



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

Third Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Troisième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Monday 24 June 2002

Lundi 24 juin 2002

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 24 June 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 24 juin 2002

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

FÊTE DE LA SAINT-JEAN-BAPTISTE

M. Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell):

C'est un honneur pour moi de souligner aujourd'hui une grande fête qui se célèbre par tous les francophones et francophiles à travers notre beau pays, le Canada. C'est la fête de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste, le patron des Canadiens français.

En effet, la langue française est présente dans notre province depuis plus de 350 ans. La communauté francophone de l'Ontario compose la communauté francophone la plus nombreuse au Canada, après celle du Québec. Le français est une des langues officielles du Canada. En Ontario, il jouit du statut de langue officielle devant les tribunaux, dans l'éducation et à l'Assemblée législative.

La vie culturelle et communautaire francophone bouillonne en Ontario. On y retrouve des centres culturels, de nombreux comités et clubs et des groupes étudiants, sans mentionner l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, le principal organisme porte-parole de la communauté franco-ontarienne. Depuis l'adoption de la Loi sur les services en français, la mise en place d'institutions collégiales et universitaires de la langue française, la dévolution des pouvoirs, la promotion de la francophonie ontarienne, le développement d'infrastructures médiatiques, la vitalité de la communauté franco-ontarienne et le programme national de l'enfance figurent parmi les priorités de l'ACFO.

Aujourd'hui je souhaite bonne fête de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste à tous et toutes qui ont oeuvré sans relâche à protéger nos droits et acquis linguistiques et qui font vivre à chaque jour le français autour d'eux.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): In this, the last week of the Legislature's spring session, I am hoping the Leader of the Opposition will finally take a position and stick with it.

Last week, Dalton McGuinty protested the one-year postponement of the corporate tax cut; a week earlier, his party recommended it. His colleague was forced to eat his hat. After this, his most recent flip-flop, I would be

happy to send over a hat for the Leader of the Opposition. Dalton McGuinty flip-flops like a sunfish out of the Rideau River. I believe that Ontario's working families deserve some consistency from the Leader of the Opposition.

My constituents in Scarborough Centre are particularly pleased that the government has delivered both tax cuts and increased spending in health care, and they look forward to more of both again next year. Dalton McGuinty railed against tax cuts, but now the Leader of the Opposition says he wants them. This amounts to the biggest flip-flop since—well, since his flip-flop on the privatization of Ontario Hydro.

Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should take the summer off, go to Chicago again and have his American advisers explain that he can't forever get away with taking contradictory positions. Then in the fall, he can return and tell us finally and definitively whether he supports tax cuts or not.

SPECIAL-NEEDS STUDENTS

Mrs Sandra Papatello (Windsor West): Parents and children in Windsor know all too well that when it comes to education, Ernie Eves is not on their side. On Friday we learned that the high schools in the Catholic school board in Windsor will lose their librarians next year. Children with special needs in the public school board are not getting the services they need. In fact, the waiting lists keep growing, but the school board is getting the same amount of money that it got in 1998.

Since then, the board has registered 200 new special-ed students, students who qualify for supports under the ministry's own guidelines, but the funding is not there. Our public board now has 100 students waiting for psychological assessments. The wait is between one and two years. Those kids who act out or are extremely destructive continue to jump the queue, but the quiet kids continue to wait. The future is bleak for these kids, and it's getting worse, not better.

The public board is now hearing from parents. They are saying, "Why is my child's education being disrupted because special-needs kids don't have proper supports in the classroom?" Our one board needs \$5 million more to meet the needs, but this government has announced \$10 million for the entire province.

Here's what it means to one south Windsor school, where some of our highest-needs kids are clustered: the ratio of child to staff was two to one; it will be three to one. Kids who need two people to move them will wait

even longer. Kids with diapers that need changing will wait even longer.

I ask this government, is this what you intended? Did you intend for it to get worse and not better?

TERRY FOX RUN

Mr John O'Toole (Durham): I'm pleased to rise in the House today to report on the success of the recent Terry Fox Run in the municipality of Clarington. This includes, of course, strong support from across the community, but in particular the business community under the corporate challenge.

I was pleased to attend a breakfast with the team captains for the corporate challenge last week. They kindly brought to my attention the following details: Clarington raised \$71,000 in last year's Terry Fox Run held in Bowmanville. This makes it the eighth largest fundraiser of the 250 communities in Ontario holding Terry Fox runs. Clarington's run is the largest in the area between Toronto and Ottawa. Imagine that.

I'd like to congratulate Matt Yates of Lifestyle Health and Fitness and the members of their team for being the top corporate fundraiser last year. They raised \$4,643.20. I'm proud to say there were 36 corporate teams. Rounding out the top corporate fundraisers were the municipality of Clarington, the Newcastle Lions Club, the Darlington nuclear generating station, and Gibson Associates. I might add that my team was one of the top teams as well.

I'd like to pay tribute to the steering committee for the Terry Fox Run in Clarington. They include Walt Gibson, Pat Marjerrison, Brad Hockin, Cathy Brogan, Mary Tillcock, Bill McIntyre, Bill Swan, Janice McRae, Jack Munday, Donna Kay and Don Yeo. The steering committee was assisted ably by 140 volunteers from the corporate as well as the community sector.

But the real credit goes to the 1,129 participants who walked, ran, cycled and participated generally in support of a cure for cancer and the Terry Fox Run in Clarington.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming-Cochrane): Bennett Environmental last week filed with the Ministry of the Environment its environmental assessment documentation to build a hazardous-waste incinerator in the town of Kirkland Lake. Last week, the company filed its assessment submission, and Bennett Environmental constantly throughout this document makes reference to its existing plant in St Ambrose, Quebec, including test burn data from that plant. This plant in Quebec is half the size of the proposed Kirkland Lake facility and uses the same technology save for a few minor modifications.

In a letter I sent to the environmental assessment branch of the Ministry of the Environment, I requested that the daily monitoring results of the stack emissions at the Quebec facility be included in the EA for the pro-

posed Kirkland Lake plant. The ministry has turned this request down, saying that because the incinerator is licensed and operating in the province of Quebec, it is required to meet different environmental standards than required in Ontario. The ministry also states that this technology is different at the Quebec plant.

This is definitely not the case. Throughout the company's EA submission, there are pages and pages that make reference to the operating history of the Quebec facility. This is another example of how the Mike Harris Environmental Assessment Act fails our environment and the people of Ontario.

Two weeks ago, the Canadian Environmental Law Association issued a scathing report of Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act. It said, "The environmental assessment process in this province is a hollow shell of what it was and what it should be."

I ask the Minister of the Environment today to consider these vital data as part of the Bennett incinerator environmental assessment.

1340

ADOPTION DISCLOSURE

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): As you may be aware, over 2,500 diseases have been identified as having a genetic origin, and more than 300,000 adoptees want to know their genetic background. Without this information, adoptees cannot provide their doctors or their families with a medical history.

Adoptees and their families are in great peril and will continue to be so until this Legislature passes Bill 77, the bill to update our adoption disclosure laws in this province. Later this afternoon I will be asking for unanimous consent once again to pass this important bill. I would say that up to 99% of all legislators from all parties, perhaps more, support passing this bill. It has been sent out to committee. I have been bringing such a bill forward since 1999; Tony Martin, before me, brought forward a bill.

The time has passed for Ontario to lag so far behind other jurisdictions all over the world in giving adoptees the same rights that everybody else has in this province. So even if you do not support it for other reasons, please, I would ask all members today to pass this bill to protect the health of adoptees across this province.

PORT HOPE

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): I rise in the House today to pay tribute to the community of Port Hope, in my riding of Northumberland. Earlier this month, Port Hope was the focus of TVOntario's current affairs program, Studio 2. In the program, Walton Street in downtown Port Hope was recognized as one of the best-preserved Main Streets in its province-wide contest. It is in good company among all other historic downtown areas in Northumberland county. Whether it is Port

Hope's Royal Bank Opera House above the bank or the restored atmospheric Capitol Theatre, I encourage you to come and see for yourself the beauty of this community.

Many thanks to Port Hope tourism coordinator Andrea Patterson for all her hard work, as well as to Port Hope Mayor Rick Austin for promoting and celebrating all that Port Hope has to offer. Many organizations deserve recognition, including the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee, the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario and Port Hope's Heritage Business Improvement Area.

Finally, congratulations to all residents of Port Hope who have worked so hard to preserve the historical buildings and features of downtown Port Hope, enabling it to win this exciting award.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): My statement today is to the Minister of Education. We know that money doesn't buy happiness, but it does buy textbooks, music programs, busing, library books, psychology testing, principals, educational assistants and some office staff.

Minister, you have said several times that our graduates need to compete with graduates from the rest of the world, so let's look at how the rest of the world funds their students. Looking at the elementary level, I talked to a school board and said, "Be generous. How much money do you get per student?" They included busing, they included every possible grant, and said, "About \$6,700." Our graduates compete with graduates from the United States system. If we look at their 50 states they spend, in Canadian dollars, in New Jersey, \$15,941 per student. New Jersey spends that much per pupil. Utah is at the opposite end and spends about \$6,400. Ontario spends about \$6,700 per elementary student. Where does that rank us in North America? We're between state 49 and state 50. Only Utah keeps us from being the lowest-funded system. That is an absolute shame for our graduates, who need to be equipped.

Each and every one of you on that side gets calls from parents who cannot get support for special education. You know they're calling. The reason the supports aren't there is because we're next to the cheapest in North America.

PERIMETER INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS

Mr Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington): On June 14, I was honoured to join the Deputy Premier and the Prime Minister of Canada in Waterloo for an announcement of government funding for the Perimeter Institute, funding that will support breakthroughs in theoretical physics, both at the institute and through the establishment of an international research centre at the University of Water-

loo's Institute for Quantum Computing. On that day, the government committed to more than \$11.5 million from the Ontario research and development challenge fund and the Ontario Innovation Trust.

The Perimeter Institute is the brainchild of Mike Lazaridis, co-CEO and founder of Research in Motion, the company that produces the Blackberry, a popular, wireless e-mail system made in Waterloo.

The province has made a sound investment in a research venture in theoretical physics that began when Mike Lazaridis launched the institute, donating \$100 million of his own money to further his other dream of creating a world-class institution devoted to un-tapping nature's most fundamental secrets.

On the Monday following that event, last Monday, the Minister of Finance announced in her budget speech that the government of Ontario has enhanced its commitment, bringing it to a total of \$25 million.

Some time ago, Mike Lazaridis was quoted in the Toronto Star as saying, "If the people don't want to do it, why should the government do it?" He took the lead, and his extraordinary and generous philanthropic gift has created a world-class research institute that will lead to the betterment of humankind.

As the same article pointed out, the Perimeter Institute is dedicated to uncovering the theory of everything, or the rules that unify the subatomic and cosmic realms of matter, potentially making sense of everything on earth and in space.

I'm proud that our government has seen fit to support this outstanding endeavour.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): I beg to inform the House that today I laid upon the table the 2001-02 annual report of the Ombudsman.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ROYAL OTTAWA HEALTH CARE GROUP/SERVICES DE SANTÉ ROYAL OTTAWA ACT, 2002

Mr Patten moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/Services de Santé Royal Ottawa.

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

Pursuant to standing order 84, this bill stands referred to the standing committee on regulations and private bills.

CARLIE MYKE AND BRANDON WHITE
ACT (SAFE SCHOOL ZONES HIGHWAY
TRAFFIC AMENDMENT), 2002

LOI CARLIE MYKE ET BRANDON WHITE
DE 2002 (MODIFICATION DU CODE DE LA
ROUTE SUR LA SÉCURITÉ
DES ZONES D'ÉCOLE)

Mr Levac moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 120, An Act to honour Carlie Myke and Brandon White by amending the Highway Traffic Act to reduce the rate of speed permitted on highways surrounding schools and to ensure traffic safety in school zones / Projet de loi 120, Loi en hommage à Carlie Myke et Brandon White modifiant le Code de la route afin de réduire la vitesse autorisée sur les voies publiques autour des écoles et d'assurer la sécurité routière dans les zones d'école.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Dave Levac (Brant): Research tells us that a pedestrian hit by a car travelling approximately 70 kilometres per hour has only a 15% chance of survival. By reducing it to 30, this chance increases to a 95% survival rate. The bill reduces the speed at which a motor vehicle can travel on a highway surrounding schools. The rate of speed is reduced to 30 kilometres per hour in the case of two-lane highways and is reduced to 10 kilometres per hour for cases of highways with more than two lanes. The bill requires municipalities and trustees of police villages to establish school traffic safety teams to review traffic problems surrounding schools in the municipality or village and to report to the municipality, the village, the school board and the Ministry of Transportation.

I have with me the parents of Carlie and Brandon in the House, and I would introduce Christine Myke and Jeff Radmore, grandparent Colin Radmore, friend Jenny Stewart, Marie and Mitchell Michalak, grandparents of Carlie, and an aunt, Shirley Roy, who are with us in the House today to support this bill.

1350

ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT
PROGRAM AMENDMENT ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE
PROGRAMME ONTARIEN DE SOUTIEN
AUX PERSONNES HANDICAPÉES

Mr Parsons moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 122, An Act to amend the Ontario Disability Support Program Act, 1997 to empower the Integrity Commissioner to determine the level of income support / Projet de loi 122, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur le Programme ontarien de soutien aux personnes handicapées en vue de donner au commissaire à l'intégrité le pouvoir de déterminer le niveau de soutien du revenu.

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

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

The member for a short statement?

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): An Ontarian on the ODSP plan is receiving a maximum of about \$11,000 a year, which is over \$7,000 below the poverty level in this province. This government has been either unwilling or unable to deal with what is a fair amount of money for the ODSP program.

My bill would refer it to the Integrity Commissioner—there has been some precedent for this—to determine the amount the payment should be and the manner in which they should be paid.

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'm not arguing about the validity of the member's point of order on the last bill introduced, or the issue. I just think there may be some orderliness to it with respect to finances and committing government to future finances. It may in fact be out of order simply because it would be referred to the Integrity Commissioner. I don't profess to know, since I haven't read the bill. There are always these timeliness arguments with respect to introduction of bills. I just want to go on the record that maybe you could review it and report back to the House.

The Speaker: The table will review it, like they do every bill, thoroughly, and they will let us know, like they always do.

LCBO DEPOSIT AND RETURN ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LES CONSIGNES ET
REMISES EXIGÉES PAR LA RAO

Mr Colle moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 125, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act to require the Liquor Control Board to establish a deposit and return system / Projet de loi 125, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les alcools pour exiger que la Régie des alcools crée un système de consigne et de remise.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence): As you know, Mr Speaker, the government liquor monopoly doesn't have to recycle. This bill basically gets rid of that double standard. It amends the Liquor Control Act to require the Liquor Control Board to establish programs to ensure that all liquor sold to the public on or after July 1, 2003, is in containers for which a deposit is charged at the time of sale and refunded on the return of the container.

The Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorized to make regulations governing the establishment and operation of these programs.

ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES
AMENDMENT ACT (WATER SOURCE
PROTECTION), 2002

LOI DE 2002 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES
RESSOURCES EN EAU DE L'ONTARIO
(PROTECTION DES SOURCES
D'ALIMENTATION EN EAU)

Mrs Dombrowsky moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 127, An Act to amend the Ontario Water Resources Act with respect to water source protection / Projet de loi 127, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario en ce qui concerne la protection des sources d'alimentation en eau.

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

The member for a short statement?

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): This bill amends the Ontario Water Resources Act with regard to the availability and conservation of Ontario water resources.

Specifically, the bill requires the director to consider the Minister of the Environment's statement of environmental values when making any decision under the act. The bill also requires that municipalities and conservation authorities are notified of applications to take water that, if granted, may affect their water sources or supplies.

MOTIONS

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I ask consent to move both of these motions for night sittings at the same time.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Is there unanimous consent? No.

Hon Mr Stockwell: You can't blame a guy for trying.

I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm until 9:30 pm on Monday, June 24, 2002, for the purpose of considering government business.

The Speaker: 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 five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1357 to 1402.

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
Arnott, Ted

Elliott, Brenda
Flaherty, Jim

Mushinski, Marilyn
Newman, Dan

Baird, John R.
Barrett, Toby
Bartolucci, Rick
Beaubien, Marcel
Bountrogianni, Marie
Boyer, Claudette
Bradley, James J.
Brown, Michael A.
Bryant, Michael
Caplan, David
Clark, Brad
Clement, Tony
Coburn, Brian
Colle, Mike
Cordiano, Joseph
Cunningham, Dianne
Curling, Alvin
DeFaria, Carl
Di Cocco, Caroline
Dombrowsky, Leona
Duncan, Dwight
Dunlop, Garfield

Galt, Doug
Gilchrist, Steve
Gill, Raminder
Hardeman, Ernie
Hudak, Tim
Johns, Helen
Johnson, Bert
Kennedy, Gerard
Klees, Frank
Kwinter, Monte
Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Levac, David
Martiniuk, Gerry
Maves, Bart
Mazzilli, Frank
McDonald, AL
McGuinty, Dalton
McLeod, Lyn
McMeekin, Ted
Miller, Norm
Molinari, Tina R.
Munro, Julia

O'Toole, John
Ouellette, Jerry J.
Parsons, Ernie
Patten, Richard
Peters, Steve
Phillips, Gerry
Pupatello, Sandra
Ramsay, David
Runciman, Robert W.
Sampson, Rob
Sergio, Mario
Spina, Joseph
Sterling, Norman W.
Stockwell, Chris
Tascona, Joseph N.
Tsubouchi, David H.
Turnbull, David
Wilson, Jim
Witmer, Elizabeth
Wood, Bob
Young, David

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

Nays

Hampton, Howard
Kormos, Peter

Marchese, Rosario
Martel, Shelley

Martin, Tony
Prue, Michael

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 71; the nays are 6.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon Mr Stockwell: I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(i), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to 9:30 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2002, for the purpose of considering government business.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All 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 1405 to 1410.

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
Arnott, Ted
Baird, John R.
Barrett, Toby
Bartolucci, Rick
Beaubien, Marcel
Bountrogianni, Marie
Boyer, Claudette
Bradley, James J.
Brown, Michael A.
Bryant, Michael
Caplan, David
Clark, Brad
Clement, Tony
Coburn, Brian
Colle, Mike
Cordiano, Joseph
Cunningham, Dianne
Curling, Alvin
DeFaria, Carl

Elliott, Brenda
Flaherty, Jim
Galt, Doug
Gilchrist, Steve
Gill, Raminder
Hardeman, Ernie
Hastings, John
Hudak, Tim
Johns, Helen
Johnson, Bert
Kennedy, Gerard
Klees, Frank
Kwinter, Monte
Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Levac, David
Martiniuk, Gerry
Maves, Bart
Mazzilli, Frank
McDonald, AL
McGuinty, Dalton

Munro, Julia
Mushinski, Marilyn
Newman, Dan
O'Toole, John
Ouellette, Jerry J.
Parsons, Ernie
Patten, Richard
Peters, Steve
Phillips, Gerry
Pupatello, Sandra
Ramsay, David
Runciman, Robert W.
Sampson, Rob
Sergio, Mario
Spina, Joseph
Sterling, Norman W.
Stockwell, Chris
Tascona, Joseph N.
Tsubouchi, David H.
Turnbull, David

Di Cocco, Caroline	McLeod, Lyn	Wilson, Jim
Dombrowsky, Leona	McMeekin, Ted	Witmer, Elizabeth
Duncan, Dwight	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Dunlop, Garfield	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David

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

Nays

Hampton, Howard	Marchese, Rosario	Prue, Michael
Kormos, Peter	Martin, Tony	

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 72; the nays are 5.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): I move that standing order 87 respecting notice of committee hearings be suspended for consideration of Bill Pr10 by the standing committee on regulations and private bills on Wednesday, June 26, 2002.

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

VISITORS

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to introduce the parents' council and the chair, Trudy Griffiths. They're in the audience today in the gallery.

Ms Marilyn Churley (Toronto-Danforth): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to ask for unanimous consent to pass third reading of Bill 77, the Adoption Disclosure Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MUNICIPALITIES

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question today is for the Deputy Premier. There is a growing consensus on the need for a new deal for our cities. Cities in Ontario are struggling, particularly the city of Toronto. It is faltering. It is having a great deal of difficulty struggling with its responsibilities: housing, public transit and infrastructure generally.

I believe it's time to rethink our relationship with our cities, particularly the city of Toronto, and to put them on a sustainable footing to ensure they reach their potential and can continue to serve us in their very important capacity as Ontario's economic engine.

My question to you is, given this growing consensus, can you tell me why the Eves government has put forging a new deal with municipalities on the back burner?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): I would refer that to the associate minister.

Hon Tina R. Molinari (Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I want to say that the new deal for cities in Ontario—I've been following the news in the last few months on all the working groups that are working toward coming up with some solutions. I intend to attend the summit that's coming up on Wednesday and listen to all those who are participating in that summit. Certainly we, as a government, are committed to recognizing what the cities are requesting—the whole issue of governance and the issue of financing—and I'm pleased to be able to consult with a number of stakeholders to work on some solutions.

Mr McGuinty: Madam Associate Minister, I can tell you that the people of Toronto are not going to take a great deal of comfort in the knowledge that you are going to listen at a conference. I think it's time to move forward, and I have a very specific proposal for you.

Some of the best work that was recently done in this Legislature was by a select committee dealing with energy matters. I thought that was a very productive and useful exercise, notwithstanding what some government members might think. I think we should be establishing a select committee to do work over the course of the summer and report to this Legislature when we resume sitting, presumably in October, to carefully consider how we might establish a new and better working relationship with our cities, and especially the city of Toronto. I ask you to consider this, Madam Minister.

Hon Mrs Molinari: The government agrees that continued competitiveness of its urban centres, such as Toronto and Ottawa, is important. We have a very keen interest in Toronto as a strong, healthy and vibrant centre.

We have taken a number of steps to strengthen the municipal sector. We have a memorandum of understanding with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario that all the municipalities participated in. The government recognizes that well-administered, economically healthy municipalities are a significant part of Ontario's competitive edge, and an appropriate legislative environment that provides municipalities with the tools they require while simultaneously protecting public health and safety without creating red tape.

We are open to listening to all the consultation processes that are coming about, and we are taking advice. Certainly the members of the opposition have the ability to give advice, and we will be listening to that too.

Mr McGuinty: Madam Minister, if you cannot make this commitment here today, then I ask you undertake to approach the Premier with this request. It's important to understand that if Toronto, for example, is going to move beyond surviving, so that it actually thrives and continues its important role for the entire province of Ontario, we need to strike a new deal with cities.

The United Way, the Toronto Board of Trade, economists at TD Canada Trust and the Royal Bank, the CD Howe Institute, the Conference Board of Canada, the

Federation of Canadian Municipalities and none other than Jane Jacobs herself are calling on your government to forge a new deal for our municipalities.

My request is very simple and, I think, very positive. I ask that you receive it in the spirit with which it is tendered. May I ask you again: could we not strike a select committee and enable representatives from all three parties to work together, report to this House in October and strike a new deal with our cities?

Hon Mrs Molinari: I'm not sure what part of the response the opposition doesn't understand. I said we will be listening. We'll be listening to the advice and the opinions of the opposition as well.

Let me be clear. When your federal cousins come through on their funding for health care for the province of Ontario, then we'll be able to make more commitments toward the cities. If the federal government is also interested in building vibrant cities, then please speak to your federal cousins and ensure they fulfill their commitment to health care funding in this province.

1420

FREEDOM OF HYDRO INFORMATION

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): It will take me a while to recover from that tongue-lashing, Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Energy. Minister, on Friday, our Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ann Cavoukian, blew the whistle on your government on the matter of Hydro again. In 1998 she said it was essential that the new Hydro companies be subject to the freedom-of-information legislation. She said the same thing in 1999. She said the same thing in 2001. Then last Friday she said, "There are a number of amendments in Bill 58 that would seriously impinge on the public's right to scrutinize and seek information about the newly deregulated electricity market in Ontario." In effect, the privacy commissioner is saying that your consumer protection bill is really a consumer blindfold.

Why are you still trying to hide what is going on in our electricity market from taxpayers and ratepayers alike?

Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader): That's not the case. The simple fact is this: we searched for a jurisdiction that would provide FOIs—freedom-of-information requests—for private corporations. We could not find one. I myself spoke with the privacy commissioner and asked if she could provide me with any examples of any jurisdiction in the world that would provide FOIs, freedom of informations, for private sector corporations. She couldn't provide me with that. I suggested to her that it was very difficult for us to attract industries to build generating stations to put power on the grid if all their personal and financial information, the sensitive stuff, would be allowed to be under freedom of information and then provided to all their competitors. She agreed that would be very difficult.

What you don't understand is that with the IMO going in there and getting all this information and the OEB adjudicating, in fact that is protection far better than any protection provided in jurisdictions.

So my question to you is, are you now telling this House you're in favour of having private sector companies fall under the freedom-of-information act and all that private sector information be allowed to go out to everybody in the world? If that's what you're saying, stand up and say it.

Mr McGuinty: Minister, you would know that your spin has no basis in fact. Freedom-of-information legislation provides for a specific exemption when it comes to protecting information that could jeopardize trade secrets or law enforcement matters.

Isn't the whole idea here—and I'm sure you will agree with me on this—to inspire confidence in the public when it comes to what you are doing with Hydro? Listen to what Derek Cowbourne, the vice-president of market services over at the IMO, recently said:

"If this market is good—and we believe it is—then it must be seen to be good. At the IMO ... we keep the lights on.... But the public is concerned because people are in the dark—and when you're in the dark, you don't know if it's a light at the end of the tunnel or a train. If what we do is not seen to be good, it won't be trusted. If it seems closed to a few industry insiders because only industry people understand the language and grasp the issues and see the benefits, it won't be trusted. And if it isn't trusted, it won't move forward."

What I am saying to you is that if you want the market to move forward, it's important that it be trusted and it's very important there be transparency there. So I ask you again, why do you stand in the way of ensuring that the new system is transparent to ratepayers and taxpayers alike?

Hon Mr Stockwell: It's as transparent as any jurisdiction in the world. How much more comprehensive can it be? It is transparent to every jurisdiction in the world. There isn't one jurisdiction in the world that says private, confidential private company information should be subject to freedom of information. The IMO can go in there, gather the information, report to the Ontario Energy Board. They adjudicate and pass penalties and so on against those companies that aren't co-operating properly.

But if you're suggesting to me—and I wish you'd say it—that private sector companies should be subject to the freedom-of-information act, then say it. Nobody else anywhere in the world is saying that. Only you, Mr McGuinty, and this privacy commissioner; besides that, no one. Stand up and tell me that private sector corporations should now be subject to the freedom-of-information act and then try to attract companies to Ontario where they would be laid bare, all financial information for all their competitors to see.

Mr McGuinty: If I have to choose between you and the privacy commissioner in terms of who's going to stand up for ratepayers and taxpayers and ensure there's

transparency, I'm with the privacy commissioner. It's as simple as that.

I say to you again, Mr Minister, there is provision in the freedom-of-information legislation to protect against revealing trade secrets and the like. You tell me this has been done nowhere else in the world. I don't care. Why aren't you so ambitious to ensure that we have something better here in Ontario? Why can't you draw upon the California experience? One of the things that commentators expert in these matters have said was that because of the lack of transparency, people were able to game the markets. Why is it that you continue to stand in the way of ensuring there is transparency for taxpayers and ratepayers?

Hon Mr Stockwell: How they gamed the market was, they didn't have the teeth for the inspection of the IMO and they didn't have the teeth or the jurisdiction of the Ontario Energy Board. That's how they gamed the market. It didn't work that way in Texas, Britain and other areas because they had a tough regulation, such as we have, at the IMO and the OEB.

Mr McGuinty: I don't care.

Hon Mr Stockwell: You don't care. Of course you don't care. You don't care if companies come here. You don't care if there's prosperity. You don't care if there are jobs. You're like your friend over here from St Catharines. You're only satisfied when everybody's on welfare, everybody's on the dole and everybody works for the government.

We care. I'm not apologizing for caring about that. It's a fact of life that this government wants prosperity. If you want to do that, stand up and say it, because I'm telling you for a fact, no jurisdiction has it. There's good reason why nobody has it. The rhetoric, baffle-gab and yadda yadda you put on here isn't worth the powder to blow it to Hades.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): New question.

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is also to the Minister of Energy. Minister, I suggest you pay careful attention to what the privacy commissioner is saying, because she says the problem is at the IMO. You want to focus this on private corporations. She points out that the IMO is a creation of your government. The IMO is charged with ensuring that price-fixing doesn't happen, it's charged with ensuring that consumers are protected, yet the IMO wants to have a blanket over the information. The IMO wants to keep consumers in the dark. The question is this: do you support the IMO keeping the privacy commissioner and consumers in the dark? If so, why are you more interested in protecting the next Enron in Ontario rather than protecting the public?

Hon Mr Stockwell: The Leader of the Opposition quoted an employee at the IMO saying, "No, this information should be public." What are you talking about? He's quoting guys from the IMO saying, "Yes, it should be public information." You're saying to me the IMO doesn't want to make it public information. I know you meet before question period. Get your strategy straight.

I say through you, Mr Speaker, to the leader of the third party, the fact is this: there isn't a jurisdiction that does this. Why don't they do it? Think about it. Private companies set their shops up in Ontario. They're subject to FOI. If they're subject to FOI, all their trade secrets, all their financial information is available to anyone in the world, and that would put them at an unfair disadvantage. We wouldn't be able to attract people under those terms and conditions, because no jurisdiction allows this.

Interjections.

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's): Wrong, wrong.

Hon Mr Stockwell: The member for St Paul's is saying, "Wrong." I know the member for St Catharines is blusterous, blathering away. If there's a jurisdiction that does allow this, give me the name of the jurisdiction that allows FOIs on private corporations.

1430

Mr Hampton: This is not about FOIs to private corporations, and you know it. This about the information commissioner being able to look at those files at the IMO, being able to determine if the IMO is in fact covering up for corporate friends of this government.

You asked for a jurisdiction that does this. After the energy blackouts in California, after the Enrons ripped off people to the tune of billions of dollars, this is what California now does to protect consumers. You can get this information off a Web site in California. You can go to the Web site and you can find out which private electricity-generating corporation has shut down. You can even find out why they've shut down. You can find out which ones are operating.

Minister, I think that if you want to promote an electricity market in Ontario, you ought to be protecting the consumers rather than your corporate friends. Will you do that?

Hon Mr Stockwell: You're saying it's all about the IMO. Well, the IMO gathers that information, and if the IMO gathers that information from private corporations and they are "FOI-able," then all that financial information about these companies would be under the FOI.

I can only say our scan indicates that we can't find a jurisdiction that subjects their IMO or independent electricity system to freedom-of-information legislation. It has nothing to do with protecting anybody. It has to do with this: private corporations are not subject to freedom of information simply because the information they have is germane to their business, and if their competitors got it, it would put them at a competitive disadvantage. That's not anything to do with protectionism at all; it has to do with fair market practices. So besides us, there is not a jurisdiction that would release this information, that would gather this information under the privacy commissioner. It would put us at a disadvantage and it would be a mindless act in order to perpetrate some myth that somehow they're not being monitored.

Mr Hampton: Enron was a myth? This is the New York Times, June 23, 2002: "Former Officials Say Enron Hid" \$1.5 billion in ripoff gains from people in Cali-

fornia. After this happened, California said, "The public deserves to know more information. We have to be concerned with protecting the public." The only Minister of Energy I can find anywhere who is still concerned with protecting the Enrons is you. Everybody else out there is concerned to make sure Enron doesn't happen again.

So I repeat my question. Why is it, Minister, that you want to put a wet blanket on information which might indicate that somebody is manipulating the market, that somebody is scamming consumers, that someone is creating an artificial electricity shortage? Why are you so committed to looking after the interests of your corporate friends, the next Enron, rather than protecting the consumers of Ontario?

Hon Mr Stockwell: What California did after that was in fact toughen up their electricity monitoring operators and their Ontario Energy Board. Why?

Mr Hampton: It ended deregulation.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Go ahead. Keep going. It ended—

Mr Hampton: It ended deregulation.

Hon Mr Stockwell: Well, right, because a lefty was trying to operate it, and we all know lefties can't operate a private sector operator. So the fact of the matter is this: they toughened up their IMO and their Ontario Energy Board because that's the kind of legislation we put in place in order for the IMO and the OEB—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. The minister has the floor.

Hon Mr Stockwell: That's the kind of legislation we put in place for the IMO to monitor the situation, the OEB to check on it.

What California did was they adopted our legislation and put it in place to ensure it can't happen. The only wet blanket I want to throw on here has nothing to do with an issue, has nothing to do with the IMO, has nothing to do with the OEB. The only wet blanket that needs to be thrown here is on something else.

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): My question is to the Minister of Labour. I would just say to the Minister of Energy that in California they put this information on the Web so people can find it.

My question to the Minister of Labour is this: your government's laws that promote scabs in the workplace have caused a situation at the Chatham Navistar plant to go from bad to horrendous. This morning, even as police continued to turn away scabs in the interests of safety, an SUV driven by a security firm hired by Navistar to get scabs into the plant struck six people who were legally picketing. Four of those people were taken to hospital. One was badly scraped up from being dragged 40 feet by the SUV, one had a broken leg and one is in critical condition and has been airlifted to the London's University Hospital with internal injuries and tire marks on his

stomach. The police have since charged the driver of the SUV.

Your government's legislation allows scabs into workplaces. It allows companies like this to promote this kind of thing on the picket line. So my questions are these: when are you going to take responsibility for the situation you have caused; will you commit today to step in and call off the strikebreaking dogs, or do you think it's appropriate for people who are legally exercising their right of association to be run over on a picket line?

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Labour): We are definitely sorry to hear about the unfortunate accident that occurred this morning down in Chatham.

Our legislation is balanced. The union has the right to withdraw their services during a strike. The company has the right to continue operating. That's the way the law is written; that's what is on the books currently in Ontario. While the leader of the third party over there wants to make political hay out of this, we on this side have been in contact with both parties, trying to get both parties back to the collective bargaining table, where this particular labour dispute will be resolved.

Mr Hampton: Navistar has rejected your government's offer of mediation. They have refused to come to the table to bargain. Instead, they're going to get SUVs and hire strikebreakers to run at the picket line. You keep telling people that under your legislation 95% of labour disputes are resolved without a strike. Before your legislation, 97% of collective bargaining situations were handled at the bargaining table. What has happened since your legislation is that you've put these kinds of professional strikebreaking companies back in business. That's what you've done. This was a company that was hired by Navistar to get scabs into the plant. Six people who are legally exercising their constitutionally protected right, freedom of associating, are run down, and all you can say is, "This is a balanced situation" that your government is creating. Create some balance. Take these companies out of business. Reintroduce legislation which says scabs are not welcome in Ontario. That's how you have balance, when you do that.

Hon Mr Clark: Again, to the leader of the third party, the government of Ontario abhors violence of any type. Nothing that is going on anywhere could condone the type of violence that has occurred. The police department will investigate the violence and they'll lay charges that are appropriate. The reality is here. We're working to resolve the labour dispute. We want both sides at the table—collective bargaining in good faith. That's what we want.

Interjection.

Hon Mr Clark: You can continue to raise your voice, you can continue to yell and scream, you can continue to incite this type of nonsense, but on this side of the House we're interested in collective bargaining. We want the company and the labour group to sit down at the same table and come up with an agreement. We want to eliminate this labour dispute and get everyone back to work. We're not interested in the political rhetoric that

you have, sir. We're interested in solving a labour dispute. That's why I'm involved; that's why we're encouraging both parties back to the table.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park): I have a question for the Minister of Education. Last Friday a Superior Court of Justice of Ontario decision exposes just how much influence you have over closing schools across the province. The decision voids the board's decision to shut down 10 schools here in Toronto.

Your funding formula requires school boards to sacrifice pupil needs in one area by shutting down schools to help pupils in a completely different area in order to build new schools. The implication, Minister, is that the school board in question is no longer closing schools to satisfy you. Now they're no longer eligible to get your funding to build new schools.

According to the Toronto Catholic school board, the bounty to take away neighbourhood schools from 3,000 children is about \$3.8 million this year. My question to you, Minister, is, are you going to take away the \$3.8 million you paid to the Toronto Catholic board for new schools now that the court has overturned the decision to close the schools and make the board eligible?

1440

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): As the member full well knows, it's up to the Toronto board to make the decisions regarding school closings, and obviously they're going to have to make sure they abide by the decision.

Mr Kennedy: Minister, you're getting very famous for not giving a direct answer. The question is very simple. Your rules say there's a deadline of December 31. The judges have said the schools cannot close. Either you're going to penalize the board by taking the \$3.8 million away from them, or you're going to penalize the students by getting involved in some process to still close these schools.

Henry Gluch is here. He's one of the parents who spent a lot of their own money going to court because of your flawed provincial school closing policy. I think you owe it to all those parents around the province, many of whom are here visiting this House looking for you to give a direct answer. Minister, are you prepared to use your discretion to help these schools survive, to not see something bad happen for the students or for the school board? In other words, are you prepared to let the board keep the \$3.8 million? Are you prepared, in fact, to implement the school closing moratorium that our leader, Dalton McGuinty, proposed, until your flawed funding formula is reviewed? That's the right answer. I'd like you to stand up in the House and tell us exactly what you're going to do.

Hon Mrs Witmer: The member opposite seems to forget that throughout the years there have been closings of both public and Catholic schools. In fact, I would like to remind the member that between 1985 and 1990,

during the Liberal tax-and-spend era, there were 37 schools closed in the city of Toronto.

I'm not criticizing the Liberals for school closures, because obviously these decisions need to be made by local boards. But what I want to make clear that it is not the policies of today that lead to school closures. School closures have always been a fact of life. However, it is important that the school board go through the appropriate consultation process with the community groups, with the taxpayers and all those involved in making their decisions.

ARTS AND CULTURAL FUNDING

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): My question is for the Minister of Culture. Three weeks ago in this House, you announced our government's joint investment with the federal government of \$233 million into the greater Toronto area—too bad George Smitherman isn't here to hear this—to support progressive building improvement projects for seven cultural institutions. I understand that just last Wednesday the Canadian Opera Company held a press conference to announce the naming donor for the new opera house. Minister, I wonder if you could tell this House how this excellent example of public-private partnership, coming together with both the province and the federal government, will result in a dream that finally will be realized.

Hon David H. Tsubouchi (Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture): The member for Scarborough Centre is quite right. About three weeks ago Premier Eves was able to announce, along with Prime Minister Chrétien, a huge investment into the culture community in the city of Toronto. That was received with great appreciation by maestro Richard Bradshaw and also the chair of the opera house, Arthur Scace.

The province's commitment is \$31 million worth of land. That's matched by the federal government in the amount of \$25 million in cash to enable the opera house to continue. I was quite privileged last week to be at the naming announcement. That, of course, is Isadore Sharp, with Four Seasons. He has committed \$20 million toward the opera house. This is a great indication of how the public and the private sectors can work together to benefit the cultural community in the city of Toronto—and not simply Toronto but right across the province of Ontario.

Ms Mushinski: We know the enormous contribution and value that the arts and culture section bring to our society and our economy, and there's no doubt that government and private partner funding make all the difference to the ultimate success of large-scale capital projects like those announced under the SuperBuild initiative.

Minister, we also know the importance of revitalizing these exciting arts and cultural buildings to keep pace with other world-class venues or simply to expand to meet the current needs of displaying, storing and pro-

curing the many treasures and artifacts of our historical past. Will you please share with this House the current status of the other SuperBuild initiatives?

Hon Mr Tsubouchi: Speaker, I would be remiss as the Minister of Culture if I didn't recognize a couple of distinguished guests in the gallery: Mr Elliott Chang, the director general of the Taipei economic and cultural office in Toronto, and Dr Michael Tsai, who is the deputy representative at the Taipei economic and cultural office.

Once again, I thank the member for Scarborough Centre. This announcement was received with great gratitude from the cultural community, whether it was the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario or the National Ballet School.

I will quote Mr Jack Cockwell. Jack, of course, is the chairman of the Royal Ontario Museum. He said, "With \$60 million recently committed to phase one of Renaissance ROM by the provincial SuperBuild initiative and the federal Canada-Ontario infrastructure program and initial private sector commitments, the Royal Ontario Museum is already halfway to completing the funding requirements for phase one of this two-phase project."

The government commitment clearly has assisted these cultural institutions in going to the private sector to create a great partnership for the benefit of the city of Toronto.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Richard Patten (Ottawa Centre): My question is for the Minister of Education. In 1997, the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board received \$556 million in funding. Nearly six years later, they're receiving \$504 million from the province toward a \$544-million planned budget. Their administrative line is 2.2%, well below the 3% guideline that your funding formula provides. They have cut \$10 million out of this year's budget alone, and they've depleted all of their reserves. They're in a heck of a mess—and don't tell me about Dr Rozanski's effort to look at the funding formula, because anybody with half a brain in two hours could figure out the problem with the funding formula with five phone calls.

Your officials held one meeting with the board and as of this morning the board has heard nothing from the ministry. I wrote to you on June 5 asking you to respond. I'm asking you now, Minister, will you appoint an investigator to review the board's books and their budget plan for the year 2002-03?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): In response to the question from the member, who has indeed discussed this issue with me, we are endeavouring to work with the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board. Their budget this year is a projected \$504 million. That is an increase of 2.3% over last year and the board's enrolment has increased by only 1.1%.

We continue to want to work with the Ottawa-Carleton board in order to ensure that the budget there

can be balanced. I know that the administration—and I think this is important to note—has presented the board with a balanced budget. They have provided the opportunity for the board to support that budget.

Mr Patten: The administration are staff, and staff look to Queen's Park for directions from the ministry. The trustees look to the people of Ottawa and the parents of the kids for what they want for quality education. So it's quite a different ballgame.

There was a poll done—and you say you worked with the board. Nobody is working with the board, by the way. You have a committee that's been working with the Toronto board for the last three weeks. If you're not around the corner or down the street, I guess you don't get attention. This is the government of Ontario, not the government of Toronto, I would remind you. Anybody outside of the Toronto always gets short shrift.

There was a recent Decima poll that showed that 77% of respondents support increased provincial funding to make up for the identified \$32-million shortfall. I tell you, if there was an election tomorrow, combining this issue with the CHEO issue, you'd be lucky to have one member of the Progressive Conservative Party in the Ottawa area.

I ask you, Minister, will you really work with the board, not just say you're working with the board? Nothing has happened. Will you work with them to arrive at a balanced budget?

1450

Hon Mrs Witmer: I think the member has made one very important point: that every school board in Ontario deserves the same type of attention, whether they're in Toronto, down in Windsor, up in Thunder Bay or in Ottawa, and I would certainly agree. It remains a difficult decision every year for trustees to balance their budget.

I can assure the member opposite that we continue to look to working with the Ottawa board. I hope they're doing what other boards are doing; that is, continuing to look at options as to how the budget can be balanced. I know that administrators in other boards are taking a look at how it can be done. As I say, I understand the administration in Ottawa has presented a balanced budget, but unfortunately the trustees did select not to adopt that budget.

CONSTRUCTION LABOUR MOBILITY

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): My question is for the Minister of Labour. Would you please update Ontarians on the government's activities and enforcement under the Fairness is a Two-Way Street Act to protect construction jobs in eastern Ontario?

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Labour): Our government remains committed to the elimination of inter-provincial trade and labour mobility barriers. That is why we redesignated Quebec under the Fairness is a Two-Way Street Act. Without that designation, construction workers and contractors from Quebec are able to work

here and do business freely in Ontario. At the same time, Quebec continues to impose significant barriers to Ontario companies doing business in Quebec. Until these barriers are removed, the measures will remain in place and will be vigorously enforced.

As to the enforcement issue, at the present time there are 68 inspectors from various ministries appointed to enforce the act. Many of these inspectors are appointed under other legislation to allow enforcement of construction-related compliance issues. This is done to ensure all contractors are playing by the same rules and have a level playing field in Ontario.

Mr Gill: Minister, I'm confident that strong enforcement will go a long way in protecting construction jobs in eastern Ontario. Could you please inform the House on the results of the enforcement activities?

Hon Mr Clark: Most construction contracts were in effect before March 9, 2002, the date Quebec was redesignated, and the provisions of the Fairness is a Two-Way Street Act do not apply. Quebec contractors and construction workers working on post-March 9 contracts are required to register with the jobs protection office.

During our inspections, whenever workers and contractors are found to be working without registration, they are directed to register with the JPO. This has proven to be very effective. As of May 31, the JPO has registered 122 contractors and 907 workers since the act was reimposed on Quebec on March 9. The JPO has also collected in excess of \$120,000 in registration fees. In addition, the office has received more than 2,000 phone calls regarding compliance requirements.

Under other statutes, numerous charges have been laid. This type of inspection activity takes place to ensure that all contractors are playing by the same rules and there is a level playing field for all.

AUTISM TREATMENT

Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Minister of Health. Your government is turning its back on thousands of autistic children in this province. Recent numbers from OHIP show that one in 500 Ontario children is diagnosed with autism. We now have a proven treatment for this neurological illness, known as intensive behavioural intervention, but the vast majority of these children will never get the treatment they need. Your government funds IBI treatment as a disability service through the Ministry of Community, Family and Children's Services. This medically necessary treatment should be funded through OHIP. Will you commit today to providing children with the medically necessary treatment they need, and will you fully fund IBI treatment to all children who need it regardless of their age?

Applause.

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): Just before the minister answers the question, I would tell all our friends in the gallery that it is not the practice for the gallery to clap. I would ask that they refrain from clapping. I know they probably didn't know that, but I'd ask them to please refrain.

Hon Tony Clement (Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): I'll refer the question to the Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services.

Hon Brenda Elliott (Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services): I thank my colleague in the third party for the question. Our government cares deeply about the needs of children with autism. We want to give them our support to make sure they reach their full potential. That is why we have put a very high priority on providing services for children in this province.

We are the first government in Ontario ever to offer an intensive treatment service for children with autism. That program is directed to children ages two to five. We began in 1999 with a \$5-million commitment and we have increased that commitment eightfold, to now \$39 million. We allocate almost all of that funding directly to service, but we do spend some on training, because there is not only an Ontario shortage but an international shortage of specialists to provide this service. It's very new. It's designed in response to the most recent research on the best treatment available and designed for autistic children. We care deeply and we are working to provide the very best service possible.

Ms Martel: My supplementary is for the Minister of Health, because IBI should be covered as medically necessary treatment and should be funded by OHIP. We have dozens and dozens of families in the gallery today who represent just a small fraction of the families who are on waiting lists now for IBI treatment in Ontario. Your government only funds this treatment until age six. Without a change in the way IBI is funded, many of these children will turn six and will never receive the treatment they need. Many more will start to get treatment, will turn six and will have their treatment cancelled. This is about medically necessary services being provided by OHIP. Will you, I ask you again, stop turning your back on these families and fund IBI treatment as a medically necessary service through OHIP?

Hon Mrs Elliott: I thank my colleague for the question. Many of us come to this place as parents. Our commitment to children, not only our own but children around this province, is deep. We are providing a service that had not been offered in Ontario until 1999 and, as I said, we've increased our investment in this very specific service eightfold. I come here as a legislator and as a policy-maker. I am not a researcher. I am not a scientist. I am not a practitioner. We act on the best advice given to us by practitioners and scientists in the field. That is why the program is designed for pre-six. We do our best to provide the very best service to give children with autism the best potential for their life. We do that diligently and with the best advice possible.

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Dalton McGuinty (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Labour. I want to return to the issue of the Navistar CAW strike in Chatham. I see nothing but bad news on the horizon with respect to this

issue. I feel that you have a responsibility, that your government has a responsibility, to do whatever you can to allow cooler heads to prevail and to ensure that this matter is resolved at the earliest possible opportunity, in a peaceful manner.

Having been warned that this might happen, can you inform this House what specific steps you took to try to prevent this kind of tragedy? And, having failed, what steps are you now taking to prevent it from happening again?

Hon Brad Clark (Minister of Labour): I thank the leader of the loyal opposition for his question. As I stated to this House on Thursday, we were already in touch with the labour leader, Buzz Hargrove, Thursday morning to discuss what was happening. Friday morning I was in touch with Tom Hennigan from Navistar. We've been working with both parties, encouraging them to get back to the table. We're not at liberty to reveal any more details about it, sir, but the reality is that we're working hard, encouraging them to get back to the collective bargaining table. As the leader of the loyal opposition would agree, I would think that this will be resolved at the bargaining table.

Mr McGuinty: Everybody hopes it will be resolved as soon as possible at the bargaining table, but there are certain things here which are painfully predictable. We understand now that there are going to be thousands of CAW workers coming to Chatham. The police are going to have some real challenges before them. I think you have a responsibility to involve yourself in this matter. If you cannot do so, if you feel that the Premier should be doing so, then the Premier himself should be involving himself in this matter, if for no other reason than to ensure that no more people are injured. It is not enough now, understanding the facts, knowing that thousands are about to collect in Chatham, to simply say, "We're hoping that things will be worked out on their own."

I'm asking you specifically what you're going to do now, understanding these facts, to ensure that no further injuries take place and that this matter truly does come to a peaceful resolution.

1500

Hon Mr Clark: Leadership is about taking the initiative, and that's what I did on Thursday, sir. We responded to both parties that are in dispute. We've spoken with the Navistar people. We continue to speak with the labour leaders. I spoke with Mr Hargrove again this morning. We have more phone calls into the company.

In labour relations, the reality is that you have to encourage both parties back to the table. I would encourage you, as the leader of the loyal opposition, and the leader for the third party to encourage all the people who are involved not to resort to attempts of violence. This will be resolved at the bargaining table, not through any act of violence. Every parliamentarian in this House should be standing up and stating that there is no excuse that would condone any of the violence that has occurred from any side of the party. The reality is that they will only resolve this matter through collective bargaining at the table.

The leadership was coming from us. We already took that step. You're late to the draw. We were already heavily involved.

BUILDING CODE

Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland): My question is directed to the associate minister responsible for rural affairs. Over the weekend I had the opportunity to read a very interesting article in the Toronto Star, written by Sheldon Libfeld, the president of the Greater Toronto Homebuilders' Association, in which he spoke about Bill 124, An Act to improve public safety and to increase efficiency in building code enforcement. It was very gratifying to see such a complimentary article in the Liberal Star about the Ernie Eves government.

What kinds of benefits will the many different building organizations see once this bill becomes law?

Hon Brian Coburn (Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I thank the hard-working honourable member from Northumberland for the question.

The legislation is based on recommendations from the Building Regulatory Reform Advisory Group. I want to thank all the individuals who participated in that. In my former role as parliamentary assistant of municipal affairs, I had an opportunity to work with them. They were regulators from the building profession, builders, consumers' groups and others who were interested in streamlining and improving the building regulatory process.

They worked together and developed the report entitled Knowledge, Accountability and Streamlining: Cornerstones for a New Building Regulatory System in Ontario. It builds on three cornerstones: public safety, streamlining and accountability. There are benefits all the way through this, certainly, not only for those in the building community, where it saves time and reduces duplication, but for municipalities that do not necessarily have the ability with all the expertise at hand. The bottom line for the consumer is that in terms of providing that efficiency, it saves dollars at the end.

Mr Galt: Minister, thank you for your genuine interest in rural affairs, both with OMAFRA and now with the Ministry of Housing. I'm pleased to see that our government has worked with so many different groups in drafting this legislation. Actually, the extensive consultation is a hallmark of our government—both the Harris government and the Eves government.

You'd be interested to know that the mayor of Port Hope recently phoned, supporting this legislation and wanting to ensure its speedy passage.

During the debate last week, I remember hearing the opposition members rail away and ramble on about how we're privatizing everything. They also spoke about the concerns surrounding the registered code agencies. Could you please clarify what this bill will actually do in regard to the registered code agencies and what it will mean to new homebuyers, particularly in Northumberland?

Hon Mr Coburn: First off, we're not imposing a regime of privatization. What we are doing is providing

choice for municipalities and certainly for the building industry, a choice that provides more efficiency and streamlines the approvals process.

Under the proposed legislation, it's up to the municipality to be able to make that decision with respect to registered code agencies. There are some municipalities that don't have the luxury of having all the expertise on staff and the knowledge to be able to deal with the building code.

In small-town Ontario, in some areas, it's much more efficient to have registered code agencies where those individuals and those groups are knowledgeable in the building code so they can perform in an efficient and more cost-effective manner for the municipality.

ONTARIO SUPERBUILD CORP

Mr Joseph Cordiano (York South-Weston): I have a question for the Deputy Premier, and it pertains to SuperBuild. Minister, as you are well aware, SuperBuild Corp was created in December 1999, almost three years ago. According to SuperBuild's 2000-01 annual report, almost \$7 billion of capital was committed by the end of the 2001 fiscal year; \$7 billion of taxpayers' money. Given that this is an enormous sum of money, could the minister today table the audited financial statements for SuperBuild Corp?

Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education): I will certainly pass on and indicate you've made that request to the Minister of Finance.

Mr Cordiano: SuperBuild has been operational now for almost three years. In that time, you've committed \$7 billion of taxpayers' money, and yet you can stand before this House and tell us there are no statements, there is no accountability for \$7 billion of taxpayers' money. You're not able to produce an audited financial statement.

Well, Minister, let me tell you something: by not producing an audited financial statement, you have a total disregard for the taxpayers of this province. Worse than that, you have actually broken the law, because you are in violation of sections 14 and 15 of the Development Corporations Act.

My question to you is this: given that you have failed to comply with your legal obligations, will you make available today to the Provincial Auditor any financial data pertaining to SuperBuild so that the Provincial Auditor can conduct a value-for-money audit in order to ensure that the taxpayers of this province are fully protected? Will you do that today, Minister?

Hon Mrs Witmer: I think the member is somewhat misinformed about SuperBuild. SuperBuild, as you know, is publicly accountable to the taxpayers of Ontario. There is a very transparent, fair process in place for approving all of the projects through cabinet. I want to tell you the information about the 3,000-plus projects that have been approved by SuperBuild is publicly and readily available on the Web site on a region-by-region basis. In fact, it's not \$7 billion, it's actually \$13 billion that has been committed to projects across Ontario. These

are investments in health care, in post-secondary, water, infrastructure, sport, culture. It's all readily available, and the information is there.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr Garfield Dunlop (Simcoe North): My question is for the Minister of Transportation. The 2000 Ontario Road Safety Annual Report tabled last week in this Legislature is certainly good news for Ontario. It demonstrates that, for the second straight year, Ontario has the safest roads in Canada and the second safest in North America.

Although cars used across North America are being built safer, many with air bags, anti-lock braking systems and other safety features that have been credited with saving lives, Ontario's safety record has improved relative to other jurisdictions. Ontario has improved from a ranking of eighth place in North America in 1994 to our current ranking of second place. What initiatives has this government put in place to help achieve this very important result?

Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Transportation): We are indeed very proud of the ORSAR because it basically puts to rest the image that this government and past governments didn't care about road safety. This report is a tremendous endorsement of this government's past steps to improve road safety in this province, including improved commercial vehicle safety, enforcement and inspection programs, mandatory remedial measures, a program for drinking drivers, vehicle impoundment programs, increased fines for many offences, longer suspension periods for convicted drinking drivers and the ignition interlock program. In addition to all those, this government has invested huge amounts of money in highway infrastructure that has made our roads much safer.

1510

Mr Dunlop: While enhancing the safety of Ontario's roads and improving our record relative to other jurisdictions is a significant and commemorative achievement, it provides little comfort to those who have lost a friend or loved one in a road crash. Clearly the loss of even one life is one too many.

As you have outlined, the government has made many road safety advances to date. But we all know more work must be done. Minister, how do you propose to further enhance road safety in Ontario and continue to reduce the loss of life on our roads and highways?

Hon Mr Sterling: I'd like to thank Garfield Dunlop in particular, because of his introduction of a private member's bill in this House to deal with the ignition interlock program. It's thanks to his leadership that we have yet another program to deal with drinking and driving.

In addition to ORSAR, which talked about safety in general, last week MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, also issued their report and put Ontario at the top of all the provinces in terms of attacking drunk driving. Approximately 26% or 27% of fatal collisions in

the year 2000 involved drinking and driving. This is not satisfactory. We will continue to make our laws tougher. We'll deal with the enforcement of these offences in a tough manner.

ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): My question is for the Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services. Two weeks ago, your government showed its lack of commitment to people with disabilities in this province. You demonstrated once again that you don't care that disabled people living on the Ontario disability support program are being forced to live well below the poverty line.

Today the Ombudsman released his annual report, stating that when it comes to providing medically necessary travel costs, your treatment of people on ODSP is unfair. People on ODSP would need an increase of between \$1,536 and \$7,211, depending on where they live, just to reach the poverty line. Minister, will you commit today to increasing benefits to people on the Ontario disability support program?

Hon Brenda Elliott (Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services): In the question, my colleague across the way forgot to mention a couple of things. He forgot to mention that it was not his government that removed individuals who suffered with disabilities from the welfare rolls; in fact it was our government that finally took them off the welfare rolls. He also forgot to mention that while he was in government he and his government did not enact an Ontarians with Disabilities Act; it was our government that introduced an Ontarians with Disabilities Act, the first one in Canada.

When my colleague asks questions about disability benefit levels, does he recognize that in Ontario those who are on a disability pension have the highest disability benefit level in Canada, in fact \$100 more than the nearest benefit level, in British Columbia?

Mr Martin: While we're talking about sharing records here, your government cut support for people on welfare by 22%, and you haven't given people on ODSP across this province one cent's increase since you came to power.

You talked last week about carrying on a review of pensions for people on disability. Well, Minister, I'm here to say to you that you don't need that review, because we already have the information you need. The poverty line for people living in cities is \$18,371. A single person on ODSP gets a maximum of \$11,160 a year. That's \$7,211 below the poverty line. That's your track record. You don't need a review to know they're not receiving enough money. What kind of government is yours that would sentence people with disabilities to a lifetime of abject poverty?

Minister, I'll ask you again: will you commit today to increasing the benefits for people on the Ontario disability support program?

Hon Mrs Elliott: To my colleague across the way I say, ours is the government that took disabled people off the welfare rolls, something you did not do. Ours is the government that introduced the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, something you did not do. Ours is the government that removed the label "permanently unemployable" from people who have disabilities in the province of Ontario. Ours is the one that increased the amount of earnings a family can keep without penalty. We raised the assets. Our commitment to the disabled is unqualified, and we will continue to do all that we can to make life better for those disabled in this province.

VISITORS

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I'd like to welcome the students and teachers from Félix-Ricard, and I know they will enjoy this petition.

PETITIONS

ONTARIO BUDGET

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Ernie Eves 2002 budget proves he'll say anything to hold on to power and is trying to run away from his own record;

"Whereas Ernie Eves's budget fails to deliver what Ontario families need, like a moratorium on school closures and a real cap on class sizes in the early years;

"Whereas the private school tax voucher should be cancelled, not delayed, and that money put into public classrooms;

"Whereas the \$2.2-billion corporate tax giveaway should be cancelled, not delayed;

"Whereas Ontario families are looking for real, positive change and only Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberal Party represent that change;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to tell Ernie Eves to put Ontario working families first and cancel the corporate tax cut and cancel the private school voucher."

Of course, I affix my signature to this petition, give it to Andrew to bring to the table, and wish Félix-Ricard a good two-day field trip.

OPTOMETRISTS

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I've got a petition to the Ontario Legislature.

"Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario will be considering a private member's bill that aims to amend the Optometry Act to give optometrists the authority to prescribe therapeutic pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of certain eye diseases; and

“Whereas optometrists are highly trained and equipped with the knowledge and specialized instrumentation needed to effectively diagnose and treat certain eye problems; and

“Whereas extending the authority to prescribe TPAs to optometrists will help relieve the demands on ophthalmologists and physicians who currently have the exclusive domain for prescribing TPAs to optometry patients; and

“Whereas the bill introduced by New Democrat Peter Kormos (MPP—Niagara Centre) will ensure that patients receive prompt, timely, one-stop care where appropriate;

“Therefore I do support the bill proposing an amendment to the Optometry Act to give optometrists the authority to prescribe therapeutic pharmaceutical agents for the treatment of certain eye diseases and I urge the government of Ontario to ensure speedy passage of the bill.”

That’s signed by hundreds of people and is, of course, signed by me, and there are more coming.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Alvin Curling (Scarborough-Rouge River): I’ve got a petition here. It says:

“Whereas by eliminating the fifth year of high school the government of Ontario has created a double cohort of students; and

“Whereas the government of Ontario has promised that there will be a space at a university or college for every willing and qualified student; and

“Whereas Ontario’s universities and colleges have not received sufficient funding from the government of Ontario to accommodate these double cohort students; and

“Whereas the quality of education at Ontario’s universities and colleges has been declining in recent years; and

“Whereas the double cohort students will add an additional strain on an already fragile university and college system;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to: provide full funding for every new student entering Ontario’s universities and colleges; provide additional funding to increase quality at Ontario’s universities and colleges; provide targeted funding to colleges for skills and innovation; and increase the per student funding to the national average over the next five years.”

I affix my signature. Jordan, will you please bring it to the desk.

1520

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I’ve got a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas many high school students in Ontario are outraged at the harshness of the new curriculum and have chosen to leave school in May of 2002;

“Inadequate funding made difficult the implementation of the new curriculum;

“High school students should not be used as forced labour in addition to the extra hours required for the new curriculum;

“There is inadequate funding for the double cohort year. Universities and colleges will have trouble providing room for all those students;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly as follows:

“We demand that a committee with government, teachers, trustees, parents and high school students establish a funding model to correct the shortcomings in the system;

“Further be it resolved that a committee with government, teachers, trustees, parents and high school students make recommendations to help those students who have had to change their career paths due to the harshness of the new system;

“Further be it resolved that students are no longer to do compulsory volunteer work;

“Further be it resolved that adequate funding be given for the double cohort year.”

Signed by Dylan Petrachenko and Lisa Furry, both of Welland, along with hundreds of others.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On behalf of the students of Herman Secondary School in my riding, I present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the secondary students of the city of Windsor believe that the new curriculum is poor because it makes classes too difficult and students are dropping out because their grades are going down;

“Whereas OAC has been taken away, leaving students to prepare themselves for post-secondary studies;

“Whereas students believe that adding grade 7 and 8 students to secondary school will overcrowd schools;

“Whereas students believe that the French immersion program should continue;

“Whereas there is a lack of funding for textbooks and other important educational resources;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, demand that the Ernie Eves government review the policies adopted by Mike Harris and make the proper management and funding of education a priority.”

As I have in the past, I’m proud to affix my signature to this petition.

AIR QUALITY

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Eves government’s wholly owned Nanticoke generating station is North America’s largest dirty coal-fired electricity-producing plant and Ontario’s

largest producer of the chemicals and acid gases which contribute to deadly smog and acid rain; and

“Whereas the Nanticoke plant, which has more than doubled its dangerous emissions under the Conservative government, is now the worst air polluter in all of Canada, spewing out over five million kilotonnes of toxic chemicals each year, including many cancer-causing chemicals and mercury, a potent and dangerous neurotoxin; and

“Whereas at least 13 Ontario municipalities and seven northeastern US states have expressed concerns that Ontario Power Generation’s proposed cleanup plan for Nanticoke is inadequate in protecting the air quality and health and safety of their residents; and

“Whereas the Ontario Medical Association has stated that 1,900 Ontarians die prematurely each year and we pay \$1 billion annually in health-related costs as a result of air pollution; and

“Whereas because the Conservative government has lifted the moratorium on the sale of coal-fired power plants and has set a date for deregulation of electricity, the operator of the Nanticoke plant will likely stoke up production to maximize profits, which will only worsen the air quality in cities like Toronto, Hamilton, Welland, Niagara Falls and St Catharines;

“Be it resolved that the Ernie Eves government immediately order that the Nanticoke generating station be converted from dirty coal to cleaner-burning natural gas.”

I affix my signature. I’m in complete agreement.

CHILDREN’S HEALTH SERVICES

Mr Jean-Marc Lalonde (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell):

I have a petition to stop the closure of cardiac surgery services at CHEO.

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to close cardiac surgery services at the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario;

“Whereas the Conservative government plans to centralize all cardiac services for children in Toronto;

“Whereas cardiac surgery at CHEO is an essential service for children in eastern Ontario;

“Whereas many children such as Shawn McCarty, the ‘miracle boy,’ would not have survived had the cardiac surgery services not been available in Ottawa;

“Therefore, be it resolved that the undersigned petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

“To demand that the Conservative government halt immediately its decision to close cardiac surgery services in Ottawa.”

I affix my signature.

ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas people with disabilities who rely on Ontario disability support program payments are facing rising costs; and

“Whereas people unable to work because of serious disabilities have had no increase in support since 1995; and

“Whereas with loss of rent controls their rents have skyrocketed, placing huge financial strains on many ODSP recipients,

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to bring fairness to the Ontario Disability Support Program Act, 1997, by amending it to provide for regulations requiring annual cost-of-living adjustments to income support programs.”

I affix my signature to this petition.

CHILDREN’S HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs Claudette Boyer (Ottawa-Vanier): To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the Ontario government is shutting down the heart surgery unit at the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario; and

“Whereas the closure of this program will restrict the accessibility to life-saving surgery for children in eastern Ontario; and

“Whereas every year CHEO treats 140 cases of seriously ill children close to home; and

“Whereas centralization of children’s heart surgery in Toronto would force patients and their families to travel 400 to 600 kilometres away from home at a traumatic time; and

“Whereas there is a waiting list for cardiac surgery in Toronto but not at CHEO; and

“Whereas the people of eastern Ontario demand accessible, quality health care for their children;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately override the government’s decision to close this life-saving program and to ensure that top-quality accessible health care remains available to every child in eastern Ontario.”

I affix my signature on this petition.

KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): I want to thank a determined citizen in my riding, Lindsay Wells, for this petition.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada; and

“Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to encourage the Canadian Institutes of Health Research to explicitly include kidney research as one of the institutes in its system, to be named the Institute of Kidney and Urinary Tract Diseases.”

I'm in full agreement and have affixed my signature to this petition.

HYDRO ONE

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex): To the Ontario Legislature:

"Whereas the Conservative government plans to sell off Hydro One and Ontario's electricity transmission grid—the central nervous system of Ontario's economy;

"Whereas the government never campaigned on selling off this vital \$5-billion public asset and never consulted the people of Ontario on this plan;

"Whereas Ontario families want affordable, reliable electricity—they know that the sale of the grid that carries electricity to their homes is a disaster for consumers;

"Whereas selling the grid will not benefit consumers—the only Ontarians who will benefit are Bay Street brokers and Hydro One executives;

"Whereas selling Hydro One and the grid is like selling every 400-series highway in the province to private interests—selling the grid means the public sector will no longer be responsible for its security and protection;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature as follows:

"To demand the Conservative government halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear mandate from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario."

This petition is signed by a number of residents from Highgate, Ridgetown and Chatham.

AUDIOLOGY SERVICES

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): This petition is for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it's entitled "Listen: Our Hearing is Important!"

"Whereas services delisted by the Harris-Eves 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-Eves government policy will virtually eliminate access to publicly funded audiology services across vast regions of Ontario; and

"Whereas the Harris-Eves government policy is virtually impossible to implement in underserved areas across 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-Ernie Eves "government move immediately to permanently fund audiologists directly for the provision of audiology services."

I affix my signature to this petition and give it to Jordan to bring to the table.

1530

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines): This is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Ontario Conservative government hastily amalgamated Niagara's ambulance dispatch services into the Hamilton Central Ambulance Communication Centre;

"Whereas an independent review of Hamilton's Central Ambulance Communication Centre found several major shortcomings, including inexperienced dispatchers, high call volume and out-of-date equipment, hindering the dispatch of ambulances in Niagara and in other parts of the province;

"Whereas poor training of Central Ambulance Communication Centre dispatchers by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care has led to improper emergency coding, resource misallocation and waste and increased wait times for those requiring ambulance services;

"Whereas the Central Ambulance Communication Centre dispatchers are handling 1,300 more calls a year than recommended by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care;

"Whereas these shortcomings in ambulance service restructuring are putting lives at risk in Niagara, Hamilton and throughout the province;

"Whereas the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care has been in possession of the independent review since October 31, 2001, which provides recommendations to greatly improve ambulance dispatch services in Niagara and Hamilton;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately act upon recommendations presented in the independent review of the Central Ambulance Communication Centre and eliminate the grievous imperfections which are placing our citizens at risk."

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr Steve Peters (Elgin-Middlesex-London): A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the provincial government has consistently underfunded public high schools; and

"Whereas the Ministry of Education has forced school boards to reduce services in order to balance their budget; and

"Whereas these cuts will severely affect the education and future of the students of Ontario's public high schools; and

"Whereas these cuts will effectively put students and their education at risk;

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to take

immediate action to increase the funding to Ontario public high schools.”

I'm in full support and will sign this petition.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs): I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 86, An Act to rescue children trapped in the misery of prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation and to amend the Highway Traffic Act, when Bill 86 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

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

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

The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr): The Attorney General has moved government notice of motion number 30. The Attorney General.

Hon Mr Young: At the outset, I'd like to take a moment, if I may, to comment upon a number of people who have, over the last short while, contributed greatly to the piece of legislation we are debating here today. I look across the floor to the member from Sudbury, Mr Bartolucci, who has tirelessly spoken out about the issue of children being exploited in various sexual trades, who has come to this Legislative Assembly with a number of excellent ideas, many of which are incorporated in the legislation in front of us here. Indeed, there are some other ideas that have come from other members. What we have here is a bill that I believe, in my respectful opinion, will improve the plight of children in Ontario, some children who are the most vulnerable. So I thank the honourable member opposite for being a champion of this issue and for bringing it forward. I look forward to hearing his comments later this day in the assembly.

I also want to reference Minister Flaherty, my predecessor in this role of Attorney General. Mr Flaherty tabled a bill very similar to the one I am speaking to today. He too spent a great deal of time and effort in relation to this very worthy cause, a cause that is very important to him. I know that by reason of our continued discussions relating to this. I thank him on behalf of the people of Ontario in anticipation of this very important piece of legislation being passed, which is of course my hope and subject to the will of the Legislature.

Sexually exploited children live in a shadowy nightmare world, far removed from the world that most of us in this Legislative Assembly, and, I dare say, most of

those individuals watching on TV, occupy. We are very lucky that we do not live within that world or anywhere close to that world. But every day, these young people—and I do mean young people, children 11 and 12 years old in some instances—are exposed to violence, they are exposed to drug abuse, they are exposed to rape, assault of various types, including murder, on some occasions. This all comes at the hands of adults. Without exception, it comes at the hands of adults, and it comes because there are adults in our community who perversely think that it is acceptable to exploit these young people in order to make a profit. Well, of course they are wrong. We in this Legislative Assembly are here today, I believe, to confirm that anyone who engages in that activity will suffer consequences related to paying any costs incurred to rehabilitate the young people we will rescue if this bill passes.

We are here to say, first and foremost, to those young people who find themselves trapped in this misery, who find themselves trapped in this cycle of despair, that there will be some hope. When we talk about young people who are trapped by these predators, trapped by these individuals who we historically have thought of as pimps standing on a street corner with a young woman nearby, when we think of that image nowadays, it is not entirely accurate or comprehensive. Indeed, the world of sexual exploitation unfortunately is much broader than it once was. The idea that it's only in downtown Toronto and it's only street prostitution that we here in this Legislative Assembly or children's aid workers or police have to confront is inaccurate; it's outdated. Sure, there are instances where young people are still on the street in big cities, no doubt. And there is no question there is a problem in the city of Toronto similar to the one I just described, but it goes much beyond that.

First of all, this is not just a problem for the city of Toronto. It happens in places like Hamilton, and it happens in places like Sudbury. It happens in places like Ottawa, and it happens in places like St Catharines. Police tell us that many young people flee smaller urban centres and small towns and rural areas and go to larger areas like Thunder Bay, Timmins or Kapuskasing, in some respects. They go to these areas often in order to avoid abusive situations, and they come to larger communities, whether it be communities like Kingston or communities like the city of Toronto.

Clearly this is a problem that involves the entire province, every part of the province. This bill, if it is passed by this Legislative Assembly, would allow for the police and children's aid workers to take action, actions that in the past they simply haven't been able to take, actions that will be motivated by these individuals and our society attempting to rescue children from prostitution and other forms of sexual exploitation.

A moment ago I said that this is not just about street prostitution. It includes street prostitution, but it's not just about street prostitution. From discussions with police and children's aid workers, we now know that it includes adult entertainment facilities, where underage youth with

some regularity are—I hesitate to use the word “employed,” but “abused” perhaps is a more appropriate word. It includes massage parlours. It includes bawdy houses. It includes escort services and telephone and Internet sex lines and indeed pornography sites.

The legislation, if passed, would allow the police and children’s aid society workers to rescue children from these very dangerous situations. It would allow them in some instances to conduct that rescue without a search warrant and without a warrant, I should say, for the apprehension of that individual. A child could be rescued without a warrant if obtaining one would jeopardize the ability to rescue the child from that situation.

It is important to remember that throughout this proposed legislative scheme, the courts are very much involved. It’s important to remember that our proposed legislation includes provisions that would ensure that the rights of these victims—and remember, we’re talking about young people who are victimized here—would be protected.

1540

So within 24 hours or as soon as possible, a judge or a justice of the peace would be obliged to review the validity of the rescue that took place and the grounds upon which the rescue was conducted. The justice of the peace or the judge would also be obliged to consider what should happen next. That member of the judiciary would then be in a position to place the child in a safe location for up to five days. That’s the first instance where we will see the intervention and consideration of members of the judiciary.

By the end of those five days, a second hearing will have to take place in a court of law. I emphasize this before going any further, because I want it to be very clear that at various stages of this proceeding—various stages of the rescue—the courts will be involved and will be there to consider whether this is an appropriate action.

By the end of those five days, a second hearing will take place. At that hearing, a decision will be made. The judge will have an opportunity to consider whether the placement should be extended for a further 30 days, whether the young person, the rescued person, should be placed in a safe location, a secure location, for a further 30 days; whether the child should be returned to his or her parents or legal guardians in those circumstances; and indeed will decide if future intervention is warranted in that particular case, because of course no one size fits all. The facts of every case must and will be considered.

At the outset of my remarks I talked about the member from Sudbury and about my predecessor, Minister Flaherty, as being trailblazers in many respects in this area, and indeed they are. But so is the province of Alberta. We have looked at Alberta’s experience with similar legislation. What we saw was quite astounding. We saw that within the first two years of a similar law being in place in Alberta, there were 545 interventions—545 interventions in the first two years.

The former director of an outreach service for prostitutes in Edmonton indicated that the number of young

prostitutes on the streets of Edmonton each and every year before their legislation was in place in Alberta was roughly 200. Since the legislation was passed, that number, in this individual’s view, has gone from 200 down to 50. A police officer in Calgary, in southern Alberta, also reported a drastic reduction in the number of young people on the streets engaged in these activities. The police officer indicated that just a fraction of teen prostitutes are out there now compared to the number that were out before the Alberta legislation was passed.

The coordinator of the government’s new program has indicated that two thirds of youth who were rescued during the first two years have turned their lives around. Indeed, that’s what this is all about: giving young people the opportunity to turn their lives around. Our proposed legislation would allow police or children’s aid society workers to rescue sexually exploited children and place them in a safe and secure location for up to 30 days, as determined by a judge—and I’ve just reviewed the procedure that would be followed. While in this safe and secure location, they would be assessed and a wide range of services and treatment would be considered, again in the context of the individual who is being helped. Services would include medical services, drug and alcohol rehabilitation and counselling, mental health services in some instances and specialized legal services in others. With the help of the children’s aid society, some children may be linked to longer term care and support solutions, particularly those children who have ongoing issues and problems.

Let there be no doubt: these are children desperately in need of help. As I mentioned earlier, many of these young people, many of these children, many of the most vulnerable in our society, have been sexually, physically or emotionally abused. In many respects they have been sexually, physically and emotionally abused. Some are addicted to drugs, others to alcohol. Some have sexually transmitted diseases. Many of these young people have given up on themselves. They actually don’t believe that they deserve any better or, alternatively, that they could possibly have a better lot in life. We know this isn’t true and the Ernie Eves government isn’t prepared to give up on them.

Treating child victims of sexual exploitation has a rather high price tag. When drafting this legislation in its current form, I spent some considerable time talking to my colleagues, talking to law enforcement personnel, children’s aid workers and considering those costs. I don’t for a second doubt that it’s money well spent by the government. I don’t for a second doubt that this is what government is here to do—to help vulnerable young people in these situations. But I did continue to come back to what in my mind was an inequity in the plan that was previously proposed. I thought about something that had been actually suggested in Saskatchewan by the NDP government there, although I don’t believe it has been implemented. That was a proposal that would allow for the government to sue those who exploited these young people in order to recover the damages that were incurred to help save, to rehabilitate these young people.

We believe that if you sexually exploit a child for profit, you should be liable for the costs associated with assisting that young person. This bill, if it is passed, will allow for the government to go to court and convince a judge that it is appropriate that there be a civil order against the individual who was the pimp or the exploiter in any form so that the government may recover the taxpayers' money. That doesn't mean that if we cannot recover for one reason or another, we won't assist this young person; quite the contrary. The assistance will be provided regardless of whether or not there is an ultimate recovery, but if there is someone out there, someone who has a home or a car or a bank account that is there because of the exploitation of the young person or a group of young people, then that asset or those funds should be recovered and returned to the taxpayers of this province in direct proportion to the amount spent to help the young people who were exploited.

In addition, this bill also targets those predators in a very significant way. If this legislation is passed, it would permit the suspension of drivers' licences of pimps and johns convicted of prostitution-related Criminal Code offences if the offence is one involving a motor vehicle. That was a nexus that we needed to draw. We felt it was important for legal reasons in order to ensure that this law survived. With this provision, with the possibility of suspending one's licence, we are sending yet another message. We are sending a strong message that the sexual exploitation of children in the province of Ontario will not be tolerated by the Ernie Eves government.

This bill that we've presented to this honourable assembly should be viewed, in my respectful opinion, as one of a series of bills that have come forward from this government. We are very proud of the fact that we have a Victims' Bill of Rights in this province. We are very proud of the fact that we have the only permanent Office for Victims of Crime in this province. We're proud of the fact that we have 15 child-friendly courts across this province, and these are courts that provide specialized support services to help make the courtroom less intimidating for young people and for witnesses. We are the only province to have an established, comprehensive sex offender registry. There are other provinces that are following our lead, that are making some considerable headway, particularly Alberta, in this regard.

I want to pause, if I may, to acknowledge the work of Minister Turnbull and Minister Tsubouchi, who have worked tirelessly in order to bring forward a sex offender registry that is now the envy of other provinces, that is now working in this province with a 93% registration rate. That means 93% of those offenders in the province who were supposed to register because they committed subject crimes have indeed registered.

1550

In February last year, after much pressure from our government, the government of Ontario, the federal government indicated they were going to move toward a national sex offender registry. I know Minister Tsubouchi, Minister Turnbull and others had been advocating

that movement for some time, hoping the federal Liberals would prioritize this. I take them at their word that they think this is important. It is really essential that we have a national program so that you can't simply move from Kenora to Winnipeg to avoid the sex offender registry. It's essential that we have a program that stretches from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean. Certainly we have offered every form of assistance possible to the federal government in relation to this endeavour. We have done so with the other provinces as well. We've offered the software related to our sex offender registry to all the other provinces free of charge.

That brings me to my last point, if I may. This issue, unlike most issues we deal with in this assembly, really should, must, can and, I hope, will cross party lines. This is not an issue where there is any room whatsoever for partisan political behaviour. I hope my comments today have reflected that. What we are doing here is what all the honourable members who put their name on a ballot and were lucky enough to be elected want to do. We want to leave this province a better place than we found it. We want to protect those who are the most vulnerable in our society. We have an opportunity with this bill we are debating today to do just that.

All the parties, and I think this is motivated by nothing other than sincerity and an earnest desire to help, have talked about initiatives like this one and reaching out to help young people who find themselves in these most unfortunate and vulnerable situations. We today have an opportunity to do more than talk. We have an opportunity to work together to pass this very important piece of legislation, and I would encourage every member of this Legislative Assembly to work in a collaborative fashion to allow for the immediate and expeditious passage of this very important bill.

I understand that as the rotation continues, the members for Kitchener Centre and Scarborough Centre will be making some comments.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr David Christopherson): Further debate?

Mr Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury): I too am pleased to rise and speak in support of Bill 86. My support, though, certainly is tinged with a little apprehension because I don't believe it has covered all the points that my original bill, Bill 18, covered. However, as time goes on, we will be able to fix that. The reality is, as we know, Bill 86 is a combination of Bill 18, which became Bill 6 and finally became Bill 22 in this past session, along with Bill 23. The government has added a few amendments, a couple of very positive points, I think, to the bill which will probably make it a better bill. But when the Attorney General speaks and applauds Alberta for their legislation, I have to remind the government that it was a very partisan approach over on the other side that delayed the passage of my Bill 18 in 1998, after extensive public hearings. Today we have what is essentially Bill 18, the legislation which was presented in 1998.

Enough about the political part of my talk. I want to speak now a little bit about the origin of the bill. As the

Attorney General did, I want to thank some people. First of all, and most importantly, I want to thank the father who came up to me in 1998, just before Christmas, and said, "The best Christmas present that could ever be given to me is legislation passed to protect my child, who is now involved in prostitution."

His name was Alan. He made a presentation before our committee when the government chose to send this bill to committee for public hearings in 1998. We heard from 50 different individuals and groups—all, except one, very supportive of the legislation. I look across the way and I see Mr Klees, who was part of those public hearings, who has been a part of this bill since 1998 and, to his credit—I want to compliment him—has always spoken in support of this type of legislation. So indeed it has crossed partisan political lines.

This is good legislation. It is legislation I only wish had been in place in 1998, but back then there was far more partisan a point of view when we discussed this legislation or any other legislation.

I want to thank Alan for his bravery, for his commitment, for coming up to me. Think about it. Think about how much courage that must have taken, for a father to come up and see a representative, whom he knew because I talked to the children, and say, "Listen, we have a serious concern here."

Second, I want to congratulate the young lady, Alan's daughter, who was involved in prostitution and who made a presentation before the committee. We'll call her Mallory because that's the name she used during the public hearings. Mallory is a brave young lady who is continuing to work to turn her life around. She deserves this bill. I only wish it had been in place when it could have helped her, but as Mallory said in her presentation, "I want legislation passed so that I won't see my younger sister or my friends caught in the same type of trap as I was caught in." Mallory, today, finally, you have gotten your wish, and hopefully this legislation will be effective legislation.

I want to thank our very proactive police service in Sudbury, who helped ensure that there was support across the province of Ontario for this. In fact, over 50 police services have come on board, thanks in large part to Chief Alex McCauley's hard work in sending out letters asking for support from his colleagues across the province. I want to thank that police service and Chief Alex McCauley.

I want to thank my community of Sudbury, because they've worked hard and they've been very supportive along the way of this type of legislation. When some would say it's legislation that shouldn't be, my community said it's legislation that must be. Today, albeit it's government Bill 86, it is a confirmation that they indeed were right.

In this spirit of sharing accolades for people who do things right, I want to thank government members across the way. I think the Attorney General has handled this rather well. I think the former Attorney General handled it quite well. Former Solicitor General David Tsubouchi,

I know for a fact argued in 1998 and 1999 for this type of resolution. I believe they deserve credit and I'm not above offering that credit.

I also believe that the NDP, the third party, deserve credit in this as well, because they offered very positive amendments over the course of Bill 18, Bill 6, Bill 22 and now Bill 86—all the same bill, by the way. Along the way, they offered amendments to make it a stronger resolution, to make it a stronger bill, to make sure it stood a court challenge, that it is legislation that is sound law in principle as well as in fact.

1600

For the people of Ontario, this may be one of the few times where you see legislation introduced by a member of the opposition, supported continually by members on the government side, and altered to make it better by members of the third party. Although it may be entitled Bill 86, it really is a combination of the commitment of the people in this House, regardless of partisan political stripe. Today, finally, after several years, we have achieved success in putting the bill together. I have no doubt that on Thursday when this comes to a vote, it will be accepted unanimously by all members in the House.

Is there a need for this legislation? Absolutely. There is no question that there is a need. I want to repeat some of the statistics I read into the record the first time we debated the government bill, which eventually died because the government prorogued the House. They're telling figures, they're startling figures, and they're figures that we in this House should be reminded of.

This was a survey conducted by Street Outreach Services. It's a very proactive group here in Toronto that deals with children involved in prostitution. They asked the many people they dealt with what their place of origin was. We're talking about child prostitutes here. Fifty-three per cent of the people they dealt with came from Metropolitan Toronto, 25% came from other cities in Ontario, 10% came from western provinces, and then there were some from eastern provinces, from Quebec, and from outside Canada. That gives you an indication that this problem is not a Toronto problem, not a Sudbury problem, but is a local problem, an urban problem, a rural problem, a problem not only in Ontario, not only in Canada, but indeed internationally.

Another question they asked was what their age was when they left home. Well, 45% of the people who responded said they were over 16. Startling, though, is the next figure: 51% said they were between 11 and 15 years of age.

I look at the pages and I look at Lauren looking at Jordan, and do you know what? They look in amazement. This is a lesson not only for adults but for you pages or for any children who may be watching: make sure you take time to listen to your parents and to thank your parents for the excellent work and love and commitment they have for you. Pages, 51% of the people Street Outreach Services work with prostituted themselves between 11 and 15 years of age. You have much to be thankful for.

They asked what their age was when they had their first trick. For those of us who don't understand that language, that's when they became involved with either a john or a pimp. Some 41% of those respondents said they were between 11 and 15 years of age.

The next question SOS asked was, "For how long have you been involved in prostitution?" Sadly, 56% of the respondents said they'd been involved in prostitution for between one and three years. Even sadder is that 24% of those people said they had been prostituting themselves for between four and six years.

The people of Ontario, like I or anyone else in this place, are shocked that children are being sexually exploited and abused for that length of time, and so young.

One would ask, "What could cause something so terrible to happen? They must all come from bad homes. They mustn't have any support mechanisms in place at home or at school. They must be outcasts." The reality is: no, no and no. Some come from very good families, some come from socio-economic levels that are well above average and some are just like your children or my children. They're just ordinary kids who somehow have become exploited and abused by johns and pimps.

The prime reason for that was to support a drug habit, to have extra money in your pocket, to buy the nice things that they couldn't afford otherwise, not understanding the severe social and emotional impact this sexual abuse and exploitation would have on them.

We're happy today to be able to stand here and suggest that there will be unanimous support by all members in the House. I only wish this had happened sooner. I only wish that those people who were affected by this exploitation and abuse in 1998 could have been helped. But I guess hindsight is always 20-20, and we could have handled this differently, and maybe we weren't thinking of what was in the best interests of the children when we debated this bill, when it was Bill 18 in 1998, when we heard 49 out of 50 people suggest that this type of legislation was important.

Well, we're here today, and we're here to say, "We support it." We're here to say that it will be legislation that will help rid the streets of these johns and pimps. I don't think anybody in this House, or in Ontario, has any use for them at all.

Let me change subjects for a moment, but it is related. Bill 86 is a combination of Bills 22 and 23, as I said, bills I introduced. But I also introduced, the very same day, Bill 24, An Act to amend the Municipal Act with respect to adult entertainment parlours. I would ask the Attorney General to read this bill carefully, because I think there are many opportunities for this government to act in a way that can be very proactive in ensuring that those people, those groups, those companies, those owners who still, and will continue to, exploit children because there isn't the strong type of legislation in place like Bill 24 has—I would hope that the Attorney General and the Eves government look carefully at this bill and study it carefully. If you can't adopt this bill, then look at adopting or creating legislation that will clearly impact on

those—some would say municipal responsibilities but I don't say that; I say it's clearly the responsibility of any level of government—businesses that would conduct what would appear to be something on the surface but something so terrible when you scratch beneath that surface. I would hope that the government, if they're not considering Bill 24, would be considering legislation equally as tough or, as my dream would be, tougher. But that's not going to happen.

1610

That's one of the concerns I have with Bill 86, and it was something the committee debated with regard to punishments for johns and pimps. Mr Klees and I have agreed an awful lot on this legislation, and one of the things we agree on is that the punishments aren't tough enough. I know the punishments that are in place for other violations, but I thought this would have been a good opportunity for us to set an example. In fact, Speaker, if I could refer to you, because you were part of the committee that was studying this clause-by-clause, it was your suggestion, if I'm not mistaken—and I'm almost going to quote you exactly—that we be bold and try to set the benchmark for other legislation to match ours. I wish they would have listened to you as a representative of the third party at that committee. I wish they would have imposed tougher penalties, but the reality is that we have this legislation here, and if it has to be amended in the future, I know whomever the government of the day is will amend this legislation to ensure that it accomplishes the goal that I know the government wants, I know the NDP wants and I know Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals want.

So today we stand united in supporting good legislation. I have to comment, though, that I don't like standing and supporting good legislation in a time allocation motion, because it stifles the debate we should be having. I really believe this legislation could have been debated more. I believe we had an opportunity here to involve in a very positive way more members of the Legislature in debating this, but that's not the case. And today I don't want to spend time telling the people of Ontario that at 5:50 I'm going to be voting against the time allocation motion. The only reason we're doing that is because we don't want to stifle debate in this place; we want to encourage debate. But the bill itself, when it comes to a vote, will certainly be supported by Rick Bartolucci.

I want to suggest to this government that we adopt some of the strategies that are being used in British Columbia with regard to the very proactive things they're doing out there. I don't agree with very much that's happening in British Columbia, but the protection of children is one thing they're working on quite aggressively. They have posters, they have billboards advertising where and how these kids can get help. I believe this legislation is going to require some public relations and some public education so that these kids will know they have a place to go; these kids will know there are people who care; these kids will know they have an alternative to their exploitation, to the abuse they're taking at the

hands of johns and pimps; these kids will know the government is sensitive to their needs; these kids will know they do not have to continue that life they've been caught up in—that johns are bad, that pimps are bad, that selling your body is bad, that selling your body for drugs is bad, that drug use is bad. There is a public education component of this legislation that is key to its success, key to having an impact on the people who are to be reached by this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say to the government, thank you on behalf of the children who will be saved by this legislation, but remember, you have to put the necessary resources into this legislation. You have to have that public education component which is key to its success. If there is a lesson to be learned, it is that kids who have to be protected must be protected as quickly as possible.

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): I will be sharing my time, hopefully, with Mr Martin when he arrives—the member from Sault Ste Marie—

Mr Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): He's not here?

Mr Prue: He is here—and also possibly, if he arrives as well, Mr Bisson, the member from Timmins-James Bay.

This is a very serious bill and I want to tell you, although I was not here at the time when Mr Bartolucci first introduced this bill, it is a bill whose time I think has come. People across this country understand what is happening to young children, understand the perils and the terror of prostitution and what is happening on the streets.

It is a bill that we probably would have hidden from public view only a generation ago. We would have pretended it didn't happen. We would have thought that those children who were out there on the streets were somehow bad or somehow unable to help themselves, were probably beyond the control of society, and we probably would have turned a blind eye. In fact, I have to say, having grown up in Regent Park, which is where I'm from—I'm a kid from Regent Park who has the privilege of standing here in this House—I have never forgotten what it was like to grow up there. I have never forgotten the things that I saw on those streets. I have never forgotten the poor and I hope I will never forget the faces of despair on the young men and women who were on the streets in those days—because yes, they were on the streets then, just as they're on the streets today.

Throughout my life I have had the fortune and the misfortune of dealing with both victims and those who victimized. As a worker with the immigration department over many years and as counsel for the Minister of Employment and Immigration appearing before the Immigration and Refugee Board, I remember on more than one occasion, actually on four or five, dealing before the board with people who had victimized children, who had been convicted of victimizing children, of pimping children, people who had done unspeakable horrors to children, and who were subject to deportation as they were not Canadian citizens.

I remember, also to my horror, the sympathetic view they got from that body, the sympathetic view that people

would have of them, that the crime they had perpetrated on young and innocent victims, the crime that they had committed on our society, was one that could be forgiven, was one that could be wiped out by a simple jail term, and that they could not be or should not be removed from this country and from their immediate families. I remember with horror those days. I think that society's view has changed even within my generation.

1620

I remember, as a mayor and as a member of Toronto city council, meeting with the family of Martin Kruze, around the issue of whether to put the luminous veil on the viaduct where so many—so many—people had jumped to their deaths. I never met Martin Kruze, but I met his father and looked that man in the eye and understood full well the torment that had been not only Martin's torment but his father's. His son had leaped to his death. His son had been on that bridge on that fateful night and had jumped off because of the despair in his life over what had happened to him as a young man going to Maple Leaf Gardens and because of the people who had perpetrated that crime.

I see this bill here today. It's a bill that I'm sure is going to pass and must pass. I'm going to speak to some of the things that should have been in the bill as well, so bear with me.

It is a bill that must pass for the protection of children. How did these children get here? We read historical books written by Charles Dickens. He talks about the poor in the streets and what they did. They went out in the streets, and most of them stole. Most of them stole things from shops. They were pickpockets. They were thieves. They did whatever they needed to do to survive. There was no welfare state that would look after them if their families neglected them or if their parents died and they were orphans. They were subject to all the things that children are subject to today. There were people just like Fagin. And just like you read in that book, there are Fagins in our society today, taking the young and vulnerable and those who have nothing else and no one else upon whom they can rely.

How did those kids get there today? They get there from many sources. They are not all poor, but most of them were. They are not all on drugs, but most of them take those drugs. They are not all escaping family violence, but most of them have been subject to family violence for part or all of their lives. They are not all without work; they are not all impecunious. But most of them cannot get jobs or do anything, because of their age, their lack of schooling or their lack of abilities, other than sell their bodies. They are subject to the Fagins of this city, of this province, of this country and probably of the entire world.

All of us who have travelled outside this great province and this great country have seen that it exists literally everywhere. If you go to the Third World especially, you can see that children are even more exploited, if that is possible, than you would find them being exploited here. These same children take to the streets. They take

mind-numbing drugs to get rid of the pain. They are commercially exploited as prostitutes. They are commercially exploited in pornography. They are commercially exploited in massage parlours. This is not done just for deviant pleasure. It is not out there just to satisfy someone or because someone wants that. It is because people know you can make money off this. The people, the pimps, who do this, do it primarily for money. They are able to have authority over the defenceless, and they do it to make money.

That's why I'm supporting this bill in the long run, because we as a society have to stop this. If we can stop it here, maybe the movement will grow. Maybe the movement will grow to all of Canada. Maybe the movement will grow to the Third World. Maybe there won't be all the sexual exploitation of children, where people leave various countries and go to the Third World where it is much freer and much easier to do. Maybe we, as a worldwide society, can say no to the way children have been treated, not just now, but in century after century leading up to today. As we become more enlightened, we need to make a difference and a change.

I commend Mr Bartolucci for first recommending this bill, and I commend the Legislature of Alberta for first enacting it. I wish we had been first, but it's better to be second than not to do it at all. I commend the Legislature of Alberta for having taken this bill, because it was a difficult process. As members may know, when it was first passed it was challenged in the courts and was overturned. It was only later that the Supreme Court of Canada in turn overturned that, which allowed the bill to continue and which allowed it to exist.

The New Democratic Party members of the Alberta Legislature supported that bill. They supported it while at the same time drawing attention to the poor and vulnerable. That's what I hope to do in the few minutes we have here, to draw attention to the poor and vulnerable, because it's not just enough to take these children off the streets; we have to do something to make sure they don't end up on the streets in the first place. If they are not there to be exploited, they won't be exploited. If they have alternatives in their lives, they will in the overwhelming majority of cases not choose this.

The problems I see with the bill, even though we're going to support it because, as the previous speaker from the Liberal Party stated, it's a start; we have to start—but there are problems already inherent in this bill that I hope the members opposite will listen to and I hope all of the members of the House will listen to, because in the next Parliament I'm sure there will be an opportunity to remedy it, to see what is happening out there in the courts, to see what is happening with the judges' orders, to see what is happening when the police and the children's aid officials are involved and to fine-tune this so that it will actually work to the betterment of the children. I wish we could have done that right away, but I want to talk about what I think needs to be done in the very near future to make this a really good bill.

The first one is that this bill is tied in, in part, to the Child and Family Services Act. When the children's aid

representative appeared before the committee looking at Mr Bartolucci's bill a couple of years ago in Sudbury, that representative spoke very carefully and succinctly about the problem with the bill. The problem with the bill is that the Child and Family Services Act is actually a superior bill for looking after children, certainly for looking after children who are under the age of 16. It will not necessarily cover those between 16 and 18, but it certainly is better than this bill in terms of looking after those who are under 16, at least according to the children's aid society. They advised that that bill gives more power than this bill will to judges, to those who will be able to make the necessary decisions to look after the children once they have been brought in and put under the court's protection.

Also, the problem with this is that this particular bill has, right in the body of it, the fact that it will override the Child and Family Services Act in a number of cases, and that is something that I see as a difficulty, given that the children's aid society is quite clear and is quite adamant that that bill is in many ways superior to this one.

The second problem I see with the bill is that although we can do what is necessary, we need to know that there will be resources within the various and sundry government departments spread out all across the system, that they have the resources to do what will be necessary if the 50 or 100 or 1,000 child prostitutes are taken off the streets. Will there be the resources necessary? I have to question the commitment of all of us, not just the government but all of us, to make sure that there are necessary resources when we do finally get them. There have been many, many government cuts, not only in the last seven years but in the last 15 years. There have been government cuts to many programs.

1630

Just to outline some of them which will further put these children at risk: agencies that deal with at-risk youth either have not had any funding increase in the last seven years or they've actually had decreases. These are the agencies that are out there dealing with the children and the youth at risk who are on the streets. They are working tirelessly, night and day, at least in this city that I know, up and down Yonge Street and all the other major thoroughfares of this city, looking for children who are out there on the streets who are prostituting themselves. They don't have enough social workers, they don't have enough volunteers, they don't have enough money, they don't have enough resources or computers in order to do their programs. Each and every year, when they come before governments—this government, municipal governments, the federal government—asking for additional sources of funds, they are told to go out and fundraise. Going out to fundraise is perhaps not a bad thing, but it takes time away from what they need to be doing. It takes time that they could be helping children. I think we need to look at ourselves in our heart of hearts, if we're going to pass this, to also look at funding those agencies which will be the eyes and ears of the commu-

ity to first recognize which children are on the street and which ones are under the control of pimps and which ones are selling their bodies.

We need to look at our underfunding of legal aid, the very people who can go out and provide legal services to these children, who can be their advocates in the courts to get them out of the situations they find themselves in, who know the legal rights of those who are being exploited, and who can help them to work against the exploiters. We need to better fund legal aid in order to help each and every one of them.

We need to start looking as a society at why we are cutting the funding in schools and why we have taken it to the bare-bones minimum, where a funding formula will not allow things like social workers in the schools to first identify the kids when they're having problems in the schools before they run away from home, to identify the problems they're having with poverty, to identify the problems they're having with education, the problems they're having with their families, to see the telltale signs, if there are signs of abuse, whether sexual, physical or mental, and to deal with those children while they are still in the school and where it is much easier to help them. We need to wonder why the schools are cutting out their counsellors, that there are no longer enough counselling services to provide trouble to at-risk youth, many of whom will end up on the street and be subject to exploitation. We need to wonder and question constantly why we are continuing the cutting of funding to school boards when much of this money is used for support services. That is among the first things that go and it is, at the same time, that which exacerbates the situation that many young people will find themselves in.

We need to ask questions. This is a tough one; there could be catcalls from across the floor. We need to ask the question about the drastic cut in welfare rates. One must remember that nearly half of all the people on welfare in this province are children. Every time the welfare rate is cut or not increased, the poverty rate is vested down upon the children we should all be trying to help, those children who, in year after year of living with poverty, will attempt to escape it. Even if there is a loving parent at home, even if there is a school they can go to, they will attempt to escape the poverty the only way they know how, and inevitably that's by running away and coming to a big city like Toronto, Hamilton or Ottawa. They will gravitate to the big cities and will be subject to those who will exploit them. We need to question whether, in keeping people poor, in keeping the poorest of the poor destitute and without hope, we are not in fact driving up that rate of prostitution ourselves.

We need to look, as a society, at whether there is not sufficient housing, whether we are building enough housing, whether in fact in places like Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and London, where the rents have started to skyrocket, we are doing everything we can to make sure people can afford them so that they don't have to live on the streets, so that they can find decent accommodation, so that they don't have to prostitute themselves or do

whatever they need to find additional funds merely to have a roof over their head.

The third problem I have with this bill, and Mr Bartolucci had it in his original one, is that there's nothing here that would allow the bill in any way, other than to take away the driver's licence of a john or the driver's licence of a pimp, to do anything and really to put them in jail.

I understand the Criminal Code of Canada has provisions that will put them in jail, but it is very, very difficult to rely simply on that because you have to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. Many of these children are afraid, they're terrified, of those who exploit them. It will be extremely difficult in the long term to do anything with the Criminal Code, and it might be better to use a civil remedy. I don't see it here and I'm disappointed, for whatever number of reasons, that it has been removed from the original bill as put forward by Mr Bartolucci.

In the end, though, one has to ask the question: is this bill better than nothing at all? The answer, quite simply, is yes, it is. As Asclepius, the father of medicine in old Greek times, so clearly said when instructing physicians, physicians should do all they can to help. But there is something that is even written in the medical code that he wrote all those years ago, even to this day. It says, "Do no harm." Does this bill do any harm to those children? I think not.

So I am satisfied in weighing all the balances, in seeing what is out there, in seeing the difference that this bill might make or might not make because it's not strong enough, that it is still worthy of support. We are not doing additional harm to these children, who require only our support.

What I am asking, though, in passing this bill, is that we watch it very carefully to make sure it is doing what it's supposed to, to make sure that the children who are brought in are not further harmed, to make sure that we as a society do everything we can for them and for every other child, whether they're engaged in this or not, who is poor, every other child who needs support, every other child who needs education, every other child who needs hospitalization, every other child who has problems, every other child, as we saw some here today, with autism. Those who need help should be given it, and this bill is one small factor. We as a government, we as a society, we as a people in Ontario, need to do all the things that make sure those kids don't end up on the street, even if that means we have to expend additional resources, if that means we have to forgo more tax cuts, if that means we have to sometimes say to people, "This has to be done and you're not going to get the program or the policy that you want put in place." I have always believed that our first obligation is to help our children. This bill will do that, but we need to do more and we will do more.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for the time I've had and I hope and pray that this bill, in the long term, will do for children on the streets as much as Charles Dickens did with his very brilliant works at the turn of the century.

Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre): This is a bill in which I think everybody in this House would have a great deal of interest. Any one of us who is a father or a mother would have a great deal of interest in this. We can't envision having our own children fall into a state like this, we can't envision that someone else's children could fall into a state like this, and yet probably every one of us knows someone whose child—or we know the child who has fallen into a situation in which they're sexually exploited.

I have to say that for me personally it's an honour to be able to speak to this bill. The legislation is about helping. It's about helping the children escape the misery of sexual exploitation. It's about helping their families, who desperately want their children to get the treatment they need in order that they can come back home. It's about helping police and helping the children's aid society workers, both of whom need the proper tools to rescue and protect sexually exploited children.

1640

The bill, if passed, would allow police and children's aid society workers to rescue the sexually exploited children from a range of situations and place them in a safe, secure location for up to 30 days. While in this safe, secure location, the children would then be able to receive some treatment and services that they need to get their lives back on track.

The legislation recognizes a troubling trend today in the sexual exploitation of children. More and more we see these children being kept underground to avoid detection by law enforcement officials.

I think we need to think back to our own childhoods. Many of us got involved in sports. Yes, we got involved in playing some hi-jinks from time to time and they didn't get us into trouble. But the kids today are under much more pressure than we ever were. If they're being kept underground to keep from being detected, how can the police find them by simply stepping up patrols in those areas?

If we have kids being forced to turn tricks, if the kids are being hidden away, forced to sell themselves, how can the police find them if they're in the back rooms of strip clubs or even over the telephone or over the Internet? This legislation, if passed, would give police and children's aid society workers the tools they need to rescue the children from any range of dangerous situations, including street prostitution, adult entertainment facilities, massage parlours, bawdy houses, escort services, telephone or Internet sex lines and the pornography industry.

The proposed legislation would allow police to rescue children with or without a warrant, and I think that's very important to keep in mind. While in most circumstances, a warrant would be obtained, nevertheless there are times that removal of the child without the warrant is necessary. It's important because, if the obtaining of a warrant would jeopardize that child, jeopardize the ability to rescue that child, then it's important that the police be able to rescue the child without obtaining the warrant.

To ensure that the child's rights are respected, the proposed legislation would require a court to review the validity of the rescue within 24 hours. Within five days, a second hearing would occur, at which time the court would be able to make a number of decisions in the best interests of the child. This could include extending the placement for up to 30 days. It could include returning the child to his or her parents or legal guardian, if appropriate care and supervision would be provided—and I should say "if appropriate care and supervision would be provided." I think we all know that there are those cases where that supervision is not there. It could include determining that future intervention is not required in the case of this particular child.

We know that sexually exploited children often end up on the streets after fleeing abusive situations at home. They hope for a better life, but instead what happens is that things get much worse for them. These children are abused again and again by the predators who sexually exploit them for profit.

Often these children are drawn into addiction to drugs and alcohol by pimps, since that is often a way to increase the child's reliance on them. These children need help to break out of this terrible cycle of sexual exploitation and substance abuse. We need to give them back the dignity they deserve. This legislation, if passed, would help ensure that sexually exploited children would get the services and the treatment they need to begin a healthy new life. These kids would be placed in a safe, secure location for up to 30 days, where they would get the help and therapy they need. The drug and alcohol counselling would be provided to them. Specialized legal services would be provided to them. Some of these specialized legal services might include witness protection or victim-witness assistance.

We might not consider this all that important. How important could this be with these children? Well, it's very important because, without that, these children's lives are in danger. We sometimes downplay the danger these children are in. As the member for Sudbury said earlier, let's understand that many of these truly are children. They're ages 11, 12, 13 and 14 years old.

They will have medical services such as detoxification and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. They will have mental health services and they will have counselling support services. The children's aid society would assume responsibility for managing the child's care while in a safe location. With the help of the children's aid society, some children can be linked to longer-term care and support services to assist them with ongoing issues and problems.

The sexual exploitation of children bears a high cost, especially for the kids emotionally, but also for us financially; for us taxpayers who ultimately will end up paying for the protection and treatment of these children. We think it is only appropriate that the people who prey on these kids be held responsible. That is why this proposed legislation would allow the government to sue pimps and others who sexually exploit children for commercial

purposes to recover the costs associated with treating their victims. Under the proposed bill, the province would be able to sue for the full amount of taxpayers' dollars that had been spent, or that may be spent in the future, to provide assistance to a particular victim or identifiable group of victims who have been exploited as a result of an abuser's conduct.

The proposed bill would target predators in another important way: it would permit the suspension of drivers' licences of pimps and johns convicted of prostitution-related Criminal Code offences involving the use of a motor vehicle. With these two measures, we are sending a strong message that the sexual exploitation of children will not be tolerated in Ontario.

We recognize this legislation is not a cure-all, but clearly it is a positive first step in protecting vulnerable children. When developing this legislation, we consulted with police and children's aid society workers, the people who work on the front lines with sexually exploited children. They told us that this bill, if passed, would help make a difference. It would give them another tool they need to better protect Ontario's children.

I do urge all members to support the bill, and I'm sure they will.

1650

Mr Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward-Hastings): I am pleased to speak to this bill but I, as are all of us in this chamber, am saddened that there's a need for such a bill.

I certainly want to compliment the government for putting these bills together. I've been here since 1999 and I need to recognize our member Rick Bartolucci's commitment to this issue, on and on to fight for the children in this province. I've been very impressed and have been appreciative of his efforts. I also wish to compliment the New Democratic Party for their support of this bill. But as I said, I very much regret that in our Ontario we need to have it.

I have mentioned before in the House and will note that our family has fostered many children over the years and a significant number of them, the majority of them, had been sexually abused. I need to pay compliments to the foster families in this province. We work with children who tell us stories and enrich our lives, but they also open up to us in our families the subculture—the absolutely horrible, repulsive subculture—that exists that finds it acceptable to abuse children. So foster families that work with these children and bring them into their homes I'm most appreciative of. It is a special challenge.

My experience and knowledge on this issue come from being a board member on a CAS and being a foster parent. I know that in far too many cases the abuse that takes place has been either with the knowledge or the involvement of the family. This bill deals with it very well, whether it's a family member or not. But we also need to recognize and have in place the financial resources and the supports to make this bill work to best serve the victims who are being removed from the bad environment.

Of all of the children we have fostered, not once have we fostered a child who did not love their parents. The

child may have known what was happening was wrong and, in fact, I've always been struck by the irony that the children knew it was wrong but the adults always claimed they didn't know it was wrong or, in my belief, they allowed their own selfish needs to overcome their obligation to protect their children. The children knew it was wrong, but they were still their parents.

This bill provides that a police officer or a child worker can remove that child from that bad environment. That is the only solution and I applaud that. But we need to recognize that from the child's viewpoint, in some cases, in the cases where their family is involved, they are being removed from their family. What we view as a place of safety, they will view as a jail: they are being sentenced to being taken away from their family. Their family may have done what's wrong, but it's the child who pays the price by having been taken away and put in with strangers—literally with strangers. I think it's fair to say that these children feel at times that they've been sentenced to a foster home, they've been sentenced to a group home, where they've been sentenced to a place of safety. That requires that the people there be highly skilled and highly trained to deal with what is a very emotional situation. I don't think any of us could comprehend being yanked out of our parents' house at 4 o'clock in the morning and placed with strangers. It is most traumatic.

We have over the years worked with children who have been sexually exploited—and I can understand if you don't accept or believe this—as young as four years old. We know of other families that have worked with children even younger than that. So for that child, that is a very traumatic experience and we need to have in place the supports.

We also have provision in the bill that within five days of apprehension the matter must be before a judge. That's good timing. That provides the opportunity for the police and the children's aid society to assemble the information they need to present to the judge. It also is a compromise. If in fact the information, when it's found out, does not bear out the allegations, the child can be returned home as safely as possible, because that has to be our number one goal.

We need to recognize that the child is entitled to be in the court, as they should be, but a court is a very, very difficult experience for a younger child. I'm sure as adults we would find it difficult to be in court. It's a very formal system that the children are not used to and they are in there perhaps in an adversarial position with their parents. Their parents may very well be there, if the parents were the abusers. The abuser is going to be in court, potentially, and we're asking the children to be in that same room. The government must provide funding for the court systems that allows the courts to minimize the impact upon these children, upon these victims, whether it be that they are able to give testimony by tape, whether it be with the children in another room, whether it be some mechanism to prevent the child from having to sit across from or, in some very rare cases, even be cross-examined by the offender.

Certainly the bill is good, but I need to emphasize that there need to be the resources put in place so that the victim is not re-victimized.

If in fact the decision is made that that child cannot return to that home situation and must move on to another placement, we need to recognize the traumatic effect on that child. The abuse that takes place against these children can influence—not “can” influence; “will” influence—the rest of their life. For the child, they have had their childhood stolen, because they can't forget what they have learned; it has become part of their fabric. We have worked with children when they're four, five or six years old, and they know things that they should not have to know, and they've experienced things that they should never have had to experience. When you remove them from that climate and put them in a place of safety, that information is in their head and will stay in their head for the rest of their life.

We have a dire shortage of mental health services in this province for victims, particularly young victims of child abuse. To put them on a waiting list—this happens in too many jurisdictions—where they may wait a year or two for counselling is unbelievable.

The children's aid society for Hastings county had some money from the province that they used to counsel victims of sexual abuse. At the time, before the name change, the Ministry of Community and Social Services removed that money, took away every penny of it, and redirected the money to a society located in another area. So in a community that already had a dire shortage of mental health services for victims of sexual abuse, it went to zero. These victims shouldn't have to pay the price for balancing the provincial budget. These victims deserve support from us. These victims deserve mental health services, and we're not talking one or two visits.

Again, none of us—and we should be very grateful. I shouldn't say, “none of us,” but none of us that I know of in this chamber have ever experienced that trauma of sexual abuse and then being removed from our parents.

We need to accept that it will cost money to deliver what the bill intends to do. To simply take the child out of the environment and leave them to deal with the mental challenges is in fact to leave them as victims for the rest of their life. We should be striving to do that extra, to support them, and that's not happening.

If we take a child who has been sexually exploited by their parents and move them to a place of safety, if we put ourselves in that child's shoes, we would realize that that child has lost their family, probably for the rest of their life. They have lost their parents, because even if the offender is just one of the parents, they will have lost contact with their parents for the rest of their life. That's literally like a death in the family. They will lose access to their siblings, potentially, because there have been cases where not all children have been removed from the home, and there have been cases where they've been placed in different foster homes. So they've lost their siblings, they've lost that peer support. They've lost every possession that was in their house; they've lost

family photographs, school mementoes. This may not seem significant to some of us, but they've lost things such as their family pet. A child who is removed from that environment starts over.

I would like to suggest that the government give serious consideration to giving the child victim the right, when they have been removed from a family situation, to have their possessions brought to them. They don't have that right now. The children come into our home with the clothing on their backs. In 15 years, we've never had an instance where their natural family has consented to give them as much as a photograph of their family, as much as a school memento—absolutely nothing. The law now is that they don't have to.

I believe what a child possesses in that home should be available to them, because if they move on and never return home, they shouldn't have to start over at zero to accumulate their life history. But again, that requires action beyond what this bill does to make sure we are taking the victims and not simply yanking them out of the situation and saying, “Look, we've saved you.” As good as that is, we need to understand we have taken on some family responsibilities.

1700

I'll tell you another statistic that bothers me with these children who have been removed from areas where they've been sexually exploited. Fewer than 5% of them go on to post-secondary education. What tends to happen is that when they turn 18, they cease being a crown ward. The province of Ontario says, “You're 18 now. We have taken you out of the unsafe environment. You're now 18 and on you go.” Anyone who has either gone to college or university or sponsored a child at college or university knows there are substantial financial costs. There's also substantial emotional support needed. Going to university or college is not an easy thing. So when we rescue these victims, which is the right thing, we need to remind ourselves that we have a commitment to help them be successful. As any average parent would help their child when they're past 18, if they're going into post-secondary, I strongly believe that this government has an obligation to say, “We will serve in the role of parent for you. We have taken on that responsibility.” But remember, it costs money.

I would suggest that we need stronger penalties than are provided in this bill. Dalton McGuinty and the Ontario Liberals call for stronger penalties. You need only talk to a victim for a few minutes or to have lived with a foster child who has been a victim for some time to realize how absolutely horrible it is. It is not murder, but it is taking away the spirit of that child. We need to recognize that the penalties need to be greater.

We also need to recognize the children's aid society workers. The province has brought in new standards. The province has new demands for the workers. I have no quarrel with that. But we have workers who are being staffed on a formula that doesn't recognize the extra paperwork or that for our children's aid societies it's not just a job. They don't come in at 8:30 and go home

at 4:30. They are dealing with very emotional issues with these children. They tend to stay on in the evenings and become part of the case with these children. We need to recognize that we need better funding and more support for our workers for it.

Certainly we support this bill, but I ask, I demand, that the government put the other supports in place that will ensure that child has every opportunity to be successful after they're removed from that environment.

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill. We are doing a very serious piece of public business here this evening. I want to make sure we look at it in the fullest context possible. I believe that in almost all instances it's important to have the law on your side and have the resources and power to deal with specific instances when the law has been broken or when people are being used or abused. On the other hand, in this place, when we consider, as we do here, what we might do about a particular circumstance or situation or challenge in a community, we have to look at it in its fullest context. For example, in this instance we talk about dealing with child prostitution. As I read the bill, I see really not much in here concerning the circumstance within which many children find themselves—the issue of poverty—and what in their family might be pushing them into a life that is so obviously difficult, a choice they make that I don't think most children in normal circumstances would make. You have to ask yourself, why would they do that? What in our society today, in a province as rich as Ontario and a country as rich as Canada, would see so many young people choosing to live on the street and make money by offering their bodies to people who have no other use for them or for their bodies except their own self-gratification and to meet some perverted need they have?

In speaking to this bill and indicating that at the end of the day I guess our caucus would probably support it, I would say that we have some really serious and significant concerns.

Just to back up a little bit, and perhaps for those who haven't been watching or don't understand, Bill 86 was introduced by the Attorney General on June 21, 2001. It replaced Bill 176, which was introduced in late December 2000—so it's been around for a little bit—and died when the House prorogued. There have been no significant changes to this bill from the previous bill.

However, the important thing here is that it wasn't the government that introduced this; it was Mr Bartolucci from Sudbury, seeing a difficulty in his own community, in the very limited and narrow way we have an opportunity to effect change in this place. I know in speaking to him and knowing of him that he would want to do the fuller thing that needs to be done here in terms of responding to the circumstance that young people who choose to go into prostitution probably find themselves in. However, given the very real circumstance that there are young people on the streets of Sudbury who are selling their bodies, as I'm sure there are on the streets of Sault Ste Marie and probably of every community across

this province, he introduced a bill in May 1998 that was—

Interjection.

Mr Martin: Not that much different, but there was one important difference in Mr Bartolucci's bill, and it was addressed at the hearings.

Mr Bartolucci introduced his bill originally in 1998 and again in 1999. I think we can take it from that that he was committed and was going to make sure something happened.

The main difference between this bill and the bill of the member from Sudbury is that his bill attempted to create a provincial offence against pimps and johns. It's one thing to go after the young people who find themselves on the street—who oftentimes find themselves victims before they ever get to the street and then victims again on the street—and not deal with those who are actually doing the victimizing: the pimps and the johns. From what I understand, there really is nothing in this bill that deals with that, and that's a serious shortcoming that we on this side take some umbrage with.

The government feels that doing that kind of thing is outside provincial jurisdiction. Well, in most instances, in my experience in my 53 years of life, where there's a will, there's a way. You find a way to do the right thing.

“The bill would authorize a police officer or a children's aid society worker to apprehend a child under 18 years of age, with or without a warrant, if the police officer or worker has reasonable grounds to believe that the child has been sexually exploited for commercial purposes or is at risk of sexual exploitation for commercial purposes in prostitution, pornography, adult entertainment facilities, massage parlours, escort services, sex lines and other sexual activities carried on for financial or other gain.”

The bill deals with conditions around confinement, an assessment of the child and timelines for court procedures. “The child may be confined in a locked facility.”

The bill would allow the government the “right of recovery from a person who sexually exploits a child for commercial purposes for the costs for the protection of the child and to assist the child in leaving situations in which he or she is sexually exploited for commercial purposes.”

1710

As I said, we supported the bill going forward to committee and we indicated we would support the bill at second reading. Unfortunately, we said then and say now that we have serious concerns with this bill, and we don't believe they were adequately addressed at committee. We're concerned that this bill doesn't prescribe the conditions of the facilities where these young people will be locked in, and it doesn't require them to receive any kind of treatment or counselling. I believe my colleague from Beaches-East York spoke a few minutes ago to the further concern we have—and it fits into that category I mentioned a few minutes ago of the context within which this bill is being passed—that this government has cut seriously and significantly a lot of the budgets to the

agencies out there in communities that will in fact be the agencies called upon to provide some of the treatment and counselling that is obviously going to be needed when and if this bill is passed.

So the question that we have, and that we want to put on the table this afternoon is, is the government going to put that money there? Is the government going to provide? Are they going to replace what they've cut already in the area of mental health services? The member from Prince Edward-Hastings, who spoke from the Liberal caucus just a few minutes ago, talked about a program in his community where the whole mental health budget was cut.

In the context of all this, the bill, first of all, doesn't require them to receive any kind of treatment or counselling, understanding that they need it and will ultimately be sent for treatment and counselling. If the people who are put in charge of making sure this piece of legislation works are going to act responsibly and accountably here, where is the money going to come from if it's already been cut? Is the government willing to commit today, as they speak on this time allocation motion, to making sure the money is in place, that those services are in place and that at the end of the day these young people don't become victims once more, this time victims of the system that takes them off the street, gives them a glimmer of hope, perhaps, or some encouragement and then drops them such that they have no choice, after they've been through the system, than to end up back on the street again? That's a real concern. It's a concern for me and a concern for my caucus.

I'm just getting a little drink of water here. I'm getting a little dry.

Second, we're concerned that this bill may override the Child and Family Services Act, where there are already far more effective provisions than this bill provides where it applies to youth under the age of 16. That's a concern. The government claims that a wide range of services would be provided, including drug and alcohol counselling, specialized legal services, medical services, mental health services and counselling services. Yet this government has cut budgets to agencies serving at-risk youth; underfunded legal aid; cut funding to schools, which allowed counselling and other support services to youth; reduced welfare payments; and attacked, underfunded and undermined programs that help low-income families and their children. There's nothing, including in the budget last week Monday, which indicates this government is moving any time soon to replace or replenish any of the services they've cut. So we have some real concerns here.

Last year we heard the government move forward, for example, on a provision that people in jails be tested for drug abuse, with the proviso, I would assume, that those folks would end up in some treatment centre somewhere. But those of us who are any way plugged into our communities or who represent our communities or understand the needs of our communities know those services aren't there for people who have indicated, even right now, that

they want or need the counselling and treatment that are necessary.

So if, as this government has suggested, you take a group out of the prison system and put them in line for these services, and now you start taking young people off the street who are out there prostituting themselves because you want to do the right thing, and you do that, and you say you're going to get them the counselling, support and legal aid they require, and when they get there, there's a lineup a mile long, how effective do you really think this legislation is going to be? How long is it going to take before people become really cynical about all of this and the ability of government, through passing laws, to actually respond to and deal with some of the very difficult and real challenges that are presented out there in communities?

So I have some real concerns, our caucus has some real concerns where that is concerned, about whether we're going to be effective at the end of the day or whether we will yet again, as we've done before over the last seven years in this place, hold out a vine, a blade of grass, to some people who are hanging by their fingernails to some hope and then only have that hope dashed because the services, the support network and the foundation aren't in place upon which this could have some hope of being successful.

Just to give you a little example of why I'm cynical about this government's commitment to actually putting the resources in place—there's nothing so obvious in this province right now as the poverty that those who are disabled are living under, who are dependent on the Ontario disability support program for their income. We made that case to the government a week ago Thursday. We got overwhelming support from this side of the House. We got two or three members of the government who have obviously heard from their constituents—some 129,000 people across this province living on between \$11,000 and \$12,000 as a single person, who are disabled through no fault of their own, living some \$7,000 to \$8,000 below the poverty line. There ought to be no argument from anybody that that is the truth and those are the circumstances and conditions under which those people are living, and yet this government says no. When I bring in a very modest proposal that their income be tagged to the cost of living, which would cost them some 2% to 3% for this year, and then every April 1 in ensuing years the income of disabled people in this province would be increased by the increase in the cost of living, the government says no.

If the government is saying no in that very clear and obvious case, what gives any of us any confidence they're going to understand when they pass this bill that they're going to require some significant and serious investment of dollars in a whole host of services: agencies serving at-risk youth; legal aid; schools so they can provide counselling and other supports to youth; welfare payments to poor families so that children don't find themselves even thinking about the possibility of prostituting themselves in order to cover some of the costs they

and their family are not able to meet? That's just a short list of some of the difficulties out there that are directly attached to and need to be dealt with if this bill is going to be effective in any way.

On introduction of the bill, the Attorney General said, "It is a big step forward toward giving children a chance at a better life. Ontario's children deserve nothing less." This province's education system would serve Ontario's children very well and give all children a chance at a better life if the government hadn't created a crisis in the system to the point where we're not sure any more. As a matter of fact, some of the statistics that are coming out now where school is concerned for young people—and perhaps this is one of the reasons some young people find themselves with no other alternative but to end up on the street—is that a whole lot of the people who were being served by the school system when they had the three areas in it: the advanced, the general—I forget the exact names of them. But there were the young people going to school, who were quite bright, going off to college and university. There were those in the general who in many instances ended up in apprenticeships or going out to work after high school; then you had a group of young people who were at a lower level going to school in the hope they would at least get some skills that would get them into some training programs so they could take advantage of some of the jobs in industries out there that would be in need of them.

1720

What we're finding now, with the change in the emphasis in education and the push to excel that's there, and the reduction of the amount of time we're allowing young people to complete high school, is that there's a whole whack of young people dropping out, more than ever before. The statistics are shocking. They're very troubling. We have indeed created a crisis in our education system. That crisis, I suggest, will produce in the long haul a significant increase in the number of young people whom we will find in the street, either begging or selling themselves in order to make ends meet. That's really tragic, and that's a direct result of some of the initiatives and the cuts in spending of this government.

They expect us to be happy, confident and sure in supporting them in this piece of legislation that, yes, at its core I think probably has some value in it, because there's nobody, as the member for Kitchener Centre said a few minutes ago, who has children who doesn't understand. If their children end up out on the street and they want to get them off the street, they want to be able to call somebody and say, "Listen, could you go and get my daughter," and know they're going to have the power to go and do that, "so we can sit down and have a talk about this?" There's nobody who would disagree that, in those circumstances, we need to be able to do that.

But in the wider context, if there are children out there being pushed into that because they no longer find the kind of support and opportunity in place in the schools, or if they find in their families, that because of circum-

stances beyond their control there isn't the money to meet the basic needs of that family and they're pushed into the only thing, perhaps, they think they can do—which is to get into prostitution or working at some of these clubs that are unseemly and exploitive—what are we going to do about that? What are we going to do to stop the flow of people who seem to have, in many instances, no other choice but to go to the street and participate in that activity?

Then of course on the other end, once you've contacted them, taken them off the street and you've realized they have some difficulties that need to be addressed, where are we going to find the money and the services, if a lot of those services have been either cut back or eliminated completely, to deal with the aftermath of some of this? Where are the judges going to send these kids for the treatment they need?

I'm sure there is time left for some government members to speak to this. They could talk to me a bit about that. What are you going to do in the area of families and children living in poverty? What are you going to do on the other end when a judge determines that what a young person needs is a certain level of intervention, treatment and counselling, and if that treatment and counselling either aren't there or they've got to get in line, and that line is a year or two or three? We know that, if that's the case, in the meantime they may end up back on the street again.

What are we going to do about an education system that's failing a number of kids in a certain category who are no longer finding themselves either welcome or supported in their effort to be the best they can possibly be? There are lots of difficulties here. There are lots of questions that need to be answered.

Ending sexual exploitation of children is admirable, provided all other policies are in sync—appropriate sentencing, independent inquiry, into the Cornwall situation, for example, that this government seems to be so shy to move forward on, and police forces with suitable resources. The member for Niagara Centre continually brings into this House the reality that we have less police on the streets today than we had in 1995. Even at that very basic level, what are we going to do if we call the police to search for a child on the street in prostitution when those police officers are already overextended, trying to do the work they've already got on their plates?

So as New Democrats we're sympathetic with the motive behind the bill. Who doesn't want to protect the most vulnerable in our society? We're talking about child prostitutes, about young men and women who are exploited, abused, victimized by johns, by the strip clubs they work in, by the pornographic film industry. We all want to find some way to intervene and protect these young people from that incredibly dangerous and repugnant world. That's why New Democrats have taken this bill and its predecessor very seriously. We participated in the public hearings around the original private member's bill. We indicated when this bill was introduced and reintroduced that we were eager to see the bill go to committee.

Alas, now that it's gone to committee, we find that the government really wasn't serious when they said they wanted to hear from us, they wanted it to be a non-partisan event or initiative and that they were willing to do whatever was required to make sure that at the end of the day it would be effective and do what we all thought it had the potential to do.

Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre): I'm particularly pleased to be able to join in this debate on this very serious issue because I believe it needs to be said that ensuring the safety and security of children has always been a very top priority for the Progressive Conservative government, and certainly for me personally. To put that into some context, I have been an elected official both at the municipal and the provincial levels for the last 20 years. I think one of the most pervasive issues to affect society has been one of attacks on vulnerable people, especially children. Supporting vulnerable people in our society I believe is one of the most responsible things that we can do. In fact, I believe that it is our duty as a government to ensure that.

The proposed legislation that is under debate today would actually help to give the police and children's aid societies the stronger tools that they need to rescue children trapped in the misery of sexual exploitation.

I can recall when I was a councillor in Scarborough a few years ago and we were liaising with the police. One of my colleagues, councillor Harvey Baron, had a particular concern about the exploitation of children through pornography, and a special project had been set up by Toronto police at that time called Project P. There were only four police officers who were charged with looking at this whole area. As I say, this was about 15 years ago. I recall distinctly being invited to attend this particular project. The police were asking us at that time to please, as politicians, as decision-makers, make sure that they had the tools by which to deal with this growing problem.

We know that children as young as the age of 12 are being forced to sell sex in a range of situations. These situations can include, as we've already heard today, street prostitution, adult entertainment facilities, massage parlours, bawdy houses, escort services, telephone or Internet sex lines—I know that in itself is almost a new crime that is growing by huge proportions, and of course there's the pornography industry itself.

1730

It's fine to talk about these situations as being adult-dominated, but we have to remember that we're talking about children as young as 12 and, I would suggest, probably younger. I can't envision the horror these young people must go through. What this proposed bill will do is to allow police and children's aid society workers to remove children from these dangerous situations with or without a warrant.

Once these children have been rescued from these terrible situations, they would be placed in a safe, secure location where they would receive the care that is required to help them turn their lives around. Children who have been sexually exploited for profit are usually in

desperate and dire need of care. Many of them have left abusive situations at home only to be further abused at the hands of pimps, johns and others. In addition to being physically, sexually and emotionally abused, they're often addicted to drugs and alcohol and sometimes have sexually transmitted diseases.

While these young people, these children, are in safe, secure locations for up to 30 days, a child can access a range of supports that will include medical services, drug and alcohol counselling, mental health services, education and specialized legal services. I believe the proposed legislation is a further example of this government's commitment to ensuring the safety and well-being of our children, especially those children who are in need of specialized services.

Since 1995, the government has taken a number of measures to improve the child protection system. I have been particularly pleased to support all of these measures, just as I support the passage of this legislation. This government has increased funding by 130% for child welfare and by more than 28% for children's mental health agencies. It proclaimed new amendments to the Child and Family Services Act, including adding neglect as a factor in determining if a child is in need of protection. The amendments to the Child and Family Services Act make it clear that the needs of children must come first.

As well, more than 1,700 child protection workers have been hired since 1995. That represents an increase of more than 77%. In total, funding for children's services has increased by over 50% since 1995, and that brings the government's total commitment to over \$2 billion a year.

As I mentioned, this government has increased funding by 130% for child welfare, to over \$829 million in 2001-02. The increased funding will help children's aid societies respond to increased service demands and better protect the vulnerable children who are there to be protected.

Ontario's 52 children's aid societies provide a comprehensive range of services that include investigation of child abuse, counselling for families where a child might be at risk, substitute care, such as a foster home or a group home, and protection of children.

Abused women and their children also receive a range of services in women's shelters that include residential support and crisis telephone counselling, as well as supportive and practical counselling to women while in a shelter and after they start their new lives.

As part of the government's initiative to provide crisis telephone counselling, it expanded the assaulted women's help line province-wide. The government is spending \$26 million to create more shelter spaces for women and their children fleeing abusive situations.

We're also spending \$10 million annually on two new programs that will support women and children who have experienced violence. These are the transitional support program for abused women and the early intervention program for children who witness women abuse. These initiatives, along with the bill, which I think has been

debated particularly eloquently today by all three sides of this House, are examples of our government's strong commitment to the well-being of children. I believe it is the responsibility of all of us to share in protecting children and providing the care and services they need in order for them to lead safe, happy, healthy lives. The proposed legislation would help some of our most vulnerable children begin the long journey back to the life they deserve. I urge all members of this House to join me in supporting this bill.

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): There are a few things I'd like to say about the debate this afternoon. The motion we are entertaining at the present time relates to Bill 86. Since I haven't had an opportunity to speak to that particular bill, I'm going to focus some of my comments on the intentions and the genesis of the bill. I know the excellent work my colleague from Sudbury, Mr Rick Bartolucci, has put forth with regard to this issue has been mentioned numerous times in the Legislature when the bill was debated, and even this afternoon. I'm very delighted for him. I know him to be a man of great commitment, and certainly a man who's committed to making the world we live in a better place for young people and particularly for children. This is an example of a member who out in the riding had a conversation with an individual and recognized, "Hey, there's something I can do to bring a message to this room, to have a debate about an important issue and to do something that will improve the lives of children in the province." So I congratulate and commend him.

I also commend the members of the government, while I may not necessarily appreciate the journey this piece of legislation has taken. It started with legislation from the member for Sudbury, and I think it would have been more appropriate if it had been his bill that passed into law. However, he's been very generous in his remarks, and his direction as well, that any bill that comes to the Legislature that will benefit children must be supported. We certainly will be supporting Bill 86. So I am happy the government has deigned to recognize that this should be a priority on their agenda and has brought it forward for debate in this way. I think debate is another important issue I'll speak to in a few moments.

I am also aware that members of the third party have spoken very positively about the need for this kind of legislation. They've been able to reference in their own experiences in their ridings as well the need within our communities for our children to be protected in this particular way. I know that Mr Bartolucci is very appreciative of the support that has been offered with regard to this legislation.

1740

I want to make reference very briefly to the victims of this kind of crime. They are children. We tend to think that this sort of activity takes place only in large cities in Ontario, but I know that is not the case. I know that because I've had conversations with colleagues and even with professionals in my riding who say that this insidi-

ous activity is not only to be found in urban centres but is in fact found in all parts of the province—another reason why it is so very appropriate that we enact a law. This isn't a municipal responsibility; it is a provincial responsibility to ensure that children across the province are protected and that there are laws to assist police to do what they must do to ensure that a youngster is protected.

I do, however, find that I must speak to the motion that's on the floor this afternoon. It's a motion to allocate time for debate. I think that's very sad, because I think an issue such as this does deserve a full airing. Many members in the Legislative Assembly should have the opportunity to speak to this bill, about the need for it, because what we do here is explain to the people we represent, to the people who watch the legislative channel, the laws that are being entertained or considered in this room, to have them understand that these are issues that need to be dealt with in this legislative process.

More importantly, I want to make a comment about the regularity with which we see the government move a time allocation motion. It seems that on every issue—there really hasn't been an issue as important as this one, which directly impacts children in our province. The piece of legislation around Hydro One, for example—all of them are treated in the same way by this government, and that is to move time allocation, which means that the government doesn't want to hear any more from the people who've been elected as local representatives. You are intent on a path, on your mission, as it were, to do only what you think is the right way to go and, unfortunately, debate in this Legislature has become quite redundant. We are regularly called to the room not to debate bills particularly but the time allocation motion. Technically, today we should be talking about why we in fact think we should be talking about the bill a little more. It certainly limits the opportunity that we have, as legislators, to bring out some very good information and perspective on any pending legislation.

So while it certainly is my intention to support Bill 86, because I do think it's good legislation, I think it's important to explain to the people who would be viewing and for the purposes of Hansard that I do not believe in time allocation motions except in extraordinary circumstances. That, of course, is why they are in the standing orders. There are times when it might be appropriate to move a bill through expeditiously. I don't believe that is the case with Bill 86. I believe the bill deserves full debate in the Legislature. I think it's unfortunate. We didn't sit for five months, and now we find ourselves in a situation that, in order to meet the legislative calendar, we're entertaining all kinds of time allocation motions. I have to tell you that when I was elected, it certainly was my hope and desire to be here and to work for the people who sent me at least according to the calendar we were provided. That did not happen.

I think it is unfortunate that again we have another time allocation motion. I will not be able to support the motion, but I am very pleased that I've had the opportunity to speak positively to the bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Further debate? Hearing none, I'll put the motion to the House.

Mr Young has moved government notice of motion number 30. 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 nays have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1745 to 1755.

The Deputy Speaker: Members, please take your seats.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Hastings, John	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Hodgson, Chris	O'Toole, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sampson, Rob
Clement, Tony	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Coburn, Brian	Kells, Morley	Stockwell, Chris
Cunningham, Dianne	Klees, Frank	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Maves, Bart	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Galt, Doug	McDonald, AL	Wilson, Jim

Gilchrist, Steve
Gill, Raminder
Guzzo, Garry J.

Miller, Norm
Molinari, Tina R.
Munro, Julia

Witmer, Elizabeth
Wood, Bob
Young, David

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

Nays

Agostino, Dominic	Di Cocco, Caroline	McGuinty, Dalton
Bartolucci, Rick	Dombrowsky, Leona	McLeod, Lyn
Bountrogianni, Marie	Duncan, Dwight	McMeekin, Ted
Boyer, Claudette	Gerretsen, John	Parsons, Ernie
Bradley, James J.	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Brown, Michael A.	Kennedy, Gerard	Phillips, Gerry
Bryant, Michael	Kormos, Peter	Prue, Michael
Churley, Marilyn	Levac, David	Pupatello, Sandra
Cleary, John C.	Marchese, Rosario	Ruprecht, Tony
Cordiano, Joseph	Martel, Shelley	Sorbara, Greg
Curling, Alvin	Martin, Tony	

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 48; the nays are 32.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being almost 6 of the clock, I declare that this House stands adjourned until 6:45 this evening.

The House adjourned at 1758.

Evening meeting reported in volume B.

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Gerard Kennedy
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Alvin Curling
Gilles Bisson, Ted Chudleigh, Alvin Curling,
Gerard Kennedy, Frank Mazzilli, Norm Miller,
John R. O'Toole, Steve Peters
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

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

Chair / Président: Marcel Beaubien
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Doug Galt
Marcel Beaubien, David Christopherson,
Doug Galt, Monte Kwinter, John O'Toole,
Gerry Phillips, Rob Sampson, Joseph Spina
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Norm Miller
Marilyn Churley, Mike Colle, Garfield Dunlop,
Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac, Al McDonald,
Norm Miller, R. Gary Stewart
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: James J. Bradley
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Michael Gravelle
James J. Bradley, Leona Dombrowsky, Michael Gravelle,
Bert Johnson, Tony Martin, Frank Mazzilli,
Wayne Wettlaufer, Bob Wood
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Al McDonald
Toby Barrett, Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant,
Garry J. Guzzo, Ernie Hardeman,
Peter Kormos, Al McDonald, Lyn McLeod
Clerk / Greffier: Tom Prins

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Présidente: Margaret Marland
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Ted Arnott, Caroline Di Cocco, Jean-Marc Lalonde,
Margaret Marland, Julia Munro, Marilyn Mushinski,
Michael Prue, Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffière: Donna Bryce

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier
Bruce Crozier, John Gerretsen, John Hastings,
Shelley Martel, Bart Maves, Julia Munro,
Richard Patten, R. Gary Stewart
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Regulations and private bills /
Règlements et projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Rosario Marchese
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop
Gilles Bisson, Claudette Boyer, Garfield Dunlop,
Raminder Gill, Pat Hoy, Morley Kells, Rosario Marchese, Ted
McMeekin, Bill Murdoch, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Continued from overleaf

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Lundi 24 juin 2002

DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

Fête de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste

M. Lalonde 1221

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi Carlie Myke et Brandon White de 2002 (modification du Code de la route sur la sécurité des zones d'école), projet de loi 120, M. Levac
Adoptée 1224

Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur le Programme ontarien de soutien aux personnes handicapées, projet de loi 122, M. Parsons
Adoptée 1224

Loi de 2002 sur les consignes et remises exigées par la RAO, projet de loi 125, M. Colle
Adoptée 1224

Loi de 2002 modifiant la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario (protection des sources d'alimentation en eau), projet de loi 127, M^{me} Dombrowsky
Adoptée 1225

CONTENTS

Monday 24 June 2002

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Leader of the Opposition	
Ms Mushinski	1221
Special-needs students	
Mrs Pupatello	1221
Terry Fox Run	
Mr O'Toole	1222
Environmental assessment	
Mr Ramsay	1222
Adoption disclosure	
Ms Churley	1222
Port Hope	
Mr Galt	1222
Education funding	
Mr Parsons	1223
Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics	
Mr Arnott	1223

FIRST READINGS

Royal Ottawa Health Care Group/ Services de Santé Royal Ottawa Act, 2002, Bill Pr10, Mr Patten	
Agreed to	1224
Carlie Myke and Brandon White Act (Safe School Zones Highway Traffic Amendment), 2002, Bill 120, Mr Levac	
Agreed to	1224
Mr Levac	1224
Ontario Disability Support Program Amendment Act, 2002, Bill 122, Mr Parsons	
Agreed to	1224
Mr Parsons	1224
Mr Stockwell	1224
LCBO Deposit and Return Act, 2002, Bill 125, Mr Colle	
Agreed to	1224
Mr Colle	1224
Ontario Water Resources Amendment Act (Water Source Protection), 2002, Bill 127, Mrs Dombrowsky	
Agreed to	1225
Mrs Dombrowsky	1225

MOTIONS

House sittings	
Mr Stockwell	1225
Agreed to	1225
Mr Stockwell	1225
Agreed to	1226

Committee sittings

Mr Stockwell	1226
Agreed to	1226

ORAL QUESTIONS

Municipalities

Mr McGuinty	1226
Mrs Molinari	1226

Freedom of hydro information

Mr McGuinty	1227
Mr Stockwell	1227, 1228
Mr Hampton	1228

Labour dispute

Mr Hampton	1229
Mr Clark	1229, 1233
Mr McGuinty	1232

School closures

Mr Kennedy	1230
Mrs Witmer	1230

Arts and cultural funding

Ms Mushinski	1230
Mr Tsubouchi	1230

Education funding

Mr Patten	1231
Mrs Witmer	1231

Construction labour mobility

Mr Gill	1231
Mr Clark	1231

Autism treatment

Ms Martel	1232
Mrs Elliott	1232

Building code

Mr Galt	1233
Mr Coburn	1233

Ontario SuperBuild Corp

Mr Cordiano	1234
Mrs Witmer	1234

Road safety

Mr Dunlop	1234
Mr Sterling	1234

Ontario disability support program

Mr Martin	1235
Mrs Elliott	1235

PETITIONS

Ontario budget

Mr Bartolucci	1235
---------------------	------

Optometrists

Mr Kormos	1235
-----------------	------

Post-secondary education funding

Mr Curling	1236
------------------	------

Education funding

Mr Kormos	1236
Mr Peters	1238

Post-secondary education

Mr Duncan	1236
-----------------	------

Air quality

Mr Bradley	1236
------------------	------

Children's health services

Mr Lalonde	1237
Mrs Boyer	1237

Ontario disability support program

Ms Di Cocco	1237
-------------------	------

Kidney disease

Mr Peters	1237
-----------------	------

Hydro One

Mr Hoy	1238
--------------	------

Audiology services

Mr Bartolucci	1238
---------------------	------

Ambulance services

Mr Bradley	1238
------------------	------

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Time allocation, government notice of motion number 30, Mr Stockwell	
Mr Young	1239
Mr Bartolucci	1241
Mr Prue	1244
Mr Wettlaufer	1247
Mr Parsons	1248
Mr Martin	1250
Ms Mushinski	1253
Mrs Dombrowsky	1254
Agreed to	1255

OTHER BUSINESS

Annual report, Office of the Ombudsman

The Speaker	1223
-------------------	------

Visitors

Mrs Witmer	1226
Mr Bartolucci	1235

Continued overleaf