as part of the recovery program from personal RSP, RIF or LIF incomes.

But there's no doubt the foundations for renewal of healthy, long-run growths are intact. Looking over the dip, looking down the road, you'll see that the economy is far more diversified. The economy is stronger and more confident. There isn't a nation, let alone a province, in this world that isn't suffering some slowdown, not simply because of September 11 but because of world harmonization and integration. Globalization is the cheapest product for the cheapest price with the best quality. That's what people are looking for. Whether they're shopping at Costco or they're shopping at the corner store, they want price and quality.

We're all in this together, employers and employees, and governments have to be responsive to that. Part of that cost is red tape. Part of that cost is tax.

I was just reading an article last month in which it was clear that the cost of regulation in Canada, in both real and external terms, is about \$11,000 per individual. The report I was reading—I will cite it for the record—was the Fraser Institute. It's a series of economists with a lot of footnotes to other global economists; it wasn't strictly a think-tank from that side. It stated that the cost of regulation is now becoming an important consideration for all provinces, in fact all jurisdictions. In fact, Australia was just here recently, and I believe our Red Tape Commission, chaired by Steve Gilchrist and co-chaired by Frank Sheehan, will be attempting to have a summit here next year on government regulations. It eventually costs someone to enforce that regulation and whoever uses that should probably end up paying for it.

Slower growth is now expected in part, as I said, because of the recent terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. That was a horrific event. The world has changed. That's been said many times. Our lives have been changed and we are thinking differently. We are a community. We're brought together more. I would put to you, on the positive side of this whole event of September 11, that it's brought people together. At the end of the day, we know we have to coexist. If we're fragmented by terrorism and by abuse of individuals' rights, then we're all suffering.

I remember an expression I heard many years ago in school, and I really didn't understand it, which is that man is born free—that's you and I, human beings are born free—yet everywhere is found in chains. Those chains are the personal responsibilities we assume for the safety and well-being of others. My freedom is limited by people who are perhaps less fortunate or by our ability to operate as a community, so there is an interaction or a relationship.

This government, as I bring it back to topic, is committed to providing the right place to live, to invest, create jobs, to raise your family and to have a great quality of life. I think we should stop being negative because the track we were on was clear. The gap was widening because, to fund the increasing deficit, to fund the increasing accumulated debt, the only alternative was to raise taxes. We took the alternative to lower taxes and to lower spending, where appropriate. It's strong leadership. It comes back to the very essence of my point: strong leadership to make the right decisions that best benefit the greatest number of people. There are always going to be people who are unhappy with difficult decisions.

Undoubtedly, the province will be affected by the tragic events in the United States. This is inevitable, given Ontario's close trade relations with the United States and the tragic impact on investors and consumers alike.

I think the world has changed. I've heard the opposition, Mr Phillips and others, say that we aren't

responsible for the economic recovery; that is, Premier Harris and his cabinet. I would put to them that the corollary to that is that if we're not responsible for the recovery, then we're not responsible for the current downturn. But I do hold our government accountable to have the right policies in place on capital tax, on employer tax, and on those ways that discourage investment.

1630

It's too early to determine the overall impact on the economy of the terrorist attack on the United States. The Ministry of Finance is closely monitoring emerging data on consumer and business response to this situation and financial market conditions. I can tell you I'm well aware that Minister Flaherty is bringing forth an economic statement. I know he's meeting with economic experts and his staff within the ministry. I'm certain and I feel confident that that disclosure will be important for the marketplace and for the families of Ontario.

Some forecasters are more pessimistic than others and there's a wide range of uncertainty. New data are coming in and will give a clearer sense of where the economy is heading. In the meantime, there are positive recent indicators that give us grounds to continue to have confidence in Ontario's economy. Given this confidence, we can support this motion of interim supply knowing that the revenue will be there to support the expenditures.

This government is committed to a balanced budget. Keep that in mind. It's not just a matter of writing blank cheques, as some governments in the past have done. Our government has worked hard to strengthen Ontario's competitive fundamentals through tax cuts and other policy stimulants to investment. As a result, we've emerged as one of the most competitive jurisdictions for business investment and job creation, not just in North America but in the G7. We have the fastest GDP growth in the G7 nations. We intend to maintain and further strengthen Ontario's competitive position. That involves a brighter future for every Ontario citizen.

"Look ahead, young man," is what John A. Macdonald used to say. Look ahead. Don't be confused by the current dip in the economy. To this end, in the 2001 Ontario budget, Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty announced Ontario's Edge, a package of tax reduction incentives, and transportation and environmental infrastructure projects. Ontario's Edge involves, among other measures, moves to improve Ontario's tax competitiveness to be the right place to invest and do business, create jobs. One component is a tax-rate cut for business. We are legislating this full schedule of corporate income tax rate cuts each year between now and 2005.

Mr Phillips takes great exception with this next phrase: by 2005, no Canadian province would have a lower general corporate income tax, which will make Ontario a prime destination in North America to do business. Clearly, if you look at globalization, just look at the North American market. One of the inhibitors to investment is tax competitiveness. If you're going to be tax-competitive, why not go all the way and be the best?

Ontario does want to be the best place to live, to invest and to raise your family. They also give business certainty for the future. Because of our tax protection legislation, businesses know that they will not be a hit with increased taxes in the future.

Also, part of Ontario's Edge is our first step toward eliminating the job-killing capital tax. This capital tax is one that to many viewers, some listening today, is unique, perhaps, to Ontario. Many other provinces don't have it. It is certainly unique in Canada. It is a drag. It's a drag on investment. It's a drag on accumulation for plant expansion. If, in down times, a commercial property owner with a mall had vacancies because of slow job growth or whatever, short-term, they would still be paying capital tax on that commercial plaza. So there's a penalty. Not only are they not making revenue, they would obviously be paying municipal tax, but they would also be paying the dragging capital tax. Tax on capital discourages investment in capital, when capital invested per worker is what is needed to boost productivity and our living standard.

We have taken the first steps toward eliminating the job-killing tax by removing it on the first \$5 million of capital tax. We have accelerated this step by proposing to make this effective October 1, rather than January, as originally outlined in Minister Flaherty's budget. This would eliminate the tax for more than 11,000 existing small- and medium-sized Ontario businesses, as well as benefiting large firms that pay this tax.

I have listened with some concern. I have, in closing, a couple of remarks. The member for Timmins-James Bay mentioned apprenticeship training. There are important agreements between the federal and provincial governments on retraining. I think that retraining agreement has not been signed in Ontario because the federal government doesn't want to pay its share. We get a lot of new Canadians and people who need skills training. I'm certain there will be more discussion on that in the future.

I'm anxious and waiting to hear from the member for Northumberland, because he has always tried to speak as much as I have, so I'll just continue and give him as little time as possible.

The five-year, \$1-billion SuperBuild millennium partnership initiative will support urban revitalization, including transit and environmental infrastructure in Ontario's large urban centres. These large urban centres are Hamilton, London, Windsor, Ottawa, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and the regions of Niagara and Waterloo.

I'm certain the member for Northumberland will make many of the same comments, because we're on the same team. In fact, he may even have the same speech.

I think Ontario is in a sound economic position. It's clear that it is the right thing to do, to vote for this government motion number 61, the supply bill, which will make sure that our civil servants, who are part of Ontario's strong government team, will be rewarded for the efforts they have provided to the people of Ontario.

With that, I'll share the rest of my time with the member for Northumberland.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr Bradley: I'm pleased that the Minister of Energy is in the House today so that I can continue to try to persuade him of the wisdom of proceeding with the Beck 3 generating station project. He reminded me an awful lot—Mr Sterling would remember this. You have to look around the House to see who would remember this, but there was a character in the Howdy Doody show called Phineas T. Bluster. I thought there was a lot of bluster in the answer of the minister, and having been a minister in years gone by, I recognize that when you don't have a good answer, bluster is often the best tactic to adopt. He adopted that. I want to compliment him. He adopted it well this afternoon for his own colleagues.

But the fact remains—and my friend Mr O'Toole would confirm this—that there are many supporters of the Beck 3 generating station project on the alternative fuels committee. His colleague Mr Gilchrist has spoken at some length on it. The Minister of the Environment seems to be very supportive of it. I know my friend the member for Niagara Falls is supportive. Mayor Wayne Thomson is very enthusiastic. This is a good project. It's a win-win project.

I was a bit worried this afternoon when the minister said there wasn't any money for it because nobody would lend Hydro One, which we used to call Ontario Hydro, any money. I would like to know, then, where they're getting the money to buy up all these local utilities. The Liberal critic in energy, Mr Conway, has said, for instance, that Brampton cost—what?—\$260 million for Hydro One to purchase. For the city of Thorold, which is nearby, it was \$17 million. They're paying about a 30% premium when they buy up these local utilities, and I think there has been in excess of 80 of those local utilities purchased. If they have the money for something they shouldn't really be involved in—that is, buying up the retail end of local utilities—then why wouldn't they have the money to invest in Beck 3? There are few projects which are what we call win-win projects. The environment certainly wins—

Hon Jim Wilson (Minister of Energy, Science and Technology): Ask me again tomorrow.

Mr Bradley: The minister asks if I'll ask him tomorrow. I might get a different answer tomorrow, I would hope.

Hon Mr Wilson: No, you'll get the continuation.

Mr Bradley: I would hope he would be persuaded by the strong arguments that many have advanced in favour of the project.

First of all, I understand it's about a \$500-million investment.

Hon Mr Wilson: That's a lot of money.

1640

Mr Bradley: That is a substantial amount of money, and I want to concede that to the minister. I do want to say, however, it would generate a lot of economic activity not just in the Niagara Peninsula—and I'm parochial enough to say that I'd like to see that activity there—but of course there are suppliers and contractors

and so on who would be involved. I think you would see a substantial amount of economic activity that would benefit the entire province.

I have obviously exercised the Minister of Energy, because he is responding to several of these compelling arguments that I'm advancing at this time.

We have the huge Nanticoke generating station burning coal, spewing out sulphur dioxide, NO_x, and 28 or 29 other poisonous substances, including mercury, which is very damaging to the brain, and a number of other substances. We could decrease our reliance upon the Nanticoke generating station and indeed coal-fired plants across the province, we could reduce our reliance on nuclear generating stations, because they have some safety problems and some operational problems, by proceeding with this project. I would be very surprised, if my friend Bart Maves were able to be with us this afternoon to speak on this bill, that he wouldn't be up on his feet agreeing with my contention that proceeding with the Beck 3 generating station is wise from an economic point of view and from an environmental point of view.

The Ontario Medical Association said there's \$1 billion in costs immediately. There are 1,900 premature deaths that take place because of air pollution. It's about \$10 billion when you look at the cost to the health care system and people missing work and so on. So here's a good chance for the government to proceed. I said when the Minister of Energy rises in the House, as he must, to make this announcement someday, I will be there to applaud because his government will have accepted yet another good suggestion and proposal from the Liberal opposition.

I want to deal as well, in the limited amount of time that I have, with certain other subjects and one is health care. Again, the Minister of Energy has been a health minister, so he would recognize the many deficiencies that are in the health care system as a result of its underfunding by the—I was going to say the Harris government; now I just say the Conservative government that is represented by a number of ministers here today.

Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): We are worried that the minister may not be looking after his own health. He seems to be much given to agitation these days.

Mr Bradley: Interjects the member for Renfrew.

I want to tell you that first of all, one of the real problems we have in our area is people with macular degeneration. They are people who could benefit from the drug that I think is pronounced Visudyne, and that drug can help the people to avoid blindness, particularly in a certain kind of macular degeneration. At the present time, people are paying in excess of \$2,000 per treatment for Visudyne. Rather than giving a \$2.2-billion tax gift to the corporations in this province—and I understand why that happens; they give huge amounts of money to the Conservative Party—instead of giving that tax cut, it would be good to invest that in something that would save someone's eyesight, would not bankrupt those

individuals in order to be able to obtain those treatments. So that's one.

Audiology services is another where we're going to see a substantial change. People won't easily be able to access those as they did in the past, and many people have contacted my office about that.

The community care access centres: Mr Speaker, you're from Hamilton. You know what the provincial government did in Hamilton. They got some flak from the CCACs, as we call them, that organize long-term care, so they fired them out the window. They fired the whole board, I understand, as they have threatened to do in other areas. There's no question that if you're kicking people out of the hospital quicker and sicker, you're going to have to have those long-term-care and home care services. Right now there's a major deficiency. I receive letters and telephone calls from people almost on a daily basis complaining about the fact that services have been cut back in that area. We have a population that is growing older. There's no one in the province who is getting younger every day; everybody is getting older every day after the day that they're born. We're going to need those kinds of services for people, and I plead with the government to provide that kind of service to people in our communities.

I also want to say that there's a need for an increase in disability pensions, disability payments to people in this province. They haven't had much of an increase, if any increase at all, in the last number of years. They could certainly use that to meet increased costs for such things as natural gas and home heating fuel and so on.

We all confront the problem of the bizarre pricing of gasoline in this province. I have called upon the Premier to call on to his carpet the corporate barons, the oil barons of this province who dispense gasoline at some strange prices. In some of our municipalities the price is substantially high and then you go to another municipality not far away, and it's lower. Obviously we have to have fair pricing of gasoline in this province, and we're simply not seeing it from the gas companies at this time.

We have seen at least 35 hospitals closed in this province, despite the fact that the Premier promised in 1995 that it was not his plan to close hospitals. The Hotel Dieu Hospital in St Catharines, when it's restructured, as they say, will no longer have any overnight beds. I remember Frank Sheehan dancing a jig with the nuns on the front steps of the Hotel Dieu Hospital when they were saved from closing. But what is left? As I say, there are no people staying overnight; it's day surgery and some other services, and certainly the emergency room will disappear.

We have housing being dumped on the regional municipality of Niagara, and that housing stock needs a lot of upgrading. That requires an infusion of funds from the provincial government.

But what it comes down to is this: the provincial Treasurer is proceeding unwisely with a \$2.2-billion tax gift to the corporations. As a result, he's going to have to apply a constraint; that is, slash left and right the various

ministries and the services that they provide. In addition to this, that's not going to create the economic stimulus they had hoped for. That's the situation we find ourselves in, and I'm waiting to hear some of my colleagues elaborate further on this.

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: The member for Renfrew says I can take a little more time, perhaps out of his time, and that does allow me to deal with a couple of other issues.

One is the issue of hospital care overall. Talk to anybody today and they will tell you it simply isn't the same. Because they are pushed out the door faster than they used to be, they find themselves in dire circumstances when they get home. The services that hospitals are able to provide, because they have fewer nurses now and fewer overall staff, aren't as good as they once were. In the homes for the aged we find that family councils and committees that are set up are advising us that the services there aren't what they should be, because of a lack of appropriate funding.

We find in the education system, both at the elementary and secondary level and the post-secondary level, that there's a need for operating funds. We've seen some capital projects proceed in places such as Brock University and Niagara College, but they're fearful that the operating funds are not going to be there to ensure that people are able to have access to post-secondary education regardless of what their personal income might happen to be. In other words, it shouldn't be just the richest people or the very brightest who have the opportunity to access post-secondary education.

I was flabbergasted when I saw the annual salaries paid to ministers and parliamentary assistants: in 1995 that was \$751,946 and this year it's \$1,103,488. That's a substantial increase, and the cabinet office has gone, as the Liberal member for Sarnia-Lambton said, from \$7.8 million in 1994-95 to over \$18 million today. So we see where the priorities are of this government.

I'm going to touch on one more subject, and I could touch on a number, but one more subject: the squandering of hundreds of millions of dollars now on self-serving, clearly partisan government advertising. The people of the province should know when that pamphlet shows up on the front steps, called ON, anything to do with the Ontario government, that's not the Conservative Party paying for it, that's the taxpayers of Ontario. When that television series on what they were doing in education, or I should say to education, appeared on the television screen, that alone was \$6 million or \$7 million of taxpayers' dollars. We saw those full-page ads concerning September 11. I looked through them and I thought, maybe we've got something here. There were nice congratulations to some of the people who worked. Then I looked through and the government started patting itself on the back. Unfortunately, it's again an excuse, using part of the ad for something legitimate, but the other part of the ad simply to congratulate the government.

1650

The Acting Speaker: Excuse me. Sorry to interrupt. There are at least four conversations going on in here in addition to the speaker. I would ask you to stop or take the conversations outside, please. Sorry for the interruption, member from St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: Thank you very much. I want to leave sufficient time for my friend from Renfrew. The government, I guess, gets the next opportunity to speak. I will now yield the floor to our next speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The floor is open for further debate.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: I know; I was debating whether or not I was going to give you the floor, since you didn't seem to want to acquiesce to my instructions earlier, but I will. I give the floor to the member for Northumberland.

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your agreeing to give me the floor for just a few minutes. The member from Durham got so enthusiastic, there's not too much time left.

Interim supply is indeed one of the most important motions that is passed in a Legislature such as this. It is a motion that gives authority to the government to continue its many programs that benefit the people of Ontario and to operate the daily business of government. It gives permission to the government to send money to municipalities, hospitals and school boards around the province, sometimes referred to as the MUSH sector, to pay social assistance benefits to those in need and to appropriate the payment of salaries to the dedicated and hard-working members of the Ontario civil service.

As the minister pointed out, these payments are currently being made under the authority of a motion for interim supply which was introduced back on April 23, 2001. As you know, the House rules of the Ontario Legislature limit the period covered by an interim supply motion to some six months. The existing motion expires at the end of this month. Payment to all our funding partners and for government programs cannot be made after that date without this important motion being passed.

In order to ensure that all payments scheduled on or after November 1, 2001, reach the people who need them, it is necessary to provide the banking system and the postal system with some lead time. This lead time is especially important to individuals living in the far reaches of our north or in the many rural areas of this vast province of ours. For instance, the gold mining community of Red Lake is some 1,930 kilometres from downtown Toronto, while the many native communities of northwestern Ontario and the James Bay coast are only accessible by aircraft. I'm sure that all of my colleagues in the Legislature from the northern and rural areas can appreciate those concerns. It is not good enough to leave enough time so that payments can be made just here in Toronto. All the people in this great province of ours are important to our government. As such, the practice has been to provide at least five working days' lead time

prior to the end of the month to ensure that payments are made everywhere. Thus, this motion must be passed without unnecessary delay.

The proposed motion for interim supply would cover the six-month period from November 1, 2001, to April 30, 2002. We sometimes forget the far-reaching impact provincial government services give the people of this province. Let me give some examples: the police and firefighters who help the citizens in distress; the teachers and professors who prepare our youth for productive lives; the doctors and nurses and other health care professionals who care for us from the minute we are born to the time we take our last breath. These are all members of the broader public service whose salaries are paid by our government through the taxes of all hard-working Ontarians.

However, the high quality and wide variety of public services provided by this government demand accountability. I've spoken to people in my riding—business owners, families, public officials and many others—and they have all told me that they want more accountable government that is efficient. We strongly believe that tax dollars belong to the hard-working people of Ontario, not to the government. We must remember that all our government is accountable for a \$64-billion corporation known as the province of Ontario. Our government believes that the buck stops here.

Those famous words were spoken by Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, who was in office from 1945 to 1953. Although those words were spoken almost a half-century ago, they're just as applicable today as they were to President Truman's era. Those words are probably the clearest and most well-known statement of accountability ever made. It leaves no doubt in anyone's mind as to where the ultimate responsibility lies. We owe this to the people of Ontario and we owe this to the next generation that follows, just as President Truman gave accountability to his generation of Americans.

Memories of the shocking and tragic events of September 11 in New York City, Washington and Pennsylvania are still with us. Although the attacks did not occur on Ontario soil, they nevertheless affected us all. Our close proximity to the United States, our shared values of freedom, security and diversity, made all of us feel more vulnerable than ever. Let us all hope that this appalling tragedy and its horrific loss of life are never repeated again. However, Ontario is part of the global economy, and with our close trading relations with the US, the provincial economy will be adversely affected by that terrorist attack.

Nevertheless, there are some very positive signs in our economy. For example, central banks have cut their interest rates sharply. This in itself will be an economic stimulus. Second, stock markets have recouped a large part of their losses from September 11. Again, the stock market moving ahead is a good indicator of a recovery of our economy. Energy prices have fallen, which increases

the disposable income of Ontarians and increases the competitiveness of our industries.

A preliminary US report on consumer sentiment in October shows an improvement over September. US auto sales improved in the first 10 days of October. Furthermore, over the first seven months of 2001, Ontario retail sales are up some 3.5% from the same period in the year 2000. For the year 2000, sales increased by some 7.3%, following a similar rise in 1999. This was the fourth year of strong growth.

Also, Ontario department store sales advanced some 9.8% in August compared to August 2000. Over the first eight months of 2001, sales are 8% ahead of the same period last year. In August, Ontario auto sales were even up by some 0.8% over July. Ontarians bought a record of 660,820 new cars and trucks in 2000, surpassing the previous record set in 1999. Sales were 2.4% in 2000, following a robust 13.1% advance in 1999.

Over the first months of 2001, Ontario housing starts are 4.7% ahead of the same period last year, which was the best year since 1989. Last year, housing starts in Ontario rose by some 6.4% to reach an 11-year high of 71,521 units. But in August, the value of residential building permits rose by 4.6%. Over the first eight months of 2001, residential permit values were up some 3% compared to the same period a year ago. In 2000, residential permit values rose by 4%, to their highest level since 1989.

In August, Ontario MLS home resales rose by 10.1% from August 2000, reaching a level of 15,018 units and making it the busiest August on record. Over the first eight months of 2001, Ontario MLS home resales are 7.8% ahead of the same period in 2000. Toronto Multiple Listing Service home resales rose 3.4%, year over year, in September, to a level of 5,021 units. Over the first nine months of 2001, Toronto home resales are 13% ahead of the same period last year.

1700

According to Stats Canada's Revised Public and Private Investment Intentions, total investment in Ontario is expected to increase 7.9% this year, revised up from last February's projection of 5.2%. This would bring total current dollar investment spending in Ontario to \$71 billion this year. Business investment in non-residential construction is expected to jump 16.1%, led by strong gains in transportation, warehousing, utilities, businesses and commercial services and construction industries. All these positive signs indicate that the economic fundamentals of this province are sound, due to this government's responsible fiscal management.

This is consistent with what I'm hearing in my riding. Just last Wednesday, when the real estate people were here having their day at Queen's Park, Scott MacDonald and Donna Causton were in to speak to me in my office. They were telling me about the robust real estate industry in my riding, and that's certainly consistent with what I've been hearing. The tourism industry, whether I'm in Northumberland or up in Hastings, Lennox and Addington or Frontenac, the same kind of thing: this year is

actually better than last year. We have exciting things going on. Great Dane is going to start building trailers in Quinte West next year. They start their plant for the building of trailers; some 500 jobs there. Just this morning we had a sod turning for the lifelong learning centre in my riding, which is going to be looked after by the Universal Workers Union, Local 183. My hat is off to that organization.

Just in closing, since 1995 our corporate and personal income tax cuts, balanced budgets, debt repayments occurred, strategic investment in health, education and transportation, and environmental concerns—all of these are of real benefit to society. In my firm belief, it is due to the Mike Harris leadership that Ontario is where it is today. His leadership has been an inspiration, and its legacy will not be soon forgotten. I am honoured to have worked with him and feel that he has helped position Ontario to be a global leader as well as helped make his government's ambitious goal ensure that the province has the best-performing economy and the highest quality of life in North America in the next 10 years. His leadership will be sorely missed, not only by myself but by this Legislature and the people of Ontario.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate? Is there any further debate? Last call: any further debate? Hearing none—I recognize the member for Toronto-Danforth.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): Thank you. I think we had a little game of chicken going on here with the member for Renfrew. He won and I lost.

I have 20 minutes to talk about many things. There's not enough time to get on the record all the things I'd like to say today. I recall from the time when we were in government, Speaker, the difficulties of trying to govern under a very severe recession and the criticisms coming from this side of the House at the time when our government made a choice—some people think it was a foolish choice, others not; I'm one of those who thinks it wasn't a foolish choice. We made the choice at the time to not borrow money to give tax cuts to the wealthy, as the Tory government, the Harris government, has done. They have borrowed, is it billions of dollars—I forget the exact number now—to finance their tax cuts to the wealthy.

I recall the difficulties of trying to make those decisions, to keep communities afloat, to try to make sure that we saved industry—for instance, some of the industry up north that was about to go under, working in partnership with those communities to save those jobs successfully, to come up with programs in our communities to keep people working, to not cut welfare, I recall, although there was a lot of pressure, I believe in particular from the party that was then the third party sitting on this side of the House, the Conservatives, to cut those kinds of programs for vulnerable people. We chose not to do it. We chose to continue to build affordable housing so that poor people and people who were being hurt by the recession could continue to have decent, affordable housing to live in.

We chose to do all of those things because our government felt it was important, particularly in times of recession, when it's always the most vulnerable, and a lot of middle-income people, who are the most hurt. We believed it was the government's role to make sure in those very difficult times that the money was there, the programs were there, the housing, the supports, that all of those things were in place to help people.

The NDP came into government at a time when the Liberals were still in power, after the recession had started, and we governed during that very difficult period. Then the Tories, lucky them, came into power some time after, when we were seeing light at the end of the tunnel, and took over. They had an opportunity to do more to enhance our communities when we were in good economic times, but they chose to do the opposite. What is really galling about it is that they chose to do the opposite while at the same time borrowing money, billions of dollars—I just can't get over this and how they can get away with it—to give mostly wealthy people and large corporations a massive tax break.

Here we are now going into another recession. Of course we all knew, before the terrible, tragic events in the United States happened, that the economy was going into a downturn. We knew that was happening, and I think we all are seeing very clearly that the events of September 11 are having a very negative impact on our consumer confidence and on our economy.

Those opportunities were there to do some building in our communities, particularly after the first year or two when the government came to power and decided to make massive cuts across the board to finance their tax cuts. There was some hope that after the first couple of years were over there would be some stabilization and that there would be refunding of those programs that were cut. But we're not seeing that now, of course. The concern is that it's a real cry in the wilderness to be asking the government to be funding some of these vital programs at this time. I want to talk about a couple of them that I find very alarming.

I think it was last week in question period that I raised in the House that our caucus had received a leaked memo. It's dated October 12, 2001, Children's Aid Society of Toronto, and it's written to all staff from Bruce Rivers, executive director of the children's aid society.

What it says is this: "On October 4, 2001, members of the executive team, along with their counterparts from CCAS and JF & CS, were called to a meeting at the Ministry of Community and Social Services. We were informed that recessionary trends in the province have worsened and been further exacerbated by the events of September 11. As a result, we were informed that all government spending—all government spending; my emphasis there—"is being affected and funding for child welfare agencies across Ontario will be seriously restricted." The memo then goes on to talk about how they're going to manage that.

But it really struck me that in this memo what these people were told is that all government spending is to be affected. That makes one wonder what is going on across the board in all of the other ministries. The Ministry of the Environment is now before estimates. I have repeatedly asked and have been told there have been no further cuts. To date, the minister is not aware that there are going to be any, but there is great concern that that ministry can't take any more. In fact, I have to hand it to the new Minister of the Environment. Since she came in as minister, there have been small, tiny injections of funds into that ministry; not nearly as much as they took out, believe me, but at least we were seeing it go up again. Now there's real concern that it's going to go down.

1710

I want to come back, though, to the children's aid society. I think we all agree in this House—we all agree; there's no argument about it—that our kids are the most vulnerable in our society, and these kids we're talking about, who come into the hands of the children's aid, are the most vulnerable. Government has to play a very important role in making sure that these kids are taken care of.

There have been a couple of studies done. I have one here dated February 19, 2001: "Kids Remain at Risk, Study Shows." What they talk about in here is that the government keeps on saying—and this was the answer in response to my question about this—that the government recently announced \$123 million for CASs. But you know, it's another shell game. That was not new money. This happens repeatedly. To the public out there, it sounds like a huge injection of dollars. That sounds like a lot of money. But this is money—and it's important for people to understand that we have a near crisis in children's aid and that whole sector right now—that's owed under the government's inadequate funding formula. In other words, they have to pay—government is forced to pay—the per diems up to a certain amount with the new caseloads. So what they did is announce that with great fanfare, and it's a cynical attempt to gain glory for not really doing anything, not helping in this crisis situation in children's aid.

So I'm looking forward to the government coming forward and telling us, legislators from all parties in this House—we shouldn't have to find out. I wonder how many backbenchers in the Tory party know what's happening in all the ministries and what cuts are being made. We need to know that. The government finance minister should stand up and tell us exactly where these cuts are going to be, because we don't know. We just found out about that one through a leaked memo.

I want to talk about community care in East York and about the challenges, to put it nicely, they are facing there. I know that community care right across the province, in varying degrees, is in the same boat. That's because the province made a decision to freeze the province's 43 access centre budgets at 2000 levels. That's going to have, and is having, a devastating impact

on seniors, and I see it particularly in seniors in East York.

The government says they haven't made any cuts, which is true. They've frozen the budgets. But what they don't tell people is that they were underfunded before. So in order for these community care centres to meet the needs—and even then they weren't meeting all the needs, believe me, but at least to attempt to meet the needs—of the frail, the elderly, the disabled, the sick—again, vulnerable people—they were, every year, having to cause a deficit in their budgets. What was happening was that the government would come in at the end of the year and give them enough money to cover those deficits. So freezing the budgets at 2000 levels is having a devastating impact right across the province.

What's happening is that personal care has been cut to subpar levels. You have situations now where incontinent clients are receiving one to two baths per week. That is one of the saddest things I've heard. One can only imagine the kind of pathetic, awful state of these people who need the support of the home care workers and the caregivers, and they are no longer able to do that.

We're finding more demands being placed on already burdened caregivers. Their health is being placed in jeopardy. A lot of them are working extra hours. They are paid very low, far below their value, what they should be paid, doing some of the most important work in our society. They are working extra hours because they can't stand to see their clients in this kind of shape. So their health, the care workers' health, is in jeopardy.

This is an astounding number here. Because of these cuts, a total of 75,000 hours of client care per year has been cut since April 2001. Now, that's just the number, but if you factor in and you start thinking about real human beings who are taken care of during those 75,000 hours, we're talking about hundreds and hundreds of vulnerable people who need this support.

I want to talk about the environment briefly. I want to talk about water in particular. We all know what happened in Walkerton: seven people died, over 2,000 people got sick and there are still many people in that community who are sick today. There are real concerns that some of the children who became sick could have very serious kidney problems and other health problems down the road. It was a real lesson for us, a wake-up call. What did the government do? It brought in some new regulations, which environmental groups across the province have said are inadequate. Nonetheless, there are some new regulations.

My safe drinking water bill, because the government members didn't get quite enough numbers in here, and thanks to the Liberal members who were here and all of my colleagues who came in for the vote, didn't get killed, as it did the last time it came forward. They tried to send it to the committee of the whole House again, where they sent the last one. Of course, as you know, that's where bills go to die. This time it got sent to the general government committee. I'm hoping very much that the government will see fit to call that bill to committee before the

end of this session so we can have a discussion with Ontarians across the province about what kind of legislation and rules we need here in the province to protect our water.

Coming back to the regulations again, the government did, to be fair, in response to what happened in Walkerton, bring in some regulations that, compared to other jurisdictions across the country, are not bad. They don't do the job. There are all kinds of problems and all kinds of holes that need to be filled in, which the Safe Drinking Water Act does. But then, when they brought in these regulations, they didn't put any dollars along with them, so you have situations where you've got communities across Ontario trying to meet the deadline of the regulation that says their sewer and water treatment plants have to have certain improvements made, but they don't have the money to do it.

You've got a ridiculous situation, and this right here points out one of the flaws with regulations as opposed to laws. Some communities are asking the government to delay the implementation date for these upgrades because they don't have the money to fix them; so the government can, willy-nilly, change dates and change aspects. It's all done behind closed doors by the cabinet. Most of the backbenchers don't even know what's going on most of the time. They go behind closed doors and change the regulations. In this case they can do that, and that's the way they may have to deal with the fact that they haven't provided the funding for municipalities to upgrade their systems.

In estimates, I asked Minister Witmer about funding for these municipalities. I remember when the government announced this last summer, again in response to Walkerton. I must admit I was up at the cottage and I came down to Toronto to hear this announcement. Dan—sorry, my mind has gone blank; I forget the minister's name at the time. I guess that's telling. I came down for the announcement, and to my astonishment what the minister announced was \$240 million, which was a dribble, when I said at the time what was needed was a flood of dollars after what happened in Walkerton. But it wasn't even money dedicated to sewer and water upgrades: "The \$240 million available through SuperBuild for municipal infrastructure projects, including water and sewer ..."

I was trying to find out from the minister last week—and I'll try again next week—how much of that money has actually been spent on sewer and water programs. Do you know what? She has no control over where that money goes. She doesn't know. She doesn't get to look at the applications. It's not her role; it's not her job. She says that we have to go to the finance minister to find out how these decisions are made about who gets funding for what purpose. Of course, municipalities are strapped for cash because of all the downloading and the new programs they've had to pick up. They need money for all kinds of infrastructure programs in their communities. So this \$240 million available through SuperBuild is not nearly enough for the needs to upgrade our sewer and

water systems, and, furthermore, it's not a dedicated fund to upgrade our sewer and water systems. How can the government bring in what they call tough new regulations to upgrade our sewer and water facilities without dollars attached to them? It doesn't make any sense. Now they're finding that they're in a hole. They talk about OSTAR—that's another fund they have—but again, it's a tiny amount of money. Municipalities are having trouble accessing that money, and again they need it for many initiatives other than sewer and water.

1720

Perhaps more than ever after Walkerton happened, and in particular after the catastrophic and terrible events in the United States on the 11th, one of the things we've seen through terrible loss of lives is the need for good government, the need for government to provide the services that keep us safe and healthy, that take care of our most vulnerable children, that take care of our elderly citizens and disabled people; that when we turn on a tap to drink a glass of water, we know the water is safe to drink, that when we go to a hospital in an emergency we don't have to be redirected all over the place—and in some cases there has been loss of life as a result of that.

Those are the kinds of things that when we pay our taxes we should bear in mind. We have to think about who came forward and whom we depended on during the events in Walkerton and during the events in the United States. Whom did we turn to? As a society, we turned to our public servants, we turned to the firemen and firewomen, the brave fire workers in the United States, many of whom died in the course of their duty. We turn to our police. We turn to our public servants to protect us and to help us. There's nothing that we can imagine more than the loss of life, whether it be seven people dying in Walkerton as a result of drinking water or thousands of people dying as a result of a terrible terrorist attack, that brings home to us how important the civil servants, the people we hire to take care of us, are to us. They're the people we depend on.

We see time and time again in this province, as a result of the downloading and the cutting of funds to all kinds of essential programs across this province, the devastating impacts and effects they are having on real people. So we as a society have choices to make. Choices were made in the last two elections to elect a government that said it didn't believe in government. They even said, "We are not the government. We're here to fix government." People have to determine whether that's the kind of government they want in the future or whether they want a government that's going to look after their interests and perhaps sometimes even do unpopular things, but make sure that the programs are there to protect us, to keep our children safe and healthy, to keep our water safe, to keep the food we eat safe, the police on the streets to keep our communities safe, our schools open, community programs available, things for our kids to do after school to keep them out of trouble. All of those things and more are important for safe communities. I

urge the government to rethink their corporate taxes which they're bringing in at this time.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate.

Mr Conway: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'm delighted to see you in the chair and, as always, doing a splendid job.

Before I begin my remarks this afternoon, I would be remiss if I did not welcome my old friend and colleague Ken Keyes, who is in the upper public gallery. Ken was for many years the mayor of Kingston and for five and a half years, in the period 1985-90, the member of this Legislature for Kingston and the Islands and the minister responsible for the department of the Solicitor General. It's good to see you, Ken.

I want to make some remarks this afternoon in connection with government notice of motion 61, the resolution for interim supply standing in the name of our friend the Minister of Finance.

There is an old maxim of British parliamentary life that says there can be no vote of supply without a redress of grievance. This supply debate provides us, as members of the Legislature, with an opportunity to address Her Majesty's government from time to time about issues before the community, matters that are unresolved or pressures in the community that have been unresponded to. I have listened this afternoon to members on both sides of the aisle raise a number of issues, and I want to speak on my own behalf, on behalf of my constituents and my colleagues about two or three issues.

I do want to begin, however, by supporting those members who have preceded me in this debate about the very real anxiety and aggravation that exists across the municipal world in Ontario today about what can only be described as, dare I say, the constipation of that creation called SuperBuild. Municipalities, large and small, have over the last 15 to 18 months responded to a call from the Harris government to prepare capital applications and fit them into a number of SuperBuild programs.

I know that in the upper Ottawa Valley, my municipalities, with my encouragement and the encouragement of their friends in the provincial government, have made application to a variety of SuperBuild accounts. I want to be fair to the Minister of Colleges and Universities, because there's been some movement on that account. But beyond the activity in the area of colleges and universities, there's been precious little.

In the last number of weeks I have been approached by several people at the municipal level in my county, Renfrew, and in the city of Pembroke who are, to say the least, exasperated. Months after the deadline for application has passed, still no word—nothing. The town of Petawawa has an application before the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation for assistance to improve a snowmobile trail, a very good proposal. It's got the support of the local municipality; it's got the support of the community. They've partnered with, among others, the Ontario Federation of Ontario Snowmobile Clubs, which has put some very real money on the table. Almost a year after the application was submitted, and

now as people in that partnership are beginning to wonder if the Ontario government is ever going to move, people are saying to me as their local member, "Please stand in the Legislature and ask your friends in government, 'When, oh, when is there going to be movement?'"

I'm delighted to see my neighbour and friend the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs here. He's a very dedicated representative of us all in eastern Ontario. I think he knows, generally speaking, of what I speak—his OSTAR fund has been heavily subscribed. I don't expect miracles; I know from my experience in government that these matters often take time. But I want to say in this supply debate today that we are almost abusing our municipal partners and the constituencies they put together to support their SuperBuild applications, whether for culture, recreation or water and sewer improvements, to name but three categories. The time for action on SuperBuild has arrived, all the more so because, as my leader Dalton McGuinty has rightly observed, we are now heading into a season of some very stormy weather economically. Hopefully, it will be a short storm. We all await the November 6 statement from the Minister of Finance as to what his best data suggest. But one would have to be living in some kind of cloud-cuckoo-land not to understand that in our Ontario economy, now so heavily integrated with the American economy, there has been a very significant downturn in the American economy, and therefore that will have a significant and unfortunately negative effect on the Ontario economy. What is it, 90% of all our exports from this province go into the United States market? The American economy is almost certainly in recession, and communities all across Ontario, particularly communities connected to the automotive sector, are feeling very real pain at the present time. The upper Ottawa Valley does not have a great economic connection to the automobile sector, though we have certainly some.

1730

I agree with the member from Northumberland, who said that the tourist operators in his part of eastern Ontario have reported a very good season, and certainly prior to September 11 that was the experience in my area, by and large, as well. But talking to my businesses in Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, I can tell you that for most of them, the circumstances have changed and they are feeling a very real chill.

Other contributors to this debate have rightly observed that government has a choice to make. We're going to debate that choice over the next few weeks as we all, in our respective political parties, speak to the general electorate as to what kind of approach we would have. The Ontario Liberal Party, under the leadership of Dalton McGuinty, has said that we think jobs are absolutely central, and that the Ontario government has a role and a responsibility to stimulate, in every reasonable way, job creation. That's why just a few days ago Dalton McGuinty, Ontario's Liberal leader, said, "Let the Ontario government look at its capital budgets right

across the spectrum and find ways and means of bringing forward as many of those projects, whether in the hospital sector, the highway sector or other sectors where work is on the books to be done, and let those capital projects go forward in the public interest, because we believe those kinds of public investments will not only give us good results in terms of improved services, but their construction in this period of economic downturn will utilize capacity that at the present time is available to us because of recession or near-recessionary circumstances.”

I want to use one specific example. It has to do with the highway program. I know my friend from Lanark, Mr Sterling, was just here. In eastern Ontario, we have a situation where four years ago the Harris government downloaded to the municipalities 50% of the old provincial highway system. I want to repeat that: about four years ago, in the middle of the Harris government's first term, the provincial government downloaded to municipalities fully 50% of the provincial highway system in the region. That was the highest percentage of download in terms of provincial highways anywhere in the province: 50% of the old provincial highway system was simply taken and transferred to municipalities, whether it was the county of Renfrew, the county of Lanark, the united counties of Prescott, Russell, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry; fully 50% of the old provincial highway system was downloaded to municipalities.

So we are now left, in my part of the province, with a much-reduced provincial highway system. In my part of the province, no highway is more important than Highway 17, that runs up the spine of the Ottawa River valley in my area, up from Ottawa through communities like Arnprior, Renfrew, Cobden, Pembroke, Petawawa, Chalk River, Deep River, Stonecliffe and on to Mattawa and North Bay. Highway 17, as it sweeps westward through the Ottawa Valley, is an incredibly busy, congested and often dangerous highway, because the combination of the volume of traffic on that highway, together with the mix of traffic—regular commuting traffic going from Renfrew, Pembroke, Arnprior into Ottawa and back, log trucks, chip trucks, tourist vehicles, because for many people, that is a way to get up into Algonquin Park.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): It's a bad highway.

Mr Conway: It is, as the member from Kitchener says, a very dangerous highway under altogether too many circumstances.

Just in recent weeks I've been driving up and down Highway 17. Just last Friday I went into and back out of the national capital, and I was astonished at just how heavy are the volumes on that highway today. To the credit of this government, a plan was announced—as it happened, on the first or second of June, 1999, within the last day or two of the last provincial election campaign, that if re-elected the Harris government would extend the four-laning of Highway 17 to the town of Arnprior. That

work is underway. We appreciate that, though there has been some delay.

I just want to make this point: that my constituents, whether they are older people living in areas like Braeside or Barry's Bay or Beachburg who are coming down that highway to medical appointments in Ottawa, or business people travelling up and down that very busy corridor, or farmers or tourists, expect this provincial government, with the revenues made available to it through the gasoline tax, to accelerate the four-laning of that Highway 17 westward because traffic volumes and public safety and economic development absolutely require it.

This year, according to the budget presented to this Legislature a few months ago, Ontario's treasury expects to net \$2.3 billion in the gasoline tax alone. When you add to the gasoline tax revenues of \$2.3 billion, the motor vehicle and other road-related fees and licences, you get another, roughly, \$1.5 billion, almost \$3.8 billion paid by those of us who use the highways, through the gas tax and motor vehicle and other road-related fees—totalling \$3.8 billion this year. I see this year, according to the budget, that the Ontario Ministry of Transportation's capital plan calls for the spending of \$673 million, down about \$120 million from last year and down about \$140 million from the year before.

Using Mr Flaherty's Ontario budget 2001, let me just remind this Legislature that this year, the Ontario provincial government plans to spend \$673 million on highway capital. Do you know that in 1997-98, we were spending nearly \$1.2 billion on highway capital?

If you look at the budget—

Mr Wettlaufer: What about the federal government?

Mr Conway: Well, exactly. The federal government has its responsibilities, and I say to my friend from Kitchener, if he wants to be a federal member of Parliament, there are 103 seats up there in Ottawa and he's welcome to have one of them.

Mr Wettlaufer: They take \$25 million.

Mr Conway: I understand that there are federal opportunities and responsibilities. I'm simply asking this Legislature to look at our situation. This year, the Ontario government will take in \$2.3 billion in gasoline tax revenues and other road-related fees of \$1.5 billion, for a total road-related revenue of nearly \$3.8 billion, and we're going to spend about \$673 million on highway capital.

According to the Canadian Automobile Association, using the most generous calculation, roughly 40% of the monies paid into the Ontario government treasury through the gasoline and other road-related taxes, only 40% of those dollars, are going back into the transportation system of this province. I stand here today on behalf of thousands of my constituents in the upper Ottawa Valley who say to me, “Stand in your place as our MPP and tell your own colleagues in the Liberal caucus and those across the way in the government caucus that we expect more of that road-related revenue to be spent improving Highway 17, among others.”

1740

I have two highways, Highway 41 and Highway 60, that serve other parts of my region in eastern Ontario. I want to tell you, if you are down in the Griffith and Matawatchan area today, and some of those people may be watching, they would want me to say, "Remind the minister of highways, remind the Premier, remind the Minister of Finance, that the state of Highway 41 between the villages of Denbigh and Dacre is unacceptable," and they're right. We've got to spend money on that highway, a very busy artery that connects Lake Ontario at Napanee to the Ottawa River at Pembroke: a lot of traffic moving up and down that part of eastern Ontario.

Highway 60, particularly the upper part of Highway 60 from the Barry's Bay area up to Madawaska, to be fair, is slated for some upgrade and renewal, but that's also going to be a function of available money. People in those communities, Barry's Bay and Madawaska, would want me to say, "How come you're not spending more of the nearly \$4 billion in road-related tax revenues to improve our highways?" for public safety reasons, for economic development reasons, and for other reasons that we could enumerate as well.

That's the kind of investment, particularly at this time of an economic downturn, that we should be making and why I totally agree with my leader when he says we've got to make tough choices, we've got to make good but prudent investments. If there is highway capital being spent in my part of eastern Ontario, I can tell you that will be good, not just for our local labour force, but it will be good for the service economy as well, and the work desperately needs to be done.

I want to repeat to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transportation, the people of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke are not happy about the current condition of their provincial highways, particularly Highway 17, Highway 41 and Highway 60. They note that you, Mr Flaherty, now have only 50% as large a provincial highway system in eastern Ontario; you got rid of half of it four years ago. You've got this big pool of revenue, nearly \$4 billion, and you only have in my region 50% of the system you had four years ago. So presumably you should have more money to spend on the highways that are still in your system.

My constituents, who have mostly no public transit, have no alternative to their car or their neighbour's car or their neighbour's half-ton truck. OC Transpo, the TTC, Hamilton transit? You've got to be kidding if you live in Bissett Creek or Burns Creek or Wilno or RR 3, Westmeath. No such thing as public transit. But every one of those people who owns a vehicle is paying a very significant portion of those road-related taxes.

I want to make a second and final observation before I turn to my friend Mr Parsons, who will conclude the Liberal remarks this afternoon. We have in the city of Pembroke one of the oldest Province of Ontario Savings Offices in this great province of ours. I've got to say to the Minister of Finance that many people, particularly older people and people from the farm community in

Renfrew county, are very upset at this scheme to basically privatize the farmers' bank, the Province of Ontario Savings Office. I have been stopped more times than I can recall since the budget was introduced this spring with this plan to privatize POSO, the Province of Ontario Savings Office. In fact, one of my constituents, Mr Donald Broome of Cobden, has made a number of very specific and detailed submissions to me and to the Minister of Finance and other members of this Legislature saying that not only should the province of Ontario not close its savings office, but according to Mr Broome, it should be maintained and expanded and given more of a mandate to compete with the chartered banks.

Do you know what is infuriating people up in my area? I know from reading the provincial press that it is the same in much of the province served by the Province of Ontario Savings Office. What's going on here? What seems to be going on is that Mr Flaherty is shilling for the Canadian Bankers Association. That's what's going on here. We've known for decades that the big banking establishment doesn't like this pesky little service-oriented Province of Ontario Savings Office that can be found serving well the people in communities like Pembroke, Simcoe, Aylmer, Owen Sound, Kingston, St Catharines, Toronto, Ottawa and Woodstock—very good offices, 23 in all; very good service. People say to me, "What possibly explains this scheme?" There seems to be only one answer: finally the big banking interests—the special interests, the most powerful interests in the country—have found a treasurer who is prepared to be their cipher, to be their skill.

Do you know what's going to happen? What's really going to infuriate these good people—older people, hard-working people, many of them with a farm background in places like Pembroke, Woodstock, Aylmer, St Marys and Owen Sound? The Royal or another of the big establishments is going to buy it, and then they're going to close it down—in your face. Then, people with names like Conway and Hardeman and Arnott and Murdoch are going to have to go home and on the main streets of Woodstock or downtown Pembroke explain to people who have, for decades, put their money in that Province of Ontario Savings Office, not only to their credit but to the benefit of the Ontario government—it's going to be gone, and with it the good, personalized service. To whose credit? To the credit of the banking establishment, one of the biggest and most powerful cartels in the land.

Mr Wettlaufer: Maybe even the credit unions.

Mr Conway: Well, we'll see. But I've known many good old Conservatives in the province who must be rolling in their graves to think that one of theirs has finally bought the line that no one from Howard Ferguson to Darcy McKeough would buy—not even Klein. Klein is under the same pressure out in Alberta. Do you think Ralph Klein and whoever is currently Treasurer is going to buy this line and shut the Alberta treasury branches down? After the Pocklington experience, they might even have cause. But you know, one

Tory looking after another shouldn't make for that kind of public policy.

On behalf of those hundreds of my constituents who have said to me, "Why and in whose interest are we making this decision to shut down POSO?" I just want to say to Jim Flaherty, "Shame on you."

Over to you, Mr Parsons.

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): The challenge for the constituents in my riding to understand is not that this government is spending money but the way they spend it. So I struggle a little with this interim supply bill. The people in my riding do not see the \$107 million spent between 1995 and 1999 as good value for their dollar. They do not see the \$6 million that the Minister of Education is spending on telling the people how well her schools are doing; they do not see the million-dollar feel-good ad in the newspapers last week as good value for their dollar.

Who are the constituents that are telling me that? These are constituents who have been discharged from hospital and found there is no home care for them—there is money for ads. I had an elderly constituent who had her breasts removed in hospital sent home. Because of this government's absolute failure to deliver on its commitment for equity funding, she received zero minutes of home care. I have constituents whose children are experiencing hearing problems. This government has said, "We'll still pay for audiologists. They just have to be involved in working with a specialist." In my riding, there are no specialists. So the children in my riding who require intensive hearing tests go to Peterborough, except it's now closed; they go to Kingston, where there's a user fee; or they go to Sick Kids hospital, where there's a six-to-eight-month waiting period. So for those parents, for those sick people in my riding who watch the ads, who watch this government commit money to further its own interests while they truly and genuinely suffer, this government is spending money but not spending it wisely.

We have a number of constituents—I know every member in this House on both sides of the floor can talk about the pain brought to their constituents because of this government's delisting physiotherapy payments. We're seeing attacks on children and on the elderly to make the money to pay for ads or to pay for those \$200 buy-a-vote cheques, which I think will backfire, because the constituents say, "I don't need the \$200. My hospital needed the \$200. My access centre needed the \$200. The children in my community need textbooks."

So I call upon the government to take the money and stop spending it as if it was this mythical "government's money." That money has come from the citizens of Ontario, not all corporations, and in fact increasingly from working families that are struggling to pay for the basic necessities of life and are now being hit with user fees because of this government delisting and down-loading and putting user fees on. The dollars that this government spends belong to each and every citizen in this province, and they need to respect that.

The Acting Speaker: Pursuant to standing order number 66, the time for debate has expired. I will now put the question to the House.

Mr Flaherty has moved that the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing November 1, 2001, and ending April 30, 2002, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1752 to 1802.

The Acting Speaker: Members please take their seats.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Sampson, Rob
Baird, John R.	Johns, Helen	Snobelen, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Sterling, Norman W.
Clement, Tony	Marland, Margaret	Stewart, R. Gary
Coburn, Brian	Martiniuk, Gerry	Stockwell, Chris
Cunningham, Dianne	Mazzilli, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Miller, Norm	Tilson, David
Dunlop, Garfield	Molinari, Tina R.	Tsubouchi, David H.
Ecker, Janet	Munro, Julia	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Mushinski, Marilyn	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Flaherty, Jim	Newman, Dan	Wilson, Jim
Galt, Doug	O'Toole, John	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gill, Raminder	Ouellette, Jerry J.	Wood, Bob
Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.	Young, David
Hastings, John		

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley
Bartolucci, Rick	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Bisson, Gilles	Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted
Bountrogianni, Marie	Gerretsen, John	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Bradley, James J.	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Churley, Marilyn	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Levac, David	Sergio, Mario
Cordiano, Joseph	Marchese, Rosario	Smitherman, George
Crozier, Bruce		

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 46; the nays are 31.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

The House adjourned at 1805.

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	Prue, Michael (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 Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	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, Frank (PC)	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, Hon / L'hon R. Gary (PC) Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip, deputy government House leader / ministre sans portefeuille, whip en chef du gouvernement, leader parlementaire adjoint	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Sorbara, Greg (L)
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet (PC) Minister of Education, government House leader / ministre de l'Éducation, leader parlementaire du gouvernement	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC)
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Whitby-Ajax	Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance / vice-premier ministre, ministre des Finances
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Willowdale	Young, Hon / L'hon David (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Sault Ste Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Dwight (L)
Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	York Centre / -Centre	Kwinter, Monte (L)
Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	York North / -Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
		York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
		York West / -Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)

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

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

CONTENTS

Monday 22 October 2001

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Health care funding	
Mr Smitherman.....	2861
Small Business Week	
Mr DeFaria	2861
Mrs Molinari.....	2862
Transit services	
Mr Patten	2861
Optometrists	
Mr Kormos	2862
Firefighters' memorial	
Mr Wood.....	2862
International Association of Chiefs of Police	
Mr Levac.....	2862
Canadian Forces	
Mr Colle.....	2863
Events in Durham	
Mr O'Toole.....	2863

FIRST READINGS

Propaganda Accountability Act, 2001, Bill 115, <i>Mr Kormos</i>	
Agreed to	2863
Mr Kormos	2863

MOTIONS

House sittings	
Mrs Ecker	2864
Agreed to	2864

ORAL QUESTIONS

Children's health services	
Mr McGuinty.....	2864
Mr Clement.....	2864
Border security	
Mr McGuinty.....	2865
Mr Runciman.....	2865
Taxation	
Mr Hampton	2866
Mr Flaherty.....	2866
Audiology services	
Mr Hampton	2867
Mr Clement.....	2867
Health care	
Mrs McLeod	2868
Mr Clement.....	2868
Water quality	
Mr Arnott.....	2868
Mr Coburn	2869
Government spending	
Ms Di Cocco	2869
Mr Flaherty.....	2869
Alternative energy sources	
Mr O'Toole.....	2870
Mr Wilson.....	2870

Labour dispute

Mr Bisson.....	2870
Mr Stockwell.....	2870

Tax credit

Mr Duncan	2871
Mr Flaherty	2871

Mining industry

Mr Miller.....	2872
Mr Newman	2872

Air quality

Mr Bradley.....	2872
Mr Wilson	2872

Fort Henry

Mr Galt.....	2873
Mr Hudak	2873

Education funding

Mr Prue	2873
Mrs Ecker.....	2874

PETITIONS

Privatization of public services

Mr Caplan	2874
-----------------	------

OHIP services

Ms Churley.....	2874
Ms Martel.....	2875, 2876, 2877

Doctor shortage

Mr O'Toole	2875
------------------	------

Audiology services

Mr Bartolucci	2875
---------------------	------

Post-secondary education

Mr Hastings.....	2876
------------------	------

London Health Sciences Centre

Mr Peters.....	2876
----------------	------

Highway 407

Mr O'Toole	2876
------------------	------

Ontario public service

Mr Hoy.....	2877
-------------	------

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Interim supply, government notice

of motion number 61, <i>Mr Flaherty</i>	
Mr Hardeman	2877
Mr Crozier.....	2879
Mr Bisson.....	2880
Mr O'Toole	2885
Mr Bradley.....	2889
Mr Galt.....	2891
Ms Churley.....	2893
Mr Conway	2896
Mr Parsons	2899
Agreed to	2900

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors

Mrs Boyer	2863
-----------------	------

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 22 octobre 2001

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2001 sur la responsabilité en matière de propagande, projet de loi 115, <i>M. Kormos</i> Adoptée.....	2863
---	------