



No. 88

N° 88

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

First Session, 41<sup>st</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

Première session, 41<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 27 May 2015**

**Mercredi 27 mai 2015**

Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

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.

### **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.

---

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 27 May 2015

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 27 mai 2015

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Good morning. Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

**Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 47 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 103, An Act to resolve labour disputes between the Durham District School Board, Rainbow District School Board and Peel District School Board, and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, when Bill 103 is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill, without further debate or amendment, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may then be immediately called; and

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

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

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

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The Minister of Labour has moved notice of motion number 39.

Minister of Labour.

**Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** Thank you very much, Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on this motion. I would like to say at the outset that our government—and I'm sure I speak for all members of the House—is always concerned when students are out of the classroom and not learning, for whatever reason. That is why the government asked the Education Relations Commission to advise as to whether this school year is in jeopardy in light of the strikes that were taking place in Durham, Sudbury and Peel.

Earlier this week, the Education Relations Commission advised that the school year is indeed in jeopardy for secondary students in Durham, Sudbury and Peel. In light of this advice, we introduced legislation that would have put our students back into the classroom yesterday, had the third party agreed to unanimous consent for speedy

passage of this bill. This legislation is designed to get 72,000 students back into the classroom so that they can complete their studies for this year.

We did not and we do not take this decision lightly. It was informed by the advice of the Education Relations Commission, and it's a real response to the concerns of students and their parents in these communities.

Mr. Speaker, as you would well be aware, the Ontario Labour Relations Board has weighed in on these matters, as well, and has also ruled now that the local strikes in Durham, in Sudbury and in Peel are indeed unlawful. Students and teachers are back in the classroom today. The OLRB has ordered that the local strikes in Durham, Sudbury and Peel must stop, and that stoppage involves a moratorium for at least two weeks.

Our proposed legislation will allow students the opportunity to successfully complete their school year without any further disruption. I think that's what we all want. This legislation ensures that students remain in school for the rest of this school year. We must ensure that students in the affected school boards that I've mentioned have the same opportunity to complete their school year.

The Ministry of Education has been working with these boards on a daily basis to ensure the remaining days of the school year will be used for learning.

Our government believes this legislation is necessary because we do not want those strikes that have been deemed to be unlawful to continue after the two-week moratorium has expired.

This is about protecting the school year for students, ensuring our students continue to achieve excellence. It's unfortunate that one party in the House continues to hold up that legislation, and I say that sincerely. I'm calling on the members of that party to help us protect the school year for students, join with the rest of us that are ready to move ahead, and make sure those students get back into the classrooms and stay there until the end of the school year.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm probably going to be even shorter than the Minister of Labour. I remember—

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** You are shorter.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I am short. Thanks, Percy. I am shorter than the minister, probably by about six inches.

I'm a little shorter than you, Minister.

I worked for my predecessor, Bob Runciman, in 2009—

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Good man.

**Mr. Steve Clark:**—thank you, Minister—when the House was recalled to deal with that strike. The three parties, by consent, moved that legislation forward. I think it was a Sunday afternoon when they got called back. I know there was a lot of negotiation between the three parties.

Our critic for education, Garfield Dunlop, the member for Simcoe North, has expressed concern for several months in this Legislature about this government and their handling of the situation in our classrooms and in our schools. Although in the past I haven't been a big fan of closing off debate, I think our party has been very clear right from the start that we were prepared to move forward, act quickly, and have this piece of legislation passed.

This motion allows each party to speak for a period of time and then allows a vote on this bill. I'm not going to belabour the point. I was very honest with the New Democrats this morning that I wasn't going to use my time. We want to see this move forward. I think it's time for all three parties to come together. Let's get the bill passed and let's get it moving.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** As always, Speaker, it's an honour to be able to stand in this House today and speak on this motion. I think, from all members and all sides of the House, the most important issue here is the families, the children, their parents and the educational system.

I'd like to comment on a few things that the government has said, not just over the course of this debate but over the course of this whole debacle with the kids being out of class because the teachers felt so aggrieved that they felt forced to strike.

First, the reason that this legislation was brought forward, Bill 103, as stated by the Minister of Labour, was to get the kids back to school. Well, the kids are back to school because of the OLRB decision. So we're debating what is a moot law, in a way. But not altogether, Speaker, because what this law is now doing is, it's back-to-work legislation in case the teachers go on strike again. That's what this is.

**0910**

So if you have pre-emptive back-to-work legislation, one has to ask the question: Is the government really serious about the negotiations? It's hard to negotiate when one of the parties has, figuratively speaking, a gun to the other party's head. In a way, this OLRB decision gives the government a second chance because now they have a bit of breathing room to actually truly negotiate. So in a way, this is a good thing.

One issue that we really take exception to—the Minister of Education, during question period a few days ago, basically lobbed it on to the third party that this was all our fault. The last time I checked, Speaker, this was a majority government. I can remember, when the Premier was campaigning for leader, that she was going to do things differently. I'd really like to make this clear: We are at the eleventh hour of this issue, but we are dealing

with a majority government that seems to be spinning their wheels with these labour negotiations. It's this government, because of their lack of will of negotiation, that has kept the children from going to class. At the last minute, to say, "Well, it's obviously the third party"—the third party in a majority government? Come on, now. We try and do as much as we can to make regulations and laws as effective as we can for the people who we represent; I think all members in the House do that. But let's be clear: This is a majority government, a majority government whose Premier and whose Minister of Education could have fully seen this coming. This should not be news.

Quite frankly, Speaker, the idea that "Well, it's obviously the third party because they wouldn't support that unanimous consent motion"—we didn't support unanimous consent because we believe that everything in this House, in a democratic society, should be debated. Should it be debated ad nauseam? That's a point of contention, but it should be debated. Because the government had failed to conclude serious negotiations—

**Miss Monique Taylor:** To do their job.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes—had failed to do their job. As a cover, as a decoy, they're blaming the third party. That's just not the way it works, Speaker.

**Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** Do you want the kids in school or don't you?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** We all want the kids in school.

As a majority government, you have been dealing with this since the election last June. We are not the people who are keeping the kids out of school, Minister. You're the Minister of Labour; we've got the Minister of Education, the Premier—you have all the power. And that's the way it is. Regrettably for the third party, that's the fact. At this point, for the ministers and the government to blame the third party for their lack of negotiation is just disingenuous.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** And funny. It's really funny.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** One of the members said it's funny. It's not really funny. It shows a lack of leadership. It shows a lack of leadership on the government's side. A government takes credit for all kinds of things, but it also should take responsibility for its occasional, sometimes fairly frequent—in this case, absolute—failure to handle this issue. As I've previously stated, this OLRB hearing has given the government a bit of breathing room. Last night, when our party rang the bells, it wasn't to be deleterious; it was to give the government breathing room to actually figure out what was going on with the OLRB hearing.

It's quite simple. The government hasn't done their job since being elected.

The government has been given this breathing room—*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Sit down.

Are we finished with the cross-floor dialogue? Thank you. You got the message. Good.

And when I'm standing, no one speaks. Thank you.

Continue.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Thank you, Speaker.

The government has had the opportunity to deliver on their promise of being a different type of government, of providing actual, true negotiations. That's one of the reasons why people voted for—regrettably, in our opinion—a majority Liberal government. But they haven't delivered on this promise, because we see the same old same old. Negotiations have failed. The teachers were forced, basically, out on strike.

We're talking about back-to-work legislation, which the government says is developed and is put in the House because of the ERC, and then, in the middle of all of this, the OLRB rules.

It is very complicated, but what it also shows is a total lack of planning on the government's side. If the government continues on this haphazard, say-one-thing-and-do-something-else—and then if that doesn't work, blame the third party, we are going to continue with crisis after crisis after crisis, and they are going to continue to impact one of the most important things in our province's future, and that's the education of our children.

They've got a second chance with this OLRB decision. There's a time allocation motion we're debating here to force this legislation through.

We are not here to obstruct this process. We are here to make sure that in a democratic system, we can put remarks on the record, Speaker, which need to be heard. And one remark that needs to be heard is that the most important thing to all of us is the children, the students, in this province.

For the government to blame the third party, when they're a majority government, is a cop-out, when they should take responsibility and leadership. If the current people who are in negotiations can't do it, maybe they have to replace the current negotiators. The government needs to move ahead and quit looking for cover and actually do its job on this.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

Mr. Flynn has moved government motion number 39. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Orders of the day.

0920

#### ONTARIO IMMIGRATION ACT, 2015

#### LOI DE 2015 SUR L'IMMIGRATION EN ONTARIO

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 12, 2015, on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 49, An Act with respect to immigration to Ontario and a related amendment to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 / Projet de loi 49, Loi portant sur l'immigration en Ontario et apportant une modification connexe à la Loi de 1991 sur les professions de la santé réglementées.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Thank you, Speaker. Yes, I guess we are shuffling right along in the orders of the day today and we're going to talk about immigration.

It is a pleasure to stand and bring the voices of Windsor–Tecumseh to this debate because, as many of you know, when it comes to a diverse population, the city of Windsor and the region and the county of Essex were the fifth most diverse area in all of Canada. Our immigrants have built our communities. It started quite a while ago, of course. We had a lot of European settlers come to work in our mines, to work in our car factories, to build our roads and high-rises, and we are a better community because of that.

We celebrate our diversity; we celebrate our immigrants; we celebrate our multiculturalism. We have great festivals in the summer, festivals such as the Carrousel of the Nations, which, no matter what ethnic group you may be from or what your roots are, there's always an opportunity to get out with friends and family. They'll enjoy the food, the music.

If it wasn't for our immigrants and welcoming arms, this bill wouldn't be needed.

Ontario is playing catch-up. Finally, we're following in the footsteps of Quebec.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** We're the first province outside of Quebec to have that.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Outside of Quebec; that's what I just said, Minister. I just said that: You're following in the footsteps of Quebec, much like you are, in recent months, by having the Premier of Quebec come and address the Legislature, much like in recent months when you had discussions with the Premier of Quebec on any number of other things. I don't see that as a negative, as a slam against the government, that you're following in the footsteps of Quebec.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** Or you could say we're ahead of all the other provinces.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** The other provinces—if you want to talk about Alberta for a while, Minister, I'd gladly talk about recent events in Alberta. It is an interesting bill, but not quite as interesting as what New Democrats have recently accomplished in the great province of Alberta. If you want me to talk about other provinces, Minister, I'll gladly lend a hand on that one.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** A majority.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** A majority government, New Democrats, province of Alberta?

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** Point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** A point of order from the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport and responsible for the Pan Am/Parapan Am games.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** Through the Speaker, I'd suggest that the member stick to the actual legislation that's being debated.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I'd like the minister's input, but unfortunately the minister was in

dialogue across the floor and got him off his game plan. So maybe if you were quiet, he'd get back to his issue.

Continue.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Thank you for that very unbiased ruling, Speaker. As a matter of fact, I was, I thought, talking about Bill 49. The minister kept giving me speaking notes across the aisle. I just happen to have about 15 minutes of notes on my desk upstairs, but I didn't bring them down this morning because I thought my good friends in the Tory caucus were going to have more to say on the other orders that were called earlier today.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Are you going to blame Mike Harris?

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** No, I won't be blaming Mike Harris, or the Prime Minister, Stephen Harper. I leave it to others to do that.

But I will say a few things, Minister; thank you for the reminder. I will say a few things about Bill 49, the Ontario Immigration Act. It would obviously, as we've already discussed across the floor, grant Ontario more control over immigration and settlement specifically as it concerns workforce placement and the setting of quotas.

Speaker, every now and again, I'll take a cab from the Walkerville train station in Windsor when I get home at 11, 11:30 at night on a Thursday after leaving Queen's Park. I'll hop into the cab, strike up a dialogue with the driver and, more often than not, the driver of that cab is from another country and he came here for a better life. More often than not, that cab driver has not only one university degree but sometimes several. They've been trained in specific fields, but they come here and the jobs just aren't there for them, so they end up driving a cab.

I know from time to time in this House we keep hearing about the shortage of skilled trades professionals and that, in the future, we're going to have a real shortage of skilled tradespeople. I believe that is one of the objectives of the minister's bill and what this is aimed at doing. If you're going to set a quota, and you need welders, no matter what country they come from, you might just be looking for welders to come into the country and fill those jobs that are there.

Speaker, I was so thrown off by the minister's comments earlier from across the floor, I don't know if I forgot to mention that I'll be sharing my time with the member from London-Fanshawe—now that she has arrived.

I just want to say, as the member is ready to roll I'm sure, that I hope to have more to say on this bill maybe later on today when I finally bring my notes down from upstairs.

So, thank you, Speaker, and with your permission, I'll throw it over to the member from London-Fanshawe.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Thanks so graciously to the member from Windsor-Tecumseh—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Hold on. Sorry. We have to do questions and comments first. You can do a two-minute questions and comments—

**Interjection:** No. They're sharing time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Point of order.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** The member from Windsor-Tecumseh said he was going to share his time with the member from London-Fanshawe.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, I get direction from the Clerks' table. Which way is it?

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Okay. Our mistake—I'll share that.

Continue.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Good morning, Speaker. It's very refreshing to be here this morning and see everybody working together so that we can actually debate this bill that's been long overdue. It's been over 10 years to get an immigration bill in Ontario, to move immigration forward and make sure people have the opportunity to come to Ontario, work here and hopefully plant their permanent roots here, raise their family and be part of our great province.

It's my pleasure once again to rise in this House and speak in my capacity as New Democratic critic for immigration on third reading of Bill 49, the Ontario Immigration Act. I've also been able to speak for my party and on behalf of immigration advocates on Bill 49 previously in debate in this House and at committee. I was pleasantly surprised that in this majority environment that a couple of my amendments—New Democratic amendments—were actually passed through committee. That was a pleasant surprise.

We've said it before: This bill can be seen as a good step in the right direction. Ontario has been waiting for this bill, and it's long overdue. It's been over 10 years and, finally, we have an immigration strategy from this government. While this bill does take action on some important issues, the reality is, the big picture hasn't really changed at all. Primarily, this bill is meant to align Ontario's Immigration Strategy with the Harper Conservatives' federal legislative changes to immigration programs and services.

Speaker, let's face it. It no longer comes as a shock or surprise for the Ontario Liberals to be taking plays right out of the Stephen Harper playbook. It's the same play they are using in their attempts to ram the sale of Hydro One through the Legislature with no consultation throughout the province and, worse, no mandate from the people of the province.

I will acknowledge that our provincial Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade has undertaken to seek support for this bill and has reached across the floor in his efforts to do so.

**0930**

Again, I was surprised to see that two NDP amendments were accepted in committee. I was disappointed that of the 13 amendments we proposed, only two were supported, because those other 11 amendments were very pertinent to this bill. But we got traction on two, so two out of 13, I guess, is better than none out of 13.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** In a majority, when they have all the power.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** That's right, in a majority, when they can kind of dictate.

Bill 49, while a step in the right direction, is missing vital components that would truly allow Ontario to take the lead in immigration standards. Instead, we continue to give that lead over to other provinces.

New Democrats have long called for updates to Ontario's lagging immigration policies. For more than 10 years, this province has sat on its hands and done nothing in this area. Our previous critic, from Beaches–East York, talked about how this has been long overdue. He was a very passionate member. We truly miss him on this side, and we miss his insight on immigration. This is not the first time that I have mentioned this. I'm sure this government isn't surprised about that comment.

Even though Ontario receives more immigrants than all the western provinces, all the Atlantic provinces and the three territories combined, Ontario has been lacking in a comprehensive immigration strategy that takes into account the challenges we face as a province as well as those faced by newcomers.

So, Speaker, what's in the bill? Let's take a look at what's in the bill and what this bill actually does, before we talk about it and what it excludes or ignores.

The bill proposes to give authority to the province to establish and govern immigrant selection programs for both temporary and permanent immigrants. It further permits Ontario to set the target levels for the number of persons chosen by Ontario selection programs. It invests new powers in the minister to conduct research, organize educational and training programs, and appoint committees on immigration-related issues.

It allows the minister to establish registries for both employers and recruiters that are interested in participating in the Ontario selection programs under the Ontario Immigration Act. It sets out some guidelines to monitor and detect possible contraventions of the Ontario Immigration Act in order to prevent immigration fraud and to protect program integrity. It sets out guidelines in that regard.

The minister is also permitted to collect, use, and disclose personal information in order to carry out these functions.

The OIA also allows the minister to enter into agreements with the federal government, other provinces, and even municipalities. The bill lays out a compliance and enforcement regime, including inspection and investigation powers. Offences and penalties for both individuals and organizations would require regulatory change and federal buy-in.

Under the OIA, applicants to employer registries can request an internal review regarding a decision made. The bill aligns requirements under the Regulated Health Professions Act with those in the Fair Access to Regulated Professions and Compulsory Trades Act in terms of timelines in decisions-making and access to records. This fulfills a request by the office of the Fairness Commissioner.

The act allows for regulation-making authority in areas such as program administration, program eligibility, compliance, internal review and payment of fees.

These new powers for the minister contained within the act appear to be relatively harmless and almost appropriate.

I am especially eager to see Ontario become an active agent in conducting our own research, organizing educational programs and appointing committees.

My only question is—

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** When I was the minister of citizenship and immigration, I didn't have a question the whole time—not one.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** And this is not a question-and-answer period, Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Minister, you forgot about me. You're supposed to go through me, if you want. You're not even in a debate on this one.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** You. Yes, you. You're having an ongoing conversation with the presenter.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** I was just talking to my friend—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, talk to your friend. Don't talk to the one across the road. And if you want to talk to your friend, take your friend outside and talk to him.

Go ahead.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Speaker, if the minister would like to speak to me later, I'd be happy to have a conversation outside the Legislature. As you mentioned, he's not even here to address it.

Back to the debate, Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Who wasn't here? You know we're not supposed to say—

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Oh, yes—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** You'll withdraw that.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Speaker, I respectfully withdraw.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. It's going to be a good day.

*Interjection:* It's going to be a long day.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Yes, it's going to be one of those days, isn't it? Until midnight.

My only question is exactly to what end these endeavours will be undertaken by the ministry. The ministry has not shown any form of leadership around the current plight facing Ontario's immigrants, and this bill seems more interested in conferring powers to the minister than changing the landscape. It's clear: Federal power over immigration remains paramount.

So what should we do in the face of such a paradox? My NDP colleagues and I agree that in light of federal authority in this area, we are afforded the luxury of moving forward with legislation that is meaningful, legislation that tempers our economic needs with our moral and ethical obligations to provide newcomers with

the supports they need to help this province grow. Quite frankly, the facts are in and the results are plain: We need newcomers as much as they need us. We are asking people to come from around the world to become members of our family, to help our province grow and achieve our goals, but what are we doing to welcome, protect and see newcomers thrive in this province?

I want to spend some time talking about the reality of immigration by taking a moment to look at the numbers and current trends. Over the past 20 years, Ontario has welcomed more than 2.4 million landed immigrants, which signifies almost 52% of all immigrants coming to Canada. This number also illustrates that Ontario continues to be the first choice for immigrants coming to Canada. That's really something to be proud of. To have people come from countries all over the world and settle in Ontario is a testament to what Ontario has to offer to its citizens in many ways. We're talking about health care, education—at one time, there were job opportunities that were very plentiful.

We saw our share of immigrants to Canada drop by almost one third. Markedly, in 2010, Ontario received 118,114 permanent residents, representing 42.1% of total admissions to Canada, which was well below our historical average. This was Ontario's lowest share in 30 years, from a high of almost 60% in 2001 to 40% in 2011.

Toronto, in particular, seems to have the greatest draw for those immigrating to Canada. According to Statistics Canada, Toronto's metro population has now surpassed six million people, meaning that Toronto alone accounts for 17% of Canada's 35 million people. They further claim that the main driver of this growth was foreign immigrants. In fact, every Canadian city with a population over one million can attribute most of its population growth to international migration. About half of the people living in Toronto were born in other countries, and this city is said to be the most multicultural city in the world.

In spite of this uptake in immigration numbers in our major cities, it is estimated that Ontario will face a shortage of 364,000 skilled workers by the year 2025. That translates into an immigration demand that exceeds our current intake by more than twice over in order to offset the decline in Ontario's labour force.

What is behind this decline in Ontario's labour force? Well, the answer is socially driven. Our baby boomers are coming of retirement age at a rate we simply can't keep up with. Combine that with our historical decline in fertility rates and the picture becomes a little clearer, all of which points to a steady decline of Canadian participation in our own labour force.

**0940**

Historically, economic growth has been the key driver behind labour requirements in Canada. However, it will no longer be the case in the coming years. Instead, job openings due to retirement will be the major driver behind labour demand in the future, far outpacing the number of new jobs created by economic expansion. Pro-

jections from Human Resources and Skills Development Canada indicate that roughly 6.4 million jobs will open up in the coming decade. Roughly 70% of these jobs will be due to replacement demand, primarily as a result of retirements, deaths and emigration, while the remaining 30% will come from new economic activity and the demand for new labour requirements.

Simply stated, this trend is driven by our changing societal demographics. The slowing in our overall population expansion and the aging of the population are clearly beginning—and will continue—to negatively impact our labour force growth.

In the coming decade, we will need to recognize the labour market challenges of replacement demand. In the coming decade, there will be a need for approximately 4.4 million jobs. Some 3.7 million vacancies will be caused by retirements. It is estimated that the number of Canadians expecting to retire is going to increase steadily over the next decade. In 2010, we experienced approximately 300,000 retirements. By 2010, it is estimated that number will rise to more than 415,000. Further, it is estimated that an additional 700,000 positions will need to be filled due to death prior to retirement, and to emigration.

Therefore, it is vital that we appreciate and understand the importance of our immigration strategy beyond our labour market demand, but our socio-cultural needs as well.

Our demographics and populations are changing, and immigration will play a vital role in supplementing our workforce. Researchers have estimated that within this decade, immigration will account for all the net growth in our working-age population. By that, I don't mean to infer that Canadian-born individuals will not make any contributions to our labour force, because, Speaker, we know we have highly educated, highly trained people in Canada and in Ontario as well. The majority of the new entrants into the labour force will be made up of those who are leaving school. While newcomers will continue to be a vital aspect of our labour supply in Ontario, it has also been noted that recent immigrants seem to have the weakest economic outcomes, despite having very high levels of education attainment.

These concerns are significant. If declining financial outcomes among recent immigrants persist, we must be ready to respond. Whether it is a moral imperative that drives us to address those needs, or an economic inclination, it is clear that it serves us well as a province to ensure that immigrants in Ontario are provided with every opportunity to succeed.

The growing demands in health care, specifically in the caregiver program, highlight our need for an adaptive immigration strategy. We have seen some changes to policy, specifically the provincial nominee program, which is designed to facilitate immigration of foreign nationals to specific provinces and territories in Canada in order to target explicit economic needs.

Yet we struggle to adapt to our policy changes. While seeking to facilitate this immigration, we have yet to



move towards a fully comprehensive system of recognition of foreign-trained professionals and their credentials. Individuals who immigrate to Canada under the provincial nominee program have the skills, education and work experience needed to make an immediate economic contribution to the province or territory which nominates them. Since the inception of this program, the focus has been on immediate occupational needs identified by the participating provinces. The provincial nominee program rules recognize that provincial governments are best positioned to determine their own specific economic needs with respect to immigration. Labour market needs vary over time due to a number of factors, such as general economic cycles, rates of growth in particular sectors and demographics in particular occupations. Generally, the program is viewed as being more responsive to more immediate needs in the labour market as compared to the Federal Skilled Worker program.

PNP applicants receive priority processing while most FSW applicants do not, and the PNP is broader based in terms of the occupational labour market field. Since the inception of the PNP, comparisons regarding labour market outcomes of the FSW program are often made. However, one must remember important differences between the two economic streams of immigration. The FSW program addresses knowledge-based and longer-term needs for skilled professionals, whereas the PNP tends to focus on short-term occupational and specific labour needs identified by a province.

Speaker, there's something too I want to share, and I did touch on it when I debated earlier. It was some information that was gathered through the Auditor General's report, so I just want to read from that. Some of them are quotes that we got from the Auditor General's report.

Last year, the Auditor General did a comprehensive review of Ontario's provincial nominee program and, quite frankly, uncovered some serious issues in the ministry. I'll read the quote from the report, which I've written out here:

"The provincial nominee program ... is delivered by the Ministry of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade. Through the program, immigrants are nominated, or recommended, to the federal government based on their potential economic contributions to the province. Since the program's inception in 2007, the province has nominated about 6,600 people. As of April 30, 2014, 3,900 nominees and 3,200 of their family members have become permanent residents through the program.

"Other significant findings included the following:

"The ministry delayed formally reporting potential abuse of the program to the federal government and the appropriate law enforcement agencies." So that was a concern. "This potentially delayed any action against people who might have been abusing the program.

"Program staff did not follow up on questionable files that were approved but flagged for follow-up. About 260 files were flagged between October 2011 and November 2013, but only 8% had been followed up on at the time of

our audit." That's the Auditor General. "As of April 2014, 71% of all nominees flagged for follow-up had become landed immigrants.

"Thirty immigrant representatives submitted applications that were denied on the basis that they contained misleading or fraudulent information.

"On a follow-up of previous approved foreign worker nominees who had become landed immigrants to Ontario, 38% of the sampled nominees were suspected to have misrepresented themselves.

"Even though the ministry says publicly that the applications are processed on a first-come, first-served basis, certain applications were given priority and processed at least three times faster than others.

"There are significant data integrity issues with the program's computer system. Controls over the case management system and nomination certificates need to be strengthened." This is what the Auditor General is talking about, Speaker.

"In 2013, two thirds of the nominees were international students who obtained a post-secondary degree in Ontario but did not have a job offer at the time of nomination."

Of specific note for me were the "significant data integrity issues with the program's computer system" coupled with the fact that there was no privacy officer assigned to work with the program. Bill 49 is seeking to allow the minister to have access to highly confidential and personal information, and yet neither the government nor this ministry demonstrated that they have the capacity to protect the privacy of the individuals participating in the program.

In fact, this government program can't even report on the effectiveness of the program, nor can it speak to the experience of those people who have previously been nominated through the program.

The Auditor General also found "there is a significant risk that the program might not always be nominating qualified individuals who can be of economic benefit to Ontario. This is because it lacks the necessary tools, including policies, procedures and training, to guide program staff to make consistent and sound selection decisions, especially in a work environment that relies heavily on temporary staff and where turnover is high."

#### 0950

This is, again, what the Auditor General has identified as problematic to delivering this program.

They also found "that the ministry did not share program integrity concerns with both internal staff and external parties"—including law enforcement and regulators—"who needed to know and could act on them accordingly."

Furthermore, they found "that program staff had not been provided with clear guidelines on how to deal with potentially fraudulent situations, and the program had not established anti-fraud mechanisms. The program lacks a strong data management system and program integrity function that would help detect high-risk applications. The program's evaluations have not been thorough and

current enough to track what happens to nominees from the various program components after they are selected.”

So it’s almost like there was never any follow-up to this program to see if it was working, if it was successful or what the outcomes were for people who entered through this program.

“Furthermore, the ministry does not have strong monitoring procedures to ensure that” all “nominees are indeed working in skilled occupations contributing to the economy after arrival”—so, again, checks and balances.

These are fairly damning findings to overcome while asking for our support in this chamber to afford greater powers to this unproven ministry. Yes, you’re asking for all kinds of extra authority, but the track record that has been reported by the Auditor General is not a glowing report.

This Premier and this government tout themselves as champions of transparency and accountability. We all know where we can go with that, but I’m going to stay here on the debate. Yet the Auditor General went on to say, “The program lacks processes to ensure transparency and avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest: Even though the ministry states publicly that applications are processed on a first-come, first-served basis, certain applications are given priority and processed at least three times faster than non-prioritized files. Although there might be instances where this practice would be justified, for example, when an applicant’s legal status to stay in Canada is about to lapse,” they noted “one situation where files submitted by a certain representative were prioritized. In this case, the representative was a former program employee. In addition, some representatives were contacting program staff directly to ask for extensions in submitting documents or to request that their clients’ applications be prioritized.” It sounds like one process for the well-connected and another for the rest of us.

“In contrast, at Citizenship and Immigration Canada, only a small number of people deal with representatives, and representatives can only make inquiries in writing.”

These were the kinds of proposals my party sought to introduce through the committee, proposals that would help instill fairness and transparency while creating a level playing field for all. Yet once again, only two out of our 13 amendments were accepted.

It’s very ironic that the ministry responsible for helping immigrants land and find employment are themselves, in many cases, temporary employees. I’ll illustrate that, in my debate, from the Auditor General’s findings. According to the Auditor General’s report, many staff received no written guidance or job training, and turnover is quite high.

“As of March 31, 2014, only 20% of program staff were permanent full-time ministry employees.... From January 2012 to June 2014, 31 staff left the program and 59 started with the program.” There’s that high turnover rate.

The program “is heavily staffed with temporary or short-term employees. This has contributed to increased

turnover and the risk of inconsistent decision-making, which in turn requires increased oversight and continual training.

“When the program began, it was approved to hire up to nine full-time positions or the equivalent” of full-time employees (FTEs). “At that time, the nomination limit was 500.”

So you’d have your nine full-time employees and your nomination limit was 500 applicants coming in.

“In 2014, approved staffing increased to 16 FTEs when the nomination limit reached 2,500.” That’s a huge number. You’re going from 500 as a nomination limit to 2,500 as a nomination limit, and the increment in employees didn’t really proportion out that increase in nomination limit. At the time of the audit, the program was only utilizing nine of the 16 FTEs, so again, these people were obviously very overworked.

“In order to meet staffing needs, the ministry re-deployed its staff from other programs and staff from one other ministry. In addition, in 2010, the program began seconding people from the federal government, and in 2012, it began to hire seasonal employees,” and that is full-time employees on annually recurring fixed-term contracts who work 10 months of the year. “These temporary staff are not included in the approved staffing complement of 16, but the ministry has obtained funding to cover the costs of the temporary workforce.

“As of March 31, 2014, the program had 45 staff in total” and “expects to continue to employ a mix of permanent and seasonal staff, but dependence on a temporary workforce could result in more turnover because staff may leave, as has happened, for more permanent positions elsewhere.” More secure jobs: That’s what people are looking for.

“From January 2012 to June 2014, 31 staff left the program. In the same period, 59 individuals started with the program, excluding returning seasonal staff.” This illustrates that instability created a risk “to the program of inconsistency in decision-making, which warrants increased oversight and constant training of staff.” Again, the irony of the employees to this program working under precarious employment conditions themselves while helping newcomers to find good, stable employment would be amusing if it wasn’t so unfair.

In addition, although the program has existed for more than eight years, the ministry still does “not have an operating manual to guide processing staff in making consistent eligibility decisions.” That was something that was very much brought to the forefront from the Auditor General: training and guidelines for staff who are actually going through these nomination applications. Moreover, at the start of the audit, none of the application-processing staff who assessed files had received any training specific to the program. So you’re thrown in the job.

What has changed that will inspire Ontarians and newcomers alike to trust your leadership and program management abilities? That would be something I would actually like to talk to the minister about, or even get

something in writing: What steps has he taken from the Auditor General's findings to get his ministry clerically up to date, training his staff and to ensure people are going to, first of all—hopefully, when they come to work there—gain skills and experience? That's what makes the employee valuable, or someone who works for you: The longer they're there, the better they are at their job. So it would be nice to know what steps they've taken to ensure that when people get that job, they are willing to stay for the long haul. That also asks: What will be different under Bill 49? What is the government's response to its own shortcomings as an employer?

I'd like to talk a little bit about caregivers because, again, in Ontario we have a need for caregivers. Many, many of those caregivers come to Ontario; they immigrate here. I think that's something that we need to highlight in Ontario and talk about, and make sure that it's on record.

When we talk about caregivers, we want to know what answers this government has for their own employees, let alone those newcomers facing the precarious work that we talked about, as in the case of Ontario's live-in caregivers. Live-in caregivers are predominantly immigrant women, coming to us from countries around the world. They work in people's homes providing vital care and nurturing our aging population, young children and people with disabilities. They come here as temporary foreign workers, without access to full immigration status.

#### 1000

On one hand, we are clearly aware of the needs and demands of our aging population, yet our federal counterparts have approved fewer than 10% of requests by potential employers to bring in foreign caregivers under their revised program. They face enormous challenges, and in some cases abuse, while our labour laws exclude many of their working conditions. Last November in Ontario, there was an on-the-job death of a Filipino nanny, Marites Angana. Marites came to Ontario to take a job as a live-in caregiver but suffered a head injury from a fall in her employer's garage on November 28. She died of a brain hemorrhage on December 2 at Toronto Western Hospital, leaving behind a 13-year-old son in the Philippines.

Speaker, this is not an unusual story for a foreign caregiver coming into Ontario. As I have said, the majority of caregivers are women. Many of them come here to support their extended family or their own immediate children, who are left at home in their countries. To listen to this story—to have Marites fall in the garage and end up suffering death because of this, and leaving her 13-year-old son, certainly isn't the only story in Ontario with regard to caregivers.

My office met with friends of Marites and several groups who were seeking to help with repatriation of her body and wanting to prevent this needless tragedy from happening again. We challenged Ontario's Ministry of Labour to look into the circumstances of Marites, even going as far as to call for a coroner's inquest into the

death, but have heard nothing but silence in return. We haven't heard any response to that request.

According to the International Labour Organization, "Domestic workers are frequently expected to work longer hours than other workers and do not have the same rights to weekly rest that are enjoyed by other workers." They go on to state that some 83% of domestic workers are women.

We know that live-in caregivers are playing a key role in providing this care in Ontario, yet they are treated unfairly by both federal and provincial governments. This begs the question I referred to earlier about what kind of immigration strategies are we promoting here in Ontario. This government continues to refuse to bring legislation forward that protects temporary foreign workers in their work environments. There has been no action taken by the Ministry of Labour in regard to protecting the workplaces of Ontario's live-in caregivers, or to address the precarious nature of their work, yet we have very high expectations for the people we charge to care for our children and our aging parents.

Speaker, if you were going to have a caregiver—I'll speak from my personal experience. If I was going to have a caregiver in my home looking after my parents or my children, I certainly would want to make sure that they were happy in what they did and that they had all the rights of someone working in another workplace, because their role—you can't have a more important career or work than looking after someone who is a child or a vulnerable senior, because your care is in their hands. So I think it's so important that we actually look at foreign caregivers and try to make their workplaces fair.

With the care of caregivers, we know that they are predominantly women, as we've said, and yet where is our moral obligation to promote their well-being and the status of all women in Ontario? Under the new rules, caregivers will no longer have universal access to permanent resident status after working in Canada for two years—again, a change like that isn't helping. They must now apply under two categories: those caring for children, and those caring for people with high medical needs. Ottawa will now allow 2,750 caregivers under both new streams to access permanent residency, for a total of 5,500 applicants a year. The annual average of caregivers who came to Canada over the past five years is over 8,000. That's well above the cap that Ottawa has set.

So how will Ontario seek to reconcile the federal regulations with the needs of Ontarians? A recent study shows that today as much as 80% of the home care services provided to older adults come from caregivers. However, as the baby boomer generation ages and as they didn't have as many children as their parents, the same in-family resources will simply not be available.

I know that my parents, when they came to Canada with five children—yes, it was five—they came to Ontario. We lived here in Ontario with five children.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Where did they come from?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Portugal.  
*Interjection.*

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Yes.

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** Great country.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Yes, it is. It's a wonderful country. Everybody who visits there just comes back with raving reviews about how they want to go back.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Weren't you the first Portuguese woman to be elected?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I was the first Portuguese woman to be elected to the Ontario Legislature. That is correct, yes.

*Applause.*

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Thank you.

If I could actually talk to that at this point, because—

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** First Portuguese woman elected to government.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** We know that another member, the member from Davenport, is the first Portuguese woman to be elected to government, because she mentioned that in one of her debates. So congratulations to her, too.

But under this program nomination act, the Ontario Immigration Act, they're going to zero in on economic class, immigrants coming to Ontario who are going to fill job positions—which is great: they want high-skilled workers. So I'm going to speak from my perspective. When my father came to Canada and Ontario, and my uncles and all kinds of relatives, they didn't have any skills. They were labourers, they were farmers, back in their country. Things were a little different then. They came to Ontario, and thank goodness that was allowed, because you guys wouldn't have me here today if that wasn't the case.

Despite the fact that they didn't have any high skills to fill the labour market that they're going to be doing research and developing programs for—and that is certainly something we need to do—they had a role to fill in this province. They contributed to the workforce and they actually helped build Ontario, specifically in the construction trade that my family was able to enter. So if it wasn't for that opportunity for immigrants who came here without skills, they couldn't have helped contribute to the economy.

And they thrived. My father bought a home. He bought a car. He contributed back to society. We brought five over. My youngest brother was born here. He raised six kids here. We're all here. We have children. We're all working and contributing. So that's something, Speaker, that they're talking about, this bill, the provincial nominee program, as looking at economic class drivers for nominating people coming to Ontario. I think there should be some room in here for people who come here who perhaps don't have those skills that they're looking for but can contribute in other ways.

Back to home care: We know that Ontarians are already confronting wait-lists for home care, bed shortages in our long-term-care facilities. The federal government claimed that noticeable decreases in the number of appli-

cants were due to higher proportions of the applications returned as incomplete. That's what they're saying about the caregiver applications limit that they changed, too.

On Friday, Prime Minister Stephen Harper said he "doesn't want to create a permanent underclass in Canada because of problems with the temporary foreign worker program." Yet it was his government that increased the cost of applications to the program. Previously the application cost was just \$275. The new cost is \$1,000, along with the labour market study. Now accessibility is becoming an issue when you raise that application fee that much.

**1010**

Harper seems adept at posturing on the case of the Filipino immigration while he's actively seeking new trade deals with their country's leaders, all of which will result in increased demand for government and private home care services and, ultimately, caregivers.

Yet this government has been silent on the cuts to the caregiver programs. There is no evidence that advocacy of any kind has taken place to protect either the caregivers or those Ontarians who are in need of their services. This Liberal government needs to accept the consequences for their part in creating and establishing a permanent group of second-class citizens. If they don't react now, it's just going to keep growing.

Speaker, we talked about the Auditor General's report and how there's a fluctuation of staff in and out of the door, how there are people on contract. The ministry's own staff are facing precarious employment.

From the article I read last week, precarious employment is on the rise. It was in our legislative clippings.

The article goes on to say, "Precarious employment is here to stay, a new study shows, and Toronto's new economic reality impacts everyone from the working poor to the middle class.

"The research confirms United Way and McMaster University's groundbreaking 2013 findings that fewer than half of workers in the GTA and Hamilton are in permanent, full-time jobs." That's pretty surprising.

"Instead, about 52% of workers are in temporary, contract or part-time positions."

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Precarious.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Yes, precarious, and we talked about precarious work here on this side of the House. It doesn't help to stabilize our economy.

"All the indicators suggest that this is the trend of the new labour market," said Wayne Lewchuk, the report's lead researcher.

"This is the new form of employment."

Personally, I was moved by this one particular story: "Diana Mavunduse, 41, who spent most of the past seven years knitting together various part-time and contract jobs to make ends meet, admits she hasn't even thought about starting a family.

"Back home, I would be married already with children," she says of life in her native Zimbabwe."

Diana goes on to talk about the immigrant experience in Ontario: "A lot of them are doctors and engineers who come with their families," she says. "They study for

years for a career, but end up coming here and getting a (menial) job. They end up focusing on their children.’

“As a result, the pressure on families is immense....”

In Diana’s case, that’s what happened, Speaker. They’re trying to survive every day, and they can’t find permanent work.

“The report, entitled The Precarity Penalty, warns that without such action, precarious work will ‘not only affect the ability of people to build stable and fulfilling lives, but it will threaten our region’s capacity to develop a competitive workforce.’”

In short, this story successfully reminds us that a poorly implemented immigration policy can be devastating to people who are caught up in this credentials issue. They come to Ontario, or Canada at large, with degrees and they can’t find work in their professions.

The degree to which we can successfully integrate new arrivals into Ontario’s labour market and social fabric does have a significant effect on our own fiscal fortunes. Immigration has always been the lifeblood of Canada, stretching back into our past, when we recruited immigrants to help populate this country.

It’s a reality that we need to have people come to Ontario, for many reasons: population reasons, economic reasons. We just need the numbers. As I mentioned before, our demographics don’t show that that’s going to be the case for us in 2025.

Our immigration history is rife with examples as well. I’m going to talk about this particular area, because it’s about immigration. It’s not something we should be proud of, of course, but it needs to be said, being the citizenship and immigration critic. Our Canadian history is rife with examples—there are some dark periods where we got it wrong. In the 19th century, we implemented the highly racist Chinese head tax, to discourage Asians from gaining citizenship, just as we discouraged Jews from entering Canada between World War I and World War II. I reference these rather painful examples from our past in order to demonstrate the need for sound legislation.

The Ontario Immigration Act is specifically designed to increase class of economic immigrants. At the same time, the profile of immigrants to Ontario has changed. The percentage of economic-class immigrants coming to Ontario has dropped by nearly 20%, from 64% in 2001 to 52% in 2011. This figure is the lowest in the country. On average, 71% of immigrants arriving to provinces outside of Ontario were economic—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I’ll have to cut you off at this point. It is 10:15. We’ll continue again when you get the floor.

*Third reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** This House stands recessed until 10:30 this morning.

*The House recessed from 1015 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I’d like to welcome members of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada to Queen’s Park for

World MS Day: Lisa McCoy, Abidah Shamji, Andrea Strath, Joanne Ticknor, Andrea Butcher-Milne, Gregory Bourne, Stella Rose, James Jackson, Marni Wolfe, and John Duffy. Welcome.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I hope everyone will join me in welcoming a group of girls who have travelled here this morning from Waterloo, My Girls Government group—first time on the GO train, first time on the TTC. From Lester B. Pearson Public School: Claudia Heeney, Maria Faroga, Faiza Haque, Erika Schneider, Ally Horne, Jessica Martin, Sapna Tripathi, Abigail Persaud, their teacher Laura Teskey, and parent volunteer Chris Martin.

From St. Luke Catholic Elementary School: Maddie Swart, Nicole Posluszny, Tamara McMahan, Tabatha Obermeyer, Natalia Benavides, Alexxis Armstrong, Rachel Williams, Jenna Langelaan, and their vice-principal Carla Santomero. Welcome to Queen’s Park.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** It gives me great pleasure to welcome Leslie Pringle to the Legislature today. She is the mother of Jesse Wright, my legislative assistant. Welcome to the Legislature.

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I’d like to welcome back to the Legislature Jeff Koller from ISCA.

**Hon. Jeff Leal:** I’m very pleased to introduce the following people from the Beef Farmers of Ontario—and I welcome members to join the BFO barbecue lunch at Queen’s Park’s lobby today between noon and 2.

I’d like to introduce Bob Gordanier, who is the BFO president; Matt Bowman, Beef Farmers of Ontario vice-president; Dave Stewart, executive director of Beef Farmers of Ontario; and Garnet Toms, who is the director of Beef Farmers of Ontario for the wonderful riding of Peterborough

Just to let everybody know, the menu includes some of the best Ontario corn-fed beef tenderloin, smoked on-site, served on a bun with side salads.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** It’s a great day today to be from Nepean–Carleton because it’s our day to have the page captain. I’d like to congratulate Brady Sterling, and of course, we all know that his grandfather is former MPP Norm Sterling, and of course often in the gallery is his grandmother Joan Sterling. Let’s give him a really big round of applause.

*Applause.*

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I just wanted to introduce Heather Shand, a wonderful volunteer from the riding of Parkdale–High Park.

**Hon. Reza Moridi:** It’s my pleasure to welcome members of the College Student Alliance visiting Queen’s Park. They’re represented by Matt Caron, Shannon Pollard and John Horrox. Please join me in welcoming them.

**Mrs. Julia Munro:** I’m pleased to welcome Kelly and Michael Gibney from York–Simcoe, who are here today as part of the Canadian PKU and allied disorders group for advocacy day. Welcome to all of you who are there on a very important mission.

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** It’s my pleasure to welcome a fairly large contingent of CUPE members who work in our education sector.

**Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn:** It's my pleasure to welcome, in the west gallery, a group from Primerica Canada. They're at Queen's Park today providing information about their services: John Adams, Hande Bilhan, Rosie Orlando, Bobby Gocool, my resident from Etobicoke–Lakeshore Lincoln Nadarajah, Darren Stephenson, David Grad, Roy House, Franco Delilo and Daniel Pirillo. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** I want to welcome Arden Schneckenburger from my riding. He's here with the Beef Farmers of Ontario, and it's great to see them this morning.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** It's my pleasure to introduce Norma Beauchamp, president and CEO of Cystic Fibrosis Canada. She is there with her chief scientific officer, Dr. John Wallenburg, Chris MacLeod, as well as Anchalee Srisombun. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** It gives me great pleasure this morning to introduce to the Legislature, in the members' gallery, the participants in my Girls Government mentorship program from Rawlinson public school in my riding of Davenport. With us we have Ryann Hoxsey-Pilon, Sana Khan, Alyssa Diseko, Cheyenne Williams and teacher Emily Praamsma. Welcome, ladies.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Please join me in welcoming, from Dufferin–Caledon, Frances and Helen Goodfellow, and Jim MacKenzie, who actually worked at Queen's Park during the Davis era. They're here to advocate on behalf of PKU and allied diseases.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I would like to welcome the Beef Farmers of Ontario here today. I met with their vice-president, Matt Bowman, who is from my riding. I'd like to invite you all to the barbecue this afternoon.

**Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** I'd like Queen's Park to give a warm welcome to Jane Bullbrook from Oakville, from a wonderful organization that helps a lot of people called Unshippable.

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I'd like to introduce Rob Lipsett, a great farmer from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound and a director with the Beef Farmers of Ontario. Again, I'd welcome everyone to lunch out on the grounds.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** I'd like to welcome, from the capital city of Ontario, former Toronto city councillor John Adams, who has also done some great work in newborn screening and on sickle-cell anemia. Welcome, John Adams.

**Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde:** As I mentioned earlier this week, Ottawa–Orléans is proud to welcome Robert Heckbert, our page in the Legislature. I would like to re-welcome his mother, Susan Bellamy, who is here in the gallery again today.

**Mr. Granville Anderson:** I would like to welcome Maryll Alcalá-Hao, a co-op student from St. Stephen secondary school. She currently works in my office as a co-op student.

I would also like to welcome Justin MacLean, who is a member of the staff in my office.

Welcome.

**Hon. Mitzie Hunter:** I'm pleased to introduce Gregory Bourne, from my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood, and Abidah Shamji. Both are visiting Queen's Park today with the MS Society for World MS Day.

**Mr. Arthur Potts:** It's a great pleasure for me to introduce Jim MacKenzie, a great political operative in the Bill Davis and Brian Mulroney years. He's here with the Canadian PKU group, along with John Adams, who is the president and a former councillor, and John Adams's son, who is a PKU patient, John Adams Jr.

We also have with us Nicole Pallone, who is a vice-president of CanPKU; Tatiana Docu, founder of CanPKU, and her son and a PKU patient, Radu Docu.

We have Cristian Baigorria, who is the former chair and a founder of CanPKU, and his wife Paola and daughter Candee; and also Dr. Bill Hanley, the first doctor to treat PKU patients in Toronto.

We also have Mary Louise Sukman and Frances Grove.

Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mrs. Kathryn McGarry:** It's my pleasure to welcome today my friends and supporters Anne Groulx and Cheryl MacInnes in the east members' gallery. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I'd also like to welcome a number of representatives from the Johnson and Johnson family of companies who are back at Queen's Park today. They're in the gallery with us. Welcome to question period.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** On behalf of the member from Toronto–Danforth, I want to introduce the page captain today, Madeleine Randmaa; her mother, JoAnn Purcell; her father, Ric Randmaa; and brother Luc Randmaa, a former page. They're in the members' gallery this morning.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** It's my pleasure to welcome students from Don Mills Collegiate to the Legislature today.

#### WEARING OF CARNATIONS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Halton on a point of order.

**Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris:** I believe you will find that we have unanimous consent for members to wear carnations in recognition of World MS Day.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Halton is seeking unanimous consent to wear carnations. Do we agree? Agreed.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The leader of the third party on a point of order.

1040

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent to have speedy hearing and third reading passage for Bill 77, the Affirming Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Act, by June 4, 2015.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The leader of the third party is seeking unanimous consent to declare third reading on Bill 77. Do we agree? I heard a no.

It is now time for question period.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### TEACHERS' LABOUR DISPUTES

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** My question is for the Premier. In the case of the teachers' strikes in Peel, Durham and Sudbury, the fact that 72,000 high school students were severely impacted had absolutely no effect on this government. Settlement talks were sporadic at best and the education minister seemed thoroughly confused. The reality is these students are back in class today because of the Ontario Labour Relations Board decision, not because of any positive action taken by this government. Now 800,000 elementary students are going to be held hostage unless this government gets serious about reaching a settlement.

Premier, is 800,000 a big enough number for you to finally get serious about doing your job and negotiating a settlement with the elementary school teachers?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Education.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I want to say how pleased I am this morning that the students in Durham, Rainbow and Peel are back in school today. I want to thank the Labour Relations Board for pointing out what we've said all along, which is that central strikes need to be about central issues, and local strikes, which are what these were, should be about local issues. The Labour Relations Board confirmed what I've said all along, that this was, in fact, an unlawful strike in the sense that it was local but based on central issues.

I do want to thank the Labour Relations Board for their ruling, because had it not been for the OLRB ruling—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary? The member from Simcoe North.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** This question is to the Premier as well. The Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario will ramp up their work-to-rule job action on June 1. Teachers will no longer make themselves available to meet with parents to discuss students' transitions to the next grade. Field trips for the next school year will not be booked. Teachers will not participate in professional development activities.

Premier, you've been preaching to us in this House for weeks about your commitment to negotiated settlements, but now we hear that you're not even at the table with the Elementary Teachers' Federation trying to negotiate a settlement.

Premier, where is your sense of urgency? When are you going to get back to the negotiating table and end the chaos you've created in Ontario's education system?

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I think this issue of a sense of urgency is really important because we had a sense of

urgency that we needed to go to the Education Relations Commission, get the ruling that the school year was in jeopardy and table back-to-work legislation. The kids could have been back in school even earlier in the week had it not been for the NDP blocking the legislation.

I would like to thank the three school boards that got the cease-and-desist order very late in the day yesterday—I would like to thank the three school boards for working very hard yesterday evening to make sure that the school boards actually do have students back in the classroom today. So thank you to the boards for that hard work.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Speaker, you know she hasn't answered either one of the questions.

Back to the Premier: The job action announced by the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario will have an immediate impact on students. Special-needs students will suffer because teachers will no longer make themselves available to talk about students' transitions to the next grade. Field trips for the next school year won't be booked.

Premier, your education minister has had over a year to negotiate collective agreements with all of these unions. In that time, she has made absolutely no progress and it is the—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Two different conversations are going on, other than the person putting the question, including members from that side as well. It stops.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Whoever said that is close to getting turfed too. I'm standing.

Please carry on.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Premier, it is the students and their parents who are suffering. You've got three months left until the beginning of September when the kids go back to school. We know we have chaos now. Premier, will you fire this education minister and put someone competent in there who can get the job done and end the anxiety for Ontario's parents and students?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** As the member just pointed out, we have three months left to negotiate with ETFO, and we will do that. But we only have 10 days left to make sure that, now that the students are back in class, they stay in class. That's why we need to go ahead and pass our Protecting the School Year Act, to make sure that those students who are back in class today stay in class for the rest of the school year. That is exactly what we intend to do: to make sure, as our top priority, that we get our legislation passed so that the kids who have gone back today can stay there and benefit from teaching for the next month, get their school year completed, and

graduate, for those who are in grade 12. That is our priority.

### HYDRO ONE

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** Back to the Premier, Mr. Speaker: When the Ombudsman released his report on the billing practices of Hydro One, the findings were astonishing and astounding, to say the least. Mistreatment, abuse, deceit and deception: just a few of the words that describe Hydro One's business practice as outlined in the Ombudsman's report.

For now, Hydro One is a crown corporation for which the Minister of Energy is ultimately responsible. It appears no one was held accountable for the findings of the Ombudsman's report.

Premier, will you hold the minister responsible? Will you fire your Minister of Energy for his complete incompetence on this file, apologize to the tens of thousands of Ontario Hydro One customers who were misled, apologize to the officers of this House who were deceived and lied to, and put a new minister in place that we can have confidence in?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

The member from Hamilton Mountain needs to be reminded: You're even a little closer now, and I can hear you. With that, I will also ask the deputy House leader, when I'm standing, to stop. I'm going to put in the new rule that I've been working with, that if I'm standing and you want to chirp, you're gone.

Premier.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the Ombudsman for his report and for his recommendations. We've acknowledged that during the transition to the new billing system there was an unacceptable number of mistakes, that there were too many customers who experienced service issues. In fact, the CEO of Hydro One has apologized to all customers.

Prior to the review by the Ombudsman, Hydro One had begun to make changes, so there was already an acknowledgement that there was a problem, and there were changes put in place. Having said that, we're pleased that the Ombudsman has done the review and there are more recommendations that have come forward.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Leader of the Opposition is aware of the fact that, as we talk about broadening the ownership of Hydro One, one of the things that needs to happen is that it needs to be a better-run company. I think this latest incident makes that very clear.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** Back to the Premier, Mr. Speaker: I don't think selling Hydro One is going to give you the oversight and the accountability that you should be exercising today. In fact, you'll lose majority control and you'll lose oversight—no more Ombudsman, no more freedom of information. And we won't even know,

because you won't put this before the parliamentary budget office or the auditor prior to signing the deals with your new private sector partners, whether or not we're getting a good deal for the people of Ontario, who own that company that you're giving away in a fire sale. Shame on you.

When are you going to have somebody take responsibility for the billing errors at Hydro One, for the months and months that they deceived the officers of this Legislature, that they deceived the members of this Legislature and impeded our ability to serve our constituents properly because we didn't have honest and direct information? No one seems to ever take responsibility in your government. No one at Hydro One has been dismissed.

I ask you again today: At least dismiss the minister. Show that you care about—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated, please. Start the clock.

Premier?

1050

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I am so pleased that the Leader of the Opposition raised the issue of a fire sale, because it was the fire sale of the 407 that was the backdrop against which we made our decision vis-à-vis our assets.

The fact is that the 407 sell-off, which retained no ongoing—

*Interjections.*

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** The difference is choice and not.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Oh, that was so close—and I don't say that with a smile.

Carry on.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well we are retaining 40% ownership of Hydro One. He knows that the regulatory controls that are in place now are going to continue to be in place. He knows that the setting of prices—the process that is in place now will continue to be in place. He knows that we will have control over the appointment of the CEOs.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition needs to understand that the way the 407 was sold off, with no ongoing revenue to the people of Ontario, with no control over that road and an undervaluation of that asset—that's the backdrop against which we made decisions, and we did it differently.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary? The member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** You know, when the Liberals are in a mess, they dodge, deflect and deny. That's their modus operandi. But they've failed to answer the question and failed to be accountable to the people of Ontario.

Back to the Premier: On December 17, 2013, the Minister of Energy's office wrote to the Hydro One



CEO, asking about the absurdly high number of complaints about Hydro One service. The CEO responded that everything was good, and the level of complaints was nothing to be concerned about. He told the Minister of Energy's office that, despite senior officials at Hydro One referring to the organization as being in "crisis mode" over the level of complaints.

Premier, has the CEO of Hydro One been held accountable for lying to the minister's office?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** We know that Hydro One has been working hard to resolve outstanding issues, and Hydro One has outlined that work in detail. However, further work and remediation is still clearly required, and that's why I've asked the chair of Hydro One, David Denison, to report back to me within 40 days with a detailed action plan describing how Hydro One can further address the recommendations in the Ombudsman's report.

But what we need to say is that this government has provided more additional oversight than any other government in the history of this province. We created the position of Financial Accountability Officer, made the French Language Services Commissioner independent, put into place a Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, allocated new powers to the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth, and expanded the Ombudsman's role to include oversight of municipalities, school boards and publicly funded universities—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### TEACHERS' LABOUR DISPUTES

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is for the Premier. On Tuesday, the Minister of Education stood in her place and said, "The act that we will be introducing this afternoon is obviously designed to get kids back into the classroom. We want the kids back in the classroom as quickly as possible."

Well, kids are back in the classroom. Why is the Premier stopping a strike that isn't even happening when, instead, she should be stopping the chaos in the schools?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Yes, the kids are back in the classroom. They could have been back in the classroom two days ago if it hadn't been for the NDP.

The fact is that it's very important that we make sure those students stay in the classroom until the end of the year, as the Minister of Education has outlined. There's no guarantee that that would be the case, so we need to continue to work to put the legislation in place so that there will be a guarantee that the students in those three boards, in Rainbow, in Durham and in—what's the third one?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Peel.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Peel—and Peel, that they are in school for the duration of the school year.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** On Tuesday, the Premier said, "We want those kids back in school. We want the collective bargaining process to continue."

In 2013, the Premier said her style is "collaborative, which is leading from within a team, bringing people to the table."

In 2014, she wrote to her labour minister and told him to "uphold and respect the collective bargaining process" and "maintain a respectful labour relations climate."

The strike is over, Speaker. The kids are back in school. It's time for this Premier to keep her word. Respect the process. Bring the people to the table and get an agreement with the teachers.

Will this Premier stop making things worse by continuing with Bill 103 and, instead, end the chaos by spending the next little while at the negotiating table trying to get a collective agreement?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Are you too occupied with—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Essex is inches away. I'd like an acknowledgement from the member from Essex that I spoke to him. Thank you.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Education.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I think we actually need to look at the ruling from the OLRB. What the OLRB has said is, "I direct that these strikes cease at least two weeks from the date of this decision." In other words, the strikes can resume with different signs on June 10.

Now, if the leader of the NDP would actually read the legislation, she would discover that the legislation not only brings people back to school, it keeps them there for the rest of the year. There will be no more strikes in Durham, no more strikes in Peel and no more strikes in Rainbow for the rest of the year. We need to pass the legislation so that kids stay in school.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I find it amazing that the Liberal government takes no responsibility whatsoever for the chaos that's happening in our schools. It's because they're refusing to bargain at the bargaining table that we're in this mess in the first place. They lost kids six weeks of their education because they are not being serious in terms of their obligation to bargain.

But you know what? Apparently, the Premier doesn't have any confidence in her minister to get a deal, which is why she's using her majority to stop a strike that isn't even happening. The only way we can get stability is with a deal. But instead of bringing people together, the Liberals are driving the sides further apart and inflaming an already very bad situation.

Will this Premier pull her bill and focus on getting an agreement that will end the uncertainty and the chaos in our education system?

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I find it quite appalling that the leader of the party opposite, first of all, wanted to maintain and continue what has turned out to be an unlawful

strike. Now she doesn't want to make sure that the strike doesn't resume in two weeks. We want to keep the kids in the strike—keep the kids out of—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

Please finish.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** It's also important to note that the legislation before the House actually sets up a scheme to continue negotiations, to have mediation, and if either negotiations or mediations are successful—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Wrap-up sentence, please.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** The bill actually does ensure that negotiations, mediation and, if necessary, arbitration take place and that's exactly what—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question?

#### PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is for the Premier. On October 20, the Premier stood in her place and said that Ed Clark said "quite clearly that he doesn't believe that selling those assets is the right answer. He has said that.

"I believe that the leader of the third party is probably having a bit of a hard time framing the question because in fact Ed Clark had said he agrees that selling those assets is not the right thing to do."

1100

Six months later, here we are, Speaker, and the Premier is selling off Hydro One. How can the Premier say people knew what her plan was—because she keeps saying that; everybody knew what her plan was, apparently. But not only did she not run on that plan, but she spent months after the election denying that plan. Even Ed Clark had no plan to do this a couple of months ago. Where is the Premier coming from?

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Eglinton–Lawrence, come to order.

Premier?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Let me once again go through what we are proposing to do and what was in Ed Clark's final report, which is that we need—

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** No, we're talking about the interim report.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I know you're talking about the interim report, but there was a final report, and the recommendations in the final report are the recommendations that we are going to implement, which means that—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I would ask that the leader of the third party listen to the answer of the question that you put.

Carry on.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** In order to be able to make the investments in infrastructure, in transportation

infrastructure, roads, bridges and transit, in order to be able to do that—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Renfrew, come to order—second time.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** In order to be able to make those investments, we are broadening the ownership of Hydro One. We are retaining 40% ownership, Mr. Speaker. No individual or entity will be able to own more than 10%. The regulatory controls and price controls will remain in place. The ability of the government to determine where a line will be built will remain in place.

Those controls were very important to us, as well as the retention of—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** On October 27, the Minister of Finance said, "We have made it clear that we are not going to sell off our assets." Here we are, six months later, and the Premier is selling off Hydro One.

One of these things is not like the other. It seems not only did the Premier keep Ontarians in the dark about her plan to sell off Hydro One, but she kept her Minister of Finance in the dark as well. How can the Premier say people actually knew about her plan when, as of October 27, even her own Minister of Finance had no idea?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, we said that we were going to review the assets owned by the people of Ontario in order to be able to invest in the new—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Come on. Release Charles from the root cellar. Release him from that root cellar and let him have some light.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke is warned.

Finish, please.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** —in order to be able to invest in the assets and the infrastructure that are needed for the 21st century. That's what we ran on. That's what we said we were going to do. We said we were going to ask Ed Clark to give us advice. He did that, and those recommendations are the recommendations that we're going to invest in, that we're going to implement.

I would ask the leader of the third party which projects that we are implementing she would cancel. Would she cancel the Hamilton LRT? Would she cancel the expansion of Highway 7 to Kitchener-Waterloo? Would she cancel the Eglinton Crosstown? Would she cancel—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** In October of last year, the Premier stood here and I stood here, and the Premier said to me, "It must actually be very hard for the leader of the third party to ask these questions. She knows that we're not selling off the assets. She knows perfectly well that that was one of the parameters as Ed Clark went into this review. She knows that we are keeping these assets in public hands."

Well, here we are. Here we are. The Premier is selling Hydro One. But six months ago, she looked at me in this

chamber—she looked me in the eye and she said that she was not selling off our assets.

How can the Premier of this province say that she has been upfront with Ontarians, let alone this Legislature, when six short months ago she insisted that Hydro One was not going to be sold?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Premier?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I would say to the leader of the third party today that it must be equally hard for her to ask questions that she knows perfectly well undermine a plan to invest in the people of this province, to invest in the infrastructure of this province, to invest in the transit in her own hometown, Mr. Speaker. She has no plan to do that. She has no way that she can look the people of Ontario in the face and say, “This is how I would do it,” because she has no plan to make those investments, Mr. Speaker, and apparently—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I’m standing.

Finish, please.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Apparently, she thinks it’s just fine to step back and say, “We don’t need to make investments in infrastructure. We don’t need to build the roads and the bridges and the transit”—in her own hometown—“that are so vitally necessary for the future economic health of this province.” She thinks that’s fine. We don’t. We have a plan to build that infrastructure, and we’re going—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, second time.

## HYDRO ONE

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** New question. The member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I’m glad I’m still here.

To the Premier: The Ombudsman’s report said that they learned from internal emails that Hydro One deliberately sanitized the script it used at that meeting with the Ombudsman. A Hydro One official wrote in an email, “If we simply state that we’re essentially in line with expected customer reaction ... that’s a healthy story.” That official was deliberately misleading an independent officer of the Legislature. They tried to hide the truth.

Premier, has the Hydro One official been fired for misleading and obstructing the Ombudsman?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, we know that the Ombudsman did a very comprehensive and thorough study of this particular issue. We have accepted his report. We’re also proceeding on the basis of having asked the current chair of Hydro One, David Denison, to follow up on the Ombudsman’s report, to report back

publicly within 40 days, looking into all of the recommendations as well as any other relevant matters around the billing issue. We will have a thorough report from the current chair. We will assess the situation at that particular time.

There were three senior officers of the corporation who were associated with the IT system who are no longer with the corporation. They left the corporation around the time that the extent of the billing errors came to light.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Again to the Premier: The Ombudsman’s office called Hydro One to ask about a billing issue. When that conversation ended, the employee emailed their manager. The manager replied, “If you get the feeling that they’re going to investigate more aggressively or escalate, let us know,” and “Good warning in case they come knocking. Please keep holding the line with messages like you conveyed.” It is obvious that the manager knew something wasn’t right and instructed their staff to at the very least bend the truth or perhaps outright lie.

Premier, has that manager been fired for instructing their staff to mislead the Ombudsman?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** I’ll just repeat what I said—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Finish, please.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** I’ll just repeat what I said in the main question.

It’s very clear that Hydro One has been working to address the outstanding issues, but we’re going further than that. We want to make it perfectly clear that we’re going to be receiving a report from the new chair of Hydro One. The newly appointed chair of Hydro One, David Denison, is overseeing a process to select a CEO moving forward, Mr. Speaker. The chair and the Minister of Energy are in the process of restructuring the board of directors. It’s going to be a better company. It’s going to be a more efficient company. It will be a very accountable company.

## TEACHERS’ LABOUR DISPUTES

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** My question is to the education Premier. The Liberal government’s—

*Interjections.*

1110

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock.

I’m going to offer some advice, and that is: Just the title. Just as we’ve done before. And it’ll stay that way. That’s the last time it’s said.

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** My question is to the Premier: The Liberal government’s chronic underfunding of education in our province has left our schools in chaos. The Minister of Education actually boasts about the fact that she cut \$250 million from education over 2014—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** It goes both ways. Finish, please.

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** The Minister of Education actually boasts about the fact that she cut \$250 million from education over 2014-15. The minister boasts about the fact that her government has closed 88 good neighbourhood schools. The minister is proud of her record of cutting \$7 million from the Geographic Circumstances Grant which supports small, rural and isolated boards. All of this, and the minister is perplexed about the unrest in the education sector.

The minister was given a simple task—get a deal with the teachers—and she failed. Speaker, will the Premier fire the Minister of Education immediately?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Education.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I think maybe we should start by reminding the members opposite about the plan that they ran on for education and health. The plan they ran on for education and health said that they'd start with the budget that we had last year and then they would take out \$600 million from the budget we had. It would seem to me that might have been about \$250 million out of education and about \$350 million out of health, because health has the bigger budget. So, in fact, their platform was to take \$250 million out of the education budget beyond the \$22.5 billion that we started with. So I'm quite surprised that this is somehow now a problem, because a year ago that's what—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Be seated.

Supplementary?

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** Back to the Premier: The Minister of Education has been sitting on the sidelines not taking this seriously for weeks. The minister has been playing the blame game, desperately trying to skirt responsibility for the mess that her government has made of education. The minister has insulted families and students by saying, "I had protests outside my office before the last election and I seem to have gotten re-elected."

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Trinity-Spadina, second time.

**Mrs. Lisa Gretzky:** It's obvious she's more interested in playing political games than getting a deal. The minister was responsible for getting a deal with teachers, and she has failed, leaving parents and families to pay the price. We have members of CUPE here from the education sector, and she's not taking bargaining with them seriously either. They've been waiting since June.

Speaker, will the Premier take responsibility for this mess and fire the Minister of Education?

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** My question, actually, is, when are the NDP going to stop blocking the legislation that enables us to make sure that now that the students are back in their classes in Durham, in Peel, in Rainbow, they'll stay there? Because the OLRB ruling did issue a cease-and-desist and got the kids back into class, but it doesn't keep them there. It says a strike can restart on June 10. We need to pass the legislation quickly that will ensure that the—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Essex, second time.

Wrap-up sentence.

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** The legislation that is before the House will ensure that students stay in their classes in those three boards for the rest of the school year.

#### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** My question is to the minister responsible for the Pan Am/Parapan Am Games. On May 30, in just three days, the Pan Am torch will be arriving in Toronto where it will begin its 41-day journey. I was excited to learn that on June 2, as one of its first stops, the torch will be arriving in my riding of Sudbury. I know many of my constituents are getting excited to welcome the torch and the Pan Am spirit to Sudbury, and there will be a celebration in Bell Park.

After it leaves Sudbury, the torch will begin the journey across beautiful northern Ontario—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. That's enough. The comments I'm hearing are just way over the top. It's not the place for this.

Finish, please.

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It will make stops in Thessalon, Blind River and North Bay, just to name a few of those beautiful places. From the north, the torch will travel around the province until it reaches the opening ceremonies on July 7.

Speaker, through you to the minister: Minister, can you tell us about the torch relay and the journey the Pan Am flame will make across our great province of Ontario?

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Hamilton Mountain—second time.

Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport, responsible for the Pan Am/Parapan Am Games.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** I'd like to thank the member for the question.

I'm so excited to know that the flame is going to arrive here in Ontario this week. There have been so many people involved in the planning of these games, and I think the arrival of the torch really captures the momentum we're building here in Ontario.

As the member mentioned, the torch will arrive in Toronto on Saturday, and it will travel to northern Ontario this Sunday, landing in the beautiful city of Thunder Bay.

We wanted to make sure that everyone in this province has an opportunity to participate in these games, and that's why we made sure that there would be 130 stops throughout the province, and then the opening ceremonies will take place on July 10.

I encourage all members of this Legislature to join in the celebration and to participate at these 130 locations. I'll give some more information in the supplementary.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:** Thank you, Minister, and thank you, Speaker. Torchbearers include Canadian icons such as Chris Hadfield, Alex Bilodeau and Simon Whitfield. They're among the over 3,000 torchbearers who will be carrying the torch during the relay. Citizens from all walks of life will get to be part of this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and it's great that so many people will get to participate. And let's not forget that people from around the province will come out to witness this incredible event happening in over 100 communities.

I know that all communities are planning unique cultural and sporting events to celebrate their connection to the games. Can the minister tell the members of this House about how our government is supporting communities in their efforts to celebrate the games?

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** Again, I'd like to thank the member for the question.

I'm happy to tell the members of this House about a great program that I had the opportunity to announce in Milton. Our government has developed the torch relay community grant to support the arrival of the Pan Am/Parapan Am flame in local communities. The torch relay community grant is part of Ontario's \$40-million strategy to ensure everyone in this province has the opportunity to benefit from these games. Funding is being made available to municipalities and band councils undertaking a torch relay community stop or celebration, or communities hosting an official torch relay event.

This is about supporting diversity. It's about supporting inclusion and accessibility and activities that will build on the excitement of these games, as well as ensuring that many Ontarians get to participate in these incredible games that are coming to Ontario.

#### WINTER HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Good morning, Speaker. My question is for the Premier.

On January 2, 2012, 18-year-old Torry McIntyre-Courville phoned her mom to tell her she loved her and that she'd be home. The next day, Torry and three teenage friends were all killed in a horrific crash in Parry Sound.

It appears that the roads were not safe for travel, and it took the Auditor General to tell us why: In 2009, to save \$36 million, winter road maintenance was drastically reduced, but the public was never told.

Ministry officials were not only aware of this—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Deputy House leader—second time.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** —but they complained to senior levels.

Premier, you took over as transport minister in 2010. What did you know about this major reduction—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The deputy House leader is warned.

Finish, please.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** You took over as transport minister in 2010. What did you know about this major reduction in safety, and what did you do about it?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Transportation.

**Hon. Steven Del Duca:** I thank the member from Nipissing for this question. I've had the opportunity to say a number of times here in the Legislature that, as Minister of Transportation, whenever I hear of an injury or a fatality on any of Ontario's highways throughout any season over the course of the year, of course I offer my heartfelt condolences and I feel deep sympathy for the family and friends of those that have been impacted.

**1120**

The auditor did come forward with her report. There were eight recommendations contained in her report. The Ministry of Transportation has accepted all eight of those recommendations. And I gladly accept the responsibility for making sure that, going forward, we continue to improve this program so that it provides the people of every corner of this province with the kind of highway maintenance that they expect and deserve.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Premier, not only were those four teenagers killed, there were 10 deaths within eight days, all kids under the age of 20. In fact, one was eight years old.

You changed the winter maintenance rules and didn't tell anybody about it. You cut back on winter maintenance to save money. You put people's lives at risk, and for five years you and your government said that that never happened. Everyone up north kept saying, "Something is different. Something is not right with our roads." It took the Auditor General to come out and tell us the truth.

I first called for a coroner's inquest in 2012. Premier, will you finally do the right thing and ask the coroner to hold an inquest into these terrible deaths?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Steven Del Duca:** Thanks again, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for the follow-up question.

Before the auditor was asked to go in and conduct her review, back in 2013 the Ministry of Transportation did conduct its own internal review of the winter maintenance program. As a result of that internal review, 105 pieces of additional equipment have been deployed both in southern Ontario and also northern Ontario—specifically in the north for truck climbing and passing lanes. In addition, more inspectors were brought to bear in every region of this province to help us with oversight.

The other aspect of the auditor's report that the member opposite doesn't reference is that she acknowledges that the ministry's moves with respect to improving this program deserve some recognition. In addition to that, it's also important to point out that over the last 13 years, the province of Ontario has consistently ranked first or

second in North America for highway safety, and we will continue to work on this program going forward.

#### PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** My question to the Premier: Can the Premier tell Ontarians whether there will be any review of selling off Hydro One to foreign owners?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** We've been talking about the review of a number of assets. Actually, we've been talking about this review since April 2014, when we brought forward the most progressive budget in Ontario's history, which was denied by the opposition, who didn't even show up for lock-up. In it, we discussed a number of initiatives going forward.

We're talking about broad ownership of Hydro One at this stage, recognizing that it's about giving opportunities for our retail and certain institutions. But it's broadly based in Ontario. We'll further discuss it in the months to come.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** So I guess that's a no. The Premier knows that foreign owners can litigate under NAFTA. They can litigate under the WTO. Independent research from the legislative library confirms that any amount of foreign ownership can open the door to litigation, and legal experts confirm that investors have the right to sue the government if the government gets in the way of maximizing their profits. They specifically say, "The balance between the public interest and the rights of foreign investors would be tipped decidedly in favour of" foreign investors.

Why is the Premier handing away control of a strategic asset like Hydro One to foreign investors?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Hydro One will be one of the biggest companies in Canada. It's going to enable us to have a progressive and growing corporation, housed right here in Ontario, and owned by Ontarians. It's going to enable us to provide an even greater increase in dividends and opportunities for the public, who will be able to have the opportunity to buy into the company.

It is about protecting the public interest as well. We'll continue to do that with the opportunities that will exist, as we do with other major corporations in Canada. We're talking about the first tranche being only 15%. The public and Ontario will still have 85% of the company this year as we proceed forward to assess the dynamics of what will perhaps occur thereafter, all with the intention of protecting the public interest, and more importantly reinvesting the money into infrastructure to earn even greater value for the province and for the people of Ontario.

#### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Mrs. Kathryn McGarry:** My question is to the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change. Recently,

our government announced that Ontario will be working towards a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 37% below 1990 levels by 2030. This ambitious but achievable target keeps our province on track to reach our 2050 target of 80% below 1990 levels.

On April 15, the federal government announced a 2030 greenhouse gas reduction target of 30% below 2005 levels, which is equivalent to only 14% below 1990 levels. This is less than half of Ontario's commitment to fighting climate change. Yesterday, the federal government had some difficulty explaining to a House of Commons committee how much Canada would have to reduce its emissions to reach their 2030 emissions target.

Speaker, through you: Could the minister please tell the House how many megatonnes Ontario will need to reduce its emissions by to reach our 2030 emission targets and how we'll reach that?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** It is challenging right now. All of the weight of greenhouse gas emissions in Canada has fallen on the backs of the provinces to do that. Our coal plant closures, amazing programs in Quebec and British Columbia—provinces have stepped up to actually reduce emissions.

It was disappointing to see that the federal minister couldn't even tell us what the numbers were in their plan—well, they don't have a plan, which is probably why they can't tell us what the numbers are.

Our commitment is consistent with other jurisdictions, which is 37% by 2030. That actually is a 65.5-megatonne reduction, which will be one of the most significant. The introduction of initiatives like our carbon market, working with California and Quebec, are the kinds of hard, practical policies that will actually get us there.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Kathryn McGarry:** Thank you, Minister. I'm really pleased to hear that our government is taking the issue of climate change so seriously and has a firm grasp of the reductions we will have to achieve to reach our important greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Many constituents in my riding of Cambridge, North Dumfries and indeed Waterloo region recognize climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time, and poses a threat to our infrastructure, food supply, drinking water and economic competitiveness. Increasingly, provinces and states have stepped up to provide leadership where national governments have failed to take meaningful action on one of the most important issues of our time. This is especially clear when we see the federal government announcing a 2030 GHG emissions reduction target which amounts to less than half of what Ontario has committed to.

Speaker, through you: Could the minister inform this House on the ways in which Ontario is working with other jurisdictions to take action on climate change?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** You can't just pull numbers out of the air. The reason that we chose 37% is because that's what we're tracking to, Mr. Speaker.

I'm very proud to be part of a government, with Premier Wynne, that's actually continuing to meet our

commitments. We met our 2014 target. Our five-year plan said we'd be at 6% by 2014. We know we've met that and may have actually exceeded that. We're now developing our next five-year plan, for 15% by 2020.

These numbers are important because they have to be sufficient to keep us under two degrees Celsius. I was just signing the under-two MOU with Governor Brown and others—progressive governments.

The problem with the federal target of 14% below 1990 levels is it's less than half of what's necessary to keep us under two degrees. So it's really like putting a band-aid on a heart attack: It simply doesn't do the job. The provinces in Canada want to see the government of Canada there in Paris with targets sufficient to keep us under two.

### ONTARIO DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

**Mr. Michael Harris:** My question is to the Premier. This morning in the media studio, we heard heart-breaking stories detailing life-changing impacts to the small number of Ontarians suffering from PKU, a rare, inherited brain-damaging disorder that can lead to severe intellectual disability without treatment.

1130

Every province began testing for PKU in the 1960s, but the families of the few hundred who suffer across Ontario are asking why this province is denying access to one of the only medications available. Extreme restrictive criteria you've set out has meant that two years after being cleared for managed access, not a single patient has received publicly funded access.

Premier, do you think it is fair that PKU sufferers are forced to come, cap in hand, like so many before them, to plead to your government for medication that will change and often save their lives?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Health and Long-Term Care.

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I greatly appreciate the question from the member opposite. I also appreciate the fact that John Adams and his colleague are here from the association representing those families and individuals who are suffering from PKU, which is an absolutely devastating disease and illness, particularly if it's not detected very early on in life.

That being said, it is a challenging process to determine which drugs to provide public funding for and which not to, and we rely on our clinical experts. We, in fact, have depoliticized the process so that we get the best possible scientific and clinical evidence to determine whether a specific drug is effective or not.

I'm pleased to say that in this interim period, because there is a national process under way to review this drug, through the Exceptional Access Program we do, on a limited basis, provide funding for this drug Kuvan, which is incredibly important in this condition.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Michael Harris:** Premier, people with rare diseases can't wait. Madi Vanstone couldn't wait, the aHUS

sufferers who were here a month ago can't wait as you make feel-good announcements when they're facing you but continue to force them to jump through hoops for access when they leave the building. It's not right, and you know it.

At the end of question period, I will be asking for unanimous consent to introduce a motion to strike a select committee into funding for rare diseases in Ontario and that the House leaders determine composition of that committee before the end of this calendar year.

Premier, will you join me in doing the right thing? Support the creation of a select committee into funding for rare diseases and end the suffering for those forced to plead with you for life-altering medication.

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I'm absolutely certain the member opposite agrees with me that this shouldn't be a process which is politicized. It should be based on the best scientific and clinical evidence possible.

Ontario has asked the national process, the Common Drug Review, to revisit this drug, Kuvan, to actually help us establish the clinical criteria that will allow us to provide it to those individuals who will benefit from it.

I have to say that this drug was reviewed by the Common Drug Review on a national basis. It was not recommended for public funding. Despite that, Ontario and one other jurisdiction—I believe Saskatchewan—went ahead and put it on its Exceptional Access Program.

As I mentioned, we've gone back to the federal process and asked them to review the clinical criteria. In fact, through the conversation I had this morning with the advocates for those suffering from this disease, I will be asking our ministry to review those clinical criteria again.

### LGBT CONVERSION THERAPY

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is for the Premier. Conversion therapy has caused far too much pain for far too many Ontarians. It needs to stop, and it needs to stop now. We can do that by passing Bill 77, but the government seems to be stalling. The government House leader has asked for a number of government bills to pass before he calls Bill 77. Many of those bills have already passed. The remainder are scheduled to pass and, still, the government refuses to pass Bill 77. But every day that the Premier forces Bill 77 to sit in limbo is another day that conversion therapy is practised here in the province of Ontario.

Why won't the Premier stop the political games, do the right thing and call Bill 77 to committee and third reading now?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Minister of Health and Long-Term Care.

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I and this government, this party, fundamentally believe that Ontarians deserve the right to be treated with dignity and respect in support of their human rights and defending those human rights.

The leader of the third party knows this well. In fact, the Premier of this province herself spoke in this Legislature directly in support of the private member's

bill that's coming from the member of Parkdale–High Park. I appreciate—we all appreciate—the work that the member from Parkdale–High Park is doing on this.

It's also important to reference the fact that I have had my ministry working hard on this private member's bill with the member from Parkdale–High Park. She met with them last week to go over the proposed legislation, the bill itself, to make—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Answer?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** —it even stronger so that we can all be proud when it comes to that moment in time when we're able to debate it in the Legislature and pass it, so that conversion therapy is no longer permitted anywhere in this province.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, I'm now even more confused than I was before. Everybody in this Legislature actually supports the bill—

*Interjections.*

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Everybody in this Legislature supports the bill. The Liberals profess over and over again that they think conversion therapy is wrong and it doesn't belong in the province of Ontario.

We have an opportunity in these next few days to get through that third reading process, to get through the committee process and put those amendments forward that the Minister of Health talks about. Let's get it done. Every day that we wait, another young person is in jeopardy of having their life ruined from conversion therapy.

This is a Liberal majority government. They need to take this on. They need to take it seriously. If the health minister supports this and knows that there are things that need to change, we can get this done by June 4. It's their job to make sure it happens.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** The House leader.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** Speaker, it is absolutely shameful and disgraceful for the leader of the third party to put the lives of young LGBT kids in jeopardy, because for the last three weeks, she has been single-handedly obstructing the passage of Bill 77. I have had many conversations with the member from Parkdale–High Park, who shares my view of the obstruction from the leader of the third party.

But not only is she obstructing that bill, she is also obstructing a very good bill from the member from Haldimand–Norfolk, Bill 27, and the member from Ottawa–Orléans, which is Bill 75.

The three House leaders have been working very closely to make sure that we pass very good private members' bills through this Legislature, but the leader of the third party has single-handedly been obstructing the passage of Bill 77. She should be regretful and ashamed about that.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated, please. Start the clock.

New question.

## LA FRANCOPHONIE

**M. Arthur Potts:** Ma question est pour la ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones. Comme vous le savez, l'année 2015 marque un jalon très important dans l'histoire de notre province : le 400<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de présence française en Ontario. Plus que jamais, c'est l'occasion de célébrer l'apport significatif des francophones à l'essor de notre province depuis 1615.

Est-ce que la ministre pourrait nous parler de l'investissement de l'Ontario à Penetanguishene dans le cadre de la commémoration des 400 ans de présence française en Ontario?

**L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Je suis très impressionnée du bon français de mon collègue le député de Beaches–East York.

Notre gouvernement a récemment annoncé un investissement de 1,4 million de dollars afin de réaménager le lieu qui revêt une grande importance pour la francophonie ontarienne et pour l'histoire de l'Ontario, soit le parc de Penetanguishene. En effet, c'est là qu'a eu lieu la rencontre entre Samuel de Champlain et le chef huron-wendat. Quatre cents ans plus tard, nous sommes fiers de participer aux efforts de réaménagement du parc de Penetanguishene.

**1140**

Je remercie le membre de Simcoe-Nord, qui ne m'écoute pas, pour son aide à amener le gouvernement fédéral dans ce projet, pour une contribution égale à la nôtre. Je remercie aussi le maire de Penetanguishene, Gerry Marshall, pour son grand enthousiasme envers ce projet.

**Le Président (L'hon. Dave Levac):** Question supplémentaire?

**M. Arthur Potts:** Merci, madame la Ministre. Vous êtes très gentille et une bonne amie.

J'aimerais remercier la ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones pour sa réponse. On voit bien la fierté, l'énergie et l'enthousiasme que dégage la ministre lorsqu'elle parle de ce projet. Je me réjouis aussi de constater à quel point le gouvernement accorde une importance de premier ordre à la reconnaissance de la contribution des Premières Nations et des francophones, deux communautés qui ont contribué—et qui continuent encore—à façonner la province et le pays dans lesquels nous vivons aujourd'hui.

Ma question est encore pour la ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones : Est-ce que la ministre pourrait nous expliquer comment ce projet à Penetanguishene a vu le jour?

**Une voix:** Bonne question.

**L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Oui, bravo. Merci beaucoup. Très bonne.

Alors, il va sans dire qu'un projet d'envergure comme celui-ci a nécessité une collaboration étroite entre



plusieurs acteurs, et ça, tant aux niveaux municipal et provincial que fédéral. Alors, encore une fois, je remercie le député de Simcoe-Nord pour son implication.

Toutefois, je tiens à préciser que le nouveau parc Rotary Champlain-Wendat est né d'abord et avant tout d'une initiative citoyenne. Du coup, je tiens à saluer haut et fort le leadership déterminé de M<sup>me</sup> Anne Gagné et de son frère David Dupuis, sans qui ce projet n'aurait jamais vu le jour. Grâce à leur dévouement inlassable à la cause francophone, nous laissons aujourd'hui un legs aux gens de Penetang mais aussi aux milliers d'Ontariens, de Canadiens et de touristes étrangers qui pourront se rendre à ce magnifique parc et en apprendre davantage sur l'histoire de l'Ontario français, et ça, pour des générations à venir.

#### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** My question this morning is for the minister responsible for the Pan Am Games. Minister, a freedom-of-information request from your ministry states that over \$5 million was spent on production and advertising for the Pan Am “invade” ad. That was in 2014.

We know that you're now airing a lot more ads. You're producing more ads. You're even putting them on during expensive times like during the Stanley Cup playoff game last night.

We also hear that you've hired a famous director—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Good choice.

Finish, please.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** We've also heard that you've hired a famous director to film people leaping off the CN Tower for a new ad.

I don't want to hear about the flame. I don't want to hear about the medals. I don't want to hear about Pachi. What I do want to know is, how much have you actually spent to produce and air advertisements for TO2015? How much money?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister.

**Hon. Michael Coteau:** It's interesting: On one side of the House, we hear we're not doing enough for advertisement; the other half are saying we're doing too much in advertising.

The one thing I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that there are only days before the torch comes here to Ontario. We have 44 days until we welcome the world to Ontario. And still the Progressive Conservative Party in the province of Ontario are not on board.

In fact, the member opposite would know exactly how much we're spending on advertising if he actually showed up for our technical briefings. We've had five of them so far, and I don't think any member from the Progressive Conservatives showed up. When will the Progressive Conservative Party stand up for the athletes in Ontario, stand up for this province, and join us as we welcome the world here to Ontario?

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Point of order, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I'm waiting for the person beside you to sit down so I can identify you.

The member from Leeds–Grenville on a point of order.

#### VISITORS

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'd like to introduce my Girls Government group that is in the gallery facing and representatives of Girls Inc. of Leeds–Grenville. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Kitchener–Conestoga on a point of order.

**Mr. Michael Harris:** Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice respecting the establishment of a select committee to research funding for rare diseases.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Kitchener–Conestoga is seeking unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice. Do we agree? I heard a no.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I'd like to introduce Equal Voice and thank them for a wonderful breakfast and panel discussion this morning and for sponsoring Girls Government day.

#### DEFERRED VOTES

##### AGRICULTURE INSURANCE ACT (AMENDING THE CROP INSURANCE ACT, 1996), 2015

##### LOI DE 2015 SUR L'ASSURANCE AGRICOLE (MODIFIANT LA LOI DE 1996 SUR L'ASSURANCE-RÉCOLTE)

Deferred vote on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 40, An Act to amend the Crop Insurance Act (Ontario), 1996 and to make consequential amendments to other Acts / Projet de loi 40, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1996 sur l'assurance-récolte (Ontario) et apportant des modifications corrélatives à d'autres lois.

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

*The division bells rang from 1146 to 1151.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Would the members please take their seats?

On May 25, Mr. Leal moved third reading of Bill 40.

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

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura  
Anderson, Granville  
Armstrong, Teresa J.

Gates, Wayne  
Gélinas, France  
Gravelle, Michael

Miller, Paul  
Moridi, Reza  
Munro, Julia

Arnott, Ted	Gretzky, Lisa	Murray, Glen R.
Bailey, Robert	Hardeman, Ernie	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Baker, Yvan	Harris, Michael	Naqvi, Yasir
Balkissoon, Bas	Hatfield, Percy	Natyshak, Taras
Ballard, Chris	Hoggarth, Ann	Nicholls, Rick
Barrett, Toby	Horwath, Andrea	Oraziotti, David
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoskins, Eric	Pettapiece, Randy
Bisson, Gilles	Hudak, Tim	Potts, Arthur
Bradley, James J.	Hunter, Mitzie	Qaadri, Shafiq
Chan, Michael	Jaczek, Helena	Rinaldi, Lou
Chiarelli, Bob	Jones, Sylvia	Sandals, Liz
Clark, Steve	Kiwala, Sophie	Sattler, Peggy
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Scott, Laurie
Coteau, Michael	Lalonde, Marie-France	Sergio, Mario
Crack, Grant	Leal, Jeff	Smith, Todd
Damerla, Dipika	MacCharles, Tracy	Sousa, Charles
Del Duca, Steven	MacLeod, Lisa	Takhar, Harinder S.
Delaney, Bob	Maihi, Harinder	Taylor, Monique
Dhillon, Vic	Martins, Cristina	Thibeault, Glenn
Dickson, Joe	Martow, Gila	Thompson, Lisa M.
DiNovo, Cheri	Matthews, Deborah	Vanthof, John
Dong, Han	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Duguid, Brad	McDonell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Dunlop, Garfield	McGarry, Kathryn	Wilson, Jim
Fife, Catherine	McMahon, Eleanor	Wong, Soo
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMeekin, Ted	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Forster, Cindy	McNaughton, Monte	Yakabuski, John
Fraser, John	Meilleur, Madeleine	Yurek, Jeff
French, Jennifer K.	Milczyn, Peter Z.	Zimmer, David

the group, which include Kathleen; Sylvia and her husband, Peter; David White; and Lyndsey.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** My guests haven't arrived yet, but they are from the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada: Lisa McCoy, president, Ontario and Nunavut division; Abidah Shamji, manager of government relations; Andrea Strath, regional director; Joanne Ticknor, director; Andrea Butcher-Milne, ambassador; Gregory Bourne, ambassador; Stella Rose, ambassador; James Jackson, ambassador; Marni Wolfe, ambassador; and, last but not least, John Duffy, MS ambassador. I welcome them here to Queen's Park today.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

**Mr. Bill Walker:** This is the second time this session that I rise to speak about multiple sclerosis. I do so in recognition of the 100,000 Canadians suffering from MS, for which there is no cure, especially my loved ones and friends directly impacted by this disease. I dedicate this statement to a long-time friend and sister of our MP, Larry Miller—her name is Mary Lou Miller—and to Dianne Hepburn and Kathy Broeckel, all from the great riding of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound.

I also wanted to welcome volunteers from the MS Society of Canada for World MS Day at Queen's Park. This year, the MS society is taking its awareness campaign to the next level by asking all of us to step up to the challenge by joining #TeamFight and to participate in local events.

I look forward to supporting events put on by the Bruce Grey chapter in my riding. In fact, this chapter has recently expanded to include both Bruce and Grey counties in an effort to improve access and service to constituents living with MS in our region.

I commend this group on its tireless advocacy and continued efforts to raise awareness about the suffering of people directly affected by MS and the need for improvements to supports for MS victims, as they are unable to work or can only work occasionally.

I thank all of you for acknowledging and wearing carnations today and I encourage you to get involved in your local MS walk or bike tour and continue to fight to end MS.

I thank all of the volunteers and all the staff people who tirelessly give for the benefit of others.

### MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** In Canada, citizens have a greater risk of developing multiple sclerosis than anywhere else in the world. Today, we, as members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, can recognize the role we play in supporting those affected by MS. We must ensure that the over 35,000 Ontarians living with MS receive quality, coordinated health care and continue

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 96; the nays are 0.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion carried.

*Third reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

There being no further deferred votes, this House stands recessed until 3 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1154 to 1500.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn:** It's my pleasure to introduce to the Legislature Armand Conant, the grandson of the 12th Premier of Ontario, Gordon Conant. Armand Conant is a resident of Etobicoke-Lakeshore.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** I just noticed a good friend of mine, Armand Conant, is in the Legislature. He is the grandson of a former Premier of the province of Ontario. I want to welcome Armand. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mrs. Kathryn McGarry:** I have a few introductions this afternoon. We have some guests coming in—I think they're just being checked in—from the MS Society of Canada. That would be Lisa McCoy, Abidah Shamji, Andrea Strath, Joanne Ticknor, Andrea Butcher-Milne, Gregory Bourne, Stella Rose, James Jackson, Marni Wolfe and John Duffy.

I think some of them are still being checked in, but I wanted to welcome them to Queen's Park.

**Mrs. Gila Martow:** I'm also waiting for a few people who are clearing security. They're here to raise awareness of Ehlers-Danlos syndrome and they include my son Mitch Martow, his friend Jacob Levitt, and members of

to advocate for the hard-working caregivers who help their loved ones get through the daily challenges of life with MS. Above all, we must ensure that those living with MS are supported so that they can live independent and fulfilling lives.

Today I am wearing a carnation to show my solidarity with the MS community and in recognition of World MS Day. I encourage the constituents in my riding to join with me by sharing this message on social media and getting involved in a local MS event such as an MS walk or an MS bike tour. I urge each and every one of us to join this fight to end MS.

#### ASIAN HERITAGE MONTH

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I rise today in celebration of Asian Heritage Month. In 2001, former senator Vivienne Poy brought forward a Senate motion designating May as Asian Heritage Month in Canada. This designation provides an opportunity for us to recognize the long and rich history of Asian Canadians and their social, cultural, economic and political contribution to this province and Canada.

In my riding of Scarborough–Agincourt there are many Asian community leaders who have made their mark in business, culture, industry and sport, like May Yee, a lawyer and founder of the Scarborough Chinese Outreach Committee and recipient of a Leading Women Building Communities Award; Wei Chen Yi, president of the Confederation of Toronto Chinese Canadian Organizations and president of FoodyMart; Hughes Eng, recipient of the Order of Ontario and long-time community activist; and Azelia Liu, a star field hockey athlete and Quest for Gold recipient.

Having the privilege of representing one of the most diverse and multicultural ridings in the greater Toronto area, I know first-hand that diversity strengthens our communities, contributes to our economy and makes Ontario a great place to work and play.

While May is drawing to a close, I encourage everyone to continue to celebrate and recognize Ontario's dynamic Asian community.

#### LIBERATION OF THE NETHERLANDS

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Exciting news: Tomorrow I'm meeting royalty. On top of that, I'm having high tea with the King and Queen of the Netherlands. King Willem-Alexander and Queen Máxima of the Netherlands are going to be in Beamsville, in my riding of Niagara West–Glanbrook. As members know, we've all risen, all three parties, in celebration of the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Netherlands and the major leading role that Canadian soldiers played in freeing that country. The King and Queen are here to help celebrate and mark that occasion.

I always like to say that in my riding of Niagara West–Glanbrook, the second language is actually Dutch. There are over a million people in Canada with Dutch heritage,

but we got most of the quality in Niagara West–Glanbrook. A large number of Dutch immigrants have settled in west Niagara. They've started businesses. They've founded churches. Leaders in civic life, they've built schools and woven a strong fabric in our community. I'm proud of that.

King Willem-Alexander and Queen Máxima are giving out new scholarships at the University of Waterloo to celebrate that relationship. They're going to be meeting with veterans who were actually there, freeing the Netherlands from the Nazis in World War II. And then they're heading to Beamsville, to CosMic greenhouses, an orchid specialist, celebrating the work of Neil van Steekelenburg and his brother Mike. They came here 11 years ago and started a business, making the best orchids, I'd say, in North America. I don't know what I'm more excited about: meeting the King and Queen or celebrating what my constituents are doing with the greenhouse business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I'm not lucky enough to have high tea, but I do get to greet them.

#### MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

**Mrs. Kathryn McGarry:** I'm proud to have been a part of the fight against multiple sclerosis for many years. I've provided care and arranged home services for many patients with MS, in and out of hospitals, in my home community of Cambridge, North Dumfries and Waterloo region in my time as a nurse and a care coordinator at the Waterloo-Wellington CCAC.

Canada has the highest rate of MS in the world and it's our job as public servants to support citizens of this great country when they are faced with such an unpredictable disease. In Ontario, over 35,000 people are living with this disease.

I encourage my fellow members to advocate for income and employment support systems, which will ensure that those affected by MS will get the help as soon as they need it. Quality and coordinated health care is needed by those living with MS so that they and their loved ones can continue to live healthy, independent, fulfilling lives.

Today and throughout MS Awareness Month, I'm wearing a carnation to signal my fight against MS, and I encourage all of you, as well as the constituents in your ridings as well as mine, to join me to show our solidarity.

**1510**  
I want to thank the many great volunteers and staff of the newly formed Grand River chapter of the MS Society of Canada, which supports my community of Cambridge and the Waterloo region. Thank you all for choosing to fight to end MS. I urge each of us to continue demonstrating this fight during World MS Day and beyond.

#### EHLERS-DANLOS SYNDROME

**Mrs. Gila Martow:** I just want to mention that my son Mitch has made it in. He's on the top row in the back with members of the Ehlers-Danlos syndrome support

group of Ontario. There are two women up here as well who join them.

I'm rising today to speak about Ehlers-Danlos syndrome. This is May, which is awareness month for EDS. Ehlers-Danlos syndrome is often misunderstood, under-recognized and difficult to diagnose. It's a connective tissue disorder. I know this because my own son, Mitch, was diagnosed with this condition only two years ago.

Its symptoms can range from extreme joint hypermobility to joint dislocations, impaired mobility, skin fragility, cranial instability, marked dizziness, cardiac irregularity and severe chronic pain. The vascular form of Ehlers-Danlos syndrome places affected people at high risk of death due to spontaneous blood vessel rupture at an early age.

Unfortunately, this disease is relatively unknown among the general public, and only some medical specialists fully recognize the nuances of Ehlers-Danlos syndrome. I hope we are successful in bringing EDS into the spotlight due to the serious, even life-threatening, effects it can have on an individual and their family. It's often misdiagnosed, and many individuals have only received their diagnoses after seeing numerous medical specialists and undertaking many expensive medical tests.

As legislators, we can play a role by raising public awareness, while ensuring adequate funding for medical research, patient care and drug affordability. This statement is intended to provide a first step in the process of identifying best care practices for patients and expediting medical research to find new treatments for Ehlers-Danlos syndrome.

#### NEUROFIBROMATOSIS

**Ms. Ann Hoggarth:** I rise today to help bring awareness to neurofibromatosis. In many communities across Canada, including the city of Barrie, May is recognized as NF month. On May 17, World NF Awareness Day, the CN Tower and Niagara Falls were alight in blue and green, which are the official colours of NF.

NF was once mistakenly thought to be Proteus syndrome, commonly referred to as Elephant Man disease. It is the most common neurological disorder caused by a single gene, occurring in one in every 3,000 children born, and can lead to disfigurement; blindness; skeletal abnormalities such as scoliosis; dermal, brain and spinal tumours; loss of limbs; malignancy; and learning disabilities.

Five-year-old Noah Daly lives in my riding of Barrie, and lives with NF, which caused optic gliomas, autism and a peripheral nerve sheath tumour that is known to disfigure.

Noah's father, John Daly, is the director of the NF Society of Ontario, a volunteer organization and Ontario-based charity that provides support and services for NF families. In addition to providing assistance to individuals and families, they work closely with clinical and research professionals who specialize in the treatment of NF.

Thank you to John and all the dedicated volunteers at NF Ontario for the important work they do every day. This is a very important cause for Noah and the other people stricken with this condition.

#### BEEF FARMERS OF ONTARIO

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I'm sure that some of us might have a hard time staying awake this afternoon, because we all had a fantastic lunch brought to us by the cattlemen. I guess now they're the Beef Farmers of Ontario; I keep thinking of them as cattlemen. It's one of the highlights of the year at Queen's Park—great tenderloin.

I'd like to thank the cattlemen for taking the opportunity. The vice-president of the Beef Farmers of Ontario, Matt Bowman, comes from my riding. I had a meeting with him and his colleagues this afternoon.

Like many farmers, there are a lot of places they'd rather be today rather than talking to politicians. But the people who are on the boards of commodity associations take time away from their own farms and actually make a lot of sacrifices to make sure that people who have the chance to change regulations and make things better—or worse—understand the sector. The cattlemen—the Beef Farmers of Ontario; I'll keep calling them “cattlemen”—have had a tough decade because of BSE and the price has plummeted. Now things are coming back; they're looking a lot better.

They are one of the base components, the cornerstones, of our agriculture sector. I'd like to commend them for the hard work they do and for the good food they provide, not only to us at Queen's Park today but to our province.

#### MEMBER'S GRANDCHILD

**Mr. John Fraser:** I'd just like to say something on a personal note. My father used to say that every baby that is born means new hope for the world. We have a bit of a case of stubborn hope in our family right now. My son, James, and his partner, Lucy—there is an impending birth today. I'm very excited about it, but it's been about four days, which beats my record of three days. That's what I put my mother through.

**Mr. Shafiq Qaadri:** Induce, induce.

**Mr. John Fraser:** They've been inducing.

I just want to say to James and Lucy: Linda and I love you. We're very proud of you. You're going to be great parents. I know that Josef and Alena feel exactly the same way. Your grandparents, Mary, Lorne and Yvonne, are all very proud of you as well.

I'm a bit jealous of all those people who are back in Ottawa—because all my family is back there. You'll be born and I won't be able to be there to welcome you into the world. So I'm going to do it from here. I can only call you “little one” because no one has disclosed the name choices to me—I don't know whether that was deliberate.

I want to say we're very excited that you're coming, and very hopeful. You really are new hope. The world is

really a wonderful place, and I look forward to you growing, learning and being with us.

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Let's jump right into question period.

I thank all members for their statements. It is now time for reports by committees.

## REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

**Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris:** I beg leave to present a report from the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills and move its adoption.

**The Clerk-at-the-Table (Ms. Anne Stokes):** Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Supply Chain Management Association Ontario.

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

*Report adopted.*

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### 1476263 ONTARIO INC. ACT, 2015

Mr. Hudak moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill Pr22, An Act to revive 1476263 Ontario Inc.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Pursuant to standing order 86, this bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills.

### ETHNIC MEDIA WEEK ACT, 2015

#### LOI DE 2015 SUR LA SEMAINE DES MÉDIAS ETHNIQUES

Mr. Smith moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 105, An Act to proclaim Ethnic Media Week / Projet de loi 105, Loi proclamant la Semaine des médias ethniques.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** In light of some recent changes in Ontario's ethnic broadcast industry and media—some ethnic programs have already been cancelled and others are wondering what their future is—we feel it's important to draw attention to the importance of ethnic media in Ontario. And we feel that a bill like this declaring a week in honour of those producers who work in ethnic media

will do just that: draw attention to the work they do and ensure that we pay tribute, remember and honour their language and their culture here in Ontario. I look forward to support from all three parties.

## PROTECTING CONDOMINIUM

### OWNERS ACT, 2015

#### LOI DE 2015 SUR LA PROTECTION DES PROPRIÉTAIRES DE CONDOMINIUMS

Mr. Oraziotti moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 106, An Act to amend the Condominium Act, 1998, to enact the Condominium Management Services Act, 2015 and to amend other Acts with respect to condominiums / Projet de loi 106, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur les condominiums, édictant la Loi de 2015 sur les services de gestion de condominiums et modifiant d'autres lois en ce qui concerne les condominiums.

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

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The minister for a short statement.

**Hon. David Oraziotti:** We're proposing legislation that would greatly increase protections for condominium owners in Ontario, improve how condo corporations are run and ensure that condo boards are well governed. The legislation, if passed, would allow for two new authorities to be created: a condo authority which would train and educate condo directors, provide owners with a single source of reliable information and help prevent common disputes; the second, a licensing authority, would ensure training and licensing for Ontario's condo managers.

Speaker, I'd like to thank and welcome the numerous individuals in the members' gallery for their contribution to the proposed legislation.

## MOTIONS

### HOUSE SITTINGS

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 6(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 12 midnight on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, for the purpose of considering government business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Mr. Naqvi moves that, pursuant to standing order 6(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 12 midnight on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, for the purpose of considering government business.

Do we agree? I heard a no.

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 five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1523 to 1528.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All members please take their seats.

Mr. Naqvi moves that, pursuant to standing order 6(c)(ii), the House shall meet from 6:45 p.m. to 12 midnight on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, for the purpose of considering government business.

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

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gravelle, Michael	Meilleur, Madeleine
Anderson, Granville	Hardeman, Ernie	Milczyn, Peter Z.
Arnott, Ted	Hoggarth, Ann	Moridi, Reza
Baker, Yvan	Hoskins, Eric	Murray, Glen R.
Balkissoon, Bas	Hudak, Tim	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Ballard, Chris	Hunter, Mitzie	Naqvi, Yasir
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Jaczek, Helena	Nicholls, Rick
Bradley, James J.	Jones, Sylvia	Oraziotti, David
Chan, Michael	Kiwala, Sophie	Potts, Arthur
Chiarelli, Bob	Kwinter, Monte	Qaadri, Shafiq
Clark, Steve	Lalonde, Marie-France	Rinaldi, Lou
Colle, Mike	Leal, Jeff	Sandals, Liz
Coteau, Michael	MacCharles, Tracy	Scott, Laurie
Crack, Grant	MacLaren, Jack	Sergio, Mario
Damerla, Dipika	Maihi, Harinder	Sousa, Charles
Del Duca, Steven	Martins, Cristina	Thibeault, Glenn
Delaney, Bob	Martow, Gila	Thompson, Lisa M.
Dickson, Joe	Matthews, Deborah	Vernile, Daiene
Dong, Han	Mauro, Bill	Walker, Bill
Duguid, Brad	McDonell, Jim	Wong, Soo
Fedeli, Victor	McGarry, Kathryn	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMahon, Eleanor	Yurek, Jeff
Fraser, John	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gates, Wayne	Miller, Paul
Bisson, Gilles	Gélinas, France	Natyshak, Taras
French, Jennifer K.	Gretzky, Lisa	Vanthof, John

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 69; the nays are 9.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**Mr. John Fraser:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Point of order.

**Mr. John Fraser:** I correct my correct. In actual fact, Sloane Ainsley Fraser was born at 12:16 today, and so she has arrived. Welcome to the world.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** While it is a point of order to correct one's record, I have to admonish the member for using a BlackBerry to read from.

### PETITIONS

#### PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** I have a petition here from Darlene Kaboni from Garson and her community members.

“Privatizing Hydro One: Another wrong choice.

“Whereas once you privatize hydro, there's no return; and

“We'll lose billions in reliable annual revenues for schools and hospitals; and

“We'll lose our biggest economic asset and control over our energy future; and

“We'll pay higher and higher hydro bills just like what's happened elsewhere;

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

“To stop the sale of Hydro One and make sure Ontario families benefit from owning Hydro One now and for generations to come.”

I couldn't agree with this more. I will sign my name and send it to the Clerks with Kerry.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Grant Crack:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas there is an evident shortage of long-term-care beds in the vicinity of Clarence–Rockland, all existing facilities have long waiting lists.

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

“Demand the establishment of a long-term-care facility within the urban area of the city of Clarence–Rockland.”

I agree with this petition, and I'm happy to put my signature on it and give it to page Jany.

#### ONTARIO DISABILITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the \$100 ODSP Work-Related Benefit provides a critically important source of funds to people with disabilities on ODSP who work, giving them the ability to pay for much-needed, ongoing work-related expenses such as transportation, clothing, food, personal care and hygiene items, and child care; and

“Whereas the Ministry of Community and Social Services plans to eliminate the Work-Related Benefit as part of a restructuring of OW and ODSP employment benefits, and has said that ongoing work-related expenses will not be covered by its new restructured Employment-Related Benefit; and

“Whereas eliminating the Work-Related Benefit will take approximately \$36 million annually out of the pockets of people with disabilities on ODSP who work; and

“Whereas a survey conducted by the ODSP Action Coalition between December 2014 and February 2015 shows that 18% of respondents who currently receive the Work-Related Benefit fear having to quit their jobs as a result of the loss of this important source of funds; 12.5% fear having to reduce the amount of money they spend on

food, or rely on food banks; and 10% fear losing the ability to travel, due to the cost of transportation; and

“Whereas people receiving ODSP already struggle to get by, and incomes on ODSP provide them with little or no ability to cover these costs from regular benefits; and

“Whereas undermining employment among ODSP recipients would run directly counter to the ministry’s goal of increasing employment and the provincial government’s poverty reduction goal of increasing income security;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to stop the provincial government’s plan to eliminate the ODSP Work-Related Benefit.”

This was given to me by the people at Community Living Tillsonburg, and I affix my signature, as I totally agree with this petition.

### OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have these petitions that were collected by Mr. Reid in Sun Valley in my riding, in part of Sudbury. It reads as follows:

“Whereas the NDP MPP for Timiskaming–Cochrane, John Vanthof, has introduced Bill 46 in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario so that” utility task vehicles “would be treated like all-terrain vehicles ... by the Highway Traffic Act; ...

“Whereas this bill will have positive economic impact on clubs, manufacturers, dealers and rental shops and will boost revenues to communities promoting this outdoor activity;”

They “petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“To vote in favour of MPP Vanthof’s Bill 46 to allow UTVs the same access as ATVs in the Highway Traffic Act.”

I fully support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask my good page Maya to bring it to the Clerk.

### WATER FLUORIDATION

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** I have a petition addressed to the Ontario Legislative Assembly. It is coming in by the hundreds. It’s entitled “Fluoridate All Ontario Drinking Water.” It reads as follows:

“Whereas fluoride is a mineral that exists naturally in virtually all water supplies, even the ocean; and

“Whereas scientific studies conducted during the past 70 years have consistently shown that the fluoridation of community water supplies is a safe and effective means of preventing dental decay, and is a public health measure endorsed by more than 90 national and international health organizations; and

“Whereas dental decay is the second-most frequent condition suffered by children, and is one of the leading causes of absences from school; and

“Whereas Health Canada has determined that the optimal concentration of fluoride in municipal drinking water for dental health is 0.7 mg/L, providing optimal

dental health benefits, and well below the maximum acceptable concentrations; and

“Whereas the decision to add fluoride to municipal drinking water is a patchwork of individual choices across Ontario, with municipal councils often vulnerable to the influence of misinformation, and studies of questionable or no scientific merit;

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

“That the ministries of the government of Ontario adopt the number one recommendation made by the Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health in a 2012 report on oral health in Ontario, and amend all applicable legislation and regulations to make the fluoridation of municipal drinking water mandatory in all municipal water systems across the province of Ontario.”

Speaker, I’m pleased to sign and to support this petition and to send it down with page Emma.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas an industrial wind turbine development is to be constructed approximately 3.5 kilometres west of the village of Crysler by EDP Renewables; and

“Whereas the project will” include “25-50 mega wind turbines and this has raised concerns by the citizens of Crysler and surrounding area related to health, safety and property values; and

“Whereas the Green Energy Act allows wind turbine developments to bypass meaningful public input and municipal approval;

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

“That the Ministry of the Environment revise the Green Energy Act to allow full public input and municipal approvals on all industrial wind farm developments, and the Minister of the Environment conduct a thorough scientific study on the health and environmental impacts of industrial wind turbines.”

I have a pile of these that I will be passing off to page Duncan.

1540

### PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Privatizing Hydro One: Another wrong choice.

“Whereas once you privatize hydro, there’s no return; and

“We’ll lose billions in reliable annual revenues for schools and hospitals; and

“We’ll lose our biggest economic asset and control over our energy future; and

“We’ll pay higher and higher hydro bills just like what’s happened elsewhere;

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

“To stop the sale of Hydro One and make sure Ontario families benefit from owning Hydro One now and for generations to come.”

I sign the petition and give it to the page.

### CREDIT UNIONS

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** I have a petition here that’s addressed to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Credit Unions of Ontario support our 1.3 million members across Ontario through loans to small businesses to start up, grow and create jobs, help families to buy homes and assist their communities with charitable investments and volunteering; and

“Whereas Credit Unions of Ontario want a level playing field so they can provide the same service to our members as other financial institutions and promote economic growth without relying on taxpayers’ resources;

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

“Support the strength and growth of credit unions to support the strength and growth of Ontario’s economy and create jobs in three ways:

—maintain current credit union provincial tax rates;

—show confidence in Ontario credit unions by increasing credit union-funded deposit insurance limits to a minimum of \$250,000;

—allow credit unions to diversify by allowing Ontario credit unions to own 100% of subsidiaries.”

I agree with this petition. I’m going to affix my name to it and send it to the table with page Madeleine.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Stormont—oh, sorry, the member from Ajax—Pickering.

### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I have a petition to the Legislature of Ontario:

“Whereas the community of Windsor—Essex county has one of the highest unemployment rates in Canada resulting in stressful lives and financial inadequacies for many of its residents and businesses; and

“Whereas recently the Ford Motor Company was considering Windsor, Ontario, as a potential site for a new global engine that would create 1,000 new jobs (and as many as 7,000 spinoff jobs) for our community; and

“Whereas partnership with government was critical to secure this investment from Ford; and

“Whereas the inability of Ford and the Ontario government to come to an agreement for partnership contributed to the loss of this project;

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

“To insist that the Ontario government exhaust all available opportunities to reopen the discussions around the Ford investment in Windsor and to develop a national auto strategy and review current policy meant to attract investment in the auto sector.”

I shall affix my signature to it and pass it to Sheila.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I did an injustice to the member from Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry. He’s up.

### HYDRO RATES

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Thank you, Speaker.

I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Green Energy Act has driven up the cost of electricity in Ontario due to unrealistic subsidies for certain energy sources, including the world’s highest subsidies for solar power; and

“Whereas this cost is passed on to ratepayers through the global adjustment, which can account for almost half of a ratepayer’s hydro bill; and

“Whereas the high cost of energy is severely impacting the quality of life of Ontario’s residents, especially fixed-income seniors; and

“Whereas it is imperative to remedy Liberal mismanagement in the energy sector by implementing immediate reforms detailed in the Ontario PC white paper Paths to Prosperity—Affordable Energy;

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

“To immediately repeal the Green Energy Act, 2009, and all other statutes that artificially inflate the cost of electricity with the aim of bringing down electricity rates and abolishing expensive surcharges such as the global adjustment and debt retirement charges.”

I agree with this and will be passing it off to page Kerry.

### PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC ASSETS

**Mr. Wayne Gates:** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Privatizing Hydro One: Another wrong choice.

“Whereas once you privatize hydro, there’s no return; and

“We’ll lose billions in reliable annual revenues for schools and hospitals; and

“We’ll lose our biggest economic asset and control over our energy future; and

“We’ll pay higher and higher hydro bills just like what’s happened elsewhere;

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

“To stop the sale of Hydro One and make sure Ontario families” and seniors “benefit from owning Hydro One now and for generations to come.”

I sign my name to it and give it to Brady.

### SOINS DE LONGUE DURÉE

**M. Grant Crack:** J’ai une pétition adressée à l’Assemblée législative de l’Ontario.

« Attendu qu’il y a un manque criant de lits de soins de longue durée dans la cité de Clarence-Rockland et environs, les listes d’attente sont très longues.



« Nous, soussignés, adressons à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario la pétition suivante :

« Exigeons la mise en place d'un centre de soins de longue durée à l'intérieur de l'aire urbaine de la cité de Clarence-Rockland. »

J'appuie cette pétition. J'y ai mis mon nom, Grant, et je vais donner la pétition à Emma.

#### LANDFILL

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas many of the resources of this planet are finite and are necessary to sustain both life and quality of life for future generations;

“Whereas the disposal of resources in landfills creates environmental hazards which have significant human and financial costs;

“Whereas all levels of government are elected to guarantee their constituents' physical, financial, emotional and mental well-being;

“Whereas the health risks to the community and watershed increase in direct relationship to the proximity of any landfill site;

“Whereas the placement of a landfill in a limestone quarry has been shown to be detrimental;

“Whereas the placement of a landfill in the headwaters of multiple highly vulnerable aquifers is detrimental;

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

“To implement a moratorium in Oxford county, Ontario, on any future landfill construction or approval until such time as a full and comprehensive review of alternatives has been completed which would examine best practices in other jurisdictions around the world;

“That this review of alternatives would give particular emphasis to (a) practices which involve the total recycling or composting of all products currently destined for landfill sites in Ontario and (b) the production of goods which can be practically and efficiently recycled or reused so as to not require disposal.”

I thank you very much for the opportunity to present this petition. I affix my signature as I agree with the petition.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

ONTARIO SOCIETY  
FOR THE PREVENTION  
OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS  
AMENDMENT ACT, 2015  
LOI DE 2015 MODIFIANT  
LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ  
DE PROTECTION DES ANIMAUX  
DE L'ONTARIO

Mr. Naqvi moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 80, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and the Animals for Research Act with respect to the possession and breeding of orcas and administrative requirements for animal care / Projet de loi 80, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario et la Loi sur les animaux destinés à la recherche en ce qui concerne la possession et l'élevage d'épaulards ainsi que les exigences administratives relatives aux soins dispensés aux animaux.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Mr. Naqvi.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me to speak on this very important bill. It's my honour to begin third and final reading on Bill 80. I will be sharing my time with my parliamentary assistant, the member from Scarborough—Rouge River.

If passed, this legislation will prohibit the breeding and acquisition of orca whales in Ontario. It will allow for the establishment of additional standards that require management, oversight practices, professional services, and the collecting and disclosing of information intended to ensure the appropriate level of care of animals, including marine mammals.

The proposed amendments to the OSPCA Act will also enable the requirement for zoos and aquariums to have animal welfare committees on location. These animal welfare committees are consistent with the recommendations of the UBC report and best practices in research facilities that care for marine mammals.

#### 1550

Speaker, at this time, I would also like to thank my parliamentary assistant, the member from Scarborough—Rouge River, for his valuable contributions to Bill 80. He worked extremely hard on the bill, and I thank him for guiding the bill through the Standing Committee on Social Policy.

I also want to thank all the members of the Standing Committee on Social Policy for their contributions. I know the member from Niagara West—Glanbrook, who will speak later, also was quite actively and passionately involved in this file, and we had some good conversations. I want to thank him, and all members, for that.

I also want to thank the hard-working ministerial staff at the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, who have done a lot of work, not just on this bill, when Bill 80 was brought forward, but for some years. That work goes back to when the Attorney General, the member from Ottawa—Vanier—who was the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services—almost three years ago, started the process of retaining the expertise of Dr. Rosen from the University of British Columbia, to procure an expert report that could help guide us as to how best to treat marine mammals. So this work has been ongoing. I want to thank the Attorney General for her contributions and, of course, the staff at the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services for their hard work.

In Bill 80, the government has taken a considered and balanced path that recognizes the characteristics of the

orca and the need to strengthen protections and oversight for all marine mammals. The member from Scarborough–Rouge River, in his time, will set out the objectives of Bill 80. Before he does so, I would like to add some thoughts of my own on this important day and debate.

I'm proud to be on the right side of history, and I would like to thank Ontarians for their support in helping our government to move this proposed legislation forward. If Bill 80 is passed today, Ontario will be the first jurisdiction in Canada, and one of a growing number around the world, to prohibit the breeding and acquisition of orcas. This summer, Ontario will also be the first province in Canada to set specific standards of care for marine mammals.

Speaker, our government has carefully considered the impact of these proposed changes. We considered the characteristics of orcas and determined that they should not be kept in captivity. That is why we are prohibiting the breeding and acquisition of orcas in Ontario, if Bill 80 is passed.

We are establishing a statutory framework so that animal care committees and other administrative measures can be required, and so that marine mammals remaining in captivity receive expert care, to ensure that they receive the best possible quality of care.

Before I pass the floor to the member from Scarborough–Rouge River, I want to say in conclusion that our government is committed to making sure that marine mammals and all animals in Ontario are protected and receive the best possible treatment and care. Prohibiting the future possession and breeding of orcas, and moving forward on standards of care that will be among the best in the world, is something that Ontarians expect and that these animals deserve.

Thank you, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Before I go to the member from Rouge River—normally, we rotate in this situation. If it's okay with the House, I'll let the member from Rouge River go, unless you wanted—

**Interjection:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Okay. Go ahead.

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** Thank you, Speaker. Thank you very much for that.

I'm happy to follow the minister on this particular bill. If I could say, public attitudes about the care and treatment of marine mammals in captivity are shifting as we come to better understand the science surrounding this issue. Our government is proud to be at the forefront of this change. I hope that this House will join us in supporting Bill 80 and passing this important piece of animal welfare legislation.

I would like to take this opportunity to touch on some of the highlights of Bill 80.

First and foremost, if this bill is passed, any facility that possesses an orca on or after March 23, 2015, when Bill 80 was first introduced, will be responsible for the removal of that animal within six months of royal assent of Bill 80. Failure to do so could result in penalties

and/or imprisonment of up to \$60,000 and up to two years upon conviction, and up to \$250,000 and two years upon failure to comply with a court order.

Kiska, the only orca currently in Ontario, will be allowed to remain at her home in Marineland in Niagara Falls. This bill does not require her to be relocated to another facility.

Speaker, the strength of any bill lies in the power to enforce. Ontario has the strongest animal protection legislation in Canada. New investment by our government has enabled the OSPCA and its affiliates to strengthen enforcement by:

- improving coverage to underserved areas of the province, such as rural and northern Ontario;

- creating a major case management team that is responsible for coordinating investigations that require specialized expertise;

- introducing a 24/7 centralized dispatch service, to ensure timely responses to complaints of animal abuse and neglect across the province; and

- establishing regular inspections of all zoos and aquariums, and developing a registry of those facilities to support the inspection process.

I am pleased to report that every zoo and aquarium in Ontario is inspected at least twice annually since our support for this program began.

If passed, Bill 80 will grant the OSPCA the authority to demand that facilities provide records and other information respecting compliance with prescribed standards of care or administrative requirements, within a specified time frame. This would help to ensure that prescribed standards are being met.

The bill also proposes to clarify that OSPCA authority to inspect a facility includes all places where animals are kept, if they are being kept for the purposes of exhibition, entertainment, boarding, hire or sale. This includes places where animals are kept in the off-season.

Bill 80, if passed, would expand existing regulation-making authority. It would allow for the establishment of additional standards that could include requiring management oversight practices, professional services, and the collecting and disclosing of information intended to ensure appropriate levels of care of any animal, including marine mammals.

The proposed legislation would pave the way for animal welfare committees to be established at non-research zoos, aquariums and other facilities that keep animals. These committees would provide the necessary oversight to help ensure the long-term well-being of animals in each facility's care.

For marine mammals, this oversight could include producing a written animal management plan, and producing a written veterinary care program, which could include an annual physical examination for each marine mammal. In addition, animal welfare committees could assist in addressing appropriate human interaction with marine mammals at an exhibition park.

Related amendments to the Animals for Research Act ensure that facilities governed by that act are subject to the same prohibitions of orcas as zoos and aquariums.

The people of Ontario demand the highest standards of care and enforcement for all animals, regardless of their habitat. Public confidence in the well-being of marine mammals is a critical issue for our government. Bill 80, if passed, gives the public assurances that Ontario is taking the necessary steps to ensure the best possible care and well-being of marine mammals in captivity.

We would be ensuring that no new orcas come into the province. We would be setting tough new penalties for individuals or entities that might try to violate this prohibition. We would be strengthening the protection of animals in captivity by supporting the inspection and enforcement authority of the OSPCA.

**1600**

Bill 80, if passed, would complete our government's three-point plan introduced in 2012 to ensure Ontario continues to have the strongest animal protection legislation in Canada. It would build on the work we started in 2009 with the first major overhaul of the OSPCA Act in 90 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his work in bringing this bill forward, members of the committee and all those who came to speak before the committee. I urge all of my colleagues in the Legislature to support this important piece of legislation as we take the next step in ensuring the protection of marine mammals in our province, because that is what Ontarians expect and these animals deserve.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I am pleased to rise on third reading of Bill 80. I appreciate the kind comments from the minister. I enjoyed working with the parliamentary assistant. I will say too I do hope we'll get a chance to work together on the regulations that move forward because they're going to be important to the future of the facility and the animal welfare of the creatures that do exist at Marineland.

There are three points I want to make—and my colleagues want to speak to the bill. Job number one, the goals of the PC caucus, at the top of the list was to make sure Ontario has the highest level of standards for animal welfare at facilities like Marineland—basically make sure we have a made-in-Ontario solution using the most modern, scientific evidence to have world-class standards in animal welfare. That was job number one.

Job number two was to avoid closure of the facility. I'll talk a bit more about the other case. Some feel that these facilities should be closed down. I do not, and I'm going to talk about the reasons why, including the economic benefit of having Marineland in my home area of Niagara and in the riding of my colleague from Niagara Falls.

Third was the importance of the humane amendment to allow the last remaining orca, Kiska, to have a companion as opposed to what effectively in Bill 80 is a life sentence of isolation. I think that was wrong.

Let me get into these issues one at a time, Speaker. We could have taken an ideological approach to this

legislation but instead we chose—what I think is a sensible, a very balanced, pragmatic approach to ensure two things: We'd have world-class standards when it comes to animal welfare, and that we continue to have the jobs and investment that come from an active marine mammal park in Niagara Falls at Marineland.

I know some would argue ideologically that the park should be able to do what it wants, that this is park property and the market would decide proper standards for animal care; the market would decide if standards are adequate or not important at all. We don't subscribe to that ideological approach; in fact, I think my colleague would agree. We didn't hear that from anybody at the committee either. It's a point of view we disagree with.

There is, on the other side of the coin, an ideological approach that says that animals of any kind should not be held in captivity. I know that there are Ontarians who subscribe to that view, Speaker. It's their right to do so. I think that they are well-meaning and passionate, and they care deeply about animals and their welfare. They've come to the conclusion that facilities such as Marineland, the Metro zoo, the High Park Zoo should all be shut down. We also disagree with that point of view. We believe that institutions like Marineland play an important role not only in the jobs they create, but in allowing scientific study of animals, the educational opportunities, and I'll discuss that more later.

So we did not choose either of the ideological routes. We chose a very pragmatic, practical path based on the highest level of animal welfare standards. In fact, the government hired a renowned, respected expert in Dr. Rosen from the University of British Columbia. We commend that appointment. We agree with Dr. Rosen, as a highly qualified individual, to lead a review of those standards, and he produced a report to the government. In his report Dr. Rosen recommended the creation of—the adaptation was called the CCAC standards, the Canadian Council on Animal Care standards—a Canadian standard based on the latest available information and scientific research for animal welfare when it comes to creatures like cetaceans—dolphins, orcas, beluga whales and other mammals.

The government did, in its regulatory approach, adopt the vast majority of those recommendations, except for one, and I'll get to that later on, which I think was an unfortunate omission by the government that will sentence the orca Kiska to a lifetime of isolation.

We thought this important, because we thought, "What does the average Ontarian think? What do we think?" And that is, if you're going to have animals in captivity of any kind, you want to make sure you have the best standards in the world. I think that's what Ontarians would demand. Then they'd have confidence that in the facility the animals are treated well, and they could enjoy the entertainment and educational aspects of Marineland—and, from that, the jobs. We thought the best approach in this bill was a sensible, balanced approach based on science—high standards, first and foremost. So we looked to the best science; we looked to expert opinion.

Look, people who object to zoos can always choose not to attend. They don't go; they don't take their children. They can choose not to attend. But there are a million people in the summer who do, including me, my family, our neighbours. I take my daughter to Marineland, and hopefully I will get a chance to bring Maitland this year, along with Miller, to Marineland. There are a million visitors a year.

Here's something very important, too, that we shouldn't lose sight of, for those who want to close the park down altogether for ideological reasons: They also include programs for kids with disabilities. Autism Ontario runs an important program through Marineland. Make-A-Wish has enabled 3,500 special-needs kids to achieve their dream—kids obviously in extraordinarily difficult circumstances and the families who want to go to Marineland; 3,500 have done so through Make-A-Wish.

Some may disagree, but I also believe in my heart and my mind that if you see these majestic creatures up close, you get a greater appreciation for their life, a greater appreciation for the science, the nature of these mammals. I think there's an important educational aspect to this that inspires a love for dolphins, orcas or seals etc. by seeing them up close and personal. I just don't believe you get the same experience by watching it on TV or through the Internet. I know some people believe that; I don't.

Let's explore that. If you went down that ideological path and you said, "We should close this down because we don't believe marine mammals should be kept in captivity"—I know some people said that at the committee. They were honest and heartfelt. What would be the impact? Well, 700 people would lose their jobs, with indirect jobs in the thousands as well. Visitor spending as a result of Marineland in Niagara is about \$152 million a year, and is the single biggest marketer of any institution, any facility, any government in the peninsula, at \$4.5 million a year.

So I understand the ideological approach of closing it down. I disagree with it. We can't lose sight of the economic impacts. I think a better path is to have the highest standards possible and allow the park to operate. People will have confidence in it and it will continue to flourish, hire people and invest in the community.

We brought forward amendments as part of this process to do just that, to make sure that the CCAC standards were the ones that are adopted by the government. We brought forward practical, science-based amendments to say that if the SPCA inspectors are going to go there to evaluate if an animal's in distress, they should be trained in marine mammal biology, with some kind of certification process. I want to know that they know the difference between a dolphin and a dog, not just by looking at them or the spelling but by how their biology works.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Dolphin and duck: One flies and the other one's in the water.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I think they would have to go a little bit further than that, though, if they were evaluating

whether they were in distress and how they could be treated.

Sadly, these recommendations were voted down by the government. I think our approach is wise. The amendments would have made it a bill that we could have confidence in, that would strengthen standards. They voted them down, every one of them.

Here's another thing I'm worried about. We heard at the committee from some groups that wanted to adopt what's called the UK standards. The UK standards are from 1986, when maybe you were playing with your new Nintendo, with the Walkman, perhaps, around your ears. That wasn't the Speaker's type. But my point is, things have changed a lot since 1986. Scientific knowledge has improved vastly. The level of treatment of animals like at Marineland has gone much, much higher.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I was a student at the University of Western Ontario, saying, "I kind of like that Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and Brian Mulroney." You're right about that. Some things don't change so much; other things do.

**1610**

But, Speaker, seriously, there are 343 facilities with marine mammals in 63 different countries. Not one facility—not one single facility—uses that UK model. It's called the UK model because they actually implemented it in the United Kingdom, and guess what? Every existing facility closed down because the standards could not be complied with if you still wanted to actually keep the facility open and keep the lights on.

To their credit, those who are ideologically opposed to marine mammals or others in captivity are very clear. Dr. Rosen was one who spoke to this. He said, "In the case of the UK standards, they in fact did not close"—sorry: "They in fact did close down all the facilities in the UK"—let me read that cleanly. Dr. Rosen said, "In the case of the UK standards, they in fact did close down all the facilities in the UK, because they decided it wasn't worth operating under those standards, and their profit margins shrank to the point where they didn't think it was worth operating." So they all closed down.

Marineland says, "The only use of the UK model in the proposed standards is in relation to facility pool size." All other standards are CCAC standards. So if you want the park to stay open, you have to reject the UK model—which, by the way, is not active anywhere, because it closes the place down.

Dr. Rosen wrote us a letter. He couldn't appear at the committee. Dr. Rosen said that instead of adopting the UK standards, "It is my opinion that what is required is a set of standards of care based upon verifiable best practices, informed by quantitative data produced and analyzed in a scientific manner. Fortunately, such a 'natural experiment' already exists within the variety of facilities and marine mammal species currently held in aquariums within North America." He said, "This would provide the basis of a study of existing pool sizes and physical parameters measured against impartial criteria

of animal health and well-being. Such an objective approach, initiated and supported by the government of Ontario, would place the province in the forefront of animal welfare practices and serve as a model for other jurisdictions.” Sounds pretty good—the government’s own expert.

Mr. Nicholls, the member from Chatham–Kent–Essex, brought forth an amendment to do just so. Sadly, the government voted it down. They say that the UK standards are still on the table. I think that would be a mistake. By leaving it on the table, you undermine the investment in the community. You leave open the question: When they bring in the regulations, are they going to, by stealth, close the park down?

I do call upon the parliamentary assistant and the minister to reject the UK model, unless you want to close it down. Don’t leave that question open—instead, a made-in-Ontario solution, as Dr. Rosen recommends, based on the latest scientific evidence and world-class standards, so we know that marine mammals at Marineland are treated the best anywhere in the world. Why won’t we take this opportunity to do so? That’s what we wanted, Speaker. Sadly, we didn’t get it.

My last point—I know my colleagues want to speak to this—the third point: We brought forward an amendment to allow the minister, at his discretion or her discretion, under prescribed circumstances to allow Kiska, the last remaining orca, to have a companion. It is not easy being alone. This government’s bill is a life sentence of isolation for that animal. We think that’s wrong.

The first big-kid movie I took my daughter, Miller, to wasn’t a cartoon; it was *Dolphin Tale 2*. A similar story: a dolphin in captivity in, I think, Florida, and they brought in another dolphin to keep her company, to make sure that her mental state was good. Why wouldn’t we leave the door open at the minister’s discretion to allow for a companion orca so Kiska does not spend the rest of her life isolated?

Some say, “Move her out.” We heard evidence from the scientific community that that’s not possible, given her age and state of health. The only other option is to allow a companion. I worry that the government, in this bill, without that amendment, could actually legislate criminal activity by forcing cruelty to animals by a permanent life sentence of isolation. I don’t think that’s your intent. I say to the parliamentary assistant and the minister: I don’t think that’s what you want to do.

It’s too bad they voted it down. Our position was clear: world-class standards based on the best available science, a made-in-Ontario solution based on the CCAC work that was already done; number two, a humane amendment to allow Kiska the killer whale, under prescribed circumstances, to have a companion and avoid a lifetime of isolation; and third and finally, Speaker, to reject a back-door attempt to close the park down with the UK model, outdated from 1986.

They’re closing them down in the United Kingdom. I don’t want to see that. I want to see the best standards. I want to see people, including autistic children and those

from Make-A-Wish Foundation, enjoy a place like Marineland—the educational value—and to ensure that we have world-class standards right here in the province of Ontario. That was our point of view, Speaker. I’m sorry it wasn’t theirs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** It is always my honour to rise in this House and speak about issues that matter to the people of Ontario. Today, I rise to speak on Bill 80, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act.

When I rose to first speak to this bill, it was my first time speaking on an issue that falls under my newer critic portfolio, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, and I am glad to again speak to this bill. The origins of this bill predate my time at Queen’s Park, which shows you how long the changes have been needed. Regardless, I appreciate that changes are being made now.

The intention of this bill is to strengthen the existing protections for marine mammals in Ontario’s marine parks and aquariums, as well as to provide new regulations for how large marine mammals can be observed or utilized for research. As members of provincial Parliament, we attempt to become educated on the various topics that we discuss in this chamber. But regardless of how extensive our research is, we are not the experts. Rather, we are representatives of the experts, and so I will bring some of the thoughts and submissions presented during committee.

Committee was interesting, but I will come to that. Let’s look at the bill. The first few schedules of the bill deal with establishing new limitations around the selling, acquisition or breeding of orcas for captivity in Ontario; namely, the prohibition of all three. However, there are some exceptions that are also established within the bill. In section 3, subsection (1) states, “No person shall possess or breed an orca in Ontario.” In subsection (2), however, there is a caveat established that, “Despite subsection (1), a person may continue to possess an orca in Ontario if the person possessed the orca in Ontario on March 22, 2015,” or the day before this bill was introduced for first reading. The reason for this exception is Ontario’s single orca in captivity, Kiska, who currently lives at Marineland.

Let me tell you a little bit about what I have learned about orcas. They are the largest whale kept in captivity. They travel the furthest and the fastest, and are uniquely unsuited to captivity. This is because there are unique challenges when it comes to keeping whales or dolphins, the biggest of which is attempting to replicate their natural environment. Orcas and other types of whales are also uniquely susceptible to stress, which can be amplified by a constrained environment.

It has been reported that the average life expectancy of an orca in captivity is roughly 40 years, which is how old Kiska is, incidentally. However, life expectancy in the wild—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Your own member is speaking, and you guys are all talking. It would be nice if you'd give her some leniency. Thanks.

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Life expectancy in the wild is significantly longer. This is something that I raised during committee. There were different researchers, vets and experts who weighed in on life expectancy, and I didn't come away from the hearings with a definite number or age. What we do know is that Kiska's well-being needs to be taken into account by the government, and they need to consult with the experts to ensure that this is reflected in their actions.

Kiska has delighted families across Ontario for more than a generation. She has helped to put Marineland on the map. She is the face on T-shirts across the province. Arguably, she is the inspiration for this bill. We have learned a lot from Kiska. We have learned a lot from studies of cetaceans and large mammals in captivity, and that is why the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act has targeted its impact at orcas in captivity.

During committee, we heard from experts, passionate voices and business interests. It was a very emotional committee, and coming from a family of animal lovers, I understand and appreciate the importance of speaking up for animals. There were conflicting opinions, competing information and decidedly divergent recommendations. I appreciated the hearings and the process, but they did not clarify many things. Quite frankly, I can't imagine how the government can be so firm on some of their decisions without spending more time really consulting and researching.

**1620**

Some of the comments and recommendations that were presented in committee were to prohibit the importation into Ontario of all new wild-caught cetaceans because they, like orcas, have complex needs that can't be met in captivity. All of the submissions agreed on the importance of Kiska's best interests.

I'll be frank: We heard compelling stories and arguments on Kiska's behalf, and we know that this government felt compelled to create this bill when, honestly, there are so many other animal welfare issues across the province. They could have easily chosen a broader issue but they chose this situation. They chose Kiska as their focus. It was clear that the government had touched base with many groups but did not consult at length with them. We heard that, time and time again.

I don't know what is best for Kiska. I have not even met Kiska. I'm not an expert. But those who work with her, those who visit and love her, those who advocate for her and those who care about her ought to be consulted and a strategy should be designed. There really ought to be a long-term-care plan for Kiska, and the government needs to be a part of it.

I would like to read a section of a letter from Lynn Kavanagh, campaign manager from World Animal Protection Canada: "We applaud the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services in putting forward Bill

80 to prohibit the keeping of orcas and for establishing standards of care for marine mammals in captivity in Ontario. Decades of research have shown us that orcas don't belong in captivity. As Minister Naqvi has said, for far-ranging, fast-moving and deep-diving predators, captive environments cannot even come close to meeting their needs.

"Like orcas, other small cetaceans, such as belugas and dolphins, also have vast home ranges and, like orcas, are highly intelligent, extraordinarily social and behaviourally complex. These qualities and their corresponding needs mean these animals become stressed and suffer in captivity.

"Thus, World Animal Protection joins Zoocheck and the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies in the opinion that Bill 80 does not go far enough in its protection of marine mammals. We ask that the importation of wild-caught individuals of other cetacean species also be prohibited."

Certainly, the focus of Bill 80, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act, has targeted its impact to orcas in captivity, but the reach of the bill is far broader than that. Under this bill, the minister's regulation-making authority would also be expanded to include prescribing administrative requirements related to the keeping of animals, including the establishment of animal welfare committees, animal care plans, veterinary care programs and mandated record-keeping and disclosure, as well as regulating human activity around the care of the animal—not just what physically touches the animal.

The legislation would also amend the Animals for Research Act, which would allow the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the OSCPA, greater oversight over the condition of large marine mammals that are used in research. This includes providing inspectors the power to look at enclosures that the animal is not currently in but enclosures that the animal might be transported to or housed in regularly to ensure that anywhere an animal might spend time is up to the standard.

The amended act would also provide for the setting of regulations around the keeping of, care and use of other marine mammals such as walrus and dolphins. Regulations surrounding enclosure sizes, limits to sound exposure to animals etc. would all be strengthened.

As I mentioned before, I am not an expert. I might at one point have been a budding biologist—it feels like in another life—but the closest that I have been to a real whale was actually in Gaspé on a boat as a child. I have been fortunate enough to swim with dolphins once on a vacation, and I might actually be the only person to be bitten by a dolphin—true story. I might also, in fairness, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** You got bitten by a dolphin?

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** I might have been bitten by a dolphin and I might, in fairness, have deserved it—totally deserved it—as I was pretending that my finger was a sardine. Anyway, those are the choices we make as 12-year-olds.

But I digress, Mr. Speaker. My point is, I'm not an expert, so I appreciate hearing from experts and people who can counsel the government and the research team when it comes to design and specifics.

In 2012, the government first announced its intention to address issues of animal welfare in Ontario. As we all know, this government doesn't exactly move too quickly with things—oh, wait, unless it's the sell-off of Hydro One in the budget. But anyway, it wasn't until 2013 that a panel was commissioned on the care and maintenance of marine mammals. The report of the expert panel was finally received the year following, in June 2014, and they reaffirmed the position of animal rights activists across the province that the current standards were, indeed, insufficient.

The report that the expert panel tabled, known as *Developing Standards of Care for Marine Mammals in Captivity and Recommendations Regarding How Best to Ensure the Most Humane Treatment of Captive Cetaceans*—or, for short, the UBC report—outlined expensive recommendations. There are 124 pages in total for the government to adopt. As additional background, a cetacean is “a mammal (such as a whale, dolphin, or porpoise) that lives in the ocean.” They are complex creatures with complex social interactions.

But back to the report: Some of the recommendations included requiring facilities that hold marine mammals to meet their physical and psychological environmental needs, requiring that facilities ensure that marine mammals are not harmed in their contact with the general public, and requiring that facilities must demonstrate commitment to the long-term care and well-being of marine mammals.

Speaker, to provide an overview of the issues that the expert panel was evaluating, I will read from the summary of the report: “There are several aspects specific to the aquarium environment that can potentially cause stress in captive cetaceans, although none are unique to this group, and most can be mitigated through proper husbandry and habitat design. The most critical issues identified are the need for adequate pool space and design, appropriate social groups, and environmental enrichment. Additional concerns relate to suitable light and sound exposure in the habitat.

“The relative survival rates of captive cetaceans in comparison to their wild counterparts seem to vary by species. However, there is an overall trend for wild-caught individuals to suffer higher rates of mortality during the capture process and upon the initial acclimation period in the facility....

“Studies have demonstrated that cetaceans show physiological responses to stress that are typical of other mammals, although the nature of the stress response varies considerably by species. Studies show that transport, arrival at a new facility, and the introduction of new ‘pool mates’ can cause acute stress in several species. Unfortunately, obtaining samples to monitor the health status of individual captive cetaceans can also lead to stress responses, although adequate training can reduce

these negative effects. Behavioural observations can be used as an alternate, inexpensive means to assess some aspects of animal well-being.”

These are fairly straightforward asks—common sense, one might even say. And regardless of the technical nature of the issue, we can all understand the need for increased regulations surrounding enclosures, interactions, etc. So we are pleased that these broad concepts are reflected in this bill, disappointed that it has taken so long to get here, and hope that the government will continue to consult more broadly to more effectively protect all animals in our province.

As I mentioned earlier, the biggest challenge when it comes to housing whales or dolphins is the challenge of trying to replicate their natural environment. It is different when we talk about terrestrial animals. We can expand as far as we have the land.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I've got one individual blocking my view of the speaker. I've got four ministers having a group session talk. I've got five other groups talking. Even the third party is talking while their member is talking. It's pretty hard for the Speaker to hear anything, so I'd appreciate it that if you want to have group talks, go outside. Thank you.

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned, the biggest challenge is trying to replicate their natural environment. To create a pool with enough space and depth for a whale—these are the finite constraints of a marine environment. Some of the primary issues that were raised during committee were around the specific proposed use of the UK standard relative to tank size and design. During committee there were significant concerns regarding these standards being adopted.

It's just so quiet after last night's midnight sitting that I—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** We can change that if you want.

**Ms. Jennifer K. French:** —can hear myself think today. It's such a shock, but I'll continue. And I appreciate people's enthusiasm for orcas and today's discussion.

**1630**

I would like to read part of a letter that my office received after the Bill 80 hearings from Mr. Bruce Dougan on behalf of CAZA. He said:

“I find the approach to the development of this bill to be rushed and improperly researched. The development of standards and guidelines for animals in captivity is a very complex one, with a need for specific criteria developed for a very unique Canadian set of challenges. The other nine provinces have addressed the issue of exotic animals in captivity and many are currently looking to enhance their legislation in this area and are waiting for the New Brunswick task force recommendations to be released prior to moving forward. Ontario is the only province that has done nothing provincially in this area, leaving this issue to the municipalities to

address. Currently there are 70 zoos in Ontario, with only 11 of these facilities having achieved accreditation.”

He continues: “I applaud the province for taking the initiative to develop standards for animal care; however, if the province is determined to go through with the guidelines and standards and a ban on orcas (and I believe that they will) then why not use a very thorough set of modern standards developed over the last 10 years here in Canada by the CCAC, not a set of standards developed 30 years ago by the United Kingdom that nobody in the world uses because they are unobtainable.”

I will continue with Mr. Bruce Dougan’s words: “As I mentioned to you, I have chaired a task force here in New Brunswick that is mandated to identify gaps and weaknesses in the current legislation, regulations and policies that led to the tragic deaths of two boys in 2013. There was very adequate legislation already in place, but our task took some nine months, comprised of weekly 78-hour meetings to reach a consensus on the recommendations, and this report has not yet been finalized and submitted. That is to say that the issue of a made-in-Ontario set of standards and guidelines will require the proper expertise, time and attention that it desperately deserves, and should not be fast-tracked.”

I would also like to share part of their submission to the committee and their thoughts on the development of these standards:

“As you may know, CAZA has long advocated that the government of Ontario address the policy, legislative and regulatory gaps that exist with respect to animals in human care.

“This is why, when Minister Naqvi indicated last January that the government would be introducing enhanced standards of care for marine mammals, we applauded his announcement.

“At the time, we expected to see unfold a process grounded in science and verifiable best practices that would begin to fix Ontario’s broken system.

“However, while we were grateful for the opportunity to participate in the development of these standards as a member of the technical advisory group, we had concerns from the outset with the timelines and scope of the exercise.

“Absent evidence of a current or imminent marine mammal welfare crisis in this province, we found the time frame as inexplicable as it was unfortunate....

“In summary, we applaud the government’s intentions, but believe that the approach chosen is flawed.

“We urge this committee to recommend a pause, and for the sake of the animals, that this important exercise be placed on solid scientific footing.”

Mr. Speaker, the CCAC standards are standards that are developed in Canada and held to be exemplary. The issue, as I understood it, as I gleaned from hearings, is that the CCAC standards did not define optimal pool size or dimensions. The government bill, however, sets out pool specifics and has based them on these 30-year-old UK standards.

I’m going to put this as clearly as I can, because it took me a while to understand this in committee, with so

many different experts weighing in on this. These UK standards are 30 years old, but really, the concern is not about how old they are. The concern seems to stem from the massive, nearly impossible to construct size and dimensions of this recommended pool. The UK standards have actually never been used anywhere, arguably because the cost and challenges of building to these standards would either be impossible or they would be financially nearly impossible.

Some voices at committee want the government to use these standards because they are the biggest, and then some said that it would be the ideal or the best. Others argued that it isn’t about the depth or diameter of the pool, but rather the design and complexity—for example, if a pool had areas for an animal to rub against. Others hoped that the standards would knock businesses out of the water, so to speak. Others asked for more reasonable standards that aren’t going to mean an end to their business viability. Quite frankly, it was a very deep issue, and people did not agree.

It was clear, however, that the government arbitrarily picked these standards because they thought they were the best, or it was the only standard that existed that had an actual number on the dimensions of the pool. They need to consult with those who would know whether or not bigger is better, or the biggest is the best. That seems to be what would be fair, and that also seems to be what would be proactive, not just reactive.

I will share with you from a letter submitted by Dr. David Rosen of the Marine Mammal Research Unit at the University of British Columbia. Dr. Rosen co-authored the report *Developing Standards of Care for Marine Mammals in Captivity and Recommendations Regarding How Best to Ensure the Most Humane Treatment of Captive Cetaceans*. This report recommended the adoption of the Canadian Council on Animal Care, or CCAC, guidelines as a specific standard of care for marine mammals. His thoughts on the arbitrary adoption of the specific UK standards are as follows—actually, he had mentioned in the CCAC report the reason they didn’t have specific standards on pool depth: “First, such a specific recommendation was outside of the scope of the report. Second, insufficient scientific information exists on which to base any quantitative evaluation.”

He goes on to say, “Unfortunately, in the 30 years since the report by Klinowska and Brown”—also known as the UK report—“insufficient research has been undertaken to make such decisions on a scientific basis. This does not mean, however, that such an approach is not possible. It is my opinion that what is required is a set of standards of care based upon verifiable best practices, informed by quantitative data produced and analyzed in a scientific manner. Fortunately, such a ‘natural experiment’ already exists within the variety of facilities and marine mammal species currently held in aquariums within North America. This would provide the basis of a study of existing pool sizes and physical parameters measured against impartial criteria of animal health and well-being. Such an objective approach, initiated and



supported by the government of Ontario, would place the province in the forefront of animal welfare practices and serve as a model for other jurisdictions.”

In addition to some of the concerns that I've mentioned, there are other ways that this bill comes up short. I've already touched on the fact that this bill took a matter of years to come to fruition, but in its current form, there are still areas for improvement, primarily in terms of enforcement.

Currently, Bill 80 would only allow the OSPCA to apply to the courts to remove a marine mammal in contravention of the act if a facility fails to do so themselves, rather than having the ability to enforce the act directly. Subsequently, this would permit the continued or potential mistreatment of animals, as any sort of lengthy court application process, wait time or extended case could immensely draw the process out.

As well, I noted earlier that the bill permits a six-month period when prohibited animals can be brought into the province temporarily before being removed, which the government, hopefully, can elaborate on.

As always, the legislation remains vague in areas about how the OSPCA's powers will be extended. Unfortunately, that wasn't sufficiently clarified during the committee stage.

Speaker, I will finish up by thanking the minister for the opportunity to speak on this bill. Like I said, I didn't expect this to be the first bill that I would speak to in my new critic role for community safety and correctional services, but it is an important topic, and I have appreciated the chance to learn and to share my thoughts. The priority of this bill must first and foremost be increasing protections and standards for marine mammals in our province, and though it is imperfect, I believe that this goal is reflected in Bill 80.

This is about setting minimum standards. The closer these minimums are to best practices, the better, but we do need to guarantee a minimum standard of care for all animals in captivity. We hope this bill will do that, but we do hope that the best practices, after consultation with the experts, actually are the best. Currently, too many things are left up to inspector discretion on what is adequate or appropriate, so minimums must be quantifiable and enforceable if the intent of this bill is going to be realized.

I appreciate that some—some—of the relevant experts and stakeholders have been consulted and included through the process, but we hope that this government will continue to regularly and thoroughly consult on issues of animal welfare with them.

**1640**

Ultimately, New Democrats support the intentions of this legislation, and I am pleased to support Bill 80, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I rise to speak to Bill 80, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act.

This is a strange bill because it's really about one animal, a killer whale at Marineland in Niagara Falls named Kiska. The killer whale is now in her late thirties, and the Toronto Star has raised numerous concerns about her health and whether she's getting good care. I want to make a point that Marineland disputes these allegations.

It's an example of the government introducing legislation to address a media story rather than introducing legislation to provide good government. We believe that animals should get good care. We believe that they should be protected, but we also believe that the government should have done more with this bill.

This bill prohibits orcas, or killer whales, from being bred or brought into Ontario. It makes it sound like this is a growing problem but, in fact, last year there were no orcas brought into Ontario or bred here. The bill also prohibits orcas from being held at research facilities in Ontario, but again, there are currently no orcas in research facilities. In fact, animal activists are upset because if this bill passes, it will result in Kiska being alone for the rest of her life. Even Bob Barker, the former host of *The Price is Right*, contacted the Premier to ask that Kiska not be forced to spend the rest of her life alone. It's an example of what happens when the government introduces legislation to respond to a media story rather than trying to make good policy.

This bill is a missed opportunity. If the government is prepared to make amendments to the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, then let's help more than one animal. Let's make a change to the legislation so it does a better job of protecting all animals. As it stands, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act isn't working for farm animals or farmers.

In a letter to the minister three years ago, the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario said, “The CCFO firmly believes that animals deserve to be treated with kindness and respect during the entire production cycle and is adamant that animal neglect or cruelty has no place in Ontario's livestock production. However, the current approach towards inspection and enforcement has led to an unacceptable situation, with widespread distrust and fear among producers which must not be allowed to continue and requires a new approach.”

That letter was more than three years ago. It asked the minister to consult with Ontario's livestock sector and other interested parties and develop policies that work. Three years later, we haven't resolved the problems for Ontario's livestock, but we have a bill for one killer whale.

Too often, we hear stories of inspectors who don't have sufficient training going onto farms. They aren't large animal vets and they don't understand farm protocol. We wouldn't send a vet used to dealing with cats and dogs to deal with killer whales; neither should we send someone without the right training to deal with farm animals.

Several years ago, a Chesterfield dairy farmer, David Robinson, was charged with 12 counts of animal cruelty

by the OSPCA for having malnourished Holstein cows. However, from reports, it sounds like the issue was more that the inspector didn't have sufficient knowledge of farm animals and older cows. Two local veterinarians said the animals were not underfed. In fact, one of them said that the OSPCA order to increase the body fat score to 2.5 in a 17-year-old cow was like asking an 80-year-old man to look 25.

There are instances where there are real problems. We unfortunately had one of those incidents in Oxford a few years ago, when a farmer was no longer able to care for his cows. They had been neglected and had to be removed. In those situations, we need people with proper training. We need people who can both recognize the problem and who know what action is needed to correct it.

If this bill were to ensure that we had more people like that, it could make a significant contribution to animal welfare.

Another issue the government should have addressed in this bill is biosecurity. Biosecurity on our farms is hugely important, especially when we are dealing with diseases such as PED and avian influenza. When we're trying to stop the spread of a disease from one farm to another, it isn't acceptable for an OSPCA inspector to go from one farm to another without taking biosecurity measures such as washing their truck. If an inspector doesn't have farm training, when a farmer asks them not to enter the property after being at a neighbour's, it sounds like they're being difficult. But the reality is that the farmer is likely just trying to protect the animals against disease.

This bill would have been a good opportunity to ensure the standards for proper training for OSPCA inspectors dealing with farm animals. Instead it is a bill that addresses one investigative series of media articles and one killer whale.

One of the issues related to biosecurity is that of requiring warrants. When the inspector needs to get permission to enter the property, there is an opportunity to talk about the need for things like a truck wash, foot wash or boot covers. There's an opportunity for the farmers to explain their biosecurity protocol that the inspectors should be following.

Too often the government introduces legislation that creates exemptions where warrants are not required. In fact, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and the Ontario Immigration Act, which is also being debated by the Legislature, both provide this exemption. Warrants are necessary, not only to protect the rights of individuals, but also to protect against issues like biosecurity on our farms and to ensure that when there is a real problem, the case isn't thrown out of court on a legal technicality. Too often we have seen the OSPCA take cases to court only to see them thrown out.

This bill was an opportunity to make some real changes that would create a better system and better protection for animals and their owners. But it's an opportunity that the government missed.

One of the other challenges that this bill should have addressed is the fact that the OSPCA has to raise money to fund operations. I remember a few years ago when there was a charity walk in Toronto. Despite the fact that there were numerous trails in the city, the participants were sent on a route along busy streets. When one of the participants asked why, she was told, "Trees don't donate." Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a real concern that the OSPCA could operate in a similar way. Headlines and publicity encourage donations. This bill could have created more separation between the charity and enforcement, but instead we are focusing on one single whale.

The killer whale is not the only animal facing health issues. If this government truly cared about animals, they would be doing a better job of investigating the causes of mortality in our bee population. The government has been focused on one potential cause without really investigating the impact of other problems. We know that the bee habitat is disappearing. We know that there are mites that could be causing bee mortality. What we don't know is the impact of those factors on our bee population. If this government cared about animals, they would be looking into the causes of bee mortality to make sure that the action they take is going to solve the problem. Instead they are causing hardships for our grain farmers without knowing whether that is the solution and that it will protect bees.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this bill, and I wish that the government had chosen to do more with it. I also wish we were focusing on bigger issues rather than spending all our time on a bill that only protects one whale: issues like the misuse and waste of social housing money at the Housing Services Corp. when we have a list of 168,000 families who need affordable housing. Each year, we have set a record for the number of families waiting for affordable housing, and yet the government continues to allow money to be wasted on items like trips to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I recently sent out a survey to every household in my riding as part of my newsletter. I didn't receive one single response asking for this legislation. I didn't receive one single response that said, "We need to do more to protect killer whales."

**1650**

What I received were responses from people who were worried about a proposal to locate a landfill site on fractured bedrock near the Thames River. That landfill would impact a lot of marine life, so maybe it should have been addressed in this bill. As I've mentioned repeatedly, it would also put our drinking water at risk. One of Ingersoll's wells is located only a short distance from the site, and that is not an acceptable risk.

I also received responses from people who were worried about wind turbines and the impact that they would have on the health of their community. I received numerous responses from people who were concerned about the increasing cost of hydro and the cost of the proposed pension plan—but again, not a single response asking for this bill.

I hope that, moving forward, the government will address more of these issues that are causing hardships and having a real impact on my constituents and the people across Ontario. I appreciate them introducing this bill, and we will be supporting this bill, but much more needs to be done to protect all animals in the province of Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rick Nicholls):** Further debate?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to yet again have a chance to speak to this. I know that the bill has gone to committee. There have been some amendments brought forward. I've heard some really good comments on the part of all members of the House who had something to say about this.

I think, in the end, we understand that Marineland is a viable business. It provides a great service to the people of the Niagara region. It's a place that we can bring our kids and where we can enjoy ourselves. Trying to deal with this entire issue in regard to how we deal with whales in captivity is, obviously, a sensitive one, depending on what side you're on, and I'll let people speak to that.

I just want to take this opportunity to say, and I said this in the second reading debate, that one of the things that I think we really need to think about—and I know we could have done this in this bill and, unfortunately, we didn't—is to take a look at tourism from a bit of a different perspective and to say that there are whales to be seen in Ontario that are not at Marineland. They actually live in the wild in Ontario. I know most members of the assembly now know this, because I've said it before, but, Mr. Speaker, there be whales in Timmins–James Bay and in Kenora–Rainy River. We have belugas up in Hudson Bay and James Bay. One of the sad things is that, as a province, we have never looked at how we are able to deal with tourism, and trying to do it in some way that is ecologically viable, to be able to see whales in their environment.

Some of us have gone to British Columbia and Alaska, or have gone to the Maritimes and to the St. Lawrence, to see whales in the wild, in their own environment. It's a majestic thing to see. I'm flabbergasted when I see whales in the wild, because it really makes you feel insignificant as a human being, being such a small person on this very big planet and sharing it with animals or mammals that are as big as they are. They're quite something to see.

I think one of the things that we could have done is said that there needs to be some sort of task force or committee or ministerial directive, or whatever you want to call it, that would say, "How are we able to develop other opportunities for tourism in Ontario where we have things like beluga whales that are natural to the province of Ontario?" so that we're able to say that the times when belugas are active—and it's a very short window. It's not all the time; let's recognize what this is. They tend to go by—well, I saw this here, and I'm going to come back to that in a minute. It's a short period of time that belugas

are able to be viewed, and there's a fair amount of work that has to be done for you to be able to see that, because they are not exactly hanging out next to shore. They're at the mouth of the river. You have to build some infrastructure so that people can actually be at the mouth of the river to be able to see these wonderful creatures in the wild.

The other creatures we see are seals. There are seals at the same time, within the mouth of the river. Why are they there? It's a natural cycle of feeding. There are all kinds of—how would you say it? The water rushing down into James Bay from the ground, coming back, is washing in all kinds of feed that the whales and seals are eating at that particular time of the year. That's why they are there. At the same time, you've got polar bears.

There's certainly a way that I think you would be able to say, "Okay, let's figure out ecologically how we're able to put in place a mechanism by which people are able to see this with the proper type of infrastructure," so that we can give young people in this province, and older people like myself, and new grandfathers like you—congratulations, by the way.

I just want to take one second to say something that was said to me some years ago by Bruce Crozier, who was a member of this assembly a number of you would know. Our first grandson wasn't born yet. We were still waiting for the delivery of our first grandchild; we didn't know if it was going to be a boy or a girl. Julie, our eldest daughter, was three or four months to due date, and I remember Bruce coming to me, and I said, "Why are people making this big fuss about grandkids? I just don't get this." He looked me square in the eye and said, "Listen, Gilles, it will change your life. You just wait until your first one is born, and your life will be changed." And I can tell you, it is a life-changing event. There's nothing that makes *mémère* and *pépère* Bisson happier than one of the grandkids walking in the door, and if they don't walk in the door, guess what? *Mémère* and *pépère* are going over there to knock on their door, because we want to be part of their lives.

I congratulate you and your family because it is really the thing that completes the cycle of life. I know other members in this House are in the same, and it's just quite something. I know you yourself—so you know what I'm talking about.

So to Bruce Crozier, our dearly departed friend, I just want to say, man, was he right on that particular note.

But back to whales: My point was, we should be looking at ways of being able to encourage ecotourism to see whales in the wild. For example, some of the infrastructure is there. Some of you have come to James Bay and you've had a chance to stay at the Eco Lodge. The last time that I had this talk, I said the number was 705-658-6400 if you want to call and book yourself at the Eco Lodge. It is a wonderful establishment built by the MoCreebec First Nation community, a non-status reserve where they have a number of commercial enterprises that they utilize to pay for infrastructure and run themselves as a traditional band. They do it in the sense of a

traditional band. It's not an Indian Act band; it's actually a traditional band, which is quite something—amazing leadership there over the years, with people like Randy Kapashesit, who is since dearly departed from us—a visionary leader—and other people like Allan and others who are there.

They have an Eco Lodge that they built, an eco-lodge where you can go and stay. You can make arrangements to get out on the bay to see the whales and the seals, and to go onto the land and experience what the Mushkegowuk Cree lived for centuries and for millennia on the James Bay coast. There's not enough of that out there. Quite frankly, even organizations like the Eco Lodge need to have some support to develop that infrastructure and the marketing necessary to attract the tourists to come, because build it and they will come.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** A train going from Toronto to northern Ontario would be a novel idea.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** A train going from Toronto would be great. We do have the train going from Cochrane in my colleague's riding that goes all the way up to Moosonee. It's still owned by Ontario Northland. So it's there; we haven't lost it. And guess what? The tracks are still there from Toronto to Cochrane, so putting the train there would be great.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** And the people are still in Toronto.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** People are in Toronto. We say that in joking, but it's serious. We never did look—this is the problem that we had with the ONTC closure. Governments and successive governments never did what they could have done with the ONTC, and that is to say, how can we utilize the train and how can we utilize this infrastructure to build economic activity that allows us to generate revenue that lessens the dependence on a subsidy that the province has to give? There will always be subsidy on trains. There's not a train in the world that runs without subsidy. The government has admitted that the amount of money we have to invest into infrastructure to provide that infrastructure is quite expensive. Then, once you run it, you've got to subsidize it. GO Transit, TTC, Timmins Transit, none of that would run if they didn't have some kind of subsidy.

I think when we look at tourism, we need to actually look at the question of how we support ecotourism so that there are other ways for people to see animals in the wild or mammals in the wild, and in the case of Marineland, which I've been to as our kids were growing up and went through there—a wonderful facility where our kids got to get up close to animals they see on television but they never get to see in person. I'm sure most members of this assembly have gone through there with their own children or their grandchildren. It's an amazing experience.

The other experience we need to look at is how we promote ecotourism in different parts of the province that allows people to see what is natural, in the wild, in our parts of the province that we live in. I think there's opportunity there. In itself, is it the silver bullet that will

resolve the economic issues in all of those communities? No, but I can tell you this: I've travelled around the world, as a lot of members in this assembly have, and it's amazing to what degree tourism can play a very big role in the economy. It's amazing what people will come to see. For example, a number of you—who's been to Thailand?

*Interjection.*

1700

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Oh, there we go. If you go to Thailand, 40 years after the movie *The Bridge on the River Kwai* came out, people still travel—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Forty years? It's 58 years. It was 1957.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Oh my God, it's 58 years. How could it be that old? I was born in 1957. I remember that movie. I must have seen the rerun, then.

But my point is: 58 years later, people are still going to the town where the bridge on the River Kwai was built. And guess what? When you get there it isn't the original bridge because it was blown up and was eventually rebuilt. It fell apart, and they put a new bridge in. But there is a bridge there.

When I went with my brother, some years ago, there were literally hundreds of people from around the world who got off buses and taxis and everything else to be able to say, "I got my picture taken on the bridge on the River Kwai."

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I see that my good friend from Nipissing actually went and did that.

I'll give you another one in Thailand that I think is equally amazing, for those of you who have gone. It's not just the bridge on the River Kwai; it's the water markets in Thailand. All it is is water, the Chao Phraya River, which runs through Bangkok. There are people who, for centuries, have been living along the river and their houses are built beside the river. Hundreds and hundreds—I would say thousands—of tourists flock to Bangkok to see the housing and the living that has gone on for centuries along the Chao Phraya River. My point is that they are showing what it is that they have—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** In North Bay we have the shadfly river.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** What was that? We have the shadfly river. Very good heckle; I appreciate that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** While I really appreciate the travelogue, as you two are travelling the world together, I'm not quite sure what that has to do with orcas. But you can continue.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I still have lots of work to do. It has to do with seeing nature in the wild. It has to do with ecotourism. It has to do with not being flabbergasted by a Speaker who I have to explain that to again and talking about—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Actually, don't be flabbergasted, for heaven's sake. Secondly, you don't have to explain to me; I've seen the movie several times, and I do believe it's a bridge, not a whale. Thank you.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Yes, the bridge on the River Kwai. That was funny. That was a better heckle from the Chair than you can get from the benches.

But I have to say: What was underneath the bridge on the River Kwai?

**Interjections:** Whales.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Snakes. One of the worst places for poisonous snakes in the world is in that area around the bridge on the River Kwai.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Well, there are some red vipers over there.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** There's a viper sitting right over there. I love these types of debates. People should be here and have to pay admission to see this; it's actually pretty funny.

The point is, there is something we have to do when it comes to being able to say to people, "You don't just have to go to Marineland to see animals. You can actually go into the wild to be able to see what is there naturally."

The other thing I just want to say very quickly as we go through this particular debate: I understand why certain people in this province have decided that they have to go the direction that they did within this bill. I think there is a certain amount of compromise that has happened throughout this process. I don't think everybody is going to be really happy with the final outcome, but you know what? That's unfortunately, or fortunately, the way it works. Sometimes compromise means that both sides aren't terribly excited and completely happy. But I think, nonetheless, that people tried their best on committee—people who came to present. I think the members of the committee tried to take into—not consent, but—

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Consideration.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:**—consideration the amendments that were brought forward. I think that what has come forward to us now at third reading is certainly a little bit better than it was when it was at second reading. Again, I just say congratulations to the members who did that.

The last thing I would say, because I promised somebody I would say this, is that certainly one of the problems the whale has at Marineland is that when they buy electricity, it's kind of hard to pump water at off-peak times. So we all know that the electricity they have to pay at Marineland—it's getting harder and harder to pay that bill at the end of the month. Now that the government is privatizing Hydro One, can you imagine what that says to the cost of being able to run Marineland when it comes to the pumps and heaters and lights and all the stuff you have to run at Marineland to make it happen? So it's going to be—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** It'll be a whale of a bill.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** You know, that's what I like about you. You're clairvoyant; you read my mind. I was going to end on this: It would be one whale of a bill that people are going to have to receive and have to pay at Marineland after we privatize Hydro One.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the time that we've had in debate. I appreciated your com-

ments and your heckling me from the chair. It was really good, and I appreciated it, and please continue the good work.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Chatham–Kent–Essex.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Thank you, Speaker. On a serious note, it is my pleasure to rise today and to speak once again to Bill 80, the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Amendment Act, 2015.

A lot has changed since the second reading of this bill, but in a way, absolutely nothing has changed. In committee, we introduced seven amendments that were designed in an effort to ensure that the contents of the bill matched the spirit of the bill. We wanted to ensure that the standards of care for marine mammals are based solely on science, not ideology. Understanding that future changes in regulations could have a direct negative impact on the economy of Niagara Falls as a whole, as well as other areas, we asked the government to note and mitigate adverse economic impacts where possible. Even the NDP voted against this amendment, and they represent Niagara Falls.

A critical concern for us was amending the bill to require that OSPCA agents get proper certification to work on marine mammals, which are incredibly diverse and complex, and also to have a veterinarian present on inspections. Finally, we tried to provide a Kiska clause, where the minister would have the ability to allow a companion orca to live with Kiska, if the minister deemed it appropriate from an animal welfare perspective.

Each and every amendment that we, the PC caucus—our team—brought forward was shot down by the Liberal and the NDP members of the committee, who had clear marching orders: "Vote down anything that's a PC amendment." I might add, too, that the government and the NDP did not bring forth any amendments at all. We were the only party to do so.

Before I move forward with the rest of my remarks and get into some of the amendments specifically, I want to take us back in time, all the way back to 1986, and there's a reason for this. Back when IBM released the first laptop, it weighed an astounding 12 pounds. It was nowhere near as powerful as the smartphones that fit in our pockets today. The Nintendo entertainment system in 1986 was released in North America, and if you recall, Speaker, cellphones had to be carried around in bags—great big bags, probably weighing anywhere between 12 and 16 pounds. They were huge; they were heavy; they were monstrous. This was modern technology back in 1986, ironically the same time period as when the UK standards of care that the government is using as a foundation for the new marine mammal care regulations—that's when they were developed: back in 1986. As we can tell, technology has come a long way. But these standards haven't.

These standards are as old as Betamax and about as widely used. Numerous experts came forward through the short public consultation process and expressed their concerns. These scientists and industry experts called on

the government to commit to basing their standards of care on the best and most up-to-date information available instead of the decades-old UK standards. Even Dr. Rosen, whose report was supposed to be the basis of this legislation and future regulations, called for the new Canadian Council on Animal Care, known as CCAC, standards to be adopted instead of the decades-old UK standards.

The report stated, in no uncertain terms, “We recommend the timely adoption of the Guidelines On: The Care and Maintenance of Marine Mammals established by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) as a specific standard of care for marine mammals under the OSPCA Act.”

**1710**

Sadly, Speaker, the government refused to make that commitment. And it could have had—and it can have, in fact—some grave consequences. Dr. Haulena is the chief head veterinarian at the Vancouver Aquarium. He’s also an adjunct professor of clinical sciences at North Carolina State University and an adjunct professor at the University of British Columbia’s fisheries science centre. In his expert opinion, it is illogical to expect to be able to implement standards developed in the 1980s for bottlenose dolphins to other marine mammals, and this would be detrimental to the quality of care received by these animals.

Dr. Haulena stated in committee, “Developing a standard for a bottlenose dolphin that now has to be, just with the mathematical model, expanded to a beluga whale or to a porpoise or to any other species is just impractical, unreasonable, unscientific and, from all we know, impossible.”

The UK standards have not been adopted anywhere in the world because they are outdated impossible to implement. If the government adopts these obsolete standards, they will cause a substantial loss of economic activity in the Niagara region. The outcome would be the closure of Marineland as well as other aquatic facilities. If that is this government’s end goal, they should be up front about it and let the region know what the economic impact of these decisions will in fact be.

Mr. Wayne Thomson, a councillor representing Niagara Falls Tourism, stated that the Marineland provides 700 jobs directly, but, more importantly, 36,000 related jobs—not only in Niagara Falls but in the entire region. It generates millions of dollars in economic activity each year and Marineland provides \$4.5 million annually in regional advertising. Closing the facility would come with a tremendous loss to the people of Niagara Falls.

Why would the NDP vote against our amendment, which would safeguard Niagara Falls and its region from the unintended consequences of this bill? Don’t they care about the region’s economy?

Even more important than the financial cost of allowing this bill to go forward without amendments is the potential harm to animals if we fail to address massive problems of the OSPCA. Yesterday, I went on to the OSPCA’s website to see if there were any job

postings for inspection agents. Well, guess what? I found a posting for an agent, so I looked at the requirements. I assumed that a relevant degree in biology, or zoology, or relevant professional experience must be required. I was shocked to learn of the actual requirements. This is a quote from what we found on the Internet, on the job posting: “The successful candidates will possess an OSSD or equivalent and post-secondary education in police foundations, law and security education, or animal enforcement.” So, Speaker, all you need to become an OSPCA inspector in Ontario is a high school diploma and a degree that is completely unrelated to animal biology, or science at all, for that matter.

If you’re currently in grade 12 and you haven’t taken any science courses beyond the bare minimum required to graduate—hopefully you can still graduate this year, after the mess the Liberals have made of the education file—you may be qualified to apply as an OSPCA agent without taking any additional science courses in college. If, for example, you take police foundations right out of high school, you can become a qualified OSPCA agent even before you turn 19. That is absolutely shocking.

It also raises some alarming issues regarding abuses of power, as well as concerns over animal well-being. This raises some alarming issues in regards to safeguarding animal welfare in Ontario. How can you honestly expect people without a proper background in marine mammal care to be able to properly assess the well-being of these incredibly diverse creatures?

OSPCA officers, overall, are very passionate and hard-working. They do their best to protect animals in this province. But they simply cannot be asked to uphold standards across such a diverse range of animals without proper training or certification. The status quo means that agents are going to miss out on clear signs of distress that a finely trained eye would catch.

That’s why we introduced an amendment that would require OSPCA agents to be certified before they inspect marine mammals. Our amendment read that “an agent or inspector of the society may enter and inspect a building or place where marine animals are kept only if he or she has been certified with respect to marine animals in a manner deemed appropriate by the minister responsible for the administration of this act.”

This amendment would give the power to the minister and the ministry to determine appropriate certification standards for inspections and for inspectors. This was a realistic amendment. We did not ask for certification to inspect dogs, cats, horses, cows, birds or any other animals. We simply asked that agents conducting inspections on marine mammals be certified to do so. We felt that this was a reasonable amendment to move, that it was a very constructive amendment and one that simply made common sense.

Common sense did not prevail, as again both the Liberals and the NDP felt it was unreasonable. They believe that inspectors should not be certified when inspecting some of the most unique animals on the planet. They feel that a black-and-white checklist is sufficient when it

comes to detecting stress or health issues in animals that inspectors may have never seen before. This is a disservice not only to the OSPCA agents, who are expected to be jacks of all trades; this is a disservice to the animals that inhabit Ontario.

Many animal rights advocates have watched debate and committee hearings of this bill closely, and I really hope they're watching right now. If you're watching this debate and you're concerned about marine mammals in Ontario, you should ask the government why they don't want people who are tasked with ensuring that standards of care are enforced are even certified to deal with marine mammals.

Another serious concern that we have is the unnecessarily rushed manner in which the government has chosen to deal with this complex matter. Bill 80 was introduced just over two months ago, and it's wrapping up debate on third reading with time allocation. It was before committee for only a couple of days, and stakeholder groups who will be providing input over the summer for the new standards of care for marine mammals are claiming that the government is limiting their time to study this issue.

Bruce Dougan, who was the head of New Brunswick's task force looking into exotic animal regulations, stated in committee that the government is unnecessarily rushing the advisory process compared to New Brunswick, which took the better part of a year to do research and hold consultations. Mr. Dougan said that "we have hoped to see the government opt for a rigorous review of options to enhance the level of care and well-being of marine mammals rather than a mad dash to an imaginary finish line."

Instead, we are seeing this Liberal government place a priority on scoring political points. This is a scientific issue, not a partisan issue. By placing unnecessary time constraints on the consultation process and voting against good-natured amendments designed to promote animal welfare, this government has jeopardized the well-being of animals that it is claiming to protect.

Many times during clause-by-clause, I asked the government to "go slow to go fast." But no, they wanted to rush right through it. They want to do what I call a Phi Slama Jama.

**1720**

As many bills are currently before the House, they want to get those bills through before we break for summer. Why? Because they can, without giving the proper consultation needed to do it right—a made-in-Ontario solution, as my colleague Mr. Hudak had indicated.

Sadly, Bill 80 represents a missed opportunity to get it right. For that reason, I cannot and we will not be supporting this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate? Further debate? Last call for further debate? Seeing none, Mr. Naqvi has moved third reading of Bill 80, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and the Animals for Research Act with respect to the possession and breeding of orcas and administrative requirements for animal care.

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Pursuant to standing order 28, they request that this be put over until after question period tomorrow.

*Third reading vote deferred.*

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** I move that notwithstanding any standing order or special order of the House, there be a timetable applied to the consideration of certain business of the House as follows:

(a) Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities

When Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities, is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment and at such time the bill shall be ordered referred to the Standing Committee on General Government; and

That the vote on second reading may be deferred pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

That following the completion of its consideration of Bill 66, the Standing Committee on General Government shall next meet at its regularly scheduled meeting for up to two days of public hearings and one day of clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 9; and

That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the committee Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 9:

—Notice of public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire; and

—Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis; and

—Each witness will receive up to five minutes for their presentation followed by nine minutes for questions from committee members; and

—The deadline for written submissions is 6 p.m. on the last day of public hearings; and

The deadline for filing amendments to the bill with the Clerk of the Committee shall be 12 noon on the sessional day following the last day of public hearings on the bill; and

Following the completion of the second hour of clause-by-clause consideration, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the Committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments

thereto. At this time, the Chair shall allow one 20-minute waiting period pursuant to standing order 129(a); and

The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than the sessional day following the day on which the committee met for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That upon receiving the report of the committee on Bill 9, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called that same day; and

In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on the sessional day following clause-by-clause consideration, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House, and shall be deemed to be ordered for third reading; and

When the order for third reading is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

The vote on third reading may be deferred 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 five minutes.

(b) Bill 37, An Act Respecting Invasive Species

When Bill 37, An Act Respecting Invasive Species, is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment and at such time the bill shall be ordered referred to the Standing Committee on Social Policy; and

That the vote on second reading may be deferred pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

That the Standing Committee on Social Policy shall, on its next four regularly scheduled meeting days commencing in the week following the passage of second reading of the bill, meet for up to two days of public hearings and for up to two days of clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the committee Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 37:

—Notice of public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire; and

—Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis; and

—Each witness will receive up to five minutes for their presentation followed by nine minutes for questions from committee members; and

—The deadline for written submissions is 6 p.m. on the last day of public hearings; and

The deadline for filing amendments to the bill with the Clerk of the Committee shall be 12 noon on the sessional

day following the second day of public hearings on the bill; and

Following the completion of the second hour of clause-by-clause consideration, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. At this time, the Chair shall allow one 20-minute waiting period pursuant to standing order 129(a); and

On the second day of clause-by-clause consideration, the committee is authorized to meet from 6:45 p.m. to 11:59 p.m., for the purpose of clause-by-clause consideration;

The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than the sessional day following the last day on which the committee met for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That upon receiving the report of the committee on Bill 37, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called that same day; and

In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on the sessional day following clause-by-clause consideration, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House, and shall be deemed to be ordered for third reading; and

When the order for third reading is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

The vote on third reading may be deferred 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 five minutes.

(c) Bill 52, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, the Libel and Slander Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest

When Bill 52, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, the Libel and Slander Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest, is next called as a government order, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment and at such time the bill shall be ordered referred to the Standing Committee on Justice Policy; and

That the vote on second reading may be deferred pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

That the Standing Committee on Justice Policy shall, on its next four regularly scheduled meeting days commencing in the week following the passage of second



reading of the bill, meet for up to two days of public hearings and two days for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the committee Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 52:

—Notice of public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire; and

—Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis; and

—Each witness will receive up to five minutes for their presentation followed by nine minutes for questions from committee members; and

—The deadline for written submissions is 6 p.m. on the last day of public hearings; and

The deadline for filing amendments to the bill with the Clerk of the Committee shall be 12 noon on the day following the second day of public hearings on the bill; and

Following the completion of the second hour of clause-by-clause consideration, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. At this time, the Chair shall allow one 20-minute waiting period pursuant to standing order 129(a); and

### 1730

The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than the sessional day following the last day on which the committee met for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That upon receiving the report of the committee on Bill 52, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called that same day; and

In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on the sessional day following clause-by-clause consideration, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House, and shall be deemed to be ordered for third reading; and

When the order for third reading is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

The vote on third reading may be deferred 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 five minutes.

(d) Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin

When debate on Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin, reaches 6.5 hours, or when the member who has the floor at that point has completed his or her remarks, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment and at such time the bill shall be ordered referred to the Standing Committee on General Government; and

That the vote on second reading may be deferred pursuant to Standing Order 28(h); and

That the Standing Committee on General Government shall, on its next four regularly scheduled meeting days commencing in the week following the passage of second reading of the bill, meet for up to two days of public hearings and for up to two days of clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the committee Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 66:

—Notice of public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire; and

—Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis; and

—Each witness will receive up to five minutes for their presentation followed by nine minutes for questions from committee members; and

—The deadline for written submissions is 6 p.m. on the last day of public hearings; and

The deadline for filing amendments to the bill with the Clerk of the Committee shall be 12 noon on the sessional day following the last day of public hearings on the bill; and

Following the completion of the second hour of clause-by-clause consideration, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. At this time, the Chair shall allow one 20-minute waiting period pursuant to standing order 129(a); and

The committee shall report the bill to the House no later than the sessional day following the last day on which the committee met for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and

That upon receiving the report of the committee on Bill 66, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called that same day; and

In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on the sessional day following clause-by-clause consideration, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House, and shall be deemed to be ordered for third reading; and

When the order for third reading is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill,

apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

The vote on third reading may be deferred 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 five minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Mr. Naqvi has moved government motion number 40. Mr. Naqvi.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** Thank you, Speaker. I'm just going to catch a little bit of a break. It was a long motion but an important motion, nonetheless. Thank you for indulging me while I read through the motion. It was a good exercise for me to read to my son when I do, so that I don't trip on words and I'm able to read to him in a concise fashion. But this will definitely put him to sleep if I read this motion to him when I see him tomorrow night, so perhaps I should consider that.

Speaker, I would like to speak to the programming motion that I just tabled before the House and currently up for debate. The pieces of legislation that are contained within this motion are extremely important and we must move forward with them in this House. Collectively, they represent a part of our government's plan to build Ontario up.

The bills are as follows: Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities; Bill 37, An Act respecting Invasive Species; Bill 52, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, the Libel and Slander Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest; and Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. I would like to speak to the significance of each of these bills individually to provide context as to why we need to move forward with this programming motion.

The people of Ontario, last June, gave us a strong mandate. They are expecting us to take action on helping to strengthen our economy, to invest in modern infrastructure and to support our essential services.

Firstly, Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities, was introduced in July 2014. In the past, Ontario's coal-fired power plants cost the people of Ontario an estimated \$4.4 billion per year in health, environmental and financial impacts. Because of the leadership of this government, Ontario's elimination of coal-fired electricity is the single largest greenhouse gas reduction initiative in North America. It is the equivalent of taking up to seven million cars off the road. It's like taking seven million cars off the road. This act, if passed, would ensure the health and environmental benefits of prohibiting coal used for electricity generation in Ontario are now protected by legislation.

Next is Bill 37, An Act respecting Invasive Species, which was first introduced in February 2014. This bill

represents our action to address the serious threat of invasive species to Ontario's economy and to our natural environment. Currently, there is a patchwork of more than 20 federal and provincial acts, none designed specifically to deal with invasive species. This proposed legislation will help address the legislative gaps.

If passed, the Invasive Species Act would be the first stand-alone legislation of its kind in Canada. It would complement the role of the federal government in managing invasive species and it would promote shared accountability for managing invasive species in Ontario.

Next is Bill 52, which is An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, the Libel and Slander Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest. This is a bill that I have been working on for quite some time, and I had the great privilege of introducing it as a private member's bill back in October 2012.

This bill, which was introduced by the Attorney General as a government bill, is proposing a made-in-Ontario approach to addressing the issue of strategic lawsuits based on consensus recommendations of an expert advisory panel and extensive stakeholder consultations. Using intimidation tactics to silence one's opponents is a misuse of our court system. By protecting citizens against strategic litigation, our government is protecting the right of Ontario residents to speak out on matters that are important to us.

If passed, this legislation will allow courts to quickly identify and deal with strategic lawsuits, minimizing the emotional and financial strain on defendants, as well as the waste of court resources.

Lastly is Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. The proposed Great Lakes Protection Act is designed to protect and restore our Great Lakes so they are drinkable, swimmable and fishable. The proposed Great Lakes Protection Act has been strengthened to help fight climate change, protect wetlands and other coastal areas, monitor and report on the health of the lakes, and bring people together to take action on priority issues.

#### 1740

The proposed act builds on Ontario's leadership in protecting the Great Lakes, including our Great Lakes Strategy and partnerships with Canada, Quebec and the Great Lakes states. Speaker, it also builds on actions we are taking to reduce harmful algal blooms, promote environmental stewardship and help local communities take action.

The Great Lakes are vitally important to the people of Ontario for our drinking water, quality of life and prosperity, not to mention that the Great Lakes very much define our beautiful province. We need to restore them now, to continue to enjoy their benefits for this and future generations.

Speaker, as you can see, these four bills are very important for the long-term prosperity of our province. They represent our plan to invest in people, build strong infrastructure, and support a dynamic and innovative

business climate across Ontario. It is a list of bills on which you will find wide consensus within the Ontario public in general, and I hope that all parties will support these bills as well.

I would like to provide some context of what this Legislature experienced in the last Parliament. The opposition parties needlessly stalled important bills that would have made a difference in the lives of Ontarians. From the time our Premier came into office, up until the election in June, because of the opposition parties' stalling, we were only able to pass 36% of our bills.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** You have a majority.

**Hon. Yasir Naqvi:** Our government was given a majority mandate to deliver on our promises—exactly the point that the member from Nipissing is making—and that's what we are doing with these four important bills.

Speaker, we look forward to debate and discussion on it, and we look forward to moving on with these bills. I hope that the members from all parties will see the merit of these four bills, because they do impact all our respective communities. They are important for the well-being and sustainability of our environment and the future prosperity of our province.

I hope members will support this programming motion, because it will allow us a very defined, clear pathway, moving forward, to ensure that we, in due time, pass these four bills into law for the future prosperity of our province.

Thank you for your time, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Wow. That's all I have to say to that: Wow. You just listened to not even an eight-minute speech by the government House leader. This substantive government programming motion, number 40, was a four-page motion. I think he took more time reading the motion than he actually did explaining the government's intention on this substantive motion.

What really frustrates me with this government House leader and this government is that a year ago, we were in the middle of an election. The election took—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Don't remind me.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm sorry to bring it up again, member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. I know you went through extensive therapy after that last election. You're doing well, buddy. I'm proud of you.

Listen, we came back here on July 2 and we were subjected, I guess—now I can use the word—to a throne speech that used words like, "This government is going to choose partnership over partisanship." That's what they said in July. Yet, in reality, this government, when it comes to its legislative agenda, could barely get a bill passed in the fall. In fact, they didn't want to have hearings at all across the province. They didn't want to hear from opposition parties. Then we have a government that came back here after Family Day in February and essentially said to the third party House leader and myself, as the official opposition House leader, "We wanted to hear from you. We wanted to hear what you had to say about

bills. We wanted to work a little more collaboratively across the aisle on getting through government legislation."

You know what happened, Speaker? Over and over and over again, we've seen the government House leader present closure motions. I think I've quoted the chair of cabinet, the member for St. Catharines, probably dozens of times so far. When he was in opposition talking about closure and time allocation motions, he used the words "choking off debate." Well, I tell you, when I read this four-page motion, they're not trying to choke off debate; they're trying to negate debate between the opposition. They're trying to program the life out of Ontarians and give them little or no opportunity to be able to provide input on government policy.

All of these bills, almost every one—that eight-minute vignette from the government House leader talked about Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities; Bill 37, An Act respecting Invasive Species; Bill 52, An Act to amend the Courts of Justice Act, the Libel and Slander Act and the Statutory Powers Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest; and Bill 66, An Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. All of these bills, every single one in this four-page motion, were brought up at a House leaders' meeting where the government said to our party and the New Democrats that they wanted to sit down and "How can we move these bills forward?"

We were very honest. I remember the third party House leader, Mr. Bisson, and I having a conversation with the government House leader about having some of these bills travel throughout the province, having maybe people in northern Ontario—I know that my leader, Patrick Brown, values the opinions in the north. In fact, he went up to the north last week on break week with the member for Nipissing. He went to the Ring of Fire. He hadn't been leader for more than two weeks, yet he decided that going up to the north and hearing northern voices, to be able to meet with people, to be able to listen to people, to be able to hear that northern perspective, was important.

You read this substantive motion, which is what we have to call it procedurally—it doesn't provide any substantive travelling of this province. It doesn't provide us with any opportunity to meet with people in northern Ontario, or quite frankly—the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke and I live in eastern Ontario. We happen to think that this government shortchanges us when it comes to organizing committee hearings in our part of the province.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Rarely see them.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** There are members here from southwestern Ontario from our caucus that rarely ever see a committee of the Legislative Assembly coming.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm not sure whether the minister responsible for francophone affairs is talking about

hearing from francophones in the province. This bill cuts that off, too. I hope that in the 52 minutes that the government left on the table, maybe she would want to talk about how we can improve this substantive motion, if that's what we're going to call it, so that we can actually hear from all Ontarians, regardless of what language they speak or where they live in this province.

This motion provides very little debate outside of this bubble at Queen's Park. I made a speech right after we came back in February about the Premier using the term that she's going to govern from the "activist centre." Well, I often think that when she says that, she means Queen's Park, because that's the only place that there seems to be any legislative activity. This government shuts down debate on a regular basis. This government, using the words that I've quoted many times from the chair of cabinet, chokes off debate. This is not just choking off debate; this is assassinating debate in the province of Ontario. This provides little or no opportunity for any Ontarian to have a chance to talk about these bills.

The government House leader—it's quite surprising that he can only muster up eight minutes of debate to talk about some very substantive bills. Let's talk about this substantive motion for a few moments. Let's let Ontarians really know how valued the Wynne government feels about hearing from the public.

**1750**

So you've got a bill that they like to talk about a lot, which is Bill 9, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act to require the cessation of coal use to generate electricity at generation facilities. This is a bill that the government loves to talk about. They love to throw it in the opposition's face. And yet, when they really get a chance to hear from Ontarians about their priority for this bill, here's what they provide. I'll read you an excerpt from this motion number 40:

"Following the completion of its consideration of Bill 66, the Standing Committee on General Government shall next meet at its regularly scheduled meeting for up to"—how many days, Speaker? Guess how many days. Two days. Two measly days, one of which is going to be for public hearings and one day for clause-by-clause of this bill. That's all they care about.

And do you know what, Speaker? Here's how they're going to engage Ontarians, to ask them what they feel about Bill 9—whether they support Bill 9, whether they want to come and give testimony at one of these few days of public hearings. Wow. This is really going to get out there to the public. They're going to put a notice of public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire. I just want to say that that is all the government is willing to do.

There are so many other opportunities that this government has to promote its hearings. I know I've been a vocal critic of the government. We have committee hearings that don't get streamed live. We don't make that investment to make sure that all of our committee rooms

have live-streaming capabilities so that we could show these hearings. We didn't used to archive anything when I first got elected; we archive a smidgen of information on our website. To me, that is the bare minimum. In fact, it's laughable that we're going to take a four-page motion and on the very first bill have just three opportunities.

The other thing I take umbrage with—and I know there are many members who have been here much longer than I have—is this section that says, "Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis." For new members who were just elected in last year's election, there was a convention around this place where parties would choose, on a rotational basis, people who would come before committees. For whatever reason, this government House leader has it in his mind that it's going to be on a first-come, first-served basis.

I can tell you, Speaker, that when I get done my address, I'm going to give the government a freebie. At one point during my time—and it looks like my time will extend over to the next time this bill is called—I'm going to change that section. I'm going to propose an amendment for (a), (b), (c) and (d) to change that. I firmly believe that if we are going to put partnership ahead of partisanship, when we choose those groups and individuals who are going to appear before committee, we should do it on a rotational basis, so that the government can choose someone, the opposition can choose someone and the third party can choose someone. I think we've been able to do that. We just did it with the bill that was debated this afternoon. Bill 80 was debated this afternoon on another programming motion—no big surprise with this government; they're the experts on programming, time allocation and closure.

I think that their chief government whip, who's very skilled with a computer and technology, should probably write a little column for some of the area papers. Maybe we can post it on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website and Canada NewsWire. That's just a suggestion, Speaker, through you to the chief government whip, that maybe he could start working on that. We could put that up and let all the Legislatures of Canada know the skill that this government has in providing time allocation of substantive motions and issues of closure. Maybe we could call it—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** They're freezing the public out.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** That's right: They're freezing the public out.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** They're freezing the public out of the process.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** That's right. Even with climate change, they're freezing the public out.

The other thing that I, again, question is the fact that in this motion—and I think it's the case through all four sections—witnesses have five minutes each for their presentation, followed by nine minutes for questions from committee members. So in a committee that meets for four, five or six hours, if you start chewing up 14 minutes per person, you're only going to have a handful

of people. I think there were some bills that this government has put forward for their time allocation where they've had maybe six, seven or eight people who have even been allowed to make presentations, because, again, they don't provide the days required to be able to debate these bills.

A five-minute presentation and nine minutes between the parties for questions and comments, quite frankly—and I'm being kind to the government—is an absolute joke.

You've got one day where basically you're going to get less than a dozen people who are going to be presenting. To me, that does not constitute having a dialogue with Ontarians.

Go back—don't take my word for it—to the throne speech. Go back, go online and read it yourself—and don't even take any of these substantive motions, time allocation motions or the closure and the ending of debate that this government has done. Just read the words that were spoken by the Lieutenant Governor in this chamber. You would think that Kathleen Wynne, the Premier of the province, and the government House leader would go out of their way to meet with Mr. Bisson and I, as the two opposition party House leaders, to try to work these out.

For some of these bills, we were very clear that we were willing to work with the government, that we were willing to sit down. There were some bills that I felt needed to have some committee hearings outside of this Queen's Park environment. There were some bills that Mr. Bisson felt needed to be travelled.

The second bill that's part of this motion, Bill 37, An Act respecting Invasive Species, is moving after some of these other bills are passed. It's only going to have two days for public hearings and up to two days for clause-by-clause, so four days—that's it—for a bill that I would suggest would have a lot of public comment.

I know in my area invasive species—there are some of the farm groups. I can't tell you how many times I've had a meeting with a farm or a farm group where I've talked about bobolinks or I've talked about Blanding's turtles. Heck, I have Highway 15 in my riding. Part of the reason why it was delayed by the Ministry of Transportation was because of the grey rat snake and the Blanding's turtle. The ministries couldn't even talk between each other. They couldn't talk between the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Natural Resources. I had to try to broker a meeting just to try to get these two groups together so that we could get construction of the road. That's just one example in my riding. I've got many more, and I'm sure my colleagues, if given the opportunity, could flood the floor of the Legislature with issues in their ridings and concerns about invasive species.

Regardless of whether this bill is good or not or has all-party support, to be able to say that you're going to stay here at Queen's Park for two days of public hearings and two days for clause-by-clause—again, they're carbon copies of each other. The only way that people are going to find out about these hearings is through the Ontario

parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly website and Canada NewsWire.

I'm not suggesting that this government spend the money that they're spending on Pan Am advertising during the Stanley Cup hockey game. That was unbelievable, some of those commercials last night. I can't imagine how many millions of dollars this government spent on Pan Am advertising—or OLG advertising, actually, as well. I know, Speaker, you're one of the critics who are involved here—he's giving me the eye.

I could stay all night, Speaker, if you want. Are you adjourning the House? What are you doing?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I will be in one minute.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Well, I'm going to take more than one minute. So you just let me know when I'm done and I'll pick it up the next time—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Okay. You're done.

*Debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** This House stands recessed until 6:45 tonight.

*The House recessed from 1759 to 1845.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ONTARIO IMMIGRATION ACT, 2015

#### LOI DE 2015 SUR L'IMMIGRATION EN ONTARIO

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 27, 2015, on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 49, An Act with respect to immigration to Ontario and a related amendment to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991 / Projet de loi 49, Loi portant sur l'immigration en Ontario et apportant une modification connexe à la Loi de 1991 sur les professions de la santé réglementées.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** My understanding is that when we last debated this bill, the member from London—Fanshawe had the floor. I recognize her to continue her debate.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Speaker, I'll just continue where I left off.

We keep talking about the shortage of skilled workers in this province, yet what concrete steps is this government taking to address this serious concern in Ontario's labour force? We must continue to attract skilled workers in order to address this long-term economic challenge. We must also do better at recognizing the credentials of immigrants coming to Ontario. When immigrants are unable to use their skills and have not had their home country education recognized, their contributions to the Ontario economy cannot be fully appreciated. Legislation that is informed not only by our own economic and labour market needs, but by the needs of those who will aid us in achieving our goals—those who are not just

looking to Canada and Ontario for employment opportunities but for a future for their own families while becoming a member of ours.

One of the more important provisions in this bill is that it confers new powers to the minister to conduct research, organize educational and training programs and appoint committees on immigration-related issues. This is a step in the right direction for Ontario. We need to do our homework to get the facts right. That requires education and research.

I am also eager to see that this bill established a registry for both employers and recruiters who are interested in participating in an Ontario selection program under the OIA. This provision does fall short on requiring employment agencies and recruiters to register. I did introduce a motion in committee to have replaced the current definition in the act of “recruiter” to include the definition of “immigration consultant,” but unfortunately, the motion was defeated.

New Democrats wanted to make sure that if and when—when, Speaker—a registry of recruiters and employers utilizing nominee and other foreign worker programs is established in the province of Ontario, if you hang a shingle out as a recruiter or consultant or employer and you offer these services, your participation in this registry becomes mandatory.

New Democrats remain concerned that workers in this province, whether born here or just arrived, enjoy protections and rights—not only the universal rights and protections we all should expect but, where appropriate, protections specific to the circumstances in which they work. That’s a piece—a big piece—of the need for immigration legislation in Ontario, and now the Ontario Immigration Act. So we’d like to acknowledge that the government members of the committee did the right thing in passing this amendment.

The creation of the registry is a good idea, and I believe that its membership should be mandatory for any person or business claiming to be an immigration consultant. We also put forward another amendment that would allow the minister to publish the names of foreign entities that participate in the registry if they are found to be in violation of requirements of the registry. That’s because there are big recruitment entities that are multi-jurisdictional. These are simple accountability measures which we feel strengthen the act.

New Democrats heard from constituents on what’s good, what’s not so good, what’s missing and what could stand to be improved. We heard again from groups in committee, and we sought changes through amendments to the bill to ensure that there were at least some teeth in the act. If you represent yourself as a recruiter or immigration consultant—or employ temporary foreign or migrant workers—and you’re active in Ontario and you take advantage of those workers and their families looking for opportunities here, then you should be prosecuted and prevented from operating again in Ontario.

**1850**

Let’s ensure that this registry becomes a reality. Right now, that’s not clear. We must strive to protect the immi-

gration process by creating a clear path to immigration that is accountable.

There are some good opportunities for settlement service organizations who have been offering direction and aid to those who come here for a better life, with information and language services. There are provisions in the act that give me hope that the ministry will provide much-needed funds to these groups for the work that they are doing now.

But increasingly, the skilled workers who come to Ontario need to be seeking out opportunities in Ontario, and many of them are heading to western provinces and out east. By giving them some certainty, by developing, as I’ve called it, a made-in-Ontario immigration system, Ontario can continue to benefit from the rich contributions of immigrants and immigrant communities to the province for generations to come.

Thank you, Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to this bill. I look forward to the questions and comments.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** A point of order, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Yes, I’m prepared to recognize the member for Windsor–Tecumseh on a point of order.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Thank you, Speaker. I beg your indulgence. I’d like to introduce a friend of mine visiting Queen’s Park this evening. Joe Bachetti is the deputy mayor of the town of Tecumseh. He’s a high school principal, and he’s in town for a policing conference. Welcome to Queen’s Park.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Welcome.

Questions and comments?

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** I thought I would just thank the member for her positive comments and talk a little bit about what the Ontario Immigration Act would do.

It will formally recognize the long history of immigration to Ontario and the important nation-building role it has played in forming Ontario’s social, economic and cultural values.

If passed, the Ontario Immigration Act would position Ontario as a full partner in immigration with the federal government, giving Ontario a framework in which to design, deliver and manage a larger and more complex selection program. Certainly, one of the aggravations in the immigration system historically is the fact that Ontario really hasn’t had the opportunity to partner fully with the federal government in immigrant selection.

Ontario needs to be well positioned so that it can take full advantage of the express-entry immigration system that Ottawa introduced in January 2015. This is important because an enhanced role in immigration selection may help Ontario increase its percentage of economic-class immigrants.

If passed, the act, as the member noted, would introduce the regulatory framework to respond to Ontario’s responsibilities in the immigration system, and support transparency, accountability and consistency in the province’s selection programs.

It would also, if passed, provide the ministry with the necessary tools to protect the integrity of Ontario’s

selection program and help protect potentially vulnerable applicants from the risk of program fraud. We've heard so much, over the years, about immigration fraud. It's really important to have the tools to deal with that and to help the many, many legitimate immigrants who want to gain entry to Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments? The member for Nipissing.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you very much, Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to speak at this hour.

My grandfather came to North Bay—obviously, an immigrant. He came to North Bay from our family's community in Italy. Today, there are more Italians from our area of Reggio Calabria in North Bay than there are residents of Reggio Calabria in the home city. It's amazing. They came over—

**Hon. Liz Sandals:** There are a lot of Calabrians in Guelph.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Almost every Italian in North Bay is from Reggio.

My grandparents are from Santo Stefano. They came because it was a land of opportunity. In my community of North Bay, at one time, there used to be three railroads: Ontario Northland, CN and CP. They came to build the railroads. Highways 11 and 17 intersect in North Bay, so there were highways to build and railways to build. My grandfather went to work for the department of highways, as it was known back then. Years later, he brought his family over, which included my mother's older brother and other relatives, but my mother and some of her other brothers and sisters were born in North Bay.

It's just one of those stories, as we begin to, next week, celebrate Italian Heritage Month. I'm looking forward to raising the Italian flag here at Queen's Park next week, because we really do have a rich history. Yes, in the past, the Italians were the labourers. They built the buildings. Today, they are the doctors, the lawyers, the engineers, the designers, the entrepreneurs—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** —the MPPs, all through Ontario. So we take great pride in talking on behalf of my Italian community and Italian Heritage Month starting in June.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I just want to say that obviously we're going to be supporting this bill. I appreciate the comments made by our colleague.

This is not really what we should be doing. Ontario should do what Quebec has done and take over a large part of the responsibility for immigration in this province. Ontario is the Mecca by which everybody comes. The largest percentage of people who are immigrating to Canada come to Ontario. We've always argued, as the Conservatives have, that in fact Ontario should take the responsibility for immigration because there's a number of settlement issues that we have to deal with.

We look at where most people end up immigrating to. They end up immigrating to the large urban centres. But as my friend from Nipissing-Renfrew-whatever—

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Pembroke.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** —Pembroke knows, and people in Timmins-James Bay and others, there are a number of places out there where our communities could be host to immigrants coming into our communities.

I look at where I come from. There's a number of skilled tradespeople and a number of technical jobs that need to be filled in the mining and forest industry, within the retail sector, within the service sector. It's difficult at times to be able to find the people to fill those jobs. So it's very important that we look at that.

The other thing I just want to comment on really quickly—I mentioned this the other day in the House. I was listening to the honourable House leader for the government talk about his experience as a 15-year-old moving to Canada, a new immigrant here. I said it at the time and I'll say it again: We take it for granted, but Canada—and Ontario—is such a great place that people can immigrate here, they can make their life here. They're accepted, they can run and they get elected as members of provincial Parliament. We have people in this House who come from different parts of this world. It's just who we are as Ontarians.

I just think it's so important that we recognize that the diversity of Ontario is the strength of Ontario. I think this Legislature has a way to go, but it's becoming much more diverse as the years go by. I look forward to a day where we have real representation from all of the communities across this province, including First Nations.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** We have time for one last question or comment.

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** It gives me great pleasure as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade, and as an immigrant myself, to stand in this House once again and speak on Bill 49, the Ontario Immigration Act.

Before I get into talking about why it's important that we have this piece of legislation pass, I just want to address some of the comments that the member from London-Fanshawe spoke about earlier this morning in indicating that we were not complying, as the ministry, with the Auditor General's report. I just wanted to provide some clarification for her, to say to her that the AG herself has said that the ministry has already taken action to address the issues before the report, that we have even finished addressing those issues, and that we have taken action on all the recommendations that the Auditor General has made. Once we pass Bill 49, we will be sure to continue the work that is necessary to address all issues.

One other thing that the member did indicate was that the minister was not available to ever speak to her or to brief her on anything going on, and that it would have been nice for the minister to have reached out to her. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here a call log of about five or six different dates in which the minister's staff did reach out to the member opposite to speak to her and to brief her on this particular bill. No response was ever received,

or she was never available. I just wanted to make sure that we were clear on that and that she wasn't misdirecting this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm here to speak to you about the—  
*Interjections.*

1900

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I believe I heard an inappropriate, unparliamentary remark, and I would ask the member to withdraw.

**Mrs. Cristina Martins:** I respectfully withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

The Ontario Immigration Act, if passed, will formally recognize the important role immigration has played in the history and development of our province and the key role that our immigrants play in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass this piece of legislation, our Ontario Immigration Act is definitely part of our plan to invest in people, support the sectors to boost the economy, and invest in Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** The member for London—Fanshawe has two minutes to respond.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** First of all, I'm probably the last person who would ever mislead this House—I'm just saying. That is the last—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Honest Abe.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Yes. Actually, I really take that as a personal comment, but I understand you withdrew, so I'll be the bigger person and let that go, as I always would stay above the fray.

The Auditor General's report was very serious in nature, identifying a lot of issues with regard to process and training and retention of employees. So I reach out to the minister, and I would love to hear what those solutions are, and I'll follow up with that.

I'll have to check Hansard, because I don't recall saying that I never heard from you at all. But I will check Hansard.

This morning, I did, in jest, speak to the Minister of Tourism and Culture, who was here. It was a jest; we were speaking in jest. I don't know if you mistook that.

Anyway, back to the bill, because that's what we're here about. We're here to talk about the bill, not about personal issues.

When I'm speaking about the bill and the Auditor General's findings, I am happy to find out how you improve the situation so that you can actually have processes that will deliver the bill that you've presented in a way that's going to accomplish the outcome of what you proposed.

I did say as well, early this morning, that I commended the committee, the members of the government, for passing the two amendments that we proposed, out of 13. They were very important amendments. One of them that they agreed to was that we struck out the language "and that is not a foreign national". They agreed to that, which was great, because if we left that language in, Speaker, it just meant that the bigger recruiters wouldn't be held accountable. That was a very important piece.

The other one they also agreed to was about, actually, moving subsection 29(1)—and they struck out and substituted the word "Offences".

That was very important, and I thank the government for that co-operation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate? The member for Parkdale—High Park.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Here I am.

*Interjections.*

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Is it okay? Might I speak?

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Sorry?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I thought there might be some revision. But, yes, you have the floor.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's always an honour to speak in this House and particularly to speak about immigration. All of us, of course, are immigrants, and we stand here on First Nations land, and it's important to acknowledge that. As immigrants, we all have our stories that we bring to the table. So as we discuss this, we have to take into account that we're not talking about "them" or someone other than ourselves; we're talking about us, and we're talking about our families and what countries they've come from, whether they're first-, second-, third-, or 10th-generation Canadians.

In my particular case, my father was born here, but his family came from Italy. My mother's family came from England and Ireland. She was born here as well, out on the Prairies. Their stories of immigration really formed me, and I think our parents' stories of immigration really formed them.

My father—very classic. I was listening to the other member talk about his Italian heritage. My father's family owned a fruit and vegetable stand on the Danforth. You can't get more Italian than that. They said that during the Great Depression—I never knew my grandparents on that side—at least they ate. I remember growing up with that story. Other people weren't so lucky. Because they had a fruit and vegetable stand on the Danforth, they actually had food, so they were some of the lucky ones.

On the British side, who grew up on the Prairies and homesteaded out there, my grandfather was the only doctor in miles and miles and miles, and my grandmother, with four little children at home, would go days and days without seeing him. She would tell stories of seeing him coming home on the horizon, a day before he got there—that's how flat the land was, looking out—and of how she would be stuck at home with these four little kids and without a whole lot of support: coming from Great Britain, where she was one of 12, a very Victorian family—coming from this huge family, to being stuck on your own, with little children in the middle of nowhere, with your husband always somewhere else.

Those are the kinds of stories that really form our character and form our being. In fact, that is in part, I think, why we are all here: because we are the products



of that and we're proud of that. We do ourselves a disservice to not remember the hardships as well as the good times.

I also grew up on stories of my father, as an Italian immigrant, being told—he was a semi-pro boxer—that he could walk in the back of a certain club—I won't name the name—but he couldn't walk in the front door, when he fought for them, because he was Italian. That was part of our heritage as well.

He told me of the boardwalk in those days. He remembers a sign that said "No Jews or dogs allowed" on the boardwalk in Toronto, in the Beach. He remembers the Christie Pits race riots, where neo-Nazis came and fought. This is all from the 1930s. This is all part of our heritage.

I kind of long to read, Mr. Speaker, that real history of the peoples of Ontario—the bad, the good, the sad, the glad. Sometimes those moments have really formed us too. Certainly, on this side of the House, in the New Democratic Party, our strong sense of necessity for social justice comes from our parents too, and from their hardship, from what it was like for them to grow up in a society that wasn't as accepting, that wasn't as multicultural, that wasn't as inclusive. That was the reality.

I remember, as a little kid, growing up in an English-speaking household for the most part, and going to Huron Street public school in downtown Toronto, which was by far—again, it wasn't a chi-chi area. It wasn't expensive back in those days. It was rooming houses. My parents ran a rooming house. Those big, gorgeous Victorians on Bedford Road were rooming houses; they were student housing back in the day.

Walking to Huron Street public school—it was a multicultural extravaganza by Toronto standards back then, but we only had one kid of colour in the entire school. There weren't many kids of colour back then. I didn't even know that she was a kid of colour. I mean, this is children, Mr. Speaker. It's really wonderful to look back on my experience and think I didn't have consciousness of difference in that way. I remember skipping with her in the schoolyard, and a photographer caught our picture, myself and her skipping together, and that became the poster. We became the poster children for Christians and Jews, the society of Christians and Jews, who were promoting multiculturalism, and we got to have lunch with the then mayor, Nathan Phillips. We were the multicultural poster children—me, a white kid, and her, a kid of colour—and there we were. We didn't even know why they would take our picture. That kind of innocence and naïveté was quite beautiful.

I also remember being invited back to the house of one of my school friends after school, and his mother—I think I was seven or eight at the time—offering me a little shot of wine—very Italian, much more Italian than my family. I thought, "This is bizarre." For a white British kid to be offered a shot of wine at the age of seven or eight was quite something in those days.

Again, these early multicultural experiences, which, when you look back on them, they're sweet, they're innocent, they're not so sweet, they're not so innocent. They're all of the above, and that's what forms us.

I'm being told by my House leader that I can now can it, so I will, reluctantly—because, of course, you know politicians: When we get a microphone, we could go on. I will cede the floor, then, to the powers that be, so that we can all go home.

Thank you, and here's to multiculturalism.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions or comments? No questions or comments?

Further debate? Further debate?

Mr. Chan has moved third reading of Bill 49, An Act with respect to immigration to Ontario and a related amendment to the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes would have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

However, I have received a notice of deferral from the chief government whip, asking that the vote on third reading of Bill 49 be deferred until tomorrow during the time of deferred votes.

*Third reading vote deferred.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Orders of the day? I recognize the chair of cabinet and deputy House leader.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Much as I was looking forward to sitting until midnight tonight, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Mr. Bradley has moved adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

*The House adjourned at 1911.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenante-gouverneure: Hon. / L'hon. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, OC, OOnt.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Tonia Grannum, Trevor Day, Anne Stokes

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

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Anderson, Granville (LIB)	Durham	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Baker, Yvan (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Ballard, Chris (LIB)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade / Ministre des Affaires civiques, de l'Immigration et du Commerce international
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
<b>Coteau, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport Minister Responsible for the 2015 Pan and Parapan American Games / Ministre responsable des Jeux panaméricains et parapanaméricains de 2015
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
<b>Damerla, Hon. / L'hon. Dipika (LIB)</b>	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	Associate Minister of Health and Long-Term Care (Long-Term Care and Wellness) / Ministre associée de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée (Soins de longue durée et Promotion du mieux-être) Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
<b>Del Duca, Hon. / L'hon. Steven (LIB)</b>	Vaughan	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Dong, Han (LIB)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure / Ministre du Développement économique, de l'Emploi et de l'Infrastructure
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Kitchener–Waterloo	

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
<b>Flynn, Hon. / L'hon. Kevin Daniel (LIB)</b>	Oakville	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Gretzky, Lisa (NDP)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hatfield, Percy (NDP)	Windsor–Tecumseh	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Hoggarth, Ann (LIB)	Barrie	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara- Ouest–Glanbrook	
<b>Hunter, Hon. / L'hon. Mitzie (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Associate Minister of Finance (Ontario Retirement Pension Plan) / Ministre associée des Finances (Régime de retraite de la province de l'Ontario)
		Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille
<b>Jaczek, Hon. / L'hon. Helena (LIB)</b>	Oak Ridges–Markham	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	
Kiwala, Sophie (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Lalonde, Marie-France (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Leal, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (LIB)</b>	Peterborough	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
<b>MacCharles, Hon. / L'hon. Tracy (LIB)</b>	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Malhi, Harinder (LIB)	Brampton–Springdale	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Martins, Cristina (LIB)	Davenport	
Martow, Gila (PC)	Thornhill	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London- Centre-Nord	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister Responsible for the Poverty Reduction Strategy / Ministre responsable de la Stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté President of the Treasury Board / Présidente du Conseil du Trésor Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
<b>Mauro, Hon. / L'hon. Bill (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
McGarry, Kathryn (LIB)	Cambridge	
McMahon, Eleanor (LIB)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough– Westdale	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Attorney General / Procureure générale Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones

<b>Member and Party / Député(e) et parti</b>	<b>Constituency / Circonscription</b>	<b>Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités</b>
Milczyn, Peter Z. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Moridi, Hon. / L'hon. Reza (LIB)</b>	Richmond Hill	Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Munro, Julia (PC)	York–Simcoe	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of the Environment and Climate Change / Ministre de l'Environnement et de l'Action en matière de changement climatique
Naidoo-Harris, Indira (LIB)	Halton	
<b>Naqvi, Hon. / L'hon. Yasir (LIB)</b>	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
<b>Nicholls, Rick (PC)</b>	Chatham-Kent–Essex	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Orazietti, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)</b>	Sault Ste. Marie	Minister of Government and Consumer Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux et des Services aux consommateurs
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth–Wellington	
Potts, Arthur (LIB)	Beaches–East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Rinaldi, Lou (LIB)	Northumberland–Quinte West	
<b>Sandals, Hon. / L'hon. Liz (LIB)</b>	Guelph	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock	
<b>Sergio, Hon. / L'hon. Mario (LIB)</b>	York West / York-Ouest	Minister Responsible for Seniors Affairs Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Leader, Recognized Party / Chef adjoint du gouvernement
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea–Gore–Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward–Hastings	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto–Danforth	
Takhar, Harinder S. (LIB)	Mississauga–Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thibeault, Glenn (LIB)	Sudbury	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron–Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming–Cochrane	
Vernile, Daiene (LIB)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe–Grey	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough–Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Première ministre Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin–Middlesex–London	
<b>Zimmer, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)</b>	Willowdale	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Monique Taylor  
Bas Balkissoon, Chris Ballard  
Grant Crack, Cheri DiNovo  
Han Dong, Michael Harris  
Randy Hillier, Sophie Kiwala  
Monique Taylor  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Présidente: Soo Wong  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Peter Z. Milczyn  
Laura Albanese, Yvan Baker  
Victor Fedeli, Catherine Fife  
Ann Hoggarth, Monte McNaughton  
Peter Z. Milczyn, Daiene Vernile  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Grant Crack  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Joe Dickson  
Mike Colle, Grant Crack  
Joe Dickson, Lisa Gretzky  
Ann Hoggarth, Sophie Kiwala  
Eleanor McMahon, Lisa M. Thompson  
Jeff Yurek  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: John Fraser  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Cristina Martins  
Vic Dhillon, John Fraser  
Wayne Gates, Marie-France Lalonde  
Harinder Malhi, Cristina Martins  
Jim McDonnell, Randy Pettapiece  
Lou Rinaldi  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qadri  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Bob Delaney  
Jack MacLaren, Michael Mantha  
Cristina Martins, Indira Naidoo-Harris  
Arthur Potts, Shafiq Qadri  
Todd Smith  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Toby Barrett  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Garfield Dunlop  
Granville Anderson, Bas Balkissoon  
Chris Ballard, Toby Barrett  
Garfield Dunlop, Michael Mantha  
Eleanor McMahon, Laurie Scott  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Han Dong, John Fraser  
Ernie Hardeman, Percy Hatfield  
Lisa MacLeod, Harinder Malhi  
Julia Munro, Arthur Potts  
Lou Rinaldi  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Présidente: Indira Naidoo-Harris  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Kathryn McGarry  
Robert Bailey, Lorenzo Berardinetti  
Jennifer K. French, Monte Kwinter  
Amrit Mangat, Kathryn McGarry  
Indira Naidoo-Harris, Daiene Vernile  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jagmeet Singh  
Granville Anderson, Vic Dhillon  
Christine Elliott, Marie-France Lalonde  
Amrit Mangat, Gila Martow  
Kathryn McGarry, Jagmeet Singh  
Peter Tabuns  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Select Committee on Sexual Violence and Harassment /  
Comité spécial de la violence et du harcèlement à caractère  
sexuel**

Chair / Présidente: Daiene Vernile  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Laurie Scott  
Han Dong, Randy Hillier  
Marie-France Lalonde, Harinder Malhi  
Kathryn McGarry, Eleanor McMahon  
Taras Natyshak, Peggy Sattler  
Laurie Scott, Daiene Vernile  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

Continued from back cover

**La francophonie**

M. Arthur Potts .....4668  
L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....4668

**Pan Am Games**

Mr. Todd Smith.....4669  
Hon. Michael Coteau .....4669

**Visitors**

Mr. Steve Clark .....4669  
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....4669

**DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS**

**Agriculture Insurance Act (Amending the Crop Insurance Act, 1996), 2015, Bill 40, Mr. Leal / Loi de 2015 sur l'assurance agricole (modifiant la Loi de 1996 sur l'assurance-récolte), projet de loi 40, M. Leal**

Third reading agreed to .....4670

**INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn .....4670  
Hon. Yasir Naqvi .....4670  
Mrs. Kathryn McGarry.....4670  
Mrs. Gila Martow.....4670  
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....4670

**MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS**

**Multiple sclerosis**

Mr. Bill Walker .....4670

**Multiple sclerosis**

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....4670

**Asian Heritage Month**

Ms. Soo Wong.....4671

**Liberation of the Netherlands**

Mr. Tim Hudak .....4671

**Multiple sclerosis**

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry.....4671

**Ehlers-Danlos syndrome**

Mrs. Gila Martow.....4671

**Neurofibromatosis**

Ms. Ann Hoggarth.....4672

**Beef Farmers of Ontario**

Mr. John Vanthof .....4672

**Member's grandchild**

Mr. John Fraser .....4672

**REPORTS BY COMMITTEES / RAPPORTS DES COMITÉS**

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills**

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris .....4673  
Report adopted .....4673

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

**1476263 Ontario Inc. Act, 2015, Bill Pr22, Mr. Hudak**

First reading agreed to.....4673

**Ethnic Media Week Act, 2015, Bill 105, Mr. Smith / Loi de 2015 sur la Semaine des médias ethniques, projet de loi 105, M. Smith**

First reading agreed to.....4673  
Mr. Todd Smith.....4673

**Protecting Condominium Owners Act, 2015, Bill 106, Mr. Oraziotti / Loi de 2015 sur la protection des propriétaires de condominiums, projet de loi 106, M. Oraziotti**

First reading agreed to.....4673  
Hon. David Oraziotti .....4673

**MOTIONS**

**House sittings**

Hon. Yasir Naqvi .....4673  
Motion agreed to .....4674

**Correction of record**

Mr. John Fraser .....4674

**PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS**

**Privatization of public assets**

Ms. Jennifer K. French.....4674

**Long-term care**

Mr. Grant Crack .....4674

**Ontario Disability Support Program**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....4674

**Off-road vehicles**

Mme France Gélinas .....4675

**Water fluoridation**

Mr. Bob Delaney .....4675

**Wind turbines**

Mr. Jim McDonell .....4675

**Privatization of public assets**

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....4675

**Credit unions**

Mrs. Cristina Martins .....4676

**Automotive industry**

Mr. Joe Dickson..... 4676

**Hydro rates**

Mr. Jim McDonell ..... 4676

**Privatization of public assets**

Mr. Wayne Gates ..... 4676

**Soins de longue durée**

M. Grant Crack..... 4676

**Landfill**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 4677

**ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR****Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to  
Animals Amendment Act, 2015, Bill 80, Mr. Naqvi  
/ Loi de 2015 modifiant la Loi sur la Société de  
protection des animaux de l'Ontario, projet de loi  
80, M. Naqvi**

Hon. Yasir Naqvi..... 4677

Mr. Bas Balkissoon..... 4678

Mr. Tim Hudak..... 4679

Ms. Jennifer K. French ..... 4681

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 4685

Mr. Gilles Bisson..... 4687

Mr. Rick Nicholls ..... 4689

Third reading vote deferred ..... 4691

**Order of business**

Hon. Yasir Naqvi..... 4691

Mr. Steve Clark..... 4695

Debate deemed adjourned..... 4697

**ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR****Ontario Immigration Act, 2015, Bill 49, Mr. Chan /  
Loi de 2015 sur l'immigration en Ontario, projet  
de loi 49, M. Chan**

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong..... 4697

Hon. Liz Sandals..... 4698

Mr. Victor Fedeli ..... 4699

Mr. Gilles Bisson..... 4699

Mrs. Cristina Martins..... 4699

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong..... 4700

Ms. Cheri DiNovo ..... 4700

Third reading vote deferred ..... 4701

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 27 May 2015 / Mercredi 27 mai 2015

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

### Time allocation

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	4647
Mr. Steve Clark .....	4647
Mr. John Vanthof .....	4648
Motion agreed to .....	4649

### Ontario Immigration Act, 2015, Bill 49, Mr. Chan / Loi de 2015 sur l'immigration en Ontario, projet de loi 49, M. Chan

Mr. Percy Hatfield.....	4649
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	4650
Third reading debate deemed adjourned .....	4657

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Bill Walker .....	4657
Ms. Catherine Fife.....	4657
Hon. Michael Coteau .....	4657
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	4657
Hon. Jeff Leal.....	4657
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	4657
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	4657
Hon. Reza Moridi.....	4657
Mrs. Julia Munro.....	4657
Mrs. Lisa Gretzky .....	4657
Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn.....	4658
Mr. Jim McDonell.....	4658
Mme France Gélinas .....	4658
Mrs. Cristina Martins .....	4658
Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	4658
Mr. John Vanthof .....	4658
Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	4658
Mr. Bill Walker .....	4658
Mr. Mike Colle.....	4658
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde .....	4658
Mr. Granville Anderson .....	4658
Hon. Mitzi Hunter .....	4658
Mr. Arthur Potts .....	4658
Mrs. Kathryn McGarry.....	4658
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	4658
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	4658
Hon. Michael Coteau .....	4658

### Wearing of carnations

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris .....	4658
--------------------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### Teachers' labour disputes

Mr. Jim Wilson.....	4659
Hon. Liz Sandals .....	4659
Mr. Garfield Dunlop.....	4659

### Hydro One

Mr. Jim Wilson.....	4660
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	4660
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	4660
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	4661

### Teachers' labour disputes

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	4661
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	4661
Hon. Liz Sandals .....	4661

### Privatization of public assets

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	4662
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	4662

### Hydro One

Mr. John Yakabuski .....	4663
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	4663

### Teachers' labour disputes

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky.....	4663
Hon. Liz Sandals .....	4664

### Pan Am Games

Mr. Glenn Thibeault.....	4664
Hon. Michael Coteau.....	4664

### Winter highway maintenance

Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	4665
Hon. Steven Del Duca.....	4665

### Privatization of public assets

Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	4666
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	4666

### Greenhouse gas emissions

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry.....	4666
Hon. Glen R. Murray.....	4666

### Ontario Drug Benefit Program

Mr. Michael Harris.....	4667
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	4667

### LGBT conversion therapy

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	4667
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	4667
Hon. Yasir Naqvi .....	4668

*Continued on inside back cover*