



No. 175B

N° 175B

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario  
Second Session, 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario  
Deuxième session, 38<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 16 May 2007**

**Mercredi 16 mai 2007**

Speaker  
Honourable Michael A. Brown

Président  
L'honorable Michael A. Brown

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **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](mailto: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](mailto: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 16 May 2007

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 16 mai 2007

*The House met at 1845.*

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Caroline Di Cocco (Minister of Culture):** I move that, pursuant to standing order 46 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 140, An Act respecting long-term care homes, when Bill 140 is next called as a government order the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That there shall be no deferral of any vote allowed pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

That, in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to 10 minutes.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bruce Crozier):** I thought for a moment we might have to leave and watch the hockey game, but Ms. Di Cocco has moved government order number 373. Ms. Di Cocco.

**Hon. Ms. Di Cocco:** I'm pleased that I have an opportunity this evening to speak on this matter. Bill 140 is an important piece of legislation because, as the bill states, it establishes a new system of governance for long-term-care homes in Ontario.

One of the important pieces for me is that this is about ensuring that residents of long-term-care homes receive quality care that is provided with compassion and dignity. Our long-term-care homes look after our most vulnerable. As we age, we need to have a place sometimes when we need extra care. We introduced Bill 140 because it's about that compassion and dignity that our elderly need.

I went to a number of homes in my riding—there's Vision, Trillium Villa, Marshall Gowland Manor—and I spoke to a number of the residents there. What is comforting to me is that they certainly appreciate the care that they receive. The people working in the long-term-care homes also have said to me that one of their challenges is that the residents in the homes are getting older—I think the average age was 85 in one home—and that the care they need is more complex and more intensive. Therefore, it's really important that this bill is where it's at and is going to—hopefully, when this receives royal assent and is passed—make some changes because it makes the

care that we're going to provide to our long-term-care residents.

We're responding. This bill, if passed, is going to be a cornerstone of the government's strategy to improve and strengthen care for residents. We've listened to a number of people in groups concerned about the quality of long-term-care homes in Ontario through a number of public consultations that were held in January. By listening to all of the advice and the input that was provided, we responded to the legislation that had been presented, and through this consultation we made the legislation even stronger. I'd like to speak to those changes that we made.

**1850**

We're establishing staffing and care standards. I believe that this is supported by the New Democratic Party. We're extending the licence terms to allow for more certainty for home operators. This allows the system to have more flexibility for long-term planning. The previous government had no plan, and that's why we have wait lists in some parts of the province while in others we have an oversupply of beds. So we had to find some equity there. We're reducing paperwork associated with the new act and recognizing the government support of the not-for-profit long-term-care-home sector.

When this legislation was introduced, there was certainly some concern out there. I heard from some of my long-term-care homes, and they thought that they were going to be closed. They're not going to be closed. This government is not closing homes, and I just want to reiterate that as many times as I can because it is certainly a perception that I want to debunk because it isn't the case. As Ontario's population continues to grow in age, this government is going to continue to make investments in long-term care.

It's important that we don't presume that, with this legislation, everything is perfect and everything can be fixed overnight. It's a process of continuous improvement. It's a process that strengthens our legislation so that different things can happen.

I want to highlight some other aspects of this legislation. For instance, it's promoting zero tolerance of abuse and neglect of long-term-care-home residents. Again, there's whistle-blowing protection for staff, residents and volunteers who report abuse or neglect. We're enshrining in legislation that a registered nurse be on duty in the home 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I say in this House that these are enshrined pieces in the legislation that strengthen and support our seniors, because, after all, it isn't about the facilities all the time; it's about the

people who are in them. It's important that the elderly live in dignity and they're cared for in every way to the best of our ability. That's what a good society is all about, and this legislation helps us to continue moving in that direction. Again, it's another example of how important it is to this government to improve the quality of life of all of our citizens, including, of course, our long-term-care residents.

I want to also, just for the record, state some of the other initiatives that have been included that have already happened in some cases and that we're moving towards. For instance, we funded long-term-care homes so that we could hire new direct care staff, and that number is 4,900 new direct care staff, which includes 1,101 nurses since 2004. Again, we're improving, we're adding people to the system and we're adding beds. I have to say that we also put 4,912 new long-term-care beds in operation since April 2004 and we have announced plans to add 1,750 new beds and to replace 662 beds in the communities of south Niagara, south Simcoe, Guelph, London, Windsor, Hastings, Kingston, Ottawa, Sudbury and Thunder Bay.

Certainly, one of the situations I've encountered a few times in my term as MPP was when one spouse was in one nursing home and another spouse was in another nursing home. That happened a few times that I encountered. You know, Speaker, we now have enabled spouses to be reunited in the same long-term-care home, and to me that's just the right thing to do so people can care for themselves.

I have to say, I watched both my parents—my father was 85, my mother was 82, and they, in the last few months of their lives, were separated because of illness. I saw that my father had a very difficult time coping with the fact that my mother was somewhere and he was not with her. They died within 10 days of one another because they were so close. So there is a need, and for the times when one is at that stage in their life, if it's possible to stay together, it is absolutely the right thing to do. As my dad said to me, "You know, the older we get, the more we love each other; the older we get, the more we care about each other." It's important that we now have that capacity to reunite our elderly, and that's what we've done. As I said, in the past that wasn't the case. We had these rules where if one spouse was in one home, it wasn't necessarily the case that the other spouse would be in the same home.

So I guess at the end of the day I'm proud of the work that this government has done. There's a lot more we have to do, that we have to continue to do, but this legislation improves and strengthens the care that our long-term-care residents will have in the later part of their years, and I'm proud of the work that we've done. I want to thank the Minister of Health and the parliamentary assistant for the work they have done on this file. I know that as time goes on, we'll continue to strength this sector.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further debate?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford):** I rise today to speak to Bill 140, which is a bill, of course, that was supposed

to deal with improving the lot in life for our seniors, to upgrade and to provide, as the minister opposite said, quality care for our seniors.

The bill doesn't seem to have achieved the goals that the government themselves set out to achieve. Of course, you would know that in the campaign document—and you know that very well, Mr. Speaker—the government promised to spend and to provide \$6,000 more per resident in the long-term-care system in order to provide that quality care. They were going to upgrade the quality of the homes. The previous government funded 20,000 new long-term-care beds which were going to be used to alleviate the backlog of people who were waiting for beds. We spent money on 16,000 beds that were D facilities that were moved up to A facilities. The government of today—I would have thought there would have been something in this bill that would help facilitate the process of taking the C beds and turning them into A beds so everyone would get the quality care and a similar level of care to what their neighbours and their friends get. There's nothing in the bill that does that, and I think that's of great concern.

I had the opportunity to attend some of the public hearings, and what I found interesting was that it didn't seem to matter what group was presenting; there was no one who came in and presented and said, "We like this bill the way it is." Everyone who came in had certain things they liked about the bill, but all had serious problems with it. I would just like to very quickly go through some of the areas.

#### 1900

At the public hearings in London—of course, as you would know, that's rather close to my riding, so that was an opportunity for some of the people who provide long-term care in my riding, some of the people who represent the associations, the resident councils and so forth in long-term-care facilities, and the labour people who provide the care in the homes for long-term care. I just want to go through some of the things that they told us were wrong with the bill and where they were concerned.

I'll start with the Oxford Health Coalition, which presented to the committee. I wouldn't think of reading through their whole presentation—we would be here for the whole day—but there is one paragraph I do want to read. I think this was fairly consistent with all the presenters who represented the labour that provides the service in the homes.

This is Shawn Rouse, who is chair of the local for the workers in the long-term-care facility:

"Where the act does fail the residents and their families is in what is missing in the act. What we see as a root issue in many of the continuing problems plaguing resident care is the missing language surrounding a minimum care standard. An interesting issue has arisen in the presentation of an actual regulation reported on the long-term-care website that speaks to a minimum requirement for staffing levels in the dietary department of 0.42 hours per resident meal day. There is a formula to amend the number if the dietary department is shared with a retire-

ment home or a hospital. Imagine that there are no minimum staffing levels in nursing, but there are in dietary. Compliance staff will be enforcing this and may request staffing schedules, records of resident meal days and duty rosters, among other things. Dietary standards are outlined in seven pages, and nursing standards are outlined in four.”

I think I would have to agree with him that in fact there seems to be a bit of a problem there, that we are more interested in looking at what is happening in the operation of the facility in the kitchen than we are in what is happening with the actual care for the people living there. I think that's a sad commentary. He brings that out because that's what is in this bill. That's what this government is proposing to do with this legislation that they said was going to provide quality care and improve that quality care for our seniors.

As I said when I started, everyone who came to present had some concerns with the bill. The minister opposite mentioned that this was designed to help the not-for-profit organizations. One of those not-for-profit organizations is the municipal home for the aged. Again, I've had the pleasure and privilege of sitting on the board of our local Woodingford Lodge and the long-term-care facilities in the riding. The warden of the county made a presentation. I just want to point out some of the concerns that they had with the legislation. Again, they were trying to deal with these issues, and it seems that they've come up short.

“A paramount concern of the county of Oxford related to this piece of legislation deals with the failure of the province to make a commitment to ensure that there will be sufficient long-term-care beds available in Ontario in general, and in Oxford county in particular, to meet the future long-term-care needs of the residents of our communities.”

Again, there is nothing in this piece of legislation that provides for increasing the number of beds and, furthermore, improving the quality of the beds that exist.

This is another problem that we found in Oxford county and in all municipal homes for the aged: “The county of Oxford contributes some \$5 million per year to the cost of resident care and services at Woodingford Lodge to meet the current standards. It is becoming progressively more difficult to maintain this level of subsidy due to the capital financing commitments. Unless the government provides additional funding, Woodingford Lodge will be forced to apply even more of its limited resources to meeting all the new administrative requirements of the act.”

Again, there are a lot more administrative things in this act that need to be done. There is absolutely nothing in this act that will help the operators of the facilities to pay for that service.

Number three was “a requirement to establish and maintain a home. Under section 117 of Bill 140, southern municipalities will continue to be required to establish and maintain a long-term-care home or joint home or help maintain a home or joint home with the ministry's

approval.” Again, of course, there's an exemption for northern Ontario. The problem that arises is that they mandate that the municipality must do it, but there is no funding applied to it. Furthermore, this bill increases the standards that are required.

When they got through with their presentation and I thanked the warden, I said, “The number one issue in the whole presentation appears to be that we can make these changes, and a lot of the changes are good for the system, but what we need is funding to go with it. So we'll leave the funding as the number one priority,” and the warden agreed with that. “As the second priority in your presentation, what would you say if we could convince the government to make a change, but only one? What would it be in the bill that would make this a better bill as it relates to long-term care and the county's operation of Woodingford Lodge?”

The warden said, “If I could maybe turn that over to Mr. Orvidas, who, as I mentioned, is the director and has a little more day-to-day interaction with staff, the residents and also family members.”

Again, it's so important that we hear from the people who actually operate the facilities and whether this legislation will do that.

“I think enhanced funding is a critical component. However, I think that's so closely tied to operational funding that one goes hand in hand with the other.”

Again, it comes down to—it's wonderful to make all kinds of rules and regulations and set standards, but you have to put funding in.

“An area that we have particular concern about, as has been mentioned, is the prescriptive regulations and the need for staff to spend so much more of their time, then, to meet those requirements rather than doing what they do best, which is bedside nursing.”

Again, he is very concerned that there is no mandate and no funding there to help with more people to look after the bureaucracy. Of course, it's going to be more and more difficult for them to meet the needs in the bill—and absolutely no improved services for the residents.

The last one I wanted to just quickly touch on was the presentation that was made by Mr. Brent Gingerich, who is the operator of PeopleCare in Tavistock. I won't go through the whole thing, but there's just one section of it here that I found rather helpful as we decide whether this bill meets the targets that were set.

“This act could be win-win for the government, could be win-win for the clients and public, could be win-win for the staff and operators and could be win-win for owners and financiers. This is why the Ontario Long Term Care Association has proposed some 95 in-depth and detailed amendments. I'd encourage you to adopt these amendments as presented.” Of course, they had been presented to the committee before.

He goes on to say further down, “With Bill 140, there's still no workable plan”—I should maybe read the paragraph before that's so critical: “PeopleCare's three homes are classified as C by the Ministry of Health, which means the physical structures, the bricks and

mortar, comply with 1972 nursing home standards but do not meet the newly introduced 1998 standards. My colleagues in the association and I have been advocating the government since the 1998 standards were introduced to develop a workable plan to get these 1972 C homes, which represent about 50% of the homes in the province, to standards more acceptable to today's residents and their families. Unfortunately, a plan has never been introduced.

"With Bill 140, there's still no workable plan for the future. According to Bill 140, I may get notification by the ministry informing me if I'll get to remain open after seven years. In the absence of such notification, I can expect to be closed." The minister said that this wasn't going to happen, but in fact, the people who are running the homes believe that it is going to happen. "That's the level of planning for capital in this act. For a long-term-care organization with an outstanding reputation that has been a model provider of long-term-care services for 40 years, this has caused a tremendous amount of uncertainty regarding our future existence"—not only for the homes but for the residents in those homes, because if they cannot get their licence extended, those people will have to find new places to live.

"The worst thing is, Bill 140 does not even identify what we need to do in order to keep our licence after seven years." They have amended the bill to now make it, I believe, 15 years. "My bank is not optimistic. My banker calls this cloud of uncertainty 'risk,' and he indicates that banks don't like risk. Unfortunately, I have to worry a lot about what my banker thinks, because part of our extended family's succession and transition plan for me required that I take out a mortgage. Now, because Bill 140 does not outline a workable plan for C homes, our mortgage rates have gone up—my payments have gone up considerably. There is less money in the budget to do the cosmetic upgrades and repairs to our home. But the worst thing—the absolute worst thing—is that we may not be able to renew our mortgage in four years—bottom line. Talk about uncertainty. Is it acceptable to create that type of environment in this sector?"—and again, not only for this sector owning the home but the people living in it. I think that's the position of the people who spoke to us, the providers of the service and the seniors.

#### 1910

I haven't talked much about the seniors, and I think it's so important. I'm going to touch on it just for a moment. Last Friday, we had a group of people in who represent the seniors in Oxford county. Their number one concern was how we go about making sure that the level of service that is being mandated is in fact being provided. The only thing that's out there to make sure it's happening is inspectors from the ministry who come in from time to time, always with a phone call to say they're coming. So how can the people be assured that their family members in the home are being cared for? Their request was that an ombudsman position would be created—which had been promised by the government—

that in fact they would be able to report to without notice, and that he could check to make sure that all the people in the home were getting the quality care they were entitled to.

With that, I've touched on the areas that I think are of great concern. I think the bill falls far short of what the government said they were trying to achieve, and it falls far short of what the seniors, the operators of the facilities, and the public and the people of Ontario have a right to expect from a bill that deals with long-term care. Again, I thank you very much for your time, and I look forward to being able to oppose this legislation on behalf of the constituents I represent.

**Ms. Monique M. Smith (Nipissing):** I appreciate the opportunity to speak again this evening to Bill 140. As you know, I can go on for hours about this particular bill and the great work that we've done in the long-term-care sector over the last three and a half years.

I just wanted this evening to briefly address some of the concerns that have been raised in prior third reading debate on Bill 140. In particular, the member for Nickel Belt raised a number of concerns that I believe need to be addressed. One of the concerns she raised was a lack of commitment to support the not-for-profit sector in this bill. In fact, I have with me this evening a press release put out by OANHSS, which is a provincial association representing not-for-profit providers of long-term-care services and housing for seniors. In their press release, which was issued shortly after we finished our clause-by-clause review of the legislation, Donna Rubin, the CEO of the Ontario Association of Non-Profit Homes and Services for Seniors, stated:

"We were very pleased to see that the unique governance structure of not-for-profit homes has now been acknowledged with more appropriate penalty provisions for municipalities and not-for-profit boards.'...

"A statement is also proposed for the preamble to the bill recognizing the government's commitment to not-for-profit delivery of long-term care.

"These were two key concerns for our members," said Donna Rubin, "and we are very pleased that the committee listened and made these important changes.... Not-for-profits have been a vital part of long-term care in this province for over a century. These amendments will go a long way to preserving and promoting our sector."

I think that speaks directly to some of the concerns that were raised by the member from Nickel Belt yesterday in debate, and I wanted to make sure that was clear.

We also heard some from the member for York South-Weston yesterday about a staffing and care standard and what he perceived to be a lack thereof. In fact, within the legislation, we have added, through an amendment, that "every licensee of a long-term-care home shall ensure that the home meets the staffing and care standards provided for in the regulations." Obviously, we're going to have further discussions on the regulations, as there was much discussion at the committee hearings on what should be included in a staffing and care standard. There

wasn't a lot of agreement between the various presenters as to which individuals who are working in a home should have their hours counted towards this staffing standard. We want to have those discussions with all of our stakeholders to ensure that we're including in that calculation the appropriate individuals and to ensure that we have an appropriate number determined as an average staffing and care standard for residents in our long-term-care homes.

You heard, I think, yesterday that the Conservatives, when they were in power, eliminated a staffing standard altogether. They eliminated a lot of standards in our long-term-care homes, but the staffing standard of 2.25 was completely eliminated by the previous Conservative government. We in fact have done recent calculations that indicate that an average of 2.86 hours of care is presently being given in our homes, and we're working with our stakeholders to determine what the appropriate staffing and care standard is for all of our homes across the province.

We heard some concern from some stakeholders leading up to the hearings and within the hearings about administrative requirements. Through the amendments that we made to Bill 140 during second reading, we have addressed some of those concerns. We've reduced the administrative requirements without compromising service to our residents. We've indicated that in packages of information that are being provided for family. It's only when material changes are made that we would have to revise those packages.

We've reduced the requirements around charting for individuals who are in our secure units. We've reduced our volunteer training to more of an orientation, less work-intensive for the staff but still ensuring that our volunteers have the appropriate orientation and are provided with the appropriate information in order to assist our residents in our homes.

I've heard a number of concerns raised about the membership of our family councils. Together with the family councils association over the last few weeks, we've been able to come up with a solution that I think is going to address their concerns. We have reduced membership to family councils to family members of the residents and persons of importance. We've heard some concern that family members of residents who have just deceased but were previous residents in the home should be allowed to continue, and so we're creating a mechanism that will allow each family council in each home to determine who should be part of their membership, as long as they're not part of a list of members that we've decided should not be, such as staff at the Ministry of Health and others who may have a conflict of interest in acting on a family council. So we've worked diligently with them, we've addressed their concerns and we've tried to get that information out to them as best we can over the last few weeks.

We have, as well, undertaken to provide in the amendments that we've passed a mechanism for recognizing excellence in long-term-care homes. We know that in the

620-some homes that we have across the province, there are some fabulous homes that are providing fabulous service to our residents, to our seniors, and we want to be able to recognize those and acknowledge the great work they're doing.

In finishing off my comments this evening, I just want to quote from a couple of stakeholder groups that were very supportive of our legislation. From the Ontario Association of Community Care Access Centres, Georgina White, their director of policy and research, indicated at the time of the introduction, "I want to congratulate the government for bringing this long-anticipated bill forward and for the principles and values reflected in the legislation, specifically the recognition that a long-term-care home is a home where residents have the right to live 'with dignity and security, safety and comfort.' Long-term-care homes are not like acute care hospitals where people may spend a few days or weeks. They are homes where thousands of Ontarians go to live each year, often for the final months and years of their lives."

Again, from Pat Prentice, who is the executive director of the Ontario Association of Residents' Councils—and this, again, is an association that represents resident councils, our residents in our homes. This is what they had to say: "They—the board, made up entirely of residents of long-term-care homes—wish to have me express to you their overall pleasure with what they have seen and their great pride in having an important part in the process. They were particularly pleased with the rights of residents being used as the framework and the attention to issues about which they had previously commented. In short, they liked, for the most part, what they saw and they have very few suggestions, most of which could probably be regarded as tweaking." And tweaking we did, as we did the clause-by-clause, and we addressed a number of those small concerns that our residents' councils had from across the province.

I believe that what we have is a piece of legislation that really reflects a resident-focused framework for governing our long-term-care homes across the province. I'm very proud of the work that we've done, and I look forward to seeing this legislation pass in this House.

1920

**Mrs. Joyce Savoline (Burlington):** I rise to speak to this bill. Some of the things I've heard tonight are in contradiction to some of the things I know. First of all, let me say that I, too, am very proud of the kind of care that residents receive in our long-term-care facilities. Folks who work there are very committed to, I think, a very difficult job, where residents transition from a very independent life to a life that's less independent, and a big change occurs. In some cases, they are even taken away from family and friends who are close to them and displaced and put in other communities.

I have great respect for the staff who work in these long-term-care facilities and provide that second family, that nurturing and that care that our seniors so well deserve. We have an aging population, and so we must prepare ourselves for the eventuality that any one of us

could find ourselves in one of these long-term-care facilities. I guess in that respect we have a vested interest to make sure that we establish the guidelines and the capacity in the system to be able to accept the aging population and the boomer population that's coming along.

Back in 1998, the Progressive Conservatives proudly announced the creation of 20,000 new beds in nursing homes and homes for the aged to add to the system. That was a substantial influx of new beds to take care of folks in the community. I think the driving factor was that people ought to have the right to remain in their own community as they age, close to family and friends who can support them through their last few years. And so in 1998, under the guidance of, at the time, Minister Elizabeth Witmer, we did announce 20,000 new beds, and that was the biggest influx of new beds in 10 years. In comparison, the number of beds that were added in this round—although welcome—I feel, given the promises that were made some three years ago, should have been substantially higher. In fact, the minister promised and vowed immediate action. He wanted to start a “revolution in long-term care.” Well, there has hardly been a revolution with this bill. In fact, very little new that we anticipated in this legislation has really come to pass.

I don't see how this bill strengthens the care of the residents. In fact, I have some concerns, because what I think is happening here is that the bill is creating an aura of suspicion about the folks who work in the homes. It fails, I think, to establish the fact that in long-term-care facilities there is a strong work ethic and a commitment to the seniors in our community. In the way the bill has presented itself, the folks who work in the long-term-care facility are depicted as folks who need mandatory whistle-blowing legislation. You would think that in our homes today there already is zero tolerance for abuse of elders, zero tolerance for abuse of the residents who are there. To have to mandate that kind of legislation leaves an aura that that is not happening in today's long-term-care and nursing facilities, that somehow it's slipping through the cracks and that the folks who look after the residents are not looking after them in the way that would be expected. I feel that that is a slight disrespect to the staff who look after our residents. I really believe that that part of the legislation is a little harsh.

There was a promise made that \$6,000 per resident was going to be added through the mandate of this Liberal government. That did not happen—yet another broken promise. There was also a promise made that there would be 20 minutes of additional care per day. That promise has been broken—yet another broken promise. I feel that, through these broken promises, the long-term-care and nursing community has missed yet another opportunity to do what they do best, and that is to look after our aging population, a population that is vulnerable, that is frail and that looks to us for support. They have given their due to our society, and it is incumbent on us to make sure that we provide in legislation for the best care possible for them.

I feel that the bill falls short because it has broken promises. There was a real opportunity here to do something meaningful to look after folks who have to leave the independence and comfort of their own homes and move into a facility where they will now be cared for. So I feel that, for those reasons, I cannot support the bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Further debate? Does any other member wish to speak?

Are you speaking or leaving?

**Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie–Lincoln):** Speaking.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Okay. The member for Erie–Lincoln.

**Interjection:** How long are you speaking for?

**Mr. Hudak:** Not more than 29 minutes and 50 seconds, I say to my colleague.

I'm pleased to rise on third reading of Bill 140. I think my colleague from Burlington and also my colleague from Oxford have spoken very well about the bill and the concerns we have.

It does show, and my friend from Burlington made some points about this, almost a hostile—maybe that's too strong a word—but an antagonistic approach that the McGuinty government takes towards some of the long-term-care homes, particularly those that are privately run charitable homes, and you can see that in this piece of legislation.

But interestingly, at a time of need at the homes toward funding for greater personal care, greater recreational care and improvement to the budget for food, the first two actions by the Dalton McGuinty government in the long-term-care industry were sneak inspections and a snitch line. The member from Nipissing was dispatched to sneak across the province to do surprise inspections of the homes. I think this showed an attitude of the McGuinty government that if you were a privately run facility, a charitable home, somehow the services you delivered to the residents were below snuff, were not beyond the suspicion of the government. So they set about with this sneaky procedure of going into homes on these surprise inspections.

Contrast, if you will, to the previous record of the Progressive Conservative government that saw 20,000 new long-term-care beds built in Ontario and some 16,000 of our oldest beds brought up to the highest and most modern standards.

Speaker, as you may know, in my riding of Erie–Lincoln there's Maple Park Lodge in Fort Erie, the Albright Manor in Beamsville, Edgewater and Grandview in Dunnville, the United Mennonite Home in Vineland, Northland Manor in Port Colborne, and the Shalom Manor in Grimsby, to name but some new homes or expansions of homes as a result of those initiatives of the Mike Harris government. We also saw expansions of funding.

The first two initiatives of the McGuinty government, after the health minister shed crocodile tears about how awful conditions were in the charitable homes and private homes, were to send out the parliamentary assistant with sneak inspections of the homes and then to bring in a snitch line. I don't know if the snitch line resulted in



better food quality for the residents or if the snitch line resulted in better-quality care. I certainly would expect that this type of antagonistic approach that Dalton McGuinty and his health minister have taken towards these homes undermines the outstanding work that those who are assisting residents in places like Albright or Shalom do on a regular basis, undermines the good work of the nurses in those homes, undermines the leadership of those who are volunteer board members.

I know the government, through Bill 140, paints a picture of nameless and faceless big corporations that run these homes, but in reality, when you look at Shalom Manor, Albright Manor, you have volunteer board members who do their utmost to ensure high-quality care for the residents of these homes. The attitude of the McGuinty government towards these individuals is highly unfortunate, to say the least.

### 1930

Let me read you, as I had on second reading, some of the concerns expressed by Shalom Manor in Grimsby, signed by the board of directors of Shalom Manor. They said:

“While we salute the spirit of the bill, we are, however, very concerned about the way in which your government”—this is a letter to the Minister of Health, Minister Smitherman—“proposes to apply the legislation.

“We are worried that the bill will result in a reduction in care and services for our residents. It places great emphasis on the enforcement of standards, and without question, homes must be held accountable. But the bill will require homes to spend a great deal more of their time and resources on compliance and documentation, and unless the government provides additional funding, homes will be forced to apply even more of their limited resources to meeting all the new administrative requirements. That means less money will be getting to the bedsides of residents.”

I think there was quite a surprise as well in the sector when we had a budget that would make Bob Rae blush with all of its end-of-year spending. We certainly have heard about the slush fund run by the Minister of Immigration and Citizenship, which seemed more motivated with advancing the cause of the Ontario Liberal Party than helping immigrants and others settle into their communities, or seniors' groups, at a time when the rate of spending by the cheques issued by the Minister of Finance and the Premier outpaced Paul Martin on speed when we recollect the types of grants and commitments that Prime Minister Martin made at the time to try to salvage his short-lived prime ministership. Unfortunately, the long-term-care sector was virtually left out entirely of the most recent budget, these massive spending increases and end-of-year spending, I think, reflecting an unfortunate set of priorities of the McGuinty government.

In reality, the funding changes that have occurred have done very little to increase nursing care, for example, or the program support envelope for rehabilitation, activation, dietitians, etc. As well, the McGuinty government

seems to be in a dispute at the same time with the sector as to how many hours of care are actually administered in our long-term-care homes. The long-term-care sector will say that Ontario is at 2.5 hours worked per resident per day. The McGuinty government claims 2.8 hours. But that number is highly suspect because it includes time when staff is actually not working. Their lunches or overtime or breaks, the government conveniently counts into the number of hours to come up with a higher ratio. In reality, if I had to judge, I would side with the Ontario Long Term Care Association in saying that Ontario is only at 2.5 hours per resident.

**Mr. Jeff Leal (Peterborough):** Two point eight six.

**Mr. Hudak:** My colleague from Peterborough parrots the notion of 2.86 hours. What he doesn't know—or maybe he does know and agrees with it—is that you're incorporating into that lunch hours, overtime hours when it's time and a half, or break hours. It's actually not an accurate measure to say that that includes hours worked per day. The long-term care association would argue that you shouldn't count lunches and break time and such, and therefore they come up with a ratio of 2.5 hours per day. So I would take issue with the member from Peterborough's comments. Maybe he will respond to that. But if I had to choose between Premier McGuinty and the Ontario Long Term Care Association when it comes to playing the numbers straight, I will side with the OLTC every time.

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci (Minister of Northern Development and Mines):** One-nothing for Buffalo.

**Mr. Hudak:** One-nothing for Buffalo? I thank the Minister for Northern Development and Mines for letting us know that. As you may know, I grew up in Fort Erie, right across the border from Buffalo, New York. I'm happy for all the Senators fans out there. We were hoping from a much better performance from the Sabres, so it's good to hear that they're leading in game four this evening.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Hudak:** I'm not a season's ticket holder. I was when I was a kid; my father and a friend of his had season tickets. Then, tickets were much more affordable in the 1970s than they would be today, although the Sabres tickets are a good deal compared to other professional sports in large cities. But I digress.

As I expressed before at second reading on this legislation, I have great concerns about the underlying attitude of Bill 140. It tends to prejudge charitable homes or for-profit or even not-for-profit homes as being more motivated towards the bottom line than providing quality care. My experience has been quite the opposite. I think that people who work in the homes in my riding do an outstanding job and put at the top of their list, day in and day out, the quality of life of the residents who call these homes their home today.

I think it's unfortunate that the government has taken that approach of the sneak inspections and the snitch line. I think resources would be much better invested in increasing the hours of care, adjusting the food budget

and, I would hope, just like my colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo brought forward—a former health minister, Mrs. Witmer—investing in the B and C beds to raise them to the highest standards. I’m certainly very proud of the investments made by the previous government to build new homes, to expand existing ones and to convert the D-level facilities to the highest standards. I have not seen much more than an inch of progress from the current government in that regard. I certainly hope that we will see, in the time ahead, better investments in converting our oldest facilities to the most modern and highest standards.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Hudak:** We certainly did not attack the people working in the charitable homes or the for-profit or not-for-profit homes, as Minister Smitherman has done, accusing them of providing low-quality care. I reject that fundamentally. It’s very regrettable the minister has made those accusations. I hope that while Bill 140 is still on the floor, we’ll have either the minister or a member of his caucus apologize for that attack on the sector.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson (Timmins–James Bay):** As I was saying, I want to have an opportunity to put a few things on the record in regard to this particular issue. Of course, I’m trying to find all of those wonderful speaking notes I had earlier, and God knows what I did with them. Here they are; they’re right here. They’re underneath my flying magazine. Over here is my flying magazine and the latest book I’m reading, the Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople. You should read it; it’s great reading.

I want to put on the record a few issues in regard to this particular issue as it affects people across this province and specifically people in my own constituency. All of us have had an opportunity to be invited by long-term-care facilities within our ridings. I know last winter all of us got the same invites, and we had the opportunity to go and visit. The first thing I want to say is that the staff who work in long-term-care facilities are dedicated people who are trying the best they can, given the circumstances, to provide the kind of care that they’ve got to provide to people who live in our long-term-care institutions. But one thing that is very clear is that there are a couple of alarming indicators that we’re starting to see within the system, and I want to speak to a couple of those.

First of all, one of the things we’re seeing is that there was a promise made by this government to try to deal with providing the proper amount of funding for long-term-care institutions. One of the promises made in the previous election, and by the Liberals in opposition, was to move a \$6,000 increase per resident into funding so that long-term-care facilities can have the money they need to increase the food allowance, to provide better staff coverage, etc., to provide services for communities. What really struck me as I went from the Foyer des Pionniers to Extendicare homes, and to the North Centennial Manor in Kapuskasing and the Golden Manor in Timmins—all great institutions—is that there’s a lot of

part-time staff within these organizations. The problem is that the long-term-care facilities don’t have the funding they need to provide the full-time staff numbers that they need in order to run these homes, and as a result, there’s a lot of part-time staff. This represents a problem, because what you tend to see is a person who works part-time, let’s say, at the Golden Manor or at Extendicare, and they’re working in another health care facility somewhere. So you have a lot of situations where somebody might be working in the hospital on a part-time basis and working in a long-term-care institution also on a part-time basis, or possibly within a couple of institutions in the long-term-care sector.

**1940**

For example, in Kapuskasing I met a number of employees who worked both at Extendicare and at North Centennial Manor. You say, “Well, what’s the problem with that?” First of all, the bigger problem over the longer term is, imagine if you have an issue of pandemic in the province. It is a way of being able to move contamination from one health facility to another. I just want to say for the record again that we need to be very careful to provide the kind of funding we need so that we can have permanent staff, so that we can isolate these units as best we can to prevent the possibility of the transference of various flus and epidemics from one institution to the other. When you have multiple staff who are part-time working in different institutions, it runs a greater risk of infecting one home with the bugs that you might find in another home.

So I would say that one of the things I think we need to look at is this whole issue of funding. We know the government had promised that they would raise funding by at least \$6,000 per year.

The other big issue is the level of care that was promised in regard to what we would provide when it comes to nursing care within institutions. I remember, because I believe at the time the Liberals had promised two or two and a half hours of nursing care to residents on a daily basis, so that we’re able to provide the level of care that we need to to our residents. The government in the previous election had made that promise of 2.25 hours to the level-of-care funding envelope, that we should be doing it. To date, we don’t see that. There was an opportunity in this bill, I thought, based on the consensus that we saw from various people who presented to the committee, that we were able to raise the level of care to 3.5 hours. Even if the government had just met its own target of 2.25, we’d be a lot further ahead than what we are now. I’m just saying, the effect of that is that residents in long-term-care facilities—mostly seniors, but others—are not able to get the level of care that they need within their institutions.

Here’s what we see. You walk into a long-term-care facility and one of the things that you see immediately is that if a resident of a long-term-care facility should choose that they want a bath on a more frequent basis—let’s say every day or every two days, because there are reasons why seniors don’t bathe every day; they’re not as

active as we are, but still people want to be able to bathe—they wouldn't be able to, if they need assistance, because you don't have the level of care within the institutions to be able to provide that. So I think one of the things that is really lacking in regard to this legislation is the commitment that the government has shown in keeping its promise of the last election. They could have, in this legislation, dealt with the level of care.

The other thing that I want to put on the record—again, I had an opportunity to speak last week with Colleen Landers, a resident of the city of Timmins who has been involved in health care for many years. Now retired, she's becoming very involved in the long-term-care system and is involved with the family organizations that help seniors within homes. She started a petition in the city of Timmins and was in my office last Friday calling on this government to move up the amount of money that we utilize to provide meals to people who live in long-term-care facilities. Currently, we're getting about \$5.50 per resident to prepare meals. This means to say that we don't have the kind of money to provide the nutrition we would like to provide seniors. What Colleen has started, along with others, is calling on this provincial government to move to increase the amount of money that we have now from about \$5.50 per resident up to \$7, which would be a step in the right direction. It's maybe not as much as people want, but it would allow us to have the kind of money that we need to provide the dietary needs of the people who live within institutions. On this current \$5.50, you're really in a situation where, in the end, you're not able to provide the kind of food that you want.

Unlike in the past, where residents every week could be used to seeing a turkey or roast beef or roast pork or whatever it might be—a mixed kind of food—now what you're seeing is more like chicken-à-la-king food preparation, with a lot more starches in their diet. I don't think that, at the end of the day, is good for seniors. I support what Colleen has started, and I would ask—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Bisson:** Well, the dietitians are the ones who came into the office to complain about this. They're saying that we need to do something to raise the level of care, raise the amount of money utilized towards funding the allowances for food.

The other thing is that the Legion had made quite a few representations in regard to the issue of not having appointed an ombudsman for seniors within the system. This is something that the government had promised, something we were expecting and unfortunately hadn't been done.

Those are just some of the points that I wanted to make in this debate. I look forward to others who want to participate.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott (Whitby–Ajax):** I'm pleased to be able to join my colleagues from Oxford, Burlington and Erie–Lincoln with respect to this time allocation motion on Bill 140. For those people who may be watching this debate this evening, I should note that this is the

third time allocation in three days. On Monday we debated time allocation on Bill 103, the police complaints bill. Last evening, Tuesday evening, we debated time allocation on Bill 69, the regulatory modernization bill, and tonight we're dealing with time allocation on Bill 140, the long-term-care bill.

We've had numerous other bills that have preceded that that have also been time-allocated in this session, the most notable being the budget bill and then the electoral reform bill, which is alleging to be dealing with democratic reform in the electoral process but of course has been time-allocated and is completely undemocratic, as far as I'm concerned, and indefensible.

You have to wonder why all three of these bills are being time-allocated in the last three days. I would suggest that this has a lot more to do with the fact that we've got an election coming in October and that the members of the Liberal government are more intent on optics than in making sure that they take the time to get this legislation right. Isn't that the reason why we're here—to be able to have a reasoned and considered debate on all of the issues on the legislation that has come forward before us? It's our duty as members of the opposition to be able to comment on these bills and to represent the views of our constituencies, as all of the other members are to represent the constituencies they represent across Ontario so that we can make sure that we get bills that represent the interests of everyone and are in everyone's best interest.

I would suggest that we're really doing a disservice, particularly with respect to this bill, Bill 140, on long-term-care homes. We're doing a disservice to the long-term-care home operators; we're doing a disservice to the seniors in our community; and, ultimately, I would submit that we're doing a disservice to everyone in our community because we're all responsible for vulnerable people in our community, and certainly many of the seniors who are in long-term-care facilities fall into that category.

I would like to say, before I comment more specifically on the nature of this bill, that as a number of the other members have indicated, I am very proud of the services for people in long-term-care homes that are being provided by the long-term-care operators in my riding of Whitby–Ajax. I have had the opportunity to visit many of the long-term-care homes in my riding. In fact, I was given an invitation, as I believe many other members were, to spend some time there. I spent half a day there with the staff. I saw the kind of work they're doing and the kind of dedication they have to the people who are under their care, and it's not easy work. As everyone knows, it's hard work; it's heavy lifting, long hours and not a whole lot of appreciation, certainly from some members of the public. But the people in those care facilities, of course are very grateful for the care that they receive. I'm very proud of the work they do and I want to support them, as all of the other members want to support the long-term-care homes in their ridings.

But I have to say that I have heard from a lot of my constituents in Whitby–Ajax about this bill, and they're not happy. They're not happy about a lot of things to do with this bill. Though time isn't going to permit me to go into a lot of detail about them this evening, there are just a few things that I would like to raise, many of which have been raised by other members in their debate on this issue.

One is the lack of capital investment in B- and C-level homes. This is something that was certainly expected by many long-term-care home operators in my riding, one being a non-profit called Fairview Lodge, which is the one I visited. It has been operating in Whitby for a number of years and provides exemplary care, but they were reasonably hoping to get some money for some capital repairs and infrastructure to upgrade the homes, because this is a facility that is well over 50 years old. While they've done their best to keep it in good repair over all those years, it's still showing some of its age. It needs some work done on it, and it also needs to be renewed and brought up to date with current standards, because people have different expectations about where they're going to live now than they did 50 years ago. So they did expect that there would be some money to allow for them to do that, but that's not happening.

#### 1950

I'd like to compare that to what was announced by the previous government under Premier Harris in 1998, when there was a \$1.2-billion infusion of capital into long-term-care facilities in order to upgrade the D-level homes and to provide 20,000 new beds for people in nursing homes and homes for the aged. Now, that is a significant capital investment. This was before my time in this Legislature, but I think that was something that was certainly appreciated by members of the public and really made a significant improvement in both the existing homes and in creating new spaces for residents who need long-term-care facilities. So we're very proud of that legacy, and I think it certainly compares very favourably with the announcements that are being made as part of Bill 140, which aren't going to go nearly far enough to meet the needs of seniors in our community.

The other is the lack of investment, in addition to upgrading the facilities, in creating more long-term-care beds. I have to say that you can quote statistics all you want, but it's the personal stories that you hear, the people I've met with in my riding office, in my community office, who have told me some stories that are really quite sad. When you reflect upon what our seniors have contributed to our communities over the years, how they've worked hard for many years, and now when they need to be supported by their communities and need a place to live, we find that many people are not being allowed to live in their home communities anymore. When you get older, any kind of change is difficult, but particularly if you're going to be separated from your spouse. I've had several situations that have been really quite heartbreaking, where I've had seniors, both of whom are not in great health—I had one person who

came to see me whose husband, as a result of a stroke that he suffered, was placed in a long-term-care facility in Cobourg while his wife was living in Whitby. She has Parkinson's disease and was reliant on her sister to drive her once a week to see her husband. It was an hour's drive away. This was very hard on both of them, naturally, and really, I think, contributed to a decline in the wife's state of health, because stress, as you know, is really difficult to manage when you have physical issues like Parkinson's disease. Even though we did our best—and I know all of the staff did their best in order to place this gentleman back in his home community—the fact of the matter is, it was another six months before they were able to place him back in his home community in Oshawa.

So I appreciate the efforts that are being made by the placement organizations in trying to place people back in their home communities, but the fact of the matter is that the beds simply aren't there. In a rapidly growing area such as my communities of Whitby–Ajax, where the population growth, the residential growth, is increasing rapidly, so is the need for seniors to have long-term-care facilities to move to. So I would submit that there is a lot more that needs to be done to allow our seniors to be able to live in dignity in their home communities with all of the supports that they need to have around them. I'm afraid that Bill 140 does not do that. In fact, this time allocation motion that's being brought before us to invoke closure and to shut off the debate on this really does a disservice to everyone concerned, and I think that's sad for everybody in our community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this.

**Mr. John O'Toole (Durham):** This is a sad, sad evening. Quite frankly, the member for Whitby–Ajax has just reiterated, with a certain amount of compassion, the reality of the situation. This, first of all, is a time allocation motion, which is most tragic. It's really subtly not giving voice to the seniors, the people who built this province. Her statements and her testimony to the people she has visited with and the people she speaks for is proof that the government is not listening.

They're prepared to go to the people, to call an election, after time-allocating very, very important, often troublesome, bills. On Bill 184 today, the Endangered Species Act, they refused to have public hearings. Our critic, Norm Miller, and others were prepared to give up any amount of time to go to the parts of Ontario that are most affected by that bill.

Here we have another bill, and I recognize that Monique Smith has done some work on this bill. She probably knows and probably wants to do the right thing, but she is being forced in time allocation to silence the voice of opposition: completely incomprehensible.

When I look around my riding of Durham, I think of the five or six homes, and I want to put on the record the names of the people, names and faces of real people and real families who are being challenged because of all of the inadequacies of this government, not the least of which is that there aren't enough doctors. There aren't

enough supports in the community. These are vulnerable families, whether it's children in need, young families—no doctor. It's troubling.

I can only start to focus on Bill 140 here in the interest of getting on the record the voices of my constituents. First of all, this is all about the residents of long-term care. This is their home, often in the latter stages of their life. In Bowmanville I have Strathaven Lifecare Centre, which has had some troubles, obviously, and is now under the direction of the province of Ontario. I think it went into receivership because of inadequate funding. I met just recently with the community committee and Patrick Brown, the residents' committee president. I was there, I visited, I spoke with, I listened, I watched and I felt their care, and I commend the staff, who are run off their feet. I'll read a petition later. I've received thousands of petitions.

This is probably the most important thing for a person, probably with very few exceptions, who is the oldest here tonight. I say that, looking towards that in the future, the way it's being managed under the McGuinty government, it's not a place you'd like to be, Mr. Speaker. You might be in roughly the same age group.

But I've also been in Marnwood Lifecare Centre recently. There was an issue with respect to—this is their home. This isn't an issue about me being pro- or anti-smoking, but the issue there was that these elderly people were being forced by this thoughtless legislation on anti-smoking—which is bad. I agree. But they made no accommodation for these people. Just by the slice of the knife, they have eliminated some privileges of some of them. This home had spent considerable money building a smoking room. Then the regulations came out, and they weren't allowed to smoke within a certain distance. These are elderly people often in walkers, often in wheelchairs, needing supports, who had an addictive problem—and I think that's unfortunate, but this is at the latter stage of their life—being forced out into the cold, potentially. So I went and listened to them and I explained the regulation. It wasn't Marnwood Lifecare Centre. Tracey Werheid, the administrator, and her staff there were trying to have the people understand that they had to obey the McGuinty law. They didn't understand. "This is our home."

They feel so threatened and so fragile that I left very saddened. But if they only knew part of Bill 140, how further threatened they are in terms of the crush of this bill, the inadequacy of this bill. This is one of the long-term-care homes that is threatened under the classification of the four types of homes. You would know that there are A homes. They're the ones that were built, as was said by the member from Whitby—Ajax, by Elizabeth Witmer as Minister of Health, as well as the Premier at the time, Mike Harris, latterly—but 20,000 new long-term-care beds.

A large amount of money was invested, and that amount of money was to upgrade another 16,000 beds so that persons would have the decency and the respect they deserve in that stage of their life. This meant that it was

handicapped-accessible with a wheelchair or a walker, with lifts for the baths and other kinds of supports for staff and patients to have dignity and convenience in their life. I just explained to them the issue there, and I felt so bad.

As I said, I was quite shaken after visiting Marnwood, and also Fosterbrooke, which is one of the most caring homes I've been in. Tina Bravos and the staff there are working in less-than-adequate facilities. I have to say that on the record. This is another of the homes being threatened under the limited licensing provision of this bill. Bill 140 does nothing to help those residents, those families, those staff or the people in that community who, in many cases, work voluntarily. It's ministerial staff; these are people of the church and others who come in and are care providers.

#### 2000

One of the others is the Community Nursing Home in Port Perry. Heather Cooper is the director of care there; she's very caring, a professional nurse. I can just tell by the tone in the residents' committee meetings held there that they're also troubled by this legislation.

Wynfield is in Oshawa, which is part of my riding; it's Katherine Jackson there. This is a newer home, so in this home they've got the gadgets, they've got the stuff. But even in this case, they were operating under some assumptions. Trusting the Premier's promise of \$6,000 in additional future funding, they went ahead with their business plan, trusting the leadership of Dalton McGuinty. What did they do? Nothing—absolutely failed. In fact, if you look at it, it's about 50 cents per person per day—50 cents. It wouldn't give one minute of additional care, what was in the budget. It's tragic.

I am going to mention Karen Sullivan from the Ontario Long Term Care Association and the work she has done to try to educate, respectfully, about the issues of this community and their families, the caregivers and the staff. This is one of the materials. This isn't a prop; it's one of the materials. "It's About Time" is the theme, and it's about long-term care. It's the Ontario Long Term Care Association. "The passion behind the compassion." That is true. It takes a special person to work in those facilities. You have to have a calling to have the patience and the compassion to be there for that individual—someone's mother, someone's father, someone's son, someone's daughter. It's at that level that they just seem to be—they've time-allocated it. They're refusing to listen.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying, on a personal level—and I hope not to break down during this. I've mentioned my mother-in-law, Madge Hall, many times. She's a lovely lady. She'll be 90 this October. Her daughter predeceased her and was a wonderful person as well: Molly Hall—Molly O'Toole at one time. Madge lives in Centennial Place in Millbrook. It is a wonderful facility, but again they are operating under the shadow of this legislation. There's very intimidating language in this bill, which some may have mentioned, on the liabilities downloaded to the owner without additional funding, whether for the meals or for the care or for the

staff—none of the main ingredients promised during the election, along with a number of other promises.

This campaign card tells the story: “The Ontario government has forgotten. Help the government remember.” This card was a powerful reminder of what we’re doing to our parents or someone else’s, our grandparents, etc. Quite frankly, I would say they do their best with the limited resources they’ve been given.

In conclusion, I’ll read this petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Ontario will not meet the needs of its aging population and ensure access to hospital services unless long-term-care homes can provide the care and services that residents need; and

“Whereas staff are now run off their feet trying to keep up and homes are unable to provide the full range of care and programs that residents need or the menu choices that meet their expectations; and

“Whereas dietary, housekeeping and other services that residents and their families value are being put at risk by operating costs; and

“Whereas some 35,000 residents still live in older homes,” with three and four in a room, inaccessible washrooms—Mr. Speaker, I am completely—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. Further debate? Does any other member wish to speak?

Ms. Di Cocco has moved government notice of motion 373. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say “aye.”

All those opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*The division bells rang from 2005 to 2015.*

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

#### Ayes

Arthurs, Wayne	Levac, Dave	Rinaldi, Lou
Balkissoon, Bas	McMeekin, Ted	Ruprecht, Tony
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	McNeely, Phil	Sandals, Liz
Colle, Mike	Milloy, John	Sergio, Mario
Di Cocco, Caroline	Mitchell, Carol	Smith, Monique
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Mossop, Jennifer F.	Smitherman, George
Gerretsen, John	Oraziotti, David	Van Bommel, Maria
Hoy, Pat	Qaadri, Shafiq	Wilkinson, John
Leal, Jeff	Ramal, Khalil	Zimmer, David

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed, please stand one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Savoline, Joyce
Bisson, Gilles	Martiniuk, Gerry	
Elliott, Christine	O’Toole, John	

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 27; the nays are 7.

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

Orders of the day.

**Hon. Ms. Di Cocco:** I move adjournment of the House.

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

All those in favour, say “aye.”

All those opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This House is adjourned until 10 of the clock, Thursday, May 17.

*The House adjourned at 2018.*

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

**Estimates / Budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Tim Hudak  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Kim Craitor, Bob Delaney,  
Garfield Dunlop, Andrea Horwath,  
Tim Hudak, Linda Jeffrey, Phil McNeely,  
Jim Wilson, David Zimmer  
Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

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

Chair / Président: Pat Hoy  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Phil McNeely  
Ted Arnott, Wayne Arthurs, Toby Barrett,  
Pat Hoy, Judy Marsales,  
Deborah Matthews, Phil McNeely,  
Carol Mitchell, Michael Prue  
Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

**General government / Affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Jim Brownell  
Jim Brownell, Vic Dhillon, Brad Duguid,  
Kevin Daniel Flynn, Jerry J. Ouellette,  
Mario G. Racco, Lou Rinaldi,  
Peter Tabuns, John Yakabuski  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**Government agencies / Organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Présidente: Julia Munro  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Cheri DiNovo  
Cheri DiNovo, Brad Duguid,  
Michael Gravelle, John Milloy, Carol Mitchell,  
Julia Munro, Laurie Scott,  
Monique M. Smith, Joseph N. Tascona  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Justice Policy / Justice**

Chair / Président: Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente: Maria Van Bommel  
Bas Balkissoon, Lorenzo Berardinetti,  
Christine Elliott, Frank Klees, Peter Kormos,  
David Oraziotti, Shafiq Qadri,  
Maria Van Bommel, David Zimmer  
Clerk / Greffière: Anne Stokes

**Legislative Assembly / Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Ted McMeekin  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Mario G. Racco  
Peter Fonseca, Ernie Hardeman, Linda Jeffrey,  
Rosario Marchese, Ted McMeekin,  
Norm Miller, Jennifer F. Mossop,  
Shafiq Qadri, Mario G. Racco  
Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

**Public accounts / Comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norman W. Sterling  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Ernie Hardeman, Jean-Marc Lalonde,  
Lisa MacLeod, Shelley Martel, John Milloy,  
Richard Patten, Liz Sandals,  
Monique M. Smith, Norman W. Sterling  
Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

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

Chair / Présidente: Andrea Horwath  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Jeff Leal  
Gilles Bisson, Bob Delaney,  
Andrea Horwath, Jeff Leal, Dave Levac,  
Gerry Martiniuk, Bill Murdoch,  
Lou Rinaldi, Mario Sergio  
Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

**Social Policy / Politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Ernie Parsons  
Vice-Chair / Vice-Président: Khalil Ramal  
Ted Chudleigh, Peter Fonseca,  
Kuldip Kular, Jeff Leal,  
Rosario Marchese, Bill Mauro, John O'Toole,  
Ernie Parsons, Khalil Ramal  
Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

## CONTENTS

Wednesday 16 May 2007

<b>Time allocation, government notice of motion number 373, <i>Ms.DiCocco</i></b>	
Ms. Di Cocco .....	8945
Mr. Hardeman .....	8946
Ms. Smith .....	8948
Mrs. Savoline .....	8949
Mr. Hudak .....	8950
Mr. Bisson .....	8952
Mrs. Elliott .....	8953
Mr. O'Toole .....	8954
Agreed to .....	8956