



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

First Session, 41st Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Thursday 2 June 2016

Jeudi 2 juin 2016

Speaker
Honourable Dave Levac

Président
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk
Deborah Deller

Greffière
Deborah Deller

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

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 416-325-3708.

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

Thursday 2 June 2016

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 2 juin 2016

The House met at 0900.

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

Prayers.

COMMITTEE SITTINGS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): A point of order from the government House leader.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Speaker, I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice with respect to a private member's public bill.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The government House leader is seeking unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice. Do we agree? Agreed.

Government House leader.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I move that, notwithstanding the order of the House dated Monday, May 30, 2016, the Standing Committee on Justice Policy be authorized to meet at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, June 2, 2016, for the purpose of a presentation from the family of Rowan Stringer for up to 10 minutes, followed by nine minutes of questions divided equally between the three caucuses.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Mr. Naqvi moves that notwithstanding the order of the House dated—

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Dispense.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Dispense? Dispensed. Do we agree? Carried.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ENERGY STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 2016

LOI DE 2016 MODIFIANT
DES LOIS SUR L'ÉNERGIE

Resuming the debate adjourned on May 12, 2016, on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 135, An Act to amend several statutes and revoke several regulations in relation to energy conservation and long-term energy planning / Projet de loi 135, Loi modifiant plusieurs lois et abrogeant plusieurs règlements en ce qui concerne la conservation de l'énergie et la planification énergétique à long terme.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Further debate?

Mr. Lorne Coe: I rise in the Legislature today to speak to Bill 135, the Energy Statute Law Amendment

Act. What's clear is that across the province, families are struggling to make ends meet, yet Ontario ratepayers continue to see unaffordable increases to their hydro bills. There's nowhere in North America where energy rates have risen like they have in Ontario over the past few years. While the Liberals would rather blame this rate increase on the weather, it's clear this is a direct result of years of scandal, waste and mismanagement in the energy sector. Companies see rates as a barrier to doing business in the province, and average Ontario families continue to struggle to pay their hydro bills.

With respect to electricity, the main issue with this bill is that it removes the autonomy of the Independent Electricity System Operator. The bill centralizes all transmission and electricity sector planning with the minister's political staff and cabinet, thereby overriding the industry experts at the Independent Electricity System Operator and the Ontario Energy Board.

When it comes to choosing what is best for the province and the electricity system within it, that decision will be made with a partisan and political lens. Building power lines to the north could easily be vetoed by a desire to bring in hydroelectric-generated power from Quebec. Clearly, energy is a necessity of life, and the Liberal government should not be able to dangle needed electricity projects that would improve affordability and reliability in front of certain ridings come election time to secure victory. We should do what's best for the province, not what's best for the Liberal government.

By making the Independent Electricity System Operator bend to the will of the cabinet, the political goals may differ from what is needed on more than just transmission. Essentially, the minister or the government can create whatever policy they like, on whichever grounds they like. That is hardly a stable system that acts in the best interests of all Ontarians.

The Independent Electricity System Operator does not have the ability to object to any of the directives or targets that are given by the ministry, even if functionally impossible. They are forced to create an implementation plan that the minister can alter or outright reject until he or she is satisfied. Again, Speaker, the Independent Electricity System Operator cannot reasonably object to any project.

Further, there is no requirement for the minister to hold consultations with Ontarians or people within the energy sector. The bill only suggests that the minister must consult with "groups that the minister considers appropriate given the matters being addressed by the long-term energy plan." Even if the government does

consult these groups, they're under no obligation to act on their advice. They are only legislatively required to "consider the results of such consultation." Since cabinet and the minister write and approve the long-term energy plan, none of the documentation rationalizing any of the plans will be made public.

In addition, because the Ontario Energy Board and the Independent Electricity System Operator are no longer allowed to hold hearings or raise opposition to any plans put forward by the government, the technical analysis regarding cost to impact on energy supply will not be brought forward. This means that if the government wants to move ahead with an expensive transmission project, they can put the entire cost onto the rate base without any objection from any entity.

The government can also do this even if the project is not needed in the first place. For example, the Caledonia power line, which does not connect to the grid, was built even with objections and analysis from the Ontario Energy Board. Speaker, imagine what kinds of decisions will be made if no objections or analysis are ever required.

However, the changes to the Ontario Energy Board Act and the Electricity Act are not the only problems with the bill. This bill will also allow the government to quietly enact home energy audits through changes to the Green Energy Act and the proclamation of past sections of that act. The bill also leaves the door open to applying these mandatory audits to businesses, as well.

This government has shown, time and time again, that it can't get anything right, and that it's not concerned with what is best for Ontarians. It is only concerned with its own political survival.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, I'll be opposing this bill. This bill does nothing to combat skyrocketing energy prices. In fact, this government doesn't appear to have any plan to do that. Instead, this bill seeks to give broad, new powers to the minister.

On energy, this government continues to show that it just doesn't get it. When they're not talking about banning natural gas, they're talking about selling Hydro One. This Liberal government's energy policies are not only hurting ratepayers; they are seriously damaging our economy and businesses.

My colleagues and I continue to question the government on hydro-related issues, and we'll continue to do that. In fact, we called for specific action to be reflected in this year's budget, which included a viable plan to deal with rising energy costs. Instead, the Liberal government put forward a budget full of tax increases and limited funding that will do nothing to ease the pressures of life on my constituents in Whitby-Oshawa.

Governing is about priorities. It is clear that this government is more concerned about banning natural gas than putting in place policies that make hydro affordable for Ontarians. I want to take the opportunity to assure Ontarians that we will continue to stand up for ratepayers in this province while the clock runs out on a government whose moment has come and gone.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Questions and comments?

M^{me} France Gélinas: I, too, will be opposing this bill, which basically takes any third-party, independent responsibility for planning electricity structure completely away. Whether we talk about the IESO or we talk about the OEB, they will become implementation instruments of the government. They will not be in charge of planning our electricity structure like we wanted it to be, like we have been doing since 2004 or should have been doing since 2004.

0910

I have a letter here that is signed by Mayor Brian Bigger, who is the mayor of the city of Greater Sudbury. He goes on to criticize this government. He has written to the Honourable Bob Chiarelli. He talks about his meeting. Basically, in Sudbury, in the city of Greater Sudbury, there is Greater Sudbury Utilities, and then 30,000 people who live in the city of Greater Sudbury are serviced by Hydro One. What the city of Greater Sudbury wanted to do was quite simple: It was to purchase the assets of Hydro One so that everybody in Sudbury would pay the same hydro rate under Greater Sudbury Utilities. You figure that could be possible, Madam Speaker? Absolutely not. The government was so bound and determined that they were going to sell off Hydro One to the highest bidder so that they could bring money in that they failed to take, basically, an equitable view of the taxpayers of Sudbury and the ratepayers of Sudbury. So Greater Sudbury Utilities was never able to have a truthful conversation so that everybody in Sudbury would be covered by Greater Sudbury Utilities. Instead, half of us use Hydro One and pay through the roof.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Questions and comments?

Mr. Mike Colle: I listened to the interesting points made by the member from Whitby-Oshawa. Sometimes it's hard to face reality. The reality is that in this province, we have a very comprehensive energy supply system that is not cheap; it is not free. It takes hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars to keep our energy supply available. Look at what is going to be required to refurbish Darlington, the Bruce Power cost. These are billions of dollars that are needed to invest in our energy sources, whether it be nuclear, whether it be natural gas, whether it be hydroelectric.

The other parties think that somehow this is done for free, that somehow we get this magical power when we turn on the light switch in our homes. It is an incredible investment that we've made in this province, and it is really illusionary to think that somehow you can freeze hydro rates, as the former Conservative Party did. I remember in 2003, we had a massive blackout. I remember standing at the corner of Avenue Road and Eglinton directing traffic because the Conservative government didn't invest in energy supply. So whether it's the natural gas we're investing in, whether it's nuclear we're investing in, you can't have a free lunch.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Point of order, Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): The member on a point of order.

Mr. John Yakabuski: The member, under standing order 23, is definitely impugning the motives of other members, and he is falsifying history. And he's—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Order. That's not a point of order.

Further questions and comments? I'm going to the member from York–Simcoe.

Mrs. Julia Munro: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker—

Mr. Mike Colle: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): The member from Eglinton–Lawrence.

Mr. Mike Colle: I had 15 seconds left. The member from Pembroke stood up and took my time because he disagreed with what I said. That should not be in order.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): That's not a point of order.

I'm going to turn to the member from York–Simcoe.

Mrs. Julia Munro: I want to make a couple of comments on the response by the member for Whitby–Oshawa. I think that one of the key issues he identified that we feel very strongly about is the question of where the decisions are being made, the concentration of decision-making by the political side of the equation when in fact it should be that the planning is based on engineering and on science, on best practices and the kinds of things that stand up to public scrutiny and transparency. That is the key to good decision-making, not ones where you are legislated an avenue into a minister's office, as opposed to the engineering work that's done before decisions are made. That is the problem.

Of course, if we look at the cost of hydro, it is out of control. It is not competitive. It acts as a deterrent for investment and for job creation. Those are the kinds of things that we on this side feel are the most important. This bill falls short of providing that kind of transparency that taxpayers need.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Questions and comments?

Miss Monique Taylor: I'm pleased to have a few moments. I will be getting up on my portion of the debate shortly after the member finishes up his own portion.

It's been lively in here already this morning. That's because this is a hot topic in the province of Ontario. The people of my riding and, quite frankly, people wherever I travel within this province—this is one of the first issues out of their mouths: the price of hydro in the province of Ontario and the concerns that brings upon a family.

The members talked about blackouts that happened in 2002. Well, we have blackouts that are happening today. They may not be off-the-grid blackouts, but they're blackouts because people can't afford to pay their bills. That's a concern. When we talk about dollars and the costs that go into producing a hydro system in the province of Ontario, how about the wasted dollars that they put into that energy file in this province?

I'll be happy to go further into those things in my portion of the debate. It's definitely something that needs

to be highlighted in this House. People on the other side of the bench—the government—need to get it. I think these new members—I'm not sure what they talk to their constituents about, but when my constituents come and talk to me, it's about how they can't afford any higher hydro costs, that there isn't any more money in their budget, that they struggle to turn the lights on and they struggle to heat their homes. And it's not necessarily electric heat. It's just keeping the lights on, keeping the house warm. Making sure there's enough food on the table these days is a struggling attempt for many people in this province.

So for the member opposite to be talking about “it costs a lot of money for the energy file,” I think he'd better look at his own back door and see really where the money has been spent on the energy file.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I return to the member from Whitby–Oshawa to wrap up.

Mr. Lorne Coe: It's a pleasure to sum up. I thank the members on both sides of the Legislature for their comments, which are always constructive. A lot of passion is presented in each of those commentaries.

Again, we still have across this province, as you know, Speaker, families who are struggling to make ends meet. I have those discussions on a regular basis with constituents whom I represent in Whitby–Oshawa.

In those discussions, it's not only families who tell me that it's a struggle to make ends meet; it's local businesses as well. I recently met with some members of the Whitby Chamber of Commerce and the Oshawa chamber of commerce, and they told me that it's really a struggle, given the unaffordable increases that they're trying to deal with overall.

They also spoke specifically to the energy rates and how high they've risen over the years here in Ontario. They just see it as an impediment to succeeding with their businesses and creating jobs here locally. Those companies see the rates as a barrier to even expanding their businesses as well. In summary, I think that there are a lot of challenges within this bill.

Another aspect that constituents tell me they'd like to see more of as we move ahead is consultation. We know that the best outcomes of bills and legislative frameworks is consultation—broad consultation—so that people have a very good understanding and they can provide their direct input about what's best for the province and what's best for their respective communities.

Speaker, I appreciate very much your time and patience in terms of the discussion of this bill this morning.

0920

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Miss Monique Taylor: I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this bill, the Energy Statute Law Amendment Act, on behalf of the people of Hamilton Mountain, people who, by the way, have a lot to say to me about this government and the way it handles our energy file. They have a lot to say, Speaker, and I have a lot to say, and I have to warn the government now that

none of it is going to be positive, as this bill does nothing to make people feel better.

The most common complaint I hear is about the ever-increasing cost of hydro in the province of Ontario. I hear it from families who are furious that their hydro bills are going through the roof. Prices went up by 80% between 2004 and 2014, and they're still going up. One constituent called to tell me what he had done, which he thought was a very wise approach: conservation. Quite frankly, I agreed with him, thinking that conservation was the right way to go. Then he continued to tell me the rest of his story. He managed to conserve so well that his usage went down to zero kilowatt hours, but he still received a bill for delivery charges. It just infuriated him that he had to pay those charges.

I hear from businesses that tell me about skyrocketing hydro bills and how they're making it really hard to survive. We know that businesses are failing, thanks to energy costs. When my colleague from Timiskaming–Cochrane spoke to this bill, he told us about businesses in his riding in the north that use a lot of energy, and they actually find it cheaper to run diesel generation than use electricity. That's incredible. One of the biggest selling points for electric cars these days is their much lower fuel costs, but diesel generators can be cheaper than electricity coming from the grid. What sort of energy system allows this to happen? People are angry about what they have to pay for electricity, and so they should be.

They're also angry that this government is selling Hydro One, because they know that it will only add to what they have to pay. They know that privatization will mean higher bills than they're already paying. They know that they didn't ask for it, and they know that they never gave anyone permission to sell it. After all, Hydro One belongs to the people of Ontario—public not private. But this Liberal government comes along and says, "Too bad. We're selling it. It's gone. We're selling your property." And they're allowed to get away with it.

So here we have a public utility that built Ontario over the past 110 years or so and a grid that has spread its tentacles throughout Ontario and facilitated the growth of a manufacturing economy, and was, quite frankly, the envy of the world. But what has this government done with that? Well, let's listen to what the Auditor General had to say, because she had quite a bit to say about this in her report last year when she spoke about electricity planning in Ontario.

She noted that determining future electricity demands requires a huge amount of technical planning, and that this was reflected in the 2004 amendments to the Electricity Act, which required "the Ontario Power Authority ... to conduct independent planning and prepare an 'Integrated Power System Plan.'" The Ontario Energy Board was "to review and approve the technical plan" so that the interest of consumers would be protected. That was how electricity planning was supposed to be conducted in Ontario, according to the 2004 amendments.

Sadly, that isn't the case. As the Auditor General says, "Over the last decade, this power system planning pro-

cess has essentially broken down, and Ontario's energy system has not had a technical plan in place for the last 10 years. Operating outside the checks and balances of the legislated planning process, the Ministry of Energy has made a number of decisions about power generation that have resulted in significant costs to electricity consumers."

She also pointed out that although the OPA developed the technical plans—one in 2007 and one in 2011—neither went forward. Instead, the ministry published its long-term energy plan, a shorter, more policy-oriented document. The Auditor General noted several problems with this plan, what she called their policy plan, and that it had no cost-benefit analysis or other alternatives.

There's a lack of transparency. Consumers are not being informed of the reasons behind the rising electricity costs. She questioned the stakeholder consultation process, and with good reason: After a two-month consultation process, the ministry couldn't provide her with a summary of the responses that they received. The plan was released just five days after the consultation period ended. I think that any reasonable person would agree that's not enough time to digest the consultation and incorporate the input into the plan.

That's a pattern that we've seen over and over and over again with this government. Consultations are no more than window dressing. We saw it earlier this year when the budget was introduced before the legislative committee could do their pre-budget report. Before that report was tabled, the government already had their budget written, so nothing from the people of Ontario whatsoever.

The Auditor General has also pointed out that "the ministry has effectively cut the Ontario Energy Board ... out of the picture." One of the main reasons, Speaker, as you know, for the OEB is to protect the interests of consumers and to consider the prices and adequacy, reliability and quality of our electricity service. But with no oversight of the power planning system and a very limited oversight of the generation costs, the Auditor General notes that the OEB cannot do what it's meant to do. That's a problem, Speaker. The two technical plans that were submitted never made it far enough to get reviewed by the OEB, something the OEB is required to do by legislation from 2004.

The policy plans that the ministry says replace the technical plans are not required by legislation, which also means the OEB is not mandated to review them. The OEB wasn't consulted at all over the privatization of Hydro One. It's one of the largest privatizations of a government-owned generation asset in Canada, and the Liberal government sees no benefit in engaging the Ontario Energy Board, a board whose job it is to protect consumers' interests. That is just more evidence of the unbelievable arrogance of this government.

This arrogance and mismanagement of our hydro system is costing the people of Ontario dearly. Smart meters were supposed to move power consumption from peak times to other times of the day. That didn't work and it

cost us \$2 billion. A boondoggle, they call it—\$2 billion. Think how that money could have been spent. We are starving our hospitals. We have wait-lists for residential services for people with severe developmental disabilities whose parents are unable to adequately care for them, people struggling to survive on minimal social assistance payments, autistic children over the age of five being denied treatment they were promised, yet we can blow \$2 billion on failed smart meter plans. Brilliant.

We dump \$1.5 billion in surplus power every year from our electricity market. The Auditor General reported last year that we actually paid \$32.6 million between 2009 and 2014 for other jurisdictions to take the power we produced. And let's not forget the gas plants scandal, Speaker—another billion dollars more down the drain, thanks to this government's energy file. And how does the government address their abysmal record? By bringing us this bill that puts the legislative requirements in place that actually codify their bad behaviour.

As bad as the past 10 years of electricity policy have been, there has at least been a legislative framework that, if followed, would have prevented some of the worst excesses, but this bill wipes all of that away and gives the minister free rein to bring further havoc to Ontarians. Several respected professionals presented to the committee. By the looks of my time, I'll have to try to get them in and their quotes and what they said at committee during that time, because there's definitely a lot to say on this bill and the hurt it does to the people of this province.

0930

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Questions and comments?

Mr. Lou Rinaldi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think this is the first time that I'm able to speak while you're in the chair. Congratulations, and I know you'll do a fine job.

I'm delighted to make a couple of comments on the 10 minutes that I heard from the member from Hamilton Mountain. I was hoping to hear her talk about Bill 135, but I didn't hear much about that.

This is really about putting in place a structure that will help planning for the future of our energy and, in some cases, so that we'll be able to manage how we control costs, how we move forward to make sure that we have a reliable system, and of course, I didn't hear much on that.

The status quo that the former government left behind—

Miss Monique Taylor: Oh, here we go.

Mr. Lou Rinaldi: Yes, that's right. Here we go.

Interjection: The truth hurts.

Mr. Lou Rinaldi: The truth hurts. And it wasn't their government. It was the government opposite.

In the municipality of Alnwick/Haldimand, which is in my riding—near the Big Apple, by the way—the government of the day had to put in a diesel generator to make sure that businesses and homes would maybe have power when they needed it, Speaker. Those days are gone. But

we have to make sure we don't go back to those—pardon the pun—dark days. This is what this intends to do.

When I hear about all the other stuff, it's hard to—I would hope that they would support this and I would hope that whoever speaks about it—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Thank you. Questions and comments?

Mr. Robert Bailey: I've heard so much of this fairy tale for so long, and the charade, so I want to applaud the member from Hamilton Mountain. I don't intend to support this bill.

I remember that blackout in 2003. Just a history lesson: It was created in, I think, Ohio from a tree branch falling, and then the power cascaded.

It's a bunch of malarkey that you guys stand up and try to defend the billions of dollars you've wasted—and that's according to the Auditor General, and you know that.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Order.

Mr. Robert Bailey: I have 5,000 names on an online petition saying that you guys are on the wrong track with your energy policies. If you want to come on down to Sarnia-Lambton and try to peddle this stuff, I'll gladly take you around to all the industries that will show you the door when you get there.

Anyway, the costs that you've unloaded onto the general public and the ratepayers of this province is a travesty, and you know it. I'd love to go and sit in your constituency offices someday and see when the people come there, because I can't believe that the people in Sarnia-Lambton or in Hamilton are the only people who care about energy rates—

Hon. Jeff Leal: Come to my office in Peterborough and I'll buy you lunch.

Mr. Robert Bailey: I wish you would.

Hon. Jeff Leal: I will.

Mr. Robert Bailey: All right. I'll come.

I want to poll the people in your ridings because I can't believe that the people in our part of the province are any different than anyone else.

I have 5,000 names on an online petition that are challenging that leaked document in the Globe and Mail. I would love to get that up to 10,000, and when I do, I'll make sure I tell you. It's online today, and this will probably help drive it up some more today. It goes up about 200 a day. I hope you heckle me some more. I'm going to try to speak all day and I'm going to mention it all the time, so I can keep increasing the numbers. I'll make sure that they know the true story.

I've got more to say, but I'll have to leave it till I get another shot at it.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I know that there is a lot of this cross-talking amongst the members. But I want to encourage everybody to be respectful. There's a lot of shouting across the floor. We need to be respectful to each other during this debate. There's a lot of emotion and a lot of cross-talk. Please speak through the Chair.

I recognize the member from Niagara Falls.

Mr. Wayne Gates: Thank you very much, Chair. I'm going to speak through the Chair. How's that?

I want to rise today on Bill 135, but I want to talk about electricity costs in the province of Ontario in relation to what's going on in the province over the next few months, over the summer. Some very important things are going to happen over the summer. Big Three bargaining is going to happen with Ford, Chrysler and General Motors, where we have an auto industry that relies on hydro.

I was at a function for the United Way. General Motors and their employees in St. Catharines donated almost half a million dollars to the United Way. But the plant manager, Carolyne Watts, pulls me over—I used to be a chair of United Way—and she says, “Gatesy, I've got to tell you, we've got a crisis in St. Catharines.” I said, “What's”—

Hon. Ted McMeekin: Gatesy?

Mr. Wayne Gates: I've worked with her before.

I said, “What's the problem?” She said, “Hydro rates are killing us. The plant will be in jeopardy if we don't get hydro rates in the province of Ontario under control.” That wasn't me saying that; that was the plant manager, who wants to make sure that those 2,000 jobs and those seven off-jobs that are there will be there in the parts sector, whether it be in machine shops.

I watched the news just the other day, and the president of Chrysler—in Windsor, they have a great plant there. They're producing one of the best vehicles in the world, where they have 6,000 or 7,000 employees right in the plant. Do you know what he said? The biggest concern for him to invest in the province of Ontario is hydro rates.

So when people stand up and talk to our colleagues on the Liberal side, it's not me saying it. I can stand up and say whatever I want and you can agree or disagree, but these are people in decision-making positions who are going to put jobs into our province and make sure our kids and our grandkids have jobs.

I'll finish this up in my next two minutes.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Questions and comments?

Mr. Bob Delaney: I listened carefully to what the member from Hamilton Mountain was saying and listened very carefully to all of the comments that followed. In the entire cycle, nobody talked about the bill. I heard talk about auto-sector bargaining, Hydro One, stranded debt, and years-old resolved issues—things that have nothing to do with power planning.

I'm looking at the notes I've made as the parliamentary assistant, supplying my own two-minuters and doing my own part in the debate. We've said almost everything that needs to be said on this particular bill. There is nothing new being said on it. I have nothing to respond to messages that have nothing to do with the bill.

It just strikes me that we are very near the time to move forward on this bill. We need to get on with the next version of the long-term energy plan. We need to get that process started, get out into the community and start

hearing from people. We need to take a system that worked well in 2013—and should now be law, should this bill pass—and get that system out so that we can give Ontarians a good vision of their energy future moving forward from 2017. It's time to get on with the job, Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I turn to the member from Hamilton Mountain to wrap up.

Miss Monique Taylor: This has definitely been a lively debate, and I think that just really goes to the heart of the matter, which is what this does to the people of this province, what it does to their pocketbook and what it does to their hydro bill.

I was reminded of another story of a woman who lives on a disability cheque. She's disabled, through no fault of her own. She lives in a lower-income part of town. She doesn't turn her heat on. She heats her home by turning her oven on and opening the door of her oven. She wears a lot of sweaters and a lot of socks and a lot of blankets, and she thinks it's okay that she lives like this. That's not okay, Speaker. It's not okay that people in our province live like this, in the city of Hamilton.

Take that farther up north, where the costs are that much higher, where many people are paying for electric heat. How are those people feeling? It's so much colder.

That's the crux of this debate. This bill went to committee, and not one amendment was passed—not one amendment. How do you put through an entire bill of this nature, that talks about our energy system in the province of Ontario, and not one amendment could be passed? Why? Because the Liberals know best. It doesn't matter what file it is; it doesn't matter what's happening; the Liberals have the majority and the Liberals win. They have the first say, they have the middle say, they have the final say and that's it. They don't want to hear from anybody else and, quite frankly, when they have to hear from somebody else, we have to put up with the heckling and everything else that goes on. My thought is the people of this province. I wish they felt the same.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to you and good morning to the good people of Ottawa–Orléans and all members of the House. It's a pleasure, actually, and a delight to stand up this morning. As my colleague mentioned and made reference to, in this bill, it's about planning for our future. When I think about our long-term energy planning, it's certainly an essential piece of legislation in terms of clean, reliable and affordable energy for our future.

Ontarians have been clear that they want to play a role in our government's long-term energy process, and this government has listened, Madam Speaker, and introduced this bill, the Energy Statute Law Amendment Act, 2015. I know we've been talking about it and I know some of my colleagues have been sharing. I just want to reiterate a few points. If passed, this legislation—and it's very important—will actually ensure that a consistent,

transparent, long-term planning process is followed. It would also enshrine in law a requirement for extensive consultation.

I'm going to have to wear my glasses on this one, Madam Speaker.

It would enshrine in law a requirement for extensive consultation with the public, stakeholders and aboriginal groups in the development of energy plans, as is already standard practice. It would also amend the Green Energy Act of 2009 by introducing two new initiatives to help Ontario families, businesses and the province as a whole to conserve energy and water to manage costs, and it would support increased competition and enhanced ratepayer value by empowering the IESO to undertake competitive processes for transmitter selection or procurement, when appropriate.

Madam Speaker, I have to say this bill has now seen over 18 hours of debate between second and third readings. I think this has been considerable debate.

Interjections.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Yes, I agree. We've heard a wide range of viewpoints, opinions and certainly perspectives. There are other pieces of legislation that need to come to the floor for debate. I want to talk about Bill 178, the Smoke-Free Ontario Amendment Act, and I think about Bill 181, the Municipal Elections Modernization Act. I would like to spend some time to debate some of those other very important pieces of legislation that are currently before the House. We really can't, because Bill 135 is still being dealt with. As a result, Madam Speaker, with your indulgence, I move that this question now be put.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Madame Lalonde has moved that the question now be put.

I'm satisfied that there has been sufficient debate to allow this question to be put to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I can hear some nos.

All those in favour of the motion that the question now be put, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion that the question be put, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. A recorded vote will be required. The vote will be deferred until after question period today.

Vote deferred.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Orders of the day? The Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

Hon. Jeff Leal: Madam Speaker, I know that in the great riding of Peterborough business is continuing as we speak, but here at Queen's Park there's no further business at this time.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): If there's no further—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): There are no points of order.

We're going to recess the House until 10:30.

The House recessed from 0944 to 1030.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Bill Walker: I'm pleased to introduce my constituency staff, Lisa LaPierre and Julie Blake, a co-op student from Peninsula Shores District School, Alex Pickett; and a Rotary Club exchange student from Osaka, Japan, Tomoki "Tomcat" Maeda. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: It's my pleasure to introduce the almost 50 young people sitting in the gallery from Grassy Narrows First Nation who are here with us today. As we know, they've travelled over 1,700 kilometres. Over 1,000 members and supporters from the community will be here demanding for their area to be cleaned up. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Ms. Ann Hoggarth: From my riding of Barrie, I'd like to welcome Ellie Stones, the recipient of the victim services award of distinction, as well as her parents, Shannon and Kevin, and her grandfather Randy Lovelace.

I would also like to welcome Jennifer Jackson and Jennie-May Banks, who accepted the same award on behalf of the Child Advocacy Centre of Simcoe/Muskoka.

Mr. Jack MacLaren: It gives me great pleasure to introduce Yvonne Lindfield, who is in the gallery behind us here. She was a recipient of a victim services award of distinction for victims of crime at the ceremony this morning with the Attorney General.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Good morning. I have a number of guests from Windsor this morning. Miss Emily Gilbert is here with her mom, Shelley. Shelley was one of the recipients of the Attorney General's awards of distinction this morning. They are joined by Theresa Ouellette-Klein from Windsor. Welcome to question period and Queen's Park this morning.

Hon. Jeff Leal: It gives me great pleasure to introduce Sheena Howard, who's in the members' east gallery today. She is a very accomplished nurse who works at the Peterborough Clinic in Peterborough.

Mr. Patrick Brown: I have a number of introductions to make. As was recognized, Jennifer Jackson, executive director of the Child Advocacy Centre of Simcoe/Muskoka is here, along with Jennie-May Banks. They won awards at the victim services awards of distinction.

I also have the pleasure to introduce a long-time family friend, Simon Hirsch, who is here today in the Speaker's gallery, as well as the most loving and smart person I know in my life: My mother, Judy Brown, is here.

Last but not least, the pillar of my family, my grandmother, who is 102 years old, is at Queen's Park for the very first time. Thank you to the Speaker for having her in his gallery.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Anyone who's 102 gets to do anything and go anywhere they want.

Ms. Andrea Horwath: It's my pleasure and honour to recognize and acknowledge Dr. Mohit Bhandari and his daughter Kaya, who are both here. Dr. Bhandari is a

recipient of a victim services award of distinction for his work on issues of violence against women and intimate-partner violence.

Mr. Chris Ballard: I'd like to recognize Rubaiyat Karim, who is the manager of the York Region Centre for Community Safety and was here accepting the Attorney General's victim services award on behalf of her organization.

Also, Leslie Bullock from the St. John Ambulance support dog project was here accepting an award on behalf of her program.

And two people from my riding of Newmarket–Aurora, Jill and Andrew Kellie, are here to have lunch as constituents.

I'd also like to welcome my constituency assistant Trish Palichuk and her son Jack, who are in the gallery today.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Given my comments over the last couple of days on introduction of guests—it looks like there are quite a few here today—let's get through those introductions. I'll give you the time that's necessary to do that, so don't fret, but let's make sure we introduce all of our guests now.

The member from Parkdale–High Park.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo: It's my pleasure to acknowledge, in the members' gallery, Elizabeth Gajewski, who is a Parkdale–High Park constituent and winner of the Attorney General's Victim Services Awards of Distinction for her work for women who have been abused and for all of those in the Eastern European and particularly the Polish communities.

Also, our page captain today is Ariane Parent. Her mother, Isabel Blair; her father, Patrick Parent; and her brother David are all here in the gallery this morning. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. Mitzie Hunter: On behalf of Lorenzo Berardinetti, MPP for Scarborough Southwest, page captain Sulin Fletcher's family is here. I'm pleased to welcome them: mother, Peggy Brooks; aunt Dianne Algera; and aunt Joanne Brooks. Welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. Glen R. Murray: It gives me great pleasure to welcome Ms. Lindsay Upton, a winner of this year's victim services awards, from my riding. She's in attendance here today. Welcome.

Hon. Deborah Matthews: I have a number of introductions. First of all, welcome to Dan Ashbourne and Rachel Crawford here from the London Family Court Clinic, being recognized in the victim services awards of distinction.

From OUSA, the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance, we have Zak Rose, Armin Escher, Danielle Pierre, Justin Bedi and Lindsay D'Souza.

Last and absolutely not least, a very special guest, Tami Tran, in the east gallery. Welcome all.

Hon. Liz Sandals: I'm pleased to introduce another one of our Attorney General's victim services awards winners: from Family Counselling and Support Services for Guelph–Wellington, executive director, Joanne Young Evans, and chair of the board, Sandra Ellis. Welcome.

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: I'd like to extend a warm welcome to Kerri Tadeu. She is also a recipient of the Attorney General's Victim Services Awards of Distinction. Thank you for being here today.

Hon. Michael Gravelle: I'm very pleased to introduce a good friend and a great Ontarian, Mr. Robert Simpson, president of HopeLink International. With Mr. Simpson is Levi Beardy, who is a board member of HopeLink International. Welcome to both of you, gentlemen.

Hon. Michael Coteau: It is my distinct pleasure to introduce Stephan Jost, who is the new CEO of the AGO, and his colleague Lisa Clements.

While I'm here, I'd also like to welcome Paul Costa to the Legislature here today.

Ms. Soo Wong: I have a couple of guests from Scarborough–Rouge River. I want to welcome them: Jan Pieter Broekhof, Anne Broekhof, Sandra Broekhof, Christopher Sampson, Lilian Sampson, Kathleen Broekhof, Maria Broekhof, Rick Gocool, Lucia Broekhof, Luke Foss, Sarah Church and Robert Sprague.

Also, I want to welcome my colleague and a friend, Dr. Gail Donner, who is here with us today.

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris: I'd like to welcome Michelle Barclay, Mary Lou Loughlin, Pam Preston and Doug Barclay, who are from my riding of Halton and are up in the public gallery. Michelle is described by police officers as "invaluable" and by victims as an "angel." She was one of the victim services awards recipients this morning.

Hon. Eric Hoskins: I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce some very important health care stakeholders we have here with us in the gallery. We have representatives from the Service Employees International Union, or SEIU Healthcare, Kitchener–Waterloo SEIU, the representatives from the Ontario Association of Community Care Access Centres, and from the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario. We also have representatives from the Association of Ontario Health Centres, the Association of Local Public Health Agencies and, finally, my external adviser on home and community care, Gail Donner.

Mr. Chris Ballard: I'd like to introduce the parents of today's page captain Waleed Malik. From the great riding of Oak Ridges–Markham, we have Asghari Begum and his father, Kashif Malik.

1040

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: I would like to introduce in the House this year's winners of the victim services award, who are here for question period—especially Ellie, who is one of the recipients, 11 years old. I think she's going to replace me in a few years.

Hon. Mario Sergio: From the wonderful riding of York West, I'd like to welcome in the House Louise Russo and friends. I hope she will enjoy the proceedings today.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Thank you. Further introductions. Minister responsible for seniors.

Hon. Mario Sergio: Speaker, I believe you will find we have unanimous consent—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): One moment, please.

I'm honoured to welcome a Brant constituent who has received a victim services award this morning for their program Embrace Her With Love, the executive director of Ganohkwasra Family Assault Services Centre, Sandi Montour. Welcome.

We also have with us today in the Speaker's gallery the education committee of the Parliament of Sweden, led by chair Ms. Lena Hallegren. Thank you for joining us.

The minister responsible for seniors on a point of order.

Hon. Mario Sergio: Speaker, I believe you will find that we have unanimous consent—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I've been notified there are other introductions.

Government House leader.

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I believe we have members of the community from Grassy Narrows here. I just want to welcome them to Queen's Park.

Also, I noticed a good friend of mine, Darcy MacNeill, is in the House. I'm just disappointed that he's sitting on the other side.

WEARING OF PINS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Now I will entertain the minister responsible for seniors' issues.

Hon. Mario Sergio: Speaker, I believe you will find that we have unanimous consent that all members be permitted to wear pins in recognition of June 2, Italy's national day, and Italian Heritage Month.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The minister responsible for seniors' issues is seeking unanimous consent to wear the pins today. Do we agree? Agreed.

WEARING OF FLOWERS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Simcoe-Grey.

Mr. Jim Wilson: I seek unanimous consent to allow all members to wear a cornflower to commemorate June as ALS Awareness Month.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Simcoe-Grey is seeking unanimous consent to wear the cornflower. Do we agree? Agreed.

ORAL QUESTIONS

AUTISM TREATMENT

Mr. Patrick Brown: My question is for the Premier. Parents across Ontario still don't know what to do since this government has turned their back on children with autism.

Parent and professor Janet McLaughlin has said that legal avenues are being considered in terms of filing

human rights complaints. She said that they are looking to challenge this government for discriminating against children with autism just because of their age.

This would not be the first time the Liberals have fought parents with children with autism in the court. I would not be surprised if the Liberals were ready to go to court again. After all, their member from Mississauga-Streetsville did call the police on a parent with a child with autism.

Mr. Speaker, will the Liberals be fighting parents in the courtroom instead of giving children the help that they deserve?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: On this side of the House, we are focused on making sure that every child with autism gets the services that they need. Otherwise, we would not be investing \$333 million. It is our focus to make sure that kids who are sitting on a waiting list—it really is surprising to me that both opposition parties think it's better to have children sitting on a waiting list getting no service than actually getting service.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I'm asking everyone to come to order. I will repeat from yesterday if I have to. I will do that quickly. It's your choice.

Finish, please.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: We recognize that every family needs to have an assessment and needs to be in contact with a provider, and that the transition needs to be clear to parents. All of us have been meeting with parents. The minister has been working to make sure that each family gets the information they need so their children can get the services they need.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Patrick Brown: Back to the Premier: Over the long weekend, I sat at a Tim Hortons in Mississauga with Melanie Palaypayon; her husband, Clint; and her son, Xavier. When they were there, the husband, Clint, couldn't stop crying—crying in the crowded Tim Hortons. They said to me that he moved to Canada a decade ago thinking that this is a country where, if you work hard, if something happens, there would be a social safety net you could depend upon. He said to me—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

Mr. Patrick Brown: The government can heckle as much as they want, but you know what? He told me that all they wanted was to talk to their government representative, their Liberal MPP, to explain what this means, that IBI wouldn't be available for their child, Xavier.

The Mississauga-Streetsville MPP apologized but only after it was exposed on the front page of the Toronto Star, only once CTV's Paul Bliss exposed it.

The family asked me to ask today if the Premier will apologize—

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

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Be seated, please. Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, the member has apologized. It is unacceptable to me that, quite frankly, any member in this House would not meet with parents who are concerned about their children. We are all doing that. A meeting has been offered to the family.

As I said, we are focused on making sure that every family in this province with children with autism has the information that they need and that their children get the services that they need.

It was unacceptable and is unacceptable to me that we would have children on a waiting list for two, three or four years, getting no service and no support. We are putting in place a program that will allow those kids to get the service that they need and to get it in the time frame that is the best for them and the most effective in terms of treatment. That's what we're focused on.

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

Mr. Patrick Brown: Again to the Premier: What is unacceptable is that your government callously kicked 2,200 kids off the list for IBI.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Deputy House leader.

Mr. Patrick Brown: My question was not to hear more government talking points; my question was the family. The family wants an apology. They want an apology from the Premier. It was the Liberal Party representative who, instead of meeting with a family in tears about seeing their child's life thrown away by this government because IBI won't be available, despite waiting three years on the list—Melanie's wish is that the Premier, today in the Legislature, will apologize for the despicable actions of the member from Mississauga–Streetsville. It is never acceptable for a member to call the cops on a constituent. Meet with that constituent. Help that constituent.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: In this instance, the member has apologized. The reality is that we all have constituency offices. We all know that we have to take advice from the police in particular circumstances. This was not one of them.

The member has apologized and has offered several dates to the family for a meeting. I hope that the family will take the member up on that and will have a meeting with him.

We are focused on making sure that every child in this province with autism gets the service that they need. The member opposite, I hope, is having the opportunity to talk with families and to give them the information—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Leeds–Grenville, come to order.

Wrap up, please, Premier.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: We know that these are families that are in transition—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Dufferin–Caledon, come to order.

The minute I sit down and somebody else says something, I'm going to warn you.

1050

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: We've been listening to the families. One of the issues that they have raised is the issue of direct funding—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Leeds–Grenville is warned. We're inching closer.

Carry on.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: One of the issues that families have raised has been direct funding. We're talking right now about whether there's a possibility of providing more direct funding. The \$8,000 is direct funding. Is there a way that parents can have more choice? That's the kind of listening that we're doing because we want to make sure that we get this transition right so that every child gets the services that they need.

ELECTION FINANCES

Mr. Patrick Brown: My question is for the Premier. And let me say, I'm disappointed that the Premier won't apologize to the Palaypayon family, despite a direct ask to do so.

But we'll talk about something else. Ever since we learned about the Liberal ministers—

Interjection.

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

Mr. Patrick Brown: Ever since we learned about Liberal ministers hosting \$6,000 dinners with those trying to do business with the government, people have been asking questions. People have been asking: How much money would you have to donate to the Liberal government to change a regulation or a law? Well, one estimate that's just out is \$52,700. That is exactly what Ticketmaster and its parent company donated to the Liberals before the government made changes to ticket sale laws in favour of scalpers.

The Liberals continue to reveal themselves one scandal at a time. How can this government deny the blatant pay-to-play policy that they've operated under?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I've been very clear that policy is made based on the evidence, based on challenges that are facing whatever sector, and have nothing to do with—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke is warned. You've asked me to go there; I'm going there.

Carry on.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Policies have nothing to do with the fundraising that we do. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that we're in the process now of getting consultations in place to go out to the public, to have a conversation about how we should change the fundraising rules. There's draft legislation that is going to be out to committee, and I look forward to the

input from people around the province on things like third-party advertising and on the rules that should be in place around donations to all of our parties, because we all operate under the same rules.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Patrick Brown: Back to the Premier: When the change was made last year, John Karastamatis from Mirvish Productions said he believed that the government caved to pressure from big ticketholder operations such as Ticketmaster and Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment. But wait a second: Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment happened to donate \$30,000 to the Liberal Party. So that's \$52,000 and \$30,000, for a total of \$82,000 from those who benefited from this change. Maybe the Liberals didn't cave to pressure, but rather it appears that government policies can be bought under this Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, if the government has nothing to hide, why would they not welcome our call for a public inquiry? I'll ask again: Will the government accept our request for a public inquiry?

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Stop the clock, please. Be seated, please. Having thought through what I heard, I will warn the Leader of the Opposition: Do not go down there again.

Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, we're moving forward to reform political fundraising in this province with the Election Finances Act. We look forward to the conversation that will take place over the coming weeks with the public in Ontario about the changes that we're putting forward, the banning of corporate and union donations, reducing the pre-writ spending limits and eliminating third-party advertising. We look forward to the committee discussions. We look forward to suggestions on amendments that might come forward. I was disappointed to hear that the NDP actually voted against that consultation yesterday. That was surprising. But we are confident that with the intensive consultations that will happen over the summer, we'll have a good bill going forward and we'll be able to reform those rules so they will be in place for January 2017.

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

Mr. Patrick Brown: Back to the Premier: As Gord Downie sang, "Isn't it amazing what you can accomplish / When you don't let the nation get in your way?" Well, isn't it amazing what the Liberals can accomplish when they don't let ethics get in the way?

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Beaches–East York is warned.

Finish, please.

Mr. Patrick Brown: Mr. Speaker, isn't it amazing what the Liberals can accomplish when they don't let ethics get in the way?

The Liberals can "hang your head in woe" now that they've been caught, but it looks like they still think they

have done nothing wrong—over \$80,000 to the Liberal Party coffers from these companies, and then, with the stroke of a pen, this government changes the law in their favour.

My question is, if this government has done nothing wrong, if the Premier feels they have done nothing wrong, why would they not want to clear the air and support our call for a public inquiry?

Interjections.

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

Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take Gord Downie's lyrics and his tone over the Leader of the Opposition's any time.

We are moving ahead on reforming the election finances of this province. We're going to do that with the opposition parties or without them. I hope they'll take part. I hope that they will take an active part in the committee discussions. But we're going to be in conversation with the people of this province so that we can get feedback on the kinds of changes that they think are appropriate. We make policy separate from political donations.

At the same time, we believe that modernizing fundraising rules is what—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I have three in mind. If I hear it again, you will.

Finish, please.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Having said that, we know that modernizing the fundraising rules is what needs to happen. We're moving ahead on that. We look forward to the participation of everyone in the House.

SCHOOL FACILITIES

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My question is for the Premier. The government keeps track of the repairs that schools need, and that information is public. If a school has something called an FCI, facility condition index score over 65%, the state of repair of that school is considered critical.

Yesterday, I was in Scarborough, where advocates told me about Sir Alexander Mackenzie school, which has—

Interjections.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: —which has an FCI score of 85%, and Sir William Osler, which has a score of 84%. Remember, 65% is considered critical. These schools are beyond critical.

Why has this Premier let Scarborough schools fall into such a state of disrepair?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: The importance of an FCI, or the facility condition index, is that a board can track the needs of schools so that there can be an orderly use of maintenance dollars as those are available. It's only responsible. It's like a municipality having an asset

management plan—understanding the condition of your assets so that as you make investments, you can do that in an orderly way so that it's not random, so that it's not haphazard, but it's actually done in a way that is responsible. That's what an FCI is about.

I am absolutely pleased that the TDSB still has an FCI, that boards across the province have those, so that as they make investments in their schools, they do so in an orderly and responsible way.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: People expect the government to get the basics right. In our education system, making sure a school is properly repaired is one of the basics. For example, students in our schools should not have to be wearing winter coats during the wintertime while they're in the classroom. But we're seeing schools falling apart, not only in Scarborough but across this province.

Can the Premier explain how she's getting something that is so basic so wrong?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Minister of Education.

Hon. Liz Sandals: As the leader has acknowledged, we in fact do keep track—

Interjections.

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

Hon. Liz Sandals: —of the facility condition indexes so that we have a common measure of the state of repair of schools around the province. We quite recognize that there are some older schools that require funding.

1100

That's why, in 2014, we actually announced an investment of \$1.25 billion over three years, specifically for the repair of schools with high FCIs. For this year, the 2016-17 year coming up, that investment will amount to \$500 million, half a billion dollars, which we are sending to boards. That's based on the boards with the most high FCIs getting—

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

Final supplementary.

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Schools in Scarborough have cracked walls, missing ceiling tiles, cracked foundations, broken doors—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Economic Development is warned.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Just to make sure you heard me as you continued, you're warned.

Finish, please.

Ms. Andrea Horwath: These schools could quite literally fall apart unless they're immediately repaired, and repaired properly.

This is not an environment that encourages learning, nor is it a proper work environment for educators. It sends all the wrong messages. Can this Premier tell students, their parents and their educators why she's letting schools fall into this kind of disrepair?

Hon. Liz Sandals: I repeat: I would question the degree of disrepair. We do not have any schools that are going to fall down, but we have—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Windsor West is warned.

Carry on.

Hon. Liz Sandals: We are investing \$1.25 billion. Over the last several years, we have invested \$13 billion in school board capital, and that includes replacing schools that are in need of repair. But we've also directed boards that have what are called proceeds of disposition from selling schools that are no longer needed. That money must also go into school repair. So we have made significant, major investments in school repair.

HOSPITAL FUNDING

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My next question is for the Premier. The Liberals won't tell Ontarians if their local hospital is one of the hospitals that needs hundreds of millions of dollars in maintenance in order to prevent an imminent breakdown, but they provide that information for schools. In fact, the Premier just said that that's because they have to ensure there's an orderly use of maintenance dollars. In fact, she just said it's only the responsible thing to do in order to make sure that the repairs are done in an orderly way, not random, not haphazard.

Will the Premier admit now that she will not release information about hospital repair backlogs because she's more worried about bad PR for the Liberal Party than she is about delivering the best care in our hospitals for our patients?

Interjections.

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

Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I'm so glad the leader of the third party asked this question, because it really demonstrates the depth of her misunderstanding.

The fact is that if she looks at the facility condition index of a school board, she will notice that there is no dollar amount attached to the school name. That's for a very good reason, because the facility condition index indicates the work that needs to be done, indicates where the challenges are and indicates the rating of that school, but it doesn't say, "And these repairs will cost X number of dollars," because that would prejudice the process of getting that school fixed.

It's a completely different process than the hospitals. It just demonstrates that she doesn't understand how we would get those repairs done in the hospitals. It's a different process. I think that if she looks at the FCIs, she'll understand why they're written the way they are.

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Be seated, please. Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Speaker, all it really shows is the depth of the arrogance of this government that responds to my question. It shows the depth of the arrogance of this Liberal Premier.

The Liberals will not tell Ontarians if their hospitals are up to code or not. In the school system, that's some-

thing that is quite well known. We know that Ontario hospitals need more than \$3 billion worth of repairs but we don't know which hospitals, and yet the school boards publicly allow that information to be out there. But for some reason, the Liberals refuse to allow the same information to be made public when it comes to hospitals. We have the information about schools, but the Liberals will not provide it about hospitals.

So my question, again back to the Premier, and perhaps she will answer it this time: Why won't she tell us which hospitals need the most repair work?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the third party is simply wrong. You do not have the information about how much money it would cost to fix the schools on a facility condition index. The fact is that what the leader of the third party is asking for is for the whole negotiation process around the cost of repairs to be undermined by making that information public, and then prejudicing the process. The leader of the third party is saying, "It doesn't matter what the negotiation is. It doesn't matter what the cost is. Let's just bump the cost up as high as it can be by acknowledging what we think the cost is, and by attaching the name of the hospital to it." That would be irresponsible, Mr. Speaker.

There are no dollar amounts attached to an FCI from a school board. The leader of the third party does not seem to understand exactly the damage that would be done if we were to do what she's asking.

Interjections.

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

Final supplementary.

Ms. Andrea Horwath: I think, Speaker, the lack of understanding that exists in this chamber is this Premier's lack of understanding of the words "openness and transparency." We say that and so does our Financial Accountability Officer. This is another demonstration of the Liberals refusing to give public information to the public.

The government is not keeping up with critical repairs and maintenance in our hospitals. And what is worse, in response to our freedom-of-information request, the government admits that they have no plan to deal with any future maintenance needs. That means the repair backlog is only going to grow and the situation in our hospitals is only going to get worse. We see what that looks like when we see packed ERs, fewer nurses and fewer beds. People can see the crisis. Every patient in this province can see the crisis, but the Liberals are pretending that it does not exist.

Will this Premier stop defending her inaction and start dealing with the crisis in our health care system?

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

Hon. Eric Hoskins: Mr. Speaker, I have a shingled roof on my house. It's old and aging. In fact, I'm getting leaks into the top floor. I'm probably going to have to replace that—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Order.

Minister?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: I got a lot of offers, actually, to provide me with contractors just then, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection.

Hon. Eric Hoskins: I'm just amazed at some of the comments coming from the leader of the third party.

The reality is, I'm not going to go out there and advertise that I'm prepared to pay \$10,000 or \$15,000 for a new roof. I'm going to seek out several competent contractors, get them to bid on it, and choose the lowest price of the one who can do the best job. That's the same way we need to do it in the hospital system.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mrs. Gila Martow: My question is to the Premier. Last month while in Israel on a trade mission, the Premier affirmed this government's opposition to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement against Israel when she said, "The BDS position is certainly not mine, nor is it that of our government. I entirely oppose the BDS movement."

At the same time, back here in Ontario, this Liberal government was quick to vote down a bill that fought against this new form of anti-Semitism, a bill that would prevent of the province of Ontario from conducting business with companies that support this movement.

We all know that if an institution organized a movement to marginalize, demonize and physically attack LGBT communities, this government would be outraged, yet when a government-funded institution does this to the Jewish communities, it's justified as free speech?

Interjections.

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

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The Minister of Energy is warned.

You have a wrap-up sentence.

1110

Mrs. Gila Martow: Why did this entire Liberal caucus, with the exception of one brave member, refuse to support our Jewish communities?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Let me just say that it was a wonderful opportunity. I was honoured to be able to travel to Israel and I did, while there, make a statement about our government's opposition and lack of support for the BDS movement. Any movement or any initiative that promotes anti-Semitism, racism, Islamophobia, sexism or homophobia, any movement that chooses to divide or encourages that kind of hatred, we're going to oppose it and we stand opposed to it. With all of our policies and with all our fibre, we will stand against any movement that does that. That remains our position. It was a huge opportunity for us to travel to Israel and to meet with businesses, to meet with people from higher education and to form partnerships based on our knowledge economy, but also based on our cultural ties that are decades deep.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary? The member from Niagara West—Glanbrook.

Mr. Tim Hudak: Back to the Premier: You say you oppose the BDS movement, but the problem is you opposed the bill. You opposed a solution to help combat the growing anti-Semitism in our province and across campuses.

A young woman named Danielle Shachar appeared at the press conference hosted by the member for Eglinton—Lawrence, Mr. Colle, and I, and she said, “Because of my vocal opposition to BDS, my name was featured on a white supremacist website that has accused Jews of being members of a reptilian race. I cannot wear a Star of David on campus lest I be harassed. I cannot identify myself as an Israeli without being called a murderer.”

She says that wherever BDS motions pass, violent anti-Semitism follows. Surely it’s time to take a stand. None of us would ever countenance signing a contract with a business that refuses to do business with somebody because it’s owned by a woman or a Muslim or any other faith, but somehow we hide behind free speech because a business is owned by Jews or by Israelis?

Premier, let’s do the right thing, join President Obama, American Legislatures and Prime Minister Cameron, and fight back against BDS.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Here’s my suggestion: I made the statement in Israel because I feel very strongly about, as I say, any movement or any initiative that would support anti-Semitism, would support Islamophobia, would support racism. I feel very, very strongly about any movement of that sort, so my suggestion to this House is, let’s figure out if we can craft a motion that is not divisive, that is actually unifying in nature, that is not flawed and chooses to divide people. Let’s see if we can work together.

I made this commitment when I was on the mission that we would work with the opposition parties, that we would try to come up with a motion that would pass in this Legislature and that would reflect the inclusiveness of all of the members of this Legislature. I suggest that we try to do that within the coming weeks.

MERCURY POISONING

Ms. Sarah Campbell: To the Premier: The people of Grassy Narrows have been told since 1970 not to eat the fish that they’ve relied on as a central part their life since time immemorial because of the mercury that was dumped in their river that makes them sick. They’ve been asking the Ontario government to fix it ever since. A report released earlier this week says it can be fixed, it can be cleaned and the fish can be made safe. Many community members are here with us today. Many of the youth who have travelled 1,700 kilometres are watching today.

Premier, will you look at these youth from Grassy Narrows who are sitting behind you and tell them that the rivers that make them sick today won’t be cleaned tomorrow and will never be cleaned in their lifetime?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is going to want to comment on this, but I just want to say to all of the young people and the people who have travelled from Grassy Narrows that this is something that is of great concern to me and to all of our caucus. I have been to Grassy Narrows. I have talked with people who have been affected by the mercury in the water and the fish.

I want there to be science that we can use to clean up the sediment and clean up the water and make sure that that ecosystem is clean. We have a report now that suggests that there may be a way of doing that, but the first thing the report says is that we need to look at some field studies, because it’s not conclusive. It’s not clear exactly how to do that without disturbing the sediment and making the situation worse. That’s the question we have to answer.

I do not want to make the situation worse; I only want to only work to fix it up.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: When asked on Monday, the Premier said she hadn’t read the report. On Tuesday, she said she read the report, but what the report calls for wasn’t clear, even though the government has had the final report since April. On Wednesday, we learned that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs had only received the report that day or the day before, when the government has had it since April.

The minister has called the science of the report “new.” This is not new science. In fact, it has been done in a number of communities across this province for decades. So let’s be clear: Enhanced natural remediation is possible.

Again, I ask the Premier: Will you tell the young people of Grassy Narrows when this government will start the remediation?

Interjections.

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

Premier.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Minister of the Environment and Climate Change.

Hon. Glen R. Murray: Mr. Speaker, through you to the member opposite and to our good friends in the gallery: We are past the idea of doing more studies to look at the problem. We are now looking very specifically—working with Grassy Narrows First Nation and the federal government to figure out exactly what we have to do. It’s a complex range of sources there in Clay Lake and on the river. There are sediment and atmospheric issues, and there are ambient levels of methyl hydrate and mercury.

We are going to work very closely through the working group that has been established to ensure that we have proper solutions. The current situation is unacceptable, but we have to make sure, as the Premier said, that we’re undertaking efficient, near-term action, consistent with the leadership and desires of the community and

with good science that will actually solve the problem and not make it worse.

I find it unacceptable. I will not see this continue on my watch, Mr. Speaker.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

VICTIMES D'ACTES CRIMINELS

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris: My question is for the Attorney General. This week is Victims and Survivors of Crime Week. Every year, this week raises awareness about issues facing victims of crime, as well as the services, programs and laws that can help these victims and their families during difficult—

Interruption.

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

Sergeant.

We're not allowed to have displays in this place, please. If you are insistent on doing so, we'll have to clear the gallery.

Interruption.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Thank you. Turn them inside out. If not, we'll have to clear the gallery, that section.

1120

Question, please.

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris: As I mentioned, it's Victims and Survivors of Crime Week. We also recognize the remarkable individuals who have put themselves on the front line to help others during crisis. These are often survivors of crime themselves and have raised the profile of victims' issues in Ontario.

Today, we're honoured to have this year's victim services award winners here at Queen's Park, including my constituent Michelle Barclay. Michelle is one of our unsung heroes and has worked tirelessly to help others.

Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney General tell us more about how this program improves services to victims and raises awareness about issues facing victims of crime in Ontario?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: I want to thank the member from Halton for this very important question.

Our government is committed to increasing the effectiveness of victim services across the province. One step in achieving this goal is to help ensure that local agencies know about and learn from the successes of exemplary individuals and organizations.

I want to acknowledge the strength and courage of victims and their family members. I also want to recognize the volunteers, professionals and organizations for their tireless efforts on behalf of the victims of crime.

This morning, I was very proud to meet with all of our award recipients. Thank you for being here today. Thank you for all you're doing on behalf of survivors in the province. It was very moving to hear all the good work that these people are doing in our communities.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris: Thank you to the Attorney General. It's unfortunate, actually, that our award winners are no longer in the gallery.

Mr. Speaker, I recently learned that the week used to be called National Victims of Crime Awareness Week, but the name was changed to include the term "survivor." That's because we recognize that victims of crime are survivors. They're able to overcome trauma and grow to a place of strength, healing and recovery.

That's why Halton resident Michelle was honoured today. For 13 years, her selfless acts of kindness and compassion have earned the recognition of her colleagues and the people she helps.

Thank you, Michelle, and thank you to all of those who assist survivors with support and healing. Through events like this morning's, which was emotional, we say "no"—no to the injustices and indignities experienced by victims of crime.

I'm proud our government has implemented initiatives like our action plan. Can the minister please expand on her efforts to support victim services in this province?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: A good question, Mr. Speaker. When we came into power in 2003, funding for victim services totalled just over \$30 million. That number has more than doubled in my ministry to over \$67 million.

I am incredibly proud of programs like our It's Never Okay action plan against sexual violence and harassment, as well as our efforts on behalf of rural Ontarians, indigenous Ontarians and many others.

However, it is the organizations and individuals who work tirelessly on the front lines to help victims of crime when they need it the most. I said it this morning, and I'll say it again today: The award recipients in the room today are role models for us all. Je veux les remercier d'être ici et je veux les remercier pour tout le travail qu'ils font dans nos communautés.

ENERGY POLICIES

Mr. John Yakabuski: My question is for the Minister of Energy. A recently published document by the Ontario Energy Board stated that the OEB intends to hide the cost of cap-and-trade-related price increases for natural gas by concealing them as delivery charges in ratepayers' bills. This concealment suggests that the OEB thinks Ontarians do not deserve to know why their rates are going up and that the government is hiding the damage that its misguided cap-and-trade scheme will do to Ontario families.

The minister likes to state in this House that the OEB is there to protect Ontario's consumers. How can that be if the OEB is saying that consumers should be kept in the dark regarding the effect the government's cap-and-trade scheme will have on natural gas prices?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: I'm not aware of the document, whatever he's reading, or where it comes from, Mr. Speaker. I'd be happy to take a look at it.

The Ontario Energy Board has done tremendous service for the province of Ontario over the last decade or

so. They are 100% independent. They represent the interests of consumers in this province. They hear hearings for rate increases and roll them back or even reduce them below what they've asked for. We're very proud of their job.

I don't know what he's referring to, but they are not accustomed to doing the type of things that he's accusing them of. I will certainly look into what he's saying, but I have trouble believing that the Ontario Energy Board would not, in every instance, be 100% transparent with the public.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. John Yakubuski: You appoint the people to the Ontario Energy Board. Perhaps they've been taking their lead from your government, because you've talked about openness and transparency, and we've yet to see it since this government was elected in 2004.

While the minister may wish to stand aside and let the OEB conceal the truth about what will happen to energy rates in this province when cap-and-trade begins to impact our economy, we believe ratepayers have the right to know the truth behind the cost of their natural gas bill.

We know this plan will drive up the cost for ratepayers and make home heating and commercial heating in this province less affordable. That the OEB and the government are trying to hide this from ratepayers is completely unacceptable given that Quebec and California, your cap-and-trade partners, allow separate cap-and-trade line items to appear on their bills.

Minister, if you want to say that the Ontario Energy Board—if you want to do an advertisement for them, that's fine. But you are used to giving directives. I would suggest it's time for you to give one more: Make sure that cap and trade has a separate line item on natural gas bills because—

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: Mr. Speaker, the member would know that under this Ontario Energy Board, the price of natural gas has gone down by about 40%. It is down lower than it has been for decades and decades. The public is being very, very well served.

It is an independent organization. It goes through—

Interjections.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: As minister, I have 100% confidence in the Ontario Energy Board to represent the interests of the consumers of this province. I don't know what document he's referring to, but they go to every end of the earth to hear the public, to have delegations come in and, in the appropriate cases, to even reduce increases that have been asked for by LDCs and gas companies.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Mr. Peter Tabuns: My question is to the Minister of Energy. Earlier this week, the Environmental Commissioner said that conservation was Ontario's cheapest energy option, and she's right. But OPG is proceeding with

an expensive nuclear refurbishment plan that will add over \$5 per month to our electricity bills on top of everything else that's coming at us—and that's if these nuclear projects come in on budget. Speaker, we know nuclear projects never come in on budget.

When Ontario already has a massive energy surplus, adding billions to our electricity bills, why didn't the minister hold back on costly nuclear projects so Ontarians can finally be rewarded, not punished, for their conservation efforts?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: I'd like to quote from the commissioner's report to begin with:

"Ontario has focused on conserving electricity and natural gas, via conservation programs delivered by electric and natural gas utilities and funded by their customers. Both gas and electricity conservation programs have consistently proven to be cost-effective. On the whole, Ontario's investments in electric and natural gas conservation have made sense." That's the quote from the Environmental Commissioner.

1130

The member will know that the projections, which have been validated by third parties, show that the cost of electricity coming from our nuclear generation after the refurbishment will be at 7.7 cents per kilowatt hour. That is a bargain for the public.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Just to note, conservation is a lot cheaper than that number. Conservation has worked in Ontario. We use less electricity to do more. But in Ontario, when we use less, we get to pay more. This is because the government keeps signing new contracts for even more electricity that we don't need. Ontarians have to pay for this electricity whether we use it or not. Ontario now has an electricity surplus far greater than the total output of Pickering.

Instead of driving up our electricity bills even further, why won't the minister allow our conservation programs to do what they're supposed to do: reduce energy use and lower our hydro bills?

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: Again, a quote from the Environmental Commissioner: "Both gas and electricity conservation programs have consistently proven to be cost-effective when measured by appropriate post-implementation cost-effectiveness tests." That's an independent assessment of our conservation program.

What the member will not talk about is the fact that we have 60% of our generation coming from nuclear. Projecting in the future, it will be 50%, and it's 100% emissions-free. We're on the right page on this file and I don't accept the criticism of the critic.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Yvan Baker: My question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, in December you released Patients First: A Proposal to Strengthen Patient-Centred Health Care in Ontario. At that time, I know that your ministry invited people from across Ontario to

provide their feedback on this proposal to strengthen and integrate Ontario's health system. In fact, I myself hosted a Patients First consultation in Etobicoke Centre at Humber Valley United Church. We had a wonderful turnout and some excellent input from a diverse group of constituents.

I understand that thousands of Ontarians responded. They said a range of things, including that they wanted a system built around the needs of the patient that represents the unique needs of all Ontarians, where home and community care, primary care and public health are streamlined, and that promotes health equity and reduces disparities. I know that in my riding I heard a little bit about the issue about equitable access to care as well.

Minister, could you please tell the House about the government's plan to put patients first?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: Thank you to the member from Etobicoke Centre for this important question. I want to again acknowledge the many health care leaders who have joined us in the gallery today.

Later today, I will introduce the Patients First Act, which would, if passed, put patients at the centre of a truly integrated health care system. It would give Ontario's 14 local health integration networks, our LHINs, an expanded role, one that connects all parts of the health care system—including, for the first time, primary care—to home and community care, to improve planning and delivery of front-line services for patients.

These proposed changes would mean easier and more equitable access to care, better coordination and continuity of care, and a greater focus on health equity and the social determinants of health. We would also honour our commitment to meaningfully engage indigenous partners through a parallel process that will collaboratively identify how we can achieve a transformational change in how care is accessed and delivered to them.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Yvan Baker: Thank you, Minister, for that thorough and thoughtful response.

In Etobicoke Centre, we have one of the largest proportions of seniors in the province. I know that the issues you're working on touch on people of all ages and all backgrounds, but certainly the seniors whom I represent in the community will appreciate hearing what you've just said.

Minister, I know that our government has worked hard to ensure that patients are at the centre of the health care system. You just referred to that. I understand that the proposed changes would strengthen local health care planning and increase efficiency to allow more funding to flow to where it matters, which is to patients and to patient care. I also have heard, and am pleased to hear that the government intends to honour the commitment to meaningfully engage with our indigenous partners as well.

Minister, could you please provide an update on the status of the Patients First Act?

Hon. Eric Hoskins: Thank you again. Our action plan includes expanding access to home and community care and ensuring that every Ontarian has access to a primary care provider. The proposed legislative changes will ar-

ticulate our vision for a better, more integrated system, a system that improves access for patients who need to find a new—or their first—primary care health provider close to home.

It will facilitate local health care planning to ensure that patients receive more equitable access to care, regardless of where they live.

It will establish a formal relationship between LHINs and local boards of health to support joint health services planning.

It will ensure that caregivers' and families' voices are at the heart of our entire system and that it's accountable to patients and connects them with the care that they need.

AUTISM TREATMENT

Ms. Sylvia Jones: My question is to the Minister of Children and Youth Services. Earlier this week, in responding to a question, the minister stated, "IBI and ABA are essentially the same thing." Yet I have minutes from the Minister of Education's Advisory Council on Special Education where your autism manager said, "Challenges with current autism services—ABA may not be intensive enough, and regression can occur between blocks of service."

Will the minister admit she was wrong to suggest that ABA and IBI are essentially the same?

Hon. Tracy MacCharles: I want to thank the member for the question. I believe what I said, Speaker, was that the difference is intensity. Intensity is the key factor in terms of responding to the individual needs of a child. That's exactly why many service providers have had hundreds of meetings to date with families to talk about the individual requirements of their autistic child going forward, to plan their transition plan going forward and, for families who are coming off the IBI wait-list, to make sure they're fully aware of their options in terms of the \$8,000 of direct funding that they can use immediately.

Yes, we are developing a new program. It's one autism program that will be more individualized and have one point of entry and one point of assessment in making sure we're supporting these children going forward.

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

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Minister, the more meetings that you have, the more confusion there is and the more children are being kicked off service. Parents understand that ABA and IBI are not the same. Board-certified analysts understand that ABA and IBI are not the same. Your own children and youth autism manager understands that they're not the same.

When will the minister start listening to the experts and stop removing children from accessing IBI therapy?

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Tracy MacCharles: To be frank, I would say, and I think my colleagues would say, that the more we

meet with families, the more helpful that is. That's the feedback that we've been getting. When members from all sides of the House need more information, my ministry's liaison is there to help, the service providers are there to help and the regional offices are there to help. Speaker, at the end of the day—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Dufferin-Caledon is warned.

Finish, please.

Hon. Tracy MacCharles: The feedback we're getting is that more and more families are understanding the path forward. More and more families want to have that clear path about how the system is going to support their child and to recognize that we're moving to a system that recognizes that there's no age cut-off for autism. Kids who are on IBI will continue on IBI, and they will have their ongoing clinical assessments to determine—

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

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Mr. Taras Natyshak: My question is to the Minister of Transportation. Speaker, unfortunately, just prior to the holiday weekend, my community was witness to yet another multi-vehicle accident that resulted in a fatality. This is the second such tragedy that has happened on the same stretch of road that has yet to be widened on Highway 3—the second in the span of a month. This is no longer a coincidence; this is a pattern.

The government's own report from 2006 calls for the complete widening of that stretch due to the volume of traffic that it supported then. That volume of traffic has now increased by 30%. Despite the data, the petitions, the motions and the letters from all local municipalities calling on this government to fulfil its promise to our community, the Minister of Transportation refuses to act on the third and final phase of this important link in my community.

We cannot wait one more day. People are refusing to drive on this highway and people are losing their lives. Will the minister rise from his seat today, fulfil his obligation to our community and immediately call for the initiation of the completion of Highway 3?

1140

Hon. Steven Del Duca: I want to begin by thanking the member from Essex for not only the question today but for, frankly, the advocacy that he has brought to this particular issue.

In his region, I do understand very clearly, this is a vitally important project or initiative that the community is looking at, and I understand the urgency. I've said this many times in the Legislature and, frankly, outside the Legislature: Any time there's a fatality or an injury on a road or a highway anywhere in the province of Ontario, my heart goes out to those involved and to the families of those who are involved. It's one of the reasons that this government, under the leadership of our Premier, has

moved forward so aggressively with a massive transportation infrastructure build-out.

In this particular case, in this particular part of Ontario, I know that the member knows that over the last number of years, our government has invested nearly \$50 million to widen 13 kilometres of this already.

I know that we have more work to do. I understand that, and I'm happy to have a conversation with that member and, frankly, meet with municipal representatives from that community—

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

Mr. Taras Natyshak: The voices of our community couldn't be any clearer: We need that highway widened now. It's a 10-year-old promise that this government made to our community.

I want to quote my predecessor, Bruce Crozier. He said, "The objective of the construction is to increase the safety of the 33-kilometre highway, the region's main artery between Windsor and much of the county, including the towns of Essex, Kingsville and Leamington."

If safety was the priority back when Bruce said it, it is most definitely the priority today.

The road is aptly named after Bruce Crozier. It's called Bruce Crozier Way, due to his efforts to have that section of the highway widened over his tenure of 17 years in this place. Bruce Crozier's way was to stick to your promise, deliver on your promise and do what you say you're going to do. If he were here today, his staff member said, he would be disgusted by the actions of this government and the lack of action.

I call on the minister—I implore the minister—to fulfill his promise, honour Bruce's legacy, get the money flowing to our community and finish Highway 3.

Interjections.

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

Minister?

Hon. Steven Del Duca: I thank the member from Essex for the follow-up question.

I had the opportunity, many years before serving as an MPP, to work here in this building as a staff person. In fact, Mr. Crozier was someone whom I knew well and respected a great deal as, at that point, in my case, a much younger man who had the chance to work here at that time.

I understand profoundly the importance of the advocacy that Bruce Crozier brought to this particular discussion. The reason that we have been in a position to expand the 13 kilometres so far, and to invest the money to widen the highway so far, is because of the advocacy of that member.

I mentioned already in my first answer that I am happy to continue the discussion with that member and with municipal leaders from his community and his region about this particular project, because I understand the importance.

But whether we're talking about this particular region in Essex or any other part of the province, we are investing billions of dollars in highways in every corner of the

province. We will continue to do so, and I sincerely hope that—

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

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mrs. Cristina Martins: My question this morning is to the Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure.

Interjection: Welcome back.

Mrs. Cristina Martins: That's right. Welcome back, Minister. It's wonderful to see you here, back in the House.

Recently, Forbes magazine reported that organizations that are looking for a competitive edge have embraced diversity, and that leading enterprises have managed to tap into employing people with disabilities.

Actually, earlier this morning I had the pleasure of speaking at a conference organized by the Creative Spirit Art Centre in my riding of Davenport, which has done tremendous work to raise awareness of the barriers faced by artists with disabilities, especially employment barriers.

The Forbes report I referred to is an important reminder during National Access Awareness Week, which Ontarians all across the province are marking until June 6. This timing gives us a great opportunity to discuss what the province is doing to improve employment prospects for people with disabilities because, despite progress, we have much work left to be done on this file.

Speaker, through you to the minister, what is this government doing to improve accessibility?

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure.

Hon. Brad Duguid: You've got to get used to that again, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for that. And, Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me my first warning this morning. It's evidence, I think, that I'm back, and I'm back here in fighting trim. I know that you probably didn't like doing that.

I want to thank the member for the question. The fact is, Ontario is a global leader in accessibility. We're first in the world to move to a modern regulatory regime that mandates accessibility. We're first in the world requiring staff to be trained on accessibility. We're first in Canada with legislation that sets out clear goals and time frames. And Ontario is currently the only jurisdiction in Canada that has enforceable standards. That being said, there's still much more work to do and very good reasons to do that.

In 2010, the Martin Prosperity Institute indicated that there's \$7.9 billion out there for us to gain in our economy if we're to become more successful.

Mr. Speaker, there's still more work to do and we're determined to do it.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mrs. Cristina Martins: I want to thank the minister for that answer as well, and for all the great work that he and his ministry have been doing on this particular file.

As I said, I'm an advocate for people with disabilities, especially with the Creative Spirit Art Centre in my riding—having been at that conference this morning.

Minister, while these achievements are impressive, it seems clear that legal standards will be difficult to implement without full buy-in from the private sector. Lately, I was encouraged to hear that 25% of the largest Canadian public companies indicate an interest in this market. I spoke to you earlier about the artists with disabilities facing employment challenges and what they could actually gain if they were employed—to be able to bring economic value and to bring personal satisfaction to their work. But it's always important to ensure that businesses do not see these standards as too cumbersome.

Minister, what are you doing to ensure—

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

Minister.

Hon. Brad Duguid: Thank you to the member for her great advocacy on this issue. She's absolutely right. Business buy-in is absolutely crucial if we're going to be able to drive that cultural shift that's so important for us to move this file ahead.

We're working with businesses and other stakeholders toward the Accessibility Certification Program, which will make it easier for people to identify accessible businesses and celebrate accessible businesses and organizations.

We're also working with our accessibility partners toward supporting a TripAdvisor-like application that allows anyone to rate businesses on their ability to welcome clients with disabilities.

In April we hosted the Accessibility Innovation Showcase, which highlighted technological innovation, so that we can ensure that that innovation helps to level the playing field for people with disabilities in their homes and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there's still a lot more work to do, but we're determined to make Ontario accessible and to continue our role as a global leader in this area.

DEFERRED VOTES

ONTARIO RETIREMENT PENSION PLAN ACT (STRENGTHENING RETIREMENT SECURITY FOR ONTARIANS), 2016

LOI DE 2016 SUR LE RÉGIME DE RETRAITE DE LA PROVINCE DE L'ONTARIO (SÉCURISER LA RETRAITE EN ONTARIO)

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

Bill 186, An Act to establish the Ontario Retirement Pension Plan / Projet de loi 186, Loi établissant le Régime de retraite de la province de l'Ontario.

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

The division bells rang from 1148 to 1153.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): All members please take your seats. Thank you.

On Wednesday, June 1, 2016, Ms. Hunter moved third reading of Bill 186, An Act to establish the Ontario Retirement Pension Plan.

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

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gates, Wayne	Moridi, Reza
Anderson, Granville	Gélinas, France	Murray, Glen R.
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gravelle, Michael	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Baker, Yvan	Gretzky, Lisa	Naqvi, Yasir
Ballard, Chris	Hatfield, Percy	Natyshak, Taras
Bisson, Gilles	Hoggarth, Ann	Oraziotti, David
Bradley, James J.	Horwath, Andrea	Potts, Arthur
Campbell, Sarah	Hoskins, Eric	Qaadri, Shafiq
Chan, Michael	Hunter, Mitzie	Rinaldi, Lou
Chiarelli, Bob	Kiwala, Sophie	Sandals, Liz
Colle, Mike	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Coteau, Michael	Lalonde, Marie-France	Singh, Jagmeet
Crack, Grant	Leal, Jeff	Sousa, Charles
Damerla, Dipika	MacCharles, Tracy	Tabuns, Peter
Del Duca, Steven	Malhi, Harinder	Takhar, Harinder S.
Delaney, Bob	Mangat, Amrit	Taylor, Monique
Dhillon, Vic	Mantha, Michael	Thibeault, Glenn
Dickson, Joe	Martins, Cristina	Vanthof, John
Dong, Han	Matthews, Deborah	Vernile, Daiene
Duguid, Brad	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Fife, Catherine	McMahon, Eleanor	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David
Fraser, John	Milczyn, Peter Z.	
French, Jennifer K.	Miller, Paul	

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

Nays

Arnott, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Pettapiece, Randy
Bailey, Robert	Jones, Sylvia	Scott, Laurie
Barrett, Toby	MacLaren, Jack	Smith, Todd
Brown, Patrick	MacLeod, Lisa	Thompson, Lisa M.
Clark, Steve	Martow, Gila	Walker, Bill
Coe, Lorne	McDonnell, Jim	Wilson, Jim
Fedeli, Victor	Miller, Norm	Yakubuski, John
Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia	
Harris, Michael	Nicholls, Rick	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 70; the nays are 25.

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

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

Third reading agreed to.

ENERGY STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 2016

LOI DE 2016 MODIFIANT
DES LOIS SUR L'ÉNERGIE

Deferred vote on the motion that the question be now put on the motion for third reading of the following bill:

Bill 135, An Act to amend several statutes and revoke several regulations in relation to energy conservation and long-term energy planning/ Projet de loi 135, Loi modifiant plusieurs lois et abrogeant plusieurs règlements en ce qui concerne la conservation de l'énergie et la planification énergétique à long terme.

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

The division bells rang from 1157 to 1158.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): On May 5, 2016, Mr. Chiarelli moved third reading of Bill 135, An Act to amend several statutes and revoke several regulations in relation to energy conservation and long-term energy planning.

Madame Lalonde has moved that the question be now put. All those in favour of Ms. Lalonde's motion, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Fraser, John	Milczyn, Peter Z.
Anderson, Granville	Gravelle, Michael	Moridi, Reza
Baker, Yvan	Hoggarth, Ann	Murray, Glen R.
Ballard, Chris	Hoskins, Eric	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Bradley, James J.	Hunter, Mitzie	Naqvi, Yasir
Chan, Michael	Kiwala, Sophie	Oraziotti, David
Chiarelli, Bob	Kwinter, Monte	Potts, Arthur
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Marie-France	Qaadri, Shafiq
Coteau, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Rinaldi, Lou
Crack, Grant	MacCharles, Tracy	Sandals, Liz
Damerla, Dipika	Malhi, Harinder	Sergio, Mario
Del Duca, Steven	Mangat, Amrit	Sousa, Charles
Delaney, Bob	Martins, Cristina	Takhar, Harinder S.
Dhillon, Vic	Matthews, Deborah	Thibeault, Glenn
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Dong, Han	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Duguid, Brad	McMahon, Eleanor	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David

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

Nays

Armstrong, Teresa J.	Gretzky, Lisa	Munro, Julia
Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Natyshak, Taras
Bailey, Robert	Harris, Michael	Nicholls, Rick
Barrett, Toby	Hatfield, Percy	Pettapiece, Randy
Bisson, Gilles	Horwath, Andrea	Scott, Laurie
Brown, Patrick	Hudak, Tim	Singh, Jagmeet
Campbell, Sarah	Jones, Sylvia	Smith, Todd
Clark, Steve	MacLaren, Jack	Tabuns, Peter
Coe, Lorne	MacLeod, Lisa	Taylor, Monique
Fedeli, Victor	Mantha, Michael	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fife, Catherine	Martow, Gila	Vanthof, John
French, Jennifer K.	McDonnell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Gates, Wayne	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Gélinas, France	Miller, Paul	Yakubuski, John

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 54; the nays are 42.

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

Mr. Chiarelli has moved third reading of Bill 135, An Act to amend several statutes and revoke several regulations in relation to energy conservation and long-term energy planning. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

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.

The division bells rang from 1201 to 1202.

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

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Fraser, John	Milczyn, Peter Z.
Anderson, Granville	Gravelle, Michael	Moridi, Reza
Baker, Yvan	Hoggarth, Ann	Murray, Glen R.
Ballard, Chris	Hoskins, Eric	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Bradley, James J.	Hunter, Mitzie	Naqvi, Yasir
Chan, Michael	Kiwala, Sophie	Oraziotti, David
Chiarelli, Bob	Kwinter, Monte	Potts, Arthur
Colle, Mike	Lalonde, Marie-France	Qaadri, Shafiq
Coteau, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Rinaldi, Lou
Crack, Grant	MacCharles, Tracy	Sandals, Liz
Damerla, Dipika	Malhi, Harinder	Sergio, Mario
Del Duca, Steven	Mangat, Amrit	Sousa, Charles
Delaney, Bob	Martins, Cristina	Takhar, Harinder S.
Dhillon, Vic	Matthews, Deborah	Thibeault, Glenn
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Vernile, Daiene
Dong, Han	McGarry, Kathryn	Wong, Soo
Duguid, Brad	McMahon, Eleanor	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	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.	Gretzky, Lisa	Munro, Julia
Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Natyshak, Taras
Bailey, Robert	Harris, Michael	Nicholls, Rick
Barrett, Toby	Hatfield, Percy	Pettapiece, Randy
Bisson, Gilles	Horwath, Andrea	Scott, Laurie
Brown, Patrick	Hudak, Tim	Singh, Jagmeet
Campbell, Sarah	Jones, Sylvia	Smith, Todd
Clark, Steve	MacLaren, Jack	Tabuns, Peter
Coe, Lorne	MacLeod, Lisa	Taylor, Monique
Fedeli, Victor	Mantha, Michael	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fife, Catherine	Martow, Gila	Vanthof, John
French, Jennifer K.	McDonnell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Gates, Wayne	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Gélinas, France	Miller, Paul	Yakabuski, John

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 54; the nays are 42.

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

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

Third reading agreed to.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): There are no further deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 1 p.m.

The House recessed from 1205 to 1300.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn: We will be joined today by members of the Italian Fallen Workers Memorial committee. They're here today to listen to a statement about Italian fallen workers. They come from the riding of Eglinton–Lawrence. Their names are Marino Toppan,

Fulvio Florio, Mario Marra, Gino Cucchi and Palmacchio Di Iulio. Please welcome them to Queen's Park.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Welcome.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

PUBLIC TRANSIT

Mrs. Gila Martow: Well, it's kind of an exciting day, because I've been involved in Thornhill politics for many years, and people know that I've been questioning when the Yonge subway expansion is going to start moving a little forward. There was a great announcement this morning: \$55 million toward the planning of it. Unfortunately, there's no timeline. There are no dates set. All of a sudden, we have to have the downtown relief line built, which will take 14 years, before we can have the Yonge subway.

I'm asking if this government has discussed the possibility, which many experts have recommended, of a Yonge subway express route which would tunnel under the existing Yonge subway, as is done in many other cities, like Seoul, Korea. It would stop only at major stops along the way. It would be very fast. Maybe they could charge extra for it. It would stop at, say, Union, Bloor, the Eglinton LRT, Sheppard and, of course, up in Richmond Hill.

We all know that a Yonge subway expansion would get tens of thousands of commuters off our roads. Maybe we need to reallocate, as I've been begging, money that's being spent on very low-priority bus lanes. They're even starting, unfortunately, to build bus lanes on Bathurst and Centre Street for a little jog that will actually make the Highway 7 Rapidway longer for commuters, which is really counterintuitive and counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, I'm excited that we're at least talking about the Yonge subway, but let's stop talking. Let's get the money for high-priority projects. Let's get those shovels in the ground and the tunnels underground and get to work.

AUTISM TREATMENT

Miss Monique Taylor: Last week, I met with a group of mothers in my riding of Hamilton Mountain. They had one thing in common: They have children on the autism spectrum.

I have to tell you, Speaker, that their experience is very different from the picture that this government tries to paint. These are parents who know their children can thrive with IBI therapy. If they're already receiving IBI therapy, they know, because they have seen the results, even after just a few short months. If they haven't had the opportunity to start IBI, they know because they have faith in the professionals they work with, who have told them that their child needs IBI therapy.

Despite what this government tries to say, their children and thousands of other children across Ontario are

being transitioned off the wait-list for IBI with no information about what their future holds. Eight thousand dollars only gets them two or three months of the therapy that they need and that is recognized by the professionals.

I stand here today and once again I plead don't leave these kids behind. They were told by professionals that this was the therapy they needed—the ideal candidate, some were told—and then told, weeks later, that they are no longer eligible, just because they're over the age of five.

I say to the members opposite, stop repeating the same tired lines, listen to your constituents, grandfather these children and ensure that they get the therapy that they need.

DON ROSS

Mr. Joe Dickson: I would like to share with you a story about an Ajax hero. Don Ross passed away peacefully on Sunday, April 3, 2016, at the age of 85, the adored husband of Valerie and predeceased by his first wife, Shirley, née Leggatt; survived by his brother Murdoch and sisters Eunice and Elsie; proud father to Donna, Gary, Glen, Larry, Shawn and Kevin; and grandfather and great-grandfather to many.

I knew Don virtually all of my life, as he dedicated four nights a week for almost 40 years training and guiding young boxing athletes and seeing their progress. His wife and family came first, and he also took a great deal of personal pride in working with youth and seeing them grow, for almost no money at all.

Don was a hard-working employee at DuPont Ajax for some 35 years before retiring.

He was a true Ajax volunteer. There was a family celebration of Don's life at our Legion, where hundreds of Ajacians created an overflow crowd that you simply could not move in. This man who moved mountains made these youth grow every day in personal stature.

In 1991, five delegates were selected for the Canadian Boxing Hall of Fame. The first name mentioned that day was Don Ross of Ajax, Ontario. He was recommended by several noted boxers, and it seemed to be a record at the time, as the entire body of officials unanimously sanctioned, by their approval, to welcome Don Ross into the Canadian Boxing Hall of Fame in 1991. His efforts had won him Ontario and Canadian acclaim. On that day, time stood still as his peers unanimously honoured him, Don Ross, forever.

May God bless you, Don. We miss you.

AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS

Mr. Bill Walker: I'm honoured to rise today in recognition of ALS Awareness Month and in support of individuals and their families living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. There are as many as 3,000 Canadians currently living with ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease, named after one of baseball's all-time greatest players, who died of ALS in June 1941.

The ALS Society of Canada, together with provincial chapters and support groups, raise funds in their community during the month of June through different campaigns, from planting blue cornflowers—which is the official international flower of hope for ALS—to the ALS bucket challenges, the ALS hike-and-cycle, or one of the 90 walks happening across Canada. Treatments have been developed for other difficult diseases, and we believe it will be developed for ALS.

I was proud to see many people participating in these campaigns and giving hope to the people living with this dreadful disease. A number of my esteemed colleagues—Nipissing MPP Vic Fedeli, Perth-Wellington MPP Randy Pettapiece, Wellington-Halton Hills MPP Ted Arnott and others, including myself—took part in the bucket challenge. It was all because of your spirit that the Canadians helped to raise a combined \$26 million for ALS last year. But the fight must go on. I myself will be attending the Warton Walk for ALS this coming Saturday.

Time is of the essence. I ask all members to once again give their support to the individuals, families, health care professionals, researchers and volunteers to continue to be champions for ALS so the dream of finding a cure soon becomes a reality.

MERCURY POISONING

Mr. Peter Tabuns: In 2012, 42 years after the mercury poisoning of the English-Wabigoon river system came to light, Premier Wynne was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. She visited Grassy Narrows, expressed deep concern about the situation there and promised to make it right. She established an Ontario/Grassy Narrows Mercury Working Group to get to the bottom of the continuing contamination and whether or not remediation of the river was possible.

Four years later, she's Premier and the working group has assembled a body of scientific work of the highest calibre that establishes that the contamination is a real and continuing threat to human health. Also, as of this week, the scientific report submitted to the working group that the Premier herself established proved that the mercury contamination can and should be remediated—that something can and must be done about it.

Yet, despite that report being delivered to her government more than a month ago, she claimed in question period on Monday that she had not seen the report and didn't "know the source of the report"—again, the report commissioned by the working group that she herself established.

How can we take the Premier seriously when she talks about reconciliation with First Nations in this province and she refuses to commit to an immediate cleanup of the mercury contamination affecting the people of Grassy Narrows? Will there be yet another generation of Grassy Narrows children who grow up to be contaminated by mercury? Will the Premier let this happen on her watch?

1310

FRANCO-FÊTE

M^{me} Daiene Vernile: J'aimerais vous parler aujourd'hui d'une manifestation culturelle fantastique dans ma communauté de Kitchener-Waterloo. Il s'agit d'un pique-nique annuel, la Franco-fête, qui aura lieu le 26 juin, cette année.

Bien que cette activité se déroule en français, tous les francophiles y sont invités. Au cours de cette activité, les gens se regroupent pour écouter des artistes francophones et pour déguster des mets typiques des régions de la francophonie. Les enfants s'amuse à des jeux et à des sports. De plus, on y fait la vente de livres en français.

Cette fête est organisée par l'Association des francophones de Kitchener-Waterloo, qui a célébré notamment le 400^e anniversaire de la présence francophone en Ontario en 2015. Cette association très dynamique propose de nombreuses activités de tous les genres et pour tous les goûts : clubs de marche, de cuisine et de lecture, par exemple.

Bref, j'ai très hâte de participer à ce pique-nique annuel, et je souhaite à tous les francophones et francophiles de ma communauté une très joyeuse Franco-fête.

CELTIC HERITAGE

Mr. Jim McDonell: There's an old saying back home that Ontario starts in SD&G, and in particular Glengarry county.

The area was originally settled by Scottish immigrants from Scotland and Scottish United Empire Loyalists who were forced to relocate after the war of independence.

The SD&G Highlanders, Canada's oldest regiment, originated back in the Highlands as the Glengarry Fencibles, settled in Glengarry county under the leadership of Bishop Alexander Macdonell, and were mobilized to play a crucial role in the War of 1812 and all of Canada's military actions since.

Today, the Celtic culture remains strong and vibrant in Glengarry. In fact, in 2003, a study reported that the percentage of young and old who are involved in Celtic music or dance dwarfs that of Cape Breton. The MacCulloch Scottish dancers continue to perform for audiences around the world. The Glengarry Highland Games have the North American Pipe Band Championships. And the Williamstown Fair, which is Canada's and likely North America's oldest fair, keeps our Celtic history front and centre each year.

Each Tuesday night in July, the Glengarry Celtic Music Hall of Fame hosts a free ceilidh at the Williamstown centre, where fiddlers, pipers and other musicians and dancers gather for informal jam sessions and refreshments.

Last week, I attended their annual induction dinner, where Neil MacDonell, David MacPhee, the Glen Orchestra, the MacQueen Family and John Paul Vachon were all inducted into the hall, joining a long list of

Glengarrians who have kept the traditions alive for more than 200 years. It was once again a sold-out affair with great food, great company and, of course, great Celtic music, singing and dancing. I want to congratulate President Isabel Clark and her team on another great event.

ALDO BOCCIA

Mr. Mike Colle: Today I'd like to honour a philanthropic superstar. He's our local dentist at Dufferin and Lawrence, and his name is Dr. Aldo Boccia. He is a proud member of the Toronto Earlscourt Rotary Club. He has raised millions of dollars for the Bloorview MacMillan centre for children who need special rehabilitation. He has raised money for his local church. He has raised money for St. Joseph's hospital. He is, again, an incredible, community-minded leader.

He has just been awarded two prestigious awards: the Humanitarian Service Award from the Alpha Omega fraternity, which is an international fraternity of dentists; and he's also been awarded, by the Ontario Dental Association, the Barnabas Day Award for Distinguished Service.

Dr. Boccia never stops donating and raising money for his community, along with his super-powerful wife, Peggy. They are amazing examples.

He's most proud of being a Rotarian. As he says all the time, "Service above self."

We praise this amazing philanthropic superstar, Dr. Aldo Boccia, and hopefully, he will continue to do this for decades to come.

CYCLING

Ms. Eleanor McMahon: I was proud that in 2014, my private member's bill declaring June as Ontario Bike Month passed in this Legislature.

It's an exciting time for cyclists in our province. Just this morning, I had the pleasure of attending the all-party cycling caucus with colleagues from all sides of the House as we enjoyed a bike ride around Queen's Park.

Ontario Bike Month recognizes and celebrates the growing popularity of cycling in communities, the economic, environmental and health benefits of cycling, and encourages Ontarians to enjoy the beauty of our province and the joy that comes with cycling. With our province's \$25-million investment in cycling infrastructure, including \$15 million to create safer, more connected provincial bicycling routes, cycling is becoming a more attractive transportation and recreation choice for many.

Now more Ontarians than ever are choosing to ride their bikes on a regular basis, with an estimated 600,000 Ontarians, or 5% of us, riding daily. Many communities across Ontario, including my own, are celebrating Bike Month with bicycling activities such as bike-to-work and bike-to-school campaigns throughout the month of June. Burlington alone has seen a 600% increase from last year in the number of schools participating in bike-to-school activities.

Also in my riding, the Burlington Cycling Committee hosted cycling seminars throughout the community to promote bike safety and maintenance for all ages, free of charge. I'm thrilled to see this increasing recognition amongst our provincial government and all Ontarians about the growing importance of cycling.

Finally, I invite all of my colleagues to participate in the Share the Road Cycling Coalition's #ridetheriding social media campaign and enjoy a bike ride with cyclists in their riding this summer. Let's celebrate June on two wheels.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

PATIENTS FIRST ACT, 2016

LOI DE 2016

DONNANT LA PRIORITÉ AUX PATIENTS

Mr. Hoskins moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 210, An Act to amend various Acts in the interest of patient-centred care / Projet de loi 210, Loi modifiant diverses lois dans l'intérêt des soins axés sur les patients.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it. Carried.

First reading agreed to.

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

Hon. Eric Hoskins: This bill would make amendments to the Local Health System Integration Act, 2006, and various other acts to expand the mandate of local health integration networks to make LHINs accountable for primary care planning, responsible for the management and delivery of home care, and formalize linkages between LHINs and public health units.

BRAIN TUMOUR AWARENESS MONTH AMENDMENT ACT, 2016

LOI DE 2016 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE MOIS DE LA SENSIBILISATION AUX TUMEURS CÉRÉBRALES

Mr. Ballard moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 211, An Act to amend the Brain Tumour Awareness Month Act, 2001 / Projet de loi 211, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2001 sur le Mois de la sensibilisation aux tumeurs cérébrales.

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. Chris Ballard: I'm pleased to rise today to introduce first reading of this bill, the Brain Tumour Awareness Month Amendment Act, 2016. The bill would amend the Brain Tumour Awareness Month Act by proclaiming the month of May as Brain Tumour Awareness Month.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

ITALIAN FALLEN WORKERS MEMORIAL

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn: Buon giorno a tutti. On a very, very cold April 28, I had the honour of attending the dedication of a memorial here in Toronto with some excellent people who I hadn't met before, but who were doing a wonderful thing that day.

1320

On that day, I met Marino Toppan, Fulvio Florio, Mario Marra, Gino Cucchi and Pal Di Iulio. What they were doing on that day was dedicating a memorial in the city of Toronto to the approximately 1,000 Italian workers who were killed on the job in Canada in the past 100 years.

It's so appropriate on June 2, which, as you'll know, is il Giorno della Repubblica Italiana. It's Italian Republic Day and I think we should honour that, because it's such an appropriate day to do what we're doing today.

The committee for the Italian Fallen Workers Memorial constructed this monument to rightly honour the tremendous sacrifice Italian Canadian workers have made in building this province that we all love and call home. These people deserve to be recognized. They should be recognized. They came to Canada, as did many other immigrants—they did and they still do—and they're simply looking for a better life. They were willing to do work that others would not. They were willing to do work that too often was very hazardous, but they were doing it in order to achieve a better life for themselves and for their families and children.

The names on the memorial that was dedicated that day represent much more than a list of those who were lost. They were human beings. They were loved and they themselves loved. They hoped and they dreamed. They built our province's railways, they built our bridges, they worked in mines, they dug up our tunnels and they constructed the roadways we drive on today.

From the start of their immigration to Canada in the 19th century, often under very harsh conditions, to playing the predominant role that they do in the construction industry in the latter half of the 20th century, Italian Canadians have built this province with their sweat and with their spirit. They sacrificed for their families and too often they sacrificed their own lives due to unsafe working conditions. They are a huge part of our province's and our very country's heritage.

While we remember those we've lost in the past, we also must remember there are those who could be lost in

the future. It's an excellent time to recommit ourselves to simply eliminating workplace injuries, illnesses and fatalities for all Canadians and Ontarians.

We know that these incidents are preventable. We know we all have a role to play in ensuring they are prevented; it doesn't matter if you work in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, in an office, in a mine, on a construction site or in a school. We were again reminded of this yesterday during Injured Workers' Day.

As we continue to build our province up, we also need to do what the fallen workers memorial committee wants us to do. We need to build a culture of prevention, in which workplace deaths and injuries are not acceptable and where safety is always a top priority, because one injury or one fatality is just one too many.

The memorial that was dedicated that day is a living reminder that when workplaces are unsafe, families suffer, people lose friends, co-workers are traumatized and companies lose both money and their own reputations.

Speaker, we're committed to building health and safety in all of Ontario, working with men and women throughout this province. It's a shared responsibility. But no matter how much training we bring in, no matter how much legislation, how we mandate that training or how many fines we issue, if the rules aren't followed on the ground by the companies, or sometimes by the workers themselves, and if workers aren't looking out for each other, it all goes for naught. We need to be in this together. Lives are at stake.

The Italian Fallen Workers Memorial is a sobering reminder of the duty we have to each other. It's a reminder of those who lost their lives ensuring that we have the province we have today. Today, with these gentlemen in attendance, let us remember those who worked hard building this province up to what it is, those who paid the ultimate price, and let us remember that we've got a lot more work to do.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Responses?

Mr. Ted Arnott: On April 28, I had the opportunity to attend a very moving day of mourning observance at the WSIB offices, which was organized by the chair of the WSIB, Elizabeth Witmer. That same afternoon, I was honoured to represent our leader, Patrick Brown, and my colleagues in the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus at the formal unveiling of the Italian Fallen Workers Memorial, unveiled to the city on the day recognized worldwide as being dedicated to the victims of work-related injuries. I was glad to join the Minister of Labour at both of those events, and I appreciated the fact that he acknowledged my presence at the second one.

Located at the Columbus Centre here in Toronto, the memorial is made up of 11 columns which represent the decades since 1900 and bear the names of fallen workers of Italian heritage discovered by a committee of volunteer researchers over the last six years. The contribution of Italian Canadians has had a vast impact in the building of this great nation and our great province. However, until the dedication of this memorial, those losses were an unrecognized part of that legacy and our history. These Italian Canadian workers literally laid the

foundation for our prosperity, and they are now being honoured for their sacrifice.

While organizers originally estimated finding between 300 to 400 names, they've uncovered over 944 verified names of victims of workplace fatalities for people of Italian origin in Ontario and over a thousand names in total. Subsequent names will be added annually.

To the families of these fallen workers, I say, *Partecipo al tuo dolore*. I share your sadness.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Marino Toppan, the activity coordinator for the project; Nick Pinto, who was involved in a memorial in Vaughan; and Villa Charities Inc., which played a key role in the memorial project. I also want to recognize our former colleague Joe Cordiano, who I understand was instrumental in the project as well.

While this memorial reminds us of the many Canadians of Italian heritage who have been tragically killed in the workplace, it's also a powerful tool so that we cannot forget about all Canadians who died in the workplace.

I remember my shock and horror when I first read about the two Brampton men killed in separate workplace incidents on May 10. On the day a boom lift type of vehicle crushed a 20-year-old construction worker at a new housing development, a lawn-cutting machine rolled over a 77-year-old worker at a golf course. Unfortunately, incidents like these are all too frequent across Canada.

This past April 21, I stood in this House to discuss the number of workplace deaths in Canada. According to the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, in 2014 there were 919 workplace deaths recorded in Canada, and that's up from 902 in 2013. This represents an average of more than two deaths on the job each and every day across the country. From 1995 to 2014, over 18,000 people lost their lives due to work-related causes across Canada, an average of 918 deaths per year. In Ontario alone, 226 workers reportedly lost their lives in 2015 due to workplace tragedies or occupational disease.

What's even more tragic is that it's estimated that 90% of these workplace deaths are entirely preventable.

The day of mourning is also an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to ensure that all our workplaces are safe. As MPPs, we must work together to improve workplace safety, with the goal of preventing any death or injury in the workplace. We have a responsibility to ensure that workplace safety is a priority and that our workplaces become safer, not more hazardous.

One of the speakers at the fallen workers memorial was a woman who had been widowed by a workplace accident in 2009. In her address, she stated that the best way to honour the men and women on the memorial is for everyone to remember and remain committed to worker safety in all workplaces. We must do this, not only for these fallen Italian Canadians, but for all Ontario workers whose lives have been cut short by workplace accidents.

I'd again like to thank the organizers and volunteers behind the Italian Fallen Workers Memorial. I think the timing is especially important because this month we mark the beginning of Italian Heritage Month.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am running out of time, but I want to again express my view that we need to do more to make our workplaces safer.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleague the member for Nipissing, Vic Fedeli, for his thoughts and his contribution to the remarks that I prepared for this afternoon, as well as to a volunteer who has been working in my office for the last three weeks, Tim McIntosh, who's joining me here, who helped me organize my thoughts this afternoon.

Once again, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Further responses?
1330

Mr. Taras Natyshak: It is an honour to rise today on behalf of the Ontario New Democratic Party and our leader, Andrea Horwath, to speak about fallen Italian workers and the monument project to honour those workers. On a personal note, I am particularly proud of this project and the wide support that it has from my union, the union that I belong to: LIUNA, the Laborers' International Union of North America.

Speaker, you may know that I spent close to 10 years in the field as a construction worker prior to entering politics. I had the good fortune to work with many Italian Canadians. They taught me a lot. They taught me a lot about hard work, how to do the job right and to take pride in the work. You see evidence of that work for generations all across this province, and I'm certainly proud to be a part of that history.

My riding of Essex can boast that approximately 20% of residents claim some level of Italian ancestry, and that is evident in just about every community one might visit in Essex county. From wineries to greenhouses, farms and factories, Italian immigrants have built successful businesses and are leaders who continue to contribute and make our riding a great place to live and raise a family.

The history of Italian workers in Canada is deeply textured, however. It is a story of enduring hardship, of leaving family and loved ones behind, of coming to a place where you don't speak the language, and even enduring bigotry and being treated like second-class citizens. Italian immigration to Canada began in the late 1800s, with most arriving between the period of 1900 and the First World War. Like other European countries, Italy was targeted by labour recruitment campaigns on behalf of the railroad, mining and forestry industries. There was a strong need for labour from Europe as our country continued to grow and the railways opened up the West to settlement.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: And the north.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: And the north.

While expecting an opportunity to work and prosper, this wasn't always the case, and many immigrants were victims of unscrupulous recruiters and were exploited. In some cases, Italian workers were traded like commodities. They found themselves sent to labour camps in northern Ontario, indefinitely. Seeking an opportunity for a more prosperous life for themselves and their families,

many Italian men left the Old World for the New World and made a perilous journey across the North Atlantic. Most landed in the US first and then came to Canada.

When they arrived in Canada, they found themselves doing gruelling work in unimaginable conditions. The dangers were ever-present. At that time in our history, workers being maimed and killed was largely looked at as the cost of doing business, the cost of building a nation. Whether it was on a railway or the Great Plains or deep in a mine in northern Ontario or on a construction site in downtown Montreal, Italian immigrants sacrificed their time, their bodies and even their lives.

It is fitting that these workers who have given so much to make Canada what it is today are honoured with a memorial, as we should always honour all workers who make the ultimate sacrifice while simply trying to provide for themselves and their families. It's also fitting that we honour the over 830 names on the monument here in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and that we use this opportunity to remind ourselves that one worker killed is one too many and to remind ourselves that in this place we have the power to enact laws which mean that fewer workers will leave in the morning and never return home to their loved ones. In thinking about this statement, I am reminded of the message from the annual National Day of Mourning: We must mourn the dead and fight like hell for the living.

On behalf of my riding of Essex, I want to thank the committee members who dedicated their time and energy to see this project through to completion: Marino Toppan, Gino Cucchi, Fulvio Florio, Fortunato Rao, Mario Marra, Odoardo di Santo, Paola Breda and Pal Di Iulio. Thank you, and congratulations to you all.

I would also like to thank the donors and the sponsors, Speaker. That list is far too long for the time that I have here today, but they all know who they are and I want to thank them again. I would also like to invite every Ontarian to visit the memorial at the Columbus Centre here in Toronto and to pay their respects to these Italian Canadians who lost their lives on the job. Lastly, I'd like to thank the families of the workers who have perished for enduring the loss. On behalf of the Ontario NDP caucus and our leader, Andrea Horwath, we offer our condolences and our commitment to continue to fight for every worker to come home after their shift.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I thank all members for their statements.

PETITIONS

HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Mr. Lorne Coe: "Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario's growing and aging population is putting an increasing strain on our publicly funded health care system; and

"Whereas since February 2015, the Ontario government has made an almost 7% unilateral cut to physician

services expenditures which cover all the care doctors provide to patients; and

“Whereas the decisions Ontario makes today will impact patients’ access to quality care in the years to come and these cuts will threaten access to the quality, patient-focused care Ontarians need and expect;

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

“The Minister of Health and Long-Term Care return to the table with Ontario’s doctors and work together through mediation-arbitration to reach a fair deal that protects the quality, patient-focused care Ontario’s families deserve.”

I agree with the contents, Speaker. I will affix my signature and provide it to page Thomas.

LYME DISEASE

Mr. Michael Mantha: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Ontario does not have a strategy on Lyme disease; and

“Whereas the Public Health Agency of Canada is developing an Action Plan on Lyme Disease; and

“Whereas Toronto Public Health says that transmission of the disease requires the tick to be attached for 24 hours, so early intervention and diagnosis is of primary importance; and

“Whereas a motion was introduced to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario encouraging the government to adopt a strategy on Lyme disease, while taking into account the impact the disease has upon individuals and families in Ontario;

“We, the undersigned, petition the government of Ontario to develop an integrated strategy on Lyme disease consistent with the action plan of the Public Health Agency of Canada, taking into account available treatments, accessibility issues and the efficacy of the currently available diagnostic mechanisms. In so doing, it should consult with representatives of the health care community and patients’ groups within one year.”

I wholeheartedly agree with this petition and present it to page Waleed to bring it down to the Clerks’ table.

ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES

Mr. Arthur Potts: I’m delighted to bring a petition from thousands of people in my community and across Ontario and the GTA relating to vaping.

“Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Bill 45, schedule 3, Electronic Cigarettes Act, 2015 needs significant amendment to allow the existing industry the fair ability to function and serve those who choose vaping as a harm reduction option to tobacco products or a method to eliminate addiction to nicotine;

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

“Definitions: ‘Vaper’ is a user of electronic cigarettes as defined by Bill 45, section 3 and ‘vaping’ is the use of electronic cigarettes as defined by Bill 45, section 3.

“To repeal item 3(1) ‘No person shall, in any place where electronic cigarettes are sold or offered for sale, display or permit the display of electronic cigarettes in any manner that would permit a consumer to view or handle an electronic cigarette before purchasing it.’ This item is tantamount to banning personal vaporizers outright as there are hundreds of styles, types and brands and modular components. This will effectively mean that most potential vapers will continue to smoke tobacco cigarettes for lack of ability to choose a product, and existing vapers will be unable to keep abreast of new products as they emerge, possibly causing them to return to smoking as well. Literature cannot sufficiently replace the ability to see and touch a product;

“And to repeal item 3(2) ‘No person shall promote electronic cigarettes,

“(a) in any place where electronic cigarettes or tobacco products are offered for sale;’

“Harm reduction has proven to work and should be promoted, especially in places where people go to seek freedom from deadly tobacco addiction, as such places as Insite reduce harm for intravenous drug users by lessening the chance of dying as a result of addiction. The argument for section 3(1), the ability to make informed choices within the places that sell, or exclusively sell, vaping products applies as well.

“To amend 10(1) ‘No person shall use an electronic cigarette in any enclosed public place or enclosed workplace.’ With no scientific evidence that suggests that second-hand vapour from vaping devices is harmful and studies demonstrate that there is no danger to public health, the choice of allowing vaping in establishments and workplaces should be at the discretion of the business owner. A specific exemption for establishments that exclusively sell vaping products is absolutely necessary for the purpose of demonstrating products.”

I agree with this petition and I sign my name to it.

1340

ALZHEIMER’S DISEASE

Mrs. Gila Martow: I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias are progressive, degenerative diseases of the brain that cause thinking, memory and physical functioning to become seriously impaired;

“Whereas there is no known cause or cure for this devastating illness; and

“Whereas Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias also take their toll on hundreds of thousands of families and care partners; and

“Whereas Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias affect more than 200,000 Ontarians today, with an annual total economic burden rising to \$15.7 billion by 2020; and

“Whereas the cost related to the health care system is in the billions and only going to increase, at a time when our health care system is already facing enormous financial challenges; and

“Whereas there is work under way to address the need, but no coordinated or comprehensive approach to tackling the issues; and

“Whereas there is an urgent need to plan and raise awareness and understanding about Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias for the sake of improving the quality of life of the people it touches;

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

“To approve the development of a comprehensive Ontario dementia plan that would include the development of strategies in primary health care, in health promotion and prevention of illness, in community development, in building community capacity and care partner engagement, in caregiver support and investments in research.”

I’m happy to affix my signature.

The member opposite’s petition must have been in very tiny font.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. John Vanthof: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the provincial government has cancelled the Northlander passenger train which served the residents of northeastern Ontario; and

“Whereas the provincial government has closed bus stations and is cancelling bus routes despite promising enhanced bus services to replace the train; and

“Whereas the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission (ONTC) has been given a mandate that its motor coach division must be self-sustaining; and

“Whereas Metrolinx, the crown corporation that provides train and bus service in the GTA ... is subsidized by more than \$100 million annually; and

“Whereas the subsidy to Metrolinx has increased annually for the last seven years;

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

“To direct the Minister of Northern Development and Mines to reverse the decision to cancel bus routes immediately and to treat northerners equitably in decisions regarding public transportation.”

I wholeheartedly agree and send it down with page Alexandra.

TRANSPORTS EN COMMUN

M^{me} Marie-France Lalonde: J’aimerais lire une pétition adressée à l’Assemblée législative de l’Ontario.

« Attendu qu’il y a un besoin criant en infrastructure de transport routier dans la province de l’Ontario;

« Attendu que d’offrir différentes alternatives ou options dans le choix du mode de transport aux citoyens aide à réduire le nombre de voitures sur les routes;

« Attendu que les transports en commun contribuent à améliorer la qualité de vie des Ontariens ainsi qu’à préserver l’environnement;

« Attendu que les résidents d’Orléans et de l’est d’Ottawa ont besoin d’une plus grande infrastructure de transport;

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

« Soutenir le plan Faire progresser l’Ontario et la construction de la phase II du train léger sur rail (TLR), ce qui contribuera à répondre aux besoins criants en infrastructure de transport à Orléans, à l’est d’Ottawa et à travers la province. »

Il me fait plaisir de supporter et de signer cette pétition, madame la Présidente.

HIGHWAY RAMPS

Mrs. Julia Munro: “Whereas the town of Bradford West Gwillimbury will continue to have robust growth of population and commercial activity in proximity to the Holland Marsh, Ontario’s salad bowl, which consists of 7,000 acres of specialty crop area lands designated in the provincial Greenbelt Plan and is situated along the municipal boundary between King township and the town of Bradford West Gwillimbury;

“Whereas the Canal Road ramps at Highway 400 provide critical access for farm operations within the Holland Marsh allowing for efficient transport of product to market, delivery of materials and equipment and patronage of on-farm commercial activities; and

“Whereas the loss of that critical access to Highway 400 may threaten the significant financial benefits that the Holland Marsh contributes to the Ontario economy;

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

“That the council of the corporation of the town of Bradford West Gwillimbury hereby advises the Honourable Steven Del Duca, Minister of Transportation, that the town does not support the elimination of the Canal Road ramps at Highway 400, and further, that the town requests that the duration of the temporary closure of Canal Road between Wist Road and Davis Road be minimized to the greatest extent possible during the Highway 400/North Canal bridges replacement project.”

I have affixed my signature as I am in complete agreement.

CAREGIVERS

M^{me} France Gélinas: I have a petition that comes from all over Ontario, and they keep coming—I would say thousands of names, probably more. It reads as follows:

“Whereas there are over 2.6 million caregivers to a family member, a friend or a neighbour in Ontario;

“Whereas these caregivers work hard to provide care to those that are most in need even though their efforts are often overlooked;

“Whereas one third of informal caregivers are distressed, which is twice as many as four years ago;

“Whereas without these caregivers, the health care system and patients would greatly suffer in Ontario;”

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support MPP Gélinas’s bill”—my bill—“to proclaim the first Tuesday of every April as Family Caregiver Day to increase recognition and awareness of family caregivers in Ontario.”

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

GOVERNMENT ANTI-RACISM PROGRAMS

Ms. Daiene Vernile: This is a petition supporting the Anti-Racism Directorate.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Ontarians are concerned that individual, systemic and cultural racism continues to create unfair outcomes for racial minorities in Ontario;

“Whereas the time has come to remove the social and economic barriers that prevent our province from achieving true equality;

“Whereas in order to accomplish that objective and to tackle racism in all its forms, our government has created the new Anti-Racism Directorate;

“We, the undersigned, acknowledge both our support for the concept behind the Anti-Racism Directorate, and recognize that there is still work to be done to build an inclusive Ontario where everyone, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or cultural background, has an equal opportunity to succeed.

“Therefore, we petition the government to work with key partners, such as businesses, community organizations, educational institutions and the Ontario Human Rights Commission in an effort to create a scope for the Anti-Racism Directorate....”

I agree with this petition and I shall sign it.

CORMORANTS

Mr. Rick Nicholls: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the noticeable increase in the numbers of cormorants in the Rondeau Bay and Eriean regions of Lake Erie has raised concerns regarding the impact on game species, the forage base, the vegetation, as well as on other colonial water birds;

“Whereas cormorants are opportunistic predators whose diets have a significant impact on fisheries, with estimates that a colony of 4,000 birds consuming a minimum of one pound per day would equal two tonnes of fish daily;

“Whereas cormorant guano is acidic and can change soil chemistry which can kill ground vegetation and damage nesting trees;

“Whereas cormorants also destroy vegetation directly by stripping leaves and small branches from trees which can lead to increased erosion along shorelines;

“Whereas cormorants tend to be attracted to the nesting sites of other colonial water birds, which may impact other colonial water bird species such as gulls, terns, egrets and herons;

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

“That the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry take the necessary steps to minimize the negative effects the cormorant colony is having on the Rondeau-Eriean region.”

I approve of this petition and affix my name.

PRIX DE L'ESSENCE

M. Taras Natyshak: J'ai le plaisir d'introduire une pétition à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, qui dit :

« Alors que les automobilistes du nord de l'Ontario » et autour de l'Ontario « continuent d'être soumis à des fluctuations marquées dans le prix de l'essence; et

« Alors que la province pourrait éliminer les prix abusifs et opportunistes et offrir des prix justes, stables et prévisibles; et

« Alors que cinq provinces et de nombreux états américains ont déjà une réglementation des prix d'essence; et

« Considérant que les juridictions qui réglementent le prix de l'essence ont : moins de fluctuations des prix, moins d'écart de prix entre les communautés urbaines et rurales et des prix d'essence annualisés inférieurs;

« Nous, soussignés, demandons à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario :

« D'accorder à la Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario le mandat de surveiller le prix de l'essence partout en Ontario afin de réduire la volatilité des prix et les différences de prix régionales, tout en encourageant la concurrence. »

J'appuie cette pétition, et je vais y affixer ma signature.

1350

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AMENDMENT ACT (DOUBLE-CRESTED CORMORANTS), 2016

LOI DE 2016 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA PROTECTION DU POISSON ET DE LA FAUNE (CORMORANS À AIGRETTES)

Mr. Bailey moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 205, An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997 / Projet de loi 205, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la protection du poisson et de la faune.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

Mr. Robert Bailey: It's an honour to stand in the Legislature today and have the opportunity to present Bill 205, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Amendment Act, for its second reading debate.

Bill 205, in essence, is a straightforward bill. Currently, section 5(1) of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act states, "A person shall not hunt or trap specially protected wildlife or any bird that belongs to a species that is wild by nature and is not a game bird." This section creates protections for all birds that are not otherwise protected by the federal Migratory Birds Convention Act.

Bill 205 amends the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1997 to permit the hunting and trapping of double-crested cormorants. This amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act places double-crested cormorants in a category of birds along with the American crow, the brown-headed cowbird, the common grackle, the house sparrow, the red-winged blackbird and starling that section 5(1) does not apply to.

Madam Speaker, after researching this issue, speaking with stakeholders and considering the potential impact of this amendment, I believe that this is an appropriate and reasonable response to the issue of the rapid double-crested cormorant population growth in the Great Lakes region.

I look forward to all of the comments on Bill 205 today. I've had many conversations with my colleagues in the official opposition regarding the impact of these birds on the delicate ecosystems in their ridings. I'm also very interested to hear the comments from both the members of the government and the members of the third party, because I know that the double-crested cormorants are also having a major impact in many of their ridings as well.

The idea of this particular amendment of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act had been put forward during previous Legislatures by the former Liberal member for Algoma-Manitoulin Michael Brown in 2001, and the Liberal member from Prince Edward-Hastings Ernie Parsons in 2006. In the decade since those members first brought forward the issue of overpopulation, the double-crested cormorant population has exploded. This is stressing delicate ecosystems, impacting biodiversity and creating concerns for property owners and the fishing and tourism industry throughout the Great Lakes region. I also understand it's very damaging to the islands here just off Toronto. On Toronto Island, the people who boat in the harbour tell me that this is causing a lot of damage to a number of properties and to the islands there.

The double-crested cormorant, or the crow duck, is a large fish-eating bird found throughout the Great Lakes region, as well as large swaths of North America. A fact

sheet issued by Environment Canada indicates that historically, the double-crested cormorant did not nest originally in the Great Lakes region. Evidence of double-crested cormorants around the Great Lakes did not appear until sometime around 1913, along the very western edge of Lake Superior. The nesting colonies of these large predatory birds continued to spread east to the Great Lakes, making it to the St. Lawrence River valley by 1945. In the 1950s, the number of double-crested cormorants in Ontario numbered at about 900 nesting pairs. By 1973, that number had dropped by 86% to approximately 125 nesting pairs. Scientists at that time believed that the decline in the cormorant population was a result of the high levels of toxic contaminants such as DDT and PCBs that were present at that time in the Great Lakes.

At the same time, the Great Lakes themselves were experiencing a change in fish populations as a result of many factors, including the decline of large predatory fish and also the introduction of invasive species and, again, the presence of toxic contaminants in the lakes. As a result of this, governments of both Canada and the United States, including the province of Ontario, began to pass legislation which banned the use of a lot of these types of pesticides, while also passing legislation to improve the overall water qualities in the Great Lakes region.

Six decades, or 60 years, later, we're all thankful that the leaders of the day saw fit to take those actions that they did to protect the Great Lakes, our greatest natural resource. But, as a result of this confluence of factors—the banning of toxic pesticides, the steadily increasing numbers of smaller fish in the Great Lakes and the seemingly hands-off approach to population management by the MNRs of different governments—population numbers of the double-crested cormorant rebounded quickly from the 1970s through to the 1990s, and have exploded even more so in recent years.

From that original group of 125 nesting pairs in 1973, the most readily available government of Canada statistics from 2009 indicated that there were more than 58,000 nesting pairs in the Great Lakes. Some bird count surveys suggest that the population increase may be happening at the rate of 7% a year, which would be unsustainable if that is the case. And from the numbers, that probably is the case.

As a result of the rapid recovery and population explosion of the double-crested cormorant, the federal Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada has listed this bird as "not at risk" since April 1978. Various other national and international conservation groups, such as the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the North American Waterbird Conservation Plan, Wings Over Water and Wild Species Canada, all list the status of the double-crested cormorant as "least of concern" or "not at risk" or "secure." This is obviously a testament to the resiliency of this species of bird. In only a few short decades, the double-crested cormorant has gone from relative rarity in the Great Lakes region to one of the most populous species of bird.

Unfortunately, this explosive population growth has led to many concerns that these birds are negatively impacting Ontario's fishing industry, vegetation base, sensitive island ecosystems and other protected water birds in our Great Lakes and freshwater system. The cormorant, a very sociable bird, almost always nests in large colonies. These nesting habits, while commendable in humans, result in the rapid destruction of existing site vegetation through breaking of branches, stripping of foliage, and loss of important ecosystem and canopy cover.

Moreover, the impact of the toxic guano of the hundreds of double-crested cormorants at a nesting site kills trees and vegetation, leaving roosting sites of double-crested cormorants ecologically barren in only a few short years. I know there's a case near Pelee Island—I think it's called Middle Island—where the ministry and the federal government went in and tried to repopulate and get that island ecosystem back, because these birds literally destroyed it.

This has been the case in many areas across the Great Lakes in Ontario. I hope to hear examples, from some of the other members who speak to the bill this afternoon, of the destruction caused by these birds in their own communities.

Moreover, there are ongoing concerns that the overpopulation and range expansion of the double-crested cormorant is having a significant impact on fisheries in the Great Lakes. Double-crested cormorants consume large amounts of fish in the areas they populate, and place a significant impact on species. A typical cormorant can consume 20% to 25% of its body weight, or roughly one pound of fish, each day. Dietary studies on these predatory birds have shown that cormorants consume a wide range of prey species and are opportunistic, generalist feeders. In other words, I guess they'll eat pretty near anything.

A report by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources indicates that cormorant prey selection primarily depends upon the abundance, availability and catchability of fish near their colonies. This includes fish up to 40 centimetres in length. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has associated declines in smallmouth bass and yellow perch abundance in the eastern basin of Lake Ontario with cormorant population increases.

Some fishermen and hunters that I know tell me that they've seen them in action. They'll see a school of fish and actually circle them, come down close to the surface of the water and beat their wings, drive the fish into the centre and then the other birds will catch them. They're quite organized. Probably a lot of people could use organization like they can put together.

1400

This unchecked predation by cormorants should be of concern to this provincial government, as their population growth has the potential to have a very serious consequence for fishing and fishing-related industries in Ontario, which we all rely on. A simple Google search

will turn up numerous stories on the impact cormorants have had on public lands, private property, businesses and communities across Ontario. Unfortunately, despite all this information and the growing concern with the impacts of the cormorant population, the Ministry of Natural Resources has been slow to take action on this issue.

Bill 205, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Amendment Act, is designed as a simple first step that this government can take to control the growth in the numbers of this predatory bird. As I stated earlier, Bill 205 will add the double-crested cormorant to the list of unprotected birds in Ontario, which I listed earlier. I believe that removing this unnecessary protection of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act is a reasonable step for this government to take. It's one more tool that will be at the disposal of those dealing with the issue of cormorant overpopulation.

I hope that members of both the government and third party will join with the official opposition to support Bill 205. I would like to see this bill moved through to the committee stage where we can all learn more about the impacts that double-crested cormorants are having across this province.

Let me make clear that in no way am I supporting the extinction of cormorants or any sort of mass culling, but I am asking the government to take action. By failing to take action for the last number of years—by all governments—we see a shift in the delicate balance of this ecosystem. This imbalance and the overpopulation of a predatory species must be addressed before the scope of the problem is too large to handle and the damage to our ecosystem is too great to recover from.

Thank you, and I look forward to all of the comments during this afternoon's debate.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Michael Mantha: How do you begin talking about an issue that has been going on for quite some time across this province, particularly, as the member from Sarnia-Lambton mentioned, as a private member's bill came out of my riding from the previous member?

If you look at the history of cormorants, particularly as it comes to Manitoulin Island, they have been an issue, but the issue has been addressed through previous programs, through culling programs from the MNR. Actually, that's where the responsibility falls as far as controlling and monitoring cormorants, but I'll come back to that a little bit later.

I do want to talk about some of the concerns when it comes to cormorants during my brief amount of time, because I've got a lot of my colleagues who want to talk to this as well.

Anglers, of course, across the island and particularly individuals who are in the aquaculture sector are very much concerned with the increased presence of cormorants on Manitoulin Island, across the North Shore. You ask yourself why. What happened and why do we have such a high population now of cormorants?

A few years ago—I would say about four or five years ago—when we had the very cold winter, there was a lot of the natural feed for cormorants that was destroyed in southern Ontario. They all pushed up to northern Ontario and that became a big issue, and the impacts it was having on the fisheries and on some of the businesses.

Just on cormorants, really quickly, they're a very crafty bird. Their beak is kind of shaped with a hook at the end, so just picture this: They can sit on the side of a net where you have an aquaculture farm, and they shoot their beaks right through the mesh of the net and actually sometimes pierce that net and harm the fry that is within those nets. It affects production and, at the end of the day, it affects their aquaculture business. So there are the big concerns there.

Again, tourism is one of those biggest things across the North Shore when it comes to the fishing industry, and it has a negative effect on it.

However, let's look at the positive that can come out of this. When we're talking about the positive, let's also look at MNR's role, which hasn't been exercised for a very long time when it comes to monitoring cormorants in the environment. Why MNR hasn't been doing their role is because their budgets have been cut. They do not have the individuals out in the field. They do not have the technicians and they do not have the biologists to monitor and make sure and actually account for the populations that are out there.

I've talked to previous individuals who had worked in their roles with the MNR, and they are devastated because they are proud individuals who used to be able to go out and actually work in the field and give concrete evidence. But right now, a lot of the decisions that MNR is making are based on third-party findings that they do in their reports. That is not good enough. I think we're missing out on an opportunity to make sure that the specially trained individuals can go out and actually do the cull in order to regulate the cormorant population. That's very important.

Now, I did talk about a positive spin that we can do on this. If the MNR is not going to do it, why don't we engage with our fish and wild game clubs? The fish and wild game clubs are just sitting on the side waiting to give their volunteer hours. They volunteer thousands of hours every year. Why doesn't the MNR take the time to go out and engage with these individuals and train them?

There is a benefit to having cormorants in areas, believe it or not. On the islands where they nest they have their excrement that falls off of them, and in their areas it creates a whole new aquatic life around these islands. Freshwater shrimp are growing in these areas in great abundance.

When you look at the negative and you look at the positive, monitoring and making sure there is a proper control on this is really key. And who has that role? That's the role of the MNR. That's where this bill should lie. We shouldn't have to deal with these bills. It's not the first time I've heard of a bill such as this come forward from the Conservatives in order to address an issue

because of the lack of initiative by the government. This is just the second, third, fourth one that I've heard over the numerous years I've been here.

Now, there is a little piece of training that will be involved in this if we are going to reach out to these other organizations to prepare for the cull, because cormorants nest on islands. Of course, they do. But there are other nesting birds there. So you have to be careful in regard to what eggs you're going to oil, what areas you're going to go into, so that you do not harm the other birds that are there in that area.

Having said that, there are definitely negatives to having cormorants in your area, but if they're controlled and if you monitor them, there's an opportunity for some positives as well. For individuals who are affected negatively by this, there is a course of action presently in the act that gives them the opportunity to regulate it as well.

With that, I'll let my other colleagues speak, but this is something, once again, that is a government responsibility that they should be doing.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I recognize the member from Ottawa–Orléans.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: I'm very proud to rise today and speak about Bill 205, An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997. As an MPP who actually represents a riding that is situated on the Ottawa River and that has a diverse ecosystem which goes from farmland to wetland, I understand the importance of having a healthy ecosystem. And I have to say, much like the member opposite, I've sought to protect the Great Lakes ecosystem myself, through Bill 75, Microbead Elimination and Monitoring Act.

I do understand the concerns brought forward by the member for Sarnia–Lambton about the double-crested cormorants and how they impact the ecosystem and landowners. Currently, as our law stands, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act allows landowners to kill double-crested cormorants if they are damaging or about to damage their property. In fact, they can take this action without authorization from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

We must be good stewards of the environment and our ecosystem, and that means taking a measured approach to any sort of population management and control. Double-crested cormorants are native to North America. During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, their populations were decimated. After these decades their populations were restored, and research has shown that their population has stabilized or actually declined slightly in recent years.

Madam Speaker, I have significant concerns about the effects of this bill, if passed. The bill strips protection from double-crested cormorants and allows for small game hunters to kill these birds. This would take Ontario out of Canadian alignment and would be the only Canadian jurisdiction to remove protections from these birds.

1410

This bill also would create problems and possibly not even solve what is seen as a problem. If passed, the bill

will allow those with small-game licences to kill these birds. It would also allow them to kill an unlimited amount, and it will not mandate these hunters to properly dispose of their bodies, leaving these dead cormorants to waste.

There is also the question of the effectiveness of hunting cormorants as a method of population control. The destruction of a cormorant's colony can remove that colony, but another could immediately move in to fill that space. Shooting can frighten these birds from the area, but they often return a few weeks later to the colony. Destruction of these colonies can also shift these colonies and birds to somewhere else in their natural habitat, setting up a colony elsewhere.

If it is determined through research and studies that cormorants are putting significant pressure on certain fish species, then the actions that the government should take should be measured. Any approach to the double-crested cormorant should be based on research, studies and scientific data. A poorly planned population control effort, such as the one that seems to stem from this private member's bill, can have medium- to long-term negative effects on the biodiversity in our ecosystem. This type of population control effort can push birds into more sensitive areas of our ecosystem. Eliminating birds in the short term can lead to a rapid population increase in the long term, putting these ecosystems under strain from this population growth. Given that the birds are native to North America and they go across many jurisdictions, any action—if decided by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry—that might be taken should be done, I believe, in collaboration with other jurisdictions for lasting population control of cormorants.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): The member from Leeds–Grenville.

Mr. Steve Clark: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's always nice to see you in the chair.

I'm honoured to join in this important debate on Bill 205, one that is being watched very closely in my riding of Leeds–Grenville.

I want to start by commending the member for Sarnia–Lambton. Bill 205 is another example of why Mr. Bailey is such an effective MPP and one of the most successful in getting private members' bills passed. He brings forward very reasonable legislation that provides a solid basis to address an issue that affects many members of this House and our constituents. As a result, members are eager to pass it on second reading, get it into committee, where we can tweak it, and come back here and have it adopted by the government. We saw that recently with his bills dealing with a tax credit for farmers donating to a food bank and with a One Call system to locate underground infrastructure.

I believe he has repeated this approach with Bill 205 to address the exploding double-crested cormorant population. We've heard how these birds are devastating the environment. They're devastating sport fishing and the bait fish industry throughout the Great Lakes and beyond. To address this issue, Mr. Bailey, the member

for Sarnia–Lambton, has brought forward legislation to amend the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997, and put some tools in our tool kit.

Certainly, we've been dealing with the problems caused by cormorants on the St. Lawrence River for years. I personally want to thank the Thousand Islands Association and their membership for helping me advocate for this action. The association, for those that don't know, has members on both sides of the river, and they're extremely frustrated with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. Their frustration, Speaker, is heightened because they see the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation taking action on the US side of the border. Recently, we started to hear, especially in my riding, about the cormorant devastation that many constituents are now seeing on the inland lakes and rivers in the riding.

These are small lakes. They're very fragile ecosystems, and a sudden influx of hundreds or thousands of cormorants will quickly strip vegetation and they will wipe out fish populations in those small inland lakes. There is an urgent need for the ministry to get engaged. So, Speaker, you can imagine my disappointment when I filed order paper questions to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry—and the two questions I asked were very straightforward: What is the ministry doing, and would they consider the measures we're debating today? Do you know what their answers were? “Nothing” and “no.” Those were the answers to the two questions. The minister said the ministry did a comprehensive review in—get this—2006 and would rely on that knowledge to continue doing nothing. That's right. People in my riding and in ridings all across the province are reporting that this is a big problem, but the government is content to use 10-year-old data as an excuse to bury their heads in the sand. Given the threat to the environment and our tourism economy posed by the uncontrolled explosion in cormorant numbers, that response is unacceptable.

I want to commend the member for Sarnia–Lambton for this very proactive piece of legislation that we're debating today. It's a great basis for a broader discussion that I hope will get to committee.

I urge all members to join me in supporting Bill 205 this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): The member from Nickel Belt.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Like about 27% of the people in my riding, in Nickel Belt, I live on a lake. I know that I'm really privileged, and I appreciate that—and so does Gilles and so does John. The privilege of living in northern Ontario is that we get to do that.

Of course, I knew of cormorants because I had gone to his riding, to Manitoulin Island, and I had seen all those black birds that I had never seen before. People explained to me that they were cormorants. So you can imagine my surprise when, about three years ago, we were sitting on our deck, looking out, and I said, “Wow, what a weird-looking loon”—because they're dark like a loon and have

a long beak. My husband said, “No, that’s not a loon. That’s a cormorant.” Sure enough, we got into the boat and we started to go around. We only had two or three. By the end of the summer, we had two or three dozen. Fast-forward to the next spring: We had 200 or 300. Those little birds multiply very fast, don’t they? Then the second thing we noticed really quickly is that if you wanted to know where the fish were, all you had to do was to go where the cormorants were because they feed on the same fish we feed on.

After about three years of this, the fishing for walleye and pickerel and bass and perch in our lake was not so good anymore. The cormorants were getting fatter, bigger and more numerous all the time. People started talking and bringing ideas like the member is bringing forward.

I also have the privilege, in Nickel Belt, to have the highest percentage of retired MNR people in the entire province. I think they all retired in Nickel Belt. We have a lot of active conservation officers, but more are retired, because the workforce of conservation officers, let me tell you, has gone down since the resources to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry have also gone down.

We started to learn more about what those birds were all about and what their role is within the ecosystem and what should and should not be done to look after those birds.

Fast-forward to this spring: I had a really busy weekend with events last weekend, but I managed to go fishing for about an hour and a half. We went to my favourite spot, close to the narrows—I’m not going to divulge all of my good fishing spots, Madam Speaker—and it was non-stop. When my husband didn’t have a fish on, I had a fish on. It came to the place with just one line at a time in the water because we could not net them fast enough. I threw them back because I hit my limit in 10 minutes and that was it. The rest of them we threw back because we respect the limits. All this to say that although we do have a whole lot more cormorants than we have ever had, I would say the population seems to have stabilized right now and the fishing has—although, in the transition, it was tough. It’s pretty boring to go fishing when you don’t catch anything, let me tell you. I can only take 20 minutes of that; then I say, “Sayonara. I’ve had enough fun.” But it has bounced back. It has bounced back because nature is like this.

1420

That’s not to say that the government does not have a role to play. The government does have a role to play through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. There should be enough resources there to make sure that they do a good job of looking at where it is a threat to our ecosystem and where it is not a threat to our ecosystem. But when you have one conservation officer for an area the size of Toronto—this is part of my riding; I’m many times the size of Toronto, and my riding is one of those big northern ridings. You have one conservation officer for all of this? I look at their map, Speaker, and some of

the lakes they will patrol—it is on the map and it’s scheduled once every 25 years. That’s because this is working flat-out trying to do their job. This is not acceptable, and this falls squarely on this government, who, year after year, has cut back.

There’s a role to play. But we have the tools in Ontario. It is called the Ministry of Natural Resources. Give them the resources to do their job. Make sure that there are enough conservation officers out there that can do that and certainly meet—we also have lake associations throughout my riding—with the people who belong to those lake associations that have questions. Ours—part of the Vermilion River Stewardship committee—had serious questions when all of a sudden there were no more fish to be caught. I even caught a crayfish—not easy to do on a line, Madam Speaker, but I managed. That was all that seemed to be left.

We have recovered, partly because we have those conservation officers that came and helped us. But they did that on a voluntary basis. There should be a conservation officer available to all of the stewardship committees of all of the lakes and rivers in northern Ontario so that when they do see an issue like this, you have access to people that have the knowledge and the skills to guide you through so you continue to have a healthy ecosystem, because this is what we all depend on. Believe it or not, Madam Speaker, we are part of that food chain, and if there is no food for those birds and those fish, there will be no food for us either.

I urge the government to really listen clearly to what people are saying. The Ministry of Natural Resources is our key to a healthy environment in the north, and right now they are failing at their job.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Lou Rinaldi: It’s a pleasure to speak on Bill 205 from my good friend from Sarnia–Lambton. I must say that his seatmate, about two or three months ago, approached me to co-sponsor this bill. But I guess he got busy or he had some other issues; he’s not here. So I’m glad that you brought it back.

I’m going to tell you a personal story. I have some experience with cormorants. If this bill was before me, I would say, 15 years ago, in the early 2000s, I would have not hesitated one little bit to jump in the fray and say, “Let’s do it.” Let me tell you the story, Speaker.

I live in Brighton, Ontario, home of Presqu’ile Provincial Park. The park had become a colony for cormorants. There are two small islands off Presqu’ile park on the west shore, right by one of the most beautiful beaches in Ontario, almost as good as the one in Prince Edward county, Sandbanks—almost.

The two islands were destroyed. Vegetation was destroyed. Because they’re not very far from this beautiful beach, it was damaging the beach as well. As a matter of fact, crews had to clean that beach every day during the summer in order to keep it safe for kids and swimmers.

To add to that, there was—there isn’t as much anymore, but the Quick family in Brighton had a phenom-

al commercial fishing business. Speaker, as you heard from other members that spoke about this, cormorants are very good when it comes to fishing. Actually, they could see the difference in their livelihood.

I was the mayor of Brighton at that time, and for two or three years it had become quite a thing in our community. I'm referring to Brighton, because that was where the biggest colony we knew of was at the time, but we knew there were others.

There was very little action from MNR back then, and some people were taking responsibility on their own. It wasn't a very good way to do things, and I won't get into those details. That was yesterday.

Finally, in 2003 or 2004, I would say, I happened to be in this place, and the ministry did start taking some action. Along with park staff, the folks from MNR in Peterborough started looking at the situation, because it was frankly becoming a bit of a health issue, plus it did destroy the vegetation of two islands.

When the member from Carleton–Mississippi Mills asked me two or three months ago, I did go back, because frankly, it went silent. But before I move ahead, I've got to tell you this story, Speaker.

There was a real faction when MNR started talking about controlling the bird population. Some of it was with guns. Of course, it brought a number of people who are fairly strongly opposed to that kind of activity. As a member of this place, I was lobbied pretty heavily to make sure that MNR would not take that action in what they call culling the birds. I was having my annual summer barbecue, with 300 or 400 people, and some of these activists, to prevent culling of the birds, dressed in chefs' uniforms and picketed outside my barbecue. Actually, some of the visitors who came to my barbecue said, "Wow, look at Rinaldi. He's got valet parking at the end of his driveway." But that wasn't the reason. Anyway, at the end of the day I spoke to the folks; they came in. I had real beef hamburgers, and they joined us for a barbecue and the day turned out well.

Let me fast-forward. I've only got—oh, my God—less than three minutes. MNR got involved. There were different ways. One was by scaring the birds. The other was by oiling the eggs to stop them from—because they do reproduce quite rapidly. And there was some controlled culling. It took two or three years, if I remember correctly, to get the population under control.

When the member from Carleton–Mississippi Mills talked to me two or three months ago, I went back to the park management, because frankly, I hadn't heard anything more in the last eight or 10 years. They said, basically, "Yes, there are still some cormorants in the area, but we're controlling them. We're keeping an eye on them, and whenever we feel that things are changing, we have some control mechanisms, based on the time of the year and based on when this is happening, and we've been very successful in keeping the population under control."

Ms. Daiene Vernile: Naturally.

Mr. Lou Rinaldi: Naturally, Speaker.

Now, I did a little bit of research. I think my predecessor spoke about some of the things that MNR is helping with where these colonies might appear, because they are there and they do damage. The ministry is prepared to assist, in a natural way, to control the population and minimize the damage they might do. And although the commercial fishing is not as strong as it used to be, it's not because of cormorants. It's just the way things are today.

I haven't heard—and I'll be very honest about something that was very top of mind 10 or 12 years ago—about a decline even in the recreational fishing population. There are lots of fishing tournaments. There was one about a month ago, a big walleye tournament in Trenton, which covers a large area. And although I'm not a fisherman, when something goes awry, you certainly hear about those issues, and you become involved.

1430

My sense is that things are under control. MNR provides the resources to keep control. So I'm not sure that we want to put more regulations in place and more structures in place. Frankly, I'm not a big fan of culling birds, even though they did it back then because it was extreme. I'm not sure I'd like to see this kind of mechanism taking place.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Tim Hudak: I'm pleased to rise in support of Bill 205, and I hope that Mr. Bailey will be successful in having his third private member's bill passed. I think it's sensible and balanced. I think it's based on good science and strong evidence.

I am a little worried—the comments from my colleague just now. They seem to be looking for excuses not to support the bill. They're making their own observations, I guess, on an alleged decline in cormorant population. I know there are some more radical environmental and animal rights' groups that have a significant foothold in the Ontario Liberal Party and New Democrats, but I think their view would be not to touch any animal population whatsoever. Some would be of the view that it's humans who are causing all the problems and we need to control humans, but they would object to this.

I try to look at this from a very objective perspective, and good advice from folks in Niagara. I don't know what he's talking about in his neck of the woods—I know my colleague from Prince Edward–Hastings will address it—but we're actually seeing an increase in population and increased damage. A quick scan of media, Madam Speaker, as I was listening to the member's speech, shows that throughout the northeastern United States, across the Great Lakes, from Milwaukee to Vermont and New York state, the cormorant populations are causing significant damage.

I spoke with Felix Barbetti about these issues over time. Felix was a respected senior civil servant in the Ministry of Natural Resources. Felix said that he remembers once driving from Thunder Bay to Lake

Nipissing to see two cormorants, years and years ago. That was the drive he had to do to actually see them in the wild. Now he sees them in his backyard—well, not exactly, but in the Niagara Peninsula, along the waterfront, like where I am, and Lake Erie. The damage to bait fish is significant. The impact on the commercial fishing industry is real and large and damaging. In fact, Felix Barbetti told me that a Brock professor and researchers were once setting up nesting sites for terns in Nest Colborne, and cormorants took over those artificial ports and displaced the terns. They'd push more fragile species out of nesting areas, including great egrets and blue herons, which I love to see along the Welland River, where I live.

Felix also told me about an experiment at Oneida Lake, New York, which is a laboratory for Cornell University. They saw a significant decline in fish populations. When they researched it, they found that the main cause was actually cormorants overfishing.

Erno Rossi, a very respected naturalist in the province of Ontario, very active in the Niagara Peninsula, remarked that many shorelines in Niagara, as well as islands including off Hamilton Harbour, are bare because the bird droppings are so toxic that they kill trees and other vegetation.

Ken Lounsbury, who's very active in the OFAH and is a resident of Beamsville, says that the best method in moving forward is to start oiling the eggs. I know that colleagues across the floor who are looking for an excuse to vote against the bill are making it seem like we're all going to go out with shotguns and start shooting them one by one, like some kind of video game. No; I think what the member from Sarnia-Lambton, Mr. Bailey, is calling for are sensible, ecologically sound measures, as in oiling eggs, to reduce populations overall. I think the evidence is strong, from an environmental point of view, from achieving an ecological balance, from the economic impacts, that Mr. Bailey's bill is a sensible, thoughtful and balanced approach to controlling cormorant populations, just as they are doing in states across the lakes to make sure we maintain habitat for other species and support commercial fishing.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Todd Smith: It is an honour to rise and speak to this bill put forward by my friend from Sarnia-Lambton on proper species management for cormorants. That's what we're talking about here.

Back when I was in radio, we used to talk about the measures that the member from Northumberland-Quinte West was mentioning during his remarks earlier, especially in the area of Presqu'île park, where cormorants were devastating that park, as the member alluded to. However, it's quite discouraging to hear that it appears as though he's going to be voting against this very thoughtful piece of legislation put forward by my colleague. We'd outlined the different methods that would be used to control the cormorant population in Presqu'île at that time.

It has been great, actually, for me to serve as the Ministry of Natural Resources critic for the PC caucus for the last couple of months to deal with issues like species management, conservation, resource management, recreational tourism and other things. Having met with a number of stakeholders in various parts of the sector over the last couple of weeks, I get a deep understanding of how interconnected the ecosystems are from mineral, plant and animal perspectives, and how active many recreational tourists and industries are in ensuring the long-term sustainability of these resources.

Contrary to the perceived opinion, hunters in Ontario actually do understand that no one benefits from over-hunting any animal. If you kill too many bears, you end bear hunting. If you chop down too many trees, pretty soon you don't have a forestry industry. People in the resources sector understand that they have a vested interest in the long-term sustainability of those resources, which brings us to today's bill on cormorants.

Here we have a predator—and that's what it is; even favourable pieces written about the species admit that it's a predator, Madam Speaker. What we have is a particularly harmful predator to long-term ecosystem sustainability and biodiversity, both because it engages in predatory activity by consuming other species and because it destroys the habitat of other species by destroying vegetation. One cormorant can take one pound of fish out of our lakes and rivers. So we have a predator that is having a detrimental effect on species management and biodiversity. We know that to be the case.

I know for a fact that conservation authorities in my area are of the opinion that the cormorant is having a detrimental effect on conservation efforts. We therefore do have a responsibility to do something.

Too often, this debate revolves around culling. That's the option that gets the most attention because it's the most violent, but it's also the option of absolute last resort, and as a result, it is seldom used. There is also a reasonable argument for why culling should be the last resort: The European Union found that where forcible culling occurs, what can end up happening is that the short-term reduction in the cormorant population results in less competition for resources and larger nests.

There are, however, methods of cormorant control that have long-term positive impacts on species management. These include egg oiling and nest disturbance, among many other viable methods for reducing the cormorant population to sustainable levels. Those are the kinds of measures that we saw, for the most part, in Presqu'île Provincial Park in the Bay of Quinte region.

We know that we have natural cormorant habitats or breeding grounds where cormorants tend to thrive. Historically in southern Ontario, that has been the major bird migratory route, along the north shore of Lake Ontario between Presqu'île Provincial Park and the Thousand Islands, but there are other problem spots across the province, as well.

What we're doing by not being active as the Ministry of Natural Resources in dealing with this is letting down

our neighbours who are doing things about this. They're doing the best they can to manage this predator that is in our lakes and rivers and destroying our property.

Guano destroys property. It destroys islands. It destroys other habitats. That's why I think it's very important that the opposition members in the third party and the government support Mr. Bailey's bill here this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I now return to the member to do the wrap-up.

Mr. Robert Bailey: I want to thank the members from Ottawa–Orléans, Algoma–Manitoulin, Prince Edward–Hastings, Leeds–Grenville, Niagara West–Glanbrook, Nickel Belt and Northumberland–Quinte West for their comments—their support or their criticism, such as the case may be.

I think the case has been made. I think everyone knows there is an issue. Maybe in some cases it's not as bad as it was at one time in the north, I hear. But this is a bird of prey that seems like it's building support. It just comes in and it cleans out a whole ecosystem where it is, and then it moves on. Maybe that's why they moved on from these other places: They cleaned it out and they had to move on. I think that's the case.

As my colleagues have said, it's not about wholesale going out and shooting birds; it's about taking those systems that work already: the oiling of the eggs, the disturbance of the nests—I don't think these birds have any natural predator, because they nest high up in the trees, so there's probably nothing that can disturb their nests other than man.

I would encourage the government party and the third party, as well, to seriously consider this. If not this, then what? We need to do something.

1440

I think this bill, in a small way, gives the Ministry of Natural Resources the ability, once we would pass that, to bring it to committee and bring in as many experts as we want from both sides: the people who say, "No, we don't need to do any more," and the ones who have been affected by this, whether it's in sport fishing, commercial fishing or the parks system. Bring them all in and let them speak and tell us how best to proceed. If there's a better way of doing it, or if they can prove at committee that it isn't an issue, then we could accept that, as well.

I would encourage everyone to support this bill so we can get it to committee, where we can really do a good study.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): We will vote on this particular bill at the end of private members' public business.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 74

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: I move that, in the opinion of this House, the Standing Committee on Social Policy should conduct public hearings on Bill 74, the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act, and refer the bill back to the House as soon as possible given that the

Legislature unanimously gave this bill second reading over a year ago, and that the House should conduct third reading without delay.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Mr. Hardeman has moved private member's notice of motion number 77. Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: Over a year ago, this Legislature unanimously gave my bill, the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act, second reading, but since then the bill has been stalled waiting for committee.

As you know, the Housing Services Corp. was created to obtain group discounts on natural gas and insurance for social housing providers. The idea was good: that purchasing together would provide a discount for everyone. But over the last decade, the organization has lost sight of its purpose, and as a result taxpayers and people in need are paying the price. My bill will ensure accountability by allowing the Auditor General to investigate the HSC, like the government gave her the authority to investigate the TSSA, which has the same corporate structure.

The Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act would add transparency by requiring salaries over \$100,000 to be reported on the sunshine list. It would save housing providers millions by letting them purchase natural gas and insurance from the best-priced source rather than forcing them to purchase it through the HSC monopoly.

Last April, after the bill received second reading, it was referred to the Standing Committee on Social Policy. Since then, the committee has met 35 times, but the government hasn't moved the bill forward. Over that time, the wait-list for social housing has increased by almost 3,000 families.

Just last week, the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association released their annual survey, which showed that there are now 171,360 families waiting for social housing in Ontario.

Every year, Ontario's housing wait-list hits a new record high. In fact, over the last 10 years the wait-list has increased by 40%, or almost 50,000 families.

The families waiting for housing don't care about partisan politics or negotiations between House leaders, but they do care about the millions of dollars that were supposed to help them and instead have been wasted or misused. They care that today, with this motion, we have the opportunity to take a step and end that abuse.

Madam Speaker, the HSC pays its expenses by marking up the cost of services to housing providers—that means that every dollar they spent is a public dollar which was intended to provide housing for people in need.

A memo from the city of Toronto shows that purchasing through the HSC cost Toronto Community Housing \$6.3 million in a single year. That's enough to provide rent supplements to house almost 1,000 families or to repair 126 units a year that have been boarded up because they are uninhabitable. In Hamilton, where there are

5,685 families on the wait-list, purchasing through HSC cost CityHousing Hamilton \$1.1 million extra in a single year. In Peel region, it added \$182,000 to the cost of gas.

The minister would have us believe that a few larger housing providers are paying more to help the smaller providers, but the facts show that just isn't the case. A detailed city of Stratford study last year showed they are paying \$40,000 more for natural gas because they are forced to purchase through the HSC and \$4,000 to be allowed to purchase insurance from a cheaper source. A Niagara region study found that for natural gas, "The HSC program has been more expensive than either Union Gas or Enbridge." A report from the Thunder Bay district social services board estimated that purchasing natural gas through the HSC added \$750,000 to the cost.

The county of Oxford, which has 1,219 families on the wait-list, estimates that they could save \$100,000 a year if they didn't have to buy insurance or natural gas through the HSC. In fact, Oxford and about 100 housing providers pay HSC every year just for the right to purchase their insurance from a cheaper source. That means their insurance isn't required to obtain volume discounts, as the minister would have us believe. It is simply about HSC taking money from housing providers.

That money is funding for-profit subsidiaries and a lifestyle that the 171,000 families waiting for housing could never afford: \$8 for water, bottles of wine, a luxury seven-day vacation in South Africa and over \$5,000 in business class air fare for one board member, all paid for with money intended for housing. The HSC is supposed to provide services for Ontario housing providers, but in the last few years—and, I would point out, for Ontario housing providers—the CEO's travel has included:

- more than \$4,600 to attend a conference in Australia;

- multiple trips to California, including flying to Santa Barbara for a single meeting, and over \$2,000 for a conference in Los Angeles;

- more than 10 trips to England, including one instance where he flew back to Ontario for two days to attend a birthday party;

- multiple trips to Vancouver, including one bill for over \$1,000 at the Fairmont Pacific Rim.

The trips to Europe, Australia, South Africa and California have all been paid for by overcharging housing providers for the services that they need, services that the government is forcing them to buy from the HSC.

After we exposed where this money went, the government's solution was to put the world-travelling CEO in charge of approving expenses for everyone else at the HSC. Expenses for just the top four show that in 2015—that's after the government says the problems had been cleaned up—housing money went to send multiple people to London, England; Manchester, England; Chicago, Illinois; Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; and Winnipeg, Manitoba. Thousands and thousands of dollars that were intended for housing instead are paying for travel.

But not all expenses appear to be reported. One person reported \$1,700 to attend a conference in Chicago, but failed to include the registration fee she charged on her HSC credit card, which made the total cost \$3,000. Through freedom of information, we found over \$3,000 spent by employees who don't publicly report their expenses to attend a conference in Nova Scotia. We also found multiple other trips to Nova Scotia and a trip to Calgary by these same employees. Unless the auditor investigates, we may never know how many trips are still being paid for with this housing money. Clearly, the problem is not solved. While 171,000 families are waiting for affordable housing, executives at the HSC are still expensing \$4 coffees and over \$200 to rent an SUV for a day to travel to meetings.

My bill would stop HSC executives from overcharging housing providers for a luxury lifestyle by allowing providers to purchase from another source if it is cheaper. It would ensure that the HSC can run efficiently and save municipalities money. That is why 65 municipalities across Ontario passed resolutions supporting this bill. Municipalities recognize that this bill will also increase accountability.

Housing money hasn't just gone to world travel; it also went to create for-profit subsidiaries, similar to those at Ornge air ambulance. This is where we need the Provincial Auditor's expertise to get the answers. We don't know why HSC invested Ontario housing money in HS 497, a corporation which never operated and whose only address was a lawyer's office in Manchester, England. But we know that at least half of that housing money is now gone.

We know that the HSC created a complicated corporate structure and, through a trust, owned the majority of a solar panel company called InnoServ. But we don't know why, year after year, they would loan InnoServ hundreds of thousands of dollars and then write those loans off as uncollectible in the same year that they were given. We don't know how many millions of dollars of housing money went to a solar panel company without anyone noticing.

1450

There is a subsidiary called GLOBE, which was created to provide energy programs and is now being dissolved. We don't know the total loss of this subsidiary, but as of December 31, GLOBE owed HSC more than \$750,000, and it was already acknowledged that they were not going to be fully repaid.

The government will tell us that these problems have been cleaned up, but HSC actually has two new subsidiaries. We know that, with a British partner, HSC created CIH Canada and loaned it \$125,000. We also know that HSC's executives have flown all over promoting it. Now it seems that they have put more money into the subsidiary.

Weiler and Company's recent report says, "All requests, in the 2015 fiscal year, for additional funding, or waiver of shareholder management fees have been approved by the HSC board of directors." They don't

report how much was approved, so until the auditor investigates, we won't know how much more housing money has been diverted. But we know that even though HSC keeps putting money in, their British partner has the option to take over more than 50% of the organization for only a nominal fee.

We also know that over the last two years, HSC has been working with partners to create a new subsidiary that appears to duplicate the lending programs of Infrastructure Ontario. According to their briefing notes, the feasibility study alone will cost \$250,000. Madam Speaker, public money that was intended to provide housing for people in need should not be going to pay for world travel, fancy meals or empire building.

It has also been more than a year since one of the two provincial appointments to the HSC board resigned after it was revealed that he was receiving more than \$70,000 in payments to his personal consulting firm as well as his pay on the board. It's more than a year, and the minister still hasn't bothered to replace him on the board to ensure provincial oversight.

During that time, the minister introduced a bill on affordable housing that actually amends the Housing Services Act, the legislation that enables HSC and requires housing providers to purchase natural gas and insurance through them. But the minister failed to introduce changes to fix these problems and help housing providers save millions of dollars by allowing them to purchase gas and insurance at the best price.

Ontario taxpayers and the 171,000 families waiting for housing need the members in this Legislature to see beyond partisan politics and House leader negotiations. They need us to pass this motion today and work together as quickly as possible to get the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act through to third reading so we can ensure that every public dollar intended to provide housing actually goes to people in need.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Mr. Hardeman has introduced a resolution calling for his bill to come forward to the social policy committee and have third reading. As you're well aware, Madam Speaker, the provincial government once promised to upload social housing costs from the municipalities. Instead, it forced municipal housing providers to buy costly services from an unaccountable monopoly whose CEO expensed more than \$100,000 in personal travel and dining over 20 months. With no provincial dollars and only property taxes for funding, Ontario's social housing providers have a tough job to do. This job is made tougher when housing dollars are misspent by the same agency that the provincial government created to help service providers spend housing dollars wisely.

One year ago, government members voted to make the Housing Services Corp. open and accountable to the public. But then the government completely ignored its commitment when it wrote Bill 204, the Promoting

Affordable Housing Act. The Housing Services Corp. could play a vital public role, and it should be open and accountable to the public.

Speaker, some background on all of this: In April 2015, the Legislature passed, at second reading, Ernie Hardeman's Bill 74, which would put the Housing Services Corp. and its subsidiaries under the oversight of the Auditor General and the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act. Housing service providers would also no longer be forced to participate in HSC programs. But the bill has gathered dust for nearly a year. And the government's new Bill 204, which amends the HSC's foundational legislation, does nothing at all to make the Housing Services Corp. more accountable or more transparent.

The government completely ignored the commitment it made last year. The government promised a review of the Housing Services Corp. in 2015. But in March 2016, Mr. Hardeman complained that the audit did not dig deep enough and noted the firm had ties to the Liberal Party. He did not describe the review in complimentary terms.

The Housing Services Corp. is a non-profit, private corporation originally created as the Social Housing Services Corp. by the Conservative government of the day, at the same time that they effectively killed the Ontario Housing Corp. and downloaded social housing onto municipal service managers.

Since 2011, the Housing Services Corp. has been constituted under the Housing Services Act, which replaced the Social Housing Reform Act, 2000, under which the corporation had been known as the Social Housing Services Corp.

The Housing Services Corp. is not a crown agency. Speaker, I just want to stop for a moment on that. This is an issue that seems to come up time and time again. We dealt with it with regard to Bill 151. We've dealt with it in other situations, where the government spins off these corporations, which are not accessible to the Ombudsman, the Auditor General or other officers of the Legislature, so our ability to actually bring in the reins on a corporation that's spending public money is dramatically reduced. I think it's entirely reasonable, the fact that we should be looking at the operation of this organization.

The job of the HSC is to provide managerial and business services to housing providers, including a bulk insurance purchasing program. In 2011, municipalities were told they could no longer buy insurance outside the Housing Services Corp. Several municipalities, including the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus, opposed this decision, asking, "If the HSC is so confident that their pricing is better, why are they unwilling to let us test the market?" The HSC said mandatory participation was needed in order to ensure the broadest pool and thus the best prices overall.

After a review, which was prompted as a result of these complaints, the HSC changed the policy yet again to allow municipalities to seek better deals under an alternate broker program. But under that program, if the municipalities used an alternate broker, they had to pay a service fee of 2.5% of the insurance premium, plus HST,

effectively penalizing municipalities for seeking the best deal, which is supposed to be the job of the HSC in the first place.

Despite the HSC's mandate to deliver the most cost-effective insurance to municipal housing service providers, several municipalities are still finding better deals outside the HSC. For 2013-14, Waterloo chose to pay the \$9,300 opt-out fee to HSC because they found insurance that was not only slightly cheaper—even with the fee—it also covered up to \$400 million in damages, as compared to the HSC policy, which covered only \$150 million. The Bruce County Housing Corp. board also chose an alternate broker in 2013-14.

There are many other examples. The NDP found that the HSC collected \$95,000 in alternate broker fees in 2013, representing nearly \$4 million worth of insurance policies purchased through alternate brokers. This is roughly one third of the value of insurance policies sold through the HSC in 2013, according to documents the NDP has obtained.

The HSC also has a bulk natural gas purchasing program. In July 2015, Mr. Hardeman revealed a confidential city of Toronto report claiming that Mayor John Tory had quietly asked Premier Wynne to change Toronto's agreement with the HSC that, according to city staff, forces the municipality to pay an extra \$6.3 million a year for natural gas purchased through the HSC.

Speaker, I don't think there's any question that there are substantial issues here that need to be probed, that the Auditor General needs to go through and look at the question of value for money. It may be that everything we've heard is misleading; that, in fact, everything is fine with this corporation. But there's enough smoke here to send in the Auditor General as a firefighter to find out what is going on.

1500

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Before I turn to the member from Burlington, I remind the member from Toronto–Danforth that you address each other as “the member from,” then the riding.

Ms. Eleanor McMahon: It is a pleasure to stand in the House today and speak to private member's motion 77, put forward by our colleague the member from Oxford. I can understand the motivation of the member opposite in putting forth this motion. As members of provincial Parliament, we all hope to have our private members' bills pass third reading and receive royal assent.

However, in order for this to take place, there is an established protocol that is followed, which is collaborated upon through regular conversation with all House leaders. This motion, in essence, looks to circumvent this legislative due process that surrounds all pieces of legislation that have passed second reading. Therein lies the challenge.

That is not to say the member from Oxford's bill in question, Bill 74, the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act, is not without merit or should not be called to committee. I know the member to be an

honourable and hard-working MPP who is a strong advocate for these kinds of issues and we appreciate that work.

Rather, it is that this bill should go through the same process as every other piece of legislation here in the House. Bill 74 proposes allowing municipalities to opt out of the mandated provision of services by the Housing Services Corp., or HSC, to municipal social housing providers and service managers.

Madam Speaker, the Housing Services Corp. is mandated to provide certain vital and valued services centrally, with a goal to reduce costs and improve efficiencies to the housing providers accessing them.

Our government recently, in 2011, reformed the legislation that governs the HSC under the Housing Services Act. These reforms included the fact that, as the member from Oxford noted, providers have been allowed to obtain equivalent insurance coverage from an alternate broker. We strengthened the accountability standards inherent in the act that require HSC to report annually to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and also to provide its audited financial statements.

The minister has previously welcomed feedback from municipalities and service managers on this matter, and our government is committed to continuing to work with partners to strengthen how social and affordable housing providers acquire these services and programs.

Having said that, it would still be improper to circumvent the time-honoured process which takes place between the three House leaders. It is this process and this process alone which should decide the bills that are called to a given committee. It is a mechanism which is part of the democratic process; as such, it allows all sides of the House to be heard through their House leader, and it functions well.

I can truly appreciate the member's desire and passion to see his bill, which I am sure he has put considerable effort into, reach the next stage of its legislative process. But rather than support this motion today, I would encourage him to follow the procedure and process already in place to have this done.

As such, I will not be supporting this motion here today. However, I would ask my colleagues here to think about their support as well and to respect the processes and procedures of this House. In closing, I would just add that I am sharing my time with the member from Etobicoke Centre. Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Lorne Coe: I'm proud to rise to speak in support of the motion brought forward by my colleague the member for Oxford. I bring two perspectives to the debate this afternoon, not only as the MPP for Whitby–Oshawa, but as the past chairperson for the health and social services committee at the region of Durham, where housing was one of the main issues that we discussed within that committee.

What is clear in the discussion of the motion before us is that Ontario is facing a housing affordability crisis, but

over the last year the government has done nothing to move forward the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act that would have helped. It would have helped, Speaker, to stop the waste and abuse of affordable housing dollars.

The government is quick to do photo ops on housing, but when it comes to a bill—a bill that could save millions of dollars intended for affordable housing—they drag their feet. In the course of that, they're ignoring families that are on the waiting list.

As my colleague from Oxford pointed out in his comments, the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association released its annual waiting list. This is not the first time they've done this, Speaker; they do it every year. Again, it showed that there are now approximately 172,000 families waiting for affordable housing, and the wait-list has increased by 40%—40%. The government has had 13 years to fix the wait-list, yet now we have the highest wait-list for affordable housing there's ever been.

If you cut through it all, life is simply harder under the Liberals. That is resulting in more and more vulnerable families being unable to put a proper roof over their heads. What these families need is a government that understands the importance of keeping life affordable and making sure that taxpayers' dollars are actually used to provide the support that people need.

This government's policies, from spiralling hydro rates to higher taxes, are simply making life more expensive—making life more expensive for seniors, making life expensive for all aspects of the community. The only real measure that we have seen from this government is that every year, the wait-list for affordable housing hits a new record high and is increased every year.

While I'm on my feet, I want to take a moment to acknowledge the member for Oxford's tireless work on this file. It's a difficult file and a complex file. Yes, it does include municipalities, and it did include the region of Durham in the course of developing its affordable housing strategy. We had so much optimism when the government introduced the Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy and spoke about the timing of bringing forward the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act in parallel and on a similar track. But it simply hasn't happened. The member for Oxford has repeatedly pushed the Liberal government to end the misuse and waste of housing money by the Housing Services Corp.

What's clear is that the constituents in Whitby—Oshawa have sent a strong message in the recent by-election to the government that they're tired of their failed policies, which lead to longer wait times, watered-down services, waste and mismanagement.

One of the main issues that I deal with in my constituency office is affordable housing and the wait-list. It crosses all sectors of my community, and I'm sure it does in yours too, Speaker.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, I'm proud to stand in support of the member for Oxford's motion. I encourage all members in the House to support his

important work. The crux of what he's asking for is a broader engagement of all sectors that are affected by the lack of affordable housing. Again, broader consultation is required, and I would encourage all members in the House to support his important work and bring this legislation back to the Standing Committee on Social Policy, of which I'm a member.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: It is a pleasure to rise today on motion number 77 from the member from Oxford. I listened very closely to not only the presentation by the member from Oxford, but to what the government was saying about this motion and the position they're taking. I'll elaborate a little on what I think about their position a little bit further after some background.

I do believe that the member from Oxford is warranted in bringing about this bill, and also that it is clearly borne out of frustration with a government that I think knows the member is on to something, and is fearful that where there is smoke, which they are aware of, there certainly will be fire, as we've seen in so many other instances. The member from Oxford presented a massive amount of anecdotal evidence to definitely warrant action and to warrant our involvement and oversight on this. It is our hope that the government would do the same.

1510

As background, in April 2015 the Legislature passed at second reading the member from Oxford's Bill 74, which would put the Housing Services Corp. and its subsidiaries under the oversight of the Auditor General and the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act. Housing service providers would also no longer be forced to participate in HSC programs. If you have been following this debate, the member from Oxford has given us many points of information as to why a municipality wouldn't want to participate in some of the programs. They're not getting the best value for dollar. They're not getting the accountability, the transparency and the partnership, it seems, that the agency was initially constructed to deliver.

So here we are. We're forced to follow the money. The government's position, as I've heard and as I understand it today, is that the member from Oxford should simply follow procedure in this House or the convention that bills be talked about and worked on through House leaders. For those who may not know, that is certainly the convention. It's tradition, and it's something that we rely on our House leaders to talk about and to figure out how this place can flow and the agenda of the House can get through and that opposition parties can have their bills looked at and scrutinized. That's the democratic process. However, ultimately, it is the government House leader that dictates any of the scheduling of the bills through this House. It's not done through a majority vote in House leaders. Whether the NDP and the Progressive Conservatives have a majority does not matter. If the government House leader decides that they don't want a bill to see the light of day, that is what's going to happen. Of course, this is why we're debating this bill today.

I believe and I support the member's ability and his right to use his private member's slot—and we all know in this House that that's a precious spot. He's using it once again to shine light on this subject, and I commend him for that, because there are so many subjects that I know we all want to touch on. To have to do it twice shows how deeply important this issue is and how he truly believes, through the research that he's done, that there's something for us to look at here.

I support the member's position. I will support the bill. It's an indication that, when the process fails in this place, we have to take all the measures that we can to ensure that our people are served and our constituents are served.

Again, I thank the member from Oxford for doing that. I think it's the right path, and I hope that government members see this argument and understand that this is the right thing to do. We don't need another Ornge Air Ambulance. We don't need another eHealth. Perhaps that's what the government is afraid of, but do the right thing and ensure that we're all working together to ensure accountability and transparency.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I'm happy to rise in the Legislature this afternoon to speak to the motion put forward by the member from Oxford. Motion number 77 calls on the House to express the opinion that Bill 74, the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act, should be referred back to the House as soon as possible and that the House should conduct third reading without delay.

Madam Speaker, I haven't been here as long as some other members, but I do understand that this motion seeks to supersede the legislative due process that surrounds all bills which have passed second reading. As with all other bills that have been referred to committee, this process is collaborated upon through regular conversation between all the House leaders. For these reasons, this matter, like all other similar private members' bills at second reading, would best be dealt with through the established process.

Furthermore, I'd like to add and insist that the fact that Bill 74 passed the Legislature unanimously at second reading has little bearing on the discussion at hand. Unanimous support to move a bill to committee should not be mistaken for unanimous support for the bill itself and does not mean that there is unanimous support to supersede legislative due process.

On April 16, 2015, I had the pleasure of rising to speak to Bill 74 itself. I thanked the member from Oxford for a sincere and well-intentioned private member's bill that wants to address some issues that I think all members of the Legislature are concerned about. However, I did point out at the time that the government had already reformed the legislation that governs HSC in 2011 and strengthened the accountability standards that require HSC to report annually to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

As I also stated in 2015, the Housing Services Corp. had asked the ministry to help facilitate an independent

third-party review of itself and its subsidiaries. That was selected through a competitive process. I supported Bill 74 at the time because we were still eagerly awaiting the results of that review, so that we could know what further steps should be taken. However, as the June 1, 2015, report by Weiler and Company stated, the HSC has taken steps to improve its efficiency through targeted expenditure controls that have resulted in significant overall expenditure reductions.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out that the report also concluded that HSC has instituted revised policies enhancing the accountability of its subsidiary and related companies, to align their policies with those of HSC. HSC is also in the process of winding up subsidiary companies that no longer serve an integral business purpose.

For all of those reasons, both procedural and substantive, I will not be supporting this motion today.

But I also cannot let pass some of the observations made by members of the Legislature about the housing wait-lists in our province. Indeed, they are large and they are growing. I'm very pleased that in the previous week, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing introduced new legislation that will include, among other things, inclusionary zoning, which I believe will address this long housing list.

But the reason why we have long housing lists, the reason why much of the social housing in this province is not in as good repair as it should be, was that a previous government deliberately cut funding, starved social housing of funding and downloaded those costs onto municipalities. Municipalities and this government have been working for a number of years now to reverse those cuts and bring social housing back to where it once proudly was in this province. We're undoing the damage that was done.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mrs. Julia Munro: I'm pleased to be able to rise today to speak to the motion on the Housing Services Corporation Accountability Act, as brought forward by my colleague the member for Oxford.

Time does not permit much of a response to the previous speaker, but I have to say that it is the choice of the member, using his private member's time, to bring to the legislative chamber once again the issue that has prompted him to bring this forward today. I think it simply demonstrates the fact that while the member opposite has referred to some changes that have been made, clearly the egregious spending and management that brought the member to this issue in bringing Bill 74 was predicated on the fact that not enough had been done, and I think that that serves, then, to clarify the purpose of today's debate.

The Legislature gave unanimous support at second reading over a year ago. It needs to undergo third reading without delay. While this bill waits in committee, Ontario is facing a housing affordability crisis. And yet, over the last year, the government has done nothing to move

forward this bill that would help put an end to the waste and abuse of affordable housing dollars. This is an opportunity to get better value for taxpayer money and to provide better help to those who need it most. The government has the opportunity to help move this bill into law.

1520

This bill would allow the provincial auditor to investigate some of the questionable expenses at the Housing Services Corp.—consider expenses to the Housing Services Corp. such as European travel, alcohol, expensive meals or a luxury seven-day vacation to South Africa for a board member. Just like other boondoggles, such as Ornge air ambulance, the Housing Services Corp. has lost money in various failed attempts to create for-profit subsidiaries. Millions lost in a failed solar panel venture and money invested in a highly questionable corporation in Manchester, England, simply add to the list.

Imagine the good that money could have done for those who need it most. Imagine how many more affordable housing units could have been created if the Housing Services Corp. had stuck to their core responsibility and mandate rather than followed the path of these failed ventures.

This bill would empower the auditor to investigate these expenses. It would increase transparency and accountability, while making sure that the funds provided for those in need really do go to those in need and not to luxury perks for staff or board members.

Countless housing providers have reported that they could save considerable money on their operating expenses if the government did not continue to force them to purchase natural gas and insurance through this agency.

Consider the following: Toronto Community Housing paid an additional \$6 million more than necessary if they had been able to purchase gas and insurance with the rest of the city of Toronto. The city of Waterloo was forced to pay \$30,000 over three years just to be permitted to purchase natural gas from a different supplier.

This issue doesn't just impact the larger municipalities in Ontario; it impacts smaller and mid-size ones as well. It flies in the face—the reality is that there are people across Ontario who need help in order to be able to afford each month's rent.

In fast-growing York region, there are several different types of affordable housing, including Housing York Inc., co-op housing and rental supplements. Housing York Inc. was established in January 2003 and is the seventh-largest social housing provider in Ontario. With a portfolio of 36 properties and 2,483 units, they serve approximately 4,000 tenants.

Ontario is facing an affordable housing crisis. It is not just that the price of home ownership is increasing; the price of rental units is increasing as well. This leaves society's most vulnerable behind, without access to an affordable place to call home. The money that has been wasted by this failed government initiative could be better spent building more affordable housing units so

that those on the wait-list in York region and across Ontario can have an affordable place to live.

The government is quick to do photo ops on housing, but when it comes to a bill that could save millions of dollars intended for affordable housing, they continue to drag their feet and ignore the roughly 170,000 families on the waiting list. These families need our help and support. It is a shame that they languish on a waiting list while board members jet-set across the world.

Millions have been lost, under this government's watch, to scandal, waste and mismanagement. Passing this bill would be a step forward in favour of accountability and transparency. I'm proud to be able to support my colleague from Oxford on this motion.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Yvan Baker: It's a pleasure to join the debate on this motion. What I wanted to do in the brief time I have remaining is speak a little bit to the topic of the bill that the member is advocating for and then maybe speak to what he has proposed in his motion.

As we know, the Housing Services Corp. was mandated to provide certain vital and valued services, and the goal was to reduce cost and improve efficiencies. As somebody who has come from a business background and who has worked on this type of work for clients, I know how important this type of approach can be, where you can consolidate purchasing and enjoy economies of scale and the benefits of expertise consolidated in a single organization. That's the principle behind the Housing Services Corp., as it follows good business practice. Of course, they support housing providers in their day-to-day operations by servicing programs such as insurance, investment pooling, bulk natural gas purchases—again, trying to leverage economies of scale.

In 2011, the government reformed the legislation that governs the HSC and we strengthened accountability standards that require HSC to report annually to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and also provide audited financial statements. Basically, we increased the scrutiny, oversight and accountability around the HSC.

Since 2012, we've also instituted flexibility because providers have been allowed to obtain equivalent insurance coverage from an alternate broker. So we've provided some more flexibility outside of the HSC for insurance purposes.

These are some of the things the government has done to address some of the issues that the member is trying to address in the proposed legislation.

I certainly sympathize with the member on what he's doing as far as advocating for his private member's bill, and I applaud him for his advocacy and persistence on something I know he believes to be very, very important. On that front, I have a tremendous amount of sympathy for what he's trying to do. The flip side of it is that we have a process here at the Legislature where private members' bills are negotiated between the House leaders, and those negotiations ultimately determine how many bills move forward, which bills move forward and that

sort of thing. So one of the challenges is that this goes outside of that current process. Perhaps the member doesn't agree with that current process. That's a discussion we could have. But given that we have a process in place where the House leaders negotiate the moving forward of legislation, what I don't understand is how this one would fall outside of that. That said, like I said earlier, I do applaud the member for, first of all, being committed to efficiency and accountability in government, and I do applaud him for his commitment and advocacy toward his private member's bill.

I myself have a couple of private member's bills that are in a similar position, that are waiting for a committee to hear them. I don't know if they have the same support from the opposition, but I would certainly like to see them move forward, as well. I'll take the 10 seconds of opportunity to plug both bills, Bill 127 and Bill 193—one that has passed second reading and one that is going to be debated next week. I hope I have the opposition's support on those.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I will return back to the member for Oxford to wrap up.

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: I want to thank everyone who responded to my bill. It seems that we have a considerable amount of consensus within the Legislature in support of the items that are in this bill.

The concern from the government side seems to be that they believe that somehow I'm circumventing the system. I would just like to point out that suggesting that I don't understand the system—I spent five years getting one private member's bill through that system, so I know exactly how it works.

One of the other things I noticed during that time is that there is a way of moving forward. The government, from time to time, will take a private member's bill and put it in place within one of their own, which, when the Housing Services Act, that the minister had just got through putting through the House—if the minister really believed this was the right thing to do, then this could have been incorporated there.

1530

The suggestion from Etobicoke Centre was that, in fact, I was doing this and advocating on my private member's bill. I want to tell you, this has nothing to do with my private member's bill. This is not a great issue in my riding. This is a great issue for the 171,000 people who need and are waiting for affordable housing.

This isn't the only answer, but as I said in my presentation, this would provide rent supplements for 100,000 more people into housing so they would have a place to live. It would repair 126 units that are presently boarded up, so people in Toronto could move into those. The only way we can do that is to get something passed so they can opt out of this.

I have a list here. The city of Toronto has—what is it here? According to a private and confidential memo from the city manager, Joseph Pennachetti, obtained through a freedom-of-information request, Toronto Community Housing Corp. would save \$6.288 million a year if they could opt out—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Thank you.

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: The minister can opt out and opt out right now—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Thank you. We will vote on the motion at the end of private members' public business.

SIKH MASSACRE

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: I move that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should recognize the state-organized violence perpetrated against the Sikhs throughout India as a genocide.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Mr. Singh has moved private member's notice of motion number 79. Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: This issue, Madam Speaker, is so vitally important to the people of this province and particularly the people in my constituency. It's an issue that impacts people across the world, and the Sikh community, but not only the Sikh community—anyone who hails from South Asia.

The problem that currently exists is that, as it stands, the violence perpetrated against the Sikh community is referred to as a "riot." It's often referred as "anti-Sikh riots." The problem is that when you refer to this violence as a riot, it suggests spontaneous violence. It suggests that there were two groups that fought against each other. In fact, it casts aspersion and blame against communities who are innocent.

The facts in this case are very clear. There was a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, India's Supreme Court, a retired Justice, Justice G.T. Nanavati, who was commissioned to do a report, which is called the Nanavati report. In that report, he makes it abundantly clear that these attacks were not spontaneous. He makes it clear that they could not have happened but for the organization of elected officials. He points out that public transit, the DTC, the Delhi Transport Corp., was used to bus in people from other locations so that these attacks could occur.

In fact, other reports point out that voter lists were used. Voter lists, which are tools for democracy, were used to identify homes that were Sikh homes, and then the mobs were directed to attack and kill those people.

In addition, the police were told, before this attack occurred, to disarm and to remove from Sikh homes any sort of weapons that could be used to protect themselves.

This was all done in a systematic and planned way.

In fact, Hindu families and Muslim families put their own lives at risk to save their Sikh neighbours. They put their lives at risk to save their neighbours. If it continues to be referred to as a riot, it does an injustice to those Hindu families who stood up to protect their own Sikh neighbours. It does an injustice to the Muslim families that almost risked death to protect their Sikh neighbours. It does a grave injustice because it's false.

The truth of the matter is, the evidence all points very clearly to the fact that this was a state-organized attack. It

was systematic, it was organized, it was planned and it was to target anyone who was of Sikh descent. The kara, which I wear on my wrist and other articles of faith were used as the identifiers that this person would be killed.

The evidence, as I said, is outstanding, but it's important to frame this and to understand why it's so important. The term "riot" divides a community, because it suggests that people just spontaneously erupted and try to kill their neighbours. That is false. It could not have happened.

The evidence in the Nanavati commission points out that it could not have happened that way. This was not a spontaneous set of circumstances, and it wasn't neighbours who were killing neighbours. They were people who were bused in from outside. They were organized; they were directed to do this. In fact, the Nanavati commission points out that key elected officials from all levels of government—there's evidence, there are affidavits that point to them being responsible for organizing these attacks.

It's important that we move away from the language of riot, which divides our community, and move towards the language of genocide, which casts the blame on the true organizers of this attack.

This attack didn't only impact people in New Delhi, which was the concentration of the attack, but impacted people across India. The Sikh community was targeted across India.

Some of the stories are tremendously harrowing. One personal story: I was getting my robes fitted, as a lawyer—one of the things we wear. Much like what you're wearing, Madam Speaker, we wear robes. The tailor who was fitting my robes asked if I knew much about what happened in November 1984. I said, "Of course I know what happened." He said, "I lived through it." I said, "Really?"

I knew, by his name, that the man was a Hindu man. He said, "In fact, I can tell you a story about what happened." I'm like, "Yeah, definitely, tell me the story."

He said, "I was a tailor then as well, and my best friend was also a tailor. He was a Sikh man. His shop was burnt down, and he fled his home. I took him into my home, and I was afraid; I was deathly afraid for my life. But I knew they were targeting Sikhs, so I let him into my home. Afterwards, he asked me if I could go"—the friend who was a Sikh said, "Could you go back to my tailor shop? There's a lockbox in which I kept all my savings."

At night, when there was a curfew, this tailor said he left his home. There was a curfew. Again, he could have been killed himself. He went to the tailor shop, which was all burned down, found and retrieved the lockbox and brought back the entire life savings of his best friend.

It's just one small example, but there were so many harrowing stories.

The one story that I want to share with you that, to me, is something different from what I normally have heard is a story of a reporter. I've met witnesses; I've met survivors who talk about what they experienced. They tell me how horrific it was to see their family members

slain in front of their eyes—the fact that they saw their brothers being killed.

Many Sikh men were targeted because of the very visible identity of being a Sikh, but women were targeted if they wore a kara, which is that steel bracelet. So the articles of faith were used to identify someone and to kill them.

One of the things, though, that really impacted me a lot was a story by Rahul Bedi, who is a Delhi-based correspondent writing for the BBC. In this story, he writes about when he was a reporter with the Indian Express newspaper. He talks about being with two colleagues and visiting the area where the attacks occurred, right after the funeral of Mrs. Gandhi. He talks about walking through laneways littered with bodies. He sees body parts that were hacked off, hair that was brutally hacked off people's heads.

At one point, he went to certain tenements, certain buildings, where the bodies were piled up so high that the drainage was blocked and there was flooding going on in the streets.

He went to a certain area and noticed a mother, who was polio-afflicted, holding onto her daughter. They went to lift the daughter up to see if she needed some care. The woman just froze in terror and screamed out, because she thought this was someone else who was going to kill her child.

This reporter, who is writing after the fact, writes about seeing a young child who was hiding underneath a bed. That room where the child was hiding was littered with dead bodies. The child had wrapped a cloth around his stomach because of a wound he had suffered and was hiding there to survive. They took that child to the hospital. That child, later on, passed away.

They were at this location, and 24 hours later, police arrived, but the carnage had already left so many dead. The reporter writes, "Police arrived in Trilokpuri 24 hours later when the Indian Express revealed the horrific massacre.

"Sadly, there were no Sikhs left to protect."

There are other cities that have recognized this genocide, and I want to point out some of the cities that have done so already. These cities are in California, many of them, and I just want to list some of the cities that have recognized it: the city of Stockton in California, April 27, 2016; Kerman city in California, November 4, 2015; Bakersfield, California, December 12, 2015; and Harvey in Cook county, Illinois, November 13, 2014.

1540

These are cities that have already recognized November 1984 as a genocide. In fact, the California State Assembly released a resolution on April 13, 2015—the resolution chair was Richard Gordon—ACR-34, and this was amended on April 8, 2015. The subject was "November 1984 Anti-Sikh Pogroms: Remembrance." In this, the assembly of California recognizes the attacks on Sikhs as an anti-Sikh pogrom.

"Pogrom" is much closer to the truth. A pogrom indicates an organized attack against a minority community.

But what we're asking today is to recognize this as a genocide. The definition of genocide, as defined by article II of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948, states "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group." The acts can involve killing members of the group, causing serious bodily harm or mental harm to the group, deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction, or forcibly transferring the children of one group to another.

The definition makes it absolutely clear, and in fact, the current government of India, the home minister—and this is an article from the Hindu, a very well-established newspaper. This is the headline of the article in the Hindu, December 27, 2014: "1984 Riots Were Genocide, Says Rajnath." That's the Union home minister, Rajnath Singh, of the current administration in India.

The Delhi state assembly passed a resolution condemning the Sikh massacres of 1984. This was on July 1, 2015. The Delhi state assembly, much like our assembly, passed a resolution condemning the massacre of 1984 and specifically calling on the investigation of Congress leader Jagdish Tytler and other individuals who were involved in the planning and organization.

Listen, Madam Speaker, this is an issue that is so deeply important. In order to ensure that there is reconciliation and healing, the first step for reconciliation and healing is to ensure that the harm that a community suffered was recognized, and to also eradicate any misconception that this was two communities fighting against each other. There is a horrible misconception this was somehow a Hindu-Sikh conflict. It was never a Hindu-Sikh conflict, and I want to highlight that. Hindu families put their lives at risk to protect Sikhs.

This was a state-organized, systematically organized attack, and it's so important for the healing and reconciliation of those individuals who suffer from the trauma of this incident to have it recognized here in Ontario. Ontario has recognized, at the provincial assembly, other genocides, like the Holodomor in Bill 147 in 2009, as well as the Armenian genocide on March 27, 1990. So there a precedent for this assembly to recognize genocide. This assembly has recognized it before.

This would do a great justice to the people who are suffering. It would clear up the misconception, which is very harmful. The notion of a genocide unites communities. It says that it's not the community's fault; it was those who are the organizers, the state, that was organizing this attack. It was not community members and it was not your neighbours who were responsible. This will bring people together instead of dividing people. The terminology "riot" continues to divide our community, continues to hurt the community, and it doesn't offer an opportunity for healing and reconciliation.

People fled the human rights violations in India. They fled this genocide. They fled the attacks in November 1984 to come to Canada. Canada is a beacon of human rights, a place where human rights are celebrated and

protected. Let's send a message that we denounce these acts of violations against human rights, we denounce genocide and we support human rights.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Interruption.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Before I recognize the member from Mississauga–Erindale, I just want to remind all the visitors: You are here to witness the debate. You're not allowed to participate, whether it's clapping or any other form.

The member from Mississauga–Erindale.

Mr. Harinder S. Takhar: This is a great opportunity for me to speak on this important subject matter. But before I do, I want to recognize the members of the Sikh community who are in the Legislature to watch this debate.

The strength of our province is rooted in the diversity of our people. Ontario is proud to be home to a vibrant Sikh community that has contributed immensely to the life of our province. The principles of Sikhism—honesty, hard work and service to others—resonate with all Ontarians and represent vital building blocks of a strong society. The Sikh community is integral to the stability and success of our country. From working in the logging and forestry industry, to building the railway, to fighting on behalf of Canada in World War I, the Sikh community has played an important role in Ontario and in Canada.

We are debating a motion pertaining to the events of November 1984 in India. This week, we mark the 32nd anniversary of the invasion of the Golden Temple. Earlier this year, as part of Premier Wynne's trade mission to India and Punjab, I had the honour to visit the Golden Temple again. The tragic events leading up to and following the invasion of the Golden Temple and the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi resulted in the unnecessary loss of thousands of innocent lives. We have all heard—and the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton talked about—some of the heart-wrenching stories from the families of the victims, seen through print media, through TV interviews and some personal contacts. We can all share some personal stories as well.

Madam Speaker, those stories are true. Innocent people, for no fault of their own, were killed. Mothers witnessed their young sons at their prime age being killed. Wives saw their husbands, fathers, fathers-in-law and brothers dragged out of their homes and murdered in front of their own eyes. Young children saw their parents being killed in front of their own eyes. Parents saw their daughters being raped, and they watched helplessly. Their homes and shops were ransacked and set on fire.

I salute the human beings who provided shelter to, and saved the lives of, some of the people who were targeted. Several countries have recognized the grave atrocities that took place in 1984. In responding to an online petition campaign that had generated over 30,000 signatures in 2013, President Obama, even though he refused to declare the 1984 anti-Sikh violence as genocide, noted that grave human rights violations had occurred and

continued to say that, “We continue to condemn—and more importantly, to work against—violence directed at people based on their religious affiliation.”

In offering his government’s apology in 2005, then-Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said the following: “I have no hesitation in apologizing to the Sikh community. I apologize not only to the Sikh community but to the whole Indian nation, because what took place in 1984 is the negation of the concept of nationhood enshrined in our constitution.

“On behalf of our government, on behalf of the entire people of this country I bow my head in shame that such a thing took place.”

Then-Prime Minister Manmohan Singh went on to say the following: “We cannot rewrite the past. But as human beings, we have the willpower, and we have the ability to write a better future for all of us.”

For some victims and their families, the 1984 event’s wounds may have healed. For others, this tragedy still carries on as an open wound to this day.

For 32 years, families of the victims have been asking that those responsible be brought to justice. Mothers have been raising their children by doing manual labour without any relief or support. In addition, some bad elements in society have further committed crimes and taken advantage of the situation by demanding money, extorting money and exploiting young women. This is shameful. My words in this House today are really empty words, and they are no relief to those families.

1550

Moreover, this is not a partisan issue. It is so unfortunate that the member who brought up this motion failed to discuss it with the other four members of the Legislature who are also Sikh members. If he had done that, we could have introduced this motion together, which could have made this motion more effective and meaningful.

I want to watch this important debate. I have an open mind on this issue. My objective as a legislator is to ensure that justice is served, those who committed crimes are punished, relief is provided to mothers who have been struggling to raise their children, steps are taken so that these kinds of unfortunate acts do not happen again, and bad elements of society do not exploit situations again.

I look forward to the debate.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Tim Hudak: I am pleased, on behalf of Patrick Brown and the PC caucus, to hear that we’re going to be supporting this motion fully. I congratulate the member for Bramalea–Gore–Malton. The PC caucus does support the motion. It is time that Ontario took a leap in Canada and joined California and North America to recognize the November 1984 state-sponsored violence perpetuated against Sikhs as a genocide, and to be clear about that.

As my colleagues mentioned, the genocide began after the assassination of Indira Gandhi by bodyguards. More than 8,000 deaths occurred in the ensuing chaos, and more than 20,000 individuals left the city in the aftermath

of the violence and riots; the worst, of course, in Delhi, where 3,000 Sikhs were beaten and burned to death, and in neighbouring Haryana.

Many thought it would be reasonable that by hiding in the local gurdwara—a religious institution, a place of worship—they would be safe. But they, too, were shown no mercy. They were massacred. Any Sikh the rioters could get their hands on was beaten and killed.

We should note, for the record, that there were many Hindu and Muslim citizens who helped to hide Sikhs, helped them to escape and protected them; ordinary citizens rising up against the government-sponsored genocide of Sikh individuals. One member who survived the riot shared his experience:

“The loss all around was unprecedented. The nearby gurdwara was strewn in blood (and those marks have barely rubbed off to this day). The head priest was slashed to death and his young children were beaten and harassed. The broken windowpanes of the gurudwara remain, a bitter memory to the stone pelting that went on for hours on the holy shrine. In Daltonganj, countless Sikh men were beaten up. A dozen died. Some houses were stoned; others set ablaze. Some local Sikhs who were travelling out of the town were dragged out of trains,” put on the ground “and killed. The hospital refused to admit the injured, unless men cut their hair. Turban-wearing Sikhs had to make a choice:” they could either cut their hair or get no medical care and die. “Across the nation, more than 8,000 ... were killed, women were raped, burnt alive, homes brought down...”

Those who survived—my colleague mentioned his friend the tailor—had their psyches impaired permanently.

Speaker, I know that I have many colleagues who want to speak to this motion as well, but I want to say that we are pleased to support the member’s initiative and hope that other provinces will join with Ontario and recognize this massacre as a genocide.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I would like to thank my colleague the member for Bramalea–Gore–Malton for introducing this motion, which, as we know, states: “That, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should recognize the November 1984 state-organized violence perpetrated against the Sikhs throughout India as a genocide.”

As always, my colleague is a tireless crusader against injustice, by which he continues to distinguish himself. I am proud to be a member of the same caucus.

Usually, we rise to speak on specific local issues, but today we have the opportunity to speak to a motion of broader reach in terms of history, the future and human rights. This is an important motion that recognizes the intent of the anti-Sikh violence that occurred in India in 1984 and denounces all intolerance and violence across the globe that ultimately stems from hatred.

It is important that we have an official position, as a province, to ensure that we remember the thousands of

victims who lost their lives during this genocide. A formal resolution renews the call to ultimately bring the perpetrators to justice.

We cannot change the horrific events of 1984, but, as members of this Legislature, we have an opportunity to represent the families of genocide victims and we have an opportunity to stand up for them.

Madam Speaker, I was six in 1984, and that was a long time ago. But time does not heal all wounds. When a community has been cut down, when families have been ended and when those who were behind the organized violence are not brought to justice, those wounds can't heal; they fester. That is a long time without justice and without healing.

Though the total number of victims is unconfirmed, more than 8,000 people lost their lives during this massacre, this genocide, and thousands of others were affected by injury, displacement and oppression. We're talking about mass murder and massive suffering, so it's important that our voices are loud and that our voices are heard. There are also a lot of voices that came together and inspired the creation of this particular motion.

In May 2000, a commission was appointed by the National Democratic Alliance government in India to investigate the violence and its causes. The one-man commission consisted of former Supreme Court of India Justice G.T. Nanavati. The commission was granted a mandate to look at the following points: What were the sparks that led to the attacks targeting members of the Sikh community? What was the sequence of events? Could these crimes have possibly been averted and were there any lapses on the part of authorities? Were administrative measures taken to stop and to deal with the violence useful? And finally, what solutions can be recommended for adoption to ultimately serve justice?

In the report, former Supreme Court of India Justice Nanavati stated that the killing of Sikhs in India in 1984 was planned and organized. Human rights organizations have also reported that democratic voter lists were used to identify and target Sikh businesses and homes and that children were found beheaded in the aftermath of those horrendous days. We've heard more specific and awful examples of the violence here today.

The words "planned" and "organized," though, are very important. They distinguish this from being a random act of violence and acknowledge that there were systemic and concerted efforts to kill thousands of Sikhs in India.

The report also states, "All this could not have happened if it was merely a spontaneous reaction of the angry public. The systematic manner in which the Sikhs were thus killed indicate that the attacks on them were organized."

It also says, "There is also evidence on record to show that on 31 October 1984 either meetings were held or the persons who could organize attacks were contacted and were given instructions to kill Sikhs and loot their houses and shops. The attacks were made in a systematic manner and without much fear of the police."

New Democrats have always supported the right of all people to live in safety and practise their faith in peace, and that is why my colleague brought this motion for debate. Today we are acknowledging the systemic murder of thousands and calling for justice in their honour and their memory. Too often, it takes us too long to acknowledge when an atrocity occurred. That prevents us from taking the necessary steps to avoid future atrocities from occurring.

By acknowledging that the violence against Sikhs in India in 1984 was, in fact, genocide allowed by those who should have kept them safe and secure in their homes, we are acknowledging that justice must be served.

In November, when we reflect on the anniversary of this genocide, it is also important to recognize, as we've heard today, the brave actions of many from other faith backgrounds and communities. They provided protection and refuge to their Sikh brothers and sisters at great personal risk to themselves. It is a reminder that our shared humanity can triumph even in the face of such a dark tragedy.

Madam Speaker, it is often at our darkest hours that people have the opportunity to shine the brightest. When we acknowledge the depths of evil and malice that can grow within humanity, we must also see and remember the spirit and virtue that can break through.

On passing this motion, we can send a message to Sikhs and other community groups around the world that here in Ontario, we stand up for human rights and denounce intolerance and violent hate crimes.

Also, Madam Speaker, we are members of a state assembly, and it is our job to make decisions to keep our constituents safe from harm. It is also our duty to call on other state legislators to remember their roles and responsibilities and, when we see that they have done harm, to speak up and say so.

1600

I will be supporting this motion, and I hope that my colleagues from all parties in the Legislature will join me.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Arthur Potts: I appreciate very much this opportunity to respond to this motion from the member from Brampton-Gore-Malton. I respect very much his intention in bringing the motion forward as a member of the Sikh community and the emotions attached to what happened in 1984. I know this is a powerful and very important emotional issue for him and the community that he represents.

My concern, however, and why I won't be supporting this motion today is I don't believe this is the right place or the right court for having this discussion. The term "genocide" was coined in 1948 by Raphael Lemkin as part of a UN declaration which was incorporated into the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948. It ultimately is an International Court of Justice determination.

While I appreciate that the member talks about other opportunities we've had to declare days in the House in support of communities who have been experiencing genocide, they were all previously determined to have been a genocide in the international community. It would be wrong for us to be inserting ourselves into that process at this point.

I'm particularly concerned, if you look at the history of genocides—the Assyrian genocide, 750,000 people over a four-year period; the Armenian genocide, 1.5 million people over a six-month period; the Holocaust, upward of six million Jews over a 12-year period. This, and so many more genocides—we don't want to in any way diminish how atrocious the genocides were, but at the same time we recognize how horrific what happened in 1984 was to the Sikh community. It was, absolutely. We stand strong with our Sikh friends all across this province in declaring that what happened there, as the Americans have done, is a grave human rights violation at the very least. It may well qualify as a genocide in the court of international justice, if that opportunity comes up.

I think that's a debate that, at best, the federal government has to be having. If the member for Brampton-Gore-Malton is successful in his endeavours to become a representative at the federal level, he can bring that so they can then bring that to the international community.

For those reasons, I'll be voting against this motion.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Todd Smith: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to join this debate. As you probably know, and members of the Legislature know, I've spent a lot of time over the last four and a half years with members of the Sikh community, marking their religious celebrations and getting to know them better in their community, learning more about their history.

If I could, on a lighter note—and I know this is a very serious topic—I know how important the Sikh community is to the culture of Canada and how important the culture of Canada is for our Sikh community, particularly here in the GTA.

This week, there is a member of the Sikh community—and I see my friend Binder Singh up there, who was a member of the Hockey Night in Canada broadcast, the Punjabi broadcast, previously. If you haven't heard it yet, a member of the Sikh community has become a YouTube sensation this week in calling the game-winning goal for the Pittsburgh Penguins in their series: "Nick Bonino! Bonino! Bonino! Bonino! Bonino! Bonino!" It was quite a call, so if you get a chance after this very serious debate to check this out, it was quite something to see in the Stanley Cup playoffs. He has become a real sensation.

On a more serious note, though, we spoke last month about Canada's history with South Asian immigrants and their treatment in trying to migrate to Canada. For a long time, members of the Sikh community and other immigrants from South Asia were subjected to prejudicial

regulations imposed by other governments as a means of restricting their immigration. In spite of the fact that Canada and India, for decades, have been members of the Commonwealth, and previous to that were members of the British Empire, the South Asian population in Canada was in the low four digits until the late 1960s.

Recently—and I have a number of books in my office about the Sikh religion and the various ordeals and tragic circumstances that they've gone through—I've learned a lot about religious violence in India and in South Asia during different points in history. While the member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton has highlighted the actions of 1984, there have been multiple instances of anti-Sikh violence, anti-Muslim violence and general religious violence throughout India's history.

Immediately after the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947, for example, Indian authorities gave the army a free hand to go after Sikh demonstrators in the streets of New Delhi. The home minister of the Indian government actually threatened to throw leaders of the Sikh community into concentration camps after days of religious violence between different Sikh, Hindu and Muslim factions, both in New Delhi and across India.

Violence against Sikhs in India, unfortunately, has a long and deeply rooted history. In that sense, it's impossible to escape the force and emotion behind the motion brought forth by my friend and colleague from Bramalea-Gore-Malton here this afternoon. It comes from a long and demonstrative history that includes the events of 1984, and that kind of prolonged and violent injustice does deserve some recognition here in Ontario.

I'll be supporting the motion put forward by my colleague from the NDP later today, and I'm pleased to do so.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Ms. Cheri DiNovo: I just wanted, first of all, to respond to the member from Beaches-East York about what is and what is not a genocide.

Defined in Article II of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948—this is the United Nations—it says that "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy"—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Order. Yes. I just wanted to remind the member.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo:—"to destroy, in whole or in part," a national group, and it goes on to define a group as of the same nationality or religion. That is a genocide. It's not about the numbers; it's about the intent. So I just wanted to correct that.

I also want to correct the sense that sometimes is out there that human rights is not a provincial matter. Human rights are everyone's responsibility, at every level of government.

I commend the member from Bramalea-Gore-Malton. He has been a tireless advocate for Sikhs in every way in this House, and I commend him for that, for standing up for those he knows and loves, and standing up for

historical accuracy and for justice, because that is what this motion is about.

I was raised in a household committed to human rights and that often talked about human rights abuses. It's interesting that it's Italian Heritage Day because, coming from, in part, an Italian background, I remember stories of my father not being allowed in the front door of establishments in this very city and being allowed only in the back doors. There were racist laws about those from the Mediterranean not congregating in cafés, on the streets. There were racist laws in the city.

In my day—and I know I'm old, but in my day there were rules: no Jews, no dogs, no Irish allowed on the boardwalk—

Mr. Gilles Bisson: No Frenchmen.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo: Yes, no francophones, although it didn't say that down at the boardwalk.

There were clubs that denied membership to people of colour. This is all within recent memory. There were race riots—race riots—in Christie Pits, all within recent memory. And let us not forget, Madam Speaker, that this country turned away Jews who were fleeing from the Holocaust.

We also have an amazing history in this chamber of supporting human rights, and we should celebrate that in a non-partisan way. The very first tri-party bill was against the Holodomor, declaring it as a genocide, where Russia—and I was happy to be a co-signatory of that—where Stalin forcibly starved to death eight million to 10 million Ukrainians. That was done in this House. Our federal government has talked about the Armenian genocide. Recognizing and naming genocide as genocide is a proud tradition in both legislative bodies.

I also want to mention something a little bit more recent in my own riding, and how this could flare up overnight. This was only 1984 that these events took place. People lived through them. They remember them. There are families who lost loved ones who are still alive in our communities here in Toronto.

Something very frightening happened in my own riding regarding racism, and that was the Roma community, under Stephen Harper. We woke one day in Parkdale–High Park to see that 200 students from one of my public schools went missing. Nobody knew where they went—200 students disappeared, because their families were threatened with deportation. They went underground; they went missing. We lost 20 teachers. Neighbours were missing. That happened just a few years ago.

So if we think that this is somebody else's problem, or if this is some other jurisdiction's issue—it is never another jurisdiction's issue. It's never someone else's problem. Racism and everything that is associated with racism is everyone's issue, and it's certainly the issue in this Legislature that we need to deal with. We recently had Black Lives Matter and I was proud to go down to their demonstration. Again, the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton has been strident and out there in terms of standing on issues of racism and standing with people of colour, not only Sikhs.

1610

So here we are again. Again, to those who would vote against this motion I simply say, “Shame,” because it's a chance for the victims' families, for those who remember, for those who carry on the memory—it's a chance to do what we can here to say that we, all of us, bear some responsibility. It's a way of paying back. I know a little-known point that has not been raised was that England—Maggie Thatcher—was involved in this genocide. Her mark was on it. So we, all of us, have some blame to bear and we, all of us, need to make recompense every moment that we can, and here's one of them.

So I urge all my colleagues to vote for this motion, to vote on behalf of our Sikh community and to vote on behalf of everyone in every community who has experienced the horror of racism and of every community that has survivors of genocide.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I rise to express my extreme sadness about the loss of thousands of innocent Sikh lives and their properties in India in 1984.

That grim tragedy in 1984 shall always be remembered as a black chapter in the history of India and a blot on the humanity of those who could, but did not, stop the tragedy from happening.

The killing and maiming of innocent Sikhs and the looting and burning of their properties was in the aftermath of the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's then Prime Minister. The history of nations bears evidence that violence is not a solution for resolving political and social conflicts. My heart goes out to those innocent Sikhs and their survivors who lost their lives and properties in that 1984 tragedy.

Madam Speaker, despite what I said and how deeply sad I feel, in my opinion, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario is not the proper forum to bring this motion and debate it; the House of Commons may be. The issues of state complicity and genocide are legal concepts that beg for an evidentiary basis. The proper forum to debate these issues is a court of law, not the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Michael Harris: It has often been said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it. What a further tragedy it would be if we, as a society, did not take the time to recognize the brutal and horrific nature of the mass violence against the Sikh community in 1984. What a further tragedy it would be if we, as a society, did not learn lessons from these sad events, now over 30 years ago, to prevent similar sector-based carnage from repeating itself.

Of course, over 30 years after these tragic events, many questions remain as to the lack of justice for the victims and their family members. While true justice in the face of unspeakable tragedies, like those we are discussing today, may never be fully realized, we fail as a

society if we don't work to right the wrongs that we can all agree have taken place.

One step toward that justice is to recognize the 1984 events for the toll they look on the lives of Sikhs who faced the brutality of riots that claimed entire families. The death toll of Sikhs that was the result of the four days of chaos points toward the declaration that today's motion asks us to support. Again, we, as a society, must learn from the lessons of the past.

Today, we stand to indicate that those lessons are not lost on this Legislature or the people of Ontario, and we stand to support the motion brought forward by the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton. I'm proud to support it.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Further debate?

Mr. Vic Dhillon: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this very, very important issue.

Needless to say, we should never, ever forget the atrocities that occurred in India, in New Delhi, in Punjab, in November 1984.

This issue hits extremely close to home for me. My family was held hostage, at gunpoint. The captors were trying to kidnap my sister, and if it hadn't been for my mom pleading on her knees and showing her fresh stitches that she had because of an operation on her abdomen, I don't think my sister would have been left without any harm. There would have been, I believe, and my family believes, some serious consequences from that.

I wasn't in India at that time. I remember my father telling me stories of gasoline being poured down the mouths of innocent people and then they were lit on fire.

These are extremely serious events that happened, and we should never, ever forget them.

As the member from Mississauga–Erindale stated, had all the other Sikh members and other members been involved in bringing this motion forward, I certainly believe it could have been a lot stronger and a lot more beneficial—

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Thank you. Further debate?

Mrs. Gila Martow: I'm very pleased to rise in support of the member from Bramalea–East York's motion today. It's not a bill. It's a motion. We just heard the member for Mississauga–Brampton South say that she believes that this should be debated in a court of law. Well, it's a motion. We're not looking to fine any companies or fine any individuals or prosecute anybody for the crimes that were committed. We're looking to create public awareness. We're a civilized society, and we understand that even civilized people such as ourselves, dressed in nice suits and ties today, can sometimes do horrific things because of horrible prejudice. So we are trying to set an example for Ontario. That's why we're here. It's the Legislature of Ontario. We represent our constituents, and we're trying to set an example and show that we understand that horrific events in 1984,

where thousands of Sikhs were murdered after two Sikh guards murdered the Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, at the time—that this is something we will not allow to be ignored or be forgotten, and we do not want to see the mistakes of the past return.

I myself have spoken here about the Armenian genocide. I've spoken about the Rwandan genocide. I've spoken about the Holocaust. I've spoken about the Yazidis and the Christians, who are right now experiencing a genocide in the Middle East.

This is why we're here talking about this motion today—not just for all the people of Sikh nationality who are here today and want their loved ones who were murdered to be remembered; but we're also here to ensure that something is being done and to pressure governments across the world to stop the genocides that are taking place right now, where young girls are being sold, possibly while we're sitting here debating this, into slavery as sex slaves by ISIS.

We want to commend, as well, with the motion—yes, we want to remember the victims, but we want to commend what the Jewish community calls “the righteous among the nations.” We refer to those individuals who, during the Holocaust, saved Jewish lives, hid Jewish families and took in children and called them their own during the Holocaust and then tried to find the relatives even afterwards. They would bury in the ground, because they didn't want the papers to be found in their home—they would bury in a jar in the ground names of the children and their relatives so that they wouldn't be forgotten, and tried to reunite the families afterwards.

I obviously commend the member for bringing it forward. Yes, of course, any time you are killing somebody because of their religion, it is a genocide. It means you are trying to destroy that culture and wipe them from the face of the earth. We understand that it's certainly more than just riots which would be spontaneous and not state-sponsored. We want to ensure that everybody in Ontario understands that hatred will not be allowed, that it will not be tolerated; and to also understand that, yes, we want everybody in Ontario to hold onto their culture, their religion and their past, and to remember it and to be proud of their heritage; and to understand that by knowing your heritage and celebrating your heritage you're raising yourself up, that you're a better person and your society is better for that; and to invite us to celebrate with you so that we can learn about your culture as well.

We will not allow people to somehow feel better about themselves by putting somebody else down. That's not what we're here for, that's not what we stand for, and we are not going to allow that to happen in our Ontario.

Thank you again for bringing the motion forward, and we on this side of the House are happy to support it.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): We'll return to the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton to wrap up this final debate.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: I want to personally name the members who spoke in favour of the motion; I think it's very important. I want to acknowledge the member from

Niagara West–Glanbrook, the member from Oshawa and my colleague the member from Parkdale–High Park. I want to also acknowledge, again, the member from Kitchener–Conestoga and the member from Thornhill. Thank you very much. It touches me to my heart and the people here today.

This issue is something that's so powerfully important, and some of the members touched on why it's so important. When you acknowledge an injustice against one community, it's to prevent injustice against other communities. I really hold strongly to the belief that injustice against one is truly injustice against all.

I celebrated the Armenian community when they were able to achieve that recognition of genocide, and I celebrated the hard work of the Ukrainian community when they were able to acknowledge their genocide. Last month was Tamil Genocide Remembrance Month, and it's a powerful reminder of how important it is to acknowledge genocides that occur.

There are ongoing injustices that happen around the world, so any time we make a clear statement recognizing this type of violence as a genocide, we're making a strong statement to reject these types of acts around the world and we're calling for a renewed commitment to fighting for human rights and defending against injustice. This would be such a powerful statement. It would impact so many people, and it would right such a grave misconception and injustice that these attacks were riots or that these attacks were spontaneous. It is so powerfully important to define what happened as a genocide, not just to give honour to the Sikh survivors but to honour any community in the world that's seeking equity, any community in the world that's facing injustice, to honour any community that's facing a genocide.

Injustice against one is injustice against all. Let's stand together against this type of crime.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION
AMENDMENT ACT (DOUBLE-CRESTED
CORMORANTS), 2016

LOI DE 2016 MODIFIANT
LA LOI SUR LA PROTECTION
DU POISSON ET DE LA FAUNE
(CORMORANS À AIGRETTES)

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): We will deal first with ballot number 45, standing in the name of Mr. Bailey. Mr. Bailey has moved second reading of Bill 205, An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 1997. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Second reading agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): What committee would that be referred to?

Mr. Robert Bailey: Legislative Assembly, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Legislative Assembly. Is it agreed? Agreed.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 74

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Mr. Hardeman has moved private member's notice of motion number 77. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

We will deal with the vote at the end of the other business.

SIKH MASSACRE

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Mr. Singh has moved private member's notice of motion number 79. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

I believe we will have a vote. It will be a five-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1624 to 1629.

CONSIDERATION OF BILL 74

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Will members please take their seats.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Order.

Mr. Hardeman has moved private member's notice of motion number 77. All those in favour, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia
Bailey, Robert	Harris, Michael	Natyshak, Taras
Barrett, Toby	Hatfield, Percy	Pettapiece, Randy
Bisson, Gilles	Hudak, Tim	Singh, Jagmeet
Clark, Steve	MacLaren, Jack	Smith, Todd
Coe, Lorne	Mantha, Michael	Tabuns, Peter
DiNovo, Cheri	Martow, Gila	
French, Jennifer K.	McDonell, Jim	

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): All those opposed, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Albanese, Laura	Flynn, Kevin Daniel	McMeekin, Ted
Anderson, Granville	Fraser, John	Milczyn, Peter Z.
Baker, Yvan	Hoggarth, Ann	Moridi, Reza
Ballard, Chris	Hoskins, Eric	Murray, Glen R.
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hunter, Mitzie	Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Bradley, James J.	Kiwala, Sophie	Potts, Arthur
Chan, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Qaadri, Shafiq
Chiarelli, Bob	Lalonde, Marie-France	Rinaldi, Lou
Colle, Mike	Leal, Jeff	Sandals, Liz
Coteau, Michael	MacCharles, Tracy	Sergio, Mario
Damerla, Dipika	Martins, Cristina	Thibeault, Glenn
Delaney, Bob	Matthews, Deborah	Vernile, Daiene
Dickson, Joe	McGarry, Kathryn	
Dong, Han	McMahon, Eleanor	

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):
The ayes are 22; the nays are 40.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I declare the motion lost.

Motion negatived.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): We're going to open the door for 30 seconds.

Berardinetti, Lorenzo
Bradley, James J.
Chan, Michael
Chiarelli, Bob
Colle, Mike
Coteau, Michael
Damerla, Dipika
Delaney, Bob
Dickson, Joe
Dong, Han

Hunter, Mitzie
Kiwala, Sophie
Kwinter, Monte
Lalonde, Marie-France
Leal, Jeff
MacCharles, Tracy
Martins, Cristina
Matthews, Deborah
McGarry, Kathryn
McMahon, Eleanor

Naidoo-Harris, Indira
Potts, Arthur
Qaadri, Shafiq
Rinaldi, Lou
Sandals, Liz
Sergio, Mario
Thibeault, Glenn
Vernile, Daiene

SIKH MASSACRE

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): Mr. Singh has moved private member's notice of motion number 79. All those in favour, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Arnott, Ted
Bailey, Robert
Barrett, Toby
Bisson, Gilles
Clark, Steve
Coe, Lorne
DiNovo, Cheri
French, Jennifer K.

Hardeman, Ernie
Harris, Michael
Hatfield, Percy
Hudak, Tim
MacLaren, Jack
Mantha, Michael
Martow, Gila
McDonell, Jim

Munro, Julia
Natyshak, Taras
Pettapiece, Randy
Singh, Jagmeet
Smith, Todd
Tabuns, Peter

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): All those opposed, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

Nays

Albanese, Laura
Anderson, Granville
Baker, Yvan
Ballard, Chris

Flynn, Kevin Daniel
Fraser, John
Hoggarth, Ann
Hoskins, Eric

McMeekin, Ted
Milczyn, Peter Z.
Moridi, Reza
Murray, Glen R.

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):
The ayes are 22; the nays are 40.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I declare the motion lost.

Motion negatived.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): I beg leave to inform the House that, pursuant to standing order 98(c), a change has been made to the order of precedence on the ballot list for private members' public business such that Mr. Ballard assumes ballot item number 53 and Ms. Naidoo-Harris assumes ballot item number 60.

Orders of the day.

Hon. James J. Bradley: Madam Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong): All right. Is it the pleasure of the House that the House adjourn? Carried.

The House will be adjourned until Monday, June 6, at 10:30.

The House adjourned at 1636.

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, William Short

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	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	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	
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	
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	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
Brown, Patrick (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and International Trade / Ministre des Affaires civiques, de l'Immigration et du Commerce international
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Coe, Lorne (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport Minister Responsible for Anti-Racism 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	
Damerla, Hon. / L'hon. Dipika (LIB)	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
Del Duca, Hon. / L'hon. Steven (LIB)	Vaughan	Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
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	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure / Ministre du Développement économique, de l'Emploi et de l'Infrastructure
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Kitchener–Waterloo	
Flynn, Hon. / L'hon. Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
French, Jennifer K. (NDP)	Oshawa	
Gates, Wayne (NDP)	Niagara Falls	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	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
Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)	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	
Hunter, Hon. / L'hon. Mitzie (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Associate Minister of Finance (Ontario Retirement Pension Plan) / Ministre associée des Finances (Régime de retraite de la province de l'Ontario)
Jaczek, Hon. / L'hon. Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Kiwala, Sophie (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Lalonde, Marie-France (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
Leal, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Hon. / L'hon. Tracy (LIB)	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	
Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)	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
Mauro, Hon. / L'hon. Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry / Ministre des Richesses naturelles et des Forêts
McDonnell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
McGarry, Kathryn (LIB)	Cambridge	
McMahon, Eleanor (LIB)	Burlington	
McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough– Westdale	Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)	Ottawa–Vanier	Attorney General / Procureure générale Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Milczyn, Peter Z. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Miller, Paul (NDP)	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
Moridi, Hon. / L'hon. Reza (LIB)	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	
Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)	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	
Naqvi, Hon. / L'hon. Yasir (LIB)	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	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham–Kent–Essex	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Oraziotti, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)	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	
Sandals, Hon. / L'hon. Liz (LIB)	Guelph	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Sergio, Hon. / L'hon. Mario (LIB)	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	
Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)	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	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough–Agincourt	Deputy Speaker / Vice-présidente
Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)	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	
Zimmer, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)	Willowdale	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones
Vacant	Scarborough–Rouge River	

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

Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses

Chair / Présidente: Cheri DiNovo
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Monique Taylor
Grant Crack, Cheri DiNovo
Han Dong, Michael Harris
Sophie Kiwala, Arthur Potts
Todd Smith, Monique Taylor
Glenn Thibeault
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Eric Rennie

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Peter Z. Milczyn
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Yvan Baker
Laura Albanese, Yvan Baker
Toby Barrett, Han Dong
Victor Fedeli, Catherine Fife
Ann Hoggarth, Peter Z. Milczyn
Daiene Vernile
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Eric Rennie

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Grant Crack
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Lou Rinaldi
Mike Colle, Grant Crack
Lisa Gretzky, Ann Hoggarth
Harinder Malhi, Jim McDonell
Eleanor McMahan, Lou Rinaldi
Lisa M. Thompson
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Présidente: Cristina Martins
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Daiene Vernile
Robert Bailey, Wayne Gates
Monte Kwinter, Marie-France Lalonde
Amrit Mangat, Cristina Martins
Randy Pettapiece, Shafiq Qaadri
Daiene Vernile
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de
la justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qaadri
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Lorenzo Berardinetti
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Bob Delaney
Randy Hillier, Michael Mantha
Cristina Martins, Indira Naidoo-Harris
Arthur Potts, Shafiq Qaadri
Laurie Scott
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Christopher Tyrell

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Monte McNaughton
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Steve Clark
Granville Anderson, Robert Bailey
Steve Clark, Vic Dhillon
Sophie Kiwala, Michael Mantha
Eleanor McMahan, Monte McNaughton
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
Chris Ballard, John Fraser
Ernie Hardeman, Percy Hatfield
Lisa MacLeod, Harinder Malhi
Peter Z. Milczyn, Julia Munro
Lou Rinaldi
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**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
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Bob Delaney
Joe Dickson, Jennifer K. French
Amrit Mangat, Kathryn McGarry
Indira Naidoo-Harris, Bill Walker
Jeff Yurek
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Christopher Tyrell

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Jagmeet Singh
Granville Anderson, Lorne Coe
Vic Dhillon, John Fraser
Marie-France Lalonde, Gila Martow
Kathryn McGarry, Jagmeet Singh
Peter Tabuns
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

Continued from back cover

Health care

Mr. Yvan Baker.....	9804
Hon. Eric Hoskins.....	9805

Autism treatment

Ms. Sylvia Jones.....	9805
Hon. Tracy MacCharles.....	9805

Highway improvement

Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	9806
Hon. Steven Del Duca.....	9806

Accessibility for the disabled

Mrs. Cristina Martins.....	9807
Hon. Brad Duguid.....	9807

DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

**Ontario Retirement Pension Plan Act
(Strengthening Retirement Security for Ontarians),
2016, Bill 186, Ms. Hunter / Loi de 2016 sur le
Régime de retraite de la province de l'Ontario
(sécuriser la retraite en Ontario), projet de loi 186,
Mme Hunter**

Third reading agreed to.....	9808
------------------------------	------

**Energy Statute Law Amendment Act, 2016, Bill 135,
Mr. Chiarelli / Loi de 2016 modifiant des lois sur
l'énergie, projet de loi 135, M. Chiarelli**

Third reading agreed to.....	9809
------------------------------	------

**INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS /
PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn.....	9809
------------------------------	------

**MEMBERS' STATEMENTS /
DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS**

Public transit

Mrs. Gila Martow.....	9809
-----------------------	------

Autism treatment

Miss Monique Taylor.....	9809
--------------------------	------

Don Ross

Mr. Joe Dickson.....	9810
----------------------	------

Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis

Mr. Bill Walker.....	9810
----------------------	------

Mercury poisoning

Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	9810
-----------------------	------

Franco-fête

Mme Daiene Vernile.....	9811
-------------------------	------

Celtic heritage

Mr. Jim McDonnell.....	9811
------------------------	------

Aldo Boccia

Mr. Mike Colle.....	9811
---------------------	------

Cycling

Ms. Eleanor McMahon.....	9811
--------------------------	------

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS /
DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

**Patients First Act, 2016, Bill 210, Mr. Hoskins / Loi
de 2016 donnant la priorité aux patients, projet de
loi 210, M. Hoskins**

First reading agreed to.....	9812
Hon. Eric Hoskins.....	9812

**Brain Tumour Awareness Month Amendment Act,
2016, Bill 211, Mr. Ballard / Loi de 2016 modifiant
la Loi sur le Mois de la sensibilisation aux tumeurs
cérébrales, projet de loi 211, M. Ballard**

First reading agreed to.....	9812
Mr. Chris Ballard.....	9812

**STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY
AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS
MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

Italian Fallen Workers Memorial

Hon. Kevin Daniel Flynn.....	9812
Mr. Ted Arnott.....	9813
Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	9814

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Health care funding

Mr. Lorne Coe.....	9814
--------------------	------

Lyme disease

Mr. Michael Mantha.....	9815
-------------------------	------

Electronic cigarettes

Mr. Arthur Potts.....	9815
-----------------------	------

Alzheimer's disease

Mrs. Gila Martow.....	9815
-----------------------	------

Ontario Northland Transportation Commission

Mr. John Vanthof.....	9816
-----------------------	------

Transports en commun

Mme Marie-France Lalonde.....	9816
-------------------------------	------

Highway ramps

Mrs. Julia Munro.....	9816
-----------------------	------

Caregivers

Mme France Gélinas.....	9816
-------------------------	------

Government anti-racism programs

Ms. Daiene Vernile.....	9817
-------------------------	------

Cormorants	
Mr. Rick Nicholls.....	9817
Prix de l'essence	
M. Taras Natyshak	9817

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS /
AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC
ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS**

Fish and Wildlife Conservation Amendment Act (Double-Crested Cormorants), 2016, Bill 205, Mr. Bailey / Loi de 2016 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du poisson et de la faune (cormorans à aigrettes), projet de loi 205, M. Bailey	
Mr. Robert Bailey	9818
Mr. Michael Mantha	9819
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde	9820
Mr. Steve Clark	9821
Mme France Gélinas	9821
Mr. Lou Rinaldi.....	9822
Mr. Tim Hudak	9823
Mr. Todd Smith.....	9824
Mr. Robert Bailey	9825
Consideration of Bill 74	
Mr. Ernie Hardeman	9825
Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	9827
Ms. Eleanor McMahon.....	9828
Mr. Lorne Coe.....	9828
Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	9829
Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn.....	9830
Mrs. Julia Munro.....	9830

Mr. Yvan Baker.....	9831
Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	9832
Sikh massacre	
Mr. Jagmeet Singh	9832
Mr. Harinder S. Takhar	9834
Mr. Tim Hudak.....	9835
Ms. Jennifer K. French.....	9835
Mr. Arthur Potts	9836
Mr. Todd Smith.....	9837
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	9837
Mrs. Amrit Mangat.....	9838
Mr. Michael Harris.....	9838
Mr. Vic Dhillon.....	9839
Mrs. Gila Martow	9839
Mr. Jagmeet Singh	9839
Fish and Wildlife Conservation Amendment Act (Double-Crested Cormorants), 2016, Bill 205, Mr. Bailey / Loi de 2016 modifiant la Loi sur la protection du poisson et de la faune (cormorans à aigrettes), projet de loi 205, M. Bailey	
Second reading agreed to	9840
Consideration of Bill 74	
The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong)	9840
Sikh massacre	
The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong)	9840
Consideration of Bill 74	
Motion negatived	9841
Sikh massacre	
Motion negatived	9841
Private members' public business	
The Deputy Speaker (Ms. Soo Wong)	9841

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Thursday 2 June 2016 / Jeudi 2 juin 2016

Committee sittings

Hon. Yasir Naqvi	9789
Motion agreed to	9789

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Energy Statute Law Amendment Act, 2016, Bill 135, Mr. Chiarelli / Loi de 2016 modifiant des lois sur l'énergie, projet de loi 135, M. Chiarelli

Mr. Lorne Coe.....	9789
Mme France Gélinas	9790
Mr. Mike Colle.....	9790
Mrs. Julia Munro.....	9791
Miss Monique Taylor.....	9791
Mr. Lorne Coe.....	9791
Miss Monique Taylor.....	9791
Mr. Lou Rinaldi.....	9793
Mr. Robert Bailey	9793
Mr. Wayne Gates	9794
Mr. Bob Delaney.....	9794
Miss Monique Taylor.....	9794
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde	9794
Vote deferred.....	9795

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Bill Walker	9795
Ms. Sarah Campbell.....	9795
Ms. Ann Hoggarth.....	9795
Mr. Jack MacLaren	9795
Mr. Percy Hatfield.....	9795
Hon. Jeff Leal.....	9795
Mr. Patrick Brown.....	9795
Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	9795
Mr. Chris Ballard	9796
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	9796
Hon. Mitzie Hunter	9796
Hon. Glen R. Murray	9796
Hon. Deborah Matthews	9796
Hon. Liz Sandals	9796
Ms. Sophie Kiwala.....	9796
Hon. Michael Gravelle.....	9796
Hon. Michael Coteau	9796
Ms. Soo Wong.....	9796
Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris.....	9796

Hon. Eric Hoskins	9796
Mr. Chris Ballard	9796
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur	9796
Hon. Mario Sergio.....	9796
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac)	9797
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	9797

Wearing of pins

Hon. Mario Sergio.....	9797
------------------------	------

Wearing of flowers

Mr. Jim Wilson.....	9797
---------------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

Autism treatment

Mr. Patrick Brown.....	9797
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9797

Election finances

Mr. Patrick Brown.....	9798
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9798

School facilities

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	9799
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9799
Hon. Liz Sandals	9800

Hospital funding

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	9800
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9800
Hon. Eric Hoskins	9801

Anti-Semitism

Mrs. Gila Martow	9801
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9801
Mr. Tim Hudak.....	9802

Mercury poisoning

Ms. Sarah Campbell.....	9802
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	9802
Hon. Glen R. Murray.....	9802

Victims of crime / Victimes d'actes criminels

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris	9803
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur	9803

Energy policies

Mr. John Yakabuski	9803
Hon. Bob Chiarelli	9803

Energy conservation

Mr. Peter Tabuns	9804
Hon. Bob Chiarelli	9804

Continued on inside back cover