



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 38th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 38^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 18 October 2006

Mercredi 18 octobre 2006

Speaker
Honourable Michael A. Brown

Président
L'honorable Michael A. Brown

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

Copies of Hansard can be purchased from Publications Ontario: 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. e-mail: webpubont@gov.on.ca

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

Des exemplaires du Journal sont en vente à Publications Ontario : 880, rue Bay Toronto (Ontario), M7A 1N8 courriel : webpubont@gov.on.ca

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 18 October 2006

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 18 octobre 2006

*The House met at 1330.
Prayers.*

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CHICKEN FARMERS

Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk–Brant):

The Chicken Farmers of Ontario are here today—they've brought a broiler display—to educate all of us on issues facing their industry. They're having a reception tonight, at 5 o'clock, in room 230. I invite all to come out and have some chicken, and learn a bit about Ontario's chicken farmers and the great product they produce.

They have two areas of responsibility. They ensure that Ontario chicken farmers grow sufficient amounts of safe, fresh, high-quality chicken to meet consumer needs. Secondly, they negotiate with licensed Ontario chicken processors prices to be paid to all Ontario chicken farmers by all Ontario processors.

Chicken farmers are primarily concerned about supply management, as we all know. From our side, the PC caucus has been clear from the start: We unequivocally support supply management, which is why our entire caucus signed the FarmGate5 initiative last year. Supply management is like a three-legged stool upon which the sustainability of our rural communities is perched. The three legs are: effective import controls, production controls and the ability to set price. If you take out one of those legs, the stool collapses, along with much of our rural economy.

I ask all MPPs to join me in welcoming my constituents Tom Beischlag, Jack Van Netten, and the Chicken Farmers of Ontario.

CHINE DRIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest):

On Saturday, October 14, 2006, I had the pleasure of visiting Chine Drive Public School, located in my riding, as part of the celebrations surrounding their 50th anniversary. This small, beautiful school of approximately 200 pupils is located south of Kingston Road and east of Midland Avenue. It is nestled in a grove of trees on Scarborough Bluffs overlooking Lake Ontario and truly is a treasure to behold.

The school was officially opened in September 1957, although the school had previously been in operation the year before, housed in portables at that time. It was built out of a growing concern from the community for pupil

safety, as children had to previously cross the increasingly busy Kingston Road to go to school.

Chine Drive Public School is sheltered along Chine Drive, and it has offered for 50 years a safe environment in which children can learn and grow. Its curriculum focuses on the natural world and works on items such as the environment and giving greater focus to native plants, butterfly gardens, and bird and insect life. The area around the school is incredibly beautiful and is located right above the water and the bluffs.

I hope all members of this House will join me in congratulating Chine Drive Public School for their first 50 years of outstanding public education. I look forward to the next 50 years of outstanding public education from Chine Drive Public School.

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): Last Thursday, I brought to the attention of the Premier and the Minister of Health that Lori Goldstein was in desperate need of a life-saving operation, that her doctor had been trying to accommodate that operation for more than three weeks, and that even at that point the earliest the operation could take place would be more than a week out. I appealed to the minister to meet with Lori's parents, and we're grateful that he did. I'm pleased to report to the House today that Lori had that operation this morning, that she is recovering and her family appreciates all of the efforts that were made to assist her.

What is sad about this circumstance is that for a simple 20-minute operation—it was a person in this province whose doctor said she could die any time, and yet they could not accommodate that operation in a timely manner. That this family had to come to their MPP to appeal for something to be done is fundamentally wrong. This health care system should not be working that way, and for this government to spend millions of dollars on propaganda that tells people in the province that waiting rooms are empty and that wait times are down is unconscionable.

I say to the government, withdraw your habit of spending millions on propaganda. Put it into the health care system so that people can be rightly served.

FOREST INDUSTRY

Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): How ironic that on the same day the Minister of Northern Development and Mines was claiming all is well in northern Ontario, 140

workers at the Nairn Centre sawmill found out the mill is closing and they don't have a job. This bad news came after Domtar announced a layoff of 116 workers at the mill in Espanola. As the mill is the biggest employer in town, the news is devastating, because no one really believes that this is temporary. But these losses also follow job cuts in the Espanola woodlands operation on March 17; 75 unionized employees are out of work as a result.

These losses affect the city of greater Sudbury too. Our neighbours are losing their jobs. A majority of workers at the Nairn sawmill live in our community, in Chelmsford, Azilda and Walden. The same is true for the workers who lost their jobs in the Espanola woodlands operation in March.

The McGuinty Liberal government has been missing in action in the face of huge forestry job losses in northern Ontario. To date, the following northern communities have been hit by a paper machine, paper mill, kraft or sawmill closure: Thunder Bay, Kenora, Dryden, Hearst, Sturgeon Falls, Opatatika, Chapleau, Temagami, Kapuskasing, Longlac, Smooth Rock Falls, Timmins, Mattawa, Espanola and Nairn Centre. To date, the job loss is just under 4,000 jobs.

What will it take to get the McGuinty Liberal government to understand that its high-priced electricity policy is a job killer in northern Ontario, and how many more workers will have to lose their jobs before this government finally acts?

1340

ACADEMIC TESTING

Mrs. Linda Jeffrey (Brampton Centre): Every now and then I hear a success story in my community that I want to share with this House. This week I learned that the EQAO test scores this year for students in the Peel District School Board in grades 3, 6 and 9 rose as much as 8%. This achievement was due to a dramatically different approach to literacy and numeracy, and the results speak volumes about the success of their efforts.

Over the last year, the Peel District School Board focused on helping students achieve higher test scores by putting together an innovative strategy that they call transformational practices. This board analyzed and gathered successful teaching strategies at schools that were making the biggest difference in boosting student achievement. These best practices were packaged in a way that all schools could easily implement, and teachers were trained to employ these techniques.

An 8% increase in EQAO test scores in only one year takes considerable effort to achieve. It's clear that the Peel District School Board has found an approach that's working and has had a significant effect. This board has strategically allocated its resources to have the greatest impact on student achievement.

Congratulations to the students, the parents and, in particular, the dedicated teaching staff at the Peel District School Board for making a tremendous effort in ensuring

that our students achieve improved literacy and numeracy in the region of Peel.

LEGAL AID

Mrs. Christine Elliott (Whitby-Ajax): In June 2002, the now Attorney General stood in this House and quoted Chief Justice of Canada Beverley McLachlin from her statement: "Providing legal aid to low-income Canadians is an essential public service.... The well-being of our justice system ... and the public's confidence in it ... depend on it. If legal aid fails, justice fails."

With respect to the need to update legal tariffs in Ontario, he then added, "It's about access to justice, and our entire justice system depends on it."

It has been almost four years since the Attorney General made this statement, yet we have seen nothing but lip service and excuses from this government with respect to legal aid. They have yet to adjust the tariffs even once, and the number of people turned away at the doors has increased by 42% in less than two years.

Last week, I co-chaired a town hall meeting on justice issues in my riding of Whitby-Ajax. Not surprisingly, the main topic of discussion was the lack of funding for legal aid. The situation is particularly urgent in family law matters involving domestic violence and in child protection matters. As was noted at the meeting by legal counsel for the Durham Children's Aid Society, "The Ontarians who are ultimately deprived of justice are the children themselves. These are Ontarians who do not get a vote, but suffer because of the choices being made about allocation of funds to the justice/legal system."

Mr. Attorney General, the legal aid system is in crisis. Children's aid societies are pleading with you, Legal Aid Ontario is pleading with you, and vulnerable people all across this province are pleading with you. When are you going to take some real, substantive action?

COGENERATION

Mr. David Oraziotti (Sault Ste. Marie): I want to congratulate seven companies selected for our government's new cogeneration strategy, including Algoma Steel in Sault Ste. Marie. Contracts with the OPA for high-efficiency cogeneration plants have secured \$800 million in investment, creating 414 megawatts of power, enough for 400,000 homes. Because the McGuinty government is offering incentives for cogeneration, Algoma Steel is making a \$135-million investment in a new 70-megawatt plant, creating 200 construction jobs. It's great news. Our city's largest employer will become more efficient while increasing job security for local steelworkers.

Paul Finley, ASI's vice-president of business, said, "The long-term purchase agreement makes the economics of the project work.... It amounts to a guaranteed return on a significant capital investment and eliminates a lot of potential financial risk."

Algoma pursued this for well over a decade, but a study concluded in 1995, after five years of NDP inaction, said that the economics didn't work. Well, there's

a surprise: NDP economics don't work, and the Conservatives offered no programs to support this project.

There are environmental benefits. Armando Plastino, ASI's vice-president of operations, said, "Once the plant goes operational, we will virtually eliminate the need for flare burn-offs." This means that nearly 400 tonnes of nitrous oxide will be eliminated annually, while the equivalent coal-fired generation would produce 300,000 tonnes of greenhouse gases annually.

The McGuinty government is making huge strides in improving Ontario's energy supply. We're proud of the investment in Sault Ste. Marie.

CHICKEN FARMERS

Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron-Bruce): It's my pleasure to rise today and welcome the Chicken Farmers of Ontario to the Legislature and to acknowledge the chicken producers. The Chicken Farmers of Ontario are responsible for representing nearly 1,100 Ontario chicken producers, a number that has remained stable over the past 10 years. That number represents one half of all chicken producers in Canada, which is over 2,800.

In 2005, Ontario produced 325 million kilograms of chicken meat, one third of the Canadian total, the majority of which was consumed domestically. Ontario's chicken industry has a farmgate value of \$521 million and is responsible for thousands of spinoff jobs in transportation, food service and retail, in both urban and rural communities.

The chicken industry in Ontario continues to grow, and in no small part because of supply management, which is a unique, successful Canadian story. Under supply management, the Chicken Farmers of Ontario have propelled this province into being the largest producer, processor and consumer of chicken in the country.

Hopefully all of the members were able to visit the special replica farm exhibit out in front of the Legislature this morning. If you were able to make it to that, you'll be able to make it to room 230 to enjoy some of the finest chicken wings and to meet and speak with the Chicken Farmers of Ontario.

I just want to say that the riding I represent is—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Members' statements?

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. John Wilkinson (Perth-Middlesex): I say to our friends today that, as the member from a rural riding where we're very proud of our chicken producers and their wonderful product, in this place being a chicken has a slightly more political overtone.

I want to mention to our friends that earlier today my good colleague the Minister of the Environment issued a challenge to John Tory, the transitory member for Dufferin-Peel-Wellington-Grey, to show up for this important vote, the vote on Bill 43, the Clean Water Act.

We know he's in the city, and we think that he would want to register his vote when it comes to this important

matter of safe, clean drinking water. Ontarians need to know where the many-minded leader of the official opposition is on this.

Gord Miller, Ontario's Environmental Commissioner, says that there is no question that the measures in this bill will make drinking water safer in Ontario. The Clean Water Act was a major recommendation of the Walkerton inquiry. And the Sierra Legal Defence Fund says that Ontario is leading the country in protecting drinking water.

Unfortunately, the official opposition seems to have a problem with clean water. When it comes time to stand up—this is the place where you vote. We have a vote. One would think that your responsibility is to stand in your place, and I'll be looking with great interest to see whether or not the leader of the official opposition is here.

We're proud of our bill. It is a balanced piece of legislation that draws all of us who share the same great source of drinking water to work together collaboratively. Others may be missing in action.

VISITORS

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): I'm pleased to introduce in the Speaker's gallery today the family of one of our pages, Sarah Edgerley. With us is Sarah's father, Dr. Michael Edgerley, and we are particularly pleased to have with us her grandfather Mr. William Edgerley, who is a veteran of D-Day. Please join me in welcoming them.

Also seated in the Speaker's gallery are the students of the Queen's University mentoring program. Please join me in welcoming them here with us today.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. John O'Toole (Durham): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, October 17, in responding to the Minister of Transportation's statement on School Bus Safety Week, I mistakenly misstated an important statistic.

To correct the record: Occupants of a school bus are 16 times less likely to be injured in a road collision than occupants in other vehicles.

I am pleased to correct the record, and thank Rick Donaldson for bringing it to my attention.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): I beg to inform the House that today the Clerk received the report on intended appointments dated October 18, 2006, of the standing committee on government agencies. Pursuant to

standing order 106(e)(9), the report is deemed to be adopted by the House.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BUDGET MEASURES ACT, 2006 (NO. 2)

LOI DE 2006 SUR LES MESURES BUDGÉTAIRES (NO 2)

Mr. Sorbara moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 151, An Act to enact various 2006 Budget measures and to enact, amend or repeal various Acts / Projet de loi 151, Loi édictant diverses mesures énoncées dans le Budget de 2006 et édictant, modifiant ou abrogeant diverses lois.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): 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 1352 to 1357.

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

Ayes

Balkissoon, Bas	Duguid, Brad	Phillips, Gerry
Bartolucci, Rick	Duncan, Dwight	Pupatello, Sandra
Bentley, Christopher	Fonseca, Peter	Qaadri, Shafiq
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoy, Pat	Ramal, Khalil
Bountrogianni, Marie	Jeffrey, Linda	Ramsay, David
Bradley, James J.	Kwinter, Monte	Ruprecht, Tony
Broten, Laurel C.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Sandals, Liz
Brownell, Jim	Marsales, Judy	Smith, Monique
Bryant, Michael	Matthews, Deborah	Smitherman, George
Cansfield, Donna H.	McMeekin, Ted	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Caplan, David	Meilleur, Madeleine	Van Bommel, Maria
Colle, Mike	Mitchell, Carol	Watson, Jim
Crozier, Bruce	Oraziotti, David	Wilkinson, John
Delaney, Bob	Parsons, Ernie	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Di Cocco, Caroline	Patten, Richard	Zimmer, David
Dombrowsky, Leona	Peters, Steve	

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

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Klees, Frank	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	MacLeod, Lisa	Runciman, Robert W.
Chudleigh, Ted	Martiniuk, Gerry	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Christine	Munro, Julia	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hudak, Tim	Murdoch, Bill	Yakabuski, John

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 47; the nays are 18.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The minister may wish to make a brief statement.

Hon. Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): This is the second bill that implements a number of the progressive and

soundly thought-out measures that were contained in the budget presented by my predecessor, the Minister of Energy. I'm actually somewhat shocked that the opposition parties would be voting against a bill that provided for additional support for seniors; that provided for tax credits to strengthen business. Of course, if they want to do that, I look forward to the debate we're going to have on second and third readings. Thank you.

MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Agreed? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Bradley: I move that, notwithstanding standing order 96(g), notice for ballot item 55 be waived.

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

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

CPR TRAINING IN HIGH SCHOOLS ENTRAÎNEMENT À LA RÉANIMATION CARDIO-RESPIRATOIRE DANS LES ÉCOLES SECONDAIRES

Hon. Jim Watson (Minister of Health Promotion): Earlier this afternoon, I was joined by a number of colleagues from both sides of the House, including my ministerial colleagues Kathleen Wynne and George Smitherman. We were honoured to join high school students in the Advanced Coronary Treatment Foundation of Canada, better known as ACT, for a reception and demonstration of lifesaving skills. I'd like to share with this House an example of why learning how to perform CPR is so important for Ontarians.

Last March, Arnie Swedler was having dinner with his wife, Sarah, at a popular Ottawa restaurant following a flight home from New York City, when he suffered a cardiac arrest. Also dining with his family that night was Ross Griffith. When he and his mother, Lise, a nurse, saw Mr. Swedler's distress, they leapt into action and performed two-person CPR on Mr. Swedler until the paramedics arrived.

Ross Griffith was among the first high school students to receive CPR training through the 1994 Ottawa pilot of the ACT Foundation high school cardiopulmonary resuscitation training program. It was the CPR training he

received through the ACT Foundation that empowered Ross to act in an emergency.

Aujourd'hui, à Queen's Park, nous avons souligné la Journée de la réanimation cardio-respiratoire en invitant des élèves d'écoles secondaires de la région, qui ont suivi la même formation que Ross Griffith, à faire la démonstration de leurs capacités.

The CPR high school program is a joint initiative between the McGuinty government and the ACT Foundation which is supported by many corporate partners, and I just want to briefly read those out to you: AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Pfizer Canada, and Sanofi-Aventis; and other partners: the Trillium Foundation, Hydro One, Shoppers Drug Mart, and the Kiwanis Club of Toronto. The whole organization is chaired by Michael Cloutier, who is president of AstraZeneca.

Also joining us in the gallery—and I think she deserves special credit, because this is a program that started in Ottawa with great determination and drive by an individual. I said earlier today that when I was mayor, one of the worst fears I had was when I heard the words, “Sandra Clarke on line 1,” because I knew she wanted something, and she always got what she wanted: Sandra Clarke, the executive director of the ACT Foundation.

Together, the ACT Foundation has trained more than 150,000 high school students annually with the skills and knowledge to save lives. In fact, over 600,000 students have now been trained, and CPR training through the ACT Foundation is now available in almost 60% of high schools in the province.

Almost two years ago, Premier McGuinty announced a \$650,000 grant as part of a matching funding formula with the ACT Foundation to provide the equipment to expand the CPR program to all Ontario high schools. Those of us from eastern Ontario know very well the commitment and the passion the Premier has, not only for the ACT Foundation but also for the work that is being done in high schools.

Maintenant, chaque année, les élèves de neuvième année de toutes les écoles secondaires de l'Ontario reçoivent une formation en RCR. Plus de 600 élèves du secondaire ont déjà suivi une formation en RCR dans le cadre de leur programme d'études. En plus d'apprendre à pratiquer la réanimation cardio-respiratoire, les élèves apprennent à reconnaître les signes d'un malaise cardiaque et l'importance d'appeler rapidement le service d'urgence 911. En outre, on leur montre comment ils peuvent apporter de l'aide avant l'arrivée des ambulanciers.

Our government is proud to be a partner of this award-winning program. According to an Ontario pre-hospital advanced life support study, eight in 10 cardiac arrests occur at home, and citizen CPR can improve survival rates for victims of cardiac arrest by almost four times. By empowering youth with CPR training, we are helping to increase the citizen response rate to victims of cardiac arrest around the province.

In conclusion, our government is committed to providing the support to strengthen local-level programs

that deliver opportunities which make our communities safer for our fellow citizens. As we progress in creating a sustained focus on health promotion in the province, the McGuinty government will continue to work with our partners to build a healthier, stronger and safer Ontario.

I want to thank those partners who were here today in the committee room, thank over 30 MPPs who arrived to receive a briefing and training in CPR, and my thanks to the ACT Foundation, something that we're very proud of in Ottawa and now very proud of throughout the province.

PERSONS DAY

Hon. Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Economic Development and Trade, minister responsible for women's issues): Today we celebrate Persons Day, the heart of Women's History Month. It's a day to commemorate the courageous women of the early 20th century who challenged the existing status of women. It's a day to salute the Famous Five—Emily Murphy, Henrietta Muir Edwards, Louise McKinney, Nellie McClung and Irene Parlby—who refused to accept that women were lesser than men and fought for their rights over 13 long years.

It's a day to recall the historical significance of the Persons Case decision of October 18, 1929, when the British Privy Council agreed with them and ruled that Canadian women were indeed persons, despite arguments to the contrary by three consecutive Prime Ministers and the Supreme Court of Canada. With dogged determination, the Famous Five achieved the right for Canadian women to serve in the Senate. They paved the way for women to participate in all aspects of public life and contribute in a meaningful way to the economy, to society and to their communities, province and country.

Seventy-seven years later, the Persons Case decision remains a landmark victory in the struggle of Canadian women for equality. The results of this decision are everywhere. Women are leaders of major corporations; women are doctors, lawyer, plumbers, entrepreneurs; women are government representatives. StatsCan reports that more women are enrolled in university than men. And we see women blending career with parenthood, guiding the next generation with competence, confidence and compassion.

Yes, we've come a long way, and we've got a long way to go. As minister responsible for women's issues I meet women who, through no fault of their own, are unable to participate fully in society. I see many who are committed to helping them, women who work on their behalf, in the tradition of the Famous Five.

1410

I'm proud to say that our government has taken an important step in addressing women's safety in their homes, workplaces and communities, and in ensuring equal opportunities for education and training, particularly in high-growth areas where women are under-represented.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, all Ontarians and Canadians are called upon to recognize

women's extraordinary contributions. The theme for 2006 is Aboriginal Women: The Journey Forward.

Earlier today, I had the pleasure of awarding three aboriginal women with Leading Women, Building Communities awards. Our government created this award earlier this year to honour women for exceptional community leadership. The three women we honour today are a true inspiration to all women and in particular to aboriginal women and girls across our province. The award recipients are in the gallery today. When I mention them, it would be great if they could stand.

We had a tremendous ceremony today. Wabano lodge from Ottawa was there to open the ceremonies with a bang, literally.

Elder Lillian McGregor, a member of the Whitefish River First Nation, Birch Island, is a respected elder—

Applause.

Hon. Ms. Pupatello: Thank you so much for being here today. She is a respected elder for Ontario's aboriginal healing and wellness strategy and is the elder in residence at the University of Toronto's First Nations House.

The Honourable Madam Justice Rose Boyko is here today, the first aboriginal woman—

Applause.

Hon. Ms. Pupatello: Madam Justice Rose Boyko is the first aboriginal woman to be appointed to the Superior Court in Canada in 1994. She is a Tsek' ehne woman from McLeod Lake, British Columbia. We are pleased that she could be here. Madam Justice Boyko currently presides over family law, criminal and civil trials in the central east judicial region in Newmarket.

Sylvia Maracle, executive director of the Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres—

Applause.

Hon. Ms. Pupatello: Sylvia, it's great to have you in this House. She is from the Tyendinaga Mohawk Territories. Ms. Maracle played a key role in the design of Ontario's aboriginal healing and wellness strategy and has created programs for aboriginal peoples in health care, justice, education, cultural and economic development.

What a proud day we had today. Join me in congratulating these three award winners on their extraordinary achievements.

Mr. Speaker, you were there to join us today as well. The Persons Day decision has improved the lives of women as a group and society as a whole. Congratulations to our recipients today.

CPR TRAINING IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): On behalf of John Tory and the official opposition, I would like to commend the Advanced Coronary Treatment Foundation of Canada or, as it is known by its acronym, ACT, for its needed and excellent work in training high school students in CPR through their dedicated high school program.

I welcome the committed high school students who took time out of their busy schedules to come to Queen's

Park today to demonstrate their CPR skills and to help raise public awareness, especially among all members here, about the important initiative to establish the CPR program in all high schools throughout Ontario. I understand that this initiative has now reached high schools as far west as British Columbia.

The aim of ACT is to see every Canadian teenager graduate from high school with CPR skills and heart health information that they will take to their present and future families and into their communities.

Due to the generous support of local partners, a class set of 30 mannequins, manuals and teacher training is donated to all schools. Community partners include AstraZeneca, Aventis Pharma Inc., the Kiwanis Clubs of North York, Riverdale, Scarborough and Toronto, Merck Frosst Canada, the National Post newspaper, Pfizer Canada, Southam, St. John Ambulance and Subway.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those community partners and sponsors who are helping ACT achieve its goal of extending the CPR program to some 27,000 students across 130 high schools.

Congratulations for all you do to train our high school students in life-saving CPR techniques.

PERSONS DAY

Mrs. Christine Elliott (Whitby-Ajax): Today I'm very pleased to speak on behalf of the PC caucus to recognize Persons Day. Persons Day is a time for all of us at Queen's Park and across the province to take notice of and celebrate the contributions women have made and are making in Ontario, Canada and around the world.

It took eight years for the Famous Five—Emily Murphy, Nellie McClung, Louise McKinney, Irene Parlby and Henrietta Muir Edwards—to succeed in their quest to have women declared persons under the BNA Act, but with perseverance, they were victorious.

We sometimes forget how significantly our lives were changed on October 18, 1929, and it is important that we have times like these—times like Women's History Month, times like Persons Day—that encourage us to be grateful and humbled and awe-inspired, not only by the acknowledgement of women as persons, but also by the constant accomplishments women are achieving in business, academia, the arts, sport and even in politics.

Of course, not only are we encouraged to look back with pride, we must also look forward with ambition and courage, and one doesn't have to look far to see areas in need of attention. Today, none of the Canadian political parties is headed by a woman and not a single one of Canada's Premiers is a woman. On an international scale, the Inter-Parliamentary Union ranks countries by the number of women in their national Legislatures. For 2006, Canada ranks 44th. We can do better.

That said, it is important to move forward with a positive outlook, and I'm delighted with the commitment and enthusiasm that has been displayed on this issue. You will remember that in June of this year, all three political leaders agreed on the need to see more women

elected to the Ontario Legislature. In fact, our leader, John Tory, has unequivocally stated his support for encouraging more women to enter politics and has pledged to run no fewer than 34 women candidates in the next election. I think the challenge that remains for us, particularly in this House, is to accelerate the progress toward inclusion of women in decision-making bodies, but we also need to increase our impact on decision-making.

I have no doubt that as we continue to work together—all three political parties—we can increase the opportunities for equality for all women. I think it's important to note that I'm especially proud to be sitting alongside a number of outstanding women who have entered public life—Lisa MacLeod, Elizabeth Witmer, Laurie Scott and Julia Munro—all of whom have not only served their province, but all serve as role models to all women.

Finally, I would like to welcome and congratulate this year's award recipients: Elder Lillian McGregor, Madam Justice Rose Boyko and Sylvia Maracle. Thank you for your contributions to our communities.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): I think it needs to be noted that most of the women in this House are the first women in their families, if they were born in Canada, to be human persons, so I am pleased to stand and speak on Persons Day.

I want to acknowledge some women. First of all, Rosemary Brown, the first woman of colour who was ever elected in Canada, in BC—NDP, of course—in 1972. Zanana Akande, the first woman of colour ever made cabinet minister in Ontario, in 1990—again, NDP. In 1996, Jenny Kwan, one of two—

Interjections.

Ms. DiNovo: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that women are still being shouted down by men in the House.

In 1996, Jenny Kwan, one of the first two women of Asian heritage ever elected to a Canadian Legislature, in BC—NDP. In 2003, Joan Beatty, the first aboriginal cabinet minister ever elected—NDP. And of course Agnes Macphail, the first woman ever to be elected to the House of Commons when women could first vote legally—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): I need to be able—

Interjection.

The Speaker: The Minister of Finance will come to order.

Member for Parkdale–High Park.

Ms. DiNovo: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply restating history. Agnes Macphail was the first woman ever to be elected to the House of Commons, in 1921, when women could first vote legally, and the first president of the Ontario CCF, later to be the Ontario NDP.

I also draw your attention to the fact that the Valiant or Famous Five were also originators of the union movement in this country, with the United Farmers of Alberta.

Finally, I have to say that the true tribute to women—

Interjection.

Ms. DiNovo: Again, Mr. Speaker, a man is shouting down a woman in the House.

1420

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Interjection.

The Speaker: The Minister of Finance.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock. Order.

Interjections.

We can wait.

Member for Parkdale–High Park.

Ms. DiNovo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, I'd like to say that the true tribute to these women, the Famous Five, or Valiant Five, is what we do now for women's rights in this province. I draw your attention to the fact that the McGuinty government promised in 2003 to put money into child care: \$300 million to be exact.

Interjections.

Ms. DiNovo: Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the opportunity to speak.

The Speaker: Member for Parkdale–High Park.

Ms. DiNovo: Again, to continue over the shouts of some of our men in the House, I'd like to say that the true tribute to women is what we do right now. Right here, in the province of Ontario, two thirds of the women who work and live on minimum wage, who can't pay the rent and feed their children, need a raise in the minimum wage to \$10 an hour. Women need child care right now. They need that \$300 million. Nine out of 10 of our children go without a child care space. So if we want to really pay a tribute to women, let's do that by acting now.

CPR TRAINING IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I was pleased to participate in CPR day at Queen's Park today. A little after 10 o'clock this morning, I was given a demonstration of life-saving skills by two students from St. Joseph's College School. I want to commend Catherine Declaro and Cristina Hernandez on the skill they demonstrated in performing CPR and on their willingness, and patience, to answer questions I had about the demonstration.

I wanted to note as well that four of the school boards in Sudbury and area have agreed to participate with the Advanced Coronary Treatment Foundation to train phys. ed. teachers to train grade 9 students in CPR. The training for the phys. ed. teachers in the French boards has already occurred. It was very successful, and I know that next week, when the phys. ed. teachers for the English school boards are taught, they will do their job well. They are instrumental in ensuring that grade 9 students in our community will be appropriately taught life-saving skills.

The final point I'd like to make is that the training in our high schools occurs through the phys. ed. program in

grade 9, which is the only time that phys. ed. is mandatory. Given that CPR skills are life-saving, we should be figuring out how we amend the school curriculum so that high school students are exposed to CPR training every year, so that they can keep up their skills. I hope the Minister of Health Promotion will take up that challenge to ensure that all high school students receive this training every year so that they feel confident they can respond to an emergency.

VISITORS

Mr. Tony Ruprecht (Davenport): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'm delighted to introduce to this House two representatives of the government of Estonia, Halve Masakas and Jaak Laanemetz, who are here to see democracy in action. They are in the east gallery.

While I'm on my feet, I'm also very happy to introduce to you a number of young women from one of the best colleges in Toronto: Loretto College. They're sitting right over there. Welcome and congratulations.

DEFERRED VOTES

CLEAN WATER ACT, 2006

LOI DE 2006 SUR L'EAU SAINE

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 43, An Act to protect existing and future sources of drinking water and to make complementary and other amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 43, Loi visant à protéger les sources existantes et futures d'eau potable et à apporter des modifications complémentaires et autres à d'autres lois.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1425 to 1430.

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

Ayes

Balkissoon, Bas	Fonseca, Peter	Peters, Steve
Bartolucci, Rick	Gerretsen, John	Peterson, Tim
Bentley, Christopher	Hoy, Pat	Phillips, Gerry
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Jeffrey, Linda	Pupatello, Sandra
Bountrogianni, Marie	Kwinter, Monte	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Lalonde, Jean-Marc	Ramal, Khail
Broten, Laurel C.	Leal, Jeff	Ramsay, David
Brownell, Jim	Marsales, Judy	Ruprecht, Tony
Bryant, Michael	Matthews, Deborah	Sandals, Liz
Cansfield, Donna H.	McGuinty, Dalton	Smith, Monique
Caplan, David	McMeekin, Ted	Smitherman, George
Colle, Mike	Meilleur, Madeleine	Sorbara, Gregory S.
Crozier, Bruce	Milloy, John	Van Bommel, Maria
Delaney, Bob	Mitchell, Carol	Watson, Jim
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Wilkinson, John
Dombrowsky, Leona	Oraziotti, David	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Duguid, Brad	Parsons, Ernie	Zimmer, David
Duncan, Dwight	Patten, Richard	

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

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Klees, Frank	Prue, Michael
Barrett, Toby	Kormos, Peter	Runciman, Robert W.
Bisson, Gilles	MacLeod, Lisa	Scott, Laurie
Chudleigh, Ted	Marchese, Rosario	Tabuns, Peter
DiNovo, Cheri	Martel, Shelley	Tascona, Joseph N.
Dunlop, Garfield	Martiniuk, Gerry	Wilson, Jim
Elliott, Christine	Miller, Norm	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hampton, Howard	Munro, Julia	Yakabuski, John
Hardeman, Ernie	Murdoch, Bill	
Hudak, Tim	O'Toole, John	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr. Claude L. DesRosiers): The ayes are 53; the nays are 28.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

JOB CREATION

Mr. Ted Chudleigh (Halton): My question is for the Premier. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked you yet again for the comprehensive jobs plan that this House—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Stop the clock. You may recall that the Speaker needs to be able to hear questions being put. You probably also recall that only one person is permitted to speak here at a time. The member for Halton has the floor. I would like to be able to hear his question.

Mr. Chudleigh: My question is for the Premier. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked you yet again for the comprehensive job plan that this House unanimously requested back in December 2005. Twenty-four hours have passed, and still no response from you or your government; another 24 hours of dithering, delaying and deflecting; another 24 hours when people in St. Thomas, London, Mississauga, Guelph and Burlington are left wondering when you're going to keep your promise. When will you listen to the members of this House, Premier, and bring forward a real, comprehensive job plan?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): To the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): I'm just not sure where my friend has been over the past three years. In fact, strong economic development has been at the heart of absolutely every measure that this government has taken over the course of the past three years. If you look at our first budget—the investments that we made in education and health care and the renewal of health care facilities right across the province. Investments in post-secondary education, which mean strong, high-paying jobs for our young people for decades to come—that was the second budget. In the third budget—the investment in roads and bridges and highways. I want to tell my friend

that over the course of the next six years, some 500,000 jobs will be created by virtue of those measures.

Mr. Chudleigh: It's a long way from a million jobs.

Minister of Finance, yesterday we heard the refrain, "Just think what \$314 million would do." We don't have to imagine. We already know what you do with that money: \$200 million to fire nurses and close community care access centres; millions on unnecessary logo changes; \$30 million to cancel a gas-fired power plant that would have replaced a coal-fired plant in Thunder Bay, and on and on.

Here's what the people of Ontario are thinking about: "What would happen if you took the issue seriously and had a plan to turn the economy around?" Well, just think, if the Premier brought forward a real plan and we had job growth like Saskatchewan's 3.2%—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order.

Interjection.

The Speaker: The Minister of Energy will come to order. I won't warn him again.

The member for Halton.

Mr. Chudleigh: This government is sensitive about jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Just think, if the Premier brought forward a real plan and we had job growth like Saskatchewan's 3.2% last year, we could have created over 200,000 jobs in the last 12 months, never mind the three years the Premier talks about.

Minister, why won't you listen to the House and bring forward that comprehensive job program that you promised in December 2005?

Hon. Mr. Sorbara: Again, I'm not sure where my friend from Halton has been for the past three years. Over the course of the past three years, this economy has created over a quarter of a million jobs; 90% of those are full-time and high-paying jobs.

We have had some difficulties recently on the manufacturing side. I want to tell my friend that he could help out in this area. We are trying desperately to get a labour market partnership agreement with the federal government. Now I want to give him a number: 613-992-4211. That's the Prime Minister's number. Why don't you give him a call and invite him to come to the table and meet his obligations to the people of this province?

1440

Mr. Chudleigh: If memory serves me correctly, on October 2, 2003, you were elected to govern this province. When are you going to start?

Minister, you continue to look for others to blame. Your Minister of Economic Development and Trade calls it a cycle. That's an insult to the people of Ontario, and it ignores the fact that Ontario is cycling down while other provinces are cycling up. Job growth equal to BC's last year of 4% would have meant over 250,000 new jobs in Ontario. Job growth equal to Manitoba's and Newfoundland's of 1.5% would have meant nearly 100,000 jobs last year in Ontario.

Your dithering, delaying and deflecting are not a plan. Your blaming of others is not a plan. Your broken promises are not a plan. The House requested a plan last year. You promised to listen to the House. Where's the plan?

Hon. Mr. Sorbara: Within I think six months of being elected, we brought forward a comprehensive automobile strategy which has resulted in some \$7 billion in new investment in the most competitive industry on the entire continent. When those folks were in power, not one additional kilowatt of electrical capacity was built. So far, through the Minister of Energy's work, we've built 3,000 additional megawatts of electrical capacity.

Moments ago, that party voted against a budget bill that will provide, if passed, additional incentives for more jobs to be created in this province. I cannot believe that after sitting in that seat for three years, the member from Halton has been completely oblivious to all of this work.

VIOLENCE IN ENTERTAINMENT

Mr. Robert W. Runciman (Leeds-Grenville): I have a question for the Attorney General. Minister, in October 2000, you issued a press release calling for the former government to regulate the sale of CDs and tapes that contain violent lyrics and crack down on artists who advocate violence and hate. You even suggested bringing an injunction to stop Eminem performing in Toronto.

You've been in office for over three years. What have you done about an issue that you told people you were very concerned about five years ago, or was this just another "Say anything to get elected" ploy by the Liberals?

Hon. Michael Bryant (Attorney General): That's an interesting version of what happened. In fact, what happened was that an individual came to my office with some grave concerns about a matter that she felt was a hate crime. She had lodged information with the Ontario Provincial Police and asked what the next steps were. In fact, the next steps were in the hands of the Ontario Provincial Police and it was within their jurisdiction to take action.

My question was to the government of the day, what their view was on it. As I recall, their view was that Jim Flaherty felt that a concert should not take place in Toronto, which was absurd.

I say to the member that you need to get your facts right. We were ensuring that each branch of the state was doing their job. I certainly don't make any apologies for standing up at that time to hold that government's feet to the fire, and I'll continue to be proud of our record when it comes to the pursuit of equality and fighting hate crimes in Ontario.

Mr. Runciman: I hope this is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker: What a crock. I happen to have your press release here, Minister, if one of the pages wants to take it over. We'll see what you were saying five years ago. Can we get a page to take this over to the Attorney General?

There was a disturbing article in the Toronto Sun recently regarding DVDs that feature real home videos of violent street fights and group beatings. Police have described the videos as “graphic celebrations of street violence, gang culture, contempt for the law and anti-social behaviour.” A couple of the titles are “Ghetto Fights” and “Wildest Street Brawls.” They’re available in Ontario at 16 bucks each.

Toronto Police expert Dave Saunders—and he’s an expert in youth crime—has described the videos as “akin to promoting ... violence and sometimes horrible gang victimization” amongst youth.

Minister, do you agree that the rating of these videos should be left in the hands of the video industry, or should the responsibility lie with the Ontario Film Review Board?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I think the member knows that consumer affairs and the labelling of videos are not within my portfolio. I think what the member is trying to get at is to see whether or not the Ministry of the Attorney General continues to dedicate itself to fighting hate crimes and preventing hate crimes in any way, shape or form. It was in the name of that that we established the first-ever hate crimes community working group, which has been doing its work with input from across the province for a number of months now, and we expect to have those reports out. I can assure the member that when those reports do come out, we will be implementing them.

Mr. Runciman: In opposition leader John Tory’s community consultations on violence affecting youth, he heard with great frequency from parents, educators and police about the concerns they have with the influence of certain aspects of pop culture on the attitude and behaviour of young people.

Another element of this, according to the Sun story, is the ease with which minors can purchase these videos. In their investigation, 15-year-olds had no difficulty making these purchases. The British Columbia government rates DVDs of this nature as adult films, which means they can only be sold in adult stores, similar to pornographic movies. Are you prepared to consider that approach in Ontario, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Bryant: I’ll refer this to the minister responsible for consumer affairs.

Hon. Gerry Phillips (Minister of Government Services): I’m prepared to look at that, certainly. For many years, as you know, under the previous government and under this government, we have been relying on the industry to rate these videos. They have been closely watched to make certain that when they’re put into a store, the store is following the rules on that. If that’s not happening, we would be very much interested in looking at it. I will take your final suggestion under advisement. I’m interested in making sure that we provide proper protection for the citizens of Ontario. There also is the usual need to make certain that we don’t unnecessarily interfere in freedom of speech. But we will balance those things. I’d be happy to look at that suggestion.

CHILDREN’S AID SOCIETIES

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River): My question is for the Premier. I believe all members of this Legislature were deeply troubled by the tragic deaths of three-year-old Serena Campione and her one-year-old sister, Sophia, while they were under the supervision of the children’s aid society.

Given this latest tragedy, given the tragic death of young Jeffrey Baldwin and given some of the concerns working families across Ontario have raised about the capacity of our children’s aid societies to protect vulnerable children, don’t you think it’s time, Premier, that Ontario gave the Ombudsman independent oversight authority in respect of children’s aid societies so we can be assured that vulnerable children will have the independent protection and oversight they deserve?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): I’m pleased to take the question. First of all, let me speak as much as I legitimately and properly can to the recent tragedy of a young mother who allegedly killed two young children.

My sympathies go out on behalf, I’m sure, of all members here to the family and friends in the community affected. I say, as well, that we are now going to allow the process to unfold. I understand that in fact there are four separate investigations underway: The coroner is conducting an investigation; the police, of course, are investigating this matter, as well they should; the Ontario’s child death review committee is also conducting an investigation; and the children’s aid society involved is now hiring an external investigator. I think when it comes to that particular circumstance, it’s important that we allow those investigations to play themselves out.

Mr. Hampton: Unfortunately, these things are all happening after the fact. When Jeffrey Baldwin died, the local CAS called it, “A collective blind spot for child welfare agencies and the courts.”

Well, there is someone in the province of Ontario whose job is to investigate collective blind spots and improve government services for everyone. It’s called the Ombudsman of Ontario. For over a year, Ontario’s Ombudsman has asked your government for independent oversight authority in respect of children’s aid societies. Eight other provinces have legislated independent oversight of children’s aid societies.

My question is this: Why, under the McGuinty government, is Ontario so far behind? Why is the McGuinty government so opposed to giving Ontario’s very credible and respected Ombudsman independent oversight authority in respect of the activities of children’s aid societies?

1450

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: The leader of the NDP will know that in fact we have made changes to the Child and Family Services Act through Bill 210, to be proclaimed, I believe, in November. He also knows that we have in fact given independent, objective, arm’s-length oversight to the Child and Family Services Review Board. He knows

that. What he's saying is that that's not good enough and his preference is that the Ombudsman be given that responsibility, and I disagree with him on that. The leader of the NDP also knows that the Ombudsman can at any time decide that he wants to investigate children's aid societies, generally speaking.

We have decided, as a government, that we agree entirely with the Ombudsman to the extent that there should be neutral, third party oversight of the children's aid societies, but we have decided to give that responsibility to the Child and Family Services Review Board.

Mr. Hampton: Premier, you know that your Child and Family Services Review Board is a part-time board, it's not independent, it reports to the ministry, and many of the people who are appointed there have no expertise, no credibility in this area whatsoever. The board simply doesn't have the knowledge or the experience to be able to address some of these complex issues.

Jane Ogden, David Witzel, Lisa Diamond, Krzysz Chmiel and Samuel Fragomeni are parents who have written, asking that the Ombudsman be able to look into children's aid society activities, address systemic problems and protect vulnerable children. Jeffrey Baldwin, Randal Dooley and now Serena and Sophia Campione are children who have died under the supervision of children's aid societies.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Question?

Mr. Hampton: It seems to me the Ombudsman makes a very thoughtful and reasonable case. There are obviously some very serious problems. Why are you so opposed to giving the Ombudsman's office, somebody who has expertise—

The Speaker: The question has been asked. Premier?

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: I want to correct the record, because a moment ago I said that the Ombudsman can investigate children's aid societies generally, and he cannot. But he does have oversight over the Child and Family Services Review Board.

There is likely going to be a coroner's inquest resulting from this particular tragedy. Of course, there is going to be a police investigation and possibly charges flowing from that. We've made a decision that it is in fact very important that we have an independent, arm's-length third party with authority to review the children's aid societies on an ongoing basis. We've given that responsibility to the Child and Family Services Review Board. Decisions coming from that board can go up to the Ombudsman, so ultimately he in fact does have oversight over these kinds of issues.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora-Rainy River): To the Premier: For days we have asked you to stop wasting millions of dollars of public money on your self-serving television ads that promote your government, because these ads certainly don't reflect the reality of what is happening in our hospital emergency rooms. Dr. John Carter works at Grand River Hospital in Kitchener. He

says there are no emergency room doctors scheduled to work several critical overnight shifts for the rest of October. Without an emergency room doctor, the emergency room will have to shut down.

Premier, the situation at the Grand River Hospital emergency room is not getting better, it is getting much worse and your self-serving television ads, which waste millions of dollars of public money, are not going to make a difference. When are you going to drop the self-serving ads and come up with a real plan to fix the problems in our hospital emergency rooms?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): First of all, I want to take this opportunity to thank not only Dr. Carter but all of the physicians and nurses who have responded to the call, who are performing heroically in order to ensure that there is coverage available at that emergency room at the Grand River Hospital. Without their support on the ground, we simply could not manage.

Let me also say to the leader of the NDP that we are, in fact, working with the physician and nurse community to ensure we can maintain such coverage on an ongoing basis. In the supplementary, I will be delighted to speak to this notion of what kind of good information is being made available to Ontarians through our advertising.

Mr. Hampton: Dr. Carter and his colleagues work full time at nearby St. Mary's hospital, and then they work as many night shifts as they can to keep the Grand River Hospital emergency room open. These local doctors care about their community and they want to keep the hospital emergency room open, but they can't sustain many more of these marathon night shifts. Dr. Carter says, "I'm at the end of my rope. It's a matter of days and weeks how much longer people are willing to keep bailing out a sinking ship."

Premier, your so-called investigator, Tom Closson, hasn't even met with these doctors yet, and the emergency room could easily close again before the end of October. This is a problem that requires immediate attention, and it requires a plan. It doesn't need more millions of dollars of public money wasted on your self-serving television ads. When are we going to see a plan instead of more propaganda?

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: Let me speak to the notion of the ads which inform Ontarians about the wait times website. The leader of the NDP may feel that it is of no particular use to him, but so far, 1.65 million Ontarians have visited that website. If you visit that website, you will find out on the first page that they'll give you a good sense of what's been happening to wait times for cancer surgeries, angiography, angioplasty, bypass surgeries, hip replacement surgeries, knee replacement surgeries, cataract surgeries, MRIs and CTs.

But more than that, if you punch in the procedure in which you have an interest, as well as the name of your community—for example, I punched in "Orangeville" and "cataract"—it tells you exactly what the wait times are in that particular community. More than that, you can also punch in, "I want the 10 fastest wait times at hos-

pitals throughout the province of Ontario,” which many Ontarians are doing, because that gives them a good choice—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you, Premier. Final supplementary.

Mr. Hampton: This is interesting. We’ve got hospital emergency rooms on the verge of shutdown, and the Premier wants to talk about cataracts in Orangeville.

Kitchener–Waterloo is the tip of the hospital emergency room iceberg. Emergency rooms in hospitals across this province are facing difficulty. If you want to talk about wait times, people are waiting seven, eight, nine, 10 hours, in urgent cases. In Sault Ste. Marie, hospital administrators say that emergency room physician coverage is fragile. Emergency rooms in Sudbury, Ottawa and Niagara are overcrowded because the shortage of long-term-care beds clogs up hospital beds, which clogs up the emergency room. Two weeks ago, Hamilton Health Sciences Centre was forced to call off surgeries.

I say again, Premier: Manitoba saw the problem coming. They developed a plan, not self-serving advertising. When are we going to see the McGuinty government’s plan instead of more propaganda?

Hon. Mr. McGuinty: The causes of our emergency room challenges are well known, and the leader of the NDP might take a long, hard look in the mirror to discover the source of some of those challenges. He will know that they cut—he doesn’t like to hear this—medical school spaces by 13%. We’re growing them by 23%. The Conservative government shut some 28 hospitals, eliminating thousands of beds. We have close to 2,000 new beds under construction.

1500

The other thing that we need to do, of course, is to invest in community-based care. What we’re doing here, in addition to investing in 49 new community health centres and 150 new family health teams—we’ve also found home care for 71,000 more Ontarians.

I’m just not nearly as pessimistic as the leader of the NDP when it comes to ensuring we maintain coverage in our emergency rooms. We will continue to work with our doctors and with our nurses so we can continue to provide that coverage.

TOURISM

Mr. Ted Arnott (Waterloo–Wellington): My question is for the Minister of Tourism. Ontario’s tourism industry directly employs more than 213,000 people. Thousands of these jobs are in jeopardy, in part because of the McGuinty Liberal government’s unwillingness to support the tourism industry. Even the Toronto Star agrees. In their editorial last Saturday condemning the self-serving, partisan, multi-million-dollar taxpayer-funded Liberal TV ads, the Star said that, in contrast, tourism advertising “fulfills a public service.”

I know someone else in this House who agrees—or used to—when he said, in June 2003, and I’m quoting from Hansard, that “using taxpayers’ dollars to promote

government policies, to congratulate itself because of policies and positions that it’s taken, is simply not acceptable,” or when he criticized what he called “a virtual orgy of self-congratulatory, blatantly partisan advertising,” or when he advocated for the Preventing Partisan Advertising Act as his private member’s bill three years ago.

Does the minister recall who made these statements, and does he still agree with what he said in 2003?

Hon. James J. Bradley (Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, Government House Leader): I don’t know how that fits the portfolio, but let me talk about the advertising in the ministry.

My good friend from Niagara had a great photograph on the back—oh, you’re not supposed to use that—of that particular document.

What I want to say to him is that in the field of advertising to lure people to come to this province, we are involved in many programs, not only in the province of Ontario, designed to keep people in Ontario, but also trying to lure our American friends across the border again. That has been a major challenge, as he would know. We have some special programs in the state of Michigan and the state of New York going on at this time. We made a new effort in the province of Quebec to bring people from the province of Quebec to Ontario, a market that perhaps had been neglected the way it shouldn’t be neglected. We will continue to work with the private sector through the Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership Corp. to ensure that we have the kind of promotional marketing—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. Supplementary.

Mr. Arnott: The minister ignored the substance of my question yet again, and in doing so, he ignores the plight of the tourism industry yet again.

Any fair-minded person who knows anything about politics knows that the singular motive of these expensive TV ads is to attempt to create a feel-good impression amongst voters that things are going well, that they should feel grateful to the Liberal Party and that they should vote for them in a year’s time. As such, they are blatantly partisan.

Given the fact that this government has budgeted tens of millions of dollars for advertising in this way, they could put a fraction of that money into enhancing the tourism advertising budget, doing targeted advertisements in our key American markets, inviting tourists to Ontario and reminding them that they don’t need a passport to visit us this fall. Will the minister do this and will he stand up for Ontario’s tourism industry?

Hon. Mr. Bradley: Let me tell you that we are doing all of these things. But I’ll tell you how you can stand up, you members of the Conservative caucus. The federal government just cancelled a program, which was a GST rebate for tourists coming to the province of Ontario. Today, that was condemned by all the major tourist organizations and coalitions in Canada. In addition to that, they had money within the Canadian Tourism Com-

mission that was already available to promote Canada. They refused to do that and decided they would take that out. They decided that they would cut funding to the small museums in many of the communities that you represent that draw people to the province of Ontario and keep people here in the province of Ontario.

I've written to the federal minister at least three times asking the federal minister, would he please convene a meeting of all the tourism ministers in Canada. He has, to this point in time, not agreed. I ask you to speak to your federal friends in Ottawa and stand up for Ontario.

WATER QUALITY

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth): My question is for the Premier. The McGuinty government's big pipe fiasco makes a mockery of your Clean Water Act as it continues to threaten source waters, the Oak Ridges moraine and Lake Ontario itself. Now, in apparent contravention of the Environmental Assessment Act, York region has approved the awarding of almost \$96 million in big pipe contracts associated with the end of that big pipe: the Duffins Creek water pollution control plant. That's prior to public comment being completed, that's prior to the time allotted for bump-up requests and that's prior to provincial approval. Premier, what does the region of York know about your pending decision on this file, about your pending decision on this stage of the big pipe EA, that others don't?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): I'll refer this to the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Laurel C. Broten (Minister of the Environment): I'm pleased to have a chance to talk today about the steps that this government is taking to ensure that we deliver safe, clean drinking water to the people of Ontario, starting with the implementation of the Clean Water Act, which passed today in this House despite opposition from both opposition parties. I can say that we have to celebrate our successes in this province because we've turned away from the days of Walkerton, when drinking water was not provided in a safe, clean and plentiful way. Most recently, the Sierra Legal Defence Fund completed its analysis of all Canadian provinces' water legislation, and do you know where Ontario ranked? Ontario ranked number one. We are delivering program after program to ensure that we inspect, that we protect, that we ensure that that water is safe, clean and plentiful for future generations. We are taking steps—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you, Minister. Supplementary?

Mr. Tabuns: It's clear that the Minister of the Environment's record on not answering questions continues unbroken. The big pipe will continue to take water out of the surrounding ecosystem forever. Between 25% and 30% of the big pipe's volume will be clean drinking water. That's thanks to the McGuinty government's refusal to stand up to York region and the developers.

Now York region is prejudging the outcome of your environmental assessment of the Duffins Creek water

pollution control plant. It's throwing your ability to uphold the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act and the integrity of this assessment into serious doubt.

It would be really nice to have an answer that addresses the question, Minister. Will you maintain the integrity of the EA process and show Ontarians you're serious about Lake Ontario waters? Will you issue a part II order and bump-up of the EA for the proposed expansion of the Duffins Creek water pollution control plant?

Hon. Ms. Broten: I think the member opposite has to examine his own decisions and determine whether he's in favour of clean water for Ontario or not, because the work that's being undertaken in the York-Durham community is as a result of the medical officer of health, who has said that sewage could back up into homes and businesses and that the long-approved growth plan is straining the existing sewage system. That work is being undertaken in York region. We will continue to scrutinize every single one of the region's activities to ensure that the many conditions that have been imposed on this environmental assessment will be abided by. The Ministry of the Environment is closely watching what is taking place in that part of the province because it is our goal and our obligation to ensure that every single Ontarian has safe, clean drinking water, and that's what we're going to do.

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron–Bruce): My question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, as part of this government's continued efforts to provide the very best health care to this province, you have announced the creation of several family health teams in rural communities. As a member from a large rural riding that is comprised of small communities, these family health teams are a very innovative idea for delivering the best health care to those not within close proximity of urban medical centres. How will these changes assist ridings such as Huron–Bruce in delivering the very best health care that Ontarians have come to expect?

Hon. George Smitherman (Deputy Premier, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care): It's a real privilege to work alongside the member from Huron–Bruce and to have had the chance, over the course of the summer, to have spent a good bit of time, although not enough for my liking, in her riding. It was probably too much for her liking, though, if we're honest.

1510

I think that one of the features of our government is the family health team initiative, which already holds a good degree of result and a lot more promise too. Ninety-one thousand patients across the province of Ontario who did not previously enjoy access to a primary care physician or a group of health care practitioners now do. In Huron–Bruce, that's 1,473 people who did not previously have access to a doctor, nearly 1,000 of them in Goderich alone.

The point is that these four teams which are coming to life at present, and some others that we've announced, are going to be able quite soon, as time moves on, to enhance the quality of care for people in that area. We know that access to health care in small communities is one of the lifebloods of those communities. Accordingly, we're very proud to be making these signature investments all across the landscape in rural Ontario.

Mrs. Mitchell: Minister, family health teams are certainly a step in the right direction, but my constituents are very concerned about the number of family doctors who are working. As you've mentioned before in the House, cuts to medical school spaces in the 1990s have placed Ontario in a very difficult position. This lack of foresight has put undue pressure on our health care system, and it's Ontarians who are paying the price.

Minister, yesterday in the House I talked about your plan to have a new group of doctors in the form of medical school residents working in our emergency rooms. What else is being done to address the doctor shortage in my riding and across the province?

Hon. Mr. Smitherman: As was noted in the House, the good people of Hanover and area who rely on the hospital had access to their hospital on the long weekend because of the actions of a medical resident, a doctor who is referred to as a PGY3, someone who already has a significant degree of training and has lent their assistance to benefit the people of Ontario. This is one example of the measures that we're involved in to grow the field, to grow the number of doctors who can be engaged in providing care in emergency rooms.

In addition is the celebrated initiative related to the growth and size of our medical schools, and bringing those satellite medical schools to places like Kitchener-Waterloo, Windsor and others and, at the same time, taking better advantage of our foreign-trained doctors.

I'm pleased to say to the honourable member that in the case of her local health integration network, known as the Southwest, at present a further 61 international medical graduates are working there. These are examples of the work that we're doing to grow the number of doctors overall. In the last five years, growth in doctors has resulted in 1,283 of them additionally on the front line in Ontario. We're working vigorously to make up the time that was lost on their watch.

HYDRO RATES

Mr. John Yakabuski (Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke): My question is for the Minister of Energy. The other day you announced through the OPA that Ontario had signed contracts for seven cogeneration projects, providing 414 megawatts. What you did not tell us, and what you have not told us, is the price of the power from these projects. Minister, with jobs being lost in McGuinty's Ontario in record numbers, the price of electricity is of paramount importance to Ontario's economy. Will you provide for the people of Ontario the pricing details of these contracts?

Hon. Dwight Duncan (Minister of Energy): If the member goes on the IESO's website, he'll find that the industrial price of electricity is lower today than when we took office three years ago. I would further suggest that he look at the whole range of prices; whether you're talking about the regulated price plan, whether you're talking about the individual contracts, these megawatts will be a small component of the overall price of electricity. We're pleased with the progress we're making on the industrial price of electricity. Those numbers are posted on a five-minute basis on the IESO's website. It would be well worth the member's time to go and look at that every day to see precisely what the price is. We're confident, because we have brought on more supply and because our conservation initiatives are having such a positive effect, that the price of electricity will continue to stay below where it was when we took office three years ago.

Mr. Yakabuski: Of course we can look at the spot price on any given day, and it might be good or it might not be good. But you promised transparency. You promised transparency, Minister, and what we get from you and your Premier is backroom deals with the Premier's friends for millions of dollars of worthless re-branding ads, but we need some clarification and we need some disclosure. It's my understanding that the RFP was for 1,000 megawatts of power, and you basically accepted every proposal that came back to you. So there's no really competitive process there. I think it is important for the people to know. If you're planning to invest in Ontario in the future, you need to know where the price of power might be going. You have a responsibility to tell the people of Ontario what the price of power involved in these contracts is. Will you do that, Minister?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: Based on the latest full year of gas price data—I don't know if the member understands how this works, but the price of natural gas really impacts on the price of electricity. Based on the prices for last year, it would have resulted in a full-year average of 10.6 cents per kilowatt hour on those specific projects. During the critical summer period, the average price for the seven projects would have been 8.3 cents per kilowatt hour. I remind the member that the industrial price of electricity is lower than when we took office.

What we're having trouble understanding is, where do you stand? What are you going to do? Are you going to close these projects? Are you not going to proceed on the Niagara tunnel project? Are you not going to bring on more supply?

Mr. Yakabuski: Answer the damn question, Dwight.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Order. Member for Renfrew, I need you to withdraw the comment.

Mr. Yakabuski: I withdraw. What did I say?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: That party's leader says he's going to contract for more private power, so why would he be opposed to this? That party says there are too many

agencies, but when they ask Mr. Tory what he would cancel, he doesn't know.

This government has an energy plan. It's working. Prices are lower now than they were three years ago. That's why you're over there and we're over here, and we're going to stay here for the next four years.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): A question to the Minister of Labour: On March 28, you promised to take action on independent operators who opt out of workplace safety insurance premiums. You said that Ontario was threatened by a growing underground economy in construction and that workers' health and safety wasn't being protected. You announced 90 days of consultation on a plan, and that was 231 days ago. Where's the plan?

Hon. Steve Peters (Minister of Labour): I thank the member for the question. The underground economy is something that every one of us in this House should be extremely concerned about. It's estimated that we lose an average of \$2 billion a year to that economy in this province. That's why we've moved forward on a number of initiatives, including developing better partnerships between the Ministry of Finance, the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency and the WSIB to look at what steps we can take to better enhance and collect those monies that are owing to the province.

This is a comprehensive report that was completed. It's an issue where there certainly are different opinions on both sides. The report has been completed, it is being reviewed by the Ministry of Labour, and I look forward in the not-too-distant future to announcing the direction that the government will be going in.

Mr. Kormos: You said that you were going to take quick action. But 231 days after your 90-day consultation period, you've got nothing to say.

As much as a third of Ontario's construction sector is in the underground economy. Let me tell you what workers are saying. They're worried that you've caved in to the pressure from business interests that want you to ignore workers' health and safety and maintain the status quo. Are you going to extend mandatory workplace safety and insurance coverage so it actually protects everyone in construction, or are you going to cave in to the pressure from the business interests?

Hon. Mr. Peters: Again, I thank the member for the question. I'm very proud of the record we have in place when it comes to inspections within the province of Ontario. We made a commitment to hire an additional 200 inspectors. We saw the number of inspectors in this province slide to a disastrously low level. We realize that inspection is extremely important, and we made that commitment to hire an additional 200 inspectors. Over 180 of them are in place, the vast majority of them dedicated to the construction sector.

1520

As well, as I said earlier, this is a very comprehensive report that has been completed. It's an issue that is going

to take time to ensure that proper consideration is being given by the government. We're going to ensure that that happens. The honourable member can comment as he wishes, and offer up his opinions.

I want to thank those who participated in the process. There were a number of divergent views put forward—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. Bruce Crozier (Essex): My question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Minister, recently, the federal government announced an environmental plan, and subsequently there was some speculation that tough new auto emission standards would be imposed on the auto sector as part of this plan.

Minister, as you and I well know, the auto sector is the heart of the Ontario economy and is a major industry in the Windsor and Essex areas. Can you please comment on the federal plan and where our government stands on this issue?

Hon. Sandra Pupatello (Minister of Economic Development and Trade, minister responsible for women's issues): I'm very pleased to respond to the member from Essex, who is a huge supporter of the automotive industry and knows full well its impact both on the manufacturing sector generally and on the Canadian economy.

Let me say this: Our Premier has made it very clear to the federal government, as have I in my meetings with them, that Ontario is prepared to do its part in terms of what we need to contribute for decreases in emissions. But the truth is that we don't anticipate that the federal government would come and put more on Ontario than it would any other province, or in fact any other specific sector.

The real question here is what support we have, and our members opposite want to laugh at this issue, but in fact, this is a huge issue if the federal government doesn't land in the right way in terms of standards on emissions. The leader of the NDP does not answer the question, where is he on gas emissions on the auto sector? I expect an answer. I want to know where the NDP lands on this. And I need them to call off—

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. Supplementary.

Mr. Crozier: I'm pleased that our government has taken a clear position on this plan. Not only is the NDP not concerned about protecting jobs here in Ontario, but the members of John Tory's caucus have come out and called our auto investments wrong-headed. Minister, are we the only party concerned about protecting our auto industry and the thousands that it employs?

Interjections.

The Speaker: Order. I need to be able to hear the minister.

Hon. Ms. Pupatello: I think the member from Essex is absolutely correct. Both parties, in fact, have been very unsupportive of our manoeuvres with the auto sector to

land \$7 billion of investment in this province, something the last government was unable to do. And while they claim to support the industry, the truth is that when we say, "Make the phone call and tell your Ottawa buddies to stop laying on the auto sector, because it has a huge impact on our industries here in Ontario," we expect you to pick up the phone. And to the NDP, we expect you to pick up the phone to your NDP friends in Ottawa and tell them to stop harping on these issues that involve the auto sector. If you truly think that our economy is in such great shape, stop asking your manufacturing questions. You can't have it both ways. Either you support the auto industry or you don't, and I'd like to know where both of those opposition parties are.

ASSISTANCE TO THE DISABLED

Mr. Gerry Martiniuk (Cambridge): My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Madam Minister, I'd like to ask you today about the long-suffering disabled people of our province. I know you would agree that our most vulnerable citizens deserve the support of all members of our Legislature. Unfortunately, your ministry puts the disabled through hoops when applying for the Ontario disability support program, according to the Ombudsman. Stalling and delaying disabled benefits is no way to save money. And if that were not bad enough, your ministry rides roughshod over the needs of the disabled for special diet allowances. Lastly, I've received numerous complaints that the McGuinty government refuses to pay an amount of benefits that would permit the disabled to live better than a subsistence level.

I ask you, when are you and Premier McGuinty going to recognize the real needs of the disabled community in Ontario?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur (Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for franco-phone affairs): I want to thank my colleague from the opposition party for his question. Yes, I was shocked to hear the question from the opposition—this party. I'm going to tell you that we're very concerned about those who are disabled and those who need support from our government, from our ministry.

When we came into power, we started cleaning the mess that you left. That's what we did: We spent so much time cleaning the mess that you left. Yes, for those who need support, we—and everything, a backlog, to help clean up the backlog. They closed the original office and they amalgamated everything, cut the staff by half and fired all the doctors who were there supporting us to help speed up the review of these files and the acknowledgement of those who need support.

Mr. Martiniuk: It's not good enough for this government to continue to make empty promises. This government has been in office for three long years, and in that time they've failed to take responsibility for the disabled. The fact is, when adjusted for inflation, Ontario's disabled pensions are hundreds less than in 1997, under

the previous government. These are not my calculations—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Stop the clock. We all need some help in here. The Speaker by himself cannot control the noise level. I need the co-operation of all honourable members. We need to recall that when one member has the floor, he's the only one who can speak. I need to hear the member for Cambridge place his question. Member for Cambridge.

Mr. Martiniuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the truth hurts, and that's the reason for the noise.

The fact is, when adjusted for inflation, Ontario's disabled persons' pensions are hundreds less than in 1997, under the previous government. These are not my calculations, but those of the Toronto Star on August 26, 2006. For many of our disabled, there was little to be thankful for this Thanksgiving. When we were sitting there with our turkeys, they couldn't afford it.

Interjections.

Mr. Martiniuk: The Liberals think it's funny. They have neglected the disabled, and they think it's humorous and they're all laughing. Too often this government has chosen to build new casinos rather than help the disabled.

I ask you again, Minister: When will you and Premier McGuinty give disabled persons the respect they deserve and, at the very least, pay a disability—

The Speaker: The question has been asked.

Hon. Mrs. Meilleur: I'm going to tell the member of the opposition party what we have done after we tried to clean up their mess. We have already made significant improvements to the ODSP application process. Yes, the member from the opposite party was right; there was a long waiting list. So we have hired 12 new staff to reduce the backlog in applications. We have set up a database to allow the DAU to review applications more quickly. We have eliminated the four-month rule. We have reduced the number of backlog files by approximately 3,000 since February 2006 through overtime. We are hiring a new deputy chief medical adviser to provide additional medical advice and support to adjudicators. We are working to provide adjudicators with ongoing training, education and advice to ensure fair, consistent and accurate decisions in disability determination. That's what we have done, and we continue to—

The Speaker: Thank you.

1530

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York): My question is to the Premier. Ontarians know that the property tax system is broken. They also know that your so-called assessment freeze is nothing more than a shell game. They fear that two years from now, if you get your way, they're going to be whacked with three years of accumulated tax increases. Seniors on fixed incomes can't pay three years' worth of increases all at once.

The Ombudsman knows it's broken; Ontarians know it's broken. What will you do to help our seniors stay in

their homes? Moreover, what's your plan right now to protect them?

Hon. Dalton McGuinty (Premier, Minister of Research and Innovation): To the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Greg Sorbara (Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet): One has to savour the moment: The member from Beaches–East York, as a former member of the city of Toronto government and its predecessors, raised taxes virtually every year he was on Metro council.

I want to say to him that he was among the members who voted against our first budget, when we put in place a major new initiative to reduce the tax burden on our seniors. I agree with him that for seniors on fixed incomes the tax burden is very significant. That's one of the reasons we put an assessment freeze in place, and we're going to have a system that is much better, not just for seniors, but for everyone around the province.

Mr. Prue: This is a minister who hasn't got a clue about history or what happened on Metro council, or my role in it. I think you should do a little bit of research before you stand up and give such silly answers.

You promised to put an end to double-digit increases in property taxes, and you failed. You promised to help seniors and people on fixed incomes, and you failed. We need to know your plan right now, not the promise of a solution after the next election, because we all know what Liberal promises are worth after the next election.

You're the government. Tell us today—now, not 18 months from now—what you are going to do to fix Ontario's broken property tax system.

Hon. Mr. Sorbara: I have to wonder out loud again why my friend across the aisle voted against the budget measure we brought to this House, which fortunately passed, to provide a \$125 credit to seniors, not just in the city of Toronto, but right across the province.

We heard from the Ombudsman. The MPAC system is now under a major review. The recommendations have been accepted; they are being put in place. To allow that to happen, we put in place a two-year freeze on assessments. We're in the midst of building a much better system than the one we inherited from the guys who sit over there.

IMMIGRANTS

Mrs. Liz Sandals (Guelph–Wellington): My question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Ontario welcomed more than 140,000 immigrants last year. That's more than the entire population of Prince Edward Island. In fact, my own community of Guelph has welcomed many immigrants. What is the government doing to assist newcomers to work in their field sooner in Ontario?

Hon. Mike Colle (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Besides spending \$53 million a year and teaching English as a second language and French as a second language to all these newcomers every year—that's more than the rest of the country spends—we also

have an incredibly successful program, in our bridge training programs, which ensures that foreign-trained nurses, midwives and pharmacists get the training they need to pass their certification exams and get a job. These bridge training programs account for a \$34-million expenditure by our government. It's the biggest program in Canada. It's very successful, because when they take these bridge training programs, they get a job, and they get a job in their field.

Mrs. Sandals: It's great to see the investments the Ontario government is making in programs that help newcomers succeed.

Guelph is a growing community with one of the leading research universities. We receive numerous internationally trained individuals each year who are working towards getting accreditation in their field of expertise. In September, the Ontario Institute of Agrologists launched the internationally educated professional agrologists project at the Ontario AgriCentre in Guelph. Minister, can you tell us more about this initiative and how it will help newcomers to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Colle: This partnership with the Ontario Institute of Agrologists is one which ensures foreign-trained agricultural scientists, agricultural engineers and agricultural technicians get this training so they can use their foreign experience and their international experience and apply it in Ontario's rural communities and Ontario's agricultural economy. It's a million-dollar investment not only in foreign-trained agrologists—highly skilled professionals from every country in the world—but it's a great investment in Ontario's rural communities and Ontario's agriculture.

This program, again, is another bridge training program success that's really going to help people who are very qualified to get a job and contribute to the Ontario economy.

ORDER AND DECORUM IN CHAMBER

Mr. Frank Klees (Oak Ridges): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I'm bringing a matter to you that I believe is indeed a point of privilege, and it relates to the standing orders that deal with order and decorum and conduct of members. I refer you to the standing orders that speak very specifically under section 13(a)—and I will read this section to you: "The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of privilege and points of order." It goes on under section 20(b). I draw your attention to that. It specifically states, "When a member is speaking, no other member shall interrupt such member, except on a question of order."

I want to point out to you—I would be surprised if I am not supported by many other members here on this issue, and I would be surprised if there are not many members in this Legislature who would support me in bringing it to your attention—that during today's session, many times in the course of either statements by ministers or responses, it was impossible for me to either hear the minister or hear the response of honourable

members. It's difficult for me as a member to do my job here on behalf of constituents under those circumstances.

During question period, repeatedly, sir, you had to stand in your place and admit that you couldn't hear. This place is getting to the point where I, as a member, am having a difficult time hearing the business of the House, being able to decide what is being said and understanding the process.

Here is my point: I heard you say today that you need co-operation from members. Standing order 15(a) states the following: "If a member on being called to order for an offence against any standing order persists in the offence, the Speaker may direct the member to discontinue, and if such member refuses to comply, the Speaker shall name the member to the House."

1540

I would ask you to use the standing order to exercise that responsibility. I find it difficult to understand why you would repeatedly have to stand and remind members of this House to allow members to speak and to be heard, and repeatedly the same people are allowed to carry on in the way that they do.

I, as a member of this House, would ask you to exercise your authority and name members of this House. I would suggest to you that the more often you do that, the sooner we will come to a point of decorum in this House. I would ask you to please consider that. Thank you.

The Speaker (Hon. Michael A. Brown): Thank you. The member has a point of order.

PETITIONS

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Ted Chudleigh (Halton): "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is silent on property rights; and

"Whereas the Alberta Bill of Rights specifically protects the right to the enjoyment of property; and

"Whereas the Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms provides that 'Every person has a right to the peaceful enjoyment and free disposition of his property, except to the extent provided by law'; and

"Whereas ownership rights should not be abridged or usurped without due process of law; and

"Whereas owners of all lands affected by expropriation should have the right to be included as parties to a required inquiry to consider the merits of the objectives of the expropriating authority; and

"Whereas the decision of an expropriating authority should be subject to judicial review; and

"Whereas, subject to specific limitations of law, the right to peaceful enjoyment of one's land must be recognized by Ontario law;

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

"To pass Bill 57, the Land Rights and Responsibilities Act, 2006."

I'm pleased to sign my name and pass it to Max, our page on this occasion.

LONG-TERM CARE

Mr. Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): I have a petition addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas, in June 2003, Dalton McGuinty said, 'Ontario Liberals are committed to ensuring that nursing home residents receive more personal care each day and will reinstate minimum standards, and inspectors will be required to audit the staff-to-resident ratios'; and

"Whereas Health and Long-Term Care Minister George Smitherman, in October 2004, said that the Ontario government will not set a specified number of care hours nursing home residents are to receive each day; and

"Whereas Ontario nursing home residents still receive the lowest number of care hours in the Western world; and

"Whereas studies have indicated nursing home residents should receive at least 4.1 hours of nursing care per day; and

"Whereas a coroner's jury in April 2005 recommended the Ontario government establish a minimum number of care hours nursing home residents must receive each day;

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

"The government of Ontario immediately enact a minimum standard of 3.5 hours of nursing care for each nursing home resident per day."

I've affixed my signature as well.

IMMIGRANTS' SKILLS

Mr. Jeff Leal (Peterborough): I have a petition today to the Ontario Legislative Assembly from people in Windsor, Burlington and Toronto.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario enjoys the continuing benefit of the contributions of men and women who choose to leave their country of origin in order to settle in Canada, raise their families, educate their children and pursue their livelihoods and careers; and

"Whereas newcomers to Canada who choose to settle in Ontario find frequent, arbitrary and unnecessary obstacles that prevent skilled tradespeople, professional and managerial talent from practising the professions, trades and occupations for which they have been trained in their country of origin; and

"Whereas action by Ontario's trades and professions could remove many such barriers, but Ontario's trades and professions have failed to recognize that such structural barriers exist, much less to take action to remove them, and to provide fair, timely, transparent and

cost-effective access to trades and professions for new Canadians trained outside Canada;

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

“That the Ontario Legislative Assembly urge the members of all parties to swiftly pass Bill 124, the Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act, 2006, and to require Ontario’s regulated professions and trades to review and modify their procedures and qualification requirements to swiftly meet the needs of Ontario’s employers, Ontario’s newcomers and their own membership, all of whom desperately need the very skills new Canadians bring working for their organizations, for their trades and professions, and for their families.”

I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Mr. Bill Murdoch (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound): I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It’s from many different people in my riding of Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound, from Hanover, Durham and all over there.

“We, the undersigned, protest the lack of action on the acute doctor shortage for rural Ontario, particularly in Grey-Bruce. Many do not have a family doctor, and specialists are leaving the area. We ask for initiatives and timelines to deal with this current problem, financial incentives, and support for the family health networks.”

I’ve also signed this.

LONG-TERM CARE

Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition that’s been signed by a number of people who live in Huron county that’s been sent to me by SEIU, and it reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas, in June 2003, Dalton McGuinty said Ontario Liberals are committed to ensuring that nursing home residents receive more personal care each day and will reinstate minimum standards, and inspectors will be required to audit the staff-to-resident ratios; and

“Whereas Health and Long-Term Care Minister George Smitherman, in October 2004, said that the Ontario government will not set a specified number of care hours nursing home residents are to receive each day; and

“Whereas Ontario nursing home residents still receive the lowest number of care hours in the Western world; and

“Whereas studies have indicated nursing home residents should receive at least 4.1 hours of nursing care per day; and

“Whereas a coroner’s jury in April 2005 recommended the Ontario government establish a minimum number of care hours nursing home residents must receive each day;

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

“That the government of Ontario immediately enact a minimum standard of 3.5 hours of nursing care for each nursing home resident per day.”

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

IMMIGRANTS’ SKILLS

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga West): I have a petition to the Ontario Legislative Assembly, and I’d like to thank Chris Janusz of Guildhall Court in the Lisgar area of Mississauga for sending it to me. It reads as follows:

“Whereas Ontario enjoys the continuing benefit of the contributions of men and women who choose to leave their country of origin in order to settle in Canada, raise their families, educate their children and pursue their livelihoods and careers; and

“Whereas newcomers to Canada who choose to settle in Ontario find frequent, arbitrary and unnecessary obstacles that prevent skilled tradespeople, professional and managerial talent from practising the professions, trades and occupations for which they have been trained in their country of origin; and

“Whereas action by Ontario’s trades and professions could remove many such barriers, but Ontario’s trades and professions have failed to recognize that such structural barriers exist, much less to take action to remove them, and to provide fair, timely, transparent and cost-effective access to trades and professions for new Canadians trained outside Canada;

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

“That the Ontario Legislative Assembly urge the members of all parties to swiftly pass Bill 124, the Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act, 2006, and to require Ontario’s regulated professions and trades to review and modify their procedures and qualification requirements to swiftly meet the needs of Ontario’s employers, Ontario’s newcomers and their own membership, all of whom desperately need the very skills new Canadians bring working for their organizations, for their trades and professions, and for their families.”

This is an excellent petition. I’ve affixed my signature to it. I fully support it, and I’ll ask page Adam to carry it for me.

LONG-TERM CARE

Mr. John O’Toole (Durham): I’m pleased to present a petition on behalf of the constituents in the riding of Durham, which reads as follows:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas long-term-care funding levels are too low to enable homes to provide the care and services our aging seniors and parents who are residents of long-term-care

homes need, with the respect and dignity that they deserve; and

“Whereas, even with recent funding increases and a dedicated staff who do more than their best, there is still not enough time available to provide the care residents need. For example, 10 minutes, and sometimes less, is simply not enough time to assist a resident to get up, dressed, to the bathroom and then to the dining room for breakfast; and

“Whereas those unacceptable care and service levels are now at risk of declining;

“We, the undersigned, who are members of family councils, residents’ councils and/or supporters of long-term care in Ontario, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to increase operating funding to long-term-care homes by \$306.6 million, which will allow the hiring of more staff to provide an additional 20 minutes of care per resident per day”—as the Liberals promised during the 2003 election and to implement this in the years 2006 and 2007.

I’m pleased to present this to Julia and sign it in support of the intent.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas, in June 2003, Dalton McGuinty said Ontario Liberals are committed to ensuring that nursing home residents receive more personal care each day and will reinstate minimum standards, and inspectors will be required to audit the staff-to-resident ratios; and

“Whereas Health and Long-Term Care Minister George Smitherman, in October 2004, said that the Ontario government will not set a specified number of care hours nursing home residents are to receive each day; and

“Whereas Ontario nursing home residents still receive the lowest number of care hours in the Western world; and

“Whereas studies have indicated nursing home residents should receive at least 4.1 hours of nursing care per day; and

“Whereas a coroner’s jury in April 2005 recommended the Ontario government establish a minimum number of care hours nursing home residents must receive each day;

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

“That the government of Ontario immediately enact a minimum standard of 3.5 hours of nursing care for each nursing home resident per day.”

I agree and will affix my signature.

1550

SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. Jim Wilson (Simcoe–Grey): “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the parents of St. Paul’s elementary school in Alliston have raised many issues regarding the

security, cleanliness and state of repair of their school; and

“Whereas a 2003 condition assessment completed by the Ontario government identified the need for \$1.8 million in repairs to St. Paul’s elementary school; and

“Whereas the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board has approached the Ministry of Education with the intention of having the school deemed prohibitive to repair as they believe the school requires \$2.28 million in repairs, or 84% of the school replacement cost; and

“Whereas there are ongoing concerns with air quality, heating and ventilation, electrical, plumbing, lack of air conditioning and the overall structure of the building, including cracks from floor to ceiling, to name a few;

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

“That the Minister of Education immediately deem St. Paul’s elementary school prohibitive to repair, secure immediate funding and begin construction of a new facility so that the children of St. Paul’s can be educated in a facility that is secure and offers them the respect and dignity that they deserve.”

I want to thank Milva Biffis and Gaynor McLeary for sending me those petitions, which I have signed.

LONG-TERM CARE

Ms. Shelley Martel (Nickel Belt): I have a petition sent to me by SEIU. It’s been signed by a number of people who live in Kingston and area. It reads as follows:

“Whereas, in June 2003, Dalton McGuinty said Ontario Liberals are committed to ensuring that nursing home residents receive more personal care each day and will reinstate minimum standards, and inspectors will be required to audit the staff-to-resident ratios; and

“Whereas Health and Long-Term Care Minister George Smitherman, in October 2004, said that the Ontario government will not set a specified number of care hours nursing home residents are to receive each day; and

“Whereas Ontario nursing home residents still receive the lowest number of care hours in the Western world; and

“Whereas studies have indicated nursing home residents should receive at least 4.1 hours of nursing care per day; and

“Whereas a coroner’s jury in April 2005 recommended the Ontario government establish a minimum number of care hours nursing home residents must receive each day;

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

“That the government of Ontario immediately enact a minimum standard of 3.5 hours of nursing care for each nursing home resident per day.”

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

IMMIGRANTS' SKILLS

Mr. Tony Ruprecht (Davenport): I keep getting petitions in support of access to trades and professions in Ontario. The petition is to the Ontario Legislative Assembly. It reads as follows:

“Whereas Ontario enjoys the continuing benefit of the contributions of men and women who choose to leave their country of origin in order to settle in Canada, raise their families, educate their children and pursue their livelihoods and careers; and

“Whereas newcomers to Canada who choose to settle in Ontario find frequent, arbitrary and unnecessary obstacles that prevent skilled tradespeople, professional and managerial talent from practising the professions, trades and occupations for which they have been trained in their country of origin; and

“Whereas action by Ontario’s trades and professions could remove many such barriers, but Ontario’s trades and professions have failed to recognize that such structural barriers exist, much less to take action to remove them, and to provide fair, timely, transparent and cost-effective access to trades and professions for new Canadians trained outside Canada;

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

“That the Ontario Legislative Assembly urge the members of all parties to swiftly pass Bill 124, the Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act, 2006, and to require Ontario’s regulated professions and trades to review and modify their procedures and qualification requirements to swiftly meet the needs of Ontario’s employers, Ontario’s newcomers and their own membership, all of whom desperately need the very skills new Canadians bring working for their organizations, for their trades and professions, and for their families.”

Since I agree with this petition, I am delighted to sign it as well.

WATER QUALITY

Mr. John O’Toole (Durham): I’m pleased, in the few remaining seconds today, to have a chance to put on the record a petition from the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

“Amend the Clean Water Act

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas every Ontarian wants the best water quality possible; and

“Whereas the goal of clean water can be achieved effectively through amendments to existing” regulations and “legislation; and

“Whereas the McGuinty” government is “determined to hammer through the flawed legislation known as the Clean Water Act;” which they did today “and

“Whereas the McGuinty” government has “failed to put in place adequate, stable, long-term funding into the bill; and

“Whereas the McGuinty Liberals have failed to effectively address the numerous problems in the bill; and

“Whereas rural Ontario stands to suffer significantly under this poorly-thought-out policy;

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

“To not pass Bill 43 (the Clean Water Act) until proper funding and amendments are in place.”

I’m pleased to sign this, even though the bill was forced through today by the McGuinty government, and present it to Patrick.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT, 2006

LOI DE 2006

SUR L’ACCÈS À LA JUSTICE

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 16, 2006, on the motion for third reading of Bill 14, An Act to promote access to justice by amending or repealing various Acts and by enacting the Legislation Act, 2006 / Projet de loi 14, Loi visant à promouvoir l’accès à la justice en modifiant ou abrogeant diverses lois et en édictant la Loi de 2006 sur la législation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Michael Prue): Further debate? Are there any members who wish to participate in further debate? Seeing none, and in the absence of the minister to close the debate, Mr. Bryant has moved third reading of Bill 14, An Act to promote access to justice by amending or repealing various Acts and by enacting the Legislation Act, 2006. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Call in the members. There will be a 30-minute bell.

Hon. David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Deputy Government House Leader): Unless.

The Acting Speaker: Unless. I have just been handed a note that reads as follows:

“To the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly:

“Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I request that the vote on the motion by Minister Bryant for third reading of Bill 14, An Act to promote access to justice by amending or repealing various Acts and by enacting the Legislation Act, 2006, be deferred until the time for deferred votes on October 19, 2006.”

It’s signed by Dave Levac, MPP, chief government whip.

Hon. Mr. Caplan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I believe we have unanimous consent to move a motion without notice respecting this afternoon’s business in the House.

The Acting Speaker: Is there unanimous consent? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Caplan: I move that the debate on Bill 103 this afternoon be considered one full sessional day.

The Acting Speaker: The deputy government House leader has moved that the debate on Bill 103 this afternoon be considered one full sessional day. Is it agreed? Carried.

INDEPENDENT POLICE
REVIEW ACT, 2006
LOI DE 2006 SUR L'EXAMEN
INDÉPENDANT DE LA POLICE

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 16, 2006, on the motion for second reading of Bill 103, An Act to establish an Independent Police Review Director and create a new public complaints process by amending the Police Services Act / Projet de loi 103, Loi visant à créer le poste de directeur indépendant d'examen de la police et à créer une nouvelle procédure de traitement des plaintes du public en modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Michael Prue): It is my understanding that on the last occasion the member for Scarborough Southwest had the floor.

1600

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest): I was, back on Monday I think it was, two days ago, speaking on Bill 103, An Act to establish an Independent Police Review Director and create a new public complaints process by amending the Police Services Act. And in my comments, very briefly, I said that I believe the act, if passed, would entrench an independent and transparent police review system that has the confidence and respect of both the public and the police.

The point I was trying to put across that I thought was quite important was that this allows the public for the first time ever to go to a non-police board; it would be individuals appointed from the government or from government agencies who could go forward and sit on this board and hear from complainants. The advantages to this, as I was saying on the last occasion a couple of days ago, are twofold. First of all, it gives impartiality so that it doesn't seem that the police are doing the investigating themselves; it provides for an independent third party, and not the police themselves, to investigate any complaint.

Beyond that, it also has the unique advantage of being able to weed out complaints that are deemed to be frivolous or not that important. If that happens now, if someone brings a complaint before the police and the police look at it and say, "We don't think it's worth pursuing," there is always the possibility that the person will say, "Of course, the police are saying that. They are being biased. They're looking at things a certain way because they want it to look a certain way." But with this new bill, it's an independent body that would be able to

look at the complaint and could then say, "This is frivolous" or, if not frivolous, "This is worth pursuing." That allows for some separation between the police and the public.

In the report prepared by Justice LeSage, he indicated quite clearly that in his consultation with over 85 groups—individuals from police and community groups and so on—the new legislation would benefit the government and also the public, and that it would be a process that would allow the public to still have confidence in the police board and in the police service itself. So he has brought forward his views on this potential bill, and we've drafted this bill based on that information and gone forward with it here today, which we are now debating.

In my view, we've struck a balance in this bill. We've ensured that legitimate complaints are heard and that frivolous and ill-motivated complaints are weeded out early. At the same time, we've struck a balance in ensuring that there is an independent civilian involvement at important stages of the police review process and that this doesn't jeopardize the relationships that have been built between communities and the police. I think it still instills and keeps confidence in the police and in what the police function and role are in individual communities across Ontario. So it isn't a shot at the police at all. In fact, in Mr. LeSage's consultation with the various groups, he did say that he met with several police groups and many were in support of it.

What the independent police review director who will be appointed, he or she, would do is, number one, be responsible for the intake and initial screening of public complaints about the police. So instead of going to a police station, which is intimidating to many individuals, especially—I can think of how in my riding of Scarborough Southwest there are a lot of new Canadians who have come to the country and who may feel somewhat intimidated. They shouldn't, but they may feel intimidated in going to complain about the police when they want to lodge some kind of complaint. So instead of going to the local 41 Division or the police division within the riding or within Scarborough, they have that opportunity to go to an independent intake person who would be non-police to lay that complaint or put that complaint forward. Then the director would have the opportunity to screen that complaint and decide whether or not to investigate that complaint. In some ways, it's somewhat similar—it reminds me, if I'm not wrong on this—to how the Ontario Human Rights Commission presently operates.

The legislation would give the director the capacity to investigate complaints himself or herself where appropriate and to go into matters relating to what the subject police force or police officers were involved with. In following the investigation, once the investigation was completed by the civilian independent person, the chief of police would make a decision about discipline, if appropriate. The new independent police review director would review these decisions as well. The police chief or someone in charge of a police department can still discipl-

line an officer or a member of the police force and do that based on information received from this independent director, which I think is quite unique. It also gives the independent police review director a chance to review the decision made by the police chief who is going to file the actual complaint against the officer.

In my view, this particular bill brings out a level of openness that up to now has not existed. I can think of many situations or circumstances where individuals—and I've had them come into my own constituency office in Scarborough and say that they had some concern regarding the police. If you say to them, "Go to the police station and complain," a lot of them will say, "No, I'm not going to go there. I don't feel that it's right." They feel intimidated by it. So I think an opportunity exists here to allow for an independent police review director to go forward and look at that situation.

What I also like, and what's unique about this bill which is really good, is that frivolous complaints can be dealt with by this independent police review director. If someone has some kind of illegitimate—or, let's say, just wants to complain about the police for some small reason, let's say they got a parking ticket and decided, "Okay, I'm going to claim that I was targeted for this particular ticket," the independent director can say, "You know what? Your complaint is not legitimate. It's not something that I'm going to pursue any further," and let it end there, which is fair. Otherwise the person would say, "Look at the police: They're after me again. First they give me a ticket; then, when I go to complain to them about it, they tell me that my complaint is frivolous." So it's better to hear from an independent police review director than from the police officer conducting the investigation.

I think the fact that there are appeals from decisions of the hearing officers that would go to the Ontario civilian police commission is also a very good thing. It's actually going to be named the Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services. This opportunity to appeal these decisions from the hearing officers in these situations is something that is also good. Under this system, there would be no further appeals to the Divisional Court. Judicial review of Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services decisions would still be available. Someone could still bring a judicial review application but no further appeal.

It's somewhat similar, I guess, to our OMB in our planning system, where the OMB gets its say. Unless there's an error in law or an error in how the OMB made its decision involving the legal system or a legal precedent, there would be no further appeal.

So I think, all in all, the bill is good. I made the comment earlier that it should go to committee. I think there should be an opportunity for this to be debated and looked at as usual. What we've done with many of our bills—most of our bills—is take them to committee to have the opportunity for them to be heard there, to allow for public hearings and then allow the committee to take the concerns the public brings forward and potentially make changes to the bill if deemed necessary.

1610

In conclusion, the bill, all in all, is an improvement on what we presently have. It allows, as I said, for an independent system to review police systems. It doesn't interfere, in my understanding of bill, with anything of a criminal nature. So the SIU and that whole section that is presently in existence, which reviews any criminal wrongdoing, would still be in existence. I don't think that's going to be touched.

This particular review panel and review system that would be set up would allow people to make complaints and would help set up a system of trust and respect for the policing system in general.

It is not totally in our best interests to remove everything from the police and do this all independently, but to work with them and allow the public to have the option of going to this independent person if they want to.

The public also has the option of bringing complaints directly to the police service; that option is not being removed. If the person feels they can bring a complaint to the police board or the police service, they can still do that. The legislation allows for this option, and it's an important one.

I think it fosters an even further sense of trust and respect for the system, because now a person is given the option of either going to the independent police review director or directly to the police, if they feel so inclined, to lodge their complaint. This opens up different opportunities for those who have complaints, and at the same time makes our system much more open to those who have complaints.

I see that my time is winding down, and I am happy to hear questions and comments from other members and to hear this debate as it continues this afternoon.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr. John O'Toole (Durham): It's a pleasure to listen to the comments being made on this bill, which has been described by the member as amending the Police Services Act. Quite often, I know from the police services board in my area—I have a great deal of respect for the people who give their time generously.

Community safety, in the broadest sense, is so important to not only being safe but feeling safe, and the police services, along with the police commission, as well as the force itself, do a lot of work to protect our communities.

I think this whole idea is interesting. I believe there should probably be hearings on the bill to make sure the public is fully aware of the procedures.

But just looking at some of the intentions in the purposes section of the bill, to put it on the record from my point of view—I'm picking up the preamble to the bill: "Other elements of the police complaints system that are established by part V include" the following: For instance, in part 1, it says, "Powers respecting the suspension of a police officer by a chief of police." Of course, there is a union that looks after those procedures. Any interference there would certainly have to follow procedures.

"2. Procedures for the withdrawal of a public complaint." Often we think there should be an independent process to deal with those complaints.

"3. Procedures respecting the resignation of a police officer after a complaint against him or her has been made and before the complaint is finally disposed of."

These are things that need to have the light of day, and I'm certain that this bill and its amendments will work with the various authorities to make sure there is an open and accountable system. We'd certainly like to make sure there are hearings to make sure the public is fully informed on any amendments to the Police Services Act.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park): The bill is certainly a step forward and we support, of course, any review that's independent of the body reviewing itself, which was the situation before with the police. There are a few issues, however. Certainly, I agree with the honourable member that it needs to go to committee, it needs to be looked at.

The issue that immediately jumps out at me is section 97. This is the section that talks about the Ombudsman Act not applying to anything done under this particular bill. Certainly, we would want to see this bill come under the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman.

The second section that jumps out at me as being possibly problematic is section 58. In paragraph 4, "A member or auxiliary member of a police force, if that police force or another member of that police force is the subject of the complaint," is prohibited from making a complaint. So is an employee of the OPP, in paragraph 5, "if the Ontario Provincial Police or a member of the Ontario Provincial Police is the subject of the complaint." So, again, here's a concern that I raised before, and that's the concern about the possible whistle-blower function; that police have a chance, should they not want to or need to be a whistle-blower, they have that option and they can go to an independent body, again, outside of their own rank and file and outside of their own brass, to be able to make such a complaint and to bring that forward. So that's another issue as well.

The third issue that I'll go into in more detail with the minutes allotted is the issue of funding. Again, this is a bill that has lots of good points to it, but if it's underfunded, it can't possibly fulfill the mandate that the bill sets forth. There are no provisions for funding here. I point to the example of legal aid and its chronic status as being underfunded. So again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your time and I'll go into this in more detail in the minutes allotted.

Mr. Jeff Leal (Peterborough): I was listening to my colleague, the member from Scarborough Southwest, discuss the bill, the Independent Police Review Act, Bill 103. I know in my municipal experience, working closely with the Peterborough Lakefield Police Services Board, I'd like to get on the record today—Chief Terry McLaren is the chief of the local force, the men and women who work so hard on behalf of the citizens, particularly in the city of Peterborough, day in and day out. The current chair of the police services board in Peterborough is Tom

Symons. Many will know Tom as the founding president of Trent University, a man who distinguished himself during the Davis years, when he did a number of royal commissions on behalf of former Premier Davis, and was a recipient for his good work of the Order of Canada.

One of the things during my municipal career that I did hear from police officers was the frivolous complaints that they may receive. So there will be an opportunity, as this bill goes forward, I suspect, with public hearings across the province, which I think is a wise course of action, to make sure in the legislation that there's a fair, sensible, clear system that does not weigh down police with frivolous complains and otherwise interfere with our police services. I think that's an important issue. There are so many demands these days upon our men and women who put their services and their lives on the line each and every day to provide protection, not only in my community, but for people right across Ontario. To have a system and a bill that protects them against frivolous complaints is a very good step forward.

The Acting Speaker: Further questions and comments? Seeing none, the member from Scarborough Southwest has two minutes in which to respond.

Mr. Berardinetti: I want to thank the member from Durham, the newly-elected member from Parkdale–High Park, whom I haven't had a chance to congratulate yet on her by-election victory, and the member from Peterborough for their remarks. Again, I think their concerns are similar to what I am seeing as well, and we will take this to committee and look at more detail there.

I had the opportunity this summer to sit down with the superintendent out in Scarborough, 41 division, Superintendent Qualtrough. We had a long discussion about what needs to be done for policing in Scarborough. The message he conveyed and his colleagues who were present conveyed to myself was that we really need to work with the community. He was saying to me that the worst thing when some kind of crime happens is when someone just phones up and says, "Get a policeman out here. Hurry up and deal with it. You guys should take care of it, and that should be the end of it."

1620

The police want to engage more with the community, want to be part of the community. They want to work with community leaders: the spiritual leaders in the community; community association presidents; the local, provincial and federal members; and other people who are involved in various aspects of the community. That's their best way of policing and that's their best way of fostering trust in the community. This bill, I think, further enhances that, by allowing the public and those people in the community who feel that something may have gone wrong or who want to make a complaint to be able to go either directly to the police to complain or to this new independent police review director.

I support the bill and I look forward to further debate and seeing this eventually going to committee and coming back.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr. Robert W. Runciman (Leeds–Grenville): This is the lead for the official opposition. I want to indicate that I will be sharing my time with the member for Whitby–Ajax.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the debate on the legislation which is dramatically changing the police complaints process in the province of Ontario. I think it's fair to indicate at the outset that the official opposition will be supporting the bill—not with any degree of enthusiasm, I have to say. As a former Solicitor General, I don't believe this legislation is necessary. I think it's going to be extremely costly and it's going to be difficult for many front-line officers in the future to cope with this. I know there have been some suggestions, and we certainly hope this is not the case, that as a result of this legislation you may see police officers failing to do their duty and carry out responsibilities that many of us would expect from them. Hopefully, that will not be the case in any situation, but certainly we've heard those concerns expressed.

The catalyst for this, I suspect, is the Toronto Star accusations—I think it's fair to characterize them that way—surrounding the Toronto Police Service, that they were engaging in racial profiling. You may recall that. A few years ago it caused quite an uproar, the front-page stories, all of these so-called examples of racial profiling being engaged in by police officers in Toronto.

I happened to be the minister at the time. Certainly we responded to those allegations and recognized that there were some legitimate concerns being expressed with respect to the system currently in place and that was in place four years ago. We recognized some weaknesses. One of them that I think was legitimate was the fact that the Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services was lodged at Grosvenor, which is also the headquarters for the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, and that there could be, and probably was, an element of intimidation for the average citizen who might want to, rather than going directly to their police service with a complaint, go directly to the Ontario Civilian Commission. One of the ways that they could do that was by entering that building.

Of course, there were other ways that they could file that complaint: through fax or through other electronic means, like e-mail. Those processes also were available, but I think there was a lack of information, a lack of understanding, even though brochures were put out in public places, like libraries, available in all the police stations across the province, in other neighbourhood community policing offices. Those kinds of opportunities were available to inform citizens, but probably not enough.

What we did in terms of reacting to that was looking at the creation of satellite offices, especially in neighbourhoods that were having concerns about their interaction with the police officers in their communities. I have to say it was a relatively small number of communities, or neighbourhoods, if you will, primarily fo-

cused in Toronto, although certainly there were concerns in some of the other urban areas such as Windsor, London and Ottawa.

As well as moving towards establishing satellite offices, the former government was also active in hiring a new vice-chair of the Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services, whose role was outreach in the various communities: going into those communities, holding public meetings and reaching out to a variety of communities and various neighbourhoods across the province to explain the role of the Civilian Commission on Police Services, to explain how one would file a complaint and how that process would unfold in terms of dealing with their complaint.

In any event, the current government made a commitment during the election process to throw, in my view, the baby out with the bathwater. We now have this bill before us which I think is going to create a fairly extensive bureaucracy, at a cost to taxpayers—the Attorney General is suggesting initially, over what period of time I'm not sure—of about \$9 million a year. He's also projecting that it's going to level off at some point in time to about \$6 million a year. I suspect that that is a very optimistic scenario and that we're going to see this, certainly in the initial phase, cost significantly more than that. It's difficult to say how much, but in any event it's tax dollars; Liberals don't lose a lot of sleep over the expenditure of tax dollars.

We talk about the racial profiling accusations of the Toronto Star, which were echoed in some of the Liberal ranks. I think it's passing strange that just last week the Liberal government announced the appointment of one Julian Fantino as the commissioner of the OPP. I'm a big fan of Mr. Fantino. I think he's an outstanding police officer. But certainly, when all of these accusations were being made, which are the catalysts for this legislation, who was the chief of police in the city of Toronto? Julian Fantino. So there's a bit of a contradiction here if you look at it from the sidelines. Here's the Toronto Star, the unofficial party organ of the Liberal Party of Ontario, and Canada, saying, "You know we have racial profiling in the city of Toronto. Julian Fantino is the chief. He's the guy where the buck stops." And if it's actually happening—the Toronto Star said it was occurring—who was responsible for that? Who's the chief of police?

But now, Mr. Speaker—you can correct me or someone can correct me if I'm ill informed on this—have we seen any criticism in the editorial pages of the Toronto Star about Julian Fantino being appointed by the Liberal government to be the new commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police? I don't know. I haven't heard of any criticism, but again, that's the way of the Toronto Star and the Liberal Party of Ontario. As someone who was a news reporter many years ago and owned a weekly newspaper, I guess it's the prerogative of the media to pick their friends and pick their issues and be very selective with respect to how they view some of these issues. Apparently that's the tack that the Toronto Star has adopted with respect to Chief Fantino's appointment.

I was involved when the process was changed back in 1995 or thereabouts—significant consultations, a week-end summit: We looked not just at the complaints process but at the Police Services Act, and made significant and much-needed changes to that legislation. I think, by and large, the system has worked pretty darned well. Over my time, while we were in government, a little over eight years—close to six of those years I spent as Solicitor General, latterly referred to as public safety and security but essentially the same role, responsible for oversight of policing in the province. I can look at those years in terms of complaints about the process: few and far between.

1630

In my constituency office, not infrequently we have people coming in and asking how they go about filing a complaint. We provide them with a brochure, we assist them, if necessary, if they require assistance. It's not something that happens on a weekly basis but it does happen. I can't recall an instance over the past 10 years or so where a constituent who has filed a complaint has come back to us and said, "Boy, this doesn't work for me. This is unfair. This process is bad for Ontario and doesn't hold police officers up to the scrutiny they should be held up to." I have had none of that.

Again, I think that reinforces my own view that the system has worked fairly well. It could use some improvement. We were moving in that direction; the former government was moving in that direction to address those concerns. But again, the Liberal government has toadied up, I guess, to the Toronto Star and is throwing this thing out and bringing in a new system which I think is going to create significant problems down the road.

As I indicated at the outset, the official opposition has decided, based on the reaction of policing stakeholders, that we will support this without a great deal of enthusiasm, but it appears that the stakeholders themselves, if they have concerns, are not prepared to voice them. They're not prepared to oppose this legislation. If you look at it from our perspective, if that's the way the stakeholders are approaching this issue, we're not going to take this upon ourselves. They're the people who have to work within the system, and if they're prepared to live with it—and I gather that that's exactly what they've said. They may have some concerns, but they are prepared to live with it. They can live with it. That's what we were told about the Ontario chiefs of police and several police associations that have commented on it, including Hamilton, Toronto, the Police Association of Ontario. They can live with it. We don't know of any policing organization, or other organizations, for that matter, that is opposed to this legislation.

We're going to point out the weaknesses. We think there are areas here that can be improved upon, and we'll be commenting on those and suggesting amendments to the legislation when it goes to committee, and hopefully there will be adequate committee hearings to deal with this.

This is a decision made by the government of the day, which apparently is being supported by the stakeholders

who are impacted by it. So who are we to vigorously oppose or delay an initiative that apparently is being supported by the people who are going to be impacted by it? I'm not just talking about those folks in policing; I'm talking about other groups like the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, and I gather some groups representing minorities in the province have also come forward to indicate that they will be supporting the bill.

The only group I know of that apparently has expressed some reservations is the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards. They noted some misgivings during a lobby day we had in this place last spring. Their view was that the process undermines the authority of police chiefs in resolving complaints, but those concerns were expressed very quietly to individual members and they have not taken any public position with respect to the legislation. So we're looking at that as tacit approval.

I guess one has to wonder about this process. As someone who has worked with the policing organizations for many years, as a critic in opposition for about four years, and then six—some as a minister, working with all of these organizations, and watching what has happened here over the last year or so—we just had a discussion about a deferred vote on Bill 14, the so-called access-to-justice legislation. There's another example of police associations in this province bewilderingly, from my side of the fence, absenting themselves from discussion on an important piece of legislation.

Bill 14, as you realize, dealt with administration of the courts, as one example. It also dealt with the shortage of justices of the peace in the province. These are issues that are major concerns—have been in the past, anyway—of the police chiefs in the province, the police association, the Ontario Provincial Police Association. I will say that Bruce Miller from the Police Association of Ontario did appear. But the chiefs have had major concerns about the lack of JPs for bail hearings and the whole range of concerns that they have, the administration of the courts and the fact that we can't seem to administer our courts in coordination with police services, calling police officers to be witnesses, their sitting in the waiting rooms and then being sent home. It is a real problem in terms of policing costs, the administration of the courts, yet the chiefs' association failed to appear. Here, with another piece of legislation which is going to place, I think, fairly significant burdens on them and on their front-line officers, they're putting up their hands: "Well, you know, we can live with it." It's a bit of a mystery, and you have to wonder.

It's nice to see the member from Huron—Bruce in here because she may want to respond to my comments, because I'm going to reiterate—

Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron—Bruce): You know how I love to respond to your comments.

Mr. Runciman: She's jibing, not from her seat, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned the other day in talking about Bill 14, and I think it applies to this legislation as well, the failure of interest groups to appear, and in this instance their failure

to take a strong position. I raised the issue of intimidation. There are various ways of intimidating individuals and organizations. One way can be the Minister of Health calling them and browbeating them, shouting at them over the phone—we have heard lots of examples of that; Bully Boy Smitherman calling hospital administrators and others in the health care sector, a group of professionals in the health care sector, a bunch of terrorists. Remember that? A bunch of terrorists. That's one way of intimidating stakeholders.

There are other, subtle ways of doing it: "If you don't do this, we'll do that," those kinds of suggestions, perhaps in a very polite way. Or there can be ways of saying, "If you want this, we want that," that kind of gamesmanship, those forms of intimidation which have occurred. I want to use an example, a true example, and I want to put it on the record again, dealing with a guy by the name of Guy: Don Guy, the former chief of staff to Premier McGuinty, who is now heading up their reelection campaign.

There was a meeting of an organization in the city of Toronto, a very prominent non-political, non-partisan organization. Mr. McGuinty was the guest speaker. The emcee for that event was given a script for the introduction of Mr. McGuinty—a script. At the bottom of it, he was being required to introduce Mr. McGuinty as "Mr. Ontario, Dalton McGuinty."

He took offence to it and said, "This is a non-partisan organization, a non-partisan event. I'll do the introduction but I am not going to say 'Mr. Ontario.'"

So what happened? The next day he gets a call from—guess who?—Don Guy, the chief of staff to the Premier of Ontario, saying, "What's this? You won't introduce Dalton McGuinty as Mr. Ontario? Who the devil do you think you are? I want him introduced as Mr. Ontario, no ands, ifs or buts." The fellow said, "Okay, Mr. Guy, I'll do it. I'll accede to your request and I'll do it this way. Does this sound okay to you? 'I got a call from the Premier's chief of staff, who demanded that I introduce our guest speaker as Mr. Ontario, so according to the chief of staff's demands, here is Mr. Ontario.'" Dead silence on the phone. He said, "Thank you, thank you"—click. Now, this fellow was strong and independent. He wasn't depending on government grants, government support or government appointments. He was truly independent and he told Mr. Guy where he could go.

1640

But how much of that intimidation goes on on a regular basis in this Liberal government? I think it's very significant and very extensive. We see it in all sectors. Regrettably—I have trouble dealing with this—I think it has happened in the policing sector. Can you imagine chiefs of police being intimidated? I find it difficult, but it appears clear to me that that's what has happened. Like so many other sectors, so many other groups, so many other organizations, they have been intimidated.

At the Bill 14 hearings there was a retired chief of police. He'd been a chief in Prince Edward Island, in Charlottetown. Before that, I believe he was a detective

sergeant in Metro Toronto. He left, retired in Toronto, and was hired in Charlottetown as the chief of police. He's now an honorary member of the Canadian chiefs' association. I raised this issue with him, my concern about all of these very important issues dealing with policing, impacting on policing operations in the province of Ontario, and I didn't expect a response from him. I didn't want him to take a position because he had not been an Ontario chief, but I said, "Don't you find it a little perplexing that the chiefs would not take an opportunity like this to come forward and express their concerns, their ideas, their suggestions on important legislation impacting on every police service in Ontario?" He said that he was astounded. He felt, as a former chief, an honorary member of the Canadian chiefs, that they should look upon that as an honour, an honour and an opportunity to appear before a standing committee of the Legislature or the House of Parliament in Ottawa to bring forward their ideas, their suggestions and their concerns about the legislation of the day. He couldn't believe it, and I can't believe it either. I think it's a sad, sad day when the chiefs and others sit on the sidelines with legislation like that.

Based on that, we have made a conscious decision that if they can live with this legislation—certainly, if we have adequate public hearings, we're going to put forward a number of suggestions. One of them is about informing police associations that if there is going to be disciplinary action or a finding against a police officer, we believe the association should be informed ASAP. We're very concerned about third party complaints. This opens up a can of worms which is unbelievable, a real can of worms about third party complaints and a number of other concerns that my colleague will be putting on the record as well.

It's a situation that doesn't make me feel terribly happy. I think the system is working reasonably well. We could have done some tinkering and improving on this to make sure that it more adequately addressed the concerns of some communities in Ontario. I think we could have done that and we're in the process of doing that, but for political reasons the government has opted to go in another direction, which I think is worrisome to some degree.

I happen to have a bit of a conflict here, I suppose. My two daughters are front-line police officers, and I think some elements of this are worrisome. But the chiefs and the associations who represent the front-line officers, in their wisdom, have said, "We can live with this." So the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario is going to live with it.

Mrs. Christine Elliott (Whitby–Ajax): I'm glad to have the opportunity to join in this debate with respect to Bill 103 on behalf of the official opposition. I would like to thank my colleague from Leeds–Grenville for sharing the time for discussion with me today.

I will use the remaining time allocated for this purpose to raise several questions I have with respect to the priority placed on passing this bill through the Legislature,

given other, perhaps more pressing, issues at the fore of our justice system, and also some questions with respect to the funding levels that will be necessary to overhaul the complaint system currently in place. I will also address some of the issues we should be wary of in moving forward with this legislation and present briefly some of the comments and concerns we have heard from some of the stakeholders.

When debating this particular piece of legislation, I would be remiss if I failed to speak to the wonderful job our police officers do each and every day to serve and protect the citizens of Ontario, so I would like to begin on a laudatory note. I know I speak on behalf of all of the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus when I say that we are extremely proud of the work our police services do across the province, and we commend the integrity, honesty and diligent work ethic of the officers who serve us each and every day. Durham regional police Chief Vernon White serves my constituents in Whitby–Ajax extremely well, and he has done a truly commendable job in this role in a very short period of time since he’s been with us. I will also say that I very much appreciate the interest that the police in Durham region have shown in contributing to community issues as well as serving and protecting our families.

I recently held a town hall meeting on justice issues in my riding of Whitby–Ajax in conjunction with the Ontario Bar Association, which was attended by Deputy Chief Mercier. It was wonderful for me and for other members of the public to hear his input with respect to issues surrounding our justice system. I look forward to working with the police in the future to address those concerns that were voiced.

I have full confidence that the police services we have in this province are second to none, and I am proud to be able to make that assertion. I must say these men and women not only have my confidence and the confidence of my colleagues on this side of the House, but they also have the confidence of the citizens of Ontario. As the Attorney General stated himself this past Monday, according to a 2003 Statistics Canada survey, more than 80% of the public say they have confidence in our police, which is a truly remarkable number.

I guess where all this is leading is that it’s just bewildering to me why the Attorney General has suddenly decided to make this particular piece of legislation a priority, given the other pressing needs in our justice system. Specifically, this is a piece of legislation that overhauls an already functioning system. I would concur with my colleague from Lanark–Carleton and also the member for Niagara Centre, who both raised this point on day one of second reading of this legislation, that there is no real haste to push this bill through as it stands. Given the fact that the Attorney General had the recommendations from former Chief Justice LeSage for a year before he felt it time to introduce legislation enacting some of these proposals, it does not seem that this matter has been pressing to the Attorney General—that is, until now.

Moreover, a costly and somewhat cumbersome overhaul of the current complaint system bewilders me, given the current state of affairs elsewhere in our justice system. I will speak specifically to the current state of legal aid, as I mentioned earlier in this House today. The member for Niagara Centre, my colleague from Leeds–Grenville and I have all watched as this Attorney General has completely neglected the legal aid file, as he’s left single mothers and vulnerable people all across the province of Ontario in desperate need of legal aid services. In fact, the number of people turned away at the door has increased 42% in just two years under his watch. Small wonder, then, that members of the legal community have charged that the system has indeed gotten worse since the appointment of this Attorney General. Yet he has decided to pursue an overhaul of a system that, although it could use some improvement—no one is questioning that—is not experiencing anywhere near the crisis levels that we’re seeing in the legal aid system.

This Attorney General has been completely off the radar when it comes to dealing with and properly funding legal aid, yet he purports to have the dollars to revamp a system in which 80% of Ontarians have confidence. The fact is, the government is proposing to change a system that is generally well received by the public, and to spend millions of taxpayers’ dollars is really somewhat presumptuous, given the need to fix so many other pressing areas of our justice system that need assistance, like the crisis we’re currently experiencing in legal aid.

1650

Now that we’re talking about dollars, or the lack thereof, I will also say that perhaps it would also be useful if the Attorney General could be more specific within the legislation about what this new proposal is actually going to cost. As is the case currently with respect to Bill 107, the proposed human rights reform legislation introduced by the Attorney General this spring, there is no clear indication about how much this plan is going to cost or, indeed, how it will be funded.

I recognize that this legislation is meant to serve as a framework for how this new complaints process will function. However, as this bill refers to a system that currently is working fairly well, I think that it’s only responsible for the Attorney General to lay out exactly how much this change is going to cost the taxpayers of Ontario. For example, while each police chief will be required to designate a senior officer to serve as a liaison with the agency director, there is no mention of additional funding to support this new burden on resources. Ewart Walters, editor of the *Spectrum*, has cautioned, “If [a civilian complaints commission] is not going to be properly staffed and properly financed, we shouldn’t bother.”

As we’ve seen with Bill 107, the human rights reform legislation, the McGuinty government has left out significant details of how this plan will actually be carried out. We should be mindful of this fact. The Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police certainly is, as they note that “the real danger in any proposed legislation isn’t always

in what it says, but in what it doesn't say. Bill 103 leaves many questions unanswered."

I understand the Attorney General has said that the agency would cost up to \$9 million in the first years, eventually levelling out at \$6 million annually, in addition to the \$1-million start-up cost. However, as I mentioned, none of these details are discussed in the bill, or really discussed in any significant detail with the extent of information the taxpayers of Ontario really need.

We on this side of the House are interested in supporting innovative ways to better our society in the province, to increase transparency in the administration of justice, and to properly and responsibly expedite complaints to lessen the burden on that system. But we would like to see some evidence that this plan is going to work out on a larger scale before we commit to it. One of our recommendations would be to design a pilot project in a large urban centre such as Toronto and then evaluate the outcome to see if it really does work before we invest in a project of this nature that's going to cost millions of taxpayers' dollars.

Don't get me wrong: No one is opposed to civilian oversight. But the fact is it already exists in the current system and has been working reasonably well. I think it would be prudent, therefore, to consider these issues before rushing any bills through this Legislature. Perhaps the extra millions the government will have to spend for an overhaul of the current system might better be spent further developing the existing process by developing its merits; making the changes to the system as it currently exists, rather than throwing the baby out with the bathwater and reinventing the wheel.

We fear that if the new system bogs down in red tape and bureaucracy, all confidence in the complaints process will be quickly lost. In fact, it seems that this concern could be a very real risk. Enabling third party complaints from individuals other than the alleged victim of misconduct can open the floodgates to a surge of minor complaints and create a bureaucratic nightmare. Many of these complaints can be successfully handled at the local level by simply explaining policies rather than being run through the proposed provincial agency. The Waterloo Region Police Services Board and association has warned, "If [the agency] gets a reputation for being terribly bureaucratic, with long delays ... people will just throw in the towel and say they're not even going to bother next time." This is advice that we should heed.

Further to the idea that perhaps the funds that will be spent on this overhaul might be put to better use elsewhere, I will highlight the opinion the North Bay Police Association has offered on the issue. They note that the government is going to spend millions to deal with minor complaints against police, when that money would be better spent within the police organizations to provide police departments with civilian members to investigate complaints. Establishing regional centres for the agencies will be costly, and inevitably there will be situations where someone with a complaint about a local service will have to speak to someone in a regional centre

hundreds of kilometres away from that existing service. Running the regional centres will involve unnecessarily spending public dollars just for the appearance of increased accessibility in limited circumstances.

What is the difference to someone in North Bay if they have to speak to someone in Thunder Bay or Toronto about a complaint? It can be done just as efficiently in one centre. The fact is that the complaints system under which we are currently operating was developed through extensive consultation and extensive research and outreach with many communities, including police organizations and front-line police officers. Since 1997, police services have been responsible for the intake, investigation and adjudication of complaints, and the independent Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services plays a role in reviewing police handling of complaints and hears appeals from police disciplinary hearings.

Bill 103, if passed, will establish a new independent police review director who would be responsible for the intake and initial screening of public complaints and would determine whether the complaint will be investigated by the IPRD, the police service affected or referred to another police service. Members of the public could still make complaints to the local police service if they wish. Third parties will also now be able to lodge complaints, provided they are direct witnesses to the alleged misconduct or have a direct relationship with the victim.

These are substantial changes, and I think it's important that we listen to our police officers before we move hastily with this legislative process. We would certainly recommend that extensive travelling consultations be conducted across the province, particularly in the north, during the winter adjournment. This is really important if we're going to make sure we have this right. If we're spending all these taxpayers' dollars on these changes, we need to make sure it's going to work.

Another issue that I think should be recognized is the way that the legislation, once enacted, will affect the relationship between the communities and their respective police chiefs. We should be mindful of the fact that, on its face anyway, Bill 103 erodes a police chief's authority and respect by giving the provincial agency a higher authority on how the particular complaint should be handled. There is a risk, if it's handled incorrectly, that this change could lead to a negative relationship between the police chief and his or her community in a critical aspect of the policing process. This is something we definitely do not want to see as part of this whole process.

Not only does this legislation provide grounds whereby this type of relationship could suffer, given that there is no opportunity for police chiefs to be consulted or involved in the new agency director's filing of an annual report until after it is made public, but this could also undermine the role police chiefs play and encourage an adversarial approach between the agency and police chiefs.

Just to be clear, we don't have a problem with the Ombudsman not having investigative control or powers

over the police. But the Ombudsman himself has raised some significant concerns with respect to this whole process that we should really be listening to and that I don't think we have heeded enough to this point in time. He has raised some significant concerns regarding the fact that the authority of the police chief might be undermined by this legislation. In fact, Dave Wilson, president of the Toronto Police Association, aptly notes—

Mr. O'Toole: Dave won, did he?

Mrs. Elliott: He won; Mr. Wilson won.

"A balance needs to be struck ... something that addresses any concerns that are brought forward but does so in a way that respects police officers and their rights."

We must also make sure that in the spirit of this legislation, one purpose of which is to provide confidence and respect from both the public and police in the complaints system, the public is extremely clear about the fact that the system is changing and why the system is changing.

Given that they will still have the option to go to their local police service to voice a complaint, they may wonder why a system that is functioning at arm's length, seeking to accomplish the same end, is now being replaced by a totally different system.

1700

I'm asking the Attorney General to be very transparent with this bill because, until now, he has really not presented a clear or compelling reason why the entire system needs to be overhauled. Taxpaying citizens deserve a clear and compelling reason as to why they are spending their hard-earned money to revamp an already functioning system. So I would urge the Attorney General to take all of these issues into consideration as we proceed with our debate on this issue.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments? The member from Parkdale–High Park—no. The member from Toronto–Danforth.

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth): What can I say? Occasionally, our ability to coordinate is impaired by the late hour.

Mr. O'Toole: It's stereo. They have the same notes.

Mr. Tabuns: We could do it in stereo. No, we don't have the same notes.

Interjections.

Mr. Tabuns: More support from the honourable member would be appreciated.

There's no question that having an independent police complaints review board is something that this province needs, it's something its citizens need and it's something its police need as well.

The police have a fairly unique role in our society and fairly unique powers. They're given the authority to use force to deal with those who are dangerous or destructive. In the use of that force, at times they themselves can be vulnerable to making mistakes; they can be vulnerable to accusations of improper use of that force. In providing a mechanism so that someone independent, someone who can be seen as unbiased, unconnected, uninterested in

that they don't have an investment in the outcome but only have an investment in the truth being told—that's very important to the credibility of the police, because complaints will be made when they make mistakes and when they don't. For the police to be able to say, "That complaint was made. It was investigated by an impartial source, and it was found in this case not to be a justifiable complaint," is extraordinarily important to the credibility of the police.

Similarly, for the public to know that if a police officer, either through mistake or through malice, does something that harms a member of the public—that member of the public deserves the protection of a body independent from the police, impartial, one that can act in the interests of society as a whole.

I'll go on in further detail later.

Mrs. Mitchell: Here we are again: another day, same old comments over and over again. When we know that the McGuinty government is committed to consulting, to working with their stakeholders, and the comment comes up again—here's the member from Leeds–Grenville saying again that we're intimidating and we're the big scary government. What nonsense. To take the lectures from across that side is just way over the top; really, the colossal nerve that it takes to talk like that about the McGuinty government.

We consulted widely. We did that. People acknowledge that. When we were at the hearings, those are the comments we heard. We hear that from our stakeholders repeatedly. We will continue to work with our stakeholders to move forward legislation that meets the needs of the people of Ontario.

Really, police chiefs intimidated? I know that is something that the member from Leeds–Grenville keeps talking about, that the government intimidated police chiefs. I can only say to you that he obviously doesn't know any police chiefs. We know the dedication that it takes to do their job day in, day out. It's a very difficult job. When they reach the status of police chief, I know that they recognize that the McGuinty government is working with them to provide the services that the people of Ontario need.

I say once again to the House—the member from Leeds–Grenville takes exception to some of my comments about intimidation but, as we say in rural ridings, the proof's in the pudding. The people know and recognize that we are working with the people of Ontario to provide the services that they need.

Mr. O'Toole: I have never heard such bombastic overstatements. I listened to the member from Leeds–Grenville and the member from Whitby–Ajax, who know of what they speak. One has been the Solicitor General of this province; the other has practised law in this province. And those who have made comments thus far know not of what they speak.

I can say on this side that the legacy would be support for both the policing functions as well as the oversight functions. In fact, I think it would be correct to say that in a broad and mild sense we are supportive of the bill, but

there needs to be some openness on such an important issue as public safety. Our critic, the member from Whitby–Ajax, is only calling for fairness and openness, and that's what I would expect her to say.

If you look at certain sections of this bill, there are things that—the member from Leeds–Grenville may have reason to say this is why we want hearings when you consider that you're bullying the police chiefs. We are all for openness and accountability, and that's what our two members who have spoken on this important bill have said. And we do call for the independence of policing. But if you look at certain sections of this bill—I think it's important to look at part V, which says that the name is being changed. The bill also says, “Police boards may continue to establish guidelines for dealing with police complaints, but may only establish such guidelines in respect of public complaints if they are consistent with any guidelines established by the independent police review director....”

So it's in that vein that I take exception with the member who has just languished in some—I don't know who gave her the notes to read, but the member from Huron–Bruce certainly overstated our position on this bill and I expect her to withdraw those complaints some time in the future.

Ms. DiNovo: I have to say, just as background to this bill that has been proposed, that certainly there is a need for a bill. There's no question that there's a need for a bill. There's no question that stakeholders, both within the police force and those who might have complaints against the police force, need an overhaul of the current system.

When we look at some of the work that Judge LeSage did, it's invaluable and needs to be acted upon. There is no question from the New Democratic Party that that is the case. We only have to think about the case—and particularly I can speak for my own riding of Parkdale–High Park, where English is a second language. People who are poor, people who are intimidated, especially those people who come from other countries where it's a very frightening act indeed to walk into a police station—we can't expect that the current system will meet their needs. To walk into a police station to make your complaint about a police officer is far too intimidating, it's not fair and, finally, it's not just. So something has to be done. The question is, does this bill do it? We have concerns and reservations about aspects of this bill—that, as usual, it doesn't go quite far enough. So in my time coming up I'd appreciate going into all of those.

There's no question from the New Democratic Party's standpoint that we will probably support this bill, but we do want to see this bill go to committee. We do want to see this go to public hearings. We do want input, particularly from our aboriginal brothers and sisters out there who have their own systems of justice and who really don't seem to have been consulted enough about this, as well as other stakeholders. So I look forward to speaking more about this.

The Acting Speaker: The member from Whitby–Ajax has two minutes in which to respond.

Mrs. Elliott: I think it's important to note that we generally agree in principle with the subject matter of this legislation, but we also urge the government to take into consideration the significant concerns that have been raised by the other members of the Legislature from the official opposition and also by the members of the third party with respect to some of these issues. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of Ontario to make sure that a cogent case is presented to them on the need for reforming this police complaints process virtually in its entirety, and to make sure that we are going to get value for money at the end of the day with respect to this whole process. So we would urge the Attorney General to consider a pilot project to make sure that we expansively consult with members of the public and stakeholders across the province, that we consult with police chiefs and police officers on duty, to make sure that we are able to come up with a complaints system, that if we are going to completely overhaul it, we're going to get it right and it's going to serve the people of Ontario in the way that it's meant to.

1710

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Ms. DiNovo: I want to start by saying that in my experience as a church minister in Parkdale–High Park in 11 division and in my experience in the city generally, we do in fact have an absolutely laudable police force. My own husband, my partner, was in fact part of Kitchener–Waterloo's police force for a couple of years before he went into the perhaps more frightening territory of academia. In that capacity, as a police officer for Kitchener–Waterloo, he experienced first hand what it is to be a police officer in the line of duty. It can be very frightening, it can be very tedious and it certainly can be the kind of job where there are not many rewards, outside of the police officers' fraternity and sorority, and sometimes you don't feel like you have a lot of friends out there. So certainly we do appreciate their concern. I want to give a nod to 11 division, which is operative in my own riding of Parkdale–High Park, and the incredible work they do, with very little support at times. They're asked to be both social worker and law enforcement officer many times during the week, and certainly we need to give them the respect they deserve. It's out of that respect, in part, that we have some reservations about this bill and some comments.

First of all, I wanted to go into the background of this bill. Folks may not know all of the background, so let's just reiterate it. In 1981, an independent civilian public complaints commissioner was set up in Toronto on a trial basis. In 1990, the public complaints commissioner was renamed the police complaints commissioner and expanded to the entire province. Then, in 1997, the police complaints commissioner was dismantled and the current public complaints system was introduced. Under the current system, police services are responsible for the intake, investigation and adjudication of complaints. The Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services, an independent body, plays a role in reviewing police hand-

ling of complaints and hears appeals from police disciplinary hearings. In the wake of those changes, complaints fell more than 30%.

In June 2004, the McGuinty government appointed the former Chief Justice of Ontario's Superior Court of Justice, Patrick LeSage, to conduct a review of the police complaints system in Ontario, and in April 2005, LeSage presented his report to our present Attorney General. The report contained 27 recommendations, including the recommendation that a new independent civilian body be created to administer the police review system in Ontario. The rest of the recommendations touched upon all areas of the system, including access, informal resolution, the investigation, hearings and appeal process, audits, and appropriately funding the system.

I just wanted to walk through the LeSage report versus Bill 103—where they match, where perhaps they don't match. Overall, I have to say the bill does implement most of LeSage's recommendations. For example, LeSage says: "An independent civilian body should be created to administer the public complaints system in Ontario. The body should not be related to OCCOPS. A civilian who has not been a police officer should lead this new organization. Civilian administrators should be responsible for the administration of the complaints system for each region of the province. The new body should produce an annual public report for the government and should also hold an annual public meeting."

In Bill 103, the independent body is created and the bill prohibits former police from heading it. The annual report is in the bill but not the annual meeting, so I highlight that.

Secondly, LeSage says: "The government should appoint community and police representatives to an advisory group for each region. The groups would meet with the head of the new body to discuss systemic concerns, but would not direct the new body."

Here in Bill 103, nothing seems to compel this recommendation of the LeSage report.

LeSage goes on to say, "The new body:

"—will engage in educating the public about the complaints system;

"—will be responsible for the intake of complaints in as many forms as possible including complaints from agents (e.g. lawyers and community groups) of complainants;

"—will provide appropriate access to the system, recognizing the linguistic, cultural and geographic diversity of the province;

"—will provide appropriate assistance to complainants in the filing of a complaint;

"—will review complaints to determine whether they should be pursued further and screen out those that do not reveal a reasonable basis for the complaint, those that may be more suitably addressed through another process or those that should otherwise not be subject to further action; and

"—will review complaints to determine whether the complaint is in regard to policy, service, conduct or any combination thereof."

Except for allowing third party complainants, Bill 103 does not lay out these provisions. One has to note that it's not that it necessarily could lay out these provisions, but it doesn't do that.

LeSage says: "Individual police services must also participate in educating the public regarding the complaints system, continue to deal with public concerns that are not subject to the complaints system and provide necessary assistance to people who have complaints.

"The police should still have the ability to listen to concerns on an informal basis where individuals genuinely do not wish to lodge formal complaints. A written acknowledgement indicating that he or she was informed of the complaint process should be obtained from such individuals prior to engaging in informal discussions."

Again, Bill 103 does not address this explicitly, nor, one must say, does it prohibit it.

LeSage says: "Each police service should designate a senior officer to act as a liaison to the new body. The responsibilities of this senior officer should include facilitating communication between the police service and the new body."

This is in the bill.

LeSage goes on to say: "The limitation period for the filing of complaints should remain at six months running from the time of the events upon which the complaint is based. However, if the complainant was charged and the complaint relates to the circumstances upon which the complainant was charged, the six-month limitation period should run from the time when the charges were finally disposed of. The new body should have broad discretion to extend the limitation period in cases where the complainant is a minor or is a person incapable of bringing forward the complaint and in cases where it is of the opinion that it is in the public interest."

Bill 103 allows the director to throw out a complaint on the basis of being more than six months old but does not compel her or him to do so.

LeSage says: "Provincial standards should be set by the government to ensure that all officers are readily identifiable by way of a sufficiently large name patch on their uniforms."

Bill 103 doesn't include this, but it doesn't prohibit it. So we can start to see how this bill actually differs in some minor, and maybe not so minor, ways from the LeSage report.

LeSage goes on to say: "Subject to the independent body's right to intervene and subject to the powers of the independent body described in recommendation 24, complaints regarding policy or service should continue to be handled in the current manner. However, the chief of police should provide a final written report regarding all such complaints to the complainant, to the police services board and to the new body."

In this instance, the bill does provide.

LeSage goes on to say: "In any final disposition of a complaint, sufficient information must be provided to the complainant to allow the complainant to arrive at an informed understanding of how the complaint was handled."

Again, we have no problem here. The bill provides for this.

Continuing on, LeSage said: "It must be clear that any person who makes a complaint or is responsible for the handling of a complaint must not be harassed, intimidated or retaliated against for making or handling that complaint.

"Any police officer who seeks to undermine the efficient and effective operation of the complaints system should be deemed to have engaged in misconduct."

Again, no problem there. The bill does this in section 79, part II.

Continuing on, however, LeSage says: "If investigated by the police service affected or by another police service, the police officers assigned to investigate should not have any connection to the incident and be removed from the persons involved in the incident."

Bill 103 does not lay this out in the section dealing with internal investigations, which is section 66.

LeSage goes on to say: "The new body should be staffed with highly skilled investigators. These investigators shall not be police officers, but may be former police officers. However, a former police officer shall not conduct investigations related to any police service with which the investigator was formerly employed.

"Not more than 50% of the investigative staff of the new body should be former police officers."

I draw your attention to Bill 103, which does not seem to make any such restrictions in the section pertaining to investigators; that's section 26.5 of the bill.

1720

Finally, just to compare and contrast the LeSage recommendations with the bill, LeSage says, "The informal resolution process following an investigation should allow a chief of police to impose any penalty available to a hearing officer at a hearing other than dismissal or demotion unless rejected by the officer complained of. Information concerning the matter, the officer's reply, if any, and the penalty should be provided to the complainant and the new body. This information should be placed on a central Internet site. Review decisions should be made publicly accessible through an Internet site.... All hearing dates, hearing locations and hearing decisions must be made publicly accessible through a central Internet site."

Bill 103 compels that decisions be publicly available and that an annual report be published. It doesn't go into the necessary detail as to how that's going to be accomplished.

But I go on, because there are stakeholders who are unhappy with this bill as it stands and have put their requests and concerns forward to us. Again, this is the Toronto Police Accountability Coalition, a coalition of concerned citizens. They acknowledge that at least Bill 103 is a step forward, that the position of independent police review director being established is a good thing and that the establishment of regional offices is a good thing, although they do point out—and we have pointed out before—that there is no part of this bill that does the

reaching out to aboriginal communities that we would like to see. There's nothing in this bill that deals with aboriginal issues specifically, or even generally.

They go on to say what the bill does not do. They say, "The bill does not guarantee that an independent investigation will be done." This is hopefully the very point of this bill. "In fact it leaves the assumption that most complaints will be investigated by the police, as they now are. Given that speed and first access are important to accurate investigations, this is a genuine reason for concern. It is of little assistance to know that after the police have completed their investigation (perhaps taking two months)"—or more—"the police report will be submitted to the director who can then wonder whether the investigation has been done in a satisfactory manner. One fears that the lack of a guarantee of an independent investigation"—and by that we mean a guarantee of an independent investigation, not the promise of one—"will mean that the bill is not much of a step forward."

They also raise a number of other questions. They raise the questions of:

"The establishment of local advisory boards (as proposed by LeSage). How is that going to happen? Where is that going to be?"

"The instances in which complaints filed more than six months after an incident will be considered legitimate." It doesn't talk in this bill about how that will be adjudicated, whether it's legitimate or whether it's not legitimate.

"The percentage of investigators working for the director who are former police officers." I already highlighted that when I contrasted the recommendations of the LeSage report with the bill itself. "(LeSage had suggested a maximum of 50% should be former officers.)" But there's no guarantee of that.

They also contrast this bill, for example, with an independent coalition called Small Claims Court Justice, which is a group of law students, legal workers and social justice activists who have recently established the Police Accountability Small Claims Collective. Again, here's a stakeholder that's not particularly thrilled with this bill, although even they admit that it is a step forward from what we have now. At least we have someone independent that an injured party can go to.

I want to bring other concerns as well, other reasons that this bill should go to committee and public hearings and be really thoroughly examined. One of them we highlighted before, section 97. The Ombudsman Act does not apply to anything done under this bill. Well, who is going to oversee the overseers? Where is the accountability and transparency if ultimately the Ombudsman does not have access to the judgments that are made by this independent director and the investigation? This is a question of safekeeping. It's a question of a check and balance on the system as set up and on whoever this director might happen to be. As in most everything else, we would want to see this come under the Ombudsman's jurisdiction, and that's absolutely critical.

The other concern I raise is actually for the police themselves, and that is, in a sense, the absence of any safeguard for a whistle-blower within the police department. I go back to section 58. Here again I read that members prohibited from filing a complaint under this new system are members or auxiliary members of the police force, only if that police force or another member of that police force is the subject of the complaint; and they go on to say, "An employee of the Ontario Provincial Police, if the Ontario Provincial Police or a member of the Ontario Provincial Police is the subject of the complaint."

So I imagine a scenario—this is not imaginary; this is actually represented by a case that is before our courts right now—where a whistle-blower complains of corruption in the force in which they serve or perhaps, for that matter, complains of something unfair done to them or done to others by the brass in their own force, and wants to have a place to go that's independent, that's safe, that will adjudicate their concerns and then issue a ruling about this. Again, part of the problem is how this independent director is going to work. Are they going to send this back to the police services in some way, shape or form to investigate in essence a complaint about themselves, or will this go to an independent body? It's not very clear in the bill.

But what's clear in section 58 is that a police officer can't partake of this. They can't come forward and use this to further all of our safety. Certainly we would want, when we look at something like this, protection for a whistle-blower. I won't go into the details of this case that's before the courts, but in this one instance, a police officer was given one count of discreditable conduct and one count of breach of confidence. Why?

Hon. David Caplan (Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, Deputy Government House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I want to refer you to standing order 23(g). It says that the Speaker shall call a member to order if they refer "to any matter that is the subject of a proceeding

"(i) that is pending in a court or before a judge for judicial determination, or

"(ii) that is before any quasi-judicial body constituted by the House or by or under the authority of an act of the Legislature."

I'm listening to the comments of the member opposite and I want to bring this standing order to your attention.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you very much. I would caution the member. The point is well taken. I don't believe, though, that she actually referred to a specific case.

Hon. Mr. Caplan: I think she was about to.

The Acting Speaker: I would caution you—

Ms. DiNovo: I wasn't, actually. Also, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could roll the clock back a bit. I've lost about a minute there. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: It was a legitimate point of order. I would caution you not to name the actual case. Please continue. I cannot roll the clock back.

Ms. DiNovo: Can I seek unanimous consent to roll the clock back? It's only a minute.

Interjections.

Ms. DiNovo: Okay, not a problem.

To continue on, just to finish up, we have some concerns here. We have concerns about the lack of the Ombudsman's involvement. We have concerns about the lack of a whistle-blower clause here, where police themselves aren't allowed to take part in the system.

Finally, and this is large, we're very concerned about funding. We have a government that has chronically underfunded legal aid, under the McGuinty government. It's to the point that 42% of legal aid cases are being turned away right now, so our concern about funding is genuine. How will this body, this director and this process be funded? There's nothing about that in the bill. Will it be adequately funded?

Our concern is that if it is not adequately funded, those who are intimidated or frightened of coming forward to the police to make their complaints, who go to the director—those complaints then won't go to an independent body, but, because of lack of funding, will go back to the police and be investigated by the very bodies that intimidate these individuals in the first place. We're very concerned that this be adequately funded. I don't see any provision in this bill for the funding of this particular provision, and the funding in general is a concern because of past performance of this government when we're looking at a body like legal aid; that's particularly apropos. Again, we've heard from stakeholders around this. We've heard concerns.

Just to conclude, certainly this is a step forward. There's no question about that. Does it need work? Absolutely. Does it need to go to committee? Absolutely. Does it need to go to public hearings? Absolutely. Certainly, we look forward to taking part in that, and certainly one of the stakeholders that would love to take part in that is aboriginal communities.

1730

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments.

Mr. David Zimmer (Willowdale): I want to address this issue of intimidation of the police chiefs and police officers that the member for Leeds-Grenville raised.

I do find it—

The Acting Speaker: You must confine your comments. It's questions and comments on the debate, and the debate was from the member from Parkdale-High Park, not a previous debate in the House.

Mr. Zimmer: I want to speak to the issue of consultation. All the members have raised the issue of consultation. I want to point out that we've consulted widely, widely, particularly with the police forces, and it just may be—in fact it is—that as a result of those consultations, all of their thinking and their thoughts were taken into account at that time and there was no need for a formal consultation in the sense of attending at committee.

Some of the members across the way in fact have children who are police officers. If any of them were

concerned that the police officers weren't consulted with, I would have expected, given their strong concerns about consultation, that they would have urged those members of their family who are police officers to send in a submission or, indeed, to appear at the committee, make a submission and bring those concerns home.

The fact of the matter is that there were wide consultations here. This bill strikes the right balance between protecting the public from abuses by police officers and, at the same time, protecting the police officers from frivolous and vexatious complaints. If there is a frivolous and vexatious complaint, it doesn't do anybody any good. It doesn't do the complainant any good, it doesn't do the member of the public any good and it doesn't do the police forces any good to deal with that type of complaint.

Mr. O'Toole: I'm quite impressed with the content of the comments made by the member from Parkdale–High Park. In fact, I think the people from Parkdale–High Park should be very flattered that she's here representing them, because I know Mr. Kennedy didn't have the passion or commitment. I'm not trying to be critical or to disadvantage him in leadership aspirations federally, which he won't win anyway. But he'll be looking for a job.

My point is, quite frankly—I want to focus on part II.1 of the bill, the independent police review director. I think this is really the core part of what the people of Ontario are most interested in. They want the independence, some autonomy, some oversight and some confidence in the process. That's why our side, the opposition, Mr. Runciman and Ms. Elliott, were calling for some public hearings to be open and consulted during this legislative initiative.

If you read section 26.1, "Appointment of independent police review director," this is absolutely paramount to establish, in principle, this independence, this at least perceived condition that it's neither the police association nor the civilian oversight. I'm just going to read this section: "There shall be an independent police review director, who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council"—this is somewhat political, unfortunately, and probably will be something we'd be looking at—"on the recommendation of the Attorney General." With Mr. Bryant there, perhaps we would need to have some independence of that. "A person who is a police officer or former police officer shall not be appointed...." So this isn't sort of an inside-the-tent kind of thing. We're looking for independence, we're looking for accountability—that's why John Tory has encouraged us to be tacitly supportive of this bill—but we do need to have hearings on it.

Mr. Tabuns: I think that the member from Parkdale–High Park has outlined quite ably the concerns we have about this bill. We certainly have an interest in and support for development of an independent complaints review board. But we are concerned about the whole question of provision of support, of resources. I have had the opportunity in my riding to meet with local legal

clinics, such as East Toronto Community Legal Services and Flemingdon legal services, and they tell me about those who need legal aid and find they can't get legal aid—lawyers saying they're not interested because they can't actually pursue the cases on that basis.

I know there's a member over there who's saying, "So where is this leading?" It's leading to this: If there is not in fact an adequate allocation of funds to this board, to this commission, so it can carry out investigations that are independent—and seen to be independent—impartial and capable, then the credibility of the board, and thus the credibility of the police, in these rulings will be undermined. The protection of the public will not be there as intended by legislators and by Justice LeSage. That is a significant concern. We see this in other areas, such as the victims of crime compensation board—again, told that there were not enough funds, and so these victims have tremendous difficulty accessing the compensation.

So we see here again a potential problem, one that I would hope is addressed by the minister at the cabinet table, so that when this bill goes forward for consultation, when this bill is presented to the public, those concerns can be addressed, because they must be addressed.

Hon. Caroline Di Cocco (Minister of Culture): I'm pleased to respond to the member from Parkdale–High Park.

This bill is about doing what has been asked for for a very long time, and that is to provide for an independent and transparent police review system. And I say to those watching this channel that the parties here—the opposition party and the third party—support this bill. In their comments, after one supports the bill, the opposition has a role, and that role is to find whatever imperfection they can in the bill. With this one, it was difficult for them to make a strong case against the bill because of the report that was provided by Mr. LeSage, where he met with 85 groups and individuals who represented the police, community groups and the general public.

This bill is a balance. It's a balance of providing both the public with significant new options for bringing forward their concerns, and also for the police to not be totally strapped and unable to do their jobs. So we have here, I think, a really good balance.

There was a lot of consultation. It is a very good bill, something that is needed in this province. I know that all three parties in this House—we, of course, presented it and the opposition parties support it, which indicates how strong this bill is.

The Acting Speaker: The member from Parkdale–High Park has two minutes to respond.

Ms. DiNovo: Again, I don't think that what you're hearing from this side of the House is lack of support for the general nature of the bill or lack of support for the necessity of the bill. Absolutely, reform is necessary; it's essential. Right now, people are intimidated—the poorest of the poor, the ones who need it most. We've seen instances of this fairly recently. Just yesterday—again, I won't mention the name of the individual—the case of

someone with mental health issues who had had a run-in with police was before the press and before the public. This happens all too frequently, and there's no recourse—or they feel there's no recourse—right now except to walk up to those who intimidated them in the first place, those they're frightened of, and complain directly to those they see as the problem.

So obviously we need a bill. We need—

The Acting Speaker: Excuse me. The member from Durham is not in his seat. You're right in the line of sight. I cannot see the person speaking.

Thank you. Continue.

1740

Ms. DiNovo: So do we need a bill? Absolutely, we need a bill. And do we need a bill like this? I would say yes again. But is this bill complete? Does it need work? That's where I'd say we differ. It does need work. Again I point out those two particular issues—and the third is funding. Section 97, oversight by the Ombudsman: We would want to see that. We're also concerned about section 58 and the lack of whistle-blower protection. And of course the overarching concern: Where is the money? How much money is going to be put into place to back this up so that they can actually do the work that we're entrusting to them to do? Because if it's underfunded, it's worse than nothing. We see right now in our legal aid system the problems inherent in a system that's set up and underfunded. So we would ask for those changes. We would look forward to working with the government on this in committee and we would look forward also to public hearings as well with our aboriginal brothers and sisters on this bill.

The Acting Speaker: Further debate?

Mr. Khalil Ramal (London–Fanshawe): Thank you for giving me this chance and opportunity to speak in support of Bill 103. I was listening to many speakers from both sides of the House talking about the importance of this bill. I believe strongly that this bill is going to make sure that all the people in Ontario, all the different communities in Ontario, are comfortable and relaxed because they have a government looking after them.

I come from London, Ontario. In this city we have a strong police force, we have a strong police organization and we have a chief, Mr. Murray Faulkner. He looks after the city very well. All of our men and women who serve with the city police are great people. So I don't want the people of London or the people of Ontario to think this bill is against them, as was mentioned by the opposition party many different times. We have a strong belief and we have full trust in the police service in Ontario. As I mentioned, I come from London. Our police service is involved on a daily basis with many different activities, whether it be ethnic communities, multi-faith communities, multi-faith groups, women's issues, poverty issues, education, justice, at many different levels. You see them involved on a daily basis with their community. They want to know, they want to understand, they want to help the community of London, and I would imagine every group of police across the province would

do the same, to make sure that all the people of Ontario, all the people of any community, are protected.

This bill is important because so much talk across Ontario has happened, not just today but many years ago. When you see some person get killed who happened to be from a certain community, from a certain ethnic background, that whole ethnic community stands up and says, "He was killed because he's Black, he's Arab, he's Lebanese," and so on. That's why this independent review is very important, to have a civilian director oversee both sides. If you have any complaints, this complaint goes to them. Then it will be reviewed and there will be a lot of dialogue between the police and the director and many people who are involved in justice to make sure all these events happen in the right way and no one is abused during the process.

I want to commend the minister and the government of Ontario for looking at this issue, because you know, Mr. Speaker—you are from the Toronto area—how many complaints are filed to the police, how many people complain about the police abusing their authority, their system. That's why this bill will protect the police and also the community. We know that the police who put in their time and effort put their lives on the line to protect us. We also don't want to be the subjects of abuse. At the same time, we're also in charge of making sure that all the communities throughout the province of Ontario are safe. This bill will create a balanced approach for both sides.

I was thrilled and happy to see that the minister hired a qualified person who was a Chief Justice of the Ontario Supreme Court and also the former chief prosecutor of Ontario, Mr. Patrick LeSage, who has a lot of knowledge about this issue and spent day after day consulting the people of Ontario. He went to many different communities. He went to small and large communities and talked to many different organizations—about 85 organizations—from aboriginal people to police organizations, ethnic multicultural groups, women, many different organizations that were concerned about safety in this province. He elicited very important information and gave it to the minister, and that formed the bill which is being debated before us today.

I was listening to the member opposite when he was talking about the importance of this bill. But they're talking about the lack of funding. I listen to them and they're always concerned about the lack of funding. They always talk about this issue as an obstacle.

I want to say to the people of Ontario that we are concerned about many different issues. When we bring a bill forward, when we have an idea or when we have to establish an organizational directorate, when we establish a fairness commissioner, we know exactly that those establishments will cost money to function well, to deliver the goods for the people of Ontario. Right now we're not talking about how much it will cost, we're not talking about how we're going to fund it; we're talking about the importance of this bill. We're talking about the element of the bill.

You hear members of the third party and members of the opposition talking about the importance of this bill, but they doubt the government all the time. If you look at our record for the last three years, you'll see a lot of transparency, from education to health to infrastructure. People know we're not just talking, we're acting; and they see the results. When you drive on the highway—I drive from here to London every week—you see the infrastructure being rebuilt. When you go to the schools, you see them being rebuilt. When you go to many different elements from our government, you see the happiness, that people are content and accept what we do in the province of Ontario. This bill is part of it. This bill will directly affect our safety in this province, the safety of the communities, making sure that all communities in Ontario that are served by our men and women on the police forces are happy. They have to feel that those people are serving them, not coming to abuse them.

I heard the member from Toronto–Danforth mention a very important element when he was talking about many of our people in the province of Ontario coming from many different countries, new immigrants who come from police states that are governed by the police. The police are not there to protect them but to abuse them. The police are there not to help them but to kill them.

We have a strong police force in the province of Ontario, built from the community, working for the community and serving the community. That's why we want a bill to make sure that the image of the police services in Ontario is maintained, the image of protection is maintained and the image of service is maintained. We want to make sure that there is a continuous connection, a continuous dialogue between the communities and the police forces in Ontario. We want to eliminate all those perceptions and make sure that the people of Ontario are being served very well by their police forces.

I want to support the bill, not because I'm part of the government but because I believe strongly in what this bill means to many people in Ontario. As I've mentioned, not many can go directly to the police to complain because they're sometimes intimidated by the police. There are things that you cannot complain about to the people who are abusing you.

1750

They want to complain to a separate body. A civilian body understands them and they can complain to it and know that the person they are complaining to has nothing to do with the police system or cannot come back and see them again when they're driving a car or when they're walking the street etc. A civilian director is going to oversee the whole system, and I believe it is going to be fair for the police service and also is going to be fair for community members who have some kind of concern.

I strongly believe and hope that all the concerns brought by the third party and the opposition party will be eliminated when this bill goes to committee. We'll hear from many different people how important this bill is. We are willing, as a government, to listen. If there is any chance for changes, I think we are willing.

I had the chance and privilege to serve on many different committees. I know that we go with a bill, and when we finish consultations we change a lot because we listen. That's why we are here today: not to force our way, our philosophy, our agenda, but to listen to the people and consult with the people and, as a result, we come up with a good bill that is reflective of the needs and concerns of the people of the province of Ontario and make sure safety is intact and in place.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments?

Mr. O'Toole: It's a good thing I was actually—

Applause.

The Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. O'Toole: Unaccustomed as I am to being appreciated—

Interjections.

Mr. O'Toole: I was pleased to see the member for London–Fanshawe rise and address what I think is often a sensitive matter dealing with policing issues. I'm not sure if he stood up as strongly during the current city of Toronto decision on relocating the dump. Perhaps he should have. We'll see some time next year if there is any cost of his inaction—that's code language for “election.”

Under part II—I never got to finish that, and I'm not sure if the member addressed that. Certainly it's all part of the independence and the accountability mechanism that I think the public that may still be listening, if they're not having dinner—it's section 26.1, and it's talking about the appointment of an independent police review director. This is absolutely fundamental. It's central to the accountability provisions under Bill 103.

What we'd like to make sure of—in here it's clear, as I said before, that the person cannot be a former police officer or police chief. So the person would have some independence and no brotherhood association, if you will. I know that this is what we all want. We want there to be a process to resolve disputes. For instance, today we passed Bill 43, which was the Clean Water Act. There was no process there to resolve disputes. But we'll work to get this bill right, and our side will certainly pay very close attention to the debate and to the public hearings that we expect will happen during the intersession.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Toronto–Danforth.

Applause.

The Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Tabuns: To those out there who are watching this—the five of you—an unusual atmosphere of non-partisan support for all speakers has broken out in the Legislature this afternoon, and I thank all of you for exhibiting that non-partisan support. This is a very rare moment, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware—a very rare moment.

The member from London–Fanshawe talked about the concern we have to show, and that we have to realize, on the part of people who come to Canada from countries where the relationship with the police is far less—what can I say?—collegial, supportive, open; from countries

where the relationship with the police is one of fear, because police operate in a far more oppressive way. So it is very important to us, as the member from London–Fanshawe said, to ensure that we have an independent police oversight body, a complaints body that can take those concerns, take those complaints and deal with them on an impartial, fair, open basis.

If those new citizens are going to have confidence in our system, in our democracy, they have to know that they can go and speak to this impartial body, have their complaints heard and have them expeditiously investigated by investigators who have the skills to do it. That's going to require investment of funds. Again, I say to the government that making sure there are adequate resources for this body is going to be crucial to its ability to succeed.

Mr. Berardinetti: I want to congratulate the member from London–Fanshawe for his comments, and especially those to do with consultation. Looking at some of the consultation that we have already undertaken, Mr. LeSage conducted a thorough and extensive review of the police complaints system in Ontario and, as the member indicated, he wants more of this consultation to occur at the committee level.

Mr. LeSage met with over 200 individuals, representing more than 85 groups and organizations. Public meetings were held in Ottawa, Toronto and Windsor. He met with lists of individuals, and this has been going on since June 2005. They include the Police Association of Ontario, the Urban Alliance on Race Relations, the Association of Black Law Enforcers, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Toronto Police Accountability Coalition, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, the Metro Toronto Chinese and Southeast Asian Legal Clinic, the Ontario Provincial Police Association, the Toronto Police Association, the Parkdale Community Legal Services, the St. Stephen's Community House: Conflict Resolution Service, the Aboriginal Legal Services of Toronto, the Scadding Court Community Centre and Operation Black Vote Canada. He also considered many letters, which he has forwarded on to the Attorney General.

So the consultation has begun and there has been quite a lot of it, which has led to this bill in front of us today. I

know that when it goes to committee we're going to hear more from the public again, as the member has indicated we should do, and hopefully we'll come forward with a bill that will be in the best interests of all people in Ontario.

The Acting Speaker: Questions and comments? Any further questions and comments? Seeing none, the member from London–Fanshawe has two minutes to respond.

Mr. Ramal: First, I want to thank the members from Durham, Toronto–Danforth and Scarborough Southwest for their comments on my speech.

It's a very important piece of legislation before us here; there is no doubt about it: All members in the House want to support it. For partisan reasons or some technicalities, I guess, every party wants to have some kind of input, which I think is normal. I believe that when the bill goes to the committee and we listen to all the sides of the House, hopefully we'll do some amendment to reflect the views of all Ontarians, not just one party of Ontario. I think that in general the public of Ontario are going to be happy, and especially the people who have some kind of doubt about the police forces. Now, with this independent review body, we'll have some safety and some convictions about how we can protect them—and they will be protected in this province. No one in this province will be abused. No one in this province will have some kind of issue not being dealt with. This is the Ontario we're looking for. This is the Ontario I love, I like. That's why I chose Ontario to be my province, why I chose London to be my city, and that's why I chose this place to serve them and to pay them back.

This is a chance for all of us today to serve and to pay back all the people who voted for us to be in this place to make sure that safety is in place, to bring in bills and regulations and rules in order to better their life, and to make sure there is safety and to create some kind of atmosphere for all the people who live in this province.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and all the members who spoke in support and commented on my speech.

The Acting Speaker: The time now being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

The House adjourned at 1800.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. James K. Bartleman
Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. Brown
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, Hon. / L'hon. Michael A. (L) Speaker / Président	Haliburton–Victoria–Brock	Scott, Laurie (PC)
Ancaster–Dundas– Flamborough–Aldershot	McMeekin, Ted (L)	Halton	Chudleigh, Ted (PC)
Barrie–Simcoe–Bradford	Tascona, Joseph N. (PC) Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Hamilton East / Hamilton-Est	Horwath, Andrea (ND)
Beaches–East York / Beaches–York-Est	Prue, Michael (ND)	Hamilton Mountain	Bountrogianni, Hon. / L'hon. Marie (L) Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, minister responsible for democratic renewal / ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales, ministre responsable du Renouveau démocratique
Bramalea–Gore–Malton– Springdale	Kular, Kuldip (L)	Hamilton West / Hamilton-Ouest	Marsales, Judy (L)
Brampton Centre / Brampton-Centre	Jeffrey, Linda (L)	Hastings–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	Dombrowsky, Hon. / L'hon. Leona (L) Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Brampton West–Mississauga / Brampton-Ouest–Mississauga	Dhillon, Vic (L)	Huron–Bruce	Mitchell, Carol (L)
Brant	Levac, Dave (L)	Kenora–Rainy River	Hampton, Howard (ND) Leader of the New Democratic Party / chef du Nouveau Parti démocratique
Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound	Murdoch, Bill (PC)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (L) Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Cambridge	Martiniuk, Gerry (PC)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Millroy, John (L)
Chatham–Kent Essex	Hoy, Pat (L)	Kitchener–Waterloo	Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)
Davenport	Ruprecht, Tony (L)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	Van Bommel, Maria (L)
Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Caplan, Hon. / L'hon. David (L) Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, deputy government House leader / ministre du Renouvellement de l'infrastructure publique, leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement	Lanark–Carleton	Werling, Norman W. (PC)
Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (L) Minister of Education / ministre de l'Éducation	Leeds–Grenville	Runciman, Robert W. (PC)
Dufferin–Peel– Wellington–Grey	Tory, John (PC) Leader of the Opposition / chef de l'opposition	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Matthews, Deborah (L)
Durham	O'Toole, John (PC)	London West / London-Ouest	Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (L) Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Eglington–Lawrence	Colle, Hon. / L'hon. Mike (L) Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration	London–Fanshawe	Ramal, Khalil (L)
Elgin–Middlesex–London	Peters, Hon. / L'hon. Steve (L) Minister of Labour / ministre du Travail	Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre	Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (L) Minister of Small Business and Entrepreneurship / ministre des Petites Entreprises et de l'Entrepreneuriat
Erie–Lincoln Essex	Crozier, Bruce (L) Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Vice-Président, Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative	Mississauga East / Mississauga-Est	Fonseca, Peter (L)
Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	Cansfield, Hon. / L'hon. Donna H. (L) Minister of Transportation / ministre des Transports	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Peterson, Tim (L)
Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	Qaadri, Shafiq (L)	Mississauga West / Mississauga-Ouest	Delaney, Bob (L)
Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (L) Minister of the Environment / ministre de l'Environnement	Nepean–Carleton	MacLeod, Lisa (PC)
Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	Lalonde, Jean-Marc (L)	Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre	Kormos, Peter (ND)
Guelph–Wellington	Sandals, Liz (L)	Niagara Falls	Craitor, Kim (L)
Haldimand–Norfolk–Brant	Barrett, Toby (PC)	Nickel Belt	Martel, Shelley (ND)
		Nipissing	Smith, Monique M. (L)
		Northumberland	Rinaldi, Lou (L)

Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti	Constituency Circonscription	Member/Party Député(e) / Parti
Oak Ridges	Klees, Frank (PC)	Stormont–Dundas– Charlottenburgh	Brownell, Jim (L)
Oakville	Flynn, Kevin Daniel (L)	Sudbury	Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (L) Minister of Northern Development and Mines / ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Oshawa	Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Thornhill	Racco, Mario G. (L)
Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Patten, Richard (L)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Mauro, Bill (L)
Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (L) Premier and President of the Council, Minister of Research and Innovation / premier ministre et président du Conseil, ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior- Nord	Gravelle, Michael (L)
Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Watson, Hon. / L'hon. Jim (L) Minister of Health Promotion / ministre de la Promotion de la santé	Timiskaming–Cochrane	Ramsay, Hon. / L'hon. David (L) Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs / ministre des Richesses naturelles, ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones
Ottawa–Orléans	McNeely, Phil (L)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins-Baie James	Bisson, Gilles (ND)
Ottawa–Vanier	Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (L) Minister of Community and Social Services, minister responsible for francophone affairs / ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires, ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones	Toronto Centre–Rosedale / Toronto-Centre–Rosedale	Smitherman, Hon. / L'hon. George (L) Deputy Premier, Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / vice-premier ministre, ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Oxford	Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Toronto–Danforth	Tabuns, Peter (ND)
Parkdale–High Park	DiNovo, Cheri (ND)	Trinity–Spadina	Marchese, Rosario (ND)
Parry Sound–Muskoka	Miller, Norm (PC)	Vaughan–King–Aurora	Sorbara, Hon. / L'hon. Greg (L) Minister of Finance, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / ministre des Finances, président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement
Perth–Middlesex	Wilkinson, John (L)	Waterloo–Wellington	Arnott, Ted (PC) First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier Vice-Président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Peterborough	Leal, Jeff (L)	Whitby–Ajax	Elliott, Christine (PC)
Pickering–Ajax–Uxbridge	Arthurs, Wayne (L)	Willowdale	Zimmer, David (L)
Prince Edward–Hastings	Parsons, Ernie (L)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	Pupatello, Hon. / L'hon. Sandra (L) Minister of Economic Development and Trade, minister responsible for women's issues / ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce, ministre délégué à la Condition féminine
Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke	Yakabuski, John (PC)	Windsor–St. Clair	Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (L) Minister of Energy / ministre de l'Énergie
Sarnia–Lambton	Di Cocco, Hon. / L'hon. Caroline (L) Minister of Culture / ministre de la Culture	York Centre / York-Centre	Kwinter, Hon. / L'hon. Monte (L) Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
Sault Ste. Marie	Oraziotti, David (L)	York North / York-Nord	Munro, Julia (PC)
Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Duguid, Brad (L)	York West / York-Ouest	Sergio, Mario (L)
Scarborough East / Scarborough-Est	Chambers, Hon. / L'hon. Mary Anne V. (L) Minister of Children and Youth Services / ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse	Burlington	Vacant
Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	Berardinetti, Lorenzo (L)	Markham	Vacant
Scarborough–Agincourt	Phillips, Hon. / L'hon. Gerry (L) Minister of Government Services / ministre des Services gouvernementaux	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	Vacant
Scarborough–Rouge River	Balkissoon, Bas (L)		
Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Dunlop, Garfield (PC)		
Simcoe–Grey	Wilson, Jim (PC)		
St. Catharines	Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (L) Minister of Tourism, minister responsible for seniors, government House leader / ministre du Tourisme, ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées, leader parlementaire du gouvernement		
St. Paul's	Bryant, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (L) Attorney General / procureur général		
Stoney Creek	Mossop, Jennifer F. (L)		

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

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

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Mercredi 18 octobre 2006

PREMIÈRE LECTURE

Loi de 2006 sur les mesures budgétaires (n° 2), projet de loi 151, <i>M. Sorbara</i>	
Adoptée.....	5570

DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

Entraînement à la réanimation cardio-respiratoire dans les écoles secondaires	
M. Watson	1401
M. Klees	5572
M ^{me} Martel	5573

TROISIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2006 sur l'eau saine, projet de loi 43, <i>M^{me} Broten</i>	
Adoptée	5574
Loi de 2006 sur l'accès à la justice, projet de loi 14, <i>M. Bryant</i>	
Vote différé.....	5587

DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Loi de 2006 sur l'examen indépendant de la police, projet de loi 103, <i>M. Bryant</i>	
Débat présumé ajourné.....	5604

CONTENTS

Wednesday 18 October 2006

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Chicken farmers	
Mr. Barrett	5567
Mrs. Mitchell	5569
Chine Drive Public School	
Mr. Berardinetti	5567
Access to health care	
Mr. Klees	5567
Forest industry	
Ms. Martel	5567
Academic testing	
Mrs. Jeffrey	5568
Legal aid	
Mrs. Elliott	5568
Cogeneration	
Mr. Oraziotti	5568
Leader of the Opposition	
Mr. Wilkinson	5569

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Standing committee on government agencies	
The Speaker	5569
Report deemed adopted	5570

FIRST READINGS

Budget Measures Act, 2006 (No. 2), Bill 151, <i>Mr. Sorbara</i>	
Agreed to	5570
Mr. Sorbara	5570

MOTIONS

Private members' public business	
Mr. Bradley	5570
Agreed to	5570

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

CPR training in high schools	
Mr. Watson	5570
Mr. Klees	5572
Ms. Martel	5573
Persons Day	
Ms. Pupatello	5571
Mrs. Elliott	5572
Ms. DiNovo	5573

ORAL QUESTIONS

Job creation	
Mr. Chudleigh	5574
Mr. Sorbara	5574
Violence in entertainment	
Mr. Runciman	5575
Mr. Bryant	5575
Mr. Phillips	5576
Children's aid societies	
Mr. Hampton	5576
Mr. McGuinty	5576
Hospital services	
Mr. Hampton	5577
Mr. McGuinty	5577
Tourism	
Mr. Arnott	5578
Mr. Bradley	5578
Water quality	
Mr. Tabuns	5579
Ms. Broten	5579
Access to health care	
Mrs. Mitchell	5579
Mr. Smitherman	5579
Hydro rates	
Mr. Yakabuski	5580
Mr. Duncan	5580
Occupational health and safety	
Mr. Kormos	5581
Mr. Peters	5581
Automotive industry	
Mr. Crozier	5581
Ms. Pupatello	5581
Assistance to the disabled	
Mr. Martiniuk	5582
Mrs. Meilleur	5582
Property taxation	
Mr. Prue	5582
Mr. Sorbara	5583
Immigrants	
Mrs. Sandals	5583
Mr. Colle	5583

PETITIONS

Property rights	
Mr. Chudleigh	5584
Long-term care	
Mr. Kormos	5584
Ms. Martel	5585, 5586
Mr. O'Toole	5585
Ms. DiNovo	5586

Immigrants' skills

Mr. Leal	5584
Mr. Delaney	5585
Mr. Ruprecht	5587

Doctor shortage

Mr. Murdoch	5585
-------------------	------

School facilities

Mr. Wilson	5586
------------------	------

Water quality

Mr. O'Toole	5587
-------------------	------

THIRD READINGS

Clean Water Act, 2006, Bill 43,

Ms. Broten

Agreed to	5574
-----------------	------

Access to Justice Act, 2006, Bill 14,

Mr. Bryant

Vote deferred	5587
---------------------	------

SECOND READINGS

Independent Police Review Act, 2006, Bill 103, *Mr. Bryant*

Mr. Berardinetti	5588, 5590, 5604
Mr. O'Toole	5589, 5596, 5601, 5603
Ms. DiNovo	5590, 5597, 5601
Mr. Leal	5590
Mr. Runciman	5591
Mrs. Elliott	5593, 5597
Mr. Tabuns	5596, 5601, 5603
Mrs. Mitchell	5596
Mr. Zimmer	5600
Ms. Di Cocco	5601
Mr. Ramal	5602, 5604
Debate deemed adjourned	5604

OTHER BUSINESS

Visitors

The Speaker	5569
Mr. Ruprecht	5574

Correction of record

Mr. O'Toole	5569
-------------------	------

Order and decorum in chamber

Mr. Klees	5583
-----------------	------

Continued overleaf