



No. 27A

N° 27A

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

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

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

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

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 26 June 2002**

**Mercredi 26 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

Wednesday 26 June 2002

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 26 juin 2002

*The House met at 1330.  
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

MATER'S MORTGAGES

**Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines):** I'm rising in the Legislature today to make yet another plea on behalf of the individuals, many of them in their senior years, who have been engaged in a very lengthy court case with the government of Ontario involving their financial losses from their investment in Mater's Mortgages.

The court case was initiated in September 1994 on behalf of over 4,000 individuals who were hopeful this matter would be resolved within months of the commencement of the legal proceedings. To their dismay and disappointment, the court case has dragged on for almost eight years and there are few signs it will be concluded in the near future without the co-operation of the government's lawyers.

Investors are of the view that lawyers acting for the government are deliberately placing obstacles in the way of a speedy resolution of the case and have expressed the wish that a fair, out-of-court settlement be reached, or at the very least, that the legal proceedings be concluded quickly in the court.

Former Attorney General James Flaherty was kind enough to meet with representatives of the Mater's Mortgages investors and indicated, in response to a question from me in the Legislature on November 24, 1999, that he was open, through the case management procedure, to assisting in expediting the resolution of these types of cases. Unfortunately, the case remains mired in procedural wrangling.

I believe their case has the potential to be resolved relatively expeditiously through the mediation process, and I ask the Attorney General to assist by instructing the lawyers acting for the government to co-operate in this regard.

EVENTS IN CALEDONIA

**Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant):** I wish to let members know of a number of events coming up in the booming community of Caledonia.

First is the July 1 parade. It's one of the best-run community parades in our area over the summer. Over the civic holiday weekend we have what's referred to as Golden Horseshoe Days. A pioneer village is constructed each year and features horse pulls and antique tractors. Of course there is the Caledonia Fair on into September.

This is a community that is experiencing very rapid growth. In fact, Haldimand county is one of the 20 fastest-growing communities in Ontario. The growth of Caledonia alone is responsible for close to 60% of the population increase we're seeing in a traditionally rural area south of Hamilton.

Of course, with more people comes the need for more and better services. I am proud to have played a role in securing government funding for Caledonia's twin pad arena and library project. Discussions with stakeholders have paid off with a provincial grant of close to \$2 million.

I'm also very pleased with developments with respect to the mid-Niagara corridor, which will parallel the northern boundary of Haldimand. Yet again, coupled with other initiatives, it can only bode well for the future economic development of this part of Ontario.

INCINERATION

**Ms Caroline Di Cocco (Sarnia-Lambton):** I must point out that there is a grave concern around the hazardous waste incinerator and landfill in St Clair township. All the ministers, including the current Minister of Environment, have shown an appalling lack of due diligence in this matter. This government is jeopardizing the health of the population and causing great harm to the environment.

Safety-Kleen is an example whereby the environmental assessment done for expansion entailed the new process begun in 1996 that's been described as having more political intervention in decision-making and far less environmental planning.

The limits currently applicable to the hazardous incinerator at Safety-Kleen are less stringent than in the United States and less stringent than those applicable to non-hazardous incinerators.

This hazardous incinerator and landfill is in the middle of prime farmland. A number of organic farmers have had to sell their properties because they were no longer able to sell their food. The stack has the largest mercury output in the province. The possible contamination of

crops and livestock, as well as the health risks to people, have been ignored by all the Ministers of Environment of this government.

As was the case in Walkerton, the people of Sarnia-Lambton will pay the consequences for such incompetence and disregard for the environment.

#### CAMBRIDGE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

**Mr Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge):** More good news from Cambridge. I would like to bring to the House's attention an important environmental achievement: the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment has named Cambridge Memorial Hospital winner of this year's Pollution Prevention Award. This is the first time that a hospital has won this award in the organizational category, which includes most public institutions across Canada.

This award is the ninth time in three years that this hospital has been recognized for its outstanding leadership role in environmental managing. They are truly a leader in Ontario.

You may recall that in the year 2000 Cambridge Memorial Hospital was the first community hospital in North America to receive ISO 14001 certification for environmental management. This is a certification that is granted to only the finest organizations in their chosen application.

I would like to commend the staff, volunteers and board members for their continued hard work. The recognition they have received is due to the ongoing, day-by-day effort of each and every member of front-line staff. I would especially like to recognize CEO Helen Wright, chair Charlie Wilson, former chair Mary Margaret Laing, members of the board and the green team project leaders for their efforts to protect our precious environment. A big thank you from Cambridge and Ontario.

#### WORLD CYCLING CHAMPIONSHIP

**Mr Dominic Agostino (Hamilton East):** In October of 2003, the city of Hamilton will be hosting the World Cycling Championship. This is a world-class lead event, probably the third-largest event in the world at any time when it comes to spectator sports. It is the largest single sporting event for the year 2003. There will be over 1,000 athletes from over 50 countries, 800 media, 450,000 spectators, plus a 500-million worldwide TV viewership.

I rise here today to urge this government to meet its end of the commitment to the World Cycling Championship. The federal government has put in \$10 million since October of last year. The city of Hamilton and the World Cycling Championship have asked the province of Ontario to come through with the \$5 million that's part of its share for the World Cycling Championship.

This government has seen fit to fund money toward the Olympic bid, and that's the right thing to do, and toward other sporting events, and it has been the right

thing to do. It is the right thing to ensure the \$5 million that is necessary to ensure the success of the World Cycling Championship in Hamilton for the year 2003 is delivered by Ontario.

#### 1340

This event is one of the top sporting events in the world. It is an amazing sport when it comes to television audiences, particularly in Europe. It is only the second time this event has been held in Canada. It was in Montreal in 1974.

I ask you today, I ask this government, I urge the government to come through with the \$5 million that has been requested for the World Cycling Championship for the city of Hamilton and be part of a team that's going to make it the greatest World Cycling Championship we've ever had in the history of the world.

#### ELVIS ZOVIC

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** Thank you for the opportunity to pay tribute to the career and life of a young Toronto Police Service constable who was killed yesterday in a traffic accident. Elvis Zovic was only 26 years old. He was a young man with a bright future, a man who was just beginning his career as a police officer in Toronto.

Constable Zovic was on his way to work yesterday morning when he was involved in a motor vehicle collision that took his life. He joined the Toronto Police Service in October 1999 and had just begun what he considered a dream assignment. Constable Zovic had joined the mounted unit based at the Canadian National Exhibition only two weeks ago. Prior to that, he worked as a uniformed officer at 22 division. Constable Zovic was excited about starting this new phase of his career. Staff Sergeant William Hurley at 22 division said he had a big love of animals. As a veterinarian, I can relate to that.

Toronto Police Chief Julian Fantino paid tribute to the young officer, saying he was a consummate professional. He breathed and lived his job. Chief Fantino called Constable Zovic's death a heart-wrenching situation and a terrible loss.

On behalf of the government of Ontario, I'd like to extend my heartfelt condolences to Constable Zovic's family and to the Toronto Police Service. We can only imagine the grief they are feeling that such a young and promising life has been cut so tragically short.

#### CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** The Conservative government's abandonment of children in this province with complex special needs requiring residential placements is appalling beyond words. Despite legislation the Tories themselves brought forward which requires the government to enter into special-needs agreements with these desperate families,

hundreds of children are simply being tossed aside as their parents struggle to find appropriate full-time care.

Earlier today I hosted a media conference at which several families talked about their frantic efforts to get the government to meet its legislative obligation to provide that care. Nancy Latowsky spoke about her son, Josh, who has been assessed as a priority for residential placement. Her only option appears to be a forced agreement to give up parental custody of Josh in order to receive that care. This is unbelievable in light of the fact that former Premier Mike Harris said in this House last year that this would never be forced on any family.

Mark and Suzanne Bashall told an astonishing story of a lawsuit brought against them by their local children's aid society demanding the Bashalls pay a portion of the costs of the full-time care for their 11-year-old son, Christopher. What in God's name is going on? The CAS has recently backed down from the lawsuit, but is now threatening to simply take their child out of this care, care which is the Bashalls' right under the law.

Minister Elliott, Nancy Latowsky and Mr and Mrs Bashall are in the members' gallery today. They are justifiably demanding that you meet with them after question period today. Minister, surely this is the least you can do. This horrific treatment by the province is totally unacceptable and must be dealt with face to face by the minister. Minister, go and meet with them.

#### TIMMINS MINING PROJECT

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I would urge the minister to meet with these people.

Anyway, I'm actually up today in order to congratulate the government on something. Can you believe it?

I know it's hard to believe, but we have in a community in the city of Timmins a mining project that is still at the initial stages. It's Globex, it's a talc-magnesium find that's just south of the city of Timmins. The mine itself is expected, should it come into production, to bring in over 100 jobs directly in the mining company. The big issue for us in Timmins is, what happens to the smelter?

It has been learned that Globex, with the Quebec government, which has been very aggressive in trying to attract that investment into their province, has been offering all kinds of incentives and all kinds of encouragement to have Globex establish the smelter in Rouyn.

As the local member for Timmins-James Bay, I have been after the government, talking to the minister and others, about trying to sit down with Globex to see what can be done in the province of Ontario in order to compete with our Quebec neighbours and make sure we're able to bring that investment to the community of Timmins.

We're not able to announce today that we're anywhere near that, but I want to encourage and thank the government for actually having taken the time to pick up on my request to meet with Globex. We'll be doing that later

on this afternoon, listening to the presentation and then working together with the community of Timmins and the greater community of Ontario to be able to find some way, should this project actually get off the ground, to attract a smelter investment in Timmins. I look forward to working with the government on that point.

#### POLICE OFFICERS OF THE YEAR

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** Mississauga recently honoured its 2002 Police Officers of the Year in an awards ceremony held at city hall. The five Peel regional police officers who received this prestigious award are Staff Sergeant Randy Patrick and Constables Dave Andrews, Darren Longpre, Ian Porter and Warren Robinson. They were recognized for their tireless efforts in apprehending a team of suspects who are believed to be responsible for a dangerous heist at a Money Mart store in Mississauga.

The prime suspect in this crime, armed with a handgun, lay in wait for two Brinks guards, grabbed a money bag containing more than \$100,000, stole a guard's .38 special revolver and fled on foot to a getaway vehicle. The officers implemented a plan involving 74 other officers from four police services. As a result, the key suspect was arrested and charged with 11 Criminal Code offences, while six collaborators were also charged. Moreover, the prime suspect was in the midst of committing another Brinks robbery on the day he was arrested.

On behalf of all residents in Mississauga, I am privileged to congratulate these exceptional police officers. Your fine work is an example to your profession and to our community. I would also like to commend all the officers with Peel Regional Police Service, Canada's fourth-largest police force and, in my opinion, our country's best police service. We are very grateful that you are willing to risk your lives in order to serve and protect us. Thank you.

#### SOINS À DOMICILE

##### HOME CARE

**M<sup>me</sup> Claudette Boyer (Ottawa-Vanier):** Compte tenu de l'importance des centres d'accès aux soins communautaires et du nombre d'appels que j'ai à mes bureaux, je me dois encore une fois de rappeler à cette Assemblée le sort pitoyable de beaucoup de gens qui tentent de vivre dans leur foyer avec l'aide des soins communautaires.

Budgets are cut, services are cut, housekeeping is cut, bathing is cut, attending care is cut, yet the clients' needs are constantly growing. Enough has been said in this Legislature about home care.

The last time I spoke about this in the Legislature, I was asked to provide examples. Well, I hold a letter here from a constituent. She is 49 and handicapped. Last August she was receiving six hours of service, in October

five, and in June one hour per week. That translates as no washing, no ironing, no meal preparation, no grocery shopping and no housekeeping.

Elle complète en disant qu'il lui reste deux choix : l'euthanasie ou le suicide assisté. Et ça, c'est une personne. Combien d'autres sont dans la même situation ?

This Legislature adjourns tomorrow and summertime is a time of rest and reflection. I don't know how much rest will be afforded to those whose very existence depends on these services for daily life, but I certainly hope that the Minister of Health will take time to reflect on the needs of these people and the pressing need to increase funding to community home care so that they can live in their homes in dignity.

#### VISITOR

**Mr AL McDonald (Nipissing):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We have a special guest in the gallery today, First Class Constable Ryan Berrigan of 22 division, Peel Regional Police Service, and his friend Jennifer. Policing must be in his blood, because his proud father, George Berrigan, is the chief of police of the city of North Bay. Welcome.

#### REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

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

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

Bill 74, An Act to amend the Marriage Act / Projet de loi 74, Loi modifiant la Loi sur le mariage.

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

This bill is therefore ordered for third reading.

1350

##### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** I beg leave to present a report from the standing committee on regulations and private bills and move its adoption.

**Clerk at the Table (Ms Lisa Freedman):** Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill Pr8, An Act to revive 1397399 Ontario Inc.

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

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### LOI DE 2002 SUR LE TRAITEMENT PARITAIRE DES RAPPORTS OFFICIELS EN DEUX LANGUES

##### OFFICIAL REPORTS IN TWO LANGUAGES PARITY ACT, 2002

Mr Bisson moved first reading of the following bill:

Projet de loi 145, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services en français pour prévoir que certains rapports sont disponibles simultanément en français et en anglais / Bill 145, An Act to amend the French Language Services Act to provide for the availability of certain reports in both English and French at the same time.

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

The member for a brief statement?

**M. Gilles Bisson (Timmins-Baie James):** La loi est très simple. Elle vise à modifier la Loi 8 pour s'assurer que, quand il y a une commission d'enquête et qu'un bureau de cette Assemblée dépose un rapport à l'Assemblée en anglais, le rapport soit déposé en français en même temps.

##### RED LIGHT CAMERAS PILOT PROJECTS EXTENSION ACT, 2002

##### LOI DE 2002 SUR LA PROROGATION DES PROJETS PILOTES AYANT TRAIT AUX DISPOSITIFS PHOTOGRAPHIQUES RELIÉS AUX FEUX ROUGES

Mr Sterling moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 149, An Act to extend the red light cameras pilot projects to November 20, 2004 or for an indefinite period / Projet de loi 149, Loi visant à proroger jusqu'au 20 novembre 2004 ou indéfiniment les projets pilotes ayant trait aux dispositifs photographiques reliés aux feux rouges.

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

The minister for short statement?

**Hon Norman W. Sterling (Minister of Transportation):** Two years ago, at the request of municipalities, our government introduced legislation that has allowed them to test the effectiveness of red light cameras at intersections. The sunset date on that legislation was November 20 of this year. Five of the six municipalities have asked us to extend the term of that pilot project to November 20, 2004. We are complying with the request, and I ask all members of this Legislature to support the extension of this date.

## CARE HOMES ACT, 2002

## LOI DE 2002 SUR LES MAISONS DE SOINS

Mrs McLeod moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 162, An Act to provide for the accreditation of care homes, to protect the rights of tenants and to amend the Tenant Protection Act, 1997 / Projet de loi 162, Loi prévoyant l'agrément de maisons de soins, protégeant les droits des locataires et modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la protection des locataires.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** Very briefly, the purpose of the bill is to put in place a bill of rights for the tenants of care homes, and to establish a care homes review board that is empowered to investigate complaints and to enforce the bill of rights. The bill also provides for the creation of an annually updated registry of care homes.

This bill was first introduced and debated in this House two years ago. It was defeated by the government of the day, which said they were going to introduce their own legislation. In the absence of that legislation having been presented, I felt it was appropriate to reintroduce the bill for debate.

GASOLINE CONSUMER  
PROTECTION ACT, 2002LOI DE 2002 SUR LA PROTECTION  
DES CONSOMMATEURS D'ESSENCE

Mr Crozier moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 163, An Act to provide information to consumers respecting the price of gasoline and the ownership of gasoline retailers and to require certain additional information from major oil companies / Projet de loi 163, Loi visant à fournir des renseignements aux consommateurs en ce qui concerne le prix de l'essence et l'appartenance des détaillants d'essence et exigeant certains renseignements supplémentaires de la part des grosses sociétés pétrolières.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex):** The main part of this bill is taken from Fairness at the Pump: Ontario Gas Prices Review Task Force report, that was prepared for the Honourable R.W. Runciman when he was Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

The bill requires every gasoline retailer to advertise a change in the price of gasoline at the retailer's gas station at least 72 hours before changing the price. The bill also requires gasoline retailers to indicate on their price signs what portion of the price is dedicated to tax.

The bill requires gasoline retailers that are affiliated with major gasoline retailers to indicate their affiliation on signs at their gas stations and on receipts issued at their gas stations.

Finally, the bill requires large oil companies that produce, refine and market gasoline to file segmented earnings reports with the Minister of Consumer and Business Services annually.

BAN ON DRIVE-THROUGH  
RESTAURANTS IN TORONTO ACT, 2002LOI DE 2002 SUR L'INTERDICTION  
DE CONSTRUIRE DES RESTAURANTS  
PERMETTANT LES SERVICES À L'AUTO  
DANS TORONTO

Mr Bryant moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 164, An Act to ban drive-through restaurants in the former cities of Toronto and York and the former Borough of East York / Projet de loi 164, Loi visant à interdire de construire des restaurants permettant les services à l'auto dans les anciennes cités de Toronto et de York et dans l'ancienne municipalité d'East York.

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

The member for a short statement?

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** Thank you, Speaker. Happy birthday to the member from Essex, I should add.

The bill regulates the issuing of building permits for constructing drive-through restaurants in the former cities of Toronto and York and the former borough of East York. It seeks to restore live-in communities, against drive-through traffic, environmental hazards and erosion of our neighbourhoods in midtown Toronto.

## BORDER SECURITY

**Hon Carl DeFaria (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: A few weeks ago, we were addressing the issue of the proposed change to a US regulation that would limit tourists' stays in the US to 30 days and seriously affect Canadian snowbirds.

Our government was active in supporting the efforts of Ellen White, president, and Heather Nicolson-Morrison, executive director, of the Canadian Snowbird Association, who were successful in obtaining a letter from the commissioner stating that all eligible Canadians are exempt from the 30-day rule.

These impressive ladies are with us and I'd ask that they be recognized in this House.

## MOTIONS

## HOUSE SITTINGS

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** I have a very important motion. I move that pursuant to standing order 9(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 pm to midnight on Wednesday, June 26, 2002, for the purpose of con-

sidering government business and satisfying the member for St Catharines.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** 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 1401 to 1406.*

**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	Eves, Ernie	Munro, Julia
Arnott, Ted	Flaherty, Jim	Mushinski, Marilyn
Baird, John R.	Galt, Doug	Newman, Dan
Barrett, Toby	Gerretsen, John	O'Toole, John
Bartolucci, Rick	Gilchrist, Steve	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Beaubien, Marcel	Gill, Raminder	Parsons, Ernie
Boyer, Claudette	Gravelle, Michael	Patten, Richard
Bradley, James J.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Peters, Steve
Brown, Michael A.	Hardeman, Ernie	Phillips, Gerry
Bryant, Michael	Hastings, John	Pupatello, Sandra
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Ramsay, David
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Ruprecht, Tony
Cleary, John C.	Johnson, Bert	Sampson, Rob
Clement, Tony	Kells, Morley	Smitherman, George
Coburn, Brian	Kennedy, Gerard	Spina, Joseph
Conway, Sean G.	Klees, Frank	Sterling, Norman W.
Cordiano, Joseph	Kormos, Peter	Stewart, R. Gary
Crozier, Bruce	Kwinter, Monte	Stockwell, Chris
Curling, Alvin	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Tsubouchi, David H.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Martiniuk, Gerry	Turnbull, David
Dombrowsky, Leona	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Duncan, Dwight	McDonald, AL	Wilson, Jim
Dunlop, Garfield	McLeod, Lyn	Witmer, Elizabeth
Ecker, Janet	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Elliott, Brenda	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David

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

#### Nays

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

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 81; the nays are 5.

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

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** On a point of order, Speaker: I'm hoping, in view of this gesture of conciliation on my part toward the government, that they might reconsider their position on ensuring that Bill 77, Marilyn Churley's adoption rights bill, receives third reading before the House adjourns.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: To the third party House leader, I'm sorry, your foot is still in your mouth.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### HYDRO ONE INC. DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS ACT, 2002

### LOI DE 2002 SUR LES ADMINISTRATEURS ET LES DIRIGEANTS DE HYDRO ONE INC.

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of Bill 80, An Act respecting directors and officers of Hydro One Inc. and its subsidiaries / Projet de loi 80, Loi concernant les administrateurs et les dirigeants de Hydro One Inc. et de ses filiales.

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

*The division bells rang from 1411 to 1416.*

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

#### Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Flaherty, Jim	Mushinski, Marilyn
Arnott, Ted	Galt, Doug	O'Toole, John
Baird, John R.	Gerretsen, John	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Barrett, Toby	Gilchrist, Steve	Parsons, Ernie
Bartolucci, Rick	Gill, Raminder	Patten, Richard
Beaubien, Marcel	Gravelle, Michael	Peters, Steve
Bradley, James J.	Guzzo, Garry J.	Phillips, Gerry
Brown, Michael	Hardeman, Ernie	Pupatello, Sandra
Bryant, Michael	Hastings, John	Ramsay, David
Caplan, David	Hoy, Pat	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Ruprecht, Tony
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Sampson, Rob
Cleary, John C.	Kells, Morley	Smitherman, George
Clement, Tony	Kennedy, Gerard	Spina, Joseph
Coburn, Brian	Klees, Frank	Sterling, Norman W.
Conway, Sean G.	Kwinter, Monte	Stewart, R. Gary
Cordiano, Joseph	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Stockwell, Chris
Crozier, Bruce	Levac, David	Tascona, Joseph N.
Curling, Alvin	Marland, Margaret	Tsubouchi, David H.
DeFaria, Carl	Martiniuk, Gerry	Turnbull, David
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Dombrowsky, Leona	McDonald, AL	Wilson, Jim
Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn	Witmer, Elizabeth
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Ecker, Janet	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David
Elliott, Brenda	Munro, Julia	
Eves, Ernie	Murdoch, Bill	

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

#### Nays

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

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 79; the nays are 6.

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

Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 19, 2002, this bill is ordered for third reading.



## NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT ACT, 2002

LOI DE 2002 SUR LA GESTION  
DES ÉLÉMENTS NUTRITIFS

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 81, An Act to provide standards with respect to the management of materials containing nutrients used on lands, to provide for the making of regulations with respect to farm animals and lands to which nutrients are applied, and to make related amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 81, Loi prévoyant des normes à l'égard de la gestion des matières contenant des éléments nutritifs utilisées sur les biens-fonds, prévoyant la prise de règlements à l'égard des animaux d'élevage et des biens-fonds sur lesquels des éléments nutritifs sont épandus et apportant des modifications connexes à d'autres lois.

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

*The division bells rang from 1419 to 1424.*

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

## Ayes

Arnett, Ted	Guzzo, Garry J.	Newman, Dan
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Hastings, John	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hudak, Tim	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Sampson, Rob
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Spina, Joseph
Clement, Tony	Kells, Morley	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Klees, Frank	Stewart, R. Gary
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Stockwell, Chris
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.
Ecker, Janet	Mazzilli, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Elliott, Brenda	McDonald, AL	Turnbull, David
Eves, Ernie	Miller, Norm	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Flaherty, Jim	Molinari, Tina R.	Wilson, Jim
Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Gilchrist, Steve	Murdoch, Bill	Wood, Bob
Gill, Raminder	Mushinski, Marilyn	Young, David

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

## Nays

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

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 51; the nays are 36.

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

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

RESCUING CHILDREN FROM SEXUAL  
EXPLOITATION ACT, 2002LOI DE 2002  
SUR LA DÉLIVRANCE DES ENFANTS  
DE L'EXPLOITATION SEXUELLE

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of 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 / Projet de loi 86, Loi visant à délivrer les enfants prisonniers de la prostitution et d'autres formes d'exploitation sexuelle et modifiant le Code de la route.

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

*The division bells rang from 1428 to 1433.*

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

## Ayes

Agostino, Dominic	Galt, Doug	Munro, Julia
Arnett, Ted	Gerretsen, John	Murdoch, Bill
Baird, John R.	Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn
Barrett, Toby	Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan
Bartolucci, Rick	Gravelle, Michael	O'Toole, John
Beaubien, Marcel	Guzzo, Garry J.	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bradley, James J.	Hardeman, Ernie	Parsons, Ernie
Brown, Michael A.	Hastings, John	Patten, Richard
Bryant, Michael	Hoy, Pat	Peters, Steve
Caplan, David	Hudak, Tim	Phillips, Gerry
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Pupatello, Sandra
Clark, Brad	Johnson, Bert	Ramsay, David
Cleary, John C.	Kells, Morley	Runciman, Robert W.
Clement, Tony	Kennedy, Gerard	Ruprecht, Tony
Coburn, Brian	Klees, Frank	Sampson, Rob
Conway, Sean G.	Kwinter, Monte	Smitherman, George
Cordiano, Joseph	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Spina, Joseph
Crozier, Bruce	Levac, David	Sterling, Norman W.
Curling, Alvin	Marchese, Rosario	Stewart, R. Gary
DeFaria, Carl	Marland, Margaret	Stockwell, Chris
Di Cocco, Caroline	Martel, Shelley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dombrowsky, Leona	Martin, Tony	Tsubouchi, David H.
Duncan, Dwight	Martiniuk, Gerry	Turnbull, David
Dunlop, Garfield	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Ecker, Janet	McDonald, AL	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Brenda	McLeod, Lyn	Witmer, Elizabeth
Eves, Ernie	Miller, Norm	Wood, Bob
Flaherty, Jim	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David S.

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

## Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Hampton, Howard	Kormos, Peter
----------------	-----------------	---------------

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 84; the nays are 3.

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

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park):** My question is for the Premier. It was reported in the media today that you're about to get tough with school boards. Today, facing you in the gallery, are parents and students of a number of boards you've already got tough with; you've got tough on their kids' education. You've done that, especially in urban areas like Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and London that have all felt compelled to either pass deficits to fund the success of their students or to make cuts they can't in good conscience make.

Premier, they want to know what kind of government you really lead. Are you a government that is prepared to listen to parents and students like this? Are you prepared to tell them today that there's some possibility you don't know more than them and their boards, and that in fact you might make changes that would allow the cuts not to happen or these boards not to have to defy you by passing deficits?

Premier, I want to ask you today to speak to these parents and these students. Are you prepared to make changes in your funding of the school boards that find themselves in difficulty, unable to provide the services needed for their students?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** The honourable member will know that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance have already provided for an extra \$557 million in addition to the funding that was already going to all boards of education across the province of Ontario. We are responding. We are also of course conducting a review of the funding formula, which will become an annual exercise as we go forward, to meet the needs of students in all 72 boards across Ontario.

**Mr Kennedy:** Premier, what the parents and students here today need is not an exercise, not public relations, not annually; they need you as the Premier right now. Sitting in the corner is Kate Godsman. Kate Godsman has written a letter. In the letter she talks about the loss of education assistants in the kindergarten at the school she goes to. She says that when kids are not taught what they need to know in kindergarten, they need more learning centres and reading clinics, and that this costs more money than having kindergarten assistants and the kids don't feel as good about themselves.

These urban areas that are struggling have needs. They have poverty, they have English as a second language, they have costs that are higher than in other areas, and your one-size-fits-all formula doesn't help them. Premier, since you've been Treasurer, you've taken away from that student, Kate Godsman, \$2,016 worth of support since 1995.

I want you to speak to Kate Godsman and her mother, who are here, and tell them: is there a chance, is there a possibility that you, now the Premier, formerly the Treas-

urer, will be putting back some of that \$2,000 worth of support you've taken away from her and all the other students in the Toronto school board?

**Hon Mr Eves:** I'd like to know from the honourable member if he thinks every child in Ontario should have an equal opportunity for education, regardless of where they are, where they're born, what their circumstances are. Whether it's Marathon or Markham, should they have an equal opportunity, yes or no?

**Mr Kennedy:** Kate Godsman is only nine years old, but I think she knows a bad answer. Premier, Kate Godsman and the other students and parents are facing you now, and what they're looking for is for you to acknowledge that you took some \$616 million out of the Toronto school board, \$117 million out of Ottawa, \$50 million out of London and \$54 million out of Hamilton.

Premier, when you say "equal," you mean equal misery. You mean, bring everybody down. You mean less for students like Kate Godsman; you mean less for each of these students here.

1440

Premier, you're sending investigators to these boards, probably all around the province. Instead, will you meet with these students? They're here, these students and these parents, in room 351. There are over 100 of them. They want to know what kind of Premier you are. Are you a Premier prepared to give excellent education or are you going to make them watch their schools deteriorate, crumble down and lose programs? Give us an answer.

**Hon Mr Eves:** First of all, let me correct the record. Since I have been the Premier, since April 15, I have not taken out one cent from any board of education across the province and we have put in—

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Eves:** He said since I became the Premier. Hello? Earth to Dwight. You know these things? They're called ears.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The member for Sudbury and the member for Kingston and the Islands, come to order please.

Minister?

**Hon Mr Eves:** The honourable member well knows that since April 15 this government has put an additional \$557 million into the public education system in Ontario. Only a Liberal could regard an additional expenditure of half a billion dollars as nothing, as a decrease as opposed to an increase in spending. There are 72 boards of education in the province of Ontario. Every child in every board deserves an equal opportunity for education and success in Ontario and that is exactly what the fundamental funding formula is in this government. We will continue to make sure, whether a child happens to be born in Marathon or Markham, that they get an equal opportunity to that education.

### NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

**Mr Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale-High Park):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I want to express my dis-

satisfaction with the Premier's answer and request a late show. I also want to send the Premier actual figures.

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** You can file that with the table.

#### HYDRO DAM SAFETY

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** My question is to the Minister of Energy and it concerns hydroelectric dams in the open and competitive electricity market that we've had in Ontario since May 1, 2002. You and all members of the Legislature know that a few weeks ago, on May 1, the electricity market opened to competition in Ontario. Can you inform this Legislature: to the best of your knowledge, have hydroelectric generators changed their operating procedures to contemplate changes that are occasioned by the open and competitive electricity market as compared to procedures those hydroelectric generators might have had in the pre-May 1, 2002, marketplace?

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** I want to thank the member for the notice that he gave me of the question. I appreciate it.

I can only tell you that the comments I've made to date are the comments that stand. I met with the Attorney General's office today and there's an OPP investigation right now. The feeling is that if I offer up any more information, there could be a possibility it could prejudice that investigation. The information I've received, I've received, and I've been informed that I can't comment any further than what I said yesterday and today. Those questions, I suppose, will be dealt with in the investigation.

**Mr Conway:** Several of my constituents, long-time residents of the Calabogie area, believe that a significant part of the tragedy that occurred along the Madawaska River near the Barrett Chute generating station this past Sunday afternoon had to do with changes in the operating procedures of the hydroelectric stations that have long been established on the lower Madawaska River. What do you have to say to those constituents of mine living in the Calabogie area who have those concerns and those questions?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Spills of water by operators of hydroelectric dams happen from time to time, and it's not just with respect to Hydro needs. It could be other situations with respect to the amount of water they have. I can only tell you that those particular processes that were put in place are now being fully inspected and reviewed by OPG. They have not only phoned but they're now physically sending people out to each individual dam to check it. This spill, as they say, is something that they have done for many years, not specifically on this site, but spills around dams and other places.

That's all the information that I am prepared to give or that I'm allowed to give, and I can assure you that all the other dams that work in this practice are having all their

practices assessed and reviewed before any more spills take place.

**Mr Conway:** Minister, there have been hydroelectric dams on the Madawaska River for nearly a century. Long-time residents of the Calabogie area have told me that what happened at the Barrett Chute-High Falls area this past Sunday afternoon, June 23, which tragically claimed the lives of two of my constituents and injured several more, was both unexpected and quite unprecedented. There are in the province of Ontario over 70 hydro dams generating something like 7,000-plus megawatts of our electricity. It seems clear that the open marketplace for electricity has brought about a change in the operating procedures of these hydroelectric stations.

My question is, not just on behalf of my constituents in the Calabogie area but on behalf of all Ontarians and those visiting our province this summer: can you table with us today in writing the specific requests you have made of all hydroelectric generators in this province and the kinds of responses you have gotten or expect to get from those generators to show the people of Ontario and their representatives that every reasonable step is now being taken to best protect the public safety of people living and recreating along those river corridors where we have hydroelectric stations generating electricity in Ontario this summer?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** That's a very reasonable request. I don't have any problem at all providing that to you or every other member of this House if they'd like that. To table it means I have to have it here for tomorrow. I'm not really sure I'm going to be able to get it done by tomorrow. But your request to make sure we provide information on how these dams now will handle these procedures to alert people and so on is not a problem. I will be happy to do that. I will be happy to get it to you as soon as possible. I'll also be happy to show you what we've done since that tragic day on Sunday. I have no difficulty whatsoever in providing you with that information.

#### COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** A question for the Premier: The Hamilton Spectator has revealed yet another problem with your privatized electricity market, this time a scheme to change the way hydro rates are charged in Ontario. Once again, consumers get burned.

Union Energy is forcing new contracts on consumers, new contracts that say that a fixed rate for hydro might not be a fixed rate after all. Union Energy wants people to sign a blank cheque so that they can charge even more for hydro.

Premier, I guess that's what you would call market discipline. But wouldn't you agree, Premier, that a fixed-rate contract for hydro should deliver a fixed rate?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I'm not aware of the situation of which the leader of the third party speaks, but if he could provide me with the information I'd be happy to look into it.

**Mr Hampton:** Well, Premier, it turns out that the source of the new cost, the new increase in hydro rates, is none other than your own Independent Electricity Market Operator. Your Independent Electricity Market Operator wants to implement something called locational marginal pricing. For example, it would increase hydro rates in a location if the transmission lines are congested. It means that not only will the cost of electricity itself rapidly move up, but the cost of transmitting the electricity would increase as well.

So, Premier, my question is: why are you turning the purchase of electricity in our province into a bizarre crapshoot for businesses and consumers alike?

1450

**Hon Mr Eves:** The Minister of Energy has a response to this.

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** It's a process they've put in place that they sell to the consumer, if the consumer wants this particular approach to paying their hydro. It's a variable. They're allowed to see their rate float, much like a mortgage. If you want to go to a short-term, six-month mortgage, you can see a variable float on your mortgage. Hydro sales people have been working with the OEB to put out different packages that are acceptable to the consumers. If a consumer doesn't want this particular package, the consumer doesn't have to accept this package. It's completely a decision of those buying the power.

You're suggesting it's a crapshoot. Well, if you think it's a crapshoot, then don't buy it. But simply because you find it difficult to understand doesn't mean everybody does, and that may mean some people out there think this is a good way to go.

**Mr Hampton:** We've had almost a million consumers who were already signed up to so-called fixed-rate contracts, only to find they're paying more than they thought they would, only to find they're paying more than they were told they would, and the minister's answer is, "Oh, well, whatever people sign is their responsibility." Well, you've got a responsibility to protect people. Your television ads say that people should sign up for fixed-rate contracts, and yet it turns out here that if they sign these, they are in effect signing a blank cheque. There's no guarantee of a fixed rate at all.

Minister, as economist Myron Gordon has said, you, the government, are creating risk for consumers and for businesses where there was no risk before. So my question is, rather than creating new wrinkles whereby someone can raise the hydro price again, or a new clause whereby they can raise the hydro price another way, why aren't you out there protecting consumers instead of finding new ways to increase the hydro bill?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** This guy is unbelievable. He spent how long riding around this province in that bus, with the light bulb above his head?

**Interjection:** Two years.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Two years, telling everybody, "When the market opens, rates are going to double and

we're going to have blackouts." So your advice was, "You should sign a fixed-rate contract." You actually frightened these people into signing fixed-rate contracts. You said, "If you don't, on May 1 your prices are going to double." Now you come into this House, when rates are well below what they were, and you're telling us you don't like fixed-rate contracts any more; you think they're somehow ripping them off. Well, six months ago you were telling them their rates were going to double. You have told them absolutely everything, but nothing has come true. You've come in here on every single issue, every single time, Chicken Little, telling them the sky is going to fall. These people signed fixed-rate contracts, and now you're telling them they're bad. For heaven's sake, the only thing you've been consistent on about this is that you've consistently driven around the province in that bus, with the light bulb above your head, and told people a bunch of fantasy tales that came up in your head. That's it.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** I just say to the government, why don't you just ditch the deregulated market? Do that. Just ditch the deregulated market, and people will be much further ahead.

My question is for the Minister of Education. All over the province, school trustees are being forced to choose between giving kids the education resources they need and breaking your laws. Last night the Thames Valley District School Board passed a budget that said no to cutting special education, no to cutting teacher-librarians and no to cutting educational assistants. But your government says if they do that, they're breaking the law. They're not allowed to vote for our children to receive the education resources they need. Minister, can you tell us how it is that under your government it's now a crime to provide children with the education resources they need in order to succeed?

**Hon Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education):** The leader of the third party obviously does not understand that in all these situations the board administrators, the directors of education, have brought in balanced budgets. It is trustees who have made the decisions, in some instances, simply not to accept those recommendations.

You refer to this legislation as being our legislation. I think it's important for the member opposite to know there has always been legislation requiring balanced budgets.

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

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** Minister, clearly what you're doing is not good enough. I've got to tell you, parents and kids don't come here to Queen's Park to protest because they want to have fun. I also have to tell you, trustees do not risk breaking the law because they want to go in your privatized jails. They fight back because they're caught in a straitjacket. They fight back to protect the programs they're losing.

You recently told me I should not encourage people to break the law. Here's what I tell you: when they tell you that in spite of what you are doing, essential educational programs will disappear in many boards, what do you expect them to do?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** We introduced the funding formula. We gave the city of Toronto, the Toronto board of education, \$910 million in transition funding in order that they could move to the funding formula. I think the member well knows that, despite the increased amounts of money that have been provided to the Toronto board over the past number of years, there are still many activities that are funded by the Toronto board that are simply not part of the funding formula.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Mr David Ramsay (Timiskaming-Cochrane):** I have a question to the Premier. Premier, 10 days ago I gave your Minister of Agriculture a letter I received from Parmalat Dairy that stated they could not assure me they would continue to purchase milk produced in the Timiskaming district if your government approves the construction of a 200,000-tonne PCB incinerator in Kirkland Lake.

The dairy industry in Timiskaming is the only growing, sustainable sector of our economy, with a farm gate value of \$15 million. On Monday of this week I also gave your office a copy of this letter and spoke to your chief of staff about the gravity of the situation. The only feedback I have received is a call from the ag minister's office about an hour ago stating I would be hurting my farmers by asking this question in the House today. I feel rather that she's more interested in intimidating me in doing my job than to save Ontario farms.

Premier, I'm asking you today to put a stop to this proposal and protect the economic viability of the largest agricultural area of northern Ontario and the 600 farm families who make their living on the land.

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** The Minister of Energy has a response.

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** The member has spoken to me about this as well. The whole point of the environmental process is that these things are vetted through the process. If we had simply jumped in and usurped the process before it even got a chance to start, there would be many members opposite who would be upset about it. I know members opposite ask me to speed up the environmental process of certain projects and so on in their ridings and, of course, I can't get involved.

It seems to me that if you have any respect for the environmental process we put in place in this province, and I think everyone does, that it needs to happen and it needs to be a full, broad review of environmentally sensitive issues, then it should happen. If it is not a meritorious or worthy request, then it won't stand the test. If it is, it will. But I think we should leave that to the experts rather than you and me.

**Mr Ramsay:** This is an issue of the major purchaser of dairy products in Ontario and in the Timiskaming district. They feel that if they get any complaints from their customers, they are no longer going to buy any of that milk from that district. That puts the viability of our agricultural area at peril. Your responsibility is to protect jobs in Ontario and protect the environment. My job is to protect the economy of my region and to prevent an environmental disaster from happening.

The member from Sarnia earlier brought to our attention in the House here today how farms are being abandoned in St Clair township because of the Safety-Kleen incinerator in Sarnia. You're asking my constituents, and you've just asked me and the people of Ontario, to have faith in an EA process in Ontario that will protect our food supply. Two weeks ago, as you know, the Canadian Environmental Law Association issued a scathing report that stated that the EA process in this province is a hollow shell of what it was and what it should be.

Minister, how can you ask the people of Ontario to trust your gutted EA process to protect our food supply when your processes have tragically failed to protect our water supply here in Ontario?

Minister, your government has the power and the obligation to step in now and protect northern agriculture and the safety of Ontario's food supply. I'm asking you today to stop this project in order to protect the environment, our food supply and the 600 farm families that farm in Timiskaming district. Will you do that today?

1500

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** I don't want to suggest that you're grotesquely overstating your position, but I think you are. With the EA process with respect to the water supply issue, I presume you're talking about Walkerton. I'm not sure how the EA process was flawed in that situation. If you could explain it to me, that would be good. But it seems like you're just piling rhetoric on top of possibly a good debate, and I don't think that's helpful.

Secondly, I can say to the member opposite that none of these applications come in that don't have opposition from community groups. They all have opposition from community groups. If we use your methodology in accepting or not accepting them, nothing would ever get done, because there's always somebody opposed. That's why we built the environmental assessment process. Yes, the report you cite says it's not up to snuff. There are other reports—some of the best reports—that say it is up to snuff.

*Interjection.*

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** It's not a question of that.

The point I'm trying to make to you is that we get these applications every day. If we dealt with the applications the way you're asking me to deal with them, which is just to say no out of hand, nothing would ever get built and we'd be in a worse situation.

I trust the environmental assessment process. I believe it is a good process. I will stand by the process. If it doesn't meet the test, it won't happen; if it does, it will.

## LONG-TERM CARE

**Ms Marilyn Mushinski (Scarborough Centre):** My question is for the Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. It's about an article I'm very concerned about in last Sunday's Toronto Sun. It refers to the level of care that was provided to a now-deceased resident. According to that article, the patient suffered greatly as a result of shuffling back and forth in transfers between various health facilities. Minister, you may be aware that in my riding of Scarborough Centre, I have perhaps one of the largest concentrations of seniors in the whole of Toronto. I have many families that have expressed great concern to me about this article. I would like you to provide an update on this issue, please.

**Hon Dan Newman (Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care):** I'd like to thank the member for Scarborough Centre for her very important question. As the Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, it's not only my job but my mission to ensure that every senior, not just in Scarborough but indeed in the entire province, gets the care they require when and where they need it. I want to assure the member that in every long-term-care facility in Ontario, every time a complaint comes forward, it is followed up by one of our compliance advisers. There are over 40 of these very capable staff who are there to ensure that our regulations are indeed being met.

Incidentally, there has been an increase of more than 25% in the number of advisers since we were first elected by the people of Ontario.

With respect to the matter mentioned by the member for Scarborough Centre, there is an investigation underway and it would be inappropriate for me to say anything more specific. But let me again say to the member that I share her concern that those long-term-care facilities receive the care they need.

**Ms Mushinski:** Minister, I appreciate that you do share the concerns many of my residents, and indeed I, have.

*Interjections.*

**Ms Mushinski:** If they stopped barking on the other side, perhaps they would be interested in this question. Looking at the wider issue, I wonder if you could tell this House what steps are being taken to ensure there is a seamless network of genuine care among CCACs, nursing homes and our hospitals so that patient care is always given first priority over turf wars.

**Hon Mr Newman:** The member for Scarborough Centre raises a very important issue. I want to assure the member that should a family member have an issue with the care their loved one is receiving in any of Ontario's hospitals, there is a patient advocate or a patient relations person designated in each of those facilities so they can have their concerns addressed. If your loved one is in a long-term-care facility and there is a problem, you can raise a complaint with the facility and one of the compliance advisers I mentioned earlier will investigate that complaint.

With respect to providing a seamless network, the Community Care Access Corporations Act, among other things will help streamline the waiting list process and make the delivery of services more efficient. Placement coordination regulations came into effect on May 1 this year and will help alleviate many of the concerns the member raised. I want the member to know I will do everything it takes to make sure all residents are treated with dignity, respect and, above all, the highest level of care.

## SLOT MACHINES

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** I have a question for the Premier. On April 10 of this year the then gambling minister, Tim Hudak, approved up to 800 slot machines for Picov Downs racetrack. This decision caused a firestorm reaction. In fact the industry expressed its outrage at this possibility prior to the cabinet taking its decision. In a letter dated March 5, 2002, Jane Holmes, executive director of the horse racing association, wrote to Hudak, and I quote, "It seems incomprehensible that Picov Downs may be allocated 800 slot machines." Can the Premier tell us now whether in fact those 800 slot machines were allocated, and if a final decision has been taken, how many machines have been allocated?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** I believe the Attorney General has a response to this.

**Hon David Young (Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs):** The member opposite, in raising this point, was good enough to reference the fact that the letter in question refers to "up to" a certain number of slot machines. No decision has been made as to how many slot machines will be allocated. There will be a consideration of various factors, including the business plan, and in due course there will be an announcement.

**Mr Duncan:** Minister, I say with respect that there is absolutely no argument that can be put for placing anywhere near 800 slots at Picov Downs. The number of slots placed at other tracks was done in proportion to total betting. Using the same formula, Picov Downs would be allocated two machines.

At its March 19 board meeting, the horse racing association passed a motion that stated in part, and I quote, "The association is strongly opposed to an allocation of 800 slot machines to Picov Downs as not being equitable, proportionate or consistent with the provincial racetrack slot machine program."

Published reports, however, have confirmed that Picov Downs gave a \$60,000 campaign contribution to the Flaherty leadership campaign and \$25,000 to the Eves leadership campaign. Given that this allocation of slots violates the racetrack slot machine initiative, given the industry association's opposition to any more than a proportionate number of slots, and given the fact that the then minister was supporting Mr Flaherty's leadership bid, would you not agree that the allocation of these slots

in any number above proportion is inappropriate, done for the wrong reasons and should be withdrawn in its entirety?

**Hon Mr Young:** In response to the first portion of the member's question, I acknowledged that he was fairly fair and accurate in his rendition of the overall situation, but interestingly, in his supplementary he read from a letter that came from the Ontario Horse Racing Industry Association. He failed to reference the fact that they publicly said they thought there was a reasonable number of machines that could be put there. What they're encouraging is what I'm encouraging the member opposite to do, which is to allow for the process to take place, the very same process that has taken place in relation to every other allocation of slot machines across this province, including, I might add, slot machines in his community.

#### REGIONAL IMMIGRATION STRATEGY

**Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford):** I direct my question to the Minister of Citizenship. There have been several days of press related to the federal immigration minister's proposal to locate newcomers with particular skills in areas or regions of the country that are in need of a particular type of skilled worker. It was reported yesterday in the National Post that Minister Coderre said his provincial counterparts are delighted by these ideas. Minister, could you clarify Ontario's position on this matter?

**Hon Carl DeFaria (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors):** I thank the member for the question. I met a few weeks ago with Minister Coderre on this issue. I would like to indicate that matching a foreign skilled tradesperson or professional with a community in need is an idea that we believe warrants further discussion and study.

What I have indicated to the federal government is that we will work to explore regional approaches to immigration. Regional approaches must include an assessment of economic impact on Ontario. I have pointed out to the federal minister that Ontario is not in agreement with any strategy that reduces the number of skilled workers coming to Ontario. Ontario receives 60% of Canada's immigrants each year. Our outstanding concern regarding adequate funding must be resolved. Ontario's immigrants cannot go on and on being shortchanged in terms of national newcomer settlement funding. Ontario's immigrants deserve their fair share.

1510

**Mr Tascona:** I thank the minister for his response. We've been hearing a lot lately about the new federal Immigration Act and their new selection process for new immigrants coming to Canada. As you said in your response, 60% of newcomers choose Ontario.

Minister, what is our government doing to ensure that immigrants benefit both Ontario and choose to make the province their home?

**Hon Mr DeFaria:** I want to assure the honourable member and my colleague that Ontario is committed to helping skilled newcomers enter the labour force quickly and to become full participants in our economy. We want to attract the world's best and brightest to Ontario by helping foreign-trained professionals and tradespeople qualify for employment and meet skill shortages.

Our government is working hard to improve access to education and training opportunities for immigrants. For example, we invested \$12 million over three years to help foreign trade professionals and individuals employ their skills more quickly in Ontario. Some \$3.5 million over three years was announced in the 2000 budget to support bridging programs for foreign-trained nurses and pharmacists. We spent \$14.4 million of the job connect program budget for 2001-02 to help newcomers prepare for the job market, and we spent \$40 million in English-as-a-second-language training. These are just some examples of what Ontario's doing for newcomers to be able to settle and be part of—

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

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River):** My question is for the Minister of Environment. One of your own cabinet colleagues, the Minister of Labour, thinks you're doing a bad job of protecting the environment. He thinks it's a bad idea to allow millions of litres of runoff from garbage dumps to be discharged into the Hamilton sewer system and the Hamilton harbour. He had to file an application with the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario, asking for a review of your policy of allowing this runoff to be discharged into city sewers. He says he's been raising this issue for years with you and with the previous Minister of the Environment.

Minister, why should the people of Ontario trust you to protect the environment when obviously one of your own cabinet colleagues doesn't trust you?

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** Let's understand this issue. The original environment minister that the member was writing letters to was Bud Wildman, and that was in the NDP caucus.

**Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues):** And they sat beside each other.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** That's right. And Mr Wildman didn't even bother writing him back. I appreciate the fact that you think just because people are in cabinet, that somehow they don't represent their constituencies. They do, and this member does a great job representing his constituency, and he's brought this issue to my attention. I gave him an undertaking that we would review it and get back to him as soon as possible with respect to an answer.

I have no difficulty—

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** Soft, warm and fuzzy.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Yes, soft, warm and fuzzy. You might want to go to that school.

In the future, if you have any concerns that you want to bring to my attention, I'll be happy to look at those as well.

**Mr Hampton:** This is unprecedented. People only write to the environment commissioner when they can't get any attention from the Minister of Environment. This is really an unprecedented step.

We're actually finding a lot of people who are complaining about this. We're finding people complain about the government's decision to take water from the Tay River, the deadly smog from coal-fired generating stations, the failure to provide safe drinking water, the minister advocating shipping PCBs to Kirkland Lake. People say, "When we ask the Minister of Environment about these things, he ignores us."

Minister, if a cabinet minister in your own government has to file an application with the environment commissioner to get attention for an environmental issue, what does it take for the citizens of Ontario to get some action from you on the environmental problems they raise?

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** Some action? This is the only government that's provided any action on the environmental front. It's true. You people piddled around for five years buying NUGs—\$5 billion in NUGs, not doing anything about the coal-fired plants except running them, running them, running them, with no alternatives, running up the debt, increasing all of the borrowing costs at Hydro One. This is the government, under Jim Wilson's leadership, that actually allowed green power to get on the grid, that actually allowed solar and wind power on the grid. This is the government that's providing nuclear power, which is now clean power. This is the government that's providing opportunities for green power to get on the grid so that people have an option to buy it.

What did you do when you were in power? You did nothing. All you did was traipse around Costa Rica looking for land to buy. You spent \$5 million on NUGs that produced no power. You made sweetheart deals with unions to write union fight songs. You people didn't do anything for the environmentalists in this province. We can thank Jim Wilson and this government for defending the greens.

#### DOCTOR SHORTAGE

**Mrs Sandra Pupatello (Windsor West):** My question is for the Premier of Ontario. This week you were expressing frustration with the doctor shortage throughout Ontario. You blamed the College of Physicians for a lack of will to streamline the integration of foreign-trained physicians into our health system instead of leaving them working as cab drivers in most urban centres.

Is the Premier aware of the number of short-term solutions we have advanced to you to get people service in this province? Creation of a SWAT team to allow foreign-trained doctors to get through quicker, and the

Ministry of Health says there are 1,500 people who could work tomorrow; funding of community health centres' applications that are sitting on your desk today; funding of nurse practitioners, 200 of whom are underutilized today; changing the billing to OHIP from clinics so there's a greater incentive for doctors to practise in family practices.

Premier, we have given you short-term solutions, but you choose instead to blame the college. When will you take responsibility and acknowledge that solutions have been presented to you and you've done nothing about them?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** That is simply not correct. This government has taken many steps to deal with physician supply in Ontario, ranging from paying for medical students to go to school to accelerating the foreign physician component in Ontario. Yes, there could be more, I believe, and we are taking steps to urge those who control this to allow people to practise medicine who are qualified to do so.

You didn't exactly quote the article from the Kitchener-Waterloo Record correctly; I presume that's where you got this. We talked about the many things we were doing, if she's reading from that article, to increase physicians in the province, and the minister certainly is doing that.

**Mrs Pupatello:** Premier, you're the one who said this week that you can't have doctors tomorrow. I'm telling you your own ministry has said there are 1,500 people in Ontario who could be working tomorrow, but you instead choose to blame the college. You said there aren't short-term solutions and we're telling you that you can do things short-term and long-term.

You, Premier, are obviously unaware that you control the mandate of the college. The college is a creature of the provincial government. I am suggesting to you that with a stroke of a pen you can change the mandate of the college to streamline the process, to have some kind of amnesty period to get these doctors working. It is within your power to do this and you can do it today without even bringing a bill into this House for debate. Surely all sides would agree to that kind of change. It is within your grasp to do it, and instead of blaming them, you have the solution at your fingertips. I'm asking you today if you will expand the mandate of the college and insist that this work be done, and do it today.

**Hon Mr Eves:** As the honourable member's voice got louder and louder, she was getting more and more frustrated, I gather.

With respect to this issue, first of all, she talked about nurse practitioners. The government has made a commitment to doubling the number of nurse practitioners in the province, and I assure her she won't have to wait too long until she sees some very concrete results out of that. With respect to the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons, the members opposite are the first ones to jump up if they think there's even a hint of government interference with respect to independent boards that run



professions and occupations. Now I have the honourable member standing up in the House today urging us to interfere with a body that is charged with professional responsibility in Ontario.

#### ONTARIO DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** My question is for the Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Two weeks ago, many residents in my Peterborough riding woke up to flooded basements, backyards and streets. A rainstorm that some say was comparable to the 100-year storm hit the city of Peterborough particularly hard. In some areas over 200 millimetres of rain fell overnight, more than the cumulative amount for the entire month of June in 2001. The fire department has pumped water and sewage from almost 300 basements, and public works crews have been working very hard to contain and repair the damage to municipal property. Small businesses and residents have suffered great loss.

Minister, I understand that the city of Peterborough can make an application to the Ontario disaster relief assistance program if the municipality is deemed a disaster area. Could you please tell the House and the residents of Peterborough more about this program and the assistance that may be available to them?

1520

**Hon Brian Coburn (Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing):** The Ontario disaster relief assistance program is intended to alleviate the hardship suffered by farmers, homeowners and small businesses when essential property is severely damaged due to a natural disaster. This program provides financial assistance to those who have sustained heavy losses for essential items such as shelter and the necessities of life.

One of the things it doesn't cover, though, is when you have private insurance, and that's something that is taken into account when an assessment goes on in these situations. ODRAP, or the Ontario disaster relief assistance program, provides assistance when damages are so extensive that they exceed the financial resources of the affected individuals, the municipality and of course the community at large. Recently, for example, Minister Hodgson declared the area around the Rainy River district a disaster area.

**Mr Stewart:** Thank you, Minister, for sharing this information with my constituents. Unfortunately, similar circumstances prevailed this morning in another very devastating storm.

Minister, the city of Peterborough has informed me that they've passed a resolution to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to declare the entire city to be a disaster area. When can we expect a decision about this request to be made so that residents and businesses in my riding will know if the financial burden of cleanup will be erased?

**Hon Mr Coburn:** Since the severe rainstorm of June 11 and 12 in Peterborough, our staff have been working

closely with city of Peterborough officials, providing timely information relating to the Ontario disaster relief program. They have toured the city and the affected area to see at first hand the amount of damage.

The city of Peterborough has indeed requested that the Minister of Municipal Affairs declare the city a disaster area for the purposes of gaining access to the disaster relief program. After assessment and consultation to determine the amount of damage, those are things that are taken into account and reviewed by the minister. After timely review of that, he will be able to respond to this request.

#### IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE SERVICES

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport):** I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship. Mr Minister, your ministry staff have admitted that funding was cut from \$5.1 million to \$3.9 million for newcomer settlement services, which in turn affected a whole bunch of programs; for instance, the Ontario Welcome Houses, the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, ESL programs, newcomer orientation classes, and English for parents with pre-school children. And you know what? Yesterday, this minister had the gall to get up and say, "Ontario is a province of promise where a young man's dream can become a reality."

Well, Mr Minister, your dream became a reality because you had access to English-language programs. Your parents had access to English-language programs. But how do you expect other people in Ontario to have their dreams come true when you're cutting this access to ESL programs and newcomer services? Will you stand up today and make one more promise, and that is to reintegrate and reinstate those programs; for instance, the Ontario Welcome Houses, the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, the race relations committee and finally ESL program funding? Please reinstate them. We're begging you to do it.

**Hon Carl DeFaria (Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors):** I will refer it to the Minister of Education.

**Mr Elizabeth Witmer (Deputy Premier, Minister of Education):** I'd just like to make reference to the amount of ESL funding that has been provided by this government since the introduction of the student-focused funding. In 1998, we were allocating \$111.3 million. I'm pleased to say it's projected that this year we will be providing \$168.5 million to the boards to support them in this endeavour.

**Mr Ruprecht:** Mr Speaker, excuse me for a second, please. I asked the Minister of Citizenship about other kinds of programs. I asked him when he is going to reinstate the Welcome Houses, and all I get here is the Minister of Education talking about one specific program, which forces me to ask my next question. It changes my next question totally, and that is, across this province—

*Interjections.*

**Mr Ruprecht:** You haven't got the guts to answer this question, because you simply don't know. You can't make the promise to reinstate those programs, because your money is being cut off.

Over here, we have a number of people of Portuguese background. They have come and they want to find out today when you will reinstate their specific program, and you are pushing it off to the Minister of Education. We want to know from you what you are going to do about these programs. They're here today specifically to ask you that question.

Mr Minister, let me finally tell you this: there are 668,000 people who are taking English-language programs today in Ontario, and there are 60,000 here in Toronto. The demand is high. But do you know what you are doing? You're cutting it by 31%. That's shameful. How will they integrate? How will they become good Canadian citizens?

Finally, I tell you simply this—

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** Order. The member's time is up. Minister of Education?

**Hon Mrs Witmer:** I'm going to refer it back to the Minister of Citizenship.

**Hon Mr DeFaria:** I don't know if the member was preparing petitions when the member from Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford asked the question and I answered the question here. But if he was, he probably should be going back to his petitions. That's what he does better in this House.

The government is committed to helping newcomers. Ontario spends approximately \$50 million a year on settlement and language training programs for immigrants. My ministry's \$3.9-million newcomer settlement program funds more than 80 community agencies that provide services for the Portuguese community. Those people there can applaud for me. Come on, you can applaud for your member. You know very well we provide services.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** Order. The member for Davenport, take his seat. The member for Davenport, you've asked your question. It's now the minister. You have about 10 seconds to wrap up.

**Hon Mr DeFaria:** As I indicated before, the Minister of Education spends \$40 million on adult English education, ESL, every year.

*Remarks in Portuguese.*

**Mr Ruprecht:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: *Remarks in Portuguese.*

**The Speaker:** Order. Member, take your seat.

1530

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker:** You didn't even realize no one heard you, which may have been the point of it. The clock was stopped. We've had our fun now. You've probably cost the Liberals another question by those antics, which doesn't matter to me. If you don't want to have the questions, that's fine. We got down to the Liberal question. We probably won't today. If you don't want to have your

colleagues ask questions, it's fine by me. I don't care how many questions we get in here.

#### ONTARIO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** That's a hard act to follow.

My question is to my very good friend the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. As MPP for Durham I consider it a duty, indeed a privilege, to ensure that this House does everything possible to support the Durham university. My constituents and the residents of Durham region and surrounding areas want reassurance that the University of Ontario Institute of Technology will be open on schedule in 2003. It is vital, indeed it's critical, that legislation to establish the university will be passed by this House.

Gary Polonsky, president of Durham College, as well as Doug Wilson, chair of the board of governors, and Bob Strickert, vice-chair, are among the members of the educational community who are anxiously awaiting the passage of this legislation. It is also about the students. There are families in Durham who are looking forward to the next step in establishing the university.

Minister, can you confirm that the incorporation of the Durham legislation as part of the budget bill will provide the necessary support to establish the university on schedule?

**Hon Dianne Cunningham (Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues):** I'm happy to respond to the member for Durham who poses this as a critical question to myself. I want everyone in this House to know that the member for Durham has worked for over two years with regard to representing his constituents as a strong supporter of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology.

Members of this House will know that this legislation to establish UOIT is part of the 2002 budget bill introduced by the Minister of Finance. I think it's a fitting combination because this is a good news budget which works perfectly with a good news bill which will, of course, support our young people from Durham and their families, as well as others across this great province of Ontario. It's being debated before the House. We hope it will be passed in the very near future. It is critical that it be passed. It's our newest university and we know that it will start on time for those students.

**Mr O'Toole:** Thank you, obligato, Minister.

I appreciate the fact that the minister is committed to providing priorities and service for students and employers and in providing the finest educational opportunity in Durham. I commend you for your leadership, vision and commitment.

I also realize that the new university in Durham is only one part of our response to a larger issue and that is the issue of the double cohort. Minister, can you ensure that there is space for every qualified post-secondary student at our colleges and university? Students in the double

cohort year are scheduled to begin their application process within the next six months. Could you kindly provide us an update on how our colleges and universities will meet and accommodate this challenge to the students and make this province a great place to live, to work and to raise a family?

**Hon Mrs Cunningham:** It's with pride that I say that earlier this week, on Monday, it was great to be able to join the chair of the Council of Ontario Universities as he and I made an announcement to say that this year we're on track, that the increase in acceptances for next September, alone, is exactly in line with the increase of applicants.

This is what we strove for this year as we saw our grade 13 students fast-tracked. Those are generally students who are hoping to go on to university. I think it's a test for the province, for the colleges and the universities, the parents, our students in our secondary schools, their teachers and their guidance teachers to work together to get this great accomplishment for September. I believe, and I'm absolutely positive, that every member in this House can reassure our young people there will be a space for them in September 2003. Our plan is working, it's in place and we're very proud of the way our system works on behalf of students.

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek unanimous consent to pass Bill 65, government order G65, the bill that would answer this and approve the Durham college. I seek unanimous consent to give second and third readings for passage of that bill right now.

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** I appreciate the opportunity the House leader for the opposition is giving me today. If he had only given it to me before we introduced the budget bill, he would have known full well we accepted it. But if we accept the offer now, it will make the budget bill out of order.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** I suggest the House leaders have their meetings outside of the House, and certainly not during question period, and I'm glad I'm not part of it.

#### TRAITEMENT DES RAPPORTS OFFICIELS

#### TREATMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTS

**The Speaker (Hon Gary Carr):** The member for Timmins-James Bay.

**M. Gilles Bisson (Timmins-Baie James):** Ma question est pour le premier ministre. Vous savez que plus tôt cet après-midi, j'ai déposé à l'Assemblée un projet de loi intitulé Loi de 2002 sur le traitement paritaire des rapports officiels en deux langues. Ce projet de loi, dit que, quand on donne le pouvoir à une commission d'enquête d'aller rechercher quelque chose comme Walkerton, à la fin de la journée, quand le rapport est

déposé ici à l'Assemblée, il est déposé en français en même temps qu'en anglais.

Je vous pose une question très simple. Êtes-vous préparé à accepter ce projet de loi ?

**Hon Ernie Eves (Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs):** Of course it has always been the government's policy, since 1986 I believe, to publish any such report or document in both official languages. I certainly don't disagree with the principle the honourable member is suggesting in the House today. I would add one slight word of caution, and that is that where the health and safety of individuals might be concerned, as was the case with Mr Justice O'Connor's report with respect to Walkerton, I think there has to be some leeway with respect to those types of things. But in principle, I agree with the honourable member's suggestion.

**M. Bisson:** J'ai la moitié de la réponse que je veux avoir, mais ce qui est clair, c'est que, si on aurait eu un tel projet de loi en place, ça veut dire que, quand M. O'Connor avait fait son travail, en même temps qu'il écrivait son rapport en anglais, on aurait eu des traducteurs en place pour faire la traduction pour qu'elle sorte pas mal en même temps que le rapport qui est sorti sur Walkerton.

Ma question est très simple. Si vous êtes d'accord avec le principe, est-ce que vous êtes préparé à donner le support de votre caucus quand ce projet de loi vient ici, soit aujourd'hui, demain ou à l'automne ?

**Hon Mr Eves:** To the honourable member, I've just heard about his suggestion today, obviously. I'm quite prepared to take it under consideration. I would remind him, though, that the Walkerton report, for example, was some 800 pages long. It's fairly substantial. But I think in principle it's a good idea.

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex):** My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Business Services. Today I introduced a bill called the Gasoline Consumer Protection Act. It would require service stations to give 72 hours' notice prior to price changes. It would require gasoline stations, on their signs, to indicate how much tax is in a litre of gasoline. It would require gasoline station retailers to indicate any connection they might have with a major gasoline supplier. It would as well require that oil-producing companies, gasoline-producing companies, segregate their earnings so that we can tell what they made from production, what they made in the wholesale area, what they make in the retail area.

I know the minister shares my concern for consumer protection. Therefore, I wonder if the minister would support me on this private member's bill and would also support a motion for unanimous consent for second and third readings.

**Hon Tim Hudak (Minister of Consumer and Business Services):** It's with great regret that I refer this to the minister responsible for gas pricing issues, the Minister of Energy.

**Hon Chris Stockwell (Minister of Environment and Energy, Government House Leader):** Thank you for that ringing endorsement.

I think obviously the member opposite would accept the fact that before anyone would agree to second and third reading and passing a bill, they should have the opportunity to read it. You just introduced it today. I heard your brief explanation of your bill, and I think it would be imprudent of me to respond for an entire government until we've actually seen the bill, had a chance to caucus the bill and talk about the bill.

So at this point in time, no, I can't agree to second and third reading of this bill, but I will give you an undertaking that certainly, in due course, this caucus will consider it and in the fullness of time we will come back with a sharp, clear response.

1540

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The government refused to give unanimous consent to passing Bill 65, the Durham bill. There's another bill on the order paper, Bill 139. The bill is identical to the other bills before this House. I seek unanimous consent to give second and third reading and final approval of the Durham College bill, Bill 139, which originally came out of Mr Flaherty's budget and stood in Mrs Cunningham's name. The bill is identical. I seek unanimous consent to pass second and third reading of Bill 139.

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** The member is playing games over there.

*Interjections.*

**Hon Mr Stockwell:** To be fair—and I don't want to take up a lot of time in the House—these bills were all tabled, we had to time-allocate them, we tried to get debate and they wouldn't pass them. Now that they're in a budget bill they want to pass them so the budget bill is out of order. It's just silly gamesmanship. Let's get on with the business of the House, for heaven's sake.

## PETITIONS

### CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr Sean G. Conway (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke):** I am pleased to present two petitions today on the same subject. It's a wonderful petition from Principal David Cresswell and the students and staff at Rockwood public school at RR 7, Pembroke, a petition which reads, in part:

"To the Legislative Assembly...:

"Whereas the Ontario Conservative government is planning to close the children's cardiac surgery services unit at the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario in Ottawa by April 2003; and

"Whereas the Conservative government is planning to centralize all children's cardiac surgery services in Toronto....

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

"To cancel all plans to centralize children's cardiac surgery services in Toronto and to keep open the children's cardiac surgery services unit at the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario in Ottawa."

Proudly, I present and endorse this petition. A similar petition is signed by scores of people in the Deep River, Pembroke and Petawawa area calling as well on the government to maintain the children's heart surgery facilities at CHEO in Ottawa.

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** I'm pleased to present a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham.

"Whereas we, the undersigned, wish to express our concern about the current debate on our health care system; and

"Whereas medicare has saved a generation of Canadians from fear of financial ruin due to illness; and

"Whereas this system is now in peril..."—according to these people;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to work co-operatively to uphold the five principles of the Canada Health Act which are in need of reinforcement and new commitment. These principles are: accessible, universally available, publicly administered, portable and comprehensive.

"We further ask that Canadians be provided with a properly funded and sustainable not-for-profit health system. We ask that Canada take back its role as a leader in national health care, insured by a public health system fully supported by the federal and provincial governments."

I'm very pleased to present this for Elizabeth Faira as well as to give it to the dutiful page here, Andrew.

### LONG-TERM-CARE FACILITIES

**Mr John C. Cleary (Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the over 60,000 Ontarians living in long-term-care facilities are older, frailer and sicker and require more care than ever before;

"Whereas government funding has not kept pace with increasing needs of residents of long-term-care facilities; and

"Whereas current funding levels only allow limited care;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly to ask the government to provide additional operating funding to increase the levels of staffing to an acceptable level of service and to reduce the risk to those individuals living in long-term-care facilities across Ontario."

I have also signed the petition, along with 464 of my constituents.

## HEALTH CARE

**Mr John O'Toole (Durham):** The petitions keep coming in and I keep reading them.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we, the undersigned, wish to express our concern about the current debate on our health care system; and

"Whereas medicare has saved a generation of Canadians from fear of financial ruin due to illness; and

"Whereas this system is now in peril;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to work co-operatively to uphold the five principles of the Canada Health Act which are in need of reinforcement and new commitment. These principles are: accessible, universally available, publicly administered, portable and comprehensive.

"We further ask that Canadians be provided with a properly funded and sustainable not-for-profit health care system. We ask that Canada take back its role as a leader in national health care, insured by a public health system fully supported by both the federal and provincial governments."

I'm pleased to present this on behalf of one of my constituents, Ms Lofsky.

## CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

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

"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 centralizing 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."

This is accompanied by two municipal council motions that come from North Glengarry and North Dundas.

## MATER'S MORTGAGES

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

"Whereas Mater's Mortgages investors have battled for a decade to receive compensation for their losses, which were incurred as a result of overzealous action on the part of an official in the Ministry of Financial Institutions, as was proven recently in a parallel criminal case;

"Whereas Mater's Mortgages investors believe that their civil action against the government of Ontario has been unduly and unnecessarily delayed in the courts by legal representatives acting for the government of Ontario;

"Whereas the new investors' committee of Mater's Mortgages has requested that legal representatives of the government of Ontario meet with legal representatives of Mater's Mortgages investors to discuss the possibility of reaching an out-of-court settlement in the investors' civil case against the Ontario government;

"Whereas many Mater's Mortgages investors are senior citizens who placed their life savings in these assessments and have suffered from extreme stress and financial hardship and continue to do so;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to encourage the government of Ontario to take immediate action to appoint a case manager to expedite the case involving the class civil action of the representatives of Mater's Mortgages investors against the government of Ontario;

"Further, we petition the Legislative Assembly to urge the government of Ontario to engage immediately in serious discussions with legal representatives of Mater's Mortgages investors with a view to reaching a fair out-of-court settlement with the investors and urge the government to instruct its legal representatives to cease any and all legal activity designed to prolong the duration of the case."

I affix my signature.

## COMPETITIVE ELECTRICITY MARKET

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport):** I have a petition that concerns hydro deregulation. It's a very serious petition. It's addressed to the Parliament of Ontario and reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned residents of Toronto, demand that the government postpone the electricity deregulation process scheduled for May 1... until the Ontario public is given proof that deregulation will not result in price increases, and

"Place a moratorium on any further retailing of electricity until the Ontario Energy Board comes up with a standard contract to be used by all retailers; and

"That a standard contract spell out in clear terms that residential users are waiving their rights to future rebates in exchange for fixed rates over a specified period of time; and

"That a non-partisan public education campaign begin immediately, explaining what consumers should look for, and look out for, when signing contracts."

Since I agree with this petition, I am signing it as well.

1550

## EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Progressive Conservative government promised in 1995 not to cut classroom spending, but has already cut at least \$2 billion from our schools and is now closing many classrooms completely; and

“Whereas international language weekend classes are a needed part of learning for many students in my area; and

“Whereas the Education Act, specifically regulation 285(5), mandates provision of these programs where demand exists; and

“Whereas the Conservative government’s”—Ernie Eves’s—“funding formula is forcing the Toronto District School Board to cancel these Saturday classes for parents and students who want this programming;

“Therefore, be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to instruct the Minister of Education to restore meaningful and flexible funding to the Toronto District School Board, to ensure that they are able to continue to accommodate these Saturday international languages classes.”

I agree wholeheartedly with this petition and I have affixed my signature to it.

## AFFORDABLE HOUSING

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul’s):** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the number of tenants receiving above-guideline increases is growing exponentially, and;

“Whereas many of these increases are for increases in utility costs, many of which have gone down since; and

“Whereas tenants should not have to pay for improvements forever, even when the costs have been realized by these rent increases; and

“Whereas the Tenant Protection Act does not give a tenant relief due to the costs being realized or a drop in utility costs; and

“Whereas tenants should not be receiving rent increases where there are work orders issued for the building;

“Therefore be it resolved that we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature to immediately pass MPP David Caplan’s Bill 134”—with the strong support of the MPP from St Paul’s, Michael Bryant—“entitled the Fair Rent Increases Act at the earliest possible opportunity so that tenants can get relief from above-guideline increases once the bills have been paid.”

I so support the petition and this bill that I’m going to sign this one myself.

## HYDRO ONE

**Mr David Caplan (Don Valley East):** These petitions just keep coming on.

This one’s called Stop the Sale of Hydro One.

“To the Ontario Legislature:

“Whereas”—Ernie Eves—“the Conservative government plan 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 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 are going to benefit from this plan 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:

“We demand that the Conservative government” and Ernie Eves “halt the sale of Hydro One until the government has a clear mandate”—and I think that’s the important part of this petition—“from the owners of Hydro One—the people of Ontario.”

This is an outstanding petition. I agree with it, and I have affixed my signature to it.

ONTARIO DISABILITY  
SUPPORT PROGRAM

**Mr Gilles Bisson (Timmins-James Bay):** I’m so glad to see the Liberal caucus supporting our NDP petitions against the privatization of Hydro. It just warms the heart.

Anyway, I have literally thousands of names here from various constituents across my riding. It reads as follows.

“Petition...

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas people with disabilities who rely on the 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”—support Mr Tony Martin from Sault Ste Marie’s bill that would have done the same—“by amending it to provide for

regulations requiring annual cost-of-living adjustments to income support programs.”

I gladly put my signature to this petition, along with my friend from Sault Ste Marie.

#### SALE OF SCHOOLS

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport):** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and it reads as follows:

“Whereas the Hughes Public School at 17 Innes Ave in the city of Toronto closed down and its premises have been declared surplus by the Toronto District School Board (TDSB);

“Whereas the city of Toronto has issued a building permit to the TDSB permitting the reconstruction of Hughes Public School for an entity called Beatrice House, for the purpose of a private academic school;...

“Whereas within the context of the zoning bylaw (438-86), the subject lands have been designated as R2 Z0.6 and permits a ‘private academic, philanthropic or religious school’;

“Whereas the TDSB has chosen not to lease the subject premises to a computer training company for \$1.25 million annually. Instead, the board has chosen to lease it to the Beatrice House for a fraction of the current market value;

“Whereas a lease has not been signed between the TDSB and Beatrice House while renovations to the building are underway;

“Whereas local taxpayers’ concerns have been ignored by the TDSB;

“Whereas other locations, such as the Brother Edmund Rice School at 55 Pelham Park or the Earls court Public School at 29 Ascot, which are being closed down, have been offered to Beatrice House to no avail;

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

“That the Honourable Minister of Education investigate the leasing arrangement between the Toronto District School Board and Beatrice House inasmuch as:

“(1) Boards are to seek fair market value when selling, leasing or otherwise disposing of schools, except that the price for the property not to exceed the value of the ministry’s grant for the new pupil places when the purchaser is a coterminous board, a provincial school or a publicly funded care and treatment facility offering programs leading to a diploma;

“(2) Boards are to offer the property to coterminous boards and other public agencies operating in the area in accordance with the priority order currently specified in regulation 444/98;

“(3) Toronto District School Board has not dealt in good faith with our neighbourhood residents;

“Therefore, we respectfully ask you to consider our plea for justice. The Toronto District School Board has ignored our concerns and due diligence. We as a community tried everything within our power to fight the glaring and obvious wrong done to us, to no avail.”

I’ll sign this petition as well.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon John R. Baird (Associate Minister of Franco-phone Affairs):** I move that pursuant to Standing Order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 109, An Act to implement the measures contained in the 2002 Ontario Budget, and to Implement other initiatives of the Government of Ontario, when Bill 109 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill, without further debate or amendment, and

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

That on the same day that the bill receives second reading, it may be called for third reading and;

When the order for third reading is called, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

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

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr Bert Johnson):** The Chair recognizes the chief government whip and deputy House leader.

**Hon Mr Baird:** I would ask for unanimous consent that the leadoff speech be given by Mr Wettlaufer.

**The Acting Speaker:** Agreed? It is agreed.

1600

**Mr Wayne Wettlaufer (Kitchener Centre):** I’d like to thank all the members of the House for departing from the original plan.

We all know 2001 was a very difficult year. The global economy underperformed what was anticipated, and certainly Ontario was no different, but nevertheless, in spite of what the global economy did in the year 2001, we see now where the economy is rebounding quite nicely in Ontario and elsewhere in the world.

For a period of five years, we had growth of 5% or better in the GDP. Last year, Ontario’s growth was only 1%. In the wake of the terrorist attack on September 11, where we had an economic expansion that was fragile, forecasts indicated that certainly we wouldn’t be in that 5% growth target. The forecasts themselves proved to be optimistic for last year and this year they have proved to be pessimistic. They never anticipated the growth would rebound the way it has.

I think we have seen that the growth has been so phenomenal in the last couple of months in Ontario that I believe Ontario’s economy has demonstrated once again that it can surpass anything in North America and anything in any jurisdiction of the G7.

The tax cuts our government implemented from 1995 until the year 2000 have cushioned any negative impact

from the downturn in the US economy. Already our economy is outstripping the growth in the American economy. These policies we implemented are responsible for the rebound in our growth.

Ontario's economy is forecast to grow this year at a rate of 3.1%. Next year real growth is anticipated to be at 4.2%. We are growing at a very good rate. Ontario's economy is once again leading this country and is helping the federal government balance its books.

Job creation, consumer and business confidence, consumer spending and housing markets are all renewed and they point to vigorous growth. Is there anybody here who can honestly say that tax cuts didn't contribute to this? There are those critics across the way who say, "Oh well, the government isn't proceeding with its tax cuts." Just a minute. We may not be proceeding with all the tax cuts, but for small business the corporate tax cut is still being put in place.

Another tax cut that was near and dear to my heart—I've been advocating for it for a couple of years—was the cut in sales tax on automobile insurance. As you know, the NDP put that into effect in the early 1990s; I believe it was 1992. They imposed a 5% PST on automobile insurance premiums. Everybody who drives a car has to buy automobile insurance, and with premiums now approaching \$1,000 on average, that's a \$40 assessment against absolutely every Ontarian driving a car. We have reduced that to 1% in this budget.

The automobile industry, not just the automobile but the auto parts sector as well, and the telecommunications equipment manufacturing industry were particularly hard hit last year, but they are growing now at a very good rate. The tragic events of September 11 dealt a terrific blow not just in human costs but certainly in economic costs through the destruction of economic activity and sharp but temporary declines in confidence. Of course, that relates immediately to a reduction in spending.

Although the province was severely affected by the global slump, the economy performed much better than it did during the early 1990s, when the NDP was in power. At that time, we know that worldwide growth had also faltered, but it had faltered for a much shorter time elsewhere in the world and certainly in the United States than it did here in Canada and in Ontario. So our rebound from that short-lived reduction in growth—I shouldn't say reduction in growth, but reduced growth this year—was directly related to our economic policies between 1995 and now. Without those economic policies, we could very easily have been in the same situation that the province was in when the NDP was in power. But our government knew what was necessary in the intervening years, and certainly now the steps we have taken are going to aid the economy to be renewed again.

There have been some attacks by those people who engage in propaganda about the amount of money that we spend in health care and how much money we spend in education. Joseph Goebbels headed up the Hitler propaganda machine during World War II. I can only say that his propaganda, his philosophy, was to tell a big

enough lie often enough that people will eventually believe it. Some of our critics are engaging in just that kind of despicable propaganda.

Health care expenses are up. In 1995, health care expenses were \$17.5 billion—\$17.4 billion to be exact. They are now \$25.7 billion. Education: we are now spending a record amount in education at \$14.3 billion.

Prior to the budget coming out, there was some polling done as to what Ontarians expected in terms of their government in the budget. Ontarians expected increased spending in health care, Ontarians expected increased spending in education, and Ontarians expected increased spending on the environment, but not just increased spending—increased attention to, increased focus on, those areas. This budget responded in those ways.

Shortly after the budget, the National Post conducted a poll. The poll gave us pretty good marks. Of those polled, 77% agreed with our government increasing by \$5 a carton the provincial tax on cigarettes; 68% supported our government in the \$245-million new investment into clean water initiatives; 64% agreed with the increase of \$1.7 billion that the budget put into health care. Health care, by the way, is now receiving 45% of all government operational spending here in Ontario. Some 64% agreed with the \$1.8-billion increase in government revenue through the sale or rental of public assets; 64% agreed with the \$117 million in new funding for public schools, an increase of 3% over last year; 64% agreed with \$520 million for new municipal infrastructure; and 58% agreed with delaying the increased tax deduction for parents whose children attend independent schools. I may not agree with that one, but I'm talking about the average in Ontario.

1610

Numbers like that show that Ontarians overwhelmingly support this budget and this government, because they believe they can continue to trust this government in managing the books. They can trust us more than they can trust either of the two opposition parties. They believe that only the Eves government can face the challenge of guiding Ontario smoothly through a new area. They also believe—

**Mr George Smitherman (Toronto Centre-Rosedale):** You don't believe that, do you?

**Mr Wettlaufer:** I certainly do believe it.

They also believe this budget was one that presented a bold plan for our government to keep its commitments to quality health care, quality education and a clean environment.

I think we need to look at what the budget did for small business. Small business, as we know, accounts for 61% of all new jobs created. We know as well that between 1995 and now, 893,000 net new jobs have been created in the province of Ontario. So the budget, in allowing small corporations and small businesses to continue to enjoy some profits and to pour some of those profits back into creating jobs, definitely was of benefit to small business.



Ontario employment is projected to increase between 1.5% and 2% this year. Most of that is because of small business and because of the opportunities we give small businesses to operate here in Ontario. In the last eight months, 70,000 net new jobs have been created. Yes, there were job losses between May and September last year. There were 22,000 job losses in that period, whereas now the economy has rebounded so strongly that 70,000 net new jobs were created. As economic growth continues, the pace of job creation will pick up.

I said we'd have between 1.5% and 2% growth in jobs this year. But next year all the experts tell us that job creation will register gains between 2.5% and 3%, because the economy will be getting stronger. New job opportunities will open up as firms continue to expand business operations in response to this province's competitive tax environment.

It's interesting to listen to the members of the opposition from time to time. They get up and say, "You're providing these great tax cuts to corporations that are making money." I've got news for you: making money is not a sin. Corporations that make money contribute to the health of this province. They contribute to jobs in this province, something the NDP never did understand, because they had a net loss of 10,000 jobs in the five-year period in which they were the government.

This government is cutting taxes; making strategic investments in education, innovation and infrastructure; modernizing financial regulations; reducing red tape; and eliminating other barriers to job growth.

Small and medium-sized enterprises have responded strongly to the improved tax, regulatory and general business climate. SMEs generated approximately 500,000 net new jobs in the 1996-2001 period. Business services and manufacturing led Ontario job growth over that period, with each sector adding about 210,000 jobs.

Ontario has a highly competitive and diverse manufacturing sector. It created 209,000 jobs in that period, more than any other province, more than any other state in the United States. During the global economic slowdown last year, Ontario's manufacturing employment slipped slightly, in contrast to continued sharp declines in the United States. So far this year, the manufacturing sector has contributed greatly to the resurgence in Ontario job growth, while US manufacturing employment has fallen further.

So when you hear the critics stand up and say, "Our growth is dependent on American growth and the American economy is rebounding, therefore ours is too," I can only point to those numbers. How come their job growth is slipping when ours is growing?

Low interest rates—

**Interjection:** Paul Martin.

**Mr Wettlaufer:** Paul Martin is responsible for the federal economy and the federal economy is only going based on what Ontario does. Ontario has been the engine of growth for this country forever. What happened when Ontario growth slipped between 1990 and 1995? The whole Canadian economy's bubble burst.

**Interjection:** And guess who was in government?

**Mr Wettlaufer:** And guess who was in government, yes. It wasn't us between 1990 and 1995.

Low interest rates support growth as well. What happens with low interest rates? What causes them? With more and more government debt, there is more and more demand placed on a limited supply of money in the world. Whether it's government borrowing the money or someone else, it drives the interest rates up. As government debt and deficits go down, there is less demand placed on the money worldwide, and that brings down interest rates.

The recent strength of our economy prompted the Bank of Canada to raise interest rates one quarter of a percentage point in mid-April and again this month, and yes, interest rates are expected to increase gradually through the rest of the year and again into next year. But that is only further evidence of firmer economic growth. The economy is healthy. Ontario's policies have worked, Ontario's policies will continue to work, and my time has run out. Thank you, Speaker.

**Mr Bruce Crozier (Essex):** I'm not pleased today to be standing here speaking to a motion of closure, of limiting debate. My colleague from Nickel Belt no doubt will mention, as she has said on numerous occasions, "It must be Wednesday because we're debating a closure motion." I give credit to her for that observation that she has made so many times.

But I am concerned that we're standing here speaking on a closure motion that involves the budget. There are few bills that are as important as the budget. That would lead one to believe that we should be given every opportunity to speak to that budget, yet today is going to be the last opportunity for debate.

This Legislature came back late. We came back in mid-May. The budget was late, and here we are, one day away from the end of the session and this government is bringing in closure on what should be, and is, a very important bill. Along with this is a great deal of confusion. The budget and the comments made by the government, the comments made since the budget was presented, have created a great deal of confusion.

Yesterday Premier Eves suggested and hinted at the possibility of reinstating tax cuts come the fall economic statement if the economy continues to rebound. But today the Minister of Finance has downplayed such an occurrence, stating that she was confident her financial forecasting was prudent. So we don't know whether there are going to be tax cuts, whether they are going to be reinstated, whether they are going to be brought back early or whether in fact we're going to get them at all.

1620

I recall some comments made after the September 11 event. The Premier at that time, Premier Harris, said that because of the September 11 events they must proceed more quickly with the tax cuts, and in fact did so. Then we get a budget this spring that says it's because of the September 11 events that we can't proceed with the tax cuts. Whether you're in favour of tax cuts or whether you're in favour of taking that revenue and putting it into

health care, education and the environment is not the issue I'm discussing this afternoon. What I'm discussing is the inability of this government to decide what the reason is for their actions, and that's what's confusing the people of Ontario.

If we go back to those months following September 11, the government's own forecasts and economic outlook would contradict what the Premier and the minister are saying today. Not only was the provincial budget balanced in the fiscal year 2001-02, but Ontario will benefit from about a \$1-billion increase in forecast revenues from higher than expected economic growth in the current fiscal year.

The economic data are fully at odds with the minister's statement that September 11 was the reason for Ontario's economic slowdown and the budget's postponement of tax cuts. Where is the post-September 11 slowdown the minister is alleging occurred? We haven't been able to find it, given that Canada averaged at least 4% growth in the last half of fiscal 2001-02.

Members on the government side will get up and speak about trust, that the citizens of Ontario should have trust in this government. We're going to be dealing with estimates in the not-too-distant future, in the next few weeks and months, that are \$3 billion different from the budget. So we still have two sets of books.

Then, when you speak of trust, there was a bill that was passed not a long time ago called the Taxpayer Protection Act. Frankly, it's not worth the paper it's written on.

**Mr Dave Levac (Brant):** Why?

**Mr Crozier:** Because this government felt there shouldn't be any change in tax rates, any increase in tax rates or any delay in tax cuts unless it was taken to the people in a referendum.

**Mr Levac:** And they're not doing that.

**Mr Crozier:** And they're not going to. They're going to scrap the Taxpayer Protection Act. Well, some protection. There again, how can you trust a government that stood firm on the ground that, "We're going to protect the taxpayers and we're not going to change those tax cut rates unless we come back to you and ask your permission"?

Do you know what the Premier said? He said, "We don't have to do that because we know how the people feel." That isn't the point. I don't know how the Premier knows how the people feel; all I know is that they gave their solemn oath that they wouldn't change those tax rates without going to the people, and they're not going to do it. So, trust? I don't know how we could have any trust in a government where the Premier says one day, "We may do something," and the finance minister the next day disallows it; where a former Premier and all those who sit on the government side said, "Our solemn oath is that we won't touch those tax rates without going to the people."

**Mr Levac:** Who was the finance minister?

**Mr Crozier:** A good question. My friend from Brant says, "Who was the finance minister?" None other than the current Premier, Ernie Eves.

Ernie said a couple of years ago, "You have my solemn oath." Today he says, "Well, maybe that wasn't a solemn oath. Maybe we'll just rip up that Taxpayer Protection Act."

You know, this budget is all about trust. There are critics of the budget; there are people who are in favour of the budget. But it's all about trust. Yet we have no idea what direction the government is going to go next week. All we know is that they're limiting debate on this budget because they want to get out of here tomorrow, when we started a month and a half late, when there's no reason why they couldn't have brought forward the motion that's already on the order paper that we sit for two weeks into July and have the opportunity to fully discuss these issues.

So whether you want to go at the bare figures of the budget, the statistics that are in the budget, or whether you're in favour of it or whether you're opposed to it, it does come down to a question of trust, I agree. I don't know how the government can ask me, as a representative from the riding of Essex, or ask my constituents to trust a government that makes a solemn oath at one point and then says, "It doesn't matter. We don't have to follow it. We're going to change it." That's not trust. That's absolutely mismanagement.

**Ms Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt):** It's a pleasure for me to participate in the debate. The member for Essex when he started, said, "On Wednesdays I have been reminding people that if it's Wednesday, it must be time allocation day." I wasn't going to say that today because the member for Sault Ste Marie is going to say it for me when he gets up and speaks. He and I share House duty on Wednesday and we know that this is very true.

I regret that the government is yet again, on a Wednesday, moving time allocation to a bill that provides some very significant changes to a number of pieces of legislation. I feel very strongly that there should be appropriate and adequate debate for that. We're not talking about a single small bill; we're talking about a bill that has changes that are incorporated as schedules—amendments, essentially—to a number of pieces of legislation, most importantly, I suspect, to the Taxpayer Protection Act, which will allow the government to do something which would otherwise be illegal, and that is for the government to defer tax cuts that were incorporated in a budget bill that we passed only last fall.

There are two schedules that I want to focus on in the time that I'm going to speak. They include schedule M, the amendments to the Tobacco Tax Act, and schedule L, the amendment to the Taxpayer Protection Act.

If you look at schedule M, that is the amendment that essentially allows this government to raise tobacco taxes by \$5 a carton. I want to focus on this because I didn't have a chance to do that in the budget debate last week and as health critic I think it's important that I put some points on the record in this regard.

The issue of raising tobacco taxes should be a health issue. I think it is absolutely imperative that it be a health issue. What is clear from the budget document that was

released by the government is that this is not a health issue at all. Purely and simply, it's a money grab—\$460 million worth of a money grab.

I agree with the government raising the tobacco tax. I want to put that on the record. But what I find most regrettable is that the government had an opportunity to view this as a health issue and the government has not. The government had an opportunity, for example, to say that the \$460 million in revenue that's going to be raised by that increase of \$5 on a carton is money that should go into a designated fund that will be used for smoking cessation programs and to encourage young people not to start smoking.

What is interesting—because I have looked at the budget document, I have looked at the budget that was read by the Minister of Finance, and nowhere in those two documents is there any reference whatsoever to the government now moving forward and establishing a designated fund so that the \$460 million that will be raised through increased tobacco taxes would in fact be used to help people quit smoking.

**1630**

I have waited as well since the budget for the Minister of Health to stand in his place and say that clearly the government sees smoking as a very serious health issue, sees the deaths caused by smoking in Ontario as a serious health issue, and that the government is prepared to use some of that money it's going to raise from tobacco to try and deal with that serious health issue. To date, the Minister of Health has said nothing. Maybe he will stand in his place tomorrow, the last day that this House sits this session, and say something significant about this important issue. I suspect he will not, so I want to use some of the time I have to indicate the problem that we've got in this province and what the government could do with that \$460 million if the government really wanted to deal with tobacco as a serious health issue.

It's worth noting that even with the increase in tobacco of \$5 a carton that was announced in the budget, even with that, Ontario remains one of the lowest-price-per-carton jurisdictions in North America. We remain lower than most states in the United States, including Michigan, New York, Minnesota, Washington and Vermont. The fact remains that even with the change announced in the budget, we in Ontario will still continue to have the cheapest cigarettes in Canada. I think that is regrettable.

I say that because I do believe it is a serious health issue, and because the government itself has in its possession a report that was done for the former Minister of Health, Minister Witmer, that was completed in February 1999. It was a report to the Minister of Health from her Expert Panel on the Renewal of the Ontario Tobacco Strategy. Let me just give you an idea of the people who were involved in doing some very important work for the Minister of Health on the tobacco issue. They included Mary Jane Ashley, MD, chair, professor at the department of public health sciences, University of Toronto; Ted Boadway, MD, executive director, health

policy, Ontario Medical Association; Roy Cameron, PhD, professor, department of health studies and gerontology, University of Waterloo; Josie d'Avernas, MSC, senior consultant, program training and consultation centre; Roberta Ferrence, PhD, director, Ontario Tobacco Research Unit; Andrew Pipe, MD, medical director, smoking cessation clinic, University of Ottawa Heart Institute; Dr Richard Schabas, head, division of preventive oncology, Cancer Care Ontario. Now he has moved on to something else. That was his position at the time that he was involved in this panel. Finally, Penny Thomsen, BPE, executive director, Canadian Cancer Society, Ontario division—some very articulate, experienced, knowledgeable people who did some excellent work for the former Minister of Health.

They, in their excellent work, did a number of things. I'll read parts of the executive summary because I think it so clearly shows the health problem that we have in this province now with respect to tobacco and gives members some idea of the recommendations that were made. The only recommendation the Ontario government has implemented is the increase in the cost of cartons of cigarettes. That's the only one that this government has now implemented, despite this being put forward to the minister in February 1999. But let us understand clearly the impact of tobacco. The executive summary says a couple of things.

“Each year, tobacco kills 12,000 Ontarians. Each year, treatment of diseases caused by tobacco requires more than one million hospital days and costs the health care system more than \$1.1 billion. Each year, tobacco costs the Ontario economy another \$2.6 billion in lost productivity. Lung cancer now exceeds breast cancer as the number one cancer killer in women. In short, the adverse impact of tobacco on the health of Ontarians and the economy of the province is nothing less than disastrous.

“Tobacco control in Ontario is failing. Almost none of Ontario's tobacco control objectives have been or will have been met by their target dates. Smoking rates among adolescents are now much higher than they were in the early 1990s. Smoking among adults has not decreased. Many Ontarians continue to be exposed to second-hand smoke at work and in public places.

“This year”—that's in 1999, and I thought this was particularly significant—“the budget of the Ontario Ministry of Health for tobacco control is less than 25% of the allocation at the height of the Ontario tobacco strategy in 1994-1995”—less than 25% of the allocation that was made by our government to the Ontario tobacco strategy in 1994-95. “This is equivalent to approximately 36 cents per capita, about 5% of the amount needed to mount an effective control program. The provincial media campaign, a critical program element focusing on youth, was eliminated in 1995.” Guess under which government. “Taxes have not been restored since the 1994 federal and provincial cuts, and cigarettes are now cheaper in Ontario than in any other province or adjacent US state.” That was the case up until the government announcement several weeks ago in the budget. “Existing provincial

legislation fails to protect workers from second-hand smoke. No new control measures have been introduced in the last four years.” Those were four years under the Conservative government.

“The effective control of tobacco is not only possible, it is an essential component of health care reform. It will save lives and prevent sickness and disability. It can produce major cost savings for both the health care system and the provincial economy. Tobacco is also an issue about which Ontarians have made up their minds.” I think the member from Waterloo made that clear when he referenced the polling results with respect to this new tax. “There is strong support across the population for action on tobacco.

“We recommend that the government of Ontario take action on tobacco prices, public education, marketing including packaging, labelling and information disclosure, retail controls, smoke-free spaces, supports for smoking cessation, finance and infrastructure, research, monitoring and evaluation, and cost recovery litigation. Action is needed in all of these areas if the tobacco disaster is to be abated. Piecemeal measures, based on ease of implementation, low cost, or other considerations, will not work.” I point out that the effect of what the government did was exactly that: a piecemeal measure based on ease of implementation. It’s not going to work to deal with what is a very serious health issue.

When you look at the recommendations in this February 1999 report, and there are 29 of them, the only one it appears this government has acted on was the first one, which was to raise and maintain tobacco prices to make them at least comparable to surrounding jurisdictions. The reality is the government didn’t even go that far, because in actual fact, even with the increase in the budget, Ontario remains the lowest-priced jurisdiction in Canada. That was the only recommendation this government has implemented of the 29 made to it by the expert panel—work, I remind you, that was requested by the Minister of Health. This is not a group of special interests, as the government likes to target people who take exception to what they are or are not doing. This is a group of experts who, at the request of and upon recommendation from the Minister of Health, produced a very important report in February 1999, which in essence has not been acted upon, except for the recommendation to increase taxes.

The shame of it is that even with the increase in taxes, this government has not established a designated fund to ensure those increases in taxes, ie, that increased revenue of \$460 million, would go toward implementing some of these other very important, critical recommendations if we are to have a coherent, comprehensive strategy to deal with tobacco and the effects on health in this province.

**1640**

I say this as strongly as I can: I regret that the government has done nothing with respect to implementing a designated fund to ensure that the \$460 million deals with the recommendations that came forward in February 1999. The government is taking the easy approach, a

piecemeal measure, as was outlined in the executive summary, and it will do very little at all to convince people to stop smoking, to provide them with the supports to stop smoking, and will do very little to stop young people from starting to smoke. The net effect will be this continued disaster with respect to health care in Ontario: thousands more who will die, thousands more who will get cancer, a huge increase in health care costs, and this government doing nothing with respect to some very important work and recommendations made by experts on what could be done.

I call on the Minister of Health—I suspect he won’t be getting to this tomorrow—to announce very publicly that all the revenue that will be generated, the \$460 million, will go to implementing the recommendations that came from the expert panel on the renewal of the Ontario tobacco strategy.

The second schedule I want to speak to is schedule L, the amendment to the Taxpayer Protection Act. Speaker, you will know that amendment will allow the introduction of a bill later in the fall of 2002 that will have the provision to defer future tax decreases, either under the Income Tax Act, the Corporations Tax Act or both for up to one year. It allows the government essentially to delay tax cuts this government previously announced without breaking the law, the government’s own law; a law, I remind you, that was only passed by this House last fall.

In the budget of 2001, the government essentially outlined a schedule of tax cuts over a number of years. If you look on page 96 of the Ontario budget papers, you will see that they’re listed under “General Corporate Income Tax Rate,” the current tax rate at 14%, and then the proposed tax rates, the proposed schedules over four years for the cuts in income tax. There are also cuts related to tax rates on manufacturing, processing, mining etc.

What happened was that from this budget document the government then developed its budget bill, which we dealt with last fall, which essentially incorporated the schedule into law. That schedule makes it very clear that as of January 1, 2002, there would be a cut to 12.5%; as of January 1, 2003, a cut down to 11%; January 1, 2004, 9.5%; January 1, 2005, down to 8%.

What must be embarrassing for the government is that we are now in a position of having to amend a bill that we only passed last fall, that this government passed, the very bill that set in place this schedule for the corporate tax cuts. The government now finds itself in the position of having this amendment today—in effect enabling legislation—that will allow them to bring in legislation this fall to actually defer the tax cuts. I think that must be just a little bit embarrassing for this government to have to do that within a year of their Taxpayer Protection Act having been passed with such fanfare.

Probably the more important point is that the amendment we are dealing with today and the bill that will come in the fall that will defer that schedule of tax cuts outlined in the 2001 budget, defer the personal income tax cut, the private school tax credit and the corporate tax

cut, as far as I'm concerned are a clear admission that tax cuts don't work.

Our party has long been telling this government that it should be cancelling these tax cuts—not deferring them as they will do this fall in a bill that will come, but should cancel them altogether. Because we know that the money that goes out to corporations that are already profitable and to Ontarians who already make the highest income and to private school supporters who should not be getting public money to support private schools, is money that could be better spent on health, on education, on the environment and on community services.

The other important point is that by continuing with these tax cuts, the government actually increases the debt of the province, because they have to borrow to finance these tax cuts. So we have two problems: money that could be better directed to essential services going to people in corporations who need it the least, and this government increasing the debt of the province of Ontario in order to finance its tax-cut regime.

I heard the member from Waterloo go on at great length today about how important tax cuts are. The obvious question is, if tax cuts work, why is this government deferring its tax-cut regime? That's a simple question. Let me make my point clear. We think they should be cancelled altogether, so we're quite pleased that they at least have been deferred. But the obvious question is that if they are working so well, if they are so fabulous for the economy, why are you deferring those tax cuts for the next year? I continue to wait to hear the government's response.

If you go back and take a look at what the former Premier had to say about tax cuts, just after September 11 he said the following, and this was from a taped address that Premier Harris made on Monday night, October 1, to the people of Ontario: "While some people said we should not proceed with these tax cuts in light of recent events"—ie, September 11—"I believe they are now more important than ever," Harris said, adding that tax cuts were designed to help stimulate our economy, which lost more steam after the attacks.

The next day, Premier Harris, in a statement to the Legislature, said the following: "On January 1, 2002, we had planned to implement a number of additional tax cuts, including cuts to personal income taxes, capital taxes and corporate income taxes. There are some who have always opposed our tax cuts." That's me; I'm one of them. "Those same people say we should not proceed with these already announced planned tax cuts in light of recent events." That's me, too. "Once again, they are wrong. The members on this side of the House believe tax cuts are more important than ever before."

He went on to say, "We are proposing to accelerate these tax cuts, because we have enormous confidence in the people of this province. We are confident that their entrepreneurial spirit, their proven productivity, will take us through this short term to long-term gains in jobs and the quality of life."

So I ask the government again, why, if the tax cuts are so fabulous, are you deferring them?

Here's a quote from the then Finance Minister, Jim Flaherty, on November 6, 2001. This is when he presented the 2001 Ontario Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review to the Legislature. Page 5: "Some people would argue that in times like these we should not move forward with our tax cuts; others would even advocate raising taxes. But we believe that sticking to our tax-cutting plan is more important than ever. Low taxes attract business. More business means more jobs and higher government revenues."

That's what Jim Flaherty had to say last November. Here we are, just a few short months later, and this same government, with some of those same players, maybe in different positions but still around, have now brought forward a budget that defers those tax cuts. I think that's a clear admission that tax cuts don't work.

I say to the government, if they were so wonderful in November, if they were so great that you even accelerated the schedule listed in the budget of 2001, why is it that you are now before us trying to defer the tax cuts which should go into effect January 1, 2003?

I said it last week and I'll say it again: I don't think you should defer the tax cuts; I think you should cancel them altogether. That has been our position; it will continue to be our position. The money that you want to blow in tax cuts is money that could be better used to finance health, education, the environment and community services, and it would also put you into a position where you don't have to borrow even more money and increase the provincial debt, which you have done by \$22 billion since you were elected. If you would cancel those tax cuts, then you wouldn't have to continue down the road of increasing the provincial debt by \$22 billion, which is what you've done since you were elected.

I will end now, because my colleague from Sault Ste Marie has some things to say as well later on.

**1650**

**M. Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex):** C'est un honneur de prendre part à ce débat sur le budget cet après-midi, le projet de loi 109. C'est vraiment le quatrième budget consécutif que notre gouvernement a balancé.

There are so many things to say but so little time to say them. I will concentrate today basically on education. I know the member for Nickel Belt doesn't believe in, she's fundamentally opposed to, tax cuts. We're fundamentally in favour of tax cuts.

She talked about this government putting the province \$22 billion in debt—we did have a plan. I would strongly suggest that when they were in government for some 52 months, they put this province \$55 billion in debt. Now who's calling the kettle black here?

Let's talk about education. I'm glad to see the member for Don Valley East is here. Let me take you back prior to 1997, when the education formula was implemented. Why was it implemented? It's too bad the member for Kingston and the Islands, who was here just a couple of minutes ago, is not here. As the former mayor of Kingston—

**Interjection:** He's across the floor.

**Mr Beaubien:** Oh, he's here. I'm sure he'll appreciate this.

**Mr Levac:** He's right there.

**Mr Beaubien:** I know he's right there. I acknowledged that he's there. I'm glad to see it, because I'm sure he had the same concerns with his constituents when he was mayor as I had when I was mayor.

If we look at the old tax bills prior to 1997, they were three-part bills: we had a municipal portion, a county or upper-tier portion and an education portion. It was not uncommon to see many constituents come to your office or to the town hall and complain about their taxes being out of control. They were elevated; they were too high. They kept saying, "You've got to do something about it."

In some municipalities, the education portion was as high as 67% or 68% of the tax bill. I refer to a small community in my riding, namely Dawn township. The education portion of their tax bill was 68%. The municipality was choked. They couldn't spend money on infrastructure, they couldn't spend money on employees, they couldn't spend any money. This government came along because many people were saying, "Governments have got to rein in the cost of education."

We're now spending \$14.3 billion on education, and I keep hearing it's not enough. When we look at it, we're spending over \$7,000 per student. For the people who may be watching at home, do the math. If you have 23 students in your classroom, that's \$161,000 provided to educate the 23 students in your classroom.

**Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton):** Where does that money go?

**Mr Beaubien:** I don't know. I ask the parents out there, is that enough money to educate 23 students? If we look at what the Christian schools are doing, they're educating their students at a cost between \$3,800 and \$4,200 per student.

As opposed to trying to gauge how much we're spending per student, maybe we should be looking at the output. I think that's why this government has introduced standard testing, a standard curriculum and testing of teachers, so there is accountability at the end of the day.

Let's look at why the funding formula is in place today. Is it the be-all and end-all of everything? Of course not. That's why this government has appointed Dr Mordechai Rozanski to assess the formula to see if it's adequate. Furthermore, I would ask the constituents in my riding, where many of the boards were spending an average of \$4,500 to \$5,000 per student and many other boards were spending almost twice that much, isn't it fair to expect that every student in Ontario would receive the same level of funding, whether you're in Kenora, Markham or Petrolia? I think every student in the province of Ontario deserves the same level of financial investment in the classroom.

**Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa West-Nepean):** What have they got against equality?

**Mr Beaubien:** What have you got against equality? What have you got against fairness? It's all about quality education, fairness and equity. That's what it's all about.

So you can say that there's not enough money in the system, but ask a question of yourself, and be honest with yourself. If you're spending \$161,000—without looking at the bricks and mortar, without the transportation costs, strictly for classroom education and administration—\$161,000 to educate 23 students, how many parents in your constituencies are going to tell you, "It's not enough"?

Do you know why I think they think it's enough? Because they don't want to pay any more taxes. How do I know that? Ask the former mayor from Kingston. He'll tell you that when he was mayor of that community he had many calls from many of his constituents concerned about the escalating and uncontrolled costs of education.

Did we have quality? Yes, I guess we had quality. Are there some problems in the system today? Yes, there are always going to be some problems. It's not a perfect system.

**Mr Joseph Cordiano (York South-Weston):** So what is it? You're speaking out of both sides of your mouth now.

**Mr Beaubien:** No, I think you are. You go this way and you go that way, and how far you go depends on the spring that controls you.

I keep hearing, "Oh, we're opposed to tax cuts." There's not enough money in the education system, but not once do we ever hear any of you guys or ladies mention an alternative to what we should be doing. It's against everything, but we're not for anything.

So what are you for? You talk about speaking out of both sides of your mouth. I think I would look at myself in the mirror when I say that.

Let's talk about health care briefly, because I have to share my time with another member. I think in your red book you said you were going to spend, if I recall, \$16.5 billion. We said, "No, we're going to spend \$17.5 billion" in 1995. Check the record. I think the figures are fairly accurate. Today, we're spending \$25.5 billion, and yet we hear that it's not enough money.

Again, I think we have to look at the output—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker:** Order. It's still daylight. I realize it's near a full moon, but grab a hold of yourselves, bring yourselves to order. There's one person allowed to speak at once. We'll go by that rule.

The Chair recognizes the member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex.

**Mr Beaubien:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I realize that some of them are getting a little nervous and upset when they hear the truth and the facts, and sometimes it hurts.

But let's go back to health care. When we look at the initiative that this government has implemented in the past seven years, I'm proud of the initiative. Why do I say that? Because on March 21, our son Marc was involved in a very serious car accident. He had to use the health care system in this province. Let me tell you that I'm proud of the system; I'm proud of the people who look after him, the nurses, the doctors, the physio-

therapists, anybody who works with him. I'm proud of the system. If there's something wrong with our system, let me tell you that the Beaubien family for two months certainly did not experience that.

**Mr Ruprecht:** Today we're talking about the budget and we're talking about cutbacks in funding to certain programs that we would like to see reinstated.

Take, for instance, what happened in this House just a few hours ago. I had made mention that through the Ministry of Citizenship and through the Ministry of Education, the funding for ESL programs, English-as-a-second-language programs, was severely restricted and that over a five-year period of time, from 1997 until 2002, where we are today, we had a drop in funding and a reduction in people attending English-as-a-second-language programs by—guess what?—a whopping 31%; 31% fewer students attending English-as-a-second-language programs.

**1700**

There are parents; there are children; there are grandparents. What do they really want? Why do they want to attend English as a second language programs and classes? Why in Canada? It takes an effort to go to these classes in the evening or in the daytime, yet the demand is there. People want to go and learn English. This government, instead of adding funds and doing whatever it would take to facilitate the programs so that people would actually go and learn English, is doing the opposite.

It's shocking, it's shameful and it's stupid. It is absolutely stupid because when a person comes to Canada, the first thing he or she has to do is try to learn the language to communicate. He or she will have to learn English to try to get a job. Without English, you can't communicate. Without English, you can't get a job. Without English, you can't get ahead. Without English, you are losing communication with your children as well, because they're in English programs and you can't speak a word.

It is shocking from our point of view that we have a government that does not see the benefits of people speaking English. There are 668,000 persons in Ontario alone who are unable to speak English. Out of these 668,000, 110,000 are presently enrolled in English classes. Some of these classes have shut down. Why have they shut down? Because the province in the budget has decided to turn off the tap so that the money can no longer flow in that direction. You've taken your responsibility very lightly.

I've always said that the chickens will come back to roost. I've also always said that on the minister's shoulders is a grave responsibility to try to ensure that those who come from other countries to Canada have a good and equal opportunity. Is that relevant? Yes, it is. Because that's what we stand for on this side. If we ever take over the government, and that may be very soon, one of the first things we're going to do is try to ensure that there will be monies available, a funding formula available for those people who wish to learn and speak English. That would be a commitment.

Do you know why we would be doing that? We would open the doors for everybody. For those who cannot speak, who are unable to go, who don't have the money, who are downtrodden and poor and are unable to speak English, we would open the doors for them, open the windows for them, open the opportunities for them, because without English there can never be opportunity in this country.

The Minister of Citizenship got up today, and especially yesterday when he said, "You know what? This Ontario has great promise and great opportunity." Sure, it has great opportunity. He said a young man can follow his dream. Sure they can follow their dream. With what? Of course they can never follow their dream and they are thrown into the dustbin because they are unable to speak English.

How can anybody in the school system, if they don't speak English, possibly understand the curriculum? How can they possibly get ahead in life? How can they possibly get the job? How can they possibly communicate? Sure he had a dream, and sure that dream was reality. But you know what? He had all the breaks that the programs that were in place previously gave him. It gave him the opportunities that we today have the responsibility to maintain.

Those opportunities, first and foremost, are the ability and the open-door policy of the government for a person to be able to speak English and try to get ahead if they want to. Whether that program consists of English on a basic level, whether that program is attended in the basement of a church or in a school or in a community hall, it is incumbent upon us as legislators to make that program available. It is a shame and a crime, I think, that we shut out these people from learning English, because when we do that, when we shut them out, when we close the doors, when we close the windows, we close the opportunity to become great Canadians and to participate in the economic future of this country. That is our very grave responsibility.

*Applause.*

**Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport):** Thank you. I understand this. But the grave responsibility is for you to open up, and you still have the chance. You still have one more year. I say to the Minister of Citizenship and to the Premier, Ernie Eves, open up your books and change your budget. Don't cut off the funding for these people. They have no classrooms; they have no house; they have no home. They can't go outside like in Africa, you know. In Africa they've got classrooms outside. We can't do that here. It's colder. They are unable to do it. So it's very important that we present these programs. As I've always said, if we are unable to do it, then we don't deserve our jobs as legislators.

The numbers are clear, and everyone agreed at that press conference today. They were all there. Do you know who was really supporting us at the press conference today? A coalition of organizations right across Ontario. Here they are: the Chinese-Canadian National Council—"Yes, we need these programs"; the Urban

Alliance on Race Relations—“Yes, we need these programs”; the Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture—“Yes, we want these programs”; the Centre for Social Justice—“Yes, we want these programs.” Why social justice? Because this is a justice issue. This is simply justice, because the opportunities are there and we have to take them. The opportunities are very clear.

In closing, I am unable to tell you all the other organizations, but let me simply say this. You have the responsibility; open the doors. We need the ESL programs. We need the schools. We want the opportunity.

**Mr Beaubien:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to recognize Maria Texiera. Maria has worked at Queen’s Park for 21 years on the maintenance staff and she is retiring on Friday. Congratulations on your retirement.

**The Acting Speaker:** Maria, we understand that you had a birthday very recently and that your last day is tomorrow. We wish you ever so well in the future and we thank you ever so much for your past services.

**Mr Ruprecht:** Mr Speaker, on a point of order: Maria had the great distinction actually to get to know us on our side of the Legislature. We were always very happy with her services. Here is a person who went beyond the call of duty. That’s the kind of Canadians we need. Congratulations to Maria Texiera. And over there are more of our persons who work here. They also deserve to be recognized when their day comes, because they too go beyond the call of duty to make sure we have a clean place—we have a clean Canada, a clean Toronto and a clean Legislature.

**The Acting Speaker:** Further debate? The Chair recognizes the member for Sault Ste Marie.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** Before I start, I’m just wondering whose time was running down there while all this—

*Interjection.*

**Mr Martin:** OK. I also want to say that we in this caucus appreciate the work and effort and friendliness of Maria, who is retiring today, and we wish her well into her future and her retirement.

I want to start off by reflecting on the comments of the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex, who so eloquently a few minutes ago said, as he got up to speak, “So much to say and so little time,” and to say to him that if he wasn’t ramming this bill through, as he does so often in this place, we’d have lots of time, because we do have lots to say on the business they bring before this House. Yet it seems to me that, as my colleague from Nickel Belt said a few minutes ago, it’s Wednesday, so it must be a time allocation motion, or the converse: it’s a time allocation motion, so it must be Wednesday. Every week we come here we are constricted to very, very little time to speak on very, very important matters that affect the public life of this province. It’s unfortunate.

1710

Today we speak, by way of a time allocation motion, to the budget bill, a bill that for many of us here and across the province, if you speak to people out there, is a

sign, the actual first real sign, that this government is losing their nerve, that this government is losing their resolve to solve absolutely every problem that confronts us as a community of people by simply introducing ever-increasing tax breaks, giving more money to those who already have it at the expense of those who need the services we provide as a government, and have become very proud of the record we’ve established over the years in delivering those services. This budget that was delivered and this bill before us today that speaks to the elements of that budget are a very clear backing away by this government from its agenda of tax breaks to cure everything.

However, there are still some troubling initiatives in the bill that I’m sure most people in this place and across on this side of the floor will speak to; for example, the selling off of half of Ontario Hydro. If you don’t have revenue coming in—and the government is beginning to recognize that if you keep giving it away, you won’t have the money to spend on the programs—you’ve got to get it someplace else. So this budget speaks very clearly to selling off what we refer to in our caucus as the family silverware, the family jewels, that which is there to take us through the thick and the thin and into the future, vehicles of government that produce significant and healthy revenue for government that this government feels—and they haven’t been able to rationalize, certainly to us in this caucus anyway, why they would want to do that or need to sell off public assets.

We noted in the last budget the government brought down, in their effort to buy an election, that they sold off Highway 407. Now they’re proposing to sell off half of Ontario Hydro. Not only that, but in this budget bill we’re looking at here today, they’re proposing to sell off the Province of Ontario Savings Office, which provides for this government a vehicle of some significant income.

The Conservatives are selling off the family silverware in the form of our public hydro system to give the appearance of a balanced budget. The budget is a repeat of 1999, when the Conservatives sold off Highway 407 and used the proceeds as an election slush fund. The same thing will happen with the sale of Hydro One and the generating assets of Ontario Power Generation and the sale of the Province of Ontario Savings Office.

The Conservatives are also opening the door even wider to private-driven health care by allowing the private sector to participate in a review of health care spending and by encouraging more private diagnostic clinics.

The budget also fails to deliver any new ideas to help revive urban Ontario.

There is little new money for education, meaning schools will continue to crumble.

There is no investment in regulated child care, affordable housing or an increase in the minimum wage.

Most important in all of this is the sense we’re getting from government that they’re unsure of their positioning—and it’s not just on the tax breaks, although that’s the most obvious and clear example.

I referred to the government last night, on a couple of occasions when I got to intervene after people spoke, as,



by way of analogy, a duck in a thunderstorm—flashes of lightning scaring the heck out of them; not knowing where to go and not knowing what's going on or what to do to gain some sense of stability and safety.

When we look at the question of Hydro, one minute they're selling it off, the next minute they're not selling it off. Then the next time we look they're selling off half of it and then we're not sure whether in fact they are going to do that or not. From one day to the next, we're never sure in this House what the response is going to be to the questions we ask, what their position is on the question of Ontario Hydro. One minute they're listening to the polls that are telling them that over 70% of the people of Ontario say, "Don't sell it off. It doesn't make any sense"; the next day, of course, they hear from their friends on Bay Street who say, "Don't stop. That's an important economic initiative for us. It will generate all kinds of profits for us. You've got to sell it off. You've got to move on that front." So from one day to the next they are very much like a duck in a thunderstorm.

On the issue of the budget, which I just spoke of a few minutes ago, last year, as the member for Nickel Belt said, the then finance minister and the then Premier said that they had to go ahead with tax breaks, that tax breaks were the be-all and the end-all, the answer to everything. Then you have the Minister of Finance coming in with the budget that we have now, saying, "We have a problem and maybe tax cuts aren't the answer we thought they were, so we're putting them off." And then only yesterday, driving to the House here in a car, I heard on the radio that the Premier was again musing—he probably had a phone call from Bay Street telling him, "Hey, you can't back off on the tax breaks." He probably read the Toronto Sun, which has been castigating the government for the last few days for backing away from their tax break agenda, and again they are having second thoughts, like a duck in a thunderstorm.

On the issue of disabilities, I brought a bill forward here a week or so ago asking the government to give a group of people in this province who haven't had an increase for over seven years, a group in this province who are living in some very difficult circumstances through no fault of their own—they are disabled. They got hurt on the job, they were born with a disability, the variety of ways that people get disabilities in this province. They were looking for a little bit of reprieve, knowing that this province has been through some six or seven good economic years and thinking that maybe it might be their turn to get a little bit of that flowing their way so they might be able to look after their needs and pay the bills. And what does the government say? No. Thirty eight of their members stood up and voted against an increase for the disabled in this province.

Then a couple of days later we have the minister, obviously responding to the backlash from that vote, saying, "Maybe we'll review it." I got up in the House the day after that and asked the minister if in fact she was going to review and got no answer, got the same diatribe we get every time we talk to this government about the

plight of the poor in this province: they blame it on us, talk about our record, as opposed to the fact that they have been government now for seven years and have had that responsibility. It's a very real and important responsibility and you're not doing anything about it—nothing.

**Mr Ernie Hardeman (Oxford):** We've still done more than you did.

**Mr Martin:** No, you didn't. You didn't do a damn thing more than we did. You took 22% away from the poorest and most vulnerable in our province with one stroke of a pen, and you took the disabled and moved them out of the welfare package, only to make life more difficult for them. The biggest issue for the disabled in this province right now is the fact that they can't access the program. You've made the bar so high that they don't qualify any more. That's what you've done to the disabled. They came here the other day in great numbers asking you to give them a paltry increase of some maybe 2% or 3% in their income, and what did you say? "No, sorry. We don't have it. We can't afford it. We have to give tax breaks to our wealthy friends and benefactors. We can't afford to give you an increase."

So this government obviously has lost its way. The signs that their program isn't working are all around us: the poverty gap, homelessness, people on the street, the shrinking economy in rural and northern Ontario. The drop in population in northern Ontario indicates that we have a problem. The system is beginning to fray at the edges, and it won't be long before that fraying begins to touch the heart of the economy and the industrial centre of this province, Toronto itself. It already is where poverty is concerned.

We have turmoil in our education and health care systems. We have turmoil in the environment. We have case after case before this House of difficulties with energy and the environment.

**1720**

What the people want is a government with resolve, and not only with resolve but with bright ideas and strong leadership, a party that knows what it stands for, is committed to what it stands for and has a plan. That party is the New Democratic Party in this Legislature. We have an urban vision, we have a northern economic development recovery plan and we know what to do about poverty. We would raise the minimum wage, we would invest in child care, we would stop the clawback, that shameful clawback, of the child tax benefit supplement and we would give people with disabilities a raise. That would make this province a better place for everybody to live in.

**The Acting Speaker:** The member's time has expired. I will be adding approximately 61 seconds to the next speaker's time, by my watch. If there's somebody who has any problem with it, write it out on a little piece of paper in 18-point print, give it to me and I'll try to give it to somebody who cares.

The Chair recognizes the member for Northumberland.

**Mr Doug Galt (Northumberland):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker—

**Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair):** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Through no fault of his own.

**Mr Duncan:** It was his own member who did it.

**The Acting Speaker:** There are two of us standing. One of us is out of order and it is not me. I will explain that it was not his caucus that caused that delay.

**Mr Duncan:** It was Marcel.

**The Acting Speaker:** No, it wasn't. It was Ruprecht.

**Mr Galt:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for acknowledging that extra minute there, 61.5 seconds; it's very much appreciated.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the time allocation motion. I heard some of the members in the opposition speaking about closure. If there weren't so much opposition and resistance and if there was a little co-operation—I've had a private member's bill here, Bill 33. It's about outriders, particularly in the back of pickup trucks. Lo and behold, the member for Niagara Centre, the House leader of the NDP, consistently objects and blocks this particular bill, a bill that could save lives—lives after lives—and there's no consideration being given to that whatsoever.

I thought the member for Nickel Belt had one good question she was posing. It was, why weren't the tax cuts being continued and brought in? She had so many things. I was confused some of the time about where she was coming from with tax cuts now or later; she was for them and then she was against them. She was opposed to the government because the debt increased after they left, even though they were running an \$11-billion deficit and then she was supportive. Then she talked about stimulating the economy and then she was opposed to it.

The one that I thought did make sense was when she was questioning why, when tax cuts stimulate the economy, we wouldn't be bringing them in. There is a bit of a time delay for that stimulation and there is a problem with revenues, so having a bit of a delay makes sense. I think the commitment that they're going to continue the tax cuts in a year's time, and possibly sooner, is the right direction to go.

I'd like to draw a little bit of a comparison with what was going on with that severe recession we went through in the early 1990s, compared to the minor recent downturn in the economy that we experienced. Part of that was stimulated by the Liberal spend and tax and borrow that was going on in the late 1980s, and part of it had to do with how the NDP government came in and what they were going to do. We were first into that severe recession, we went the deepest and we stayed down there the longest.

Compared to other provinces, compared to the US, what happened in the recent downturn? We were the last to go in, we went down the least amount and we came out the soonest. That's the difference in the kinds of policies we had back in the early 1990s, during that lost decade of the Liberal and the NDP governments. That

was what happened with those policies. Our change in policy, stimulating the economy with tax cuts, has made all the difference in the world.

I think it's quite a compliment to our present Premier, the then Minister of Finance, Ernie Eves, that he was making these tax cuts and, lo and behold, the federal Liberal government laughed at us, but then Paul Martin, understanding this kind of thing as the federal Minister of Finance, brought in tax cuts and started to recognize the importance of what they were doing for our country.

I would challenge the opposition to give me one solid economic policy the federal government brought in, other than cutting the transfer payments to the provinces. The biggest one had to do with health care. It was indeed very unfortunate that they decided to cut there. We would be in such a great position if they would just return to the 18% level of transfer payments for the cost of health care, the level of the Brian Mulroney government. But the Chrétien government chopped that and down it went. It's been pretty tough for Ontario. In dollars we're almost back to where we were when we took office in 1995 in transfers coming to the province. Of course, the percentage is way down, and we've increased spending for health care alone by \$8 billion.

**Mr Hardeman:** That's a lot of money.

**Mr Galt:** That is a lot of money. That's almost an increase of \$1,000 for every man, woman and child. We've increased spending in health care by about \$800 for every man, woman and child in Ontario, all because the federal Liberals are not stepping up to the plate, when they committed 50% to health care funding.

The thrill I had when the Minister of Finance, Janet Ecker, stepped up to the microphone and said, "The budget is balanced. This will be the fourth balanced budget in Ontario." We were saying with three balanced budgets that that was a first in close to 100 years, so I suspect this is a record since Confederation. I don't have proof of that at this time, but I expect that is in fact true. To have four balanced budgets in a row is indeed a credit to our present Minister of Finance and our previous two, particularly the Honourable Ernie Eves, who set us in motion for this kind of thing to happen. It was a great budget, an excellent budget for 2002, Growth and Prosperity: Keeping the Promise.

As I mentioned about the balanced budget, to date we have paid off \$4.2 billion of the debt that has accumulated, most of which was accumulated during that lost decade. Even in the last year with the downturn, we were able to put \$127 million toward that particular debt. We didn't expect the growth we had for some years in excess of 5% to continue forever, but certainly it was growth that was stimulated as a result of the policies of this province, and certainly they have stimulated the economy tremendously.

I mentioned earlier about the transfer payments. What has been going on with this reduction in transfer payments from the federal government is that the feds have been cheating the provinces on what was promised to them some 30 years ago. They committed to that kind of

health care spending. They've just not stayed at the plate and haven't been doing their job. What they have been doing is overtaxing on things like the employment insurance program, penalizing the provinces. As a result, it's tough to create jobs when they are doing that kind of thing. That kind of payroll tax is very tough on jobs.

I see my time is running out. I just want to wind up by complimenting the Honourable Janet Ecker on doing a great job, and also our Premier, the Honourable Ernie Eves, for the support and what he has been doing with balanced budgets in the past.

**Mr Levac:** I want to thank my whip this evening for providing me with a few minutes to make a few comments about the budget.

I want to start by saying something the government did that I support. I think it's a great idea for our environment, my riding and the people for whom I've been fighting for the last six months regarding the tax credit for biodiesel. I think it's a great thing to do. It's an intelligent opportunity for us to improve our health and our environment, and actions that can be taken. So thank you very much for that.

I would also like to point out that in public safety and security, the government will create a firefighters' memorial here at Queen's Park, again something I've been asking three ministers to do. Somebody else came up with the idea on that side. It doesn't matter who did. The fact is that the government is doing it, so thank you for that. But except public safety and security, that we're supposed to be spending more money on since September 11, the government has refused to listen to the idea Dalton McGuinty proposed, the \$100-million Ontario security fund. They've cut the budget by \$70 million. Shame on you for cutting a budget and telling us you're going to be able to provide safety and security at the same time.

The members on that side talk about education and the money spent on special ed. They don't have a clue what they've done to the ISA grants. They don't even know what they are. They are taking educational assistants away from kids who need this special help. They raised the bar. They almost have to be on a gurney in order to get an EA now. Shame on you for doing that.

The biggest thing I want to end on—my time is up, because I only asked for a couple of minutes—is shame on all of you for coming up with all kinds of statistics from 1995 to now, when you can't give a senior citizen a shower a day. You're telling us you can't give our senior citizens, the people who built this country, a shower a day. Shame on you.

1730

**Mr Cordiano:** I'm delighted to speak on this budget, because it truly demonstrates what an incredible betrayal this government—this leadership we see under Ernie Eves, the new Premier—has perpetrated. What an incredible betrayal of the loyal supporters of this government: a complete reversal, denying everything this government has done for the past seven years under the

premiership of Mike Harris. I call it a deathbed repentance: completely reversing itself, denying what it stood for and trying to change the direction it's going in. Why? Because that direction is no longer popular with the public. They can no longer sell the bill of goods they've been selling for two election campaigns. The Common Sense Revolution, they want to believe, is dead.

Well, I say to the members opposite, I don't think it's going to work. It's a betrayal of the faithful who supported this government, the neo-con core who supported this government. They knew that this government stood for something. Under the premiership of Mike Harris, you at least knew where Mike Harris stood. I didn't support it; I disagreed with it. But I'll tell you it was straightforward and it was clear and you knew where they were coming from. You knew where Mike Harris was coming from. Again, I say I didn't support it, and I debated in this House at every turn when the government brought forward its agenda. But it was clear.

What you have now under this Premier is great uncertainty. What direction is he going in? What does he stand for? What do they believe in? They don't even know themselves. I don't recall which member it was who referred to the amount of money spent per pupil on education and saying, "There's more than enough money being spent on education—more than enough money. Just look at how much is being spent per pupil in each classroom." If you add up the number of kids in a class, I think he cited somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$160,000 in one classroom of 22 children.

Then he fails to realize that his Premier has put, he suggests, more than \$340 million additional in this budget for education. I would add, of course, that this government has been cutting the education budget for years. Now this member stands up and says there's more than enough money. The Premier and his cabinet have the backbenchers in this government so confused that they don't know what rhetoric to use any more. Is it more spending for education or are there enough dollars in education?

So his backbench is arguing that there's plenty of money in education; it's just not being spent properly. Yet the cabinet has suggested that they've put more money into education. From our point of view, they cut education far too severely in the past and they should be putting even more money in. It's not adequate at all.

I want to talk about the thing that I think is just obscene when it comes to this government. I want to talk about CCACs and home care. It's shocking, and I've brought this up and so have my colleagues in the opposition, time and again. It is shocking, what's happening to our seniors across this province. I've literally had hundreds of people come to my office to talk about the deplorable state that exists in long-term-care facilities and with regard to home care. The underfunding is so severe now. In North York, for example, the CCAC was facing a \$10-million shortfall, which meant they had to cut the number of hours that seniors were receiving in

terms of home care in half. Is it any wonder that the Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care stands up and says, "Everything's fine folks, and if somebody's breaking the law, we're going to go after them." He doesn't realize that there isn't enough funding. Maybe he should start going out there and trying to help those seniors. Maybe he should do it first-hand and see what's at stake here. The fact that they're not getting baths often enough is a reality. We're not making this stuff up. It's happening across this province. These seniors have the right to live with some sort of dignity. We need to provide that for them. This government has failed them miserably.

I want to talk about infrastructure and I want to talk about the fact that this government wants to tout its SuperBuild, the greatest thing that has ever happened to Ontario, according to this government. They want to spend \$20 billion, they say, over the next five years. The fact of the matter is, when we were the government in the 1980s—and I made this reference in a speech that I gave earlier in the year—we spent at least 2% more in terms of the budget on capital than this government is now spending under SuperBuild. It was a significant amount of money additional to what this government is claiming it's going to spend under SuperBuild.

The fact is that this government is also relying on private sector funding to top up the funds that are being offered by this government in this budget. The \$10 billion that is being provided by the province is supposed to be matched by the private sector. Guess what? It isn't happening. All the information we have suggests that the private sector isn't stepping up to the plate, that in fact it's the federal government that is stepping up to the plate and flowing funds to make up for the lack of private sector funding. It's the federal government that is doing just that. Most of these projects involve the municipalities as well, and they are putting up their share of the funding. So there's very little private sector money going into SuperBuild at the present time. It's a small fraction of what they had expected. So SuperBuild is simply not working, not meeting the expectations.

As well, I would suggest to the government that there are no audited financial statements. As I pointed out earlier this week in a question that I asked the Deputy Premier, this government has broken the law when it comes to providing and tabling audited financial statements for SuperBuild. It failed to do that under the Development Corporations Act. It is a requirement under that act that this government table those audited financial statements so that the public can be protected, so that we know in fact what the government is spending.

My time has run out and I would turn it over to my colleague.

1740

**Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands):** I'm pleased to wind up the debate on this time allocation motion. Actually, I'm not pleased. I don't like time allocation motions. Basically it's an undemocratic move

by the government to invoke closure. We've seen it time after time. Over 90% of all the bills that have been presented by this government since 1995 have been time-allocated. In other words, closure has been moved and they don't want any further debate.

Governments prior to that, including Conservative governments, back during the 40-year reign up to 1995, used it very sparingly—less than 2% or 3% of the time.

I don't like time allocation motions, particularly with respect to this motion here. This bill that we're dealing with affects about 20 different acts, acts from the Tobacco Tax Act to the Fuel Tax Act to the health care system to the education system to the so-called Taxpayer Protection Act. You can just go on and on. This is not just a small, little bill that we're dealing with here; it's a bill that goes over 70 pages long. It deals with a wide variety of issues. Of course, the interesting one is the Taxpayer Protection Act, where the government, that a year ago said, "There can never be tax increases again without it going to the people," now, in its very first year since it passed that act, has had to renege on that promise and say, "In this particular case, we have to actually pass this bill so that we can get out of the act that we passed last year." That's pretty awful, Speaker. I think you'd agree with me on that.

I don't want to spend time on that. Even though I'd love to spend the rest of the few minutes that I have to talk about time allocation, because I really think that closure is wrong, wrong, wrong for our parliamentary system, there are so many issues to talk about, such as health care funding. I think the government loves to say, "Health care funding has gone up from \$17.4 billion seven years ago to \$25 billion now." It's a tremendous increase; I agree. It's also interesting that the federal government over the last two to three years has put back in an additional \$2.5 billion of that increase. I think it's also interesting to note that I don't get too excited about the fact that 47% of all our expenditures now are in health care. If that's where the need is, then that's where the money should be spent. We live in an aging society where people need more medical help, because we all grow older. We live in a society that increases in Ontario by over 100,000 people per year. We've got an additional 700,000 people since 1995, so obviously we're going to have to spend more money in these areas. I don't get too excited about that.

I think the fundamental question that people have to ask is, "Do we have a better health care system now than we did seven years ago?" When you and I and our parents and our children need to go to a hospital or need to see a doctor, are they more or less available, and would the treatment be better or worse than it was seven years ago? I would say the vast majority of people who have had to use the system during the last seven years would say it's worse, and it's worse in a number of different respects. Waiting lists are much longer. Emergency departments are overcrowded. The family doctor shortage that we have, in just about every community

you can think of, is a major, major problem, even for the people who have lived in this province for 40 or 50 years. I know families, where their family doctor has retired or has gone down to the States, that are not able to get a family doctor.

This leads me to my next issue: why isn't the government using more nurse practitioners? I received a letter from a nurse practitioner student in the Kingston area. I'll take a couple of minutes to read parts of this letter. She's an individual who has just graduated from the system and wants to work as a nurse practitioner.

Among other things, she says, "There are approximately 467 nurse practitioners registered in Ontario; however, less than half of these individuals are being utilized fully." We know that. The government hasn't provided funding, in this budget or in previous budgets, for the people who are nurse practitioners who could be taking some of that doctor shortage away to the extent that they could be meeting some of the needs that doctors aren't meeting. Why aren't we utilizing these people? We train these people across the province, but for some reason we're not providing the funding for them. They could deal with a lot of the shortages that are out there in our health care system.

I know the government loves to bring up these statistics, where they say, "We're funding another 25 or 50." What I'm saying is, get enough money to get every one of these 467 nurse practitioners who are currently registered in Ontario—get them enough funding so that we can put them all to work and deal with some of the medical doctor shortage situations.

This individual goes on to say, "I find it disheartening that I have the much-needed knowledge and skill to provide care to those within the province of Ontario but due to the lack of funding the possibility of moving to other provinces or even ... to the United States is becoming an option to consider," more and more.

I am simply saying to the government, take a look at that program. We've got all sorts of foreign-trained doctors driving cabs here in the city of Toronto. We've got all these doctor and nursing shortages across the province. Why aren't we utilizing them to a much greater extent?

Even the Premier talked about it the other day in Kitchener, apparently. Today, of course, in the House he said he doesn't want to interfere with the work of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Nobody is telling him to interfere with them, but he can certainly tell them, "Look, we are in charge in the province of Ontario and we want more doctors who are qualified according to our standards, qualified in this province and licensed in this province." Surely, that's not interfering with the actual qualification process, but he could certainly speed it along so that the College of Physicians and Surgeons can in effect have examinations or qualify these people in a much faster way than is currently the case so that these people can be utilized in the areas where have doctor shortages.

I see my time is almost up and there are so many other issues to talk about, and perhaps I'll have an opportunity

to speak about them tonight. When you look at the debt of this province—this government loves to say how they managed the economy well. The debt in this province, according to your own document, has gone up from \$90 billion to \$110 billion.

The other one that I always find very interesting is that we spend more on financing the debt than we do on all the social services in this province. This budget should not be passed. It's going in the wrong direction. It is not doing justice to the people of Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker:** Mr Baird has moved government notice of motion number 33. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 1748 to 1758.*

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

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Gill, Raminder	Newman, Dan
Baird, John R.	Guzzo, Garry J.	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Hardeman, Ernie	Runciman, Robert W.
Beaubien, Marcel	Hastings, John	Sampson, Rob
Chudleigh, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Spina, Joseph
Clark, Brad	Jackson, Cameron	Sterling, Norman W.
Clement, Tony	Klees, Frank	Stockwell, Chris
Coburn, Brian	Marland, Margaret	Tascona, Joseph N.
Cunningham, Dianne	Martiniuk, Gerry	Turnbull, David
Dunlop, Garfield	Mazzilli, Frank	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Ecker, Janet	McDonald, AL	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Brenda	Miller, Norm	Witmer, Elizabeth
Eves, Ernie	Molinari, Tina R.	Wood, Bob
Flaherty, Jim	Munro, Julia	Young, David
Galt, Doug	Murdoch, Bill	
Gilchrist, Steve	Mushinski, Marilyn	

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

#### Nays

Bartolucci, Rick	Curling, Alvin	Martel, Shelley
Bisson, Gilles	Duncan, Dwight	Martin, Tony
Caplan, David	Gerretsen, John	Phillips, Gerry
Cleary, John C.	Gravelle, Michael	Prue, Michael
Conway, Sean G.	Hampton, Howard	Pupatello, Sandra
Cordiano, Joseph	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramsay, David
Crozier, Bruce	Levac, David	Ruprecht, Tony

**Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers):** The ayes are 46; the nays are 21.

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

About an hour ago I made a ruling and I was asked, quite properly, by the House leader for the official opposition to give a public explanation. The member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex requested on a point of order to introduce a special guest, and he was told quite properly by the clerks that that time should come from the debating time of his caucus. That is because the debating time is a little bit inflexible during a motion when debate is shared equally.

Immediately thereafter, the member for Davenport rose on a point of order and took time to make an introduction of some other guests. I of course don't control the clock or the time, and so I indicated that I thought the member for Northumberland should be able to recuperate the minute that was used by the different caucus. I don't have any control over that, so it didn't

happen. So I hope that is the explanation that you wanted.

I hope you're not only happy but hungry. It being 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 6:45.

*The House adjourned at 1802.*

*Evening meeting reported in volume B.*

## OTHER BUSINESS

<b>Visitor</b>	
Mr McDonald.....	1322
<b>Border security</b>	
Mr DeFaria.....	1323
<b>Notice of dissatisfaction</b>	
Mr Kennedy.....	1326

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 26 juin 2002

### DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

<b>Soins à domicile</b>	
M <sup>me</sup> Boyer.....	1321

### PREMIÈRE LECTURE

<b>Loi de 2002 sur le traitement paritaire des rapports officiels en deux langues</b> , projet de loi 145, <i>M. Bisson</i> Adoptée.....	1322
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la prorogation des projets pilotes ayant trait aux dispositifs photographiques reliés aux feux rouges</b> , projet de loi 149, <i>M. Sterling</i> Adoptée.....	1322
<b>Loi de 2002 sur les maisons de soins</b> , projet de loi 162, <i>M<sup>me</sup> McLeod</i> Adoptée.....	1323
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la protection des consommateurs d'essence</b> , projet de loi 163, <i>M. Crozier</i> Adoptée.....	1323
<b>Loi de 2002 sur l'interdiction de construire des restaurants permettant les services à l'auto dans Toronto</b> , projet de loi 164, <i>M. Bryant</i> Adoptée.....	1323

### DEUXIÈME LECTURE

<b>Loi de 2002 sur les administrateurs et les dirigeants de Hydro One Inc.</b> , projet de loi 80, <i>M. Stockwell</i> Adoptée.....	1324
--	------

### TROISIÈME LECTURE

<b>Loi de 2002 sur la gestion des éléments nutritifs</b> , projet de loi 81, <i>M<sup>me</sup> Johns</i> Adoptée.....	1325
<b>Loi de 2002 sur la délivrance des enfants de l'exploitation sexuelle</b> , projet de loi 86, <i>M. Young</i> Adoptée.....	1325

### QUESTIONS ORALES

<b>Traitement des rapports officiels</b>	
M. Bisson.....	1335
Mr Eves.....	1335

# CONTENTS

Wednesday 26 June 2002

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

<b>Mater's Mortgages</b>	
Mr Bradley.....	1319
<b>Events in Caledonia</b>	
Mr Barrett.....	1319
<b>Incineration</b>	
Ms Di Cocco.....	1319
<b>Cambridge Memorial Hospital</b>	
Mr Martiniuk.....	1320
<b>World cycling championship</b>	
Mr Agostino.....	1320
<b>Elvis Zovic</b>	
Mr Galt.....	1320
<b>Children with special needs</b>	
Mr Gravelle.....	1320
<b>Timmins mining project</b>	
Mr Bisson.....	1321
<b>Police Officers of the Year</b>	
Mrs Marland.....	1321
<b>Home care</b>	
Mrs Boyer.....	1321

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

<b>Standing committee on justice and social policy</b>	
Mr Barrett.....	1322
Report adopted.....	1322
<b>Standing committee on regulations and private bills</b>	
Mr Marchese.....	1322
Report adopted.....	1322

## FIRST READINGS

<b>Official Reports in Two Languages Parity Act, 2002, Bill 145, Mr Bisson</b>	
Agreed to.....	1322
<b>Red Light Cameras Pilot Projects Extension Act, 2002, Bill 149, Mr Sterling</b>	
Agreed to.....	1322
Mr Sterling.....	1322
<b>Care Homes Act, 2002, Bill 162, Mrs McLeod</b>	
Agreed to.....	1323
Mrs McLeod.....	1323
<b>Gasoline Consumer Protection Act, 2002, Bill 163, Mr Crozier</b>	
Agreed to.....	1323
Mr Crozier.....	1323
<b>Ban on Drive-Through Restaurants in Toronto Act, 2002, Bill 164, Mr Bryant</b>	
Agreed to.....	1323
Mr Bryant.....	1323

## MOTIONS

<b>House sittings</b>	
Mr Stockwell.....	1323
Agreed to.....	1324

## SECOND READINGS

<b>Hydro One Inc. Directors and Officers Act, 2002, Bill 80, Mr Stockwell</b>	
Agreed to.....	1324

## THIRD READINGS

<b>Nutrient Management Act, 2002, Bill 81, Mrs Johns</b>	
Agreed to.....	1325
<b>Rescuing Children from Sexual Exploitation Act, 2002, Bill 86, Mr Young</b>	
Agreed to.....	1325

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr Kennedy.....	1326
Mr Eves.....	1326
Mr Hampton.....	1328
Mrs Witmer.....	1328
Mr Marchese.....	1328
<b>Hydro dam safety</b>	
Mr Conway.....	1327
Mr Stockwell.....	1327
<b>Competitive electricity market</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	1327
Mr Eves.....	1327
Mr Stockwell.....	1328
<b>Environmental assessment</b>	
Mr Ramsay.....	1329
Mr Stockwell.....	1329
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Ms Mushinski.....	1330
Mr Newman.....	1330
<b>Slot machines</b>	
Mr Duncan.....	1330
Mr Young.....	1330
<b>Regional immigration strategy</b>	
Mr Tascona.....	1331
Mr DeFaria.....	1331
<b>Environmental protection</b>	
Mr Hampton.....	1331
Mr Stockwell.....	1331
<b>Doctor shortage</b>	
Mrs Papatello.....	1332
Mr Eves.....	1332
<b>Ontario disaster relief assistance program</b>	
Mr Stewart.....	1333
Mr Coburn.....	1333

## Immigrant and refugee services

Mr Ruprecht.....	1333
Mrs Witmer.....	1333
Mr DeFaria.....	1334

## Ontario Institute of Technology

Mr O'Toole.....	1334
Mrs Cunningham.....	1334

## Treatment of official reports

Mr Bisson.....	1335
Mr Eves.....	1335

## Consumer protection

Mr Crozier.....	1335
Mr Stockwell.....	1336

## PETITIONS

### Children's health services

Mr Conway.....	1336
Mr Lalonde.....	1337

### Health care

Mr O'Toole.....	1336, 1337
-----------------	------------

### Long-term-care facilities

Mr Cleary.....	1336
----------------	------

### Mater's Mortgages

Mr Bradley.....	1337
-----------------	------

### Competitive electricity market

Mr Ruprecht.....	1337
------------------	------

### Education funding

Mr Caplan.....	1338
----------------	------

### Affordable housing

Mr Bryant.....	1338
----------------	------

### Hydro One

Mr Caplan.....	1338
----------------	------

### Ontario disability support program

Mr Bisson.....	1338
----------------	------

### Sale of schools

Mr Ruprecht.....	1339
------------------	------

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

### Time allocation, government notice of motion number 33, Mr Stockwell

Mr Wettlaufer.....	1339
Mr Crozier.....	1341
Ms Martel.....	1342
Mr Beaubien.....	1345
Mr Ruprecht.....	1347
Mr Martin.....	1348
Mr Galt.....	1350
Mr Levac.....	1351
Mr Cordiano.....	1351
Mr Gerretsen.....	1352
Agreed to.....	1353

Continued overleaf