



No. 31B

N° 31B

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

Fourth Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Quatrième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 24 June 2003

Mardi 24 juin 2003

Speaker
Honourable Gary Carr

Président
L'honorable Gary Carr

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Copies of Hansard

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

Exemplaires du Journal

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



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 24 June 2003

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 24 juin 2003

The House met at 1845.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon Tina R. Molinari (Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): I seek unanimous consent to move a motion prior to orders of the day without notice, amendment or debate respecting the interim supply motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Do we have—no.

The Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Hon Mrs Molinari: I move government notice of motion number 57: That the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2003. Such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

1850

The Acting Speaker: Mrs Molinari has moved government notice of motion number 57. Minister?

Hon Mrs Molinari: Interim supply is one of the most important motions that is proposed by the government of the Legislature. It is this motion that, if passed, gives government the authority to continue its many programs that benefit the people of Ontario and to operate the daily business of government. Approval of the motion for interim supply gives the government permission to send money to municipalities, hospitals and school boards around the province; it gives permission to pay social assistance benefits to those in need; and it gives permission to pay the salaries of Ontario's civil service.

The motion for interim supply does not specify a dollar amount but proposes to grant authority to spend for a specific period of time. Approval of this motion for interim supply would cover the six-month period from April 1, 2003, to September 30, 2003. Without spending authority, statutory payments can continue to be made. These payments include interest on the public debt and all payments from special purpose accounts. However, unlike the statutory payments, scheduled and unscheduled payments could not be made without passage of an interim supply motion. These include payments to nursing homes, hospitals, doctors, municipalities, general

welfare recipients, children's aid societies and suppliers' accounts.

Teachers and health care professionals are just some of the members of the broader public service whose salaries are paid for by our government through the taxes of all working Ontarians—dedicated professionals like our teachers and professors, who prepare our youth for tomorrow, and doctors, nurses and other health care professionals, who care for the sick and the elderly.

I know the hard work that these professionals do. My sister is a nurse at the Barrie hospital, and she tells me about the dedicated staff and colleagues she has, who work so hard for all of our elderly and sick in our hospitals. I want to thank all of the health care workers and all the public service workers for all the work that they do on our behalf. Many of them live in Thornhill and many of them work in Thornhill, my wonderful riding. I'm certainly grateful for all of the work they do.

Interim supply gives our government the authority to spend, but we must make responsible choices to ensure we stay on the course of prosperity. Since 1995, our government has been pursuing a very deliberate plan to place Ontario on the path of growth and prosperity and to keep it there. It's very important that we keep our plan of growth and prosperity.

Our sound fiscal plan has produced historic results. We have added over 1,078,000 jobs to the province's economy since 1995. This year we are on track to achieving our fifth consecutive balanced budget. That's five balanced budgets.

Interjections.

Hon Mrs Molinari: I know that the opposition heckles over five balanced budgets, something they were not able to achieve, but this government has achieved it. Not only that, but we have also paid down \$5 billion toward the debt. We have introduced 225 tax cuts, 17 of them introduced in this year's budget. We have also introduced the equity in education tax credit, which is one tax credit that is very, very important to my riding of Thornhill. There are several parents in the riding of Thornhill who feel that this is an absolute, important tax credit, an absolute initiative for this government to take on.

I want to quote some of the members of the Thornhill riding who have said how important this is. We have Rabbi Israel Janowski, who is a Thornhill parent with kids in a Jewish day school. He's also a founder and former president of the Ontario Association of Jewish Day Schools. This is an individual who's very involved

in his community, who is very, very involved in the school system. This is what Rabbi Janowski said:

“We are happy that the Eves government has taken into account the educational needs of each child in the province. We are tremendously appreciative of the support we have received from this government and others who were supportive of this initiative.”

It’s not just people from Thornhill who believe that the equity in education tax credit is a fair tax credit for the people who choose to send their children to a school other than the publicly funded system. John Vanasselt of the Ontario Alliance of Christian Schools has said:

“We are very pleased that the Ernie Eves government has reaffirmed its commitment to parental choice in education by restoring the tax credit.

“We also support the government’s initiative to keep parents informed as to how our schools evaluate students’ progress.”

These are just two of many, many people who support this government on the decisions that this government makes, especially with respect to giving parental choice, because that’s what this tax credit is about.

Robert Samery, a parent of three children attending Jewish day schools, has said, “This announcement has brought Ontario back in line with most other Canadian provinces by providing parents choice and empowerment in their children’s education.”

These are just some examples of what people from Thornhill and across the province are saying about some of the policies of this government.

We introduced a new set of fundamentals to fiscal and economic management of this province. We took control of our finances through cutting waste and prudent fiscal management. This resulted in balanced budgets. Did I say “five years of balanced budgets”? It’s five years of balanced budgets and debt repayment—another \$5 billion in debt repayment.

We introduced disciplined management of public spending to focus on key priorities and to ensure more efficient and effective delivery of government programs and services.

We cut taxes to raise personal incomes, to make Ontario more competitive with all of our trading partners and to support investment and job creation.

We cleared away unnecessary regulations that were weakening investor and employer confidence and that were crippling investment and initiative. To date, we have eliminated more than 2,000 unnecessary and outdated regulations.

We have introduced balanced and innovative regulatory approaches across the government and improved regulatory protections in a number of areas such as clean water and clean air, which are all very important to the people of Thornhill and to the people of Ontario.

A sound regulatory system can do much to promote confidence, efficiency, competitiveness and growth while protecting health, safety, the environment and other vital public interests.

We have also implemented measures to increase transparency and accountability of the government’s report-

ing. On April 1, 2003, the government’s spending authority and appropriation control moved to the accrual basis of accounting, which significantly increases the government’s accountability to the taxpayers. One of the main priorities and thrusts of this party and this government is to be accountable to our taxpayers. A lot of our policies reflect the accountability that we feel any government has to those who elect them and put them in office.

We made key investments in priority areas to meet the needs of our growing population, to improve the quality of life of our citizens, to build opportunity and to support economic growth.

The average private sector forecast for real growth is 2.6% in 2003 and 3.4% in 2004. Strong economic fundamentals reinforced by sound fiscal policies will help to maintain Ontario’s healthy economic growth, despite the negative economic impact of SARS and the higher-than-expected Canadian dollar.

1900

Ours is the first government to receive nine credit rating improvements from Standard and Poor’s, including four upgrades to our long-term rating—five balanced budgets, for those in the opposition who are asking; five years of balanced budgets, \$5 billion toward our debt.

Mr David Christopherson (Hamilton West): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Standard and Poor’s said they don’t have a balanced budget.

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order. I apologize, Minister.

Hon Mrs Molinari: I will reiterate that ours is the first government to receive—

Hon Robert W. Runciman (Minister of Public Safety and Security): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: An NDPer wouldn’t know a balanced budget if he tripped over one.

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order either. Let’s not do that this evening.

Hon Mrs Molinari: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but that was an important interruption. I value my colleague’s input on any debate that we’re having in the Legislature.

I do want to reiterate that ours is the first government to receive nine credit rating improvements from Standard and Poor’s, including four upgrades to our long-term rating. There are, of course, other indicators that reflect the strength of our economy. Ontario’s unemployment rate is 7.1%. That’s lower than the national rate of 7.8%.

Since our government took office in 1995, 618,292 fewer people in Ontario depend on welfare. These are people who have found jobs; these are people who are now working. Our government believes in a hand up, not a hand out. These people are now working. They have the dignity of a job. That’s what this government has been able to provide for these individuals. Consumer confidence is up 20%; housing starts are up over 114%; real disposable income has increased by nearly 21%; Ontario’s economy has grown more than 32%, compared to just over 28% in the rest of Canada. It’s clear that Ontario is leading the way in Canada in economic growth

and prosperity. We have created a province where people want to come, live, work and raise a family because it's a province of prosperity.

Revenues to pay for programs and services have risen by \$14 billion last year. By the end of the current fiscal year, those revenues are expected to have risen by \$16 billion. Since when, you might ask. Since we began cutting taxes. That's when it all started. It's cutting taxes that created the prosperity that we have in Ontario.

The opposition members don't want to believe it, but it's clear, it's fact, it's true. Cutting taxes raises revenue and allows the government to invest in priority areas such as health care, education and the environment. We have achieved these results by listening to the people of Ontario and by moving forward with a sound fiscal plan. We have put in place the right fundamentals to help protect the provincial economy from unexpected events.

Now more than ever, it is time to stick to an economic plan that works. It's clear that this is a plan that works. The foundation of strong economic fundamentals that we have put in place will help Toronto and Ontario bounce back more quickly from the impact of SARS.

On May 28, 2003, our government announced \$720 million worth of measures to support the health care sector and front-line employees following the recent outbreak of SARS. And where is the federal government?

Mr John Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands): In Ottawa.

Hon Mrs Molinari: They're nowhere to be seen. That's right, they're in Ottawa. I don't know what they're doing in Ottawa. They're certainly not supporting Ontario.

Interjection: And Dalton McGuinty's making excuses.

Hon Mrs Molinari: And Dalton McGuinty's making excuses for their federal cousins, as we've seen today during question period. That they think \$250 million is—

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It's been called to my attention that the minister has called the wrong motion, that her House leader's staff wanted her to call the notice of motion number 56, not notice of motion number 57. In the interests of this government being accommodated, I'm prepared to let this debate collapse and the minister can then call notice of motion number 56—if she wants, I'll call it—and then we can proceed with proper debate on the proper motion, because motion 56, as I understand it, is written to comply with the new requirements of the Ministry of Finance in terms of the accounting rules that have been adopted by the bureaucracy. And of course it's an interim supply motion that nobody here was going to dispute, because we received a memo from the government House leader on the Ministry of Finance letterhead indicating that this was going to be the new language being used for interim supply motions, correct? So, yes, 56 is an interim supply motion; no dispute with that.

Perhaps Mrs Molinari should be given a chance to roll back the tape and start over again, calling notice of motion number 56. My apologies for interrupting you.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Well, it's not the minister's fault because she's left there on her own.

The Acting Speaker: We have a government notice that we are debating. The order is in order. We should continue to debate it unless the minister has other views, I suspect.

Hon Mrs Molinari: I think the Speaker has spoken. It is the proper motion that we are debating here today.

On May 28, 2003, our government announced \$720 million worth of measures to support the health care sector and front-line employees following the recent outbreak of SARS. I want to say again that the federal government was nowhere to be seen with assistance for the province of Ontario for any of these funds.

This \$720 million supplements the \$118 million worth of measures to aid the tourism sector announced by the government on April 29, 2003, and the June 13 announcement that we will compensate workers who lost wages due to quarantine by public health officials.

This government has also introduced a temporary retail sales tax holiday for admissions and transient accommodation from May 1, 2003, to September 30, 2003. This initiative sends a positive signal to the tourism industry while encouraging tourists to enjoy the hotels and attractions that Ontario has to offer. The members opposite can also enjoy the attractions Ontario has to offer, especially those that are from outside of Toronto enjoy what we have in Toronto. It's a beautiful city.

Be assured that we will do whatever it takes to help Toronto recover from this setback.

The absence of the federal government in assisting Toronto is absolutely astonishing, and it's a shame that they would not consider Ontario the same way they consider other provinces that encounter the same types of disasters.

Since 1995, this government has continued to make tough decisions and responsible choices. We have focused on creating conditions to increase growth and achieve the highest quality of life for the people of Ontario.

We have stuck to our plan. In Ontario, our government has set investment priorities based on the values of everyday Ontario taxpayers. We know that these taxpayers are not reckless spenders. We know that the taxpayers know how to spend their money, and this is why we believe in tax cuts, in putting more money into their pockets and allowing them to spend the money how they see fit. We have seen that tax cuts not only create jobs but provide prosperity in the province because, when Ontarians have more money in their pockets, they're out spending money, and as they spend money it creates jobs.

1910

We know they believe in balancing their books and spending wisely, like everyone in their household balances their books and spends their money wisely. We know they want the same from this government. They expect the same from a government as they do with their own money. If a government is spending taxpayers' money, it should be spent as if it was your own money.

Balanced budgets, paying off the debt and making sure your decisions and everything you spend that money on is clearly necessary. It's a priority that Ontarians have. The ability to set priorities is perhaps the most important aspect of effective, efficient and accountable government planning.

The Ontario SuperBuild Corp is responsible for the strategic management of the government's investment plan, including investment in the province's own assets and transfers to capital purposes like hospitals, municipalities and post-secondary educational institutions. In 2003-04, SuperBuild will invest approximately \$3.2 billion in Ontario's infrastructure.

The government will invest over \$1 million in highway planning, expansion and rehabilitation in 2003-04. The province is also investing \$359 million in 2003-04 in transit assistance through the transit investment plan, which includes GO Transit and the renewal of municipal transit systems through the transit renewal program.

In the health sector, this fiscal year the province will invest \$504 million in hospitals, community health and long-term-care capital initiatives. This will enable hospitals and other health care providers to continue to modernize, retrofit and expand their infrastructure and services across the province.

In post-secondary education capital, \$97 million will be invested this year. Thornhill is located in York region. We've had many new students come into York region who need post-secondary education when they graduate, and what I'm hearing from my constituents is that they see this is a government that is behaving responsibly. We have looked after all of the students who will be entering post-secondary education in September. Our Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Dianne Cunningham, has worked very hard to make sure there's a place for every qualified student in Ontario in post-secondary education. Students are now being accepted to the post-secondary institutions that they selected to go to.

I want to congratulate all the students who have been accepted in post-secondary institutions. I want to wish them well as they pursue their years in post-secondary education in the province because we have some of the best colleges and universities in Ontario.

For environmental purposes, investments will be \$116 million in 2003-04, which will include \$45 million for upgrades to drinking water systems and other infrastructure at Ontario parks and \$15 million for environmental cleanup projects. The province is also investing \$15 million for ongoing implementation of Ontario's Living Legacy: \$7 million for watershed-based source protection and \$5 million to improve conservation authority dams.

SuperBuild will also continue to make investments in municipal partnership initiatives. Of the \$3.2 billion SuperBuild plans to invest in 2003-04, \$608 million is for municipal and local infrastructure. These investments need to be made to ensure Ontario's economic growth remains on the right path. The 2003 Ontario budget

reflects the priorities we heard from the people of Ontario during pre-budget consultations in 17 communities.

Economic growth, spurred by tax cuts, has enabled this government to invest in priority programs and services such as health care, education and the environment. The passage of the motion for interim supply will permit spending that specifically benefits two of these priorities: health care and education.

We have made, and continue to make, significant investments in health care to meet our commitments of improving and modernizing Ontario's hospitals. In 1995, Ontario was investing \$17.6 billion annually in health care operating expenditures. This year Ontario will invest \$27.6 billion in health care. That's an increase of \$10 billion since we came to office.

I hope all members of this Legislature will recognize the importance of passing this bill in the House this evening. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to enter this debate on this very important bill.

Mr Raminder Gill (Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to take an opportunity to recognize Aileen Muan and her proud parents, Alberto and Permina Muan, who are from my great riding of Bramalea-Gore-Malton-Springdale and are visiting us this evening. Please welcome them.

The Acting Speaker: Welcome.

That, of course, is not a point of order. Further debate?

Mr Gerretsen: Let me just say that obviously we want to see that transfer payments are being made, so that all the different organizations around the province that depend on provincial funding, such as our nursing homes, our homes for the aged, our universities, colleges and schools, get their funding; there's no question about that. Also, I think I should pay tribute to the thousands upon thousands of hard-working, dedicated civil servants we have working for the province, either directly or in one of the institutions I talked about before.

I found it very interesting that when the minister talked about accountability, she wouldn't agree with me that perhaps this is the perfect time to pass Bill 6, which I introduced in this House and that had second reading in the previous session and has gone through committee and is ready for a final vote in this House any time it's called. It basically calls for greater accountability for hospitals, universities, colleges and other organizations that receive grants and other transfer payments from the government or crown agencies.

It would give the Provincial Auditor the power to basically follow the money, because you and I know, Speaker, that probably somewhere around 60% of all the funds being spent by the province are not being spent by the province directly but in effect are being expended by the transfer agents I mentioned before. I can't for the life of me understand why a government that has loved talking about accountability for the last eight years is unwilling to actually implement a bill—to call a bill for third reading that has been given approval in committee, that has been given second reading in the House—that would allow exactly that to happen: to have greater

accountability as to how taxpayers' money is being spent. They're all talking about accountability, but when you get right down to it, they don't mean a word of it.

I also think it's kind of interesting, for those people who may be watching who saw the earlier kerfuffle as to what motion was actually being called, that we may have a major problem here. It is my understanding that since the government has now gone to an accrual method of accounting, order number 56 should have been called and not number 57. I think the government has made another huge mistake by calling the wrong order, and this may very well cause us to be here on Friday and on Monday—not on Tuesday, since that's Canada Day—and we'll sit the whole summer. A government that's been in charge for eight years now—to not even get the proper motion before the House, to make sure that the transfer payments are being made to the nursing homes and the homes for the aged and all the other institutions out there and to pay our own civil servants, is a pretty sad state of affairs. I hope the government can get its act together. If not, well, we'll have to be back here next week as well.

1920

I like to refer to the last eight years as the cruel years—the eight cruel years. Yes, some people are better off than they were in 1995, but you and I know, Speaker, that an awful lot of people out there are a lot worse off. I look at government as being the institution that levels the playing field amongst those who have and those who haven't as far as getting health care services, as far as getting educational services out there, so that everyone has an equal opportunity and an equal chance in life. That's what the role of government should be, whether we're talking about the provincial, the national or the local level.

In that regard, this government has failed the people of Ontario about as dramatically and as dastardly as you can think of. The people at the lower end of the totem pole, the people who need help and assistance, whether they're the vulnerable in hospitals or the elderly in our long-term-care facilities, are the people who have been failed, whether it's the student out there who is now paying 40% more in tuition fees, or the student for whom the OSAP loans are more and more difficult to get, or the person who lives on an Ontario disability pension. You can just go on and on. Those people are a lot worse off. You may very well recall that within the first couple of months of this government taking over in 1995, the first thing they did was cut the social assistance payments for those people who need it by 22%. That was sort of an indication of the eight cruel years that followed.

That continues. They like to make a great issue about the senior citizen tax credit program. Obviously they're trying to buy the election, or a certain number of people in the electorate who will be enticed by it. There is a certain amount of enticement for that. I can well imagine, if you're sitting there in a home and somebody says to you, "You're going to get the education portion back of your property taxes," that there's a certain kind of appeal to that.

We on this side of the House are saying that Frank Stronach doesn't need \$27,000. A lot of the other people too who live in multi-million dollar homes don't need a rebate of \$20,000 to \$25,000. The people who really need the help are the people who are in our nursing homes, so that they can get more personal care and nursing care service. You may recall that right now we rank absolutely dead last in the 10 jurisdictions that this government has studied in the amount and the number of hours of nursing and personal care that we're able to provide to people in nursing homes and long-term-care facilities.

We're saying, you want to spend \$450 million? Don't give it to all the seniors out there; give it to those seniors who need it. Spend \$225 million of that in our nursing homes, and spend it in our long-term-care facilities and homes for the aged. Spend the other \$225 million in home care so that particularly elderly people can stay in their own home much longer. That's the much-preferred situation for everybody. Everybody would love to stay in their own home as long as possible, but some people need help.

When you look at all the people who have been cut off from home care over the last four to five years—that \$225 million, according to the Ontario Long Term Care Association, is what they need to give to various community care access centres around the province so that there is enough money in the system for home care so that people aren't arbitrarily cut off once they exceed 60 hours per month of home care.

That's where the priorities should be. We say, yes, invest \$450 million in the seniors of this province. But at least do it for those seniors that need help in either home care or in nursing homes.

Let's talk about a couple of other issues, since we're allowed to do this under this motion, even though this appears to be the wrong motion and we may have to go through all this again. The SARS money: a perfect example where you have this government basically trying to set up the federal government as the bad guys.

Dalton McGuinty brought a motion forward today—actually it was yesterday; it was placed on the order paper today—which basically says in its most simplistic terms, "Why don't we have the Provincial Auditor actually audit the expenses that have been incurred by hospitals and other suppliers?" I have the exact motion here; let me just read it to you. I'll read the entire motion to you: "In order to strengthen the province's rightful case for disaster relief and other financial assistance for SARS from the federal government, the Ontario Legislative Assembly hereby exercises its authority under ... the Audit Act to direct the Provincial Auditor to prepare a report outlining the amount of additional expenditures that have been or will need to be incurred as a result of SARS by the government of Ontario, its municipalities, hospitals and all other organizations."

What could be more direct than that: let's get an independent assessment of how much the different organizations are actually out as a result of money being

required for SARS? It seems to me that if you want to make the case to the federal government that the province of Ontario, in one way or another, is actually out that money, that's how you build a business case.

But for a minister of the crown to get up one day and say, "We need \$700 million from the federal government," and say a couple of days later, "Well, I think it's a billion dollars," etc, to my way of thinking, is totally unaccountable and totally unrealistic. Surely to goodness, whether you're in Ontario or anywhere else in Canada, any other level of government from whom you're trying to get assistance has a right to get a report prepared that is done in a professional way. There is no better way to do that than through the independence of the Office of the Provincial Auditor.

Yet what happened here today? Well, there was a lot of name-calling during question period. As a matter of fact, Mr Speaker, you were almost forced into a situation where you were asked to throw a number of members out for disorderly behaviour etc. To my way of thinking, the government could easily have gone along with this motion and built a strong case so that the people of Ontario could benefit in a more direct way from the amount of money they're going to get from the federal government. That's how you do it.

Let's talk about one other issue that's out there, the hydro issue. I spoke about this issue at some length some time ago. I remember a speech that was given by the member from Nipissing-Pembroke. I guess tomorrow or the next day will be his last day in the House after 28 years of meritorious service in this House. This gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to Sean Conway. He's always been a mentor to the people of eastern Ontario, particularly in the days when we weren't as fortunate to have as many Liberal seats as we have today.

He made the point, with which I totally agree, that one of the main problems when it comes to hydro is the lack of supply. We have to build the supply of hydroelectric power in this province by somewhere between 20% and 30% in the almost immediate future. Why is nobody on the government side really addressing that issue? Instead, we've taken the easy way out—and I know we voted in favour of it as well—of guaranteeing everybody a rate of 4.3 cents per kilowatt hour for the next three years.

You and I know, Speaker, that since that's been in effect, it has cost the taxpayers of Ontario close to a billion dollars, because we've had to buy that power outside Ontario—in the States or wherever we buy power to make up the 20% to 30% deficit we currently have—at much more than 4.3 cents a kilowatt hour.

To me it's almost totally unsustainable to keep that going for a long period of time. Yes, the ratepayer will be happy for a certain period of time, because obviously the rates are going to be flattened and not have the tremendous gyrations they had in them last year at this time. On the other hand, are we any better off if we add another \$4 billion to \$5 billion to the public debt or to the hydro debt of this province during that period of time? That's what we have to come to terms with.

1930

We have already said that one of the first issues a McGuinty government would have to deal with, should we be fortunate enough to win the next election, is the hydro situation.

As I indicated before, I think it was very interesting last week that the government of Ontario finally approached the government of Manitoba to see what could be done with respect to importing some power or getting involved in a major power project in Manitoba, from which Ontario could benefit as well. I think we have to make those same approaches to the province of Quebec. We have to do something about installing Beck 3, as it were, in Niagara Falls.

I certainly don't pretend to be an expert in this whole energy situation, but I think it's a known fact that in the long run, hydroelectric power is probably the cheapest power to produce by far. So why aren't we looking at that, particularly when you look at the fact that some of our nuclear plants have in effect been shut down, or their maintenance and repair program is taking much longer? Today we heard—and I've forgotten whether it was Pickering or one of the other nuclear plants—in effect, it's not coming on-stream; there has been a delay in that again.

The government has had to resort to putting temporary generators outside some cities. Obviously, if it's necessary, it's necessary, but it certainly gives me the impression that it almost speaks to something of the Third World. It's the kind of thing you expect to see in an undeveloped country, but certainly not in the developed economy that we have here in Ontario.

I say that there has been an awful lot of grandstanding on that issue, but what has the government really done to deal with that particular issue? It's something that has to be dealt with almost immediately if we should be fortunate enough to form the next government.

In the final few moments I have left—and maybe I have no more time left, if my timing is correct. Under these new rules, our time to speak is limited. There's so much to say, particularly since this may be the last opportunity before the next election. There are so many issues to talk about. We could be talking about health care issues, education issues, environment issues or the smog situation out there, but unfortunately I won't have any further time to do that.

Speaker, I wish you a good summer and I hope we'll see you back again in the fall. With that, I'll just take my seat.

Mr Dwight Duncan (Windsor-St Clair): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe that we have a serious issue in front of us with respect to the propriety of this particular motion.

Mr Kormos: It's not improper. It's just not good.

Mr Duncan: Not the propriety but the wording of it; excuse me. The government submitted two government notices of motion on to the order paper, number 56 and number 57. We are debating number 57. I have in my hand a briefing note from the Ministry of Finance that was forwarded to us by the government House leader—

The Acting Speaker: I heard this point of order from the member from Niagara Centre. There is nothing out of order with number 57.

Mr Duncan: Mr Speaker, if I might: we have a briefing note here that says the wording of this motion is not—

The Acting Speaker: That might be. However, the order that is before the House is in order.

Mr Kormos: What the opposition House leader was trying to say—I'm using my speaking time now, you see.

The Acting Speaker: Start the clock.

Mr Kormos: Let's get going. Thank you.

Of course the motion is in order. If it hadn't been in order, the Clerk would have said it isn't in order. But the minister called the wrong motion, and here we in the opposition parties have been scrambling, trying to help the government. Look, I concede that it doesn't happen often but I'm embarrassed for the government this evening. They've had a bad month in terms of the press. The last thing we need is for this government to literally blow another sessional day on the wrong interim supply motion. Good grief. As it is, the government won't be able to get its Bill 41—remember the budget bill that it promised would be moved, debated and passed before the House rose on June 26? Sorry, folks, it's not going to happen. Yikes.

What Mr Duncan was trying to tell you—and he's going to take the floor in short order himself—is that the government filed two notices of motion. Now if you take a look at the record, you'll see that your motion number 57 is consistent with interim supply motions of the past—no two ways about it. I, for instance, sent one of the legislative staff down to the library just a few minutes. On October 22, 2002, Mr Tsubouchi moved the right motion. That was in the wording of notice of motion number 57.

The problem is that you've amended the Financial Administration Act since then. You changed the whole nature of government accounting. There is this memo—Mr Duncan has one, I've got one, half the world has one—from the legal services branch of finance. This is the high-priced help. The memo says, "Up until April 1, 2003"—that, friends, was over two months ago—"the finances of the government was based on a modified-cash accounting basis. Under this accounting basis," before April 1, 2003, "The government sought approval from the House for supply based on payments made." Listen carefully: "Transactions were booked on the finances when payments were made. This accounting system did not take into consideration that such payments were often made as the result of encumbrances made earlier, often in past fiscal years. In addition, this method of accounting did not reflect other non-cash expenses incurred by government, including depreciation on assets."

Way back in the year 2000—and I know that every member of the government caucus went to a briefing on this and recalls that briefing as if it were yesterday—"the Public Service Accounting Board recommended that

Ontario and other governments adopt an accrual accounting method for government expenses to recognize these non-cash expenses and also to recognize these non-cash expenses when the encumbrances were incurred."

"In 2002," and that's where we get to the government's amendments to Financial Administration Act, "the government moved to adopt the accrual accounting method for government finances"—this is where the big asterisk should be, this is where the underscoring should be, this is where the bold print should be—"starting with the fiscal year 2003-04," to wit today, or as Mr Marchese would say, "aujourd'hui." "The move to accrual accounting was part of the 2002 budget."

"In 2002, amendments were made to the Financial Administration Act, the Treasury Board Act, 1991 and the Ministry of Treasury and Economics Act, as part of the spring 2002 budget bill and fall 2002 budget bill, to implement the accrual accounting method for Ontario government finances."

Now I want you folks on the government benches to know that we did not support those bills, but you did. You voted for them, and indeed you used your majority to pass them. So those amendments became law and this is what the amendments did:

"The Financial Administration Act was amended to ensure that both cash and non-cash expenditures were included in the definition of appropriation in the act. The amendments had the effect of requiring"—and this is important; it should be in bold print, underscored—"that non-cash expenditures be included in estimates of expenditures submitted for consideration by the Legislature.

"Amendments to Financial Administration Act prohibited the incurring of non-cash expenses, such as depreciation on a capital asset, without an appropriation. This same restriction applies to the making of cash payments. These amendments went on to provide that this prohibition did not affect the ability of the government to make cash payments or incur non-cash expenses under the authority of a motion for interim supply passed by the House."

Perhaps there's somebody who could take this to the Hansard desk. It would save this young woman a whole lot of grief.

1940

That takes us up to the present. Now, you had two notices of motion. You had notice of motion number 56, which would have been the proper interim supply motion prior to your 2002 amendments to, among other things, the Financial Administration Act. You also filed notice of motion number 57, which is the interim supply motion that you need after your amendments. The motion that you wanted to call was 56—57, and I correct if I inverted those two—

Hon Mrs Molinari: Why did you give unanimous consent?

Mr Kormos: You don't need unanimous consent because you filed the notice of motion. What's the matter with you guys? You've tabled the notice, for Pete's sake. You don't need unanimous consent. You call it as of

right. That's why you table notices of motion. Lord love a duck. I'm not going to give you unanimous consent for anything. That's why you've got to file the notice of motion. For Pete's sake, don't go whining about how you sought unanimous consent. Of course I'm not going to give you unanimous consent. I wouldn't give you unanimous consent to tell you what the time of day is. That's the way it is around here. I didn't create that hostile climate. I didn't create that frigid antipathy between the government and opposition parties; you did.

This place used to work in a co-operative way. Yet do I get any credit for rising to the occasion? Did you give me any credit for standing up here and saying, "Ms Molinari, you called the wrong notice. You should have called notice number 56"? No, you said, "You're wrong. We're right." You did. I tried to pull you out of a jackpot and I get rebuffed in a crude way.

Interjections.

Mr Kormos: In a more civil climate, somebody would apologize to me, but I don't expect it here.

Here I am doing my best to try to pull your feet out of the fire, trying to explain to you that you're debating the wrong motion. You could have had time to beg forgiveness and sought the assistance of the opposition parties in cleaning up the mess you made—

Mr Christopherson: We're here to help.

Mr Kormos: —because, as Mr Christopherson says, "We're here to help." But, no, you want to stubbornly forge ahead. You don't want to read the memos that come from your own House leader's office. Your House leader sent me a memo explaining why motion number 56 was the right motion, as compared to motion number 57. My caucus mates reviewed that motion with me. They said, "Of course, we're going to assist the government in acquiring interim supply. We may not vote for it, but we know these things have to be done. It's part of the rigors of governing."

The problem is, here you go—and now you're going to say, "We want your co-operation," after you hurt our feelings? No, it doesn't work that way, not at all, not after you mock us and hurt our feelings and offend us. And then you want our help? No. Didn't your mama teach you nothing? When I grew up, my old grandmother was very careful to explain to me—you know, it's like Bob Dylan said: "If you live outside the law, you must be honest." The problem is that if you're going to do these sorts of things, you can't then offend the people whom you need to help you.

Far be it from me at this point to try to show you the error of your ways. I just rely upon the advice from lawyers from the Ministry of Finance—your lawyers, the ones you pay. I rely upon the advice from your government House leader. I rely upon the advice from your government House leader's staff, those hardworking people.

Here's your House leader, Mr Baird. He's aged 10 in the last 10 minutes. He's lost his hair.

Interjection: He's losing it.

Mr Kormos: You're right. He hasn't lost all of it yet, but he is clearly in the process of losing his hair, because you may have lost or blown a sessional day when time was scarce.

I suspect some of you folks over there on the government backbenches have plans for the holiday weekend. I suggest you call your partners, spouses, kids, grandkids, neighbours' kids, distant relatives. You should get on the phone and say, "Hello, my name is so-and-so, Ontario Conservative MPP. We screwed up big time in the Legislature on Tuesday night. Even though the opposition tried to help us out and tried to clean up our mess for us before it got too big and too deep, we said, 'No way; we like screwing up.'" Tory backbenchers, get on the phone and say, "We like screwing up. We did it again, and this time we're doing it on purpose. And we did it notwithstanding the best efforts of the opposition to rescue us."

Hon Mrs Molinari: That'll be the day.

Mr Kormos: Ms Molinari, thou doth protest too much. Give me a break, because we all know I tried to give you one. But no, you wouldn't respond. Look, it's not your fault. You were in here all alone. You were all alone. Nobody was helping you. I saw your caucus mates around you. They weren't concerned. They saw you going through the papers. They didn't care whether you messed up. They figured, "Oh, Ms Molinari is going to be left hanging out there to dry. She's on her own up there north of Toronto where Ms Molinari is going to run in her campaign." They're all out there looking after themselves. Boy, oh boy, don't expect your caucus mates are behind you. Look over your shoulder. They're way behind you. You can see them on the horizon like this. They're behind you all right.

Hon Helen Johns (Minister of Agriculture and Food): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I don't believe the member opposite is speaking to the bill.

The Acting Speaker: This is a motion for supply. The member for Niagara Centre.

Mr Kormos: Folks, this isn't a bill; it's a motion. If it were a bill, it would require first, second and third readings. It's a motion; it's an interim supply motion. It's a motion that has a restricted period of time for debate. It's a motion that you shouldn't have called, because it's the wrong interim supply motion because of your amendments to the Financial Administration Act.

Hon Mrs Johns: I think you're wrong.

Mr Kormos: Of course you think I'm wrong, and so does Ms Molinari. That's why your lawyers wrote a memo to everybody in this Legislature saying, "People, please be careful. Don't think you can continue to word interim supply motions in the way you always have, because this government amended the Financial Administration Act, which requires interim supply motions to be worded in this way, to wit, the way you did." Why did you file two motions? What's the matter with you guys? Why do you think there are two different motions? Because one was in compliance with the new legislation and one wasn't.

So you go ahead and finish debating this motion, and at around 9:20 we'll vote against it. I suspect you will

vote for it. It's perfectly in order, because there is nothing defective about the motion. It's just that it may not have the effect you want it to have.

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Oh, Ms Ecker. Ms Ecker will be spitting nails when she finds out about this motion. Goodness, you'll hear her from one end to the other. I remember the day Jim Flaherty bushwhacked her with the private school tax credit. I remember that day, because we were in here for the budget—was it the budget or the throne speech?

Mr Christopherson: It had to be the throne speech. We don't do budgets here.

Mr Kormos: That's right. It's been a long time.

We were in here, and there's Ms Ecker just sitting there listening, because Flaherty's the Minister of Finance at the time, and he comes out—it had to be the budget, because he comes out with the private school tax credits and I saw the O form of her mouth, and then I saw the words that followed and how she looked at Mr Flaherty. I saw her in the hallway afterwards, and her temperature had gone up around 30 degrees Celsius. She was smoking. She was on fire. I've never seen anybody that mad at a colleague here at Queen's Park. Well, that's not true. I've seen MPPs mad at colleagues—

Interjection.

1950

Mr Kormos: That's right. But it's been a long time since I've seen an MPP that mad at one of their colleagues. She'd been bushwhacked.

But if you think that performance, that little firestorm, was something, I bet you it was one heck of a cabinet meeting that followed that and possibly even some interesting exchanges in the caucus meeting, not that any of your caucus mates talk about what happens in caucus; I use my imagination to figure these things out. If you think that's something, you wait until Ms Ecker has to sit down to be told.

“You passed what motion? Are you guys nuts?” Holy moly. You haven't seen nothing yet.

Interjection: Tell her it's in order.

Mr Kormos: That's right. Say, “Ms Ecker, it's OK. The Clerk's table said it was in order.” Of course it's in order. And say, “After all, it was the opposition parties that pointed out we passed the wrong motion,” as if that'll be any justification.

Who knows? Maybe somebody is on the phone to Mrs Ecker right now, as we speak, on that cellphone. She's in the back of that Lincoln Town Car, motoring on the 401 to—

Hon Mrs Johns: Oh, come on, Peter.

Mr Kormos: Is it a Cadillac Seville, a Lincoln Town Car? Heck, I don't know. All I see are these shiny, dark cars that keep their motors running and the air conditioning going for hours at a time while they're waiting for cabinet ministers to get out to the east entrance, with little concern about conservation or smog.

All I know is they're big dark blue and black cars. What do I know about cars? I don't know cars. What do I

know about cars? But I can tell big and I can tell dark blue and black and I can tell leather interiors, because there's nothing that beats the smell of leather upholstery. You walk past that phalanx of big, black Seviles or Lincoln Town Cars or whatever the heck they are, and between the exhaust fumes you can smell the leather. So at this very moment—

Mr Ted Chudleigh (Halton): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know that Corvettes come with leather interiors, and I know the member used to drive one. Do you still have the Corvette, Peter?

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr Kormos: I've got to tell you there's nothing sweeter than a forest green 'Vette with a brown leather interior, ragtop down. Bowling Green, Kentucky, is where they're manufactured. My sisters and brothers in UAW down in the United States do one heck of a job on Corvettes, no two ways about it.

But nothing beats the overwhelming scent of the upholstery as you see half a dozen of these Town Cars and DeVilles, gagged as they are, motors running, exhausts spewing fumes, the air conditioning causing frosting of the vent lines along the roof. It's incredible sitting outside here. Gasoline is what? These expensive Cadillac cars and Lincoln Town Cars all use high-test gas. You're talking about 68.5 cents a litre on a good day, never mind when you get to the long weekend.

So Ms Ecker could, at this very moment, be on her phone, speeding back to Queen's Park.

Hon David Turnbull (Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation): On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It's quite apparent that we know the NDP used to use Town Cars. We just use low-level GMs and Fords—

The Acting Speaker: No, no. Sit down.

Mr Kormos: I want my sisters and brothers at DaimlerChrysler to understand why Chrysler has had to reduce production here. This government refuses to buy Chryslers; only Ford and—

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: That's what the member just said: only Ford and General Motors products, and I have no qualms about that. But go out to the members' parking lot and you'll count an awful lot of Lexuses and those other offshore manufactured things. In any event, I do digress.

Ms Ecker could be speeding back here now in the back of her limo just spitting. You can just see the spit as she's trying to talk on the phone with some minion who's shaking in his or her shoes, knowing that Ms Ecker is going to be in less than fine humour when she gets here because, after all and at the end of the day, this bill is pretty relevant to her. I can hear her now: “Can't you guys ever get anything right? What's the matter? I leave this place for half an hour, and you start fouling things up.”

I can see Mr Stockwell now, wherever Mr Stockwell is. Mr Stockwell is sitting in front of a large-screen TV in some high-priced hotel room somewhere with his feet up, watching the legislative channel saying, “Boy, oh boy, so

you wanted me out, did you? Look what you get for wanting me out. This never happened on my watch.” To Chris Stockwell I say, “Look, you’ve been lucky. You were fortunate because”—

Hon Mrs Johns: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, or maybe it’s a point of privilege: I think the Minister of the Environment would say it wasn’t the Conservatives who wanted him out but the Liberals and the NDP.

The Acting Speaker: That would not be a point of order either. But I would caution the member for Niagara Centre: he of course knows we should use only riding names or ministerial positions.

Mr Kormos: My apologies. The former, fired, resigned government House leader and Minister of the Environment, as he was then, who is now a backbencher and who relinquished—I mean, the most unsettling thing about losing—

Hon Mrs Johns: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the Minister of the Environment is waiting for a report from the Integrity Commissioner, and there is no problem.

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker: We’re playing games here. Let’s just go with the debate. The member from Niagara Centre.

Mr Kormos: Anyway, the former Minister of the Environment loses that title to Mr Wilson. I mean, that’s what’s really steaming and frosting him. He could have handled it had it gone to Mr Gill, who would make a very good cabinet minister, if it had gone to Mr Arnott, who would be a very good cabinet minister, or if it had gone to Mr McDonald from North Bay, who has wanted to be in cabinet from the day he was elected and who needs the profile.

But do these people get appointed to cabinet? Look what happens—you’ve got to understand what happens. When you’ve got a cabinet minister like that who’s been cut loose and set adrift, you’ve got all sorts of backbenchers rushing to get the morning papers, hoping—

Interjection.

Mr Kormos: Well, they do. This is what happens. Come on. Some of you people who were—Mr Ramsay, you were in government; you know the feeling: hoping that a minister gets cut loose so you finally get the key to the cabinet ministers’ washroom. Poor Mr Gill and Mr McDonald were falling over each other, tearing open Toronto Star, Toronto Sun and Globe and Mail boxes waiting for the day.

I’ve got to tell you, this motion is going to end up being a very interesting part of legislative history. This is going to be a day we will all remember fondly. When I read the memoirs of any number of Conservative members, I expect at least a couple of pages referring to the day the motion died. I expect there will be at least a few pages devoted to the motion that really didn’t respond to the amendments this government itself had made.

Folks, it’s been interesting. It’s been a great deal of fun. Ms Molinari, I did my best.

Mr Christopherson: He tried.

Mr Kormos: I tried. I just want you to know that if you ever need me again, I’ll be there for you. You can count on me any time.

I surrender the floor. I know my colleague Mr Christopherson, who in all likelihood will be the mayor of Hamilton next year at this time, will want to speak to this as well.

Mr John O’Toole (Durham): I’ve been waiting for some time to respond.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: Order. The member for Durham has the floor.

Mr O’Toole: I believe you’re right, Mr Speaker; I do have the floor. We’re basically at a point in time where we’re debating the motion for interim supply; I believe it’s notice of motion number 57. For those viewing, to bring some settlement to this debate, the member from Niagara Centre certainly got us what I’d consider a bit off the trail.

2000

Notice 57 says, “That the Minister of Finance be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2003. Such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply. Filed on June 23, 2003.”

Certainly it is my pleasure—as my colleague has mentioned, the interim supply bill is the most important motion that is passed by this Legislature, for all of the reasons that even the members of the opposition have outlined. For the record, the motion gives authority to the government to continue to pay its programs that benefit the people of Ontario, and to operate the daily business of government. It permits and gives permission to the government to send money to municipalities, hospitals and school boards around the province of Ontario, as well as paying social assistance benefits to those in need and paying salaries to the dedicated members of the Ontario civil service.

These payments are currently being made under the authority of a special warrant which was issued on March 26, 2003, and which authorized the incurrence of necessary expenditures to be made during the 2003-04 fiscal year. Those listening may have responded during question period a few weeks ago. They raised this outlandish remark about the \$36 billion that was being allocated at that time. This, of course, supersedes that. Because whenever the House is sitting, it’s the orders that state that it must be debated in the House and indeed voted on here.

Payment to all our funding partners and the government programs cannot be made, once these funds are exhausted, without this important motion that we’re discussing tonight. In order to ensure that all payments scheduled to be made after the Legislature recesses on June 26 reach the people who need them, it is necessary to provide the banking system, as well as the postal

system, logically, with some advance time. This lead time is especially important to individuals specifically in the far-reaching northern and other rural parts of the vast province of Ontario. I'm sure all of my colleagues in the Legislature from the north and rural areas can appreciate these concerns. It's not good enough to leave enough time so that the payments can be made just here in Toronto; all of the people in this great province of ours are important to this government as well. As such, the practice has been to provide at least five working days' lead time prior to the expiry of the current authority to ensure that payments are made everywhere. Thus, this motion must be passed without unnecessary delay or procedural wrangling. The motion for interim supply does not specify a dollar amount, but indeed provides authority to spend for a specific period of time, which I outlined just prior to these comments.

As you know, the House rules of the Ontario Legislature limit the period covered by an interim supply motion to six months. The proposed motion for interim supply would cover the six-month period from April 1, 2003, to September 30, 2003. Without spending authority, statutory payments can continue to be made. These payments include interest on public debt and all payments for special-purpose accounts. However, most scheduled and unscheduled payments cannot be paid. These include, for instance, payments to nursing homes, hospitals, doctors under OHIP, municipalities, general welfare recipients, children's aid societies and suppliers' accounts. These are suppliers that supply services to the House, as well as to other parts of the province.

The motion for interim supply must be passed to ensure that all of Ontario's dedicated civil servants continue to receive their salaries. We sometimes forget the far-reaching impact of provincial government services and those who provide them, the dedicated civil servants of Ontario. The teachers and professors who prepare our youth for productive lives, the doctors, nurses and other health care professionals and, I might remark at this point, with SARS, persons working on the front line of health care, I want to be on the record publicly for thanking them, specifically the people working at Lakeridge Health and all of the hospitals associated with Lakeridge Health, which includes three in my riding: Oshawa General Hospital, the old general hospital in Lakeridge, the Port Perry community hospital as well as the Bowmanville hospital—who care for us from the minute we are born to the last breath we take, are all members of the broader public service whose salaries are paid by our government, through the taxes of all hard-working Ontarians in this great province.

I think it's important to realize that none of these things could happen without a government that's able to generate wealth. The wealth we've been able to generate in the last eight years as the government is due to encouraging a strong economy that allows us to enjoy the standard of living that we all share in this great province.

To illustrate why the motion for interim supply must be passed with expediency, it would perhaps help if I

outlined some of this government's spending commitments. Our government has an agenda of spending on those priorities that respond to the needs of Ontarians and encourage growth, job creation and prosperity. These priorities are health care, education, the environment and of course, more importantly, the infrastructure going forward.

Let's look at how supporting the motion for interim supply will benefit two of these priorities that I'll just discuss briefly: health care and education. Ontarians want and deserve a health care system that they can count on when they need it for themselves and for their families. We are making significant investments to meet our commitment of improving and modernizing Ontario's hospitals to better meet the needs of the citizens of this great province.

In 1995, Ontario was spending \$17.6 billion annually on health care. This year, Ontario will invest \$27.6 billion in health care, an increase of almost \$10 billion since this government took office in 1995. This record level of funding for health care includes specific items such as additional funding to continue to support residents in long-term-care facilities and to continue the expansion of long-term-care beds. That's the 20,000 long-term-care beds as well as the 16,000 retrofit modernized beds.

Many of the most frail senior citizens reside in our long-term-care facilities. To provide them with the additional nursing care and assistance they need, our government is providing an additional \$100 million annually, bringing year-over-year increases to this area alone of \$400 million. It also includes almost \$200 million for payments to physicians and other practitioners, including primary care renewal. I applaud the nurses and nurse practitioners who have made this great commitment during the time of SARS to make health care available to people where and when they need it. It includes almost \$200 million to cover higher utilization of Ontario drug programs and \$193 million for diagnostic and medical equipment upgrades and replacement. I know this commitment includes my riding, more specifically the CAT scan in the Bowmanville hospital. This include equipment upgrades and replacement.

Hospitals are central to our health care system. In 2003-04, Ontario will provide \$10.4 billion to support hospitals. In addition, we will provide an additional \$130 million one-time funding for diagnostic and medical equipment, which will bring the total grants to hospitals to \$10.4 billion. This is a 10% increase over the 2002 budget.

To meet these health care spending commitments, we must ensure that a new motion for interim supply be in place before this legislative session recesses.

We have also made significant commitments to education in Ontario, because a quality education is primary. For the last 10 or so hours, the Minister of Education, the Honourable Elizabeth Witmer, has been attending before the estimates committee, which I'm part of, and I'm pleased to report that in my riding in each and every case the school boards have received additional funding. If I

could just bring you up to date on education funding, it started at \$12.862 billion dollars. With what has been concentrated here in the student-focused funding model, post-Rozanski we have a commitment by the minister of \$15.325 billion to public education. I'm pleased to say that that funding includes special funding for technical education training which has been announced in my riding.

2010

I believe that all the investments we make in education pay a dividend down the road, not just for our children today but for our lifestyle tomorrow. There's always more to be said on education. I believe that the people of Ontario know that this government's record is very strongly in support of quality education, accessible, available public education, with accountability for our students and our teachers. More importantly, this government has to take the stand that education is the pathway to the future. With that, I'll leave the rest of the remarks to our very able House leader.

Mr Tony Ruprecht (Davenport): I was listening very carefully to the remarks of the Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs on interim supply. She of course said that the Conservative Party made tough decisions and that essentially they made the right choices. I would argue that, yes, in this interim supply they made tough decisions, but they didn't make the right choices. Why do I say that? Because essentially there is a fundamental difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals in terms of how we perceive government. What is the difference? First of all, has the government the right to be the defender of the public good or do we take the government to be simply a night watchman in the old days, looking around with a lantern to see that everything is OK in the old city? There is a fundamental difference here.

The minister said very clearly, "Do you know what? We want to give back to the people as much money as possible, because they know how to spend it." Who would disagree with that? Who would disagree with giving back money to the people, because it was hard-earned and they certainly have the right to make the decision on how to spend it? We'd all agree with that. There's definitely no doubt about that.

But at the same time, you have a responsibility to do the responsible decision-making that essentially you were elected for. It is not responsible for you to not give enough money to schools, to hospitals, to roads, to drinking water, to children's services, and the litany goes on and on.

Here we are: the difference. On this side, we believe in this fundamental choice, and that is that Liberals think that we are and would be the public defender of the public good. In other words, we have the responsibility to make sure there are no holes in our roads; we have the responsibility to make sure there is no gridlock; we have the responsibility to ensure that our drinking water is safe and clean and that our families are not in danger. We have the right to ensure with public money that the

Ministry of the Environment has enough inspectors. We have the right to ensure that our schools are properly funded.

When I go to the schools in my area I'm ashamed, and so should you be. There are some older schools in the older parts of our cities that have broken windows that are taped over with some plastic or cardboard because the windows have fallen out. We have a responsibility to make responsible choices to ensure our kids go to good schools, have good textbooks, have good teachers, have places where they can go swimming, have places where there are community centres. Do we have the right to expect that from the government, or do we just run around with the old lantern and see, well, nobody got killed today, so therefore everything seems to be OK and forget about the gridlock, forget about our schools and forget about our safe drinking water?

You know I'm speaking the truth. You have to give back money to the people, of course, but at the same time, it was your government that said, "We don't have enough money to give people back a tax credit for private schools." Wasn't it Ernie Eves who said that? Wasn't it he who said, "We couldn't afford it"? Was it not he who said you couldn't afford it?

Mr Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford): No.

Mr Ruprecht: I hear a no on the other side, and that is not the truth. The truth was, there was not enough money because he had back-pedalled and he said we couldn't afford it. So that's the truth. We're simply saying on this side of the House that a responsible choice would be to do equitable funding, that there should be enough money to the schools so that our kids get the best education possible, but you haven't done that, unfortunately. You haven't done that.

When I look at our roads today in my part of town in Toronto, I would be ashamed to have a visitor come, take a car and go across these roads, including some of the potholes of 401. I know Mr Kormos is driving down the highway with his big—what's he driving now? Is it a Lincoln Town Car?

Interjection.

Mr Ruprecht: He's got a motorcycle, right, with his brown boots. If he is—

Interjection.

Mr Ruprecht: Never mind if he's speeding on the highway. Don't let me even get excited about this because, do you know what? It is the Premier's name on the signs on these highways, and even those highways are not properly maintained. Even those highways have big holes in them. But should Mr Kormos be as unlucky as to drive over one of these potholes with his motorcycle, he'd be dead. He'd be dead.

Hon Mr Turnbull: You're as phony as your doctoral title.

Mr Ruprecht: I'll just not even listen to the comment the honourable member made. It has no relevance to this point.

I'm just simply saying to you, Mr Turnbull: fix the roads. You've got the power to do it. Stop your limo, get out there and look at the roads and fix the roads, fix the gridlock and do something about transportation in this city.

Hon Mr Turnbull: We did.

Mr Ruprecht: It is not true. Fix the roads. That's what we're asking you to do. And fix the schools while you're at it. Fix the schools.

Interjection.

Mr Ruprecht: The point is simply being missed. As a defender of the public good, you have responsible choices to make, and one of the responsible choices has been that the budget you claim does not have a hole in it of \$2 billion—I'm asking you, how will you make up the difference? Where will you take \$2 billion from to have a balanced budget? I'm hearing nothing. Two billion dollars is missing unless you sell some of our provincial lands; if you sell the properties that we have in the province of Ontario, you can't make up the difference. You're fooling yourself if you think that there is no \$2-billion hole in the budget.

You haven't told us what you will do, how you will spend and how you will get the \$2 billion back to fix up that hole. We're asking that question today, and we do not get an answer.

What concerns me even more is the condition of our schools, especially as it relates to private schools, because the government has now made a decision that will put up to \$3,500 into the pockets of parents who send their kids to private school. We've already withdrawn \$2 billion from the public system. If we continue with the private tax deduction for tuition fees, \$3,500 per child, we're going to have a major, major problem.

What concerns me again is this: will there be monitoring in the private schools where parents can now send their children? Is there going to be a monitoring system in place? Private schools can hire teachers who have no accreditation under this system of the Conservative government. There will be no education ministry official who will check out the curriculum. There will be no one required to administer the standardized tests that the public school students face. This is a massive difference. This is a fundamental difference that this government is introducing. We're asking you today: if you are proposing to give a tax credit which will eventually grow to \$3,500 per child per year, if you're providing a tax credit, how will you monitor the private schools? It's not in the bill.

This government has much to do. We're asking today and we're concerned, along with the Ontario Human Rights Commissioner—his name is Keith Norton, as you know. He has expressed alarm about what could happen. He's warning us all. This scheme of this government—and the truth is that Keith Norton, of course, has been a former government member. In fact, he has been a minister of a Conservative government. It is not coming from the Liberal benches; it is coming from a former minister of the Conservative government, who is saying

to you and warning you that this scheme of the Conservative government “has the potential to result in racial, ethnic and religious apartheid in our educational system, as well as intolerance and ignorance.” That, he says, will in fact happen.

2020

I'm asking this government, if the human rights commissioner, Keith Norton, is expressing alarm to this degree, what is the answer that you're providing me, without your laughter and your congenial remarks? Be serious for once and answer the question that the human rights commissioner is asking you. Give me some feedback where you can in all seriousness say to me, “Do you know what? We're not concerned about the tax credit scheme, we're not concerned about monitoring the private schools, and we're not concerned about \$3,500 per child for this tax credit scheme.” What is your answer to that? There is no answer. I hear no answer.

Interjection: We didn't hear the question.

Mr Ruprecht: You know what the question is because I repeated the question twice. There is no answer. Therefore, you should really be ashamed of foisting this system on to the taxpayer and on to the educational system in Ontario. You should hang your heads in shame. Without a monitoring system, how can you produce a bill that doesn't do what our public school system is required to do?

So it is clear. We're looking at our education critic, Gerard Kennedy, who says that 42 new private schools opened last year alone and that the enrolment has risen by 50% under the Tory watch.

Interjection: A success, eh?

Mr Ruprecht: That's a success all right, but at the same time you must understand that our school system is more than simply a factory for learning. It is a system that has produced first-class citizenry in proposing and in educating the masses of our ethnocultural groups that come from all over the world. They come into one classroom, they get to know each other, and they therefore take a great educational experience back home because they get to know and to understand different cultures.

So it is clear: this kind of system that is in the private schools will not have the kind of educational requirements or the kind of educational experience we've had in the past. You're destroying that. You're destroying a fundamental principle of giving every student in Ontario the right to be exposed to a multicultural and a multi-racial experience. You're taking that away from our students. You're giving a right to every tribe to have his or her own school so that they can be all together by themselves and consequently not have the experience that others will have. That is a right that every student should have in the province of Ontario.

Finally, let me simply say this, which concerns me a great deal. We've had some reports by Statistics Canada in the newspapers, reports that have been very, very interestingly analyzed. It says in this newspaper article alone that the poverty rate among immigrants who have arrived here in Canada within the last five years is now

36% under your watch. Do you know what it was 10 years ago? It was 24.5%. This shows a tremendous difference. This shows that the more education a new Canadian has when he or she comes to our shores, the less likely they are to succeed and get a proper job and the less likely they are to become taxpayers, to participate and purchase our goods. Again, this is an issue that is of grave importance because it shows there is a different priority.

Their priority should be to take new Canadians and make taxpayers out of them as soon as possible, to make them productive citizens as soon as possible. That is to say that the public has to spend money in our school systems so that the new students and their parents get an educational experience that not only proposes that they will be good civic taxpayers but that they will also be citizens who pay taxes. The point is simply this: when people come to this county, they have been promised that they will be able to get a job, especially when they're highly educated. They come to Canada, and what do they find? They find that some of the doors are closed. The facts speak for themselves. I'm not making this up. This is a census by Statistics Canada. I'm not making this up or using flowery words. These are the facts. Under your administration, the poverty rate for new Canadians has increased by more than 12%.

You should be asking yourselves what you're doing wrong and what you could do to improve a system that will permit new Canadians to enter the workforce as soon as possible. But what you have done is something unheard of in any other western county: you've taken away the finances and the right, basically, of people to enter our schools and have English-as-a-second-language programs. You should invest more money in our school system so that people will be able to speak English as soon as possible. Without English, no one can enter the workforce; without English, no one can find a job; without English, you certainly can't understand an educational process. The point is to ask yourselves how you can help people when they come here to enter the workforce. The Conservative government has taken away the Ontario Welcome Houses.

Interjection.

Mr Ruprecht: Thank you. At least I'm getting through to some of you. Ontario Welcome Houses were designed so there would be someone there when new immigrants were coming in to help them find their way around to schools, to jobs and to a way so that they could make a new life in a new country. You've taken that away. That is very important.

Let me just make a final remark. You have a responsibility to ensure that you're also serving the public good, and that our fundamental difference between the night watchman of the Conservative Party and the defender of the public good, which is the Liberal Party—if that concept goes through your heads, you'll see that you have to spend some money so that new Canadians are able to work and find a better taxpaying life faster in this country.

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): I had to enter the chamber this evening believing that I'd have an opportunity to speak to the supply motion. However, my colleague Mr Gerretsen and the member for Niagara Centre have raised, I think, some very important points about the appropriateness of this motion. They would present that while the motion might be in order in this House, it is in fact the wrong motion, that the government has put the wrong motion for debate. I don't know how the minister could make such a mistake. We have precious little time in this chamber and we have very important work to do. I believe that the supply motion is one of the most important motions that we deal with. It provides the agencies of the government with the ability to pay the bills when we're not sitting. That's what it does, and it would appear that the minister has put the wrong motion to us. So we're spending a lot of time in this chamber paying attention to a motion that will not, in fact, do what the government intended it to do. I am also aware that the government is aware of it too. They know that they've made a mistake. I don't know how the minister could introduce a motion that isn't going to help them.

2030

My House leader has received a memorandum. This was June 20. That was four days ago. It was very clearly explained in a memo from the government House leader that the changes to the legislation and the regulations—and I do remember the minister, in her opening remarks, speaking specifically to the fact that the government has gone to a new accounting system. It's gone to an accrual system. That has required some adjustments to the supply motion.

The government House leader has provided a memo to the other House leaders—the House leader for the opposition and for the third party—that in effect states that the changes to the legislation and the regulations were administrative in nature and maintain long-standing principles of appropriation, supporting the existing financial framework and appropriation mechanisms.

The recommended wording is as follows. In order that the government can now achieve supply, provide supply to its various ministries, the wording was changed to that the crown be authorized to incur expenditures relating to the salaries of civil servants and other necessary matters pending the voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 2002, and ending on September 30, 2002, such expenditures to be charged to the proper appropriation for the 2003-04 fiscal year following the voting of supply.

The memo goes on to explain the wording of the motion that we are in fact debating tonight. The background is that, effective the fiscal year starting April 1, 2003, legislative spending authority and appropriation control are on an accrual basis of accounting. In the 2002 Ontario budget bill, Keeping the Promise for Growth and Prosperity Act, Bill 109, the government introduced amendments to legislation that converted legislative spending authority and appropriation control to the

accrual basis of accounting. The printed estimates—that is, the legislative spending authority and appropriation controls—are now on the same basis of accounting as other financial documents and reports, which provide for more transparency, especially for the members of the Legislature and the public.

The amended definition of “appropriation” in section 1 of the Financial Administration Act is as follows: “‘appropriation’ means an authority to pay money out of the consolidated revenue fund or to incur a non-cash expense.”

So on February 3, 2003, cabinet approved the regulations, prescribing six non-cash expenses, of which three are voted and the other three are statutory. The three voted non-cash expenses are the reduction of a prepaid expense, a loss on the disposition of a capital asset, and imputed interest on a loan bearing interest below the prevailing market rate.

Interjection.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Minister, I’m trying to clarify why I believe the motion that we are debating, in my opinion, will have no effect at the end of the night. Your minister introduced the wrong motion. I’m explaining why the motion that was introduced, that we’ve spent time on here this evening, is not in order and will have no effect.

For those of us who sit in this House and read all the documents that are here in our desk, that might be very clear. But I think it’s very important for the public record, for anyone who might be watching these proceedings on television, to understand and be very clear about the kind of mistake that you have made tonight.

You are in charge of all of the finances of the province of Ontario. You have come here this evening—we were supposed to be debating a supply motion. The motion that is on the table, by the advice of your own council, will not have the effect that you want it to have, because you introduced the wrong motion. The people of Ontario, I think, should be very clear about the fact that we have very important business to do here, and you can’t get it right. This is a very serious problem.

I know that other good members of this Legislature tried to bring this to the attention of the minister, to no avail. That’s really unfortunate, because there were a lot of issues around supply that do impact constituents of mine. In my riding there are many issues that I wanted to highlight. We know that when we come to the chamber to debate supply or to speak to a motion on supply, it is an opportunity to highlight those areas where we think some of the plans of the government are deficient in terms of supplying the needs of the people in our community. I know in my own riding there are many areas—and I’m hearing from people across the province, particularly with regard to my critic portfolio.

The government would suggest that they have some history in balancing budgets. There are very learned people in the financial field who would suggest that in fact the budget is not balanced, that there’s one major \$2-billion hole that the government simply turns away from,

winks at and pretends isn’t there. But the people who deal with finances on a very regular basis will not ignore it, and will speak out and tell the people of Ontario, “Don’t be fooled. The budget’s not balanced.” It’s been suggested that we’re going to receive \$2.2 billion by selling provincial assets, but they won’t tell us what assets are being sold.

With regard to supply and with regard to issues in my riding and across the province, I find it interesting that they would suggest they’re balancing budgets. Many of their transfer agencies would like to say the same, but this government hasn’t been giving them the resources that they need to do that. Children’s aid societies across Ontario are running deficits. They have been told to max out their lines of credit. Is that the way to provide essential services to the most vulnerable children in our society, to say to their agency, “You know, if you need money, you should go to the bank. Use your line of credit,” and hope that the government’s going to cover it at the end of the day or the end of the month or the end of the year? There’s a real worry out there that they’re going to go so far into debt—and it has happened, in fact—that the banks are saying, “No. Sorry, but you’re at your maximum.” The government is then forced to come up with some money. That’s no way to run a business, no way indeed.

They talk about their fine accounting principles. What do they leave for their transfer agencies? What do they leave for their hospitals? How many hospitals in this province have deficits because they are underfunded? It’s very easy for the members of the government to say, “Oh, we’ve balanced the budget,” when all of their transfer agencies are starving for cash; they are in debt; they are in deficit situations; they are cutting services. The hospital corporation in the community that serves my riding, Quinte Health Care Corp, is in fact considering laying off nurses as part of its cost efficiencies.

So I would say to this government, which put a supply motion forward, that there are many, many areas in the province in which you can talk about balanced budgets, but they’re balanced only because you’re starving the transfer agencies of your government that need those dollars.

Another example in my riding is the fact that the VON in Kingston, that has served the community for 106 years, is on the verge of folding, collapsing, because they can’t afford to provide the service. The Kingston, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington CCAC doesn’t have money to increase the compensation packages for the community health providers. It has created a climate of great uncertainty in health care. This government comes into my community and they talk about all they’ve done, while the people in the riding are saying, “There’s something wrong when agencies like VON, that have provided quality community health services for 106 years, are forced to fold. There’s something very wrong with that.” So I am making comment on the minister’s remarks earlier about what this government has done and how they perceive what they’ve done has been good for the

province. I'm suggesting that there's another side to that. I have some responsibility, as an elected representative, to share with you those things which I hear on a very regular basis that are not working well.

2040

We heard just this week that the Family Responsibility Office is seriously, seriously understaffed. What's the result when those sorts of agencies are understaffed? It means that families and children are not getting the money they are entitled to, that they deserve, to the tune of \$1.3 billion. There is a serious need in the Family Responsibility Office.

I just want to go back to the original point I was making about the motion we're debating tonight. It's the wrong motion. There is very serious concern that, in fact, at the end of this day, this government will not be able to do what it intended to be able to do, what it should be able to do at the end of a supply motion, and that is pay for the supply of the services that the government provides to the people of Ontario. While I know that the table has ordered that the motion is in order, it's the effect of the motion that is in serious question here this evening. I commend my colleague Mr Gerretsen and also the member from Niagara Centre, who I think have very ably explained the problem that we have before us here this evening. It is indeed regrettable. We assume that a government that is in charge of managing almost a \$70-billion budget knows—they should know, they've been doing it for eight years—how to run the business of this province. But, you see, they change the rules—they're good at that; they do it all the time—and then they get caught by changing their own rules. I think that is in fact what has happened here this evening.

I do hope that the people of Ontario are paying attention to this and I hope that they're maybe a little bit concerned, as we are on this side of the House, that we have a government that likes to pat itself on the back for doing everything right. They run away from any kind of blame, and here tonight I think they've made a very serious error. I really question whether or not we will be able to pay for the supplies of the province at the end of the day.

Hon Frank Klees (Minister of Transportation): I just want to make it very clear to the members of this House that I believe this is a motion that deserves the full support of every member here and I certainly intend to support it.

Mr Christopherson: Just by way of an update, as I understand things with 56 and 57, indeed, the House leaders of the opposition were correct that it was the wrong motion to call, but the enterprising lawyers in the Ministry of Finance—and I remember many of them—think they have found a way to make this work. Make no mistake, the government still did call the wrong motion, and both of the opposition House leaders were indeed correct in pointing that out.

In the short time that I have, I want to begin by commenting on a couple of the remarks that the Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing made, some-

one who actually is a very good speaker and who I think understands things quite well. It's a shame that she persists in reading things word for word, because at this point she doesn't need the crutch. I know that she wants to stretch as a parliamentarian and as a minister, and that would be a good start.

Nonetheless, she read it word for word, and one of the phrases that was in there spoke to the "fundamentals" being "sound." It's interesting, because if anyone who's a fan of John Kenneth Galbraith—and I am—reads his works, he goes on at great lengths, particularly when he does the analysis of the crash of 1929, to caution everybody that in the future, if you hear a finance minister or someone speaking on behalf of a government and they start talking about the fundamentals being sound, that's when you should start worrying. Indeed in that speech the government was talking about the fundamentals being sound, and the reality is that the fundamentals of this province are not sound—not by a long shot—not if you measure things in terms of the quality of life for the vast majority of the citizens of Ontario.

Another thing the minister said was that they needed to pass this interim supply because they needed the authorization to pay out social assistance benefits "to those in need." The phrasing, "to those in need," suggests that they care about those who are in need. What they don't talk about, even though they have lots of time to brag about tax cuts, they have lots of time to talk about the tens of thousands of dollars—and millions, if you include the corporate and the personal income tax that Frank Stronach is going to get from this budget, the measures of this government—is that if you take a look at people who are in need, the lowest-income earners, the lowest-income receivers in the province, are people on social assistance. I want to point out that half of those people—half—are kids. They're children. People on social assistance in the province of Ontario woke up in June 1995, a few days after that election, to find out that their income had been cut by 21.6%.

I've been a part of the discussions about MPPs' pay increases from day one, and I was one of those who stood behind the notion that the then Integrity Commissioner, Evans, would be tasked with reviewing all that. And I was one of those who also acknowledged, and was prepared to say, that I thought an increase was due. I thought most of it, as it's going to, should take place with the next Parliament, because we shouldn't benefit from our own votes, but put it in place for the next Parliament, that if you agree that that's the money you should get, run on and stand on it, and if not, say so, and then say you won't take it and then don't take it.

My point in raising that is, I remember very well—I'm not going to name names, so everybody can calm down, I wouldn't do that, but I do remember the discussions with honourable members on all sides of the House, and there was an awful lot of engagement and concern and passion and tenacity around that issue. Fair enough. I'd just like to see a fraction of that applied to the people that the minister referred to as "those in need," because that

21.6%, I'm told by people who are good at these calculations, amounts now to the equivalent of a 30% cut. So when we talk about all the benefits that have been accrued by certain segments of the population as a result of this government's budgets for eight years, let's remember that it doesn't include those in need, it doesn't include those children who are in need. You know, it seems to be in modern-day Ontario politics that there's no appetite among the public to hear a lot of these things.

A politician's first reaction, then, is, "Don't speak to it; speak to things that the public are interested in and engaged in, things that are vote determinants."

2050

But at some point, and maybe it happens late in the day when virtually no one is watching and no one in the House is paying a lot of attention and we're all doing our work at our desk, maybe that's the only time it can come up. Somewhere in all this, when the Frank Stronachs of the world are getting richer and richer, somebody's got to stand up and say that you can't keep standing up and mouthing the words that you care and saying things like, "This bill will allow us to pay out the social assistance benefits to those in need," and try to convey a whole lot of compassion and caring and meanwhile go to a cabinet meeting every Wednesday and do nothing about it.

Some of those kids are hungry. Some of them have got, I grant you, lousy parents. Guess what? Lousy parents come in all shapes and sizes and all income levels. Just because you make a lot of money, that doesn't make you a good parent, and just because you're poor, that doesn't make you a bad parent. But the fact of the matter is that it's children who are in poverty to start with, and not only have you done nothing to alleviate that poverty, you've made it worse.

I said at the time and I'll say it again on my way out the door, which is coming within a few weeks, it will be seen as one of the darkest periods in the history of this province, first of all that you did it, that you took a majority government and the first thing you did was to cut the income of the poorest of the poor. The second shame is that the people of Ontario let it happen.

Obviously, things haven't changed an awful lot, because there's nothing in this budget to correct it, not even a modest increase or a modest announcement, something to give action to the minister's words when she said "benefits to those in need." I have no doubt that the minister has a great deal of compassion, but she also has a lot of power and authority right now and could do something. That applies to every other minister and, quite frankly, every member of this House but particularly the government cabinet ministers who have a direct say in exactly what happens in this province.

I would just say that it's a shame to sit here after this length of time and still hear ministers stand up and say that, and yet the reality is that those kids' circumstances get worse and worse with every passing month and every passing year. Now they're living with the equivalent of a 30% cut. The other reason I raised the MPP thing is that so many people don't want to talk about welfare; they

don't want to about it any more. All those negative stereotypes kick in. I've got to tell you, I don't care how many of those stereotypes may or may not be true; the fact of the matter is we're talking about kids in poverty. In my opinion, it's wrong to stand up as a minister of the crown and talk about wanting to help those in need when we've got a budget that we debated this afternoon that does nothing about it. I notice that not one of those ministers is looking at me.

The minister also mentioned their SARS relief dollars. I just wanted to bring to the attention of the House a constituent of mine; I obviously won't mention his name, but the circumstances are interesting and I've made his case, as his elected representative, to the Premier and the Minister of Health. It's interesting because I suspect there are a lot of other people who are in similar circumstances. Those circumstances are these: the SARS relief dollars are for those who lost income or who had to pay out extra money as a result of being quarantined during the SARS crisis. My constituent was not one of those citizens. However, my constituent's circumstances are that he was scheduled for major surgery that was expected, upon his recovery, to allow him to go back to work so that he could once again be a productive member of society.

His surgery was cancelled because there wasn't the surge capacity. We've all learned now what that means, that the surge capacity in our health care system has been lost. That meant that when the SARS crisis hit, there wasn't the buffer to deal with it and let the regular operations of the health care system continue. It was all hands on deck, and everything had to be let go that could possibly be let go that wasn't life and death, and those health care professionals were redirected over to deal with the SARS crisis.

When that happened, my constituent was one of those whose surgery was cancelled—the night before—because everybody had to leave everything. He'd already done all those preparations that you often have to do for operations, and everybody has an idea what those are. He was all ready, and the very night before he got the phone call, the surgery had been cancelled. It's still cancelled. It's not rescheduled. His life, as he wants it to be and as his family wants it to be and, quite frankly, as it deserves to be for him as a citizen, is on hold. He's making the case, "I was impacted by the SARS crisis as well as anyone who was quarantined. Is there no relief for me?"

It's a good question. I'll bet there are an awful lot of people across the province who are also once removed, but you can still make the direct connection. I would hope it's something the government would look at in terms of the implementation of their SARS relief plan.

Earlier this afternoon, Speaker, we were talking about the budget. Indeed, you were in the chair as a matter of fact. Now that we're talking interim supply, both measures of course allow quite a broad range of discussion. Speakers tend to allow a lot of latitude. The rules allow for a lot of latitude, so this gives me a great opportunity—it's almost the same amount of time, too. I can

pick up where I left off and make a few more of those points I want to make, because they apply just as well to interim supply debate as they would to the budget bill.

One of the things I wanted to raise this afternoon, in addition to all the others I talked about, is the fact that this budget does absolutely nothing for licensed child care—again, children. The minister responsible is in the House. This budget doesn't do an awful lot for kids. I guess Frank Stronach's kids will be better off, because there will be an even bigger inheritance. Beyond that, I'm not sure what good all this is going to be for the parents in my riding of Hamilton West who want, need and deserve licensed child care—not a word.

Affordable housing: every one of us who lives in a major urban centre lives with the blight of having homeless people on our streets. For us here at Queen's Park, it's hard to go from here either to your office if you're a Toronto member or to your apartment if you're an outside member without passing people who are homeless. A homeless person died a few years ago just across the street from where we are. We hear stories about Washington, DC, as an example, where right across the street from the White House are teams of people who are homeless, living in the parks, living in the streets. You ask yourself, those of us who are not residents of the US, "How can that be right across the street from the White House, the seat of the most powerful elected position on the planet?" Sometimes you just need to see things as they happen closer to home to understand how that is, because we live it right here, right across the street. You can almost throw a stone from where I'm standing right now to where that person died.

Homelessness has been declared a national emergency. I know in the city of Hamilton, because of the downloading, just the thought of trying to maintain and keep in proper repair the existing stock of social housing, affordable housing, is an incredible challenge. The ability to tackle the homelessness problem and the whole issue of affordable housing in one of the wealthiest societies in the world is beyond the means of most municipalities. Certainly it's beyond the means of Hamilton city council to deal with it in any kind of adequate fashion.

2100

Earlier this afternoon, I talked about a report that had been published by the provincially funded organization, the Institute for Competitiveness and Prosperity, headed up by Mr Roger Martin, who's the dean of the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. In fact, Mr Runciman, when I mentioned his name, said, "Good guy." I'll take him at his word; I'm sure he is. As I said this afternoon, he's probably a very smart guy.

What did that report say about the relationship with municipalities? It speaks very directly to the finances of this province and the lack of adequate prioritizing. The report said, "We believe that Ontario has opportunities to increase our productivity in our city regions, but that our cities are handicapped by significant economic, fiscal, and political barriers to closing the prosperity gap."

We've heard from a former federal finance minister who's likely to become the next Prime Minister, if you

follow all the reports. We've got the TD Financial Group that came out a year ago, and we also have the report from the alliance—not that Alliance—the alliance here in Toronto. I believe it's entitled Enough Talk.

All those reports I'm referring to, and the former federal finance minister, have said that municipalities cannot possibly meet the challenges that they're facing in terms of affordable housing, in terms of infrastructure, public transit, environmental challenges, virtually everything across the board. They can't do it. As much as this government might like to say it's the fault of the councils because they can't manage their money, which is basically what you've said over the years, more and more there's a body of evidence you can't ignore that makes the case that municipalities are being financially strangled.

Let me tell you, it is impossible to have a healthy, vibrant, successful Ontario if we don't have healthy, vibrant, successful municipalities. You can't do one without the other. The budget, the spending plans of this government, do nothing about that. As we predicted years ago, the government stands up, puffs itself up and says, "We cut taxes and we balanced the budget, and we did this, that and the other," paying absolutely no attention to the damage they've done to the major transfer partners that had their funding cut so you could stand up and say these things.

Before I forget, the Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing also, interestingly, after some comments I and others made this afternoon about balanced budgets, got up and did exactly what I predicted the government would do—not that it took any kind of brilliance on my part to see it coming. One just has to hang around here long enough and you can see this kind of stuff coming, but sure enough—she wasn't in the House this afternoon—the minister stood there this evening and said, "Five balanced budgets." When I heckled that they aren't really, the minister got very testy, very upset and totally dismissed what I was saying, as this government frequently does with people they don't agree with.

The same minister—it's interesting, because I said that ministers would do this. This afternoon I said they would do it, and here they were doing it. The minister would talk about Standard and Poor's in a light that made them look good, completely ignoring the fact that it was Standard and Poor's that said you didn't have a balanced budget last year and you're not on track to have a balanced budget this year. Standard and Poor's said that, and if you recall just a few hours ago, when I was rhetorically asking the government, "How are you going to respond to that?" their ultimate answer was: "Standard and Poor's is wrong. They're wrong."

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York): The Tories are always right.

Mr Christopherson: We've had this on every occasion. When they've got nothing else to argue with, nothing else to say and no other way to justify their position, they turn on whoever is saying it. They merely look over and

say, "You're wrong." Yet almost in the same breath, the minister was taking credit for something Standard and Poor's had said about the government. You can't have it both ways.

Let's also understand, any of us who were here before when the now government was over here, that if Bob Rae had tried to claim five balanced budgets in a row and Standard and Poor's came out and formally said, "In our opinion, there was no balanced budget last year and there's no balanced budget projected for this year," we'd never have gotten away with even attempting to say, "Standard and Poor's is wrong and we are right." Yet that's exactly what you've done here today: you're right, and everybody else is wrong.

It's like the education system: the teachers are wrong, the students are wrong, the trustees are wrong, the public is wrong, the parents are wrong; everybody's wrong except you.

Mr O'Toole: Look at the time.

Mr Christopherson: I'm not the only one running out of time, John.

Everybody's wrong except them. You know, you can only play that game for so long. Eventually it catches up with you. That's what we're starting to see, and that's why I think you can't get the bounce that you want in terms of the polls. You wanted to go in the spring. The numbers weren't there. SARS came along, and it was a great fig leaf. One could argue the merits of whether you should or shouldn't have gone if you had the numbers. Nonetheless, it worked out fine and gave you a nice little bit of cover.

But you didn't call the election, because you don't have the numbers. You came out with a couple of measures that really don't fit into any kind of overall economic strategy or short-, medium- or long-term plans for the future of the economic health of this province. It was merely a question of: "Let's do the polling. Let's do the focus groups. Let's find issues that will move people, because we've got to move the poll numbers."

But I have to tell you, I want to say very sincerely to the government, I think that no matter what you do, you're going to have a really difficult time as a party. I know. I've been where you are. Individually, some of you who have laid down really strong roots, those who have a history of serving the community and have a very good reputation among virtually everybody—like my friend Mr Arnott and others who have done the same sort of thing—probably have a really good chance of surviving. But for a lot of you, I have to tell you, when that tidal wave hits, you're going with it, and it is, in large part, because these things are all catching up with you. You can't keep doing what you've been doing on a sustained basis and not expect that at some point the public will begin to understand the difference between what you say and what you do.

Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, Government House Leader): I'm pleased to rise and to speak to the interim supply motion.

There has been a bit of a discussion about the two motions which appear on the order paper. Interim supply is two things. Firstly, it's a bill that leads to the main Supply Act. It's not simply a motion, but an act. It's also a general motion rooted in parliamentary tradition to authorize the government of the day to make certain expenditures. It's not just for the salaries of the civil servants, though more than 100 years ago the salaries of public servants would be the principal payments required. Obviously, it also covers, as the motion that we're dealing with talks about, "other necessary payments pending the voting of supply." Of course, we'll vote on supply, and it's traditionally normally done at the end of the fall sitting in November or, more likely, December.

2110

This motion before us is the traditional motion. It's one which, as very learned followers of parliamentary tradition will tell you, has been used for decades in the province. This motion has some status in this chamber. It isn't a routine motion that can be made during routine proceedings before question period, and neither is it a motion that requires an extensive amount of debate and someone either putting the question or a motion to bring in closure. It's a motion of tradition, rooted in parliamentary tradition, to say that the members of the Legislature assembled here at Queen's Park consent to the government's paying for the salaries of the public service and other necessary payments.

Over the past 100 years, there have been likely dozens, if not hundreds, of changes in accounting standards and approvals. I would strongly suggest that the changes brought forward in the recent 2002 budget, where we went to accrual accounting from simple payments under cash, are covered by the interim supply motion, because it's not the definitive expression of Parliament's support; rather, it's an interim expression of the people of Ontario as represented by their members assembled here at Queen's Park. Accruals, of course, as you know, have been included in the estimates, but they're not part of necessary payments and their relationship to accrual.

So I think the debate here tonight has been one of inside baseball. The traditional parliamentary motion and the special status that the interim supply motion has certainly enjoys a tradition here and is a general motion rooted in parliamentary tradition. It in no way will limit the authority of the bill that this Legislature will deal with later in the year, whether it's in this Parliament or the following Parliament.

I think it's important that this House consent to payments being made for hospitals, for our school boards, for our seniors' residences, for those organizations, those transfer payment agencies that deal with people with developmental disabilities. It's important that the Minister of Finance have the authority, through the consolidated revenue fund, to cut cheques on the consolidated revenue fund for shelters in the case of violence against women, for measures to police the environment, for law

enforcement, for a variety of activities. This vehicle is, of course, that resolution, that expression of public support to do just that. There could in this interim supply be a great debate with respect to the word "incurred." Of course, if you're accruing, there's no payment, and I think it's somewhat of an inside baseball.

I would, if there's any debate, place my confidence and my trust in the practice of this Legislature going back many years and quite comfortably do so. This House has had the opportunity to debate the budget motion presented by the Minister of Finance. We had a good amount of debate on that. This House has had the opportunity to debate three bills with respect to the budget. Normally we only have a spring budget bill and then a fall budget bill. The government presented all three up front; a different practice.

We've had a significant amount of debate on two of those pieces of legislation. On two of them, in fact, we'll have the opportunity to conduct an important part of the debate, which is making a decision. Making a decision, standing up in your place, voting and being counted is an important part of the process on Bill 43 and Bill 53. We'll have occasion in the next number of days to give an expression on two important bills: the equity in education tax credit, a bill to say that parents who send their children to an independent school have some support in doing that, and that we recognize and acknowledge that support.

I was really impressed with Monte Kwinter, who had the courage of his convictions to stand up in his place and support that legislation. I don't think that could perhaps be said for his seatmate, the member for Scarborough-Rouge River. It was pretty gutsy for the member for Scarborough-Rouge River to do that. He supported the government and then indicated in lightning speed that he in fact didn't support that.

What I was surprised by is that the member for St Paul's, after saying, "You can't suck and blow on the same issue"—of course, that's a term which goes back to the Roman days and poetry in years past; I checked it out to make sure what its origin was—the member for St Paul's has proven that you can do both of those activities at the same time. He stood up and voted against something that he had spoken in favour of.

We'll certainly get a definitive judgment on two bills. We're going to have the opportunity this week to debate more budget bills and to debate the fall budget bill in the spring, having more debate on the budget in the spring than we've perhaps ever had in the province of Ontario.

I know my friends in the NDP will be surprised because, in a majority of cases, they didn't even vote on the provincial budget. The member for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound is here, and I know he was shocked when the NDP didn't even get their budget passed by the Legislature, let alone presenting all the budget bills.

I say to my friends in the Liberal caucus that they brought in an aviation fuel tax and never got legislative authority. Five years went by, and they never got legislative authority. Another five years went by under the

NDP. They never sought legislative approval to levy that tax. Thank goodness we had a finance minister in Ernie Eves who put that into legislation. Speaker, I know that you are thankful for that as well.

I should say that I appreciate your comments in the House, Mr Speaker. You were a real gentleman to acknowledge the work that we had done with respect to consumers in a certain community in northern Ontario. We're tremendously pleased that that solution was able to be addressed.

I'm looking forward to seeing if the members on the other side of the House want to stand up and support our hospitals, our school boards and our organizations that help people with developmental disabilities. I look forward to seeing if they're going to stand and be counted.

The Acting Speaker: This completes the time allocated for debate.

Mrs Molinari has moved government notice of motion number 57. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 2119 to 2129.

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

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Guzzo, Garry J.	Murdoch, Bill
Baird, John R.	Hardeman, Ernie	Mushinski, Marilyn
Barrett, Toby	Hastings, John	Newman, Dan
Beaubien, Marcel	Hodgson, Chris	O'Toole, John
Chudleigh, Ted	Jackson, Cameron	Runciman, Robert W.
Clark, Brad	Johns, Helen	Sterling, Norman W.
Coburn, Brian	Johnson, Bert	Stewart, R. Gary
Cunningham, Dianne	Kells, Morley	Tascona, Joseph N.
DeFaria, Carl	Klees, Frank	Tsubouchi, David H.
Dunlop, Garfield	Marland, Margaret	Turnbull, David
Elliott, Brenda	Martiniuk, Gerry	Wettlaufer, Wayne
Eves, Ernie	Maves, Bart	Wilson, Jim
Flaherty, Jim	Mazzilli, Frank	Witmer, Elizabeth
Galt, Doug	McDonald, AL	Wood, Bob
Gilchrist, Steve	Molinari, Tina R.	Young, David
Gill, Raminder	Munro, Julia	

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Crozier, Bruce	Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	Levac, David
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Caplan, David	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Christopherson, David	Hampton, Howard	Prue, Michael
Cleary, John C.	Hoy, Pat	Ramsay, David
Conway, Sean G.	Kormos, Peter	

Clerk of the House: The ayes are 47; the nays are 20.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
CONSUMER PROTECTION
AND GOVERNANCE ACT, 2003
LOI DE 2003 SUR LA PROTECTION
DES CONSOMMATEURS ET LA RÉGIE
DE LA COMMISSION DE L'ÉNERGIE
DE L'ONTARIO

Resuming the debate adjourned on June 18, 2003, on the motion for second reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998 and the Municipal Franchises Act in respect of consumer protection, the governance of the Ontario Energy Board and other matters / Projet de loi 23, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario et la Loi sur les concessions municipales en ce qui a trait à la protection des consommateurs, à la régie de la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario et à d'autres questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 23, 2003, I'm now required to put the question.

On June 16, 2003, Mr Baird moved second reading of Bill 23. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 2132 to 2137.

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

Ayes

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

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Crozier, Bruce	Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	Levac, David
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Caplan, David	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Christopherson, David	Hampton, Howard	Peters, Steve
Cleary, John C.	Hoy, Pat	Prue, Michael
Conway, Sean G.	Kormos, Peter	Ramsay, David

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 48; the nays are 21.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
CONSUMER PROTECTION
AND GOVERNANCE ACT, 2003
LOI DE 2003 SUR LA PROTECTION
DES CONSOMMATEURS ET LA RÉGIE
DE LA COMMISSION DE L'ÉNERGIE
DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Baird moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 23, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Act, 1998 and the Municipal Franchises Act in respect of consumer protection, the governance of the Ontario Energy Board and other matters / Projet de loi 23, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario et la Loi sur les concessions municipales en ce qui a trait à la protection des consommateurs, à la régie de la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario et à d'autres questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 23, 2003, I'm now required to put the question.

Mr Baird has moved third reading of Bill 23. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

The division bells rang from 2142 to 2147.

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

Ayes

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

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

Nays

Bisson, Gilles	Crozier, Bruce	Lalonde, Jean-Marc
Bountrogianni, Marie	Dombrowsky, Leona	Levac, David
Boyer, Claudette	Duncan, Dwight	McLeod, Lyn
Caplan, David	Gerretsen, John	Patten, Richard
Christopherson, David	Hampton, Howard	Peters, Steve
Cleary, John C.	Hoy, Pat	Prue, Michael
Conway, Sean G.	Kormos, Peter	Ramsay, David

Clerk of the House (Mr Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 48; the nays are 21.

The Acting Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, Government House Leader): Because I want to help seniors get a break on their property taxes, I call order G43.

ONTARIO HOME PROPERTY
TAX RELIEF FOR SENIORS ACT, 2003

LOI DE 2003 SUR L'ALLÈGEMENT
DE L'IMPÔT FONCIER RÉSIDENTIEL
POUR LES PERSONNES ÂGÉES
DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Baird, on behalf of Mrs Ecker, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 43, An Act to provide Ontario home property tax relief for seniors / Projet de loi 43, Loi prévoyant un allègement de l'impôt foncier résidentiel pour les personnes âgées de l'Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 11, 2003, I'm now required to put the question.

Mr Baird has moved third reading of Bill 43. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

I have received two notes, pursuant to standing order 28, that the vote be deferred to deferred votes tomorrow afternoon.

Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, because I believe in the equity in education tax credit, I call order G53.

THE RIGHT CHOICES FOR
EQUITY IN EDUCATION ACT
(BUDGET MEASURES), 2003

LOI DE 2003
SUR LES BONS CHOIX POUR L'ÉQUITÉ
EN MATIÈRE D'ÉDUCATION
(MESURES BUDGÉTAIRES)

Mr Baird, on behalf of Mrs Ecker, moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 53, An Act respecting the equity in education tax credit / Projet de loi 53, Loi concernant le crédit d'impôt pour l'équité en matière d'éducation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Michael A. Brown): Pursuant to the order of the House dated June 17, 2003, I am now required to put the question.

Mr Baird has moved third reading of Bill 53. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

I have received a note from the chief government whip requesting that the vote on this bill be deferred until tomorrow during deferred votes.

Hon John R. Baird (Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, Government House Leader): Mr Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

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

All in favour will say "aye."

All opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

This House will now adjourn until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 2152.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon / L'hon James K. Bartleman

Speaker / Président: Hon / L'hon Gary Carr

Clerk / Greffier: Claude L. DesRosiers

Deputy Clerk / Sous-greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks at the Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Algoma-Manitoulin	Brown, Michael A. (L)	Hamilton East / -Est	Agostino, Dominic (L)
Ancaster-Dundas- Flamborough-Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Marie (L)
Barrie-Simcoe-Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC)	Hamilton West / -Ouest	Christopherson, David (ND)
Beaches-East York	Prue, Michael (ND)	Hastings-Frontenac- Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Leona (L)
Bramalea-Gore-Malton- Springdale	Gill, Raminder (PC)	Huron-Bruce	Johns, Hon / L'hon Helen (PC) Minister of Agriculture and Food / ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation
Brampton Centre / -Centre	Spina, Joseph (PC)	Kenora-Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Brampton West-Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest-Mississauga	Clement, Hon / L'hon Tony (PC) Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, John (L)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kitchener Centre / -Centre	Wetlaufer, Wayne (PC)
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Kitchener-Waterloo	Witmer, Hon / L'hon Elizabeth (PC) Deputy Premier, Minister of Education / vice-première ministre, ministre de l'Éducation
Burlington	Jackson, Cameron (PC)	Lambton-Kent-Middlesex	Beaubien, Marcel (PC)
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Lanark-Carleton	Sterling, Hon / L'hon Norman W. (PC) Attorney General, minister responsible for native affairs / procureur général, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Chatham-Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	Leeds-Grenville	Runciman, Hon / L'hon Robert W. (PC) Minister of Public Safety and Security / ministre de la Sécurité et de la Sécurité publique
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Cunningham, Hon / L'hon Dianne (PC) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités, ministre délégué à la Condition féminine
Don Valley East / -Est	Caplan, David (L)	London West / -Ouest	Wood, Bob (PC)
Don Valley West / -Ouest	Turnbull, Hon / L'hon David (PC) Associate Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre associé de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation	London-Fanshawe	Mazzilli, Frank (PC)
Dufferin-Peel- Wellington-Grey	Eves, Hon / L'hon Ernie (PC) Premier and President of the Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / premier ministre et président du Conseil exécutif, ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales	Markham	Tsubouchi, Hon / L'hon David H. (PC) Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet, Minister of Culture / président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement, ministre de la Culture
Durham	O'Toole, John R. (PC)	Mississauga Centre / -Centre	Sampson, Rob (PC)
Eglington-Lawrence	Colle, Mike (L)	Mississauga East / -Est	DeFaria, Hon / L'hon Carl (PC) Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for seniors / ministre des Affaires civiles, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Elgin-Middlesex-London	Peters, Steve (L)	Mississauga South / -Sud	Marland, Margaret (PC)
Erie-Lincoln	Hudak, Hon / L'hon Tim (PC) Minister of Consumer and Business Services / ministre des Services aux consommateurs et aux entreprises		
Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L)		
Etobicoke Centre / -Centre	Stockwell, Chris (PC)		
Etobicoke North / -Nord	Hastings, John (PC)		
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	Kells, Morley (PC)		
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)		
Guelph-Wellington	Elliott, Hon / L'hon Brenda (PC) Minister of Community, Family and Children's Services / ministre des Services à la collectivité, à la famille et à l'enfance		
Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)		
Haliburton-Victoria-Brock	Hodgson, Chris (PC)		
Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)		

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Nepean-Carleton	Baird, Hon / L'hon John R. (PC) Minister of Energy, Minister responsible for francophone affairs, government House leader / ministre de l'Énergie, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, parlementaire du gouvernement	Scarborough Southwest / -Sud-Ouest	Newman, Hon / L'hon Dan (PC) Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / ministre associé de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Niagara Centre / -Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)	Scarborough-Agincourt	Phillips, Gerry (L)
Niagara Falls	Maves, Bart (PC)	Scarborough-Rouge River	Curling, Alvin (L)
Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)	Simcoe North / -Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)
Nipissing	McDonald, AL (PC)	Simcoe-Grey	Wilson, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC) Minister of Northern Development and Mines, Minister of the Environment / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines, ministre de l'Environnement
Northumberland	Galt, Hon / L'hon Doug (PC) Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip / ministre sans portefeuille, whip en chef du gouvernement	St Catharines	Bradley, James J. (L)
Oak Ridges	Klees, Hon / L'hon Frank (PC) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports	St Paul's	Bryant, Michael (L)
Oakville	Carr, Hon / L'hon Gary (PC) Speaker / Président	Stoney Creek	Clark, Hon / L'hon Brad (PC) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail
Oshawa	Ouellette, Hon / L'hon Jerry J. (PC) Minister of Natural Resources / ministre des Richesses naturelles	Stormont-Dundas-Charlottenburgh	Cleary, John C. (L)
Ottawa Centre / -Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Rick (L)
Ottawa-Orléans	Coburn, Hon / L'hon Brian (PC) Minister of Tourism and Recreation / ministre du Tourisme et des Loisirs	Thornhill	Molinari, Hon / L'hon Tina R. (PC) Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associée des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Ottawa South / -Sud	McGuinty, Dalton (L) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	Thunder Bay-Atikokan	McLeod, Lyn (L)
Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean	Guzzo, Garry J. (PC)	Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Ottawa-Vanier	Boyer, Claudette (Ind)	Timiskaming-Cochrane	Ramsay, David (L)
Oxford	Hardeman, Hon / L'hon Ernie (PC) Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre associé des Affaires municipales et du Logement	Timmins-James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Parkdale-High Park	Kennedy, Gerard (L)	Toronto Centre-Rosedale / Toronto-Centre-Rosedale	Smitherman, George (L)
Parry Sound-Muskoka	Miller, Norm (PC)	Toronto-Danforth	Churley, Marilyn (ND)
Perth-Middlesex	Johnson, Bert (PC)	Trinity-Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Peterborough	Stewart, R. Gary (PC)	Vaughan-King-Aurora	Sorbara, Greg (L)
Pickering-Ajax-Uxbridge	Ecker, Hon / L'hon Janet (PC) Minister of Finance / ministre des Finances	Waterloo-Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC)
Prince Edward-Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Whitby-Ajax	Flaherty, Hon / L'hon Jim (PC) Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation / ministre de l'Entreprise, des Débouchés et de l'Innovation
Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke	Conway, Sean G. (L)	Willowdale	Young, Hon / L'hon David (PC) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Sarnia-Lambton	Di Cocco, Caroline (L)	Windsor West / -Ouest	Pupatello, Sandra (L)
Sault Ste Marie	Martin, Tony (ND)	Windsor-St Clair	Duncan, Dwight (L)
Scarborough Centre / -Centre	Mushinski, Marilyn (PC)	York Centre / -Centre	Kwinter, Monte (L)
Scarborough East / -Est	Gilchrist, Steve (PC)	York North / -Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
		York South-Weston / York-Sud-Weston	Cordiano, Joseph (L)
		York West / -Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)
		Mississauga West / -Ouest	Vacant

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

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

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

Estimates / Budgets des dépenses

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

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

Chair / Président: Joseph Spina
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ted Arnott
Ted Arnott, Marcel Beaubien,
David Christopherson, Monte Kwinter,
John O'Toole, Gerry Phillips,
Rob Sampson, Joseph Spina
Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

General government / Affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: Steve Gilchrist
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Norm Miller
Marilyn Churley, Mike Colle,
Garfield Dunlop, Steve Gilchrist, Dave Levac,
Norm Miller, R. Gary Stewart, Wayne Wettlaufer
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux

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

Justice and Social Policy / Justice et affaires sociales

Chair / Présidente: Toby Barrett
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: AL McDonald
Toby Barrett, Marcel Beaubien, Michael Bryant,
Garry J. Guzzo, Ernie Hardeman,
Peter Kormos, AL McDonald, Lyn McLeod
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative

Chair / Présidente: Margaret Marland
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Julia Munro
Caroline Di Cocco, Jean-Marc Lalonde,
Margaret Marland, Bart Maves,
Julia Munro, Marilyn Mushinski,
Michael Prue, Joseph N. Tascona
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Public accounts / Comptes publics

Chair / Président: John Gerretsen
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Bruce Crozier
Bruce Crozier, Garfield Dunlop,
John Gerretsen, Raminder Gill,
John Hastings, Shelley Martel,
AL McDonald, Richard Patten,
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

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

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

CONTENTS

Tuesday 24 June 2003

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Interim supply, government notice of motion number 57, <i>Mrs Molinari</i>	
Mrs Molinari.....	1449
Mr Gerretsen.....	1452
Mr Kormos.....	1455
Mr O'Toole.....	1458
Mr Ruprecht.....	1459
Mrs Dombrowsky.....	1462
Mr Christopherson.....	1464
Mr Baird.....	1467
Agreed to.....	1468

SECOND READINGS

Ontario Energy Board Consumer Protection and Governance Act, 2003, Bill 23, <i>Mr Baird</i>	
Agreed to.....	1469

THIRD READINGS

Ontario Energy Board Consumer Protection and Governance Act, 2003, Bill 23, <i>Mr Baird</i>	
Agreed to.....	1470
Ontario Home Property Tax Relief for Seniors Act, 2003, Bill 43, <i>Mrs Ecker</i>	
Vote deferred.....	1470
The Right Choices for Equity in Education Act (Budget Measures), 2003, Bill 53, <i>Mrs Ecker</i>	
Vote deferred.....	1470

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mardi 24 juin 2003

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2003 sur la protection des consommateurs et la régie de la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario, projet de loi 23, <i>M. Baird</i>	
Adoptée.....	1469

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2003 sur la protection des consommateurs et la régie de la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario, projet de loi 23, <i>M. Baird</i>	
Adoptée.....	1470
Loi de 2003 sur l'allègement de l'impôt foncier résidentiel pour les personnes âgées de l'Ontario, projet de loi 43, <i>M^{me} Ecker</i>	
Vote différé.....	1470
Loi de 2003 sur les bons choix pour l'équité en matière d'éducation (mesures budgétaires), projet de loi 53, <i>M^{me} Ecker</i>	
Vote différé.....	1470