



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

Second Session, 40th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 6 November 2013

Mercredi 6 novembre 2013

Speaker
Honourable Dave Levac

Clerk
Deborah Deller

Président
L'honorable Dave Levac

Greffière
Deborah Deller

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF ONTARIO**

Wednesday 6 November 2013

**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
DE L'ONTARIO**

Mercredi 6 novembre 2013

The House met at 0900.

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

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

**SCHOOL BOARDS COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING ACT, 2013**

**LOI DE 2013 SUR LA NÉGOCIATION
COLLECTIVE DANS LES CONSEILS
SCOLAIRES**

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 30, 2013, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 122, An Act respecting collective bargaining in Ontario's school system / Projet de loi 122, Loi concernant la négociation collective dans le système scolaire de l'Ontario.

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

Mr. Rob Leone: I'm pleased to join the debate and offer the PC lead on Bill 122, the School Boards Collective Bargaining Act. Mr. Speaker, when I became the critic for education, just more than a month ago, I expected that I would be engaged in the government's education agenda quite readily and speedily as the critic. But what I thought we would be talking about in education are some of the things that are perhaps lacking in our school systems. We have, certainly, some questions related to how our teachers are being hired with regulation 274. We have questions with respect to our test scores and what seems to be happening in our schools today with test scores not performing as well as they might.

We could talk about a number of different things that are problematic in our education system, yet since I've been appointed as the PC critic for education, we've been faced with two particular pieces of legislation. This piece of legislation, which is called the School Boards Collective Bargaining Act, deals with the collective bargaining process for teachers and their schools, and school boards and the government. We're also dealing with an Ontario College of Teachers bill which talks about strengthening the process and the regulations by which we entrust the Ontario College of Teachers. These are two pieces of legislation that the government has brought forward in the education field, and I would suggest that contrary to my previously stated objective, which is to help improve our education system here in the province of Ontario,

what we're dealing with are really what amount to process bills: a process for collective bargaining and a process for disputing whether we should license certain teachers or not in the Ontario College of Teachers bill that we've started debate on already in this Legislature. Nothing has been said, nothing has been done to talk about some of the ailments in our system.

I'm going to talk a bit about those in a few minutes, but I think that if we are to have an honest conversation about education—and we like to have conversations in this Legislature—we should talk about those matters which are perhaps not all well and good in our education system, and try to address those problems and those concerns.

Ultimately, when we hear about education from our constituents, it's often coming from parents who have certain concerns about what's happening in our schools: whether our schools are safe and nurturing places to foster and nurture a child's natural curiosity to learn, whether parents are happy with what their students are learning. These are the kinds of concerns that are brought to members of this Legislature all the time in their constituency work, yet we're confronted with two pieces of legislation that essentially do not address some of those prevailing concerns. That, by way of introductory remarks, is a criticism I'm going to level at this government.

Let's start getting on with fixing our education system. Let's try to have some legislation in place that will actually improve test scores. Let's do that, and we need to do that sooner rather than later. So I hope that the next time the government introduces an education bill, they're doing so with the lens of trying to fix the problems that are inherent—the problems that exist—in our education system.

I also have to say, by the way of introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, that our PC caucus has done what I think has been a pretty historic move with a programming motion that we had passed in this Legislature to clear the decks, to try to see whether the government does in fact have an economic plan, to see whether those ideas about kick-starting the private sector and the job growth that needs to happen in our private sector are brought forward. This is another example of a piece of legislation that does not address the prevailing jobs crisis, economic crisis and fiscal crisis in the province of Ontario. This is what we hoped the government would do, once we passed that programming motion. We hoped they would say, "Yes, we need to act on the economy."

I guess, Mr. Speaker, we're pinning our hopes that in tomorrow's economic update we're going to have some

semblance of an idea that the government is prepared to fix the economy. But we've already heard from the finance minister that he's not tabling any legislation that's going to actually do that. If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, I think we owe it to the people of Ontario to roll up our sleeves and talk about the kinds of laws and policies that will enable job growth in the private sector to happen—that would be a good start—and to actually have a plan in place to balance this province's books when the time indeed does come.

In debating the context of Bill 122, we can't ignore what's transpiring in this Legislature as we speak today: no jobs plan and no education policy that's actually going to address the prevailing problems we face in our education system.

Mr. Speaker, the government likes to talk about its partners in education, and obviously this piece of legislation is designed to make peace with those partners in education. I just want to spend a little bit of time talking about exactly the scope of what is happening in our education system today.

As of 2012-13, the year that just passed, the number of students in Ontario was 2,031,205. That's a lot of students. That's a lot of families who have their children in the education system. I think what I would suggest is that if we are talking about partners in education, we obviously have to be addressing the kinds of concerns our students in the system are facing—2,031,205 as of last year. We also had, at the end of last year, 3,978 elementary schools and 913 secondary schools in the province of Ontario. The government's total investment in education is \$21 billion, and a total capital investment of \$1.4 billion.

0910

Mr. Speaker, the scope of this ministry is very big. It affects moms and dads. It obviously affects the ability of a government to manage the fiscal issues it has incurred. Those fiscal issues have been voiced by many members, particularly in the opposition, who believe we need to do something to fix and avert our fiscal crisis before we have to make some difficult decisions. That's what the members of the PC caucus are very concerned about. We want a well-funded and well-resourced education system. That's going to be challenged by the lack of fiscal discipline on that side of the House. We're not going to be able to do what we want in education if we continue to spend money we don't have and kick the can further down the road of economic ruin.

We have in our system approximately 115,000 full-time teachers, full-time equivalents. We have 7,326 administrators: principals and vice-principals. We have 4,390 ECEs, or early childhood educators, in our school system. That's a large number of people who are affected by the kinds of policies we are creating in this Legislature. Not only do we have more than 2 million students, our kids, in the system, but we have more than 100,000 people who are directly employed in this sector. So it's a very big issue that we have to face here, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the growing demands of our elementary and secondary schools.

The Ministry of Education is responsible for overseeing all aspects of Ontario's public education system. Ontario's Education Act sets out the duties and responsibilities of the minister, the school boards, supervisory officers, principals, teachers, parents and students. It's important, as this piece of legislation talks about solidifying the role of the crown or the role of the ministry in the collective bargaining process, to understand exactly what they do.

The ministry is responsible for setting policies and guidelines for school boards; for allocating funding to school boards using a funding formula; for establishing the provincial curriculum; for setting the requirements for graduation, for diplomas and certificates; and for creating lists of approved textbooks and other resources to be used by teachers and by students in the classroom.

In addition to the ministry obviously having a role in our system, they are also the funder of how we pay for the system. More than \$20 billion, as I previously noted, is being spent in our education system today. That number is more than \$8.5 billion more than occurred in 2003, so spending is significantly up in this sector. The question we're going to talk about and explore a little bit more is whether we have in fact received our bang for the buck, whether that increased investment has led to what I think all parents want, which is improving the quality of education for our students and our kids. I think the jury's out on that. I know the government likes to talk about gains in the system, but I'm going to spend some time talking about some of the, maybe, myths about the gains they have currently. It is what it is.

Another aspect of this bill talks about the partners of education being the school boards. The school boards are the people who are entrusted, the employers of our teachers and our administrators and our early childhood educators in all regions of the province of Ontario. They obviously perform a particular task and particular role.

There are 72 school boards in the province of Ontario: 31 English public, 29 English Catholic, four French public and eight French Catholic. There are also several school authorities that oversee schools in hospitals, treatment centres and remote regions of the province. There's a vast array of folks who are involved in education today, not just the students and the teachers, but also from the employer's side on our school boards, that we obviously have to recognize and reconcile when we're having a debate on this particular issue.

In terms of who does what, we talked a bit about what the Ministry of Education does; perhaps it's instructive to talk a little bit about what school boards are responsible for. They're responsible for deciding how to spend the funds they receive from the province for things like hiring teachers and other staff, building and maintaining schools, and purchasing school supplies. School boards are responsible for deciding where new schools should be built, and when and if schools should close. School boards provide programs in schools such as special education, programs for newcomers and French immersion programs that I think a lot of people take advantage of.

They're responsible for developing local educational policy. Local educational policy is particularly related to safe schools, to homework guidelines and the like. They're responsible for setting an annual balanced budget for the school board. I know some school boards have complained about their lack of ability, given the resources provided by the government, to actually do that, and particularly when we see governments coming into the collective bargaining process and ignoring what school boards are dealing with, as happened through Bill 115.

Our school boards are also responsible for ensuring schools follow the rules that are set out by the Education Act. Obviously, that is an act of this Legislature. Certainly, the Ministry of Education is very concerned about making sure that the Education Act is followed, and school boards are in many ways the police that make sure that it happens.

Finally—at least finally on this page—school boards are responsible for establishing a school council at each school and a parent involvement committee of the board. I think that this is obviously a very important component of this, particularly when we're talking about partners in education.

The government has instituted a process through Bill 122, the bill that we're debating today, where the government's going to be a party to the negotiations, the school boards are going to be party to the negotiations and the respective teachers' federations are going to be party to the negotiations that we face. Three parties to the negotiation process will be institutionalized should Bill 122 pass this Legislature.

One growing concern that I have is the fact that those very parents, many of whom volunteer their time after completing a day's work, who try to make sure their students and their schools have the kinds of things that parents expect from their schools, have been seemingly shut out of this process and this discussion of being included as partners in this whole discussion about partners in education. I'm concerned about the fact that the very people who are going to be most affected by the kinds of things that are going to be talked about have very little role in the setting of education policy in the province of Ontario. We should be doing more to consult parents, not less. We shouldn't be shutting them out of the process; we should be including them. I think that if we're looking at how we can address the contents of this bill, we might well think about the role of our parents and our students in our education system and including them among the list of who we would consider as partners in the education system.

My water arrived a little late, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping I would have a cup before I started.

0920

We also have trustees. I know that the bill talks about the role of trustee associations in the collective bargaining process, obviously something we need to consider as well. School trustees are officials, elected every four years during municipal elections, who serve on school

boards. Their cycle is every four years, and their elections are about to occur next year, which I think is an important marker. Trustees are responsible for setting the school board's overall policy direction and the board's budget, and they represent the interests of the community, parents and students in their area.

I don't know how many members of the Legislature have actually visited their local school board in the course of being the MPP for their area, but I would certainly encourage that to happen, because there are interesting things that are brought up at those meetings that, in the absence of actually attending, you probably wouldn't know about. I learned a lot. I think it has been about half a year since I've been to one of our school boards in a school board meeting where—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I'm having trouble hearing your own member. If you would like a little trio talk, go outside and do it, please.

Continue.

Mr. Rob Leone: Would it help, Mr. Speaker, if I spoke a little louder?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): You might want to talk to your friends.

Mr. Rob Leone: Okay.

As I mentioned, trustees are responsible for setting the school board's overall policy direction. They represent the interests of the community, parents and students in their communities. Like I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted by you and my colleagues—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): It's my job to interrupt you when you're doing something wrong. Thank you for that notification.

Continue.

Mr. Rob Leone: Mr. Speaker, as soon as I said that, I realized I had made a little bit of a mistake, so I will slap myself on the wrist.

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: —ever, ever, ever, ever do that again.

Mr. Rob Leone: The member for Nepean—Carleton suggests that I should apologize to the Speaker, and I will take that offer, Mr. Speaker. I'm very sorry for perhaps questioning your authority, which I wasn't intending to do in the first place, and I won't ever, ever, ever, ever do it again—I think that was the other part.

Back to Bill 122, I think, would be a better place to start. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think that what the government is trying to do with Bill 122 is certainly to grab hold of this monstrosity of a ministry that deals with lots of students, lots of teachers, lots of trustees and, most importantly, I think, lots of families who are deeply wedded to what's happening in our schools.

I would say that if we are to set some priorities, we should do so in the following manner: We should do so by judging each and every piece of legislation by how it improves test scores and the quality of education of our students, and the respect we afford and allot to our educators, who are certainly performing miracles every day in our classrooms, and how we can properly resource

our teachers to not only do the job they're currently doing, but do it even better. How we can discuss mechanisms by which that occurs, I think, is very important in how we can judge and assess education policy going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I think we also have to judge the policies that come before us based on what parents might be saying. I think we have to have a mechanism by which we understand precisely what parents are saying about what's happening in our schools. You know, I'm deeply concerned about some of the things I'm hearing as an MPP. I hope that some of the things I'm hearing aren't actually happening in my son's school, and I think that is the case, to a large degree. But when we hear some of these disturbing stories that are happening in our schools, we have to have the ability to talk about policies and the direction of policies that can actually eliminate those problems. Through the process we've seen, which has unfolded, we're dealing with legislation, again, that I think strays from those priorities.

We cannot ignore the context by which Bill 122 has been introduced in this Legislature. I know that the government has done its best effort and has conducted its best efforts, in the last round of negotiation, to try and rein in the seemingly endless increases in expenses in our education system, which is what led to Bill 115. One cannot ignore, in debating this piece of legislation, Bill 122, the context in which Bill 115 had occurred.

I will state very clearly that our party did support Bill 115. We supported Bill 115 because it was the first acknowledgement by this government that we actually have a fiscal crisis in the province of Ontario, and that there needed to be corrective action taken to ensure that we would actually protect education by making sure we're making prudent financial decisions today so that my kids, when they're going through their school, have an education system that we all can be proud of.

So we supported that piece of legislation, even though it wasn't our preferred piece of legislation. We don't want to be pitting teachers against nurses against police officers against MPPs and other public servants. We believe that it was the appropriate move to freeze public sector wages across the board for two years. I think that approach was an approach that would have been a lot easier to swallow if everyone was in the battle together, if we all joined hands, if we're arm in arm battling the fiscal crisis that is still before us.

In the course of doing that, Mr. Speaker, in the process of doing what they did with Bill 115, of course, the government irritated its partners in education. We're not just simply talking about the teachers' federations. I know my friends in the NDP will probably have a lot more to say about this particular part. The teachers' federations were upset about the process that they were forced to submit to. But the school boards themselves were also upset. They were sidestepped; they had to implement an agreement without actually having any input into the process.

I realize what the government is trying to do here. They obviously want to make sure that we are correcting

some of the issues that have emerged since Bill 115 and in the process that unfolded therefrom. I will say that one of the things I like about this legislation is that it actually does that. It sets out the roles and responsibilities of the government, of the teachers' federations and of the school boards. Now, whether the government has it right in terms of every little bit that's in this bill—I think the jury is still out on that; I don't know.

Like I said earlier, I was in this position to talk about education policy and improving our schools and improving our students' test scores, not about debating the minutiae of collective bargaining. I would say that I'm more of an expert in education policy and less in understanding of how collective bargaining works. I've never been at the central table. I'm not a labour lawyer. I think the labour lawyers and the negotiators are probably going to have more to say about this piece of legislation than I could, and I think that is an important aspect that we have to understand.

We are trying to institutionalize, in this bill, the process that unfolded prior to Bill 115, which is that there were voluntary framework agreements that happened between the government and the teachers' federations that ended up being the basis by which local collective agreements would occur. Now we are institutionalizing that process and formalizing the government's role in doing that. I think the government actually needs to be there; I've said that a couple of times already. The government funds education in the province of Ontario. They need to have a say in how it transpires. From that perspective, it's something that I like about the bill.

0930

But what I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that if we are looking at how this bill might transpire and what we can say about the various aspects of this legislation, we aren't going to really know how this bill will play out until we've actually done a complete negotiation, a cycle of negotiation. I would say that. I'm not a labour expert, but I would say that given the people whom I've talked to on this piece of legislation, whether it's the teachers' federations, whether it's school board officials, whether it's parents, the one thing that I would say is that we're actually not going to know the details of how this legislation is going to unfold and whether the rules actually make sense to the parties that are involved until we actually complete one round of negotiation.

So I would suggest, by way of improving this piece of legislation, that we should include some provision to review this legislation after one cycle of bargaining is complete. I think including a sunset provision or a review clause in this piece of legislation will strengthen it. It would give an opportunity for the "partners in education" to come before the legislative committee or to consult with the ministry officials about the kinds of things that worked with this piece of legislation and the kinds of things that perhaps need to be modified. I think if the government is really interested in improving this piece of legislation, they would actually focus on perhaps this idea. Let's call everybody in after the process is done. Let's see what worked.

Perhaps we could do it in a legislative committee; perhaps we could do it by way of ministerial consultation and conversation. I'd like to use that word—have kind of sullied the word in my vocabulary, but I'll still use the word “conversation” with these partners to see whether or not it's transpired and it's worked out in quite the way they intended.

As a member of the Legislature who has not participated directly at the negotiation table, the kinds of rules that are established in this piece of legislation—and it's a lengthy piece of legislation; I think I picked it up on the way in. I'm going to be searching quite a while for the pieces of paper here, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a copy, but it's quite a lengthy piece of legislation. You can't actually read this piece of legislation without understanding labour law and the Labour Relations Act, which I think, certainly, the Minister of Labour is probably the noted expert here on that.

It's a very technical bill, and I think that is certainly—I wouldn't say a problem I have with it, because obviously you need to have some of these rules established, but it's hard to, in some ways, criticize a bill without having the expertise and knowledge and wherewithal to see how these kinds of rules play out. So I would suggest that there's some room for improvement on this piece of legislation coming forward—here it is; it's a few pages long.

As I mentioned, Bill 122 talks about the role of central versus local bargaining. I listened intently when the minister was making her remarks and when the parliamentary assistant was making her remarks on this. It talks about the various roles, the central versus local bargaining. There is obviously a need and a role for the government to be a party to this. I think we would say, on this side of the House, that there's some reasonable expectation as the people paying the bills that we're actually going to do this. Like I said, there's a part of the bill that I think we can certainly have some agreement on.

It establishes the bargaining representatives, so there's a section of the bill that talks about the bargaining representatives from the labour perspective, the AEFO, ETFO, OECTA and the OSSTF, which are four broadly defined teacher federations that will be party to the central negotiating table with the corresponding trustee associations that are going to be party to it as well, as well as the crown.

There is a local bargaining component that's still maintained between the school board and their teacher federation locals that I understand the teacher federations want to preserve and to maintain. I think that the bill reflects at least that acknowledgement that local bargaining still needs to take place, and I think that's well established.

I think that there are issues around the support staff in central bargaining that obviously were previously left out. I know sometimes we talk to these organizations and support staff directly. It always seems that it's about the teacher federations and not the support staff and to what extent support staff need to have an ability to negotiate as well.

These are the sorts of things that the bill includes, that are obviously—as I suggest, I think we need to see it play out before we can actually understand whether things are going in a particular direction.

I want to talk about some of the things that I think the bill is lacking. First of all, as I suggested earlier, this is about process. It's about setting out the rules and establishing the authority.

I know that some of the criticism I've heard, particularly on this bill, is that there's too much left to the discretion of the Minister of Education with respect to some of the rules that are at play. I don't know, again, not being a party to the negotiating process, how that criticism actually plays out in real life. That's why I would like to see the process unfold before we come back and review whether the latitude we've been giving to the Minister of Education has been and is appropriate to the process itself.

Mr. Speaker, what I've tried to assert several times during the last half hour is that I think what parents want to talk about is improving the schools. Since we're talking about process, we're not talking about how we can do that: how we can improve student test scores, how we can improve our schools, how we can help our teachers do the tasks that we entrust them with by teaching our students. We haven't seen that in this bill.

This isn't about improving any gains that the government purports to have made in education. We have no understanding of how this bill will actually encourage that. It's not about understanding how we grapple with the fiscal pressures that we find in the province of Ontario today. We're spending \$8.5 billion more in education in the last 10 years. Meanwhile, we have 250,000 fewer students in our schools. Do the purported gains that the government likes to talk about correspond with that increase in money spent? Do we see our test scores improving?

I want to spend a little bit of time talking about that particular issue. What this bill does not do, when we're talking about the fiscal pressures this government faces, is understand how we can actually deal with those problems. This bill does not talk about that at all. In fact, what I think I'm hearing from the government is quite the opposite: that when it comes to regulation 274 and amending it, that's going to be subject to the negotiating table. Well, if that's going to be subject to the negotiating table, and if we're going to talk about everything else with education policy being subjected to the negotiating table, then what are we doing in this Legislature?

We're supposed to be debating what we can do to improve our schools, to improve our student test scores, to help build confidence with parents in our education system. If those tools are going to be taken away because we're relegating all of this to the collective bargaining process, then I would suggest that we have some significant issues with respect to that, because there is legislation that we can implement in this Legislature that actually does improve schools, that will improve student test scores and will do a whole lot more than simply

taking a hands-off approach on this. And if this bill is intended to ensure that all aspects of education policy will not be subjected to legislation from this Legislature and actually be totally removed from this Legislature and only at the hands of the collective bargaining table, then, again, Mr. Speaker, there are certain issues that we would have with that process.

0940

Let's talk about those gains. I note with interest that I have been looking at some of the test scores, and the international comparisons of those test scores. We can talk about the PISA test scores, which we're going to get to in a little bit. But at least five countries and provinces performed better than the province of Ontario, which is, I think, pretty good. We're at least among the top, which is important. That's for reading. For mathematics—which is a growing concern; I know that our test scores or results in mathematics are on the decline—our PISA results show that Ontario is the 12th highest jurisdiction. So we're obviously faring a lot worse in mathematics. International statistics are suggesting that we are lacking in our math skills. I think there's certainly a concern that is expressed with that.

I know in the remarks that the member from Trinity–Spadina made on Bill 122, he addressed the problem about declining math scores, and he suggested an idea that I think is worthy of consideration: whether we should have specialized math teachers in our schools teaching mathematics. I think that's an idea that I would like to actually have a debate about in this Legislature. But at the end of the day, we're talking about process. We're not talking about how we can improve results in math. I think the member raises a very interesting point.

If we look at the change of our PISA test scores over the last number of years, our reading scores since 2000—and you have to remember who was in power in the year 2000—have actually declined. They've gone down by two points—on a raw score of two points on a year-over-year comparison. Our mathematics score has gone up just slightly by, again, two points. Our science scores have improved as well.

There are certainly concerns that over time—which I'm going to get to in the next international comparison I'm going to make, in terms of where we fare on the TIMSS test. I'm not talking about the leader of the official opposition here. We're not talking about him, because he would certainly outperform a lot of the scores and a lot of measures that we've seen here. But the TIMSS test results on grade 4 mathematics show that 20 jurisdictions in the world are outperforming the province of Ontario. Actually, we're doing worse; we're in the middle of the pack now with our grade 4 math scores. Those are 2011 results. In grade 8 mathematics, there's a slight improvement: 16 jurisdictions around the world are actually doing better than what's happening right here in the province of Ontario—16 jurisdictions. I remember during the last election campaign we were told that we were the best jurisdiction in the English-speaking world, but certainly the international indicators have suggested otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I noticed in one of the trends in the TIMSS test results is, if we look at the trends in Canadian provinces for grade 8 mathematics achievement, the best scores that we received—continually, from 1995 to 2003, our scores were going up. In 1995, the year we took power, the score was at 501. By 1999, it improved to 517. By 2003, our test scores in grade 8 mathematics got up to 521. Today, it's down to 512. So during our time in power, we saw grade 8 math scores actually improve. Yet, despite spending \$8.5 billion more in education today, we're seeing our grade 8 math scores decline under this government. Grade 4 science scores: 18 jurisdictions in the world scored better on grade 4 science than the province of Ontario. Florida, the Russian Federation, Finland and Singapore all scored better than the province of Ontario.

Mr. Rob E. Milligan: Florida?

Mr. Rob Leone: Yes, Florida. Florida used to be at the very bottom of the US test scores and has now surpassed even Ontario.

Grade 8 science tests, the TIMSS scores for 2011: 19 jurisdictions fared better than the province of Ontario. If we look at trends in Canadian provinces for science, the same trend appears to have taken place. In Ontario from 1995 to 2003, we saw test scores increase, but from 2003 to 2011, we've seen them decrease, this despite the fact that we spend today \$8.5 billion more in education. Where are the results going, Mr. Speaker?

Grade 8 science achievement: Again, the trends show a particular phenomenon. The raw score in 1995 for grade 8 science achievement was 496, in 1999 it was 518 and in 2003 it was 533. In 2007 it went down to 526 and in 2011 it went down to 521, this despite spending \$8.5 billion more in education today than they did 10 years ago. Where has the money gone?

All the while, we see that we have these EQAO test results, and every year, for reading and writing, those scores have gone up. The EQAO, which is a provincial standardized test instituted by our government, has shown a significant increase, which is contrary to what these international results, the PISA and the TIMSS results, are showing right here in the province of Ontario. One has to wonder, when looking at this data, how can that possibly be? How could it possibly be that the international comparisons are showing that Ontario is on the decline, but our provincial standards show us going up? One has to have a serious and honest debate about why this might be the case. The potential answer to that may well be that we're relaxing the standards on our standardized tests. If the international scores are showing a decline while our own tests are showing an increase, there's something that is seriously wrong with the “gains” that this government purports to be making in education, and this despite—we have to say it once again—that we spend \$8.5 billion more in education today than we did 10 years ago. Meanwhile, we have 250,000 fewer students. Where has the money gone? Have we seen any appreciation on test scores going forward?

I read with interest, I think members of this Legislature should know, that this government created the

Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. The title: *Making the Grade? Troubling Trends in Postsecondary Student Literacy*.

I know all members of the Legislature will know that prior to entering this Legislature, I was a university professor. I have talked to the university professors that had been there before I got there and who had taught for a span of 15 or 20 years. They told me that the quality of the student now coming into university has deteriorated, has declined. Their reading and writing skills are certainly not what they were even a generation before. Well, Mr. Speaker, we now have a HEQCO report that actually talks about that. Let me take a little bit of time to outline what some of these reports have said.

0950

The executive summary suggests that “there is growing concern that Canadians’ literacy skills, including those of students attending post-secondary institutions in Ontario, are not meeting expectations.”

They go on to talk about the timing of this. The “troubling trends in literacy achievement and a lack of consistency in expectations for high school students who go on to post-secondary education” are very real.

“According to IALS, not even a quarter of respondents aged 18 to 65 scored above level 3—the minimum level of proficiency.” I think level 3 is related to the PISA scores—oh, sorry, the IALS. I made a mistake there.

“The most recent literacy results from PIAAC also registered no improvement but rather a slight deterioration in Canadians’ scores at both ends of the literacy spectrum, with a greater number of Canadians scoring at level 1 and below and fewer Canadians scoring at levels 4 and 5.” This is certainly a trend that we’re seeing right across the country, Mr. Speaker.

But what interested me about this report was a section that we find on page 16: “Are High School Graduates Prepared for PSE?”—for post-secondary education.

I’ll quote from the report: “The literature abounds with examples of college and university faculty bemoaning the perceived underpreparation of their first-year students.... In one survey of professors at Western University”—this is at Western University, right here in London, Ontario—“91% agreed that high schools do not sufficiently prepare students to write essays at a university level.” And we’re talking about gains in our system.

It goes on to suggest that “prose remains inelegant and unsophisticated, document structure is rudimentary and is often limited to the ‘five-paragraph essay’ taught in Ontario’s high schools, and critical thought often seems to be nonexistent.” These are what our professors are saying, once our students exit our elementary and secondary schools and go on to college and university.

“When a focus group of students at an Ontario university was asked how prepared they felt for university upon entry, most students stated that they were not at all prepared.” Again, we spend \$8.5 billion on education today, and there is a discrepancy between what these gains mean for the preparation of our students to succeed in our colleges and universities.

“A recent HEQCO-funded project at George Brown College recognizes outright”—this is a quote from this HEQCO-funded project—“that the ‘Ontario secondary school diploma or equivalent does not guarantee that all students are prepared for the rigors of post-secondary academic work.’” Again, we spend \$8.5 billion in the province of Ontario and we’re seeing a decline.

It concludes, on page 24: “The gap in expectations between high school graduation and post-secondary admission needs to be reconciled.”

Mr. Speaker, this seems to point to a troubling trend and an issue I have with our education system that I’ve expressed, and these international test scores actually show a lack of improvement. In fact, we’re doing worse today than we were 10 years ago. But we’re setting these standards lower for students, actually. Our EQAO scores might have gone up on a couple of indicators, but our international test scores don’t reflect that. And when these students leave our elementary and secondary schools, they’re not prepared to succeed in college or university. And at the end of the day, they’re calling these gains. Despite spending \$8.5 billion more on education today, they are met with modest success. You can read the report yourselves, if you would like.

I also read with interest—I love how in education you get lots of reports. I know the government is very happy with this report, which is the Final Report: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Ontario Full-Day Early Learning-Kindergarten Program. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to state very succinctly that, as a member of this Legislature, I actually believe in early literacy. I think we should be making investments in improving early literacy and making sure our students are well prepared for the challenges of the 21st century.

But if we actually go into this report and the details of the report, we’re finding some troubling things, that despite the fact the government likes to say that everything is hunky-dory in education, it may not actually be the case.

There’s a number of aspects that have been studied here, but the fact that our special-needs students—the kinds of students that we’re hoping to improve with the introduction of full-day kindergarten—actually perform better in non-FDK schools is, for me, a very troubling trend. These are the very people we’re trying to help, and the report actually looks at the fact that for example, on social competence, students performed better overall in non-FDK schools, but that trend was even more pronounced for students with special educational needs. That’s a troubling trend.

In emotional maturity, again, the overall trend is that students actually performed a little better in emotional maturity in non-FDK schools, but that trend was even more pronounced for students with special educational needs.

The report talks about a number of results indicating that kindergarten students from FDK—sorry, that’s not the one I want.

On page 85 of the report, it states: “A final observation of the findings worth noting is that on several meas-

ures, the non-FDELK programs were associated with more positive outcomes. This was especially true for non-FDELK programs in low needs schools, on the EDI measures of emotional maturity and communications skills and general knowledge. To be clear, some children appear to have done worse with the FDELK than with non-FDELK.”

What we’ve suggested all along is that we actually have to understand the results and to modify the program to address these kinds of concerns. We’re spending \$1.5 billion on full-day kindergarten in the province of Ontario, and we’re just starting to see the results. There have been some positive results—I will acknowledge that—but there are some troubling trends as well.

“The children with special educational needs showed superior outcomes on the measures of social competence and emotional maturity in non-FDELK programs.” The basis of this difference is unclear, of course, but nonetheless, this is what the study found, and if we are going to be honest about the program, we should be addressing these concerns.

So at the end of the day, we have a lot to talk about with respect to gains, but one thing that I want to focus on in my remaining time is what I think is the priority of the Ontario PC caucus, and it involves regulation 274. We have stated—and we had a private member’s bill in the name of my friend from Nepean–Carleton, who wanted to modify regulation 274. We think it’s a priority of our party and should be the priority of the government.

We are increasingly troubled by what we’re hearing from the Minister of Education with respect to modifying regulation 274. We don’t think this should be something subject to collective bargaining. We think that legislators in this assembly have a role and a responsibility to ensure that we are putting the best teachers in front of our students. That best teacher might be the most experienced teacher, and quite often it is the most experienced teacher, but we shouldn’t limit the opportunity for our younger teachers to have a crack, particularly if they are showing superior skills in leading in the classroom. We should enable our principals to make those decisions on who is best able to fulfill a vacancy in that school based on their ability to teach effectively in the core subject matter, based on whatever holes that school needs to fill, if it’s with extracurricular activities or the like. We shouldn’t be limiting our teachers and our principals in finding the best teacher in front of the classroom.

1000

I know the minister has also talked about the fact that we’re trying to root out nepotism and that there are actually some things in regulation 274 that are actually good, and I agree. Posting positions: great. Eliminating nepotism, which our bill actually suggests, can be fulfilled by modifying hiring practices.

What we suggest—and I know the minister wants to talk about fast and speedy passage of this legislation. I would suggest in this Legislature, right here, right now, that if the minister is sincere about that, if they are sincere about putting this legislation forward and getting

this into committee so that the federations can come in and the school boards can come in, so that everybody who has a perspective, a point of view, can come in, and they want to do that as expeditiously as possible and before the next round of collective bargaining begins, which will happen early next year—then what I am asking the Minister of Education to do right here and commit to is to modify regulation 274 so that we can have merit-based hiring back in our schools, so we can ensure that the best teachers are in front of the classroom, so that we can ensure that principals in our school system are the ones who are going to determine the best person to fill that job—not based on seniority, not based on anything but the quality and the qualifications of that teacher. If the government is willing to meet us on that request, then we will meet them in their request to move this bill to committee as fast as possible. But if they are unwilling to talk about modifying regulation 274, then we’re going to have a serious discussion about the merits of this piece of legislation.

So I would suggest, in my final comments on this piece of legislation, let’s talk about putting regulation 274 back on the table. Let’s make sure that legislators in this assembly have a say on what happens and ensure that our students have the best teacher in front of the classroom. Then we can make peace with this legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Questions and comments?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: While I applaud the intentions of the member from Cambridge—I think it’s clear that he’s concerned about the education system and the services that we provide for our students, and so I applaud the member for his intentions. I have some concern with the logic that he employs, and I simply suggest this as constructive criticism so that he can perhaps bolster his argument. The comparisons that he brought up, while I found them very interesting and certainly illuminative on the issue of how we fare internationally—the comparisons that the member from Cambridge drew were with science and math. Certainly there are a number of jurisdictions that performed better, but comparing the EQAO test on reading and writing and suggesting that those are indicative of a decline or incline when comparing with science and math isn’t the best argument. But I certainly take his point that we need to do better if we are falling behind other jurisdictions internationally. I think it’s a great point, and I support that concern.

What I want to talk about in my remaining minute is the three areas of grave concern I find in our education system. One is that while we have a significantly increasing population of new Canadians coming from various parts of the world, we are failing those new Canadians when it comes to ESL. Many school boards have talked about the fact that there is funding set aside for ESL but there’s a clear reduction in terms of ESL classes and ESL education and ESL students. That’s an area that we need to address. Why is there a reduction when we know that, in terms of population and demographics, there is certainly no reduction? We see, instead, an increase.

Another two areas—I think we need to have a fulsome education system which supports music. Music and arts are a fundamental aspect of developing yourself as a well-rounded human being.

And finally, physical education: We can only look at our youth to see that physical education is something that we need to make a priority, to prevent some of the ailments and illnesses that happen, moving forward. We need to focus on physical education as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Questions and comments?

Hon. Liz Sandals: Let me speak very briefly about the quality of education in Ontario. I think two things stand out very strongly. If you want to look at the pan-Canadian results, which are tests of all students in all jurisdictions in Canada, Ontario is the only province in which the students perform better than the Canadian average in math and science and literacy. So that's a Canadian, not an Ontario test, an across-Canada test.

If you look at the graduation rate on a very strict measure of following individual kids for five years, in 2003 the Ontario high school graduation rate was 68%. It is now 83%, and that's following individual children to see what individual kids have graduated. So we have made great strides in Ontario education.

Now, what the bill is actually about, of course, is school board collective bargaining. I know this is a highly technical bill, which may be why the member chose not to talk about it very much. But I do want to assure him that the Ministry of Labour experts have supported us greatly in terms of it, because it is a technical bill, and we've worked very closely with the labour relations experts from the Ministry of Labour to work out the details with both the school boards and the unions.

But what I really did find strange were the closing comments, in which I think what I heard was that for a bill on labour relations to figure out how to do collective bargaining, the support of that party is conditional on having the Legislature override something that was a result of collective bargaining. I find that very peculiar logic.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Questions and comments?

Mr. Rob E. Milligan: First off, I want to congratulate my colleague the fine member from Cambridge, Mr. Leone, on his new appointment as the critic for education. I know, as an educator myself, and Mr. Leone being a doctor, he obviously is more than qualified to address the issues or concerns around our education system.

I just want to make a few observations, if I may, on what the Minister of Education acknowledged. I think, though, that some of her facts are mis-skewed, if you will. What we see first-hand is—I was in the classroom when our graduation rates were such, and what this government has done is lowered the bar so low that my dog could graduate from high school as an honour student.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I think the comparative analysis was a little rough. I would suggest you withdraw that last one.

Mr. Rob E. Milligan: His name is Shakespeare—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I said withdraw.

Mr. Rob E. Milligan: Withdraw. His name is Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker, by the way.

I saw and witnessed first-hand the standardized test, the EQAO testing, under Mr. Harris, the quality of testing that was brought forward and what was instructed. I also witnessed first-hand, as my wife has, who is an elementary teacher, the standardized testing under this government, and I can honestly tell you, Mr. Speaker, the differences are leaps and bounds.

I think Mr. Leone made it very clear that there is obviously a problem in the education system. That's why Mr. Leone has left his profession as a professor and that's why I have left my profession as a teacher: to improve those scores.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Questions and comments?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I want to thank the member for Cambridge for his comments. There was a lot of content in that speech, and several things I'd like to focus on.

The first is that I'm glad that the member for Cambridge recognized the loss to school boards of their right to participate in collective bargaining, which affected school boards as much as teachers. I hope that that indicates that they recognize the error of their ways in supporting Bill 115, which really triggered that loss of collective bargaining.

The second thing I wanted to say: As a researcher myself, someone who has written reports for the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, I know how statistics can be taken out of context and used in ways to support whatever side of an argument you want to stand on. There has been research that has critiqued an over-reliance on PISA and TIMSS scores, and EQAO testing scores, as these tests measure the extent to which the education system is delivering prescribed content.

There are other international measures. There is something called the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, or GEM, which is also conducted in over 50 countries internationally, and that global measure looks at the extent of the level of entrepreneurial activity, the level of start-ups, innovation within a country, and has found there is absolutely no correlation between PISA scores and the level of entrepreneurial activity. I think that's something that all sides of this House can agree on, that we need to support a knowledge economy, we need to support students to become innovators and to participate in future economic development.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Cambridge has two minutes.

Mr. Rob Leone: I appreciate the comments and questions—I don't know if I have any questions, but at least the comments—from the member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton, the Minister of Education, my good friend the member from Northumberland-Quinte West and the new member from London West. I really appreciate the comments that were made.

I do want to address a couple of things. I know the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton suggested that I used comparisons of decline in math and science and TIMSS scores, but I also did mention that on the PISA scores, from 2000 to 2009 there actually has been a slight decline in the year-over-year comparisons. That was the reference I was making to that. I wanted to make sure he understood the context by which I was making those comments.

To the Minister of Education: I notice she mentioned that Ontario is performing well. I have to admit I was—I don't have the latest statistics on this to know whether this is true or not. Still, it's interesting. The PISA results from 2009 at least suggest that Alberta outperformed Ontario in reading, that Alberta and Quebec outperformed Ontario in math, and that—let's see here—British Columbia and Alberta, in the 2009 PISA test results, outperformed Ontario as well.

We can obviously quibble about the statistics, but what I was trying to present today is the fact that we're spending an increasing amount of money, and are the results going up in correspondence with those increased investments? I think the jury is still out on that, Mr. Speaker, which is why I wanted to present that to the members of this Legislature, to the people of Ontario, who I'm sure are watching this debate today. My concern is about improving test scores, improving the quality of our schools, improving the effect that teachers can have on our students. That's what our priorities are on this side of the Legislature.

Second reading debate deemed adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): It being close to 10:15, this House stands recessed until 10:30 this morning.

The House recessed from 1013 to 1030.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. Monte McNaughton: This morning, it gives me great honour to welcome my aunt Diane Brewer to the Legislature today. Diane has been the reeve of our municipality for almost 30 years. Also a family friend of ours Claudia Cloke is here today too. So welcome.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I want to welcome all the grade 9 students and young people from Don Valley West, who are here for Take Our Kids to Work Day: from Windfields Junior High School, Bella Rodriguez, Mateo Lopez and Alina Jing; and from St. Andrew's Junior High School, Asil Uzuak, Bill Chen and Keith Marin. Welcome, everyone.

Mr. Todd Smith: It's a pleasure to welcome Jakob Sundman to the House today. Jakob is a visiting co-op student from Åre, Sweden. He's going to Centennial Secondary School in Belleville.

Joining Jakob is Ian Acton, who is my old producer on the OHL Tonight on TVCogeco with the Belleville Bulls. It's good to see Ian.

Ms. Catherine Fife: It's my pleasure to welcome Michelle Billek from Mississauga–Erindale to Queen's Park today.

Hon. Jeff Leal: It's a great pleasure for me to introduce two people in the members' east gallery today as part of Take Our Kids to Work Day: Guy Skipworth and his son, Ian Skipworth. Guy Skipworth and I, in a previous career here at Queen's Park, worked for the late John Eakins, who represented the riding of Victoria–Haliburton from 1975 to 1990. Mr. Eakins of course was a Royal Canadian Air Force veteran in the Second World War.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Barrie. Let's be brief, please.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to introduce Andrea Chiappetta, who was a former page here during the one-day prorogation page term. He has come back today to shadow me around and get a better taste of how the Legislature works. So I'd like him to—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Thank you. The member from London–Fanshawe.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: It's my pleasure today to introduce my guests, Jay Peterson and his daughter Riley Peterson. Today is bring your daughter to work day, so Jay has brought Riley in. She attends grade 9 at Vaughan Road Academy in Toronto. She's a dedicated hockey player, playing as goalie with the Aurora Panthers Bantam AA. I just want to say, welcome to the Legislature.

Hon. Michael Chan: I'd like to welcome three constituents of mine from Markham–Unionville. They are Kosan, Hisan and Uswa Shafaque. They are the brother and sister of page Sarhan Shafaque.

Speaker, I would like to welcome five staff members from my ministry from the Ontario public service. They are joining us this morning in the public gallery with 23 grade 9 students as part of their Take Our Kids to Work Day. Welcome, everyone.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: As the Premier made reference to, it is Take Our Kids to Work Day today. It is my pleasure to introduce my son—he tells me that he is my greatest achievement—Dawson.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Who are we to argue?

Introductions?

Hon. Reza Moridi: It's my pleasure to introduce Debbie Havill, a sonographer by profession, and Leonard Domino from the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences. The association is visiting the House today, so please join me in welcoming them to the Ontario Legislature.

Ms. Laurie Scott: I'm pleased today to welcome Gary Burtch and Aggie Tose from the Haliburton County Home Builders Association. I want to mention that Aggie received from the Ontario Home Builders Association the David Horton Leadership Award for her outstanding achievements. So welcome in the public gallery.

L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Je voudrais présenter Paul Grenier, ici de Welland, qui est avec sa fille Claire; Sébastien Goyer, who is the current chief administrative

officer and clerk for the municipality of French River; and Brennan Kenny. They are here in the gallery with us today.

Mr. Garfield Dunlop: I'm pleased to welcome my assistant at Queen's Park, Krystina DeRose, here today, along with my granddaughter, Rachel Rynard, who was a former page. She's here for Take Our Kids to Work Day and I'm teaching her all about the Ontario College of Trades.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I'd like to welcome my nephew Harry O'Malley who is here as part of Take Our Kids to Work Day.

Mr. Mike Colle: I would like to welcome, as part of take your kid to Queen's Park day, Brigid Waddingham who's here. She's a grade 9 student at the amazing St. Clement's School in my riding. Welcome, Brigid Waddingham.

Mr. John O'Toole: I welcome home builders here today. As well, from my riding the Durham home builders are here.

Mr. Jim McDonell: I would like to welcome Len Domino and Debbie Havill from the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences. They're here today to meet with MPPs and I want to welcome them to the Legislature.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: I would like to welcome Kadie Ward from London to question period today. This is Katie's first question period.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Further introductions? Last call for introductions.

Just before we start, I would like to also remind members that I've made the commitment to try to get everyone's introductions in. Please resist the temptation to enter into a short minister's statement or a member's statement. It would be helpful to all of us so that we can get our introductions in, and I would appreciate it very much.

It is now time for question period.

ORAL QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Tim Hudak: I have one very straightforward question to the Premier. Premier, when the NDP support our want of confidence motion in the House later this afternoon, will you obey the will of the House or will you put the Liberal Party first once again?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, we are focusing on creating jobs, on making the investments that we know are needed for people to thrive, for communities to thrive, for infrastructure to be built and for businesses to be able to grow and expand in the province. That is our focus. I look forward to the response from the opposition parties on the fall economic statement tomorrow. I look forward to explaining to people across the province our plan for those investments in people and in

infrastructure and in a business climate that is going to be able to bring investment to the province, and what we're going to do to stimulate that kind of investment, because I believe that is the way forward. It's a sharp difference from what the party opposite would like to do, which is cut and slash. I do not believe that is the way forward. I believe that investing in our future is the way that we need to go.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Tim Hudak: Sadly, it's just what I expected. It sounds just like Dalton McGuinty all over again. We have a party here that wasted \$1.1 billion to save two Liberal seats. You didn't care about somebody in Milton who could use some treatment to prolong her life and spend time with her family to fight cancer. That didn't matter to you. What mattered to you was saving two Liberal seats in the last election campaign. That's your priority.

This motion says that we simply do not trust the Liberals to run this province anymore, that the cries from seniors, men and women across the province that enough is enough have been heard by at least one party, the PC Party. If the NDP have the courage to do what's right and support our motion, will you listen to the voice of the majority of members in the Legislature or will you again put the Liberal Party first each and every time?

Interjections.

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

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am listening to people across this province who are telling me that they elected a minority Parliament and they expect us to do everything in our power to make that minority Parliament work.

Let me just say that there has been a lot of legislation that has moved through in the last few weeks: the Local Food Act, passed yesterday, the Wireless Services Agreements Act, the Supporting Small Businesses Act, consumer protections, the Financial Accountability Officer legislation, family caregiver leave legislation, protecting kids from skin cancer. The Legislature is working, and it's very gratifying that we've been able to find common ground and we've been able to bring those pieces of legislation to the House and move them through. That's because the opposition parties and our government have been able to find a way to work together. That's what people expect of us, Mr. Speaker. That's what we're going to continue to do.

1040

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

Mr. Tim Hudak: The only reason things moved through the House, Premier, is because we agreed to clear the decks to see your jobs plan. We're the ones who said, "Pass that stuff through." We cleared the decks to see what you've got. But 10 months later, Premier, all we see is a vacuous Liberal agenda putting more fluff into the system. You've got all kinds of balloon animals and

card tricks to try to distract attention; you don't have a plan for jobs.

We have a plan for jobs. We have a plan to put our economy back on track with more jobs and better take-home pay. My view: Let's get on with the job. And if the NDP finally discovers their moral compass and says that they are on the side of taxpayers like we are, why don't you actually listen to the will of the House when that happens later on this afternoon?

Interjections.

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

Premier.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I just don't believe that those 2,000-plus young people who have been able to find positions because of our youth employment strategy think that's not important.

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Order. Member from Leeds–Grenville, second time.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I don't think the people who have jobs at the Ford plant think that the \$70 million that we are investing to make sure that Ford can compete in the global economy don't believe that's important. I think the people who live in northern and rural communities think that the \$100-million infrastructure fund that we've put in place is exactly what's needed in order to be able to invest in their future. I think the people who are—and I will say this, Mr. Speaker—part of the horse racing industry, who see that they have a sustainable future, think that that is a very good thing. So we are doing the work that is necessary—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Stop the clock. I need to hear.

Wrap up, please.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I know that the people who met with us yesterday from the chicken farmers are very pleased that our government has taken a strong position on supply management. We've made that position nationally and we will continue to advocate for that.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Tim Hudak: Look, I don't even know how to answer that. I talked to the folks in the horse racing industry as soon as Monday. Premier, if they heard that answer, they would say "Horse feathers," but not exactly—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Excuse me. Stop the clock. I have two things in my head at the same time. I didn't hear who it was directed to, and the Minister of the Environment will come to order.

Direction, please.

Mr. Tim Hudak: To the Premier, Speaker. I think the Premier has lost touch. I think she has surrounded herself with Liberal insiders who are benefitting from the inside deals. I think the reason why she's not answering my

question on the want of confidence motion—the motion basically says Ontarians have lost trust in the Liberal government to run this province anymore, that enough is enough. I think the reason why she's dodging those questions is because the fix is in, that no matter what happens, no matter what they do, the NDP will give them a get-out-of-jail-free card every time because you're basically one and the same. We'll see what the vote is later today; we'll see if the NDP has any kind of moral compass. But the bottom line for me is we need change for a better, stronger—

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

Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I just want to be clear with the Leader of the Opposition: I do not take for granted the position that we are in. I believe very strongly that we have to earn the respect of the people of this province every single day. That is why we are working so hard to do what we believe is right based on the evidence that we see around us. We have constrained spending over the last number of years. We have overachieved on our deficit reduction targets. We believe that now it is very important that we make the investments that are going to allow this economy to thrive, that we make the investments in infrastructure, in the future of people, making sure that people have a decent retirement, that they have a strong education system, a strong health care system, and making sure that we put in place the business conditions that will allow businesses to thrive. I call on the Leader of the Opposition to support us in getting the small business act—

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

Interjections.

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

Mr. Tim Hudak: Now we understand the problem. The Premier says the only problem is that the Liberals are a bunch of overachievers. Well, let's look at what you have overachieved. We've lost 300,000 well-paying manufacturing jobs while you added 300,000 to the government payroll. Hydro rates have doubled and they're going through the roof. The debt has doubled in our province—

Interjection.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Minister of Rural Affairs, come to order.

Mr. Tim Hudak: The mighty province of Ontario that had always been the engine that drove this great country is now first in debt and last in jobs. I want to see Ontario have a turn-around plan to make us first in jobs and last in debt, a place where people come from all over the world to settle here.

I think the problem is that you're out of ideas. You've got 36 panels going. You're the same as Dalton McGuinty. You've got them in your back pocket and this province continues to spiral. I think it's time for change. I think people across our province are saying enough is enough. Let's get rid of the Liberals. Let's build a stronger Ontario for our children and grandchildren.

Interjections.

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

Premier.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that, as a province, we have created and attracted more jobs than other jurisdictions. The fact is that we went through a huge economic downturn and we have in the order of 400,000 net new jobs, so we have come a very long way.

I am not suggesting that there isn't more to do. In fact, I'm suggesting the opposite. I'm suggesting that we have to take this moment in our history very seriously and we have to, as a province, make a decision. We have to decide collectively whether we are going to go down a path of cutting and slashing and diminishing the economy in this province, Mr. Speaker, which is what the PCs are advocating. They are advocating that we cut services, that we cut the public service, that we diminish the services that are available to people in health care and in education. I don't believe that's the way we should go. I believe that we should make the investments that are necessary to allow the economy to expand to support businesses and—

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

Mr. Tim Hudak: The bottom line is, the people of Ontario don't trust the Liberals anymore. You've bankrupted the province, you've chased jobs out of Ontario and you've put us deep, deep in provincial debt.

You know what, Premier? As I travel around the province, and I'm sure you do too, I hear two things about your gas plant scandal. I hear (1) somebody should go to jail over this, and (2) I hear the Liberals should pay that money back, not the taxpayers of the province of Ontario.

The problem is, I don't know where the NDP draws the line. I don't know why they give you a pass each and every time. I hope they will screw up the courage to actually be on the side of taxpayers like we are and say the time for the Liberal, corrupt government—it's time to go. Let's bring real change to our province of Ontario and follow the vote later on today.

Interjections.

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

Premier.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I don't think there was a question in there, but the reality is that we are intent on making the investments and putting the supports in place so that people have what they need, the services that they need, so that businesses have a climate that they can thrive in. Part of that is the small businesses act, Mr. Speaker. We really very much believe that it would be important to get that act passed so we can support those small businesses and give them a break on their payroll taxes. That bill is being blocked in committee, and it would be of great assistance to the small businesses in this province if the opposition would work with us and get that through.

I also believe that making the investments in infrastructure that are necessary in our rural and northern—

Interjections.

Hon. Mario Sergio: The Walkerton days are over.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Stop the clock. Minister responsible for seniors, I don't need that. Thank you.

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I know we face challenges, and that's why it's extremely important that we make the right decisions at this point that will set us up for the future that Ontario can achieve. That's why those investments are so important, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're going to continue to look for ways to support the economy and make sure that it can thrive.

MANUFACTURING JOBS

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My question is for the Premier. The Liberal government has for years insisted that policies of tax giveaways and harmonization would actually improve productivity and spur investment in our province. Can the Premier explain why, then, Ontario ranks ninth out of 10 provinces when it comes to productivity growth?

1050

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: The leader of the third party raises a very good question about the particular configuration of tax credits and so on that are in place. One of the things the finance minister will talk about tomorrow is that it's important that we actually do make sure that those are working, that they are having the intended impact. It's one of the things Don Drummond has spoken to us about and it's something that I think is very important that we look at. I'm glad the leader of the third party has raised it, but we're already on it, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Since the Liberals were first elected, Ontario has lost 300,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs, and despite promise after promise, those good jobs have not come back.

Today, 110 women and men who work at the Kellogg plant in London have learned that they'll be losing their jobs come January.

Is the Premier admitting that the government's policy of no-strings-attached giveaways hasn't been working?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: No, Mr. Speaker. What I'm saying is that there are a number of things at work here. One of them is that we need to look at the tax credit system and make sure the tax credits that are in place have the desired impact. We are doing that and the minister will talk about that tomorrow.

The other reality is that the manufacturing sector has changed. When I visit manufacturing plants across the province, as I have, whether it's in food processing or whether it's in another sector, what I see is that advanced manufacturing (a) needs a different set of skills, and (b) needs a different size of workforce.

We're in a transition. It is a difficult transition, and that's why it's very important that in our diverse econ-

omy we play to our strengths and we make sure that we put in place the supports where we can thrive. That's the work that we're doing, Speaker, and I would welcome her support in that.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Over the last 10 years of Liberal government, 300,000 good manufacturing jobs have disappeared. Our province has the highest electricity rates in the country, the lowest productivity growth and an unemployment rate that is above the national average. The Premier still insists the plan is working, while at the same time her actions seem to suggest something different. When are people like the women and men losing jobs in London going to see some real action from the Liberal government?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: There are jobs across the province that have come back. There are factories that are expanding, businesses that are expanding. But as I said before, it's very important that we play to our strengths and we find those sectors that have the capacity to expand.

I will just say, wearing my hat as Minister of Agriculture and Food, that that is one of the sectors where there is huge potential to expand, and that's why I've put a challenge in place to the food processing and the food producing industry to do what they can to expand, with our support. We are looking at the regulatory scheme. We've got in place risk management programs. We're working with the sector through the Local Food Fund—\$30 million over the next three years—to make sure we make those investments that are going to allow that agri-food sector to expand.

That's what I mean by playing to our strengths, and that is how we are going to grow in Ontario.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Ms. Andrea Horwath: My next question is also for the Premier. The Premier says she wants greater openness and transparency, but she doesn't seem willing to walk the walk. Why did Liberal members just this morning vote against asking the Auditor General to look into the \$180 million the government spent on their cancelled nuclear expansion plans?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I appreciate the question. I haven't seen the Hansard from this morning, so I don't know exactly what went on at the committee, but what I can say is that I have answered this question before about the \$180 million, that the \$180 million was spent in order to prepare for new nuclear build that we have determined, through the evidence, is not necessary. But that work that has been done is not for naught. It is absolutely work that can be used if and when we determine that we need to go ahead.

So I think that \$180 million is money that was well spent. The information is necessary, and that work will stand us in good stead if the decision should change in the future.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Andrea Horwath: Ontarians know that the Liberals can't be trusted to tell the whole story on money wasted in the energy sector. The Liberals claimed it would cost \$40 million to cancel the Oakville gas plant. The auditor showed it would cost 20 times as much. The Liberals claimed it would cost \$190 million to cancel the Mississauga gas plant. The auditor showed that was off by \$85 million.

I'm disappointed that Mr. Hudak's Conservatives chose to vote against transparency as well, but we know not to expect very much from them except for political games. But the Premier said she wants to be open, so why did Liberal members vote to stop the independent Auditor General of this province from determining the full costs of cancelling their nuclear expansion plans?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Government House leader.

Hon. John Milloy: I think the honourable leader of the NDP, in her question, points out the obvious fact that the Liberals do not have a majority on any legislative committee. In fact, we were joined by the opposition in opposing the motion, and the reason why is that the motion itself was flawed. The suppositions behind it in terms of the costing that had been put forward in the motion were incorrect, and the committee—and I think we all agree that committees should be free to do their work—deemed, with the support of the official opposition, that it was not an appropriate motion.

If the honourable member wants to talk about transparency, I will talk about our Premier, who asked the Auditor General to look into the Oakville gas plant, who has appeared in front of the justice committee—in fact, I understand, will be appearing again in front of the justice committee to answer questions—and comes to this House virtually every day to answer questions on a project that the leader of the NDP wanted cancelled herself.

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

Ms. Andrea Horwath: For families and businesses paying the highest electricity bills in Canada, this is a pretty simple issue. They're tired of watching the Liberal government use the hydro system as a political football, and then sticking them with the bill.

We called for the auditor to look at how much money was spent planning for a project that was shelved, and how much more would be spent if this government or a future government then takes that plan off the shelf again. Why is the Premier scared—afraid, frightened, worried—about an independent review of the decision they made?

Hon. John Milloy: Minister of Energy.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: First of all, deferring new nuclear is the right decision. We're not going to invest \$15 billion in power that we don't need, because we have a surplus at this time. All of OPG's expenditures—

Interjections.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Order. The member from Stormont, come to order. The member from

Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound, come to order. The member from Northumberland, come to order.

Hon. Bob Chiarelli: All of OPG's expenditures have been reviewed by the Ontario Energy Board, an independent semi-judicial agency, and posted publicly on their website. The information they are asking the committee to work on has been published on the OPA website. Please refer to the OPA website, and you will get the answer that you need.

Secondly, they have no plan for energy. All they do is criticize. Their base out there in the community is calling us and thanking us for the decisions that we're doing, because they have no policy.

POWER PLANTS

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: My question is to the Premier. Yesterday in justice committee, JoAnne Butler once again joined us. She confirmed, yet again, that everyone in cabinet, including yourself, knew that the true cost of the cancelled Oakville power plant would have been more than \$40 million.

I'm troubled by the fact that you stand here, day in and day out, and deny that. You refuse to call a judicial inquiry, you refuse to appear before committee and you refuse to put forward a confidence motion on the floor of this House. The only thing we can do as the official opposition is table an opposition motion, which we are today, to talk about the trust of this government, which has been lost by the public. We'll be having a vote on whether or not the majority of the House, including the people of Ontario, have had their confidence in you drained. It's going to be up to you whether or not you're going to ignore or listen to the will of the people.

If it passes, will you do the honourable thing and resign?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I know that the House leader is going to want to speak to the technicalities of the committee in the supplementary, but if the reason that the opposition is bringing forward the motion is that I won't appear at committee, then they can cancel their motion, because I've got a date. I'm going in on December 3. I've been there once, I've told the committee everything that I know, I've been asked to come back again; I am going back again on December 3. I will answer the questions again, but the fact is, I have given the committee all the information that I have.

1100

As I said, we have a date now for December 3. It was just a matter of arranging our schedules. I will be there on December 3 to answer those questions again.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: The last time the Premier appeared, I was actually there, and she really didn't answer any of our questions. In fact, she stuck to that \$40-million claim that she had, which JoAnne Butler debunked yesterday.

It's very clear that you would do anything to cling to power. You wasted \$1.1 billion, and you refuse to be

held accountable for that massive scandal. The moral bankruptcy of this Liberal Party is so patently obvious that you are only able to stay in government because the NDP are enabling you.

Unlike the NDP, we in the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party have been listening to constituents. My leader is right: People want someone to go to jail, and they want the Liberal Party to pay that money back.

While we are here today holding this Liberal government accountable, it is the NDP who are standing on their heads and spitting nickels and sending little trinkets and trash to the horse racing community. We want—

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

Interjections.

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

Premier?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Government House leader.

Hon. John Milloy: Mr. Speaker, let's review the facts. It was this Premier who asked the Auditor General to look at the Oakville plant, who asked the justice committee—expanded the scope—asked them to look into the situation, has appeared in front of committee and has taken responsibility for what happened and put a plan to correct it moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, it was that party that spent the last election going around saying that the only way—the only way—to have the gas plant cancelled was to vote for the Progressive Conservatives. It was that party that put out press releases and went on the Twitterverse and made YouTube videos. It is that party which refuses to talk about their plan and about their costing. It is that party which is not allowing five of their candidates to come forward to the committee and talk about costing.

If you want to talk about a lack of accountability, you have to look no further than the official opposition.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr. Percy Hatfield: My question this morning is for the Premier. Good morning, Premier.

Speaker, New Democrats have repeatedly asked this government to take action to protect cancer services in Windsor and Essex county. Despite grand assurances, cancer patients are set to lose all thoracic surgeries next spring. It seems to the people in Windsor and Essex county that this Liberal government is not listening to their concerns.

I ask the Premier: Is she prepared to stand by and do nothing as Windsor and Essex county lose essential health care services?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I appreciate the question. I know that the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care actually answered this question yesterday and acknowledged, as I want to, the advocacy that the member for Windsor West has done on this issue, both with the Minister of Health and with me, to make sure that the decisions that are being made are in the best interests of all of the constituents in the community.

The experts at Cancer Care Ontario are working to ensure that all patients, including those in Windsor, get the highest quality of care. What that means is that they are looking for ways and assurances that outcomes for cancer patients will continue to improve. That means that hospitals have to meet a minimum volume of surgeries in order for those outcomes to continue to improve and in order to be designated, in this case, as a thoracic centre. We know that the more surgeries that are performed, the better the outcomes are, and that's why the decisions that are being made have been made.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Speaker, the residents of Windsor and Essex county are mobilizing in order to protect health care services. They're asking the government to listen to the hospitals, listen to the physicians and listen to the patients, who know that moving thoracic surgery to London is the wrong thing to do.

Exceptions have been made before. Yet this time the government seems unwilling to consider that the number of surgeries isn't as important as the access to those life-saving cancer surgeries.

I ask this government yet again: Will they take action to protect health services in Windsor and Essex county or are they determined to sit back and do nothing as the public outcry grows and grows and grows?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: We are not going to sit back; we have not been sitting back. It is of primary concern to us that those services are the best services and that they are available to all of the constituents in your riding and the ridings in the community. It's very important to us that the people of Windsor have the very highest-quality services, so we continue to work with the community.

The Ministry of Health continues to work to make sure that the best and highest-quality services are available. That is exactly what the member for Windsor West has been advocating for. She has raised the issue with us. We will continue to work with her and with the member opposite to make sure that those services are available and of the highest quality.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: My question is for the Minister of Labour. I know that our government is committed to investing in youth through our youth employment fund. A large part of investing in our youth is making sure that, while working, they are in a fair and safe workplace.

The constituents in my community of Scarborough–Guildwood are pleased that we're helping youth as this is a top priority for our community. However, they are concerned about the use of internships, where they are not paid, and are speaking out about this issue.

Speaker, through you to the minister: Are such internships legal in Ontario, and what is the ministry doing to make sure that when young people in my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood start a new job, they will be paid for the work that they do?

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: I want to thank the member for Scarborough–Guildwood for asking a very important question and her advocacy on behalf of our young people.

The youth employment fund is a great investment, and I'm pleased that over 2,400 youths across our province have already found jobs through this initiative. That very much speaks to building a stronger workforce and about building safe and fair workplaces.

Speaker, I want to be absolutely clear to all members in this Legislature. In Ontario, it does not matter what your job title or your position is; if you work for someone, you are covered by the Employment Standards Act. There is no such thing as an unpaid internship. There is a narrow exemption for co-op students in accredited university and college programs, trainees and the self-employed.

Any concerns regarding working arrangements can be referred to the Ministry of Labour's hotline at 1-800-531-5551. Help is available in 23 different languages.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you to the minister for his answer outlining the strong rules we have on internships in Ontario. I know the families and the young people in my community of Scarborough–Guildwood will also be pleased to know that their loved ones are protected and treated fairly. It is great to hear that over 2,400 young people have already found jobs through the youth employment fund and can begin building their careers.

But, Minister, I sometimes hear from constituents that even though they know the Ministry of Labour is there to help them, they are reluctant to reach out. Speaker, through you to the minister: Are formal complaints and reactive inspections the only way that the ministry will investigate?

Hon. Yasir Naqvi: Again I want to repeat very clearly that under the law in Ontario, there is no such thing as an unpaid internship. If you work for someone, you are covered under the Employment Standards Act and you're entitled to at least minimum wage, vacation pay etc.

The ministry has been very active on this issue. I, as the Minister of Labour, have been very actively writing to student groups, to post-secondary institutions, to employers and to job sites to make sure that they know what the rule is and that there's no confusion around our rules. As I said, we will investigate any and all complaints to enforce our rules. In addition, our enforcement officers specifically ask about internships during our proactive inspections.

In fact, this past spring, in the budget—through that budget, we are investing an additional \$3 million for proactive employment standards enforcement so that interns' rights are protected. I encourage interns to go to ontario.ca/internshipstandards for clarification.

PAN AM GAMES

Mr. Rod Jackson: My question is to the minister responsible for the Pan Am Games. Minister, security and

transportation are linked, and your laissez-faire approach to security has me a little bit worried about transportation plans as well.

1110

The GTA already experiences some of the worst gridlock in North America, yet there's no plan and no extensive budget released yet. I am concerned because venues like the Pan Am park and the Pan Am villages are connected by one of Toronto's top 10 worst roads or, alternatively, a streetcar that's already the TTC's busiest route. According to leaks, your curious solution is to add thousands more vehicles on this route during the Pan Am Games.

Minister, when are you exactly going to release the transportation master plan for the Pan Am Games?

Hon. Michael Chan: I think that in the last couple of weeks, I had two scheduled debates with the member opposite. They did not happen. Well, he did not show up, and up to this time, I do not know what the reason was for that.

But having said that, as has been our practice, once host jurisdiction responsibilities and plans are confirmed, we state them openly—

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): It has been pointed out that the microphone isn't on or is not working. Can we try that, please? Is it on? It's on.

Hon. Michael Chan: Thank you, Speaker.

That speaks to our commitment to make these games the most open and transparent games.

Our government brought the organizing committee under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. We required senior executives to publicly disclose their salaries on a yearly basis, and we will continue to communicate our progress on the games to the public.

Speaker, in terms of security, once plans are finalized, we will publicly disclose the parts of the plan that will not compromise citizens' safety.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Speaker, you don't start making the plan midway through the process. We know that we're one and a half years out, as the minister keeps pointing out, but it's never too early to become the minister responsible for the Pan Am Games.

I've figured out you won't answer anything in question period, so I've attempted to extract answers through the order paper, and on April 29, I asked you for a transportation plan. You responded that you're working on and it will be completed in "late 2013." Minister, guess what? It's late 2013. There's no plan, there's no budget, and we don't have any word from you on what this is going to cost us.

To avoid transparency, you even desperately tried blocking a motion in committee by voting against an investigation into Pan Am. At any cost, you're avoiding answering these simple questions. Why is that, Minister? Give us the exact date the public can see your transportation master plan and budget.

Hon. Michael Chan: This is not December 2013 yet, so it is not really that late.

Speaker, our transportation master plan will guide our operations as we prepare for the games. We're also working together on an integrated stakeholder outreach and engagement plan which will be used to guide transportation-related communications to all stakeholders.

We cannot speculate what the costs of transportation will be at this moment; the costs will be revealed when the plan is finalized. In other games, transportation plans have come out 12 to 18 months before they are under way, and we are on pace to meet that timeline.

SECURITY AT CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Ms. Peggy Sattler: My question is to the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. This past weekend, Adam Kargus was brutally beaten and murdered at the Elgin-Middlesex Detention Centre. On Monday, the minister shared with this House the number of inmates at EMDC on the night of the murder but failed to tell us the number of correctional officers. We now learn that there were only two officers overseeing three units with a total of 150 inmates, when there should have been two officers in each unit that night. Does the minister believe that this is the right level of staffing to ensure inmate and officer safety?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: The member is speculating on how many staff was there. I know that the EMDC capacity was under capacity that day. I also know that we have done a lot to improve the safety of both our inmates and our correctional officers in EMDC. I am going to continue to work with both the union and the management to make sure that the situation does improve at EMDC.

As I said, we have installed 350 security cameras, a new control module and six metal detectors, and we have increased correctional officers by 11 in the facility.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Again to the minister: The minister is repeating what she told us on Monday, that these new security cameras and these new enhancements are the solution to violence at EMDC. It's true that the cameras helped the police identify and lay charges against the suspects after the fact, but they did not prevent Adam Kargus from losing his life.

When is the ministry going to fix the design flaws at EMDC, implement direct supervision and prevent tragedies like this from ever happening again?

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Yes, this is a tragedy; what happened at EMDC is a tragic situation. I know the police are doing the investigation as we speak, so we're not going to speculate. The coroner's office also will do its own investigation, and, internally, we are doing our investigation. That's the situation, Mr. Speaker.

In our correctional facilities, on a daily basis, the correctional staff deal with and manage risk of inmate violence, and we have policies and procedures to do so.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I'm glad about is that from last year to this year—

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

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Last year there were 244 inmate-on-inmate assaults, and this year we reduced it to—

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

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. John Fraser: My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Minister, I understand that you announced the government's intention to review the Development Charges Act on Friday. On October 18, I, along with all my Ottawa colleagues, joined Mayor Jim Watson to witness the official start of tunnelling for Ottawa's new LRT. This line will transform downtown Ottawa, but also neighbourhoods like "the avenues" in Eastway Gardens and Cyrville, both in my riding of Ottawa South. These investments could cause significant development, radically altering neighbourhoods in communities that my constituents call home. This increased density means additional strains on existing critical infrastructure such as bus routes like the 114, schools like Riverview Alternative and hospitals like the Ottawa Hospital and CHEO.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, could the minister explain to my constituents and me how this review of development could help my community better prepare for it?

Hon. Linda Jeffrey: I want to thank the member for the question. Communities across Ontario are experiencing some of the kinds of changes that are happening in Ottawa, and our government continues to work with municipalities to make sure that that development doesn't mean existing taxpayers are on the hook for costs required for that new development.

We've heard that municipal leaders feel the current system limits their ability to recover all capital costs for some of the services and their ability to pay for those vital infrastructure projects. We've also heard from the development community that they want more accountability and transparency. At the end of the day, everybody wants more clarity when it comes to the costs the government imposes.

Our government believes it's time for a refresh. It's time to make sure the development charges system still answers our communities' needs. I want to urge you and your constituents to participate in the review. We expect the review to include communities and municipal governments, because we want to hear their solid ideas for improvement.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. John Fraser: It's good to hear about our government's continued respect for communities and municipalities, unlike the opposition party, who did not consult with municipalities when they forced amalgamations on communities across the province.

Development, whether it happens in Ottawa or Oliver Paipouge, Niagara Falls or Northeastern Manitoulin, can be contentious. My constituents have numerous questions about land use planning, the appeals system and the Ontario Municipal Board. Some find the current process complicated, difficult to navigate and even harder to understand.

Minister, our government needs to ensure that our planning system works well for municipalities and community groups as well as developers while remaining responsive to the changing needs of our communities. Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, can you explain to my constituents about how they can get involved in this important review?

1120

Hon. Linda Jeffrey: As a former municipal city councillor, I know how challenging development can be for communities, no matter where they are in the province. However, our land use planning system gives municipalities the tools that they can use to manage growth so we can all build the kinds of cities and towns that we want to live, work and play in.

I, too, have heard from municipal leaders, from planners, from developers and from the public that the rules are too complex. They're concerned about the delays, and appeals are also frustrating. That's why our government will be holding regional workshops in Kitchener-Waterloo, Ottawa, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Peel region and Toronto to hear from everyday Ontarians on how we can make the system more responsive to Ontario's changing needs, because well-planned cities that balance Ontario's needs to develop with the protection of our natural heritage mean that our cities are more able to ensure long-term prosperity, environmental health and the social well-being of all the residents of Ontario.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr. Ted Chudleigh: My question is to the Premier. Premier, the people of Ontario love and rely on our health care system. Some say it's one of the defining characteristics of what it means to be Canadian, as it represents a number of our core values as a nation. We define ourselves in terms of our shared responsibilities toward one another and our diverse and inclusive society. We especially help the most vulnerable in our society. It's the Canadian thing to do.

Within that context, the Minister of Health bears a sacred trust and is the person of last resort to whom Ontarians turn in their hour of need. So, Premier, your government continues to refuse to help Kimm Fletcher and others like her.

Premier, my health care system includes Kimm Fletcher. Why doesn't yours?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I know that the Minister of Health has addressed this issue a number of times, and I just want to say that it is, as she has said, a very sad and tragic situation that a young woman with children would

be in this situation and would have such a frightening prognosis.

There is nothing more important than being able to save people's lives and to have the health care system work. But part of that is taking the politics out of these kinds of decisions. That is exactly what we have had to do. We have all the drugs go through an expert committee that undertakes a thorough evaluation based on the best available evidence. That is the process that is in place, and we have to respect that process.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. Ted Chudleigh: Premier, your health care system has devolved into one that creates winners and losers. It is one where you are content to stand back at arm's length awaiting a decision to reach the health minister from a faceless committee that may or may not meet in a timely fashion.

However, time is not a resource that vulnerable individuals like Kimm Fletcher have in abundance. Not knowing whether your health minister's committee will find in her favour, anxiety and worry eat up the time she has left to herself, her family and her friends.

Kimm Fletcher's case also speaks to one of the core values of the role of the Minister of Health. If she can't help vulnerable people like Kimm Fletcher, then what is the purpose of the Minister of Health?

Premier, my health care system includes Kimm Fletcher. If yours doesn't, your Minister of Health is failing the people of Ontario and should be replaced. Premier, will you replace your Minister of Health?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Our Minister of Health is committed, as I believe previous Ministers of Health from other parties have been, to evidence-based practice, because that is the only way to have an objective system that weighs all of the alternatives. The Committee to Evaluate Drugs has twice reviewed Avastin, but even though that is the case, the Minister of Health has asked the committee to ensure that they've reviewed the most recent evidence on Avastin. She has taken that action to make sure that that review happens, but it is imperative that we have some objective measures by which to make these decisions. Difficult and tragic as they are, it is absolutely imperative that we have a system in place in order to make decisions. That is what we will adhere to.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. John Vanthof: My question is to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines. Minister, 20 months ago, the Liberal government announced the divestment of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission without any consultation with northerners and, as it turns out, any thought about the real costs. Northerners united and forced the government to backtrack. In response, the minister created the minister's advisory committee and has since repeatedly stated that divestment is not the only option for the ONTC.

The committee has released its recommendations. My question is simple: Will the minister act on those recommendations?

Hon. Michael Gravelle: Thank you very much for the question. I very much appreciated it. Indeed, we are very committed to seeing that the ONTC remains an efficient and sustainable transportation and telecommunications organization. We are very committed to working with the minister's advisory committee, which we brought together in the early spring. We've had a number of meetings and had some very, very important—and, may I say, some very candid—discussions about the best course forward.

You're right: At the FONOM gathering this past May, I was able to speak there. I wanted to say publicly at that time that we did not see divestment as necessarily being the only option. We've continued those discussions.

You mentioned recommendations coming forward. The fact is that we are still very much continuing our work with the ministerial advisory committee. I'm looking forward to getting together with them again relatively soon, hopefully sometime later this month—we haven't got a date picked quite yet. But again, our commitment is to maintain a system that will work and be efficient and effective for northerners, something we understand how important it is in northeastern Ontario.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. John Vanthof: Once again to the Minister of Northern Development and Mines: The minister's advisory committee has released its recommendations and they show a clear plan forward. The committee and northerners are concerned because the status quo is preventing the company from bidding on contracts, and it's leaving 900 families in turmoil.

Time is of the essence. My question is simple: Is the government going to listen to northerners and act on the recommendations of the minister's advisory committee?

Hon. Michael Gravelle: Again, certainly I will very much acknowledge that the minister's advisory committee has recognized that the status quo is not an option. As I say, we've had significant discussions looking into all lines of the ONTC, and we recognize that the status quo is not an option.

We are determined to find a sustainable solution for all the lines of the ONTC. Indeed, there are opportunities, we believe, potentially in terms of the refurbishment division. Certainly we recognize how important the freight division is, and we're very convinced that, indeed, there are ways that we can actually improve the operations of the ONTC.

We are continuing to work with the members of the minister's advisory committee. They have been very dedicated, and they've worked very, very hard and listened very much to all the information that we've been able to bring together.

That work continues. Our commitment continues—something the Premier feels very strongly about as well. We recognize that the status quo is not an option, we recognize that the right decisions need to be made, and

we're committed to seeing that the right decisions are indeed made.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: I've got a question this morning for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I'd like to ask the minister about one of the recommendations that came out of the Ipperwash Inquiry report.

Speaker, you will know that in 2008, the New Relationship Fund was established, with the intention to facilitate consultations between the government, the private sector, First Nations and Métis communities. Constituents in my riding routinely ask about what action the government is taking to ensure that all First Nations and Métis persons have the same access to opportunities that all Ontarians have.

The New Relationship Fund is obviously a great initiative. It's a very worthwhile cause, but would the minister please tell us about how much progress has been made on this program to date?

Hon. David Zimmer: Thank you for that question. The New Relationship Fund provides communities with tools that will support sustainable economic growth, growth that needs to be in place if there's going to be any kind of effective long-term and meaningful change with our aboriginal communities. The New Relationship Fund supports aboriginal communities and organizations to engage in consultation with government and the private sector.

There are three types of funding. Core consultation funding is available to First Nations and Métis communities so that they can better engage with government and the private sector on lands and resources issues. A second type of funding, enhanced capacity-building funding, is available to First Nations, Métis communities and aboriginal communities. This helps to build additional capacity over and above the core capacity funding.

1130

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the future prosperity of Ontario is dependent on the full participation of all Ontarians—First Nations, Inuit and Métis—

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

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: The fund sounds quite progressive. It appears to be a very solid step in ensuring that First Nations and Métis persons in Ontario have access to good opportunities.

What my constituents want to know, though, Speaker, is how the fund is actually working. What they really want to know is how the New Relationship Fund is delivering results, and they want to know that the funding is money well spent.

Can the minister tell the House of some very specific examples of the New Relationship Fund and how it's working to link aboriginal communities in a meaningful engagement with the government and the private sector?

Hon. David Zimmer: Quite specifically, between 2008 and 2013, the New Relationship Fund has invested

\$77.4 million to support over 520 projects in 137 First Nations, 33 Métis communities and 23 aboriginal organizations. That's a total of 193 recipients. We've created more than 540 jobs.

A further \$14.5 million in funding has been allocated for the 2013-14 year to fund another 50 new projects and the existing core consultation multi-year agreements. There are three new core capacity multi-year agreements and 47 enhanced capacity projects, which include, for the first time, three First Nations and aboriginal organizations.

The New Relationship Fund is just another step in strengthening our government's relationship with aboriginal peoples.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we are all in this together—all Ontarians—aboriginals, Métis and First Nations. We're going to build a stronger Ontario for everyone.

PENSION PLANS

Mrs. Julia Munro: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. You and your government have had 10 years to come forward with a plan on retirement security. You've had a decade to reform our public sector pension system to reduce the \$100-billion unfunded liability. You've had a decade to address the lack of financial literacy in this province. You've had years to come forward with PRPP legislation. You have done nothing, while every year more and more people see their savings as inadequate for retirement.

Now, over the last few weeks, you are advocating CPP reform and possibly a new Ontario pension plan. Which ever it is, it amounts to more mandatory deductions from Ontario workers and businesses.

On Monday, you said that an enhanced CPP is your first choice to help Ontarians be ready for their retirement. What is your second choice?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: Minister of Finance.

Hon. Charles Sousa: I appreciate the question. I appreciate the work and concerns that the member opposite and all members of this House share, and that's the well-being of Ontarians in retirement. I think we can all agree, amongst the people in this House, and for that matter all across Ontario, all across Canada, Speaker, that there is a problem. The problem is, people don't have enough to retire—for those who are relying on CPP alone. As a consequence, the Ministers of Finance gathered here in Toronto last week, and we came to an agreement that we need to address it. We came to an agreement with principles that will be used when the Premiers meet at the Council of the Federation next week. That will also be the premise on which we speak with Minister Flaherty, your counterpart in the federal government, to encourage him to look at ways to enhance the CPP in a moderate way to protect Ontarians, while at the same time stimulating economic growth in our province.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mrs. Julia Munro: Well, that answer suggests to me that your second choice is the idea of a new Ontario pension plan, an OPP that would mimic the CPP. This idea of yours would be an additional payroll tax on employers. An Ontario plan would be new liability for the provincial government because it would pay the employer portion of the pension for its nearly 1.4 million employees.

You are aware that the province has a budget deficit of \$10 billion and a \$280-billion debt. Each year, the province pays nearly \$11 billion in interest on its debt. It is time for cost containment and wage freezes, but you still want to spend your way out of economic difficulty.

Premier, are you aware that a new Ontario pension plan would cost taxpayers an additional \$3.3 billion per year?

Hon. Charles Sousa: What I think the people of Ontario are looking for is leadership. They're not looking for the short-sighted vision that's being spewed by the opposition. What they're afraid of is making some tough decisions today for the benefit of our children of tomorrow.

We recognize that we are in economic times where we're trying to recover. We're making everything possible to stimulate that growth, but we're going to take leadership to try to protect the interest of Ontarians in the future, and, for that matter, all of Canada. The opposition would rather stay as it is and take things away from Ontarians and Canadians. The other side wants to give it away, no less. We have to take a balanced approach. We've got to look to the future. We will do that with or without you. We are looking at other opportunities. PRPPs are part of the mix, but we have to do better, and that's why we need to encourage everyone to come together and look at enhancing the CPP.

AGRI-FOOD INDUSTRY

Mr. John Vanthof: My question is to the Premier and Minister of Agriculture and Food. Ontario's small food processors have been hit with constant regulation changes that are unpractical, costly and do not improve food safety. Half of our 267 abattoirs in Ontario have shut down since 1998. The NDP included a motion in the Local Food Act that one of the goals and targets for the minister would be to reduce or streamline regulations, specifically for small abattoirs. That motion was defeated by the government.

You can't have local food without local processors. Is the Premier prepared to ensure that small processors can keep their doors open?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: The member opposite is asking this question in the aftermath of my most recent meeting with the Open for Business round table. That table is specifically geared to government and our ministry working with the sector to make sure that regulations that need to be changed—or that need to be loosened or tightened—that that happens at that table and we come to some agreement. It is working very well.

In fact, there were a number of regulations, things like waste water, that have been raised with me and that have been changed, that are being changed because we heard from the sector that they weren't working. I can think of no better process than actually working with the people who are in the business giving us information about what government is doing that is either hampering them or helping them. We're going to continue in that manner.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Supplementary?

Mr. John Vanthof: Once again, to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I'd repeat: Rural areas need local food too.

I know that table is happening, but currently the regulations facing processors are one-size-fits-all and, quite frankly, that doesn't work for a lot of mom-and-pop shops that aren't necessarily now included in that open table process. Those are the ones that process local food for small communities. It's very important.

Once again, will the Premier ensure that those processors are also represented, like they could have been in the Local Food Act?

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne: I really do appreciate the question, and this is something that has been raised with me a number of times as the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I understand the difference in the capacity of the smaller operators compared with the larger operators, so we're going to continue to work with them.

I also know that they are acutely aware of the need to have high safety standards and food security standards in place, and I know the member opposite appreciates that as well. We will continue to work with all of the processors, and as I say, the Open for Business round table is the place where that discussion needs to take place.

SPECIAL REPORT, ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSIONER OF ONTARIO

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table a special report from the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario.

VISITORS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): You may have noticed that there were two people in the Speaker's gallery; they had to leave.

One of them was a good school chum of mine, Mr. Pat Hickey, who was drafted in the NHL in 1973 and played until 1985. I beat him in basketball, but he beat me in hockey. He played for the Rangers, Rockies, Leafs, Nordiques and Blues.

With him was Matt Hurst, a colleague of his who is presently working in the capital markets.

The member from London-Fanshawe on a point of order.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I want to just add to the visitor introduction that I did that Riley plays both as a goalie with the Bantam AA Aurora Panthers and as a centre with the Weston Dodgers. She's a very busy girl.

DEFERRED VOTES

REGISTERED HUMAN RESOURCES
PROFESSIONALS ACT, 2013LOI DE 2013 SUR LES PROFESSIONNELS
EN RESSOURCES HUMAINES INSCRITS

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

Bill 32, An Act respecting the Human Resources Professionals Association / Projet de loi 32, Loi concernant l'Association des professionnels en ressources humaines.

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

The division bells rang from 1140 to 1145.

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

On November 5, Mr. Dhillon moved third reading of Bill 32.

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

Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Gravelle, Michael	Milloy, John
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Hardeman, Ernie	Moridi, Reza
Arnott, Ted	Harris, Michael	Munro, Julia
Bailey, Robert	Hatfield, Percy	Murray, Glen R.
Balkissoon, Bas	Holyday, Douglas C.	Naqvi, Yasir
Bartolucci, Rick	Horwath, Andrea	Nicholls, Rick
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Hoskins, Eric	O'Toole, John
Bisson, Gilles	Hudak, Tim	Oraziotti, David
Bradley, James J.	Hunter, Mitzie	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Campbell, Sarah	Jackson, Rod	Pettapiece, Randy
Cansfield, Donna H.	Jaczek, Helena	Piruzza, Teresa
Chan, Michael	Jeffrey, Linda	Prue, Michael
Chiarelli, Bob	Jones, Sylvia	Qaadri, Shafiq
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Sandals, Liz
Clark, Steve	Leal, Jeff	Sattler, Peggy
Colle, Mike	Leone, Rob	Schein, Jonah
Coteau, Michael	MacCharles, Tracy	Scott, Laurie
Crack, Grant	MacLaren, Jack	Sergio, Mario
Damerla, Dipika	MacLeod, Lisa	Shurman, Peter
Del Duca, Steven	Mangat, Amrit	Singh, Jagmeet
Delaney, Bob	Mantha, Michael	Smith, Todd
Dhillon, Vic	Marchese, Rosario	Sousa, Charles
Dickson, Joe	Mauro, Bill	Taylor, Monique
DiNovo, Cheri	McDonell, Jim	Thompson, Lisa M.
Duguid, Brad	McKenna, Jane	Vanthof, John
Dunlop, Garfield	McMeekin, Ted	Walker, Bill
Elliott, Christine	McNaughton, Monte	Wilson, Jim
Fife, Catherine	McNeely, Phil	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Meilleur, Madeleine	Yakabuski, John
Forster, Cindy	Miller, Norm	Yurek, Jeff
Fraser, John	Miller, Paul	Zimmer, David
Gélinas, France	Milligan, Rob E.	

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

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 95; the nays are 0.

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.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member for Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound, on a point of order.

Mr. Bill Walker: Mr. Speaker, on November 4 when speaking to Bill 36, I stated \$527 million. I'd like to correct my record: It should have been \$527,000.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): As all members know, it's very in order to correct your record.

There are no further deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m. this afternoon.

The House recessed from 1150 to 1500.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

4-H

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of 4-H in Canada. The organization was founded in 1913, with an Ontario branch opening just two years later.

4-H is an important part of many communities throughout the province, including in my riding of Oxford. The organization teaches children valuable life lessons and skills by allowing children to learn to do by doing, which is the 4-H motto.

Today is 4-H wear green day, an annual event to raise support and awareness of 4-H. In honour of the 100th anniversary, many members of the PC caucus are wearing green today, the official colour of 4-H. In fact, the anniversary is particularly special for many of our members who are former 4-H participants. Some of those proud 4-H alumni include the members from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, Kitchener–Conestoga, Carleton–Mississippi Mills, Dufferin–Caledon and the member from Huron–Bruce, who was a past chair of the Ontario 4-H Foundation.

4-H promotes growth and learning in a fun and safe environment, including countless contributions to rural Ontario. The program also teaches children about arts and culture, livestock and agriculture, food preparation and nutrition. Really, the list goes on and on.

4-H continues to shape our youth into wonderful members of our communities across the province. I'm happy to wear green today, in support of 4-H, and wish them all the best in the next 100 years. Congratulations.

SHINE THE LIGHT
ON WOMAN ABUSE CAMPAIGN

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: This past Friday, I had the honour of joining members of the London community for the kickoff of the 2013 Shine the Light on Woman Abuse campaign. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce this vital campaign to the members present.

Shine the Light on Woman Abuse is an initiative of the London Abused Women's Centre, an organization providing abused women with hope, and help for their

hurt, through the provision of advocacy, counselling and support services in a safe, non-crisis, non-residential setting in the London community.

Launched in 2010, the campaign aims to raise public awareness of male violence against women by turning cities, regions and countries purple for the month of November to stand in solidarity with abused women and support them in the understanding that the shame and/or blame they feel does not belong to them but to the perpetrators of their abuse, and to raise the profile of the community agencies that can provide abused women with help as they attempt to live their lives free of violence and abuse.

Each year, the shine the light campaign honours those women who have lost their lives to domestic abuse, and I would like to express my gratitude and support for the London Abused Women's Centre and its ongoing efforts to raise social awareness and eradicate violence against women.

I would also like to encourage my fellow MPPs to wear purple on November 15 and help spread the word about this important campaign in their respective communities.

CAREFIRST ONE-STOP MULTI-SERVICES CENTRE

Ms. Soo Wong: I'm pleased to rise today to join leaders from my community at the official groundbreaking at the Carefirst One-Stop Multi-Services Centre in Scarborough. This centre will combine community, social and health services at a one-stop, easy-to-access location that will serve my constituents in Scarborough–Agincourt.

This centre is only possible through this government's commitment to deliver health care and social services in the right place and at the right time.

This ambitious initiative is led by Carefirst Seniors and Community Services Association, and will provide programs to Chinese, Filipino, Tamil and many other ethnic community members who are traditionally underserved.

I want to congratulate Sunny Ho, Helen Leung and the entire team at Carefirst Seniors and Community Services Association, who made this one-stop, multi-service centre possible.

It is also through Carefirst's dedication and commitment to serve our community that they were successful in raising over \$6 million and further support from the Ontario Trillium Foundation and Ontario Infrastructure loans. We expect this centre will be open in 2014, and I look forward to the many success stories that I'm also confident they will have in the years ahead.

ONTARIO DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Elgin–Kent–Middlesex.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Elgin–Middlesex–London.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Elgin–Middlesex–London.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Thanks, Speaker. I rise today about an issue of growing concern to residents in my riding and across the province. In October 2012, Health Canada approved the medication Esbriet for individuals with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Esbriet is the first medication of its kind to be approved in Canada for the treatment of IPF to slow the progression of this fatal disease.

The Ministry of Health has refused to list Esbriet on the Ontario drug benefit formulary, and the expense of this medication is creating financial hardship for many individuals and their families. Most patients go without treatment.

There's an ever-growing list of newer, high-cost medications for the treatment of complex diseases not covered by the ODB plan. This list will continue to grow as technology improves drug development and gives the medical community new medications to treat and cure diseases that we never thought possible.

It is time for the government to review the Ontario Drug Benefit Program drug approval and reimbursement policy. This program has created a two-tier health care program: those who can afford life-saving, modernized medication to treat disease and those who will go without.

In the meantime, I call on the government to reconsider their position and include Esbriet in the ODB formulary.

NORTHERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Percy Hatfield: In my role as infrastructure critic, I had the opportunity to visit the thriving community of Thunder Bay, and I am in awe of the great potential for future development in northwestern Ontario.

There are nine mining projects ready to be online in the near future. That will lead to an investment of more than \$7 billion—that's billion, with a "b." More than 4,600 construction jobs will be created, and they'll need more than 3,500 people in operations. But the region needs more reliable energy sources and more roads and transmission lines.

Almost a year ago to the day, this Liberal government stopped the plan to convert the coal-burning Thunder Bay generating station to natural gas. Last month, the Minister of Energy told us that a decision would be made soon on what to do about that, but first he wanted more meetings—more conversations, more meetings, more delays.

The people I met with are tired of the delays. People in northwestern Ontario want leadership on this file. They want answers. They want decisions now, not next spring sometime on the eve of an election, so a tip of the hat to the hard-working people of northwestern Ontario.

I join my leader, Andrea Horwath, and my NDP colleagues in recognizing that although the Liberals don't have a plan, people in the Thunder Bay region do. They

have a plan for growth, but they need more reliable sources of energy to make it happen.

No more delays. Action for the north is required now.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti: It gives me great pleasure to rise in the Legislature today to share my experiences at the youth employment fund echo announcement that took place at the Career Foundation in my riding of Scarborough Southwest on Friday, October 18.

Located on Kingston Road, the Career Foundation has provided a number of individuals with the skills and resources necessary to make them more competitive in today's economy. The purpose of the event was to promote awareness of the Ontario Youth Jobs Strategy and the Ontario Youth Employment Fund.

I was pleased to hear from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities that over 1,200 young people had received job placements and gainful employment through this particular initiative. That means that as of last Friday, 2,414 individuals had been placed into this program, and that doubles our previous benchmark.

Let's be real for a moment, though. The province of Ontario is currently experiencing one of the highest levels of youth unemployment that we've seen in recent history. However, initiatives such as the youth employment fund are modest but promising examples of how our government is tackling youth unemployment head-on and making Ontario a more fair and prosperous province for all.

That's basically what I want to say this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I rise today to recognize the upcoming special day, Remembrance Day. In doing so, I have come to reflect on the many sacrifices made by men and women from communities across Ontario in times of war. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we can't do enough in terms of saying thank you and recognizing these folks.

So I was heartened, a week ago, while I was running around Queen's Park on first floor, that there are some wonderful displays. One in particular caught my eye, and that display comes from Clinton, Ontario—more than just Alice Munro comes from Clinton, Ontario. Here, downstairs, I encourage everybody to take time to walk towards the west door. Specifically, you'll see a display that honours and reflects on something that is unique to Clinton, Ontario: the Clinton Station, which was established in 1941 by the Royal Air Force.

1510

Again, Clinton is a farming community, but as part of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan to train Canadian radar operators and technicians, it was established right there in Clinton. The idea behind training was to prepare these people to go overseas. It was the

first radar base in North America, in what is today our riding of Huron—Bruce.

There's a display, as I said, in the lobby, along with other displays on the contributions of communities from across Ontario to recognize their efforts in World War II. I would encourage all of you to take a look as we pause to remember their heroic sacrifices. We can never forget.

TASTE OF STREETSVILLE

Mr. Bob Delaney: At western Mississauga's Credit Valley Hospital, now part of Trillium Health Partners, they think of the annual Taste of Streetsville restaurant promotion and fundraiser as "A Taste of Money." Ten of our most exquisite restaurants in historic Streetsville—155 years young—each year offer a three-course prix fixe menu for just \$25 per person. You heard that right: just \$25 per person. The promotion ran from September 9 through October 6. A portion of those proceeds goes to the redevelopment of the Credit Valley Hospital emergency ward.

It's how our neighbours in Lisgar, Meadowvale and Streetsville pitch in together to build a great community. It's why people everywhere come to our three northwest Mississauga communities and wish that they could live there.

For 2013, the Taste of Streetsville raised \$2,222 for our local share of the Credit Valley Hospital emergency ward redevelopment. That donation will show up as expanded clinical support services, such as diagnostic imaging. It took more than 4,000 diners to come together and raise that money.

Kristin Scarfone, manager of community development, called it the most successful Taste of Streetsville ever. Ontario's thanks also go to Angie Trewartha and the Streetsville BIA for organizing the Taste of Streetsville in this year of 2013.

TAKE OUR KIDS TO WORK DAY

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Today, all across Ontario, workplaces are changing, because today is Take Our Kids to Work Day. Workplaces are transforming into mini-classrooms as thousands of grade 9 students are finding out first-hand what it's like to have a job. Students are being welcomed into the varied workplaces of their parents or volunteer hosts. This is an exciting day for many students, because it provides them with an opportunity to experience first-hand different careers.

In Ontario, grade 9 students may for the first time consider a career path because they have the opportunity to observe and participate in a workplace. Educational experiences beyond the walls of our classrooms are recognized as valuable learning tools, and Take Our Kids to Work Day is an important extracurricular activity for students who are in the process of deciding and planning their futures.

I applaud the students, school boards, employers and employees who are participating today because they

recognize the importance of sharing on-the-job experience with our youth. I wish everyone a productive and safe Take Our Kids to Work Day. I know the lessons learned through this experience will be memorable for all, particularly the two hours of committee that my son is going to sit through this afternoon.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): We still don't disagree with his original statement.

I thank all members for their comments.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti: I beg leave to present a report on agencies, boards and commissions, Workplace Safety and Insurance Board, from the Standing Committee on Government Agencies and move the adoption of its recommendations.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Mr. Berardinetti presents the committee's report and moves the adoption of its recommendations.

Does the member wish to make a brief statement?

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti: No, thank you. I'd just like to move adjournment of the debate.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Mr. Berardinetti moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

Debate adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

WORKPLACE SAFETY AND INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT (PERMANENT PARTIAL DISABILITY SUPPLEMENTS), 2013

LOI DE 2013 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA SÉCURITÉ PROFESSIONNELLE ET L'ASSURANCE CONTRE LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL (SUPPLÉMENT POUR INVALIDITÉ PARTIELLE À CARACTÈRE PERMANENT)

Mr. Berardinetti moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 128, An Act to amend the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997 with respect to permanent partial disability supplements / Projet de loi 128, Loi modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la sécurité professionnelle et l'assurance contre les accidents du travail en ce qui concerne le supplément pour invalidité partielle à caractère permanent.

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. Lorenzo Berardinetti: The bill amends section 110 of the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997 so that any pension a worker is eligible for under the Old Age Security Act of Canada does not reduce the worker's permanent partial disability benefits for pre-1985 and pre-1989 injuries under the pre-1997 act.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

ABORIGINAL VETERANS

Hon. David Zimmer: Speaker, I want to make some remarks around Remembrance Day and the role of our aboriginal community in veterans' events. I want to acknowledge first that I am delivering my remarks on the traditional territory of the Mississaugas of New Credit.

I rise today in the Legislature to recognize that November 8 is Aboriginal Veterans Day, an opportunity for Ontarians, and indeed all Canadians, to recognize the sacrifices of First Nation, Inuit and Métis veterans in protecting our freedoms.

Time and time again, aboriginal men and women have volunteered to fight alongside British and Canadian soldiers. In fact, many historians agree that if it weren't for the First Nation warriors and the Métis fighters who fought alongside British soldiers and Canadian militia during the War of 1812, there would be no country called Canada today. Aboriginal people and communities are proud of their military contributions and achievements, and rightly so. They are truly warriors.

As an example of the tradition of military service that exists, members of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, located on the Bruce Peninsula, served in the War of 1812, the 1991 Gulf War in the Middle East and every major conflict in between. As another example, during the First World War, more than 4,000 aboriginal people across Canada left their First Nations to join the fight, even though they were exempt from conscription.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I've had the honour of meeting several First Nation and Métis veterans. During the Métis Nation of Ontario's annual general assembly in August, I met 100-year-old Métis veteran Alex Boucher, who served in the Second World War. He was fit, he was vital and he was proud of his service. He had a chest full of medals that sparkled in the sunlight.

1520

It is vital that young people understand and appreciate the role that veterans, especially aboriginal veterans, have played in protecting Canadian freedoms. That's why I was so pleased to learn that Mr. Boucher and other Métis veterans had the opportunity to tour the Canadian War

Museum with the Métis youth in attendance at that AGM a couple of months ago.

Mr. Speaker, although war should never be glorified, it is important to take the time to recognize the sacrifices of veterans from all backgrounds. That's why we have produced a short video to raise awareness of the contributions of our aboriginal veterans. The video includes interviews with Six Nation veterans Jesse Green and M.C. White as well as Métis veteran Alis Kennedy. It also features Peter Ittinuar, who shares memories of his father, Ollie, who was a Canadian Ranger and the first person from Nunavut to be invested with the Order of Military Merit for his bravery on the battle scene.

The Canadian Rangers are volunteers who provide a military presence on Canada's sparsely populated northern coast and other isolated areas, including northern Ontario, where they provide formal support for the Ontario Provincial Police in very dangerous search and rescue operations. These brave men and women are often the first responders in northern remote communities, providing assistance during medical evacuations as well as when communities are under the threat of forest fires or flooding.

The video also includes an interview with Alison Baker, a teacher at Bala Avenue Community School in the Mount Dennis neighbourhood of Toronto. Ms. Baker is teaching her students about the sacrifices that veterans of all backgrounds made during the war. She also wants her First Nations students to be proud of and to recognize the heroism of veterans from their own culture. The video is available now on the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs' Tumblr site and will be featured on the government of Ontario's blog tomorrow.

Many aboriginal soldiers distinguished themselves on the battlefield by using their traditional hunting and military expertise to carry out very dangerous tasks. During the First World War alone, over 50 medals were awarded to aboriginal peoples in Canada for their bravery and heroic acts on the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, on Aboriginal Veterans Day, November 8, I urge all people of Ontario and all Canadians to take some time and learn about the contributions and achievements of First Nation, Métis and Inuit veterans. Hundreds of aboriginal people across Canada have made the ultimate sacrifice: They have died, giving fully of their lives so that Canadians can experience peace and inherit freedom. For that, Speaker, Ontarians owe aboriginal veterans and veterans of all backgrounds an everlasting debt of gratitude.

Lest we forget.

CRIME PREVENTION WEEK
SEMAINE DE LA PRÉVENTION
DU CRIME

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to acknowledge Crime Prevention Week in Ontario, which runs from November 3 to 9. During this

week, we celebrate the partnership among police, community organizations and the people of Ontario as they work together to keep our communities and neighbourhoods safe. Throughout the week, the ministry is showcasing examples of these partnerships on our ministry website. It is through local collaboration and engagement that communities are able to develop an effective multi-sector approach to crime prevention and to build stronger and safer communities. I hope the message will resonate with all Ontarians.

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario reconnaît l'importance d'investir dans la prévention du crime et des initiatives de sécurité communautaire partout dans la province et joue un rôle actif dans le maintien de la sécurité des quartiers de l'Ontario.

Preventing crime is more effective than simply focusing on enforcement and punishment. As the old saying goes, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. A dollar invested now in crime prevention and early intervention avoids \$7 spent on prosecution, incarceration and other associated costs in the future. It is on the ground, at the community level, where we can make the biggest difference.

This year, under the proceeds-of-crime grants, approximately \$2.2 million has been allocated to 20 police services to implement projects related to crime prevention and community mobilization initiatives.

Since 2003, we have allocated approximately \$7 million in local, community-based, crime-prevention programs through our Safer and Vital Communities Grant.

The government has also invested over \$85 million in funding for other grant programs related to crime prevention, including the Toronto and provincial anti-violence intervention strategies and the Reduce Impaired Driving Everywhere grant program.

In addition to our grant programs, ministry staff are meeting with police services, community groups and other interested parties across the province to continue the dialogue we started with the publication of our booklet *Crime Prevention in Ontario: A Framework for Action*.

We are now in phase 2. We are engaging various stakeholders through community consultations, and collecting input from Ontario's diverse urban, rural and remote communities, including aboriginal communities. It is important that we get this right by involving all of our stakeholders. These are not decisions the government or the police can make on their own.

Nous sommes tous partenaires dans la prévention du crime. C'est la raison d'être de la Semaine de la prévention du crime.

Ontario businesses, schools, community groups, police, and probation and parole officers need to continue to work together to protect our neighbourhoods, prevent at-risk Ontarians from becoming first-time offenders, and stop first-time offenders from becoming repeat offenders.

This week, I encourage all members to take part in Crime Prevention Week activities in their communities and to send a clear message that in Ontario we stand united in crime prevention.

MEDICAL RADIATION SCIENCES WEEK

Hon. Deborah Matthews: November 3 to 9 is Medical Radiation Sciences Week in Ontario, celebrated in conjunction with Medical Radiation Technologists Week in Canada. This week gives us an opportunity to express our heartfelt gratitude to our dedicated medical radiation science practitioners, who play such a crucial role in the province's health care system.

Today, members of the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences are with us at Queen's Park to educate MPPs and raise awareness of the importance of their work to the health of Ontarians and the province's health care system.

Speaker, I believe we have people in the House with us today, so I'd like to welcome Greg Toffner, Julie Mathewson, Komal Mazhar, Marie Girotti, Cathy Baxter, Danica Prusic, Sheena Bhimji-Hewitt, Stephanie Mercier, Debbie Havill, Diana Farcas, Mary Markwart, Leonard Domino, Veni Li, Bernard Miller and everyone else from the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences. Thank you for coming to Queen's Park today.

In Ontario, approximately 5,800 medical radiation technologists are employed in hospitals, clinics, research labs, industry, education and administration. Nationwide, there are about 11,000 technologists. Members of the association are an integral part of the health care team, adding their expertise in five disciplines of medical imaging and radiation science: radiography, magnetic resonance imaging, nuclear medicine, ultrasonography, and radiation therapy. The importance of their contributions to a safe and effective health care system cannot be overstated, and their dedication and commitment to the health of Ontarians deserve to be recognized and celebrated. Indeed, they form a vital link between care and technology. Our modern health care system simply could not function without their professional knowledge, skill and expertise.

1530

MRTs and ultrasonographers use radiation, electromagnetism or sound waves to produce images of the body and to administer radiation for the treatment of disease. MRTs and ultrasonographers undergo rigorous training in anatomy, examination and treatment-delivery techniques, equipment protocols, radiation safety, radiation protection and patient care. By the time they're qualified to practise, they are very well versed in the application of new imaging and therapeutic technologies. By analyzing a variety of complex diagnostic images, they help clinicians to make the correct diagnosis so the right treatment can be applied.

Medical radiation science practitioners are highly dedicated, knowledgeable and competent health care professionals, and I'd like to briefly describe the work of their different disciplines.

Radiological technologists operate highly technical equipment, using film or computers to produce images of the body for the purposes of diagnosis and treatment. For example, they provide mammograms to women across the province.

Radiation therapists play a particularly important role in Ontario's cancer treatment system. They must have the knowledge to interpret the radiation treatment prescription, determine its appropriateness, counsel the patient regarding side effects, and monitor the patient's physical and psychological well-being during the entire course of treatment. In their careful hands, radiation helps to destroy tumours while minimizing harm to healthy tissues. Truly, they walk beside so many patients throughout their cancer journey. For that, they have my deepest gratitude.

Nuclear medicine technologists safely detect disease in its early stages. They use special cameras, computers and radioactive tracers to image how disease or treatment alters organ system function.

Ultrasonography is a highly evolving profession. Ultrasonographers use high-frequency sound waves to acquire real-time images of the human body. They have a wide range of specialties and therefore provide a wide range of services to Ontarians, including obstetrical, cardiac and musculoskeletal imaging.

Finally, magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI, technologists produce images using magnetic fields and radio-frequency pulses to aid in the diagnosis of disease. The safety and non-invasiveness of MRI makes it a valuable tool for physicians. MRI is the fastest-growing imaging modality, and it's replacing many invasive procedures in today's health care environment.

I'm proud to say that our government is making important strides in the area of medical radiation sciences. Our government is undertaking a review of the Healing Arts Radiation Protection Act, or the HARP Act, in order to keep pace with the changes in Ontario's medical imaging system. That legislation protects the public by setting safety standards and by limiting who could prescribe the irradiation of persons and who can operate X-ray machines and equipment.

Phased consultative exercises began in December 2012 and are still under way. A broad range of stakeholders and experts in the field are being consulted about ways to modernize the legislation, including individuals and organizations representing the MRT profession.

Speaker, as we mark Medical Radiation Sciences Week in Ontario, let us thank these highly trained health care professionals who help keep Ontarians healthy. I'd also like to thank the members of the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences for coming to Queen's Park today and for your dedication to continued quality improvement.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Responses?

ABORIGINAL VETERANS

Mr. Norm Miller: It's my pleasure in the short minute and a half I have to respond to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and to talk about Aboriginal Veterans Day.

Every year on November 8, we remember the First Nation, Métis and Inuit men and women who participated

in wars and armed conflicts throughout Canada's history. Over 7,000 recognized aboriginal people fought in the First and Second World Wars and in the Korean War as well as an unknown number of Inuit, Métis and non-status First Nations people. One aboriginal veterans group estimates that 12,000 aboriginals served in these three wars, and 500 lost their lives.

I would also like to note, of course, that the most highly decorated First Nations soldier in Canadian history was Francis "Peggy" Pegahmagabow from Wasauksing First Nation in my riding of Parry Sound–Muskoka. That is certainly something we're very proud of in the riding of Parry Sound–Muskoka.

Also, I would like to note that the Canadian Forces Rangers, who are members of the Canadian Forces Reserve, maintain a national military presence in remote areas of northern Canada, and over half of the rangers are of aboriginal descent.

On behalf of PC leader Tim Hudak and the PC caucus, I would like to thank all First Nations, Métis and Inuit men and women for their long history of military service and for sacrificing their lives to ensure peace and freedom for all Canadians.

CRIME PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. Steve Clark: I'm pleased to respond to the minister's statement on Crime Prevention Week. I first want to acknowledge some leaders in Ontario's policing community who represent the men and women proudly serving Ontarians and police services across this province. They include OPP commissioner Chris Lewis and Ontario Provincial Police Association president Jim Christie; Police Association of Ontario acting president Dan Axford and their CAO, Paul Di Simoni; and Chief Paul Cook, president of the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police.

Our PC caucus has been a strong supporter of Ontario's police. As the new critic, I look forward to building on that relationship.

Crime Prevention Week highlights the fact that police work is more than just investigations and arrests—things that happen after a crime is committed. Some of the most important work police do is educating people about how to avoid becoming a victim of crime. I look at my own Brockville Police Service; their Lock It or Lose It initiative is just one example of that program.

We all applaud the fact that crime rates are falling, but we must recognize it doesn't happen by magic. It takes a lot of hard work. As we mark Crime Prevention Week, front-line police officers can count on our caucus to be strong advocates for them to have the resources they need to do their jobs and to keep Ontarians safe.

MEDICAL RADIATION SCIENCES WEEK

Mrs. Christine Elliott: I'm pleased to respond to the minister's statement with respect to Canadian Medical Radiation Sciences Week. Medical radiation science

practitioners are an integral part of our health care system. The Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences represents the medical radiation technologists, radiation therapists and ultrasonographers.

The association has joined us today at Queen's Park—and we thank you very much for your presence here today—to educate members on why sonographers should be governed under the Regulated Health Professions Act. Digital medical sonographers are often required to perform invasive procedures that require the use of controlled acts listed under the RHPA. Sonographers work in hospitals, independent health facilities, research labs, educational institutions and commercial sectors.

The association would like to see sonographers regulated through a regulatory college, which they believe will legitimize standards, create accountability and better serve the public interest. Sonography is part of the multidisciplinary approach to diagnostic imaging, which includes the existing regulated medical radiation technology specialists of radiological technology, magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI, radiation therapy and nuclear medicine.

In conclusion, I would like to thank everyone representing the Ontario Association of Medical Radiation Sciences for joining us today at Queen's Park and for raising these important issues.

ABORIGINAL VETERANS

Ms. Sarah Campbell: I'm pleased to rise and speak in support of Aboriginal Veterans Day, which is taking place on November 8. Aboriginal veterans have served in Canada's military forces in great numbers since the War of 1812. It is thanks to their unwavering commitment and contributions that Canada is what it is today.

A colleague once told me about a Canadian aboriginal war veteran who chose to serve in the Korean War. He was one of an estimated 12,000 aboriginal people from across Canada to serve in this war and the First and Second World Wars, and his story is reflective of the special circumstances and challenges that this group of veterans faced. This young man, barely 20, spent very little of his brief life in the world beyond his tiny First Nation community, and some of his community members questioned his commitment to a cause so far away from home and his own people.

1540

His company came under fire on the train platform soon after arriving in Korea, and within weeks he had been wounded by sniper fire and a grenade blast. Then the plane that was airlifting him back to his home country crashed.

His family was notified of his death after a search for the wreckage failed to locate it. When a later search proved successful in finding both the wreckage and survivors, news did not immediately make it back to his small Canadian First Nation community. Imagine the shock as this decorated soldier walked into the house during his own funeral. This veteran said that he had

essentially crossed through two worlds as part of his service, one in Canada and a second in Korea.

Hundreds of Canadian aboriginal war veterans never did make it home after making this commitment, and hundreds more have been decorated with honours and awards for their bravery and special services. Across my riding of Kenora–Rainy River, there are hundreds of stories of aboriginal war veterans, both men and women, who have served and continue to serve. As should be the case for all who make this sacrifice, these veterans should be acknowledged and commended, but with a clear understanding of their special circumstances.

Lest we forget.

CRIME PREVENTION WEEK

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I'm pleased to offer my comments on behalf of Andrea Horwath and the NDP caucus in recognition of Crime Prevention Week in Ontario. This week acknowledges that proactively preventing crime contributes more to community safety and well-being than enforcing the law once a crime has been committed. It also recognizes that the most effective crime prevention strategies involve partnerships among police, school boards, community organizations, health and social service professionals, residents, businesses, and others.

The crime prevention strategies being showcased this week across Ontario generally fall into three categories.

Traditional approaches involve the police, the courts and the correctional system. Under Ontario's new model of community policing, this approach is placing greater emphasis on community engagement, consultation and mobilization.

The second approach is situational, involving strategies that range from common sense safety precautions to comprehensive community planning.

The third approach, crime prevention through social development, is also the most effective. It is focused on changing the underlying conditions that are the root causes of crime, such as poverty, poor parenting, inadequate housing, family violence, substance abuse, negative school experiences, unemployment and social exclusion.

We all have a part to play in finding new, innovative and collaborative ways to work together to prevent crime and make Ontario neighbourhoods safe.

MEDICAL RADIATION SCIENCES WEEK

M^{me} France Gélinas: Mr. Speaker, I will use wisely my minute and 25 seconds left.

I'd like to start by thanking Greg Toffner and Stephanie Mercier, who came to see me to make sure that they had our support from the NDP to bring sonographers into the realm of people under the Regulated Health Professions Act, and I assured them that I will do everything in my power to help them achieve that.

Medical Radiation Sciences Week is a good time to say thank you to all of the medical radiation technologists. They are the people behind the high-tech medical diagnostic tests that we go to. So if it is a child playing hockey and with a suspected broken bone, you will see a radiology technician for your X-ray or MRI. If it's the one in five Canadians who faces cancer, there's a good chance that you will see a radiation technologist; they are the ones who give you your radiation therapy if the oncologist decides that you need this. Same thing with a sonographer: They are the people that you go to. As people age and start to worry about their heart health, they often go for an echocardiogram. They are the people who do that kind of work. And of course, one that is very close to my heart is nuclear medicine, including PET scans, and you all know how this technology should be accessible to everyone in Ontario, including people in the northeast.

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

PETITIONS

DARLINGTON NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Durham, off and running.

Mr. John O'Toole: Yes, thank you very much. I was paying attention today. I'd like to present a petition on behalf of my constituents, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the economic benefit of the retained nuclear scenario is \$60 billion. Eliminating the wind options in the long-term energy plan (LTEP) will have a positive economic benefit of \$21 billion. Forgoing the nuclear option in the LTEP will have an economic loss" for Ontario "of \$38 billion;

"Whereas the Durham region economy is based on the new build. It was Premier Wynne who cancelled the new build at Darlington, costing Ontario 20,000 direct and indirect jobs associated with the new build;

"Whereas this severely limits employment opportunities for university graduates from the University of Ontario Institute of Technology who were to gain experience in Darlington nuclear's training centre;

"Whereas in addition to refurbishing the four existing reactors at Darlington the building of new capacity is important for the future of Ontario's manufacturing sector and for jobs and investment in our Ontario;

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

"That Ontario's elected MPPs and the provincial government reaffirm their commitment to the complete refurbishment of all four units at the Darlington generating station"—as well as the ones at the other facility—"and that the Ontario government reinstate the original

plan for the completion of the two new reactors at the Darlington generating station.”

I'm happy to present this to Arianna, one of the pages.

TAXATION

Ms. Sarah Campbell: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the cost of living in northwestern Ontario is significantly higher than other regions of the province due to the high cost of necessities such as hydro, home heating fuel, gasoline and auto insurance; and

“Whereas an increase in the price of any of these essential goods will make it even more difficult for people living in northwestern Ontario to pay their bills and put food on the table;

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

“To reject any proposed increase to the harmonized sales tax, gas tax or any other fees or taxes in the northwest; and instead investigate other means such as increasing corporate tax compliance or eliminating corporate tax loopholes in order to fund transit in the greater Toronto and Hamilton area.”

I support this petition, will affix my signature and give it to page Jake to deliver to the table.

AIR QUALITY

Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Ontario’s Drive Clean Program was implemented only as a temporary measure to reduce high levels of vehicle emissions and smog; and

“Whereas vehicle emissions have declined so significantly from 1998 to 2010 that they are no longer among the major domestic contributors of smog in Ontario; and

“Whereas the overwhelming majority of reductions in vehicle emissions is the result of factors other than Drive Clean, such as tighter manufacturing standards for emission-control technologies; and

“Whereas the current government has ignored advances in technology and introduced a new, computerized emissions test that is less reliable, and prone to error; and

“Whereas the Auditor General identified that Drive Clean has had little to no impact on the reduction of emissions in Ontario and that the program’s pass rate has exceeded 90% every year since 2004; and

“Whereas the Auditor General’s No. 1 recommendation is for the government to ‘formally evaluate the extent to which the Drive Clean program continues to be an effective initiative’;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to take immediate steps to begin phasing out the Drive Clean program.”

I affix my signature in support.

ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES

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

“Whereas these vehicles are as safe as any motorcycle carrying a passenger since all of the manufacturers of the ‘2-up machines’ have redesigned their original models by extending the wheel bases, beefing up their suspension to allow the carriage of passengers on the machine safely and providing a rear seat, many with handholds;

“Whereas the privilege to ride on secondary highways and trails with two people on a recreational vehicle is denied to off-road vehicles (ORV) operators but is granted to snowmobiles;

“Whereas the definition of an all-terrain vehicle (ATV) in regulation 316/03 no longer reflects the majority of ATVs being marketed and sold in Ontario;

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

“Amend the definition of an ATV to include those that are: (a) designed to carry a passenger; (b) with more than four tires and designed to carry passengers; (c) without a straddle seat; and (d) carries passengers and has a steering wheel.”

I agree with this petition and present it to page Ian to bring it down to the Clerk.

LONG-TERM CARE

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

“Whereas Ontario ranks ninth of 10 provinces in terms of the total per capita funding allocated to long-term care; and

“Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care data shows that there are more than 30,000 people in Ontario waiting for long-term-care placements and wait-times have tripled since 2005; and

“Whereas there is a perpetual shortage of staff in long-term-care facilities and residents often wait an unreasonable length of time to receive care—e.g. to be attended to for toileting needs; to be fed; to receive a bath; for pain medication. Since 2008, funding for 2.8 paid hours of care per resident per day has been provided. In that budget year, a promise was made to increase this funding to 4.0 hours per resident per day by 2012. This has not been done; and

1550

“Whereas the training of personal support workers is unregulated and insufficient to provide them with the skills and knowledge to assist residents who are being admitted with higher physical, psychological and emotional needs. Currently, training across the province is varied, inconsistent and under-regulated;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to:

“(1) immediately increase the number of paid hours of nursing and personal care per resident per day to 4.0 hours (as promised in 2008);

“(2) develop a plan to phase in future increases so that the number of paid hours per resident per day of nursing and personal care is 5.0 hours by January 2015;

“(3) establish a licensing body, such as a college, that will develop a process of registration, accreditation and certification for all personal support workers.”

I agree with this and will be passing it on to page Jack.

LONG-TERM CARE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from—let’s see. Oh, okay, Sud—Nickel Belt.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you were just toying with my emotions there, because if you don’t know where I’m from, you and I need to talk.

Here’s a petition from the people of the northeast.

“Whereas there are a growing number of reported cases of abuse, neglect and substandard care for our seniors in long-term-care homes; and

“Whereas people with complaints have limited options, and frequently don’t complain because they fear repercussions, which suggests too many seniors are being left in vulnerable situations without independent oversight; and

“Whereas Ontario is the only province in Canada—including the three territories—where our Ombudsman does not have independent oversight of long-term-care homes;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to expand the Ombudsman’s mandate to include Ontario’s long-term-care homes in order to protect our most vulnerable seniors.”

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): My thanks to the member, and I certainly know where she’s from.

FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette: I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Ontario Fishing Regulations Summary is printed each year by the Ministry of Natural Resources and distributed to recreational fishermen throughout the province to inform them of all the relevant seasons, limits, licence requirements and other regulations; and

“Whereas this valuable document is readily available for anglers to keep in their residence, cottage, truck, boat, trailer or on their person to be fully informed of the current fishing regulations; and

“Whereas the MNR has recently and abruptly drastically reduced the distribution of the Ontario Fishing Regulations Summary such that even major licence issuers and large fishing retailers are limited to one case of regulations per outlet; and

“Whereas anglers do not always have access to the Internet to view online regulations while travelling or in remote areas;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately return the production of the Ontario Fishing Regulations Summary to previous years’ quantities such that all anglers have access to a copy and to distribute them accordingly.”

I affix my signature in full support.

MINIMUM WAGE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Parkdale—High Park. I got that one right, didn’t I?

Ms. Cheri DiNovo: You did indeed, Mr. Speaker. Praise be.

This is a petition to raise the minimum wage.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas Ontario’s minimum wage has been frozen at \$10.25 an hour since 2010, and some workers earn even less due to current exemptions in the Employment Standards Act; and

“Whereas full-time minimum wage workers are living at nearly 20% below the poverty line as measured by the Ontario government’s low-income measure (LIM); and

“Whereas minimum wage should, as a matter of principle, bring people working 35 hours per week above the poverty line; and

“Whereas an immediate increase in the minimum wage to \$14 per hour would bring workers’ wages 10% above the LIM poverty line; and

“Whereas raising the minimum wage will benefit workers, local businesses and the economy by putting money in workers’ pockets to spend in their local community;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to immediately increase the minimum wage to \$14 per hour for all workers and thereafter increase it annually by no less than the cost of living.”

I’m going to give this to Tristan, affixing my signature, to be delivered to the table.

WIND TURBINES

Mr. Victor Fedeli: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas industrial wind turbine development on the sacred land of Mnidoo Mnis (Manitoulin Island) has disrupted our peaceful life, dividing First Nation and non-First Nation communities and families; and

“Whereas there is growing opposition to Northland Power’s McLean’s Mountain industrial wind turbine project; and

“Whereas it would be a very sad chapter in our history if we stand by and let the pursuit of money destroy this beautiful land; and

“Whereas the Manitoulin Coalition for Safe Energy Alternatives, the Wikwemikong Unceded First Nation elders, community members and youth, the North Channel Preservation Society and others stand together to preserve and protect the healthy environment along with

traditional culture and heritage values which we cherish so greatly;

“We, the undersigned, hereby oppose industrial wind farm development on Mnidoo Mnis (Manitoulin Island).”

I agree with this, sign my name to the petition and give it page Jake.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr. Michael Mantha: I’m still receiving hundreds of these petitions. They petition ServiceOntario cuts.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas northern Ontario will suffer a huge loss of service as a result of government cuts to ServiceOntario counters;

“Whereas these cuts will have a negative impact on local businesses and local economies;

“Whereas northerners will now face challenges in accessing their birth certificates, health cards and licences;

“Whereas northern Ontario should not unfairly bear the brunt of decisions to slash operating budgets;

“Whereas regardless of address, all Ontarians should be treated equally by their government;

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

“Review the decision to cut access to ServiceOntario for northerners, and provide northern Ontarians equal access to these services.”

I agree with this petition and present it to page Victoria to bring down to the Clerks.

AIR QUALITY

Mr. John O’Toole: It’s a privilege to begin and end with a petition.

“Whereas Ontario’s Drive Clean program was intended originally as a temporary measure to reduce high levels of vehicle emissions and smog; and

“Whereas vehicle emissions have declined so significantly from 1998 to 2010 that they no longer are among the major domestic contributors to smog in Ontario; and

“Whereas the new Drive Clean test introduced by the McGuinty/Wynne government in January of 2013 using vehicles’ onboard computers has caused numerous false fails; and

“Whereas this new test has led to higher costs and economic hardship for Ontario drivers and car dealerships; and

“Whereas this government has collected an estimated \$19 million in windfall profits from Drive Clean, despite the fact that revenue-neutral programs like Drive Clean are not permitted to produce profits;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to end the Drive Clean cash grab and take immediate action to phase out this program altogether.”

I’m pleased to sign and support it on behalf my constituents in the riding of Durham.

HOME CARE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): My favourite member, from Nickel Belt.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You’re also my favourite Speaker.

I have a petition that comes from all over Ontario.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas many Ontarians need health care services at home and 6,100 people are currently on wait-lists for care;

“Whereas waiting for over 200 days for home care is unacceptable;

“Whereas eliminating the wait-lists won’t require any new funding if the government caps hospital CEO salaries, finds administrative efficiencies in the local health integration networks (LHINs) and community care access centres (CCACs), standardizes procurement policies and streamlines administration costs;”

They “petition the Legislative Assembly:

“That a five-day home care guarantee is established and existing wait-lists eliminated so that Ontarians receive the care they need within a reasonable time frame.”

I’m happy to sign this petition and give it to Tristan to bring to the Clerk.

LYME DISEASE

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: “To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the tick-borne illness known as chronic Lyme disease, which mimics many catastrophic illnesses such as multiple sclerosis, Crohn’s, Alzheimer’s, arthritic diabetes, depression, chronic fatigue and fibromyalgia, is increasingly endemic in Canada, but scientifically validated diagnostic tests and treatment choices are currently not available in Ontario, forcing patients to seek these in the USA and Europe;

“Whereas the Canadian Medical Association informed the public, governments and the medical profession in the May 30, 2000, edition of its professional journal that Lyme disease is endemic throughout Canada, particularly in southern Ontario; and

“Whereas the Ontario public health system and the Ontario Health Insurance Plan currently do not fund those specific tests that accurately serve the process for establishing a clinical diagnosis, but only recognize testing procedures known in the medical literature to provide false negatives 45% to 95% of the time;

1600

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to request the Minister of Health to direct that the Ontario public health system and OHIP include all currently available and scientifically verified tests for acute and chronic Lyme diagnosis, to do everything

necessary to create public awareness of Lyme disease in Ontario, and to have internationally developed diagnostic and successful treatment protocols available to patients and physicians.”

I agree with this petition and I affix my signature.

OPPOSITION DAY

POWER PLANTS

Mr. Tim Hudak: I move that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario calls upon the government,

To recognize that the Premier and the Liberal government put their political interests ahead of taxpayers’ interests by cancelling the Mississauga and Oakville gas plants during the 2011 election and failing to provide taxpayers with the true costs;

To recognize that the Premier bears responsibility for the gas plant cancellations...; and

Therefore, it is the opinion of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that Ontarians no longer trust the Premier or the Liberal government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day number 2. Mr. Hudak.

Mr. Tim Hudak: Speaker, I have a vision of an Ontario with more jobs and with better take-home pay; a strong, confident province of Ontario with the capability of supporting its most vulnerable citizens, where the generosity of Ontarians meets their means to help seniors, to help those with disabilities, to build a stronger Ontario.

But to get there, it is never more clear than after the gas plant scandal that we’ll only get that Ontario when we change the team that leads this province.

Today is the day to show the people of Ontario that at least one party—at least the PC Party—is on their side. The motion and today’s debate is the only way that we can demonstrate to hard-working Ontario families, to seniors and to men and women that their cries that “enough is enough” have finally been heard.

This will put the members of the House to the test. The cost of the Liberals’ self-interest and their willingness to give almost any deal to hang on to their government is huge. That’s why we’re here today. That’s why my colleagues are here today. That’s why I am here today, because I want to put it to the public straight that it’s time for the Premier to stand up and to explain herself when it comes to her role in the cancellation of the gas plants that cost us \$1.1 billion. I look forward to the Premier’s comments.

Quite frankly, the same goes for the NDP leader, Andrea Horwath. Where exactly will she finally draw the line? The time has come for the leader of the third party in this House to stand up and tell Ontarians exactly whose side she is on.

A motion on the floor of the House is one of the strongest tools that we have at our disposal for accountability as legislators. So the question we’ll resolve today:

Whose side is this House on? An up-or-down vote of all MPPs, of all parties, to tell the people in the ridings: Are they here for the people or are they here as MPPs for themselves, lining up at the trough of the Liberals? It’s a straight-up question, so I’m looking forward to a straight-up answer from the other two parties.

Quite frankly, I hear this everywhere I go. The people of Ontario want to know whether the leader of the NDP is on the side of the people—with me, with us—or is she on the side of the Liberal Party? Has she lost her moral compass and will she continue to support the Liberals, no matter what they do? We’ll find out later this afternoon.

Clearly, Speaker, changes must be made. When I talk about change, I’m concerned that the only time the NDP talk about change is when their definition of “change” simply means how you change your backroom deal with the Liberals: What else is the price to prop them up time and time again? I could be proven wrong. Maybe they’ll stand up on their feet and be on the side of taxpayers instead of being on the side of the Liberals every single time.

But change does not mean more reckless government spending. Change does not mean more lost jobs for Ontario men and women. It doesn’t mean more wasteful scandals that seem to cost us a billion dollars in taxpayers’ money each and every single time, just to save a couple of Liberal seats in the last election campaign. That’s not change. The change that we support is changing the team that leads this province. Change means electing a leader who will actually get our great province back on track. That’s the kind of change we need.

More jobs, with better take-home pay, putting entrepreneurs back in business and our books back in balance—that’s what we stand for. That’s why we’re standing on our feet today and saying “enough is enough” with this motion.

Ontario needs to know exactly where the NDP stands. Are they finally ready to do this and say Ontario deserves better? Ontario’s hard-working families need to know. Our seniors need to know. Men and women need to know. Those without a job need to know. We want to know, so let’s hear from the leader of the NDP to tell us exactly where they’re going to stand. We know where we stand: for a better Ontario.

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

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I’m happy to speak to the motion, and I’m always very cautious, because every time I speak against something the Tories introduce, I am afraid to insult them or to offend them. I try to be as gentle as I can—through you, Speaker—but there are times when it’s hard to do. So if I offend, you’ll have to forgive me.

On this motion, there are things about this motion that New Democrats agree with. The gas plant scandals in Oakville and Mississauga were serious—are serious. They continue to be a big problem for people in Ontario. The waste—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Everybody listened so intently when you were speaking, the Leader of the Opposition. Now the decibel level has gone up when the member from the NDP is speaking. I'd like a little quiet. Thank you.

Continue.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: The waste of \$1.1 billion is a serious matter, and I believe the Liberals will be hurt when there is an election. And when we will have this election, whenever the time happens to be, my view is that the public will punish them—I have no doubt about that—in the same way that the public punished the Conservatives for those painful eight and a half years. When the Conservatives say that people lost trust in the Liberals after 10 years, I lost trust in the Conservative Party in three and a half weeks when they were there. Of course, it's all relative, depending on where you stand in this place. But we all lose trust with each other, and political parties eventually will lose trust—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): You might want to get back in your seat if you want to yell.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I don't care about the facts.

Continue.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Thank you, Speaker. You see? I do my best not to offend, but I know it hurts.

As the Tories have lost trust in the Liberals, I just wanted to point out that I lost trust in the Conservatives when they were in power in very short order, and I had to tolerate them for eight and a half long years. It was painful to me and to many who live in my riding. Of course, eventually there's an election. That's what happens, and then they judge the political party.

The good thing is that the Conservative Party finally realized—it doesn't take much, but they finally realized they can't introduce a motion of want of confidence of the government. They can't. That's the law. They, I think, are smart enough to know it, but if they want to play politics, as they do and they've done, they can say, "We want to do it, but the NDP doesn't want to do it." You can't have a motion of want of confidence of the government. The government can introduce any motion at any time with a want-of-confidence component contained in it. We can't do that. So they cleverly drafted a message saying, "We lost trust in the Liberal government." That's okay. That's clever and it's smart, and it allows the Conservative Party to attack the Liberals. It allows us to attack the Liberals as well on this scandal.

1610

I have to admit, when the Premier stands up on a regular basis and talks about how, when new evidence is before us, we have to take the new evidence into account and therefore we have to deal with the new evidence, what, pray tell, is the new evidence that the Premier got

that she didn't have four years ago? Ah, children and families all of a sudden appeared.

I would imagine there were families and kiddies over there at the time when they made the decisions to have those gas plants, but all of a sudden an emergence of new evidence appears. Kids and families have appeared on the scene, and we have to change our minds. That was the new evidence. It just doesn't make any sense and it makes the Liberals look bad, so it gives me an opportunity to attack them as well. It's not a problem; I like to do that as well.

But you guys, all you do is goof around. I have to use the vernacular here. You're just goofing around. That's all I can say. You infantilized the issues last week when you introduced another motion to simply say that the Liberals should be paying for that \$1.1 billion. That is infantile. Please. You know you can't do that because if you were to do that and you were serious, people would immediately say, "Hold on a moment. Highway 407 happened, and that was a giveaway of a beautiful deal, of a 100-year deal, to the private sector—100 years." Your fine Tories, your Mike Harris regime, gave that private toll away for 100 painful, long years. You have given public money away to the private sector for a whole long time. Why would you do that? Are you saying New Democrats should have said, "You should be paying that out of your pocket"? It's silly; you understand that? It's infantile. When you play those games—through you always, Speaker—when they play those games, it's difficult for people like me. I can't deal with it very well.

What does the Conservative Party do? With a bill called Bill 74—it is amazing how they could tease and make fun of New Democrats for being in collusion with the Liberals, yet with Bill 74, that certainly wasn't collusion with the Liberals, was it? Oh, no. It certainly wasn't establishing common ground, was it? Oh, no. It wasn't simply conniving with the Liberals to bring forth Bill 74 that would, in effect, give a whole lot of good to EllisDon, who, by the way, brings in \$2.3 billion in profits. That's what they hold in profits. God bless; they're doing okay. Yet the Tories colluded with the Liberals to bring about such a bill.

By the way, I feel the pain of Tories. I do, because the government let them down. They had a deal. It was sealed. It was a sealed deal. And then the Premier said, "Okay, I changed my mind," and the Tories got stuck with that problem. So they were the only ones who said, "Jeez, now are we the only ones who are going to be seen as helping our developer friends?"

It doesn't look good, because—understand this, Speaker—the Liberals get more money from developers than the Tories do. They both do incredibly well. The highest amount of money that comes to this party and that party comes from developers and the development industry. But they get a little more—not by much. They are neck and neck.

But when they introduced Bill 74, they got stuck holding that stinky bag all to themselves. You understand that they have no problem colluding with the govern-

ment? When they say, “But the NDP is propping up the Liberals,” that’s supposed to be okay, but when they prop up the Liberals to a certain end, i.e. Bill 74, that’s not okay? That’s different? That is totally different? You see how you play games. That’s why I say they’re goofing around. They’re spitting nickels each and every day in this Legislature. Each and every day, as our leader said, they stand on their heads and spit nickels. Would that they did something useful for a change.

In the last three years—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Simcoe–Grey.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: —they’ve done absolutely nothing to deliver anything good to the public—nada. In two years, through two budgets, when the NDP decided that we wanted to deliver—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I’m sorry, folks. I’ve really put up with quite a bit today. Here’s the bottom line: I’m going to start keeping track, and you’ll get one warning—I’ve already given a couple—and the next one is “Hasta la vista.” That’s the way it’s got to be, because I’m losing control of this, and I don’t want this to go the way it’s going.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The members know very well, being experienced, that if they want to talk, get in their own seats—especially those two.

Continue.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: What we got is a surtax. Those who are millionaires, those who earn over \$500,000, get to pay a little more. We imposed that surtax on the Liberals as a way of making sure that if they wanted our support, we’d get something for working men and women. We have made it possible for millionaires to pay a little more than often gouging those who earn \$40,000 or \$50,000. We got the Liberals to freeze the corporate tax cut that Tories wanted to slip down, and Liberals as well. Between the two of them, they wanted corporate taxes to go down. Who’s helping the little guy? It’s this party, not that party and the Liberals.

We said to the Liberals, “If you want our support, we want more support for home care, we want jobs for young people and we certainly want auto insurance rates to go down.” This is something that we call a victory for people in Ontario. This is not about us; it’s about helping working men and woman. That’s what we’re doing that’s positive.

The Tories? They just goof around, spit nickels all day long.

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

Mr. Bob Delaney: It is a pleasure, as a Mississauga member and a proud citizen of the city of Mississauga, to join this debate on this motion, which is, as my colleague from Trinity–Spadina put it so eloquently, “nothing but rhetoric.” It is pure rhetoric.

Let’s start with a review of what actually happened here. In 2003, many people remember the big blackout. I certainly remember it. We were blacked out into our third day, and one of the first lessons learned out of that blackout is that that area called the southwest GTA, which for all practical purposes means Mississauga and Oakville, didn’t have sufficient power generation or transmission.

Following that summer of 2003, when the voters of Ontario looked at the absolute mess that the Conservative government had made of electricity, they tossed them out and elected us to fix this problem. Now, going into that summer of 2004, one of the important priorities of our Ministry of Energy and the then minister Dwight Duncan was: How do we prevent the system, which had been run into the ground for more than 10 years, from simply falling apart? It was at that point that the Ministry of Energy issued a call for proposals for peak power generation in that southwest GTA. For all practical purposes, that means Mississauga and Oakville.

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Northumberland–Quinte West.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Of the four proposals accepted, two were abandoned, and that left two: one in Oakville and one in Mississauga. Now, Speaker, who put those plants there? The answer is: the proponents. The proponents had to find land zoned by the municipality for power production and legally acquire the land and apply for and receive from the municipality permission to build the plants where they had proposed.

The land in Oakville had been specifically zoned for industrial uses. The land in Mississauga on 2315 Loreland Avenue had been zoned “industrial/power plant.” The proponents—TransCanada Energy in Oakville, Eastern Power in Mississauga—legally bought the land and legally worked with both cities to build power plants.

1620

Now, just to sort of make this point very clear, let me read from a document that came out in the Standing Committee on Justice Policy. My colleagues opposite in the Conservative Party know this document perfectly well because it’s now a public document. This is a letter from the city of Mississauga, from the planning and building department. It’s signed by one Barbara Leckey, supervisor of zoning, planning and building department, dated July 12, 2005, addressed to Eastern Power. The letter reads, in part, referring to 2315 Loreland Avenue, the site at which that power plant was proposed to have been built: “Upon removal of the holding symbol, the lands may be used for”—this is the operative part—“among other things, manufacturing or industrial undertakings, which would include the generation and distribution of electrical power.”

So, who put the power plant where it was proposed in the city of Mississauga? The answer is, the city of Mississauga’s planning and building department did just that. They had zoned the land, as had the town of Oakville, “industrial” or, again, in the case of Mississauga, “industrial/power plant.” That’s how those two power plants came to be sited where they were.

As a Mississauga resident, I think that Oakville plant was far too large and certainly inappropriate for that place that it was proposed. The town of Oakville—Mayor Rob Burton, who led the council then, said the same thing. They said, “That plant is inappropriate for the place that the proponent had proposed it.” The town of Oakville then enacted some bylaws and said, “We’re going to stop you from building it.” The proponent said, “But you can’t stop us. You zoned the land for it. We were able to buy the land.”

In the city of Mississauga, the same occurred. Eastern Power, facing opposition from the city of Mississauga after this letter, after the letter of 2005 saying, “Go ahead and build a power generation plant,” when Mississauga changed its mind, said to the city of Mississauga, “See you at the Ontario Municipal Board.”

The Ontario Municipal Board reviewed the zoning from the city of Mississauga and said to the city, “You zoned this for a power plant. They legally bought the land. They have a fair and a legal contract to build a power plant on land they bought, on land you zoned for a power plant.” It was at that point that both the town of Oakville and the city of Mississauga came to see the province and said, “Help us here. We don’t have a recourse. If we simply continue on our present course, they’re going to build that power plant,” both on Loreland Avenue in Mississauga and on what were called the Ford lands, near the merger of Highway 403 and the QEW in Oakville.

The plant in Oakville was some 50 or 55 metres from the nearest commercial establishment and far, far too close to residential establishments. To put some size on it, the Oakville plant had 850 megawatts. That proposal was about the same size as building a Bruce nuclear reactor on that site—clearly off-base.

Faced with that dilemma, the city of Mississauga and the town of Oakville asked the province, “What action can be taken here?” And the province advised them, “You guys zoned it.” They said, “Yes, well, that was before we had had the type of growth that we have had since the plan was last reviewed.”

So let’s understand this. What’s the first lesson to be learned here? The lesson to be learned is that cities have to take a much more proactive part in the zoning of land for energy infrastructure and have to treat the delivery and transmission of electricity, as well as its generation, in the same fashion as they handle water and sewer and waste removal and other municipal services. One of the things that have come out in the justice committee is that in fact they don’t have to do this. This is almost surely a recommendation to come out of the Standing Committee on Justice Policy’s look at these two plants.

Having established that the plants were put where they were by the two municipalities on land that was legally acquired by the proponent, let’s look at some of the other things in this motion. Most people in Ontario don’t realize that PC Party leader Tim Hudak was personally prepared to pay \$1 billion to cancel each plant—\$2 billion in total—\$2 billion—and that’s with no electricity having been generated. He’s on record as having said it.

So, Speaker, the challenge before the province is: Okay, we’ve got two plants that were contracted for. They’re not properly located. What do we do here? Do we just pay the people for the money they put into them and stop building them, in which case we’ve paid out a lot of money but we don’t get any electricity? How do we get electricity into Mississauga and Oakville?

One of the answers was a transmission corridor from the Bruce Peninsula to connect into the big substation at Milton. We now have a transmission solution that, from the vantage point of those of us in Mississauga and Oakville, will at least allow us to transmit electricity from Bruce and get it into the city. Now, that made a big difference in the blackout in July. We were able to get back online within about six hours in most places. We may still—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): It appears that there are a few members who come into the House and don’t acknowledge the Chair. That’s not acceptable, and we’ll be monitoring that. Thank you.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Speaker, having now established that the PCs were willing to pay twice as much money to get no electrons—no electricity—the province, working with the two cities, was at least able to offer the two proponents contracts of roughly equal value located somewhere else, and that at least got us electricity for having made the investment.

Let’s talk about some of those costs. I’ve heard some strange numbers floated around. Not a single one of the numbers advanced by the opposition can be found in either Auditor General’s report. Does Ontario know where they get that number? I’ll tell you where they get that number. They add up all the costs and don’t subtract any of the savings. They consider all of the costs spread out over 20 years to be equivalent to having been paid out in front, which in fact is not the case.

The sunk costs for Oakville and Mississauga have already been paid out: Oakville two years ago and Mississauga last year. The balance of the costs, which would average, depending on whose numbers you choose to work with, somewhere between \$15 million and \$30 million per year out over 20 years, are offset by savings with the renegotiation of the Samsung agreement and the reworking of the requirements for domestic content. They amount to a savings—savings—of about \$5.6 billion spread out over 20 years. So we’ve got costs of some \$15 million to \$30 million, as opposed to savings on an average basis per year of \$280 million. Somehow or other, that takes one of the clauses in this and just shoots it completely down.

Now, the motion before us talks about the Liberals putting political interests ahead of taxpayers. You know, Speaker, when I go and stand in front of my residents and say that I’m proud to have supported the cancellation of that plant, they say, “Good for you, man. That was the right decision. That wasn’t needed in our community, and you stood up for us.” That’s something the Conservatives did not do.

If political interests actually meant something, Speaker, would you please tell me whose ridings were at

stake? They have never been able to do that. Which sitting MPPs stood to lose their ridings if something didn't happen? These people have never done that, and the reason is that they can't. The reason is because the member from Mississauga South won with the largest plurality of the elections he has contested. The member for Etobicoke–Lakeshore was elected with more than 50% of the vote. The member for Etobicoke Centre was elected with the largest plurality she ever had. I was out canvassing in Mississauga East–Cooksville with our candidate, and the matter never came up. So I ask again, Speaker: If seats were at stake, tell us which ones. The answer is that they can't.

You know, Speaker, the easiest thing for the government to have done in this case was absolutely nothing. But we're Liberals; we don't do that. We had a serious power shortage brought on by years of Conservative incompetence. We addressed it. There were two decisions that went wrong—I pointed out some of the reasons why—and we fixed them. And I'm quite willing to go to the doors to talk about that, whether it be next spring or whenever.

1630

If they want to talk about bad decisions, we can always pick up where my friend from Trinity–Spadina left off and talk about Highway 407, the single largest privatization boondoggle in the history of the world. We still have 86 more years of paying for it—and paying and paying and paying.

Speaker, this resolution is nothing more than empty rhetoric from a party that's out of ideas, out of gas and soon to be out of time.

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

Ms. Lisa MacLeod: It was an honour for me to not only follow my leader but listen to the amazing works of fiction by my two predecessors who spoke today: the member from Trinity–Spadina and, of course, the member from Mississauga, who might be enlightened to know that his former leader, his current leader, his former finance minister and many members of the public service have told us that the cancellation of those gas plants were “political.” They were political.

I also would remind the member that it is very clear that the members from Mississauga and Oakville who were returned to this House in the last election were returned because of extensive lobbying by those members—because they were afraid—to win their seats.

Just as an aside, my seatmate and I often like to point out that I had the highest vote total in all of Ontario; he had the highest percentage. So if you want to start talking about pluralities, we don't mind having that discussion, because, I'll tell you one thing, it was very clear in most of Ontario that members of the public wanted a change.

All we seem to have gotten from this Liberal government is evading the answers that we have been asking through our questions. They refuse to hold a judicial inquiry. They refuse to put a confidence motion on the floor of the assembly. They refuse to answer our ques-

tions, whether it is in this House or it is in the justice committee. But we do continue to get snippets.

This is what we have learned. People like Serge Imbrogno, people like Shelly Jamieson, people like Colin Andersen and people like JoAnne Butler have all come before the justice committee to say that that Liberal government knew there would be costs well in excess of \$40 million for the cancellation, despite the fact that that Premier, that cabinet and all of that caucus have stood up in this House and told us one thing when they knew another was actually the truth. They knew as early as December 2012 that costs were far in excess of \$700 million. Yet, that Premier, in April of last year, came not only to this House but also to committee—under oath, I might add—and told us it was only \$40 million.

I listened to a long laundry list from the member from Trinity–Spadina, about all of the accomplishments of the New Democrats, and—Speaker, you're going to be interested—I've done a laundry list of the accomplishments of the Liberal Party and the NDP combined. This is what they have done together: a \$273-billion debt, a \$12-billion deficit, one million people out of work, a \$1.1-billion cancellation of a gas plant. And, together, they did what no government ever wanted to do, and that is put rural Ontario out of business and kill horses while they did it.

It was that party and that party who passed a budget, Speaker, and it is that party and that party who are going to be accountable.

It is this party, under the leadership of Tim Hudak, who is going to continue to stand up and get the answers we so desperately need, not only at the gas plant committee, but in this House.

That's why we expect this party, the NDP, to support this motion. Or it's time for them to actually come clean to the taxpayers and it's time for them to actually look at them and say this: Andrea Horwath and the NDP are more concerned about their own personal aspirations and their jobs than they are about the taxpayers of this province. Speaker, they should stand up, defend them and they should do the right thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Kitchener–Waterloo.

Ms. Catherine Fife: That's a tough act to follow, I must say. I just want to bring this so-called debate back to a little bit of reality. Let's be really clear: The leader of the official opposition knows—he knows absolutely—that his party's motion has no teeth and won't accomplish what he claims. Outside of this House, it will accomplish, namely, nothing. The motion itself is not a confidence motion. While I participated and took note of his press conference this morning, where he threw down the gauntlet to our leader and talked about confidence—this is not a confidence motion and they know it. That's why many of them are leaving as I speak.

That's why I want to spend some time, actually, today, to talk about the ineffectiveness of the official opposition. The PC caucus knows that their own motion isn't actionable, and in fact, the PC caucus knows full well

how not to get any action. Actually, that should be their theme song. They have spent every day since the last general election standing on their heads, shouting from the sidelines and ignoring the wishes of the people of this province, who sent us here to do a job. We have heard Ontarians loud and clear; they have not.

In October 2011, they spoke loudly when they sent a minority government here to Queen's Park. The people of this province wanted a minority government to form. They wanted us to figure it out. Since that day, the PC caucus and the leadership of the official opposition has been calling for an election, which, in my view and the view of the New Democratic Party, is completely disrespectful to the people of this province.

What the people of this province want is a government that delivers for them. Clearly, that wasn't something that they were experiencing during the McGuinty administration, and New Democrats have been doing that since we arrived here after the 2011 general election.

I understand that the PC caucus has actually been taking notice of what we've been doing. They have turned their view over here a little to the left, because we've been getting results. We know that they're concerned with those results, because they watched us win and steal and take and definitely advocate on behalf of the people of this province throughout the two budget sessions. We got results during those processes.

People in Ontario are taking notice of the results, and all of a sudden, they're talking about Andrea Horwath a lot and they're talking about the NDP and they're talking about our results. I think that that's because they're genuinely worried. They're two years into a term and they've accomplished nothing.

I understand where the members of the PC caucus are coming from, perhaps better than most, actually, because the reason why you're training your guns on New Democrats is because we've been very successful. When we have essentially gone out to the people of this province and said, "In the 2012 budget, we were able to negotiate this," and in the last budget, unbelievable concessions on youth employment and home care—that translates well at the door, I have to say.

In particular, Ontarians in Kitchener–Waterloo, Windsor–Tecumseh and London West saw that there was only one party they could trust to get results for them. They rewarded New Democrats for the job we have been doing, and we are going to continue to deliver for them. They know that we are not here to play games. They know that. They know that we're not here to play games and make meaningless noise on the sidelines. We're not interested in taking our lead from the PCs, a party that seems utterly out of touch with the people of this province. The PCs can't even be trusted to be serious in this place, which is why we're debating this motion.

Do you know what we should be talking about in this House? We should be talking about the economy. We should be talking about strengthening health care. We should be talking about making workplace safety—

Applause.

Ms. Catherine Fife: —don't applaud, because the Liberals have failed on this front—a priority. We should be talking about the young man, Nick Lalonde, who fell to his death—23 years old—when you had the regulations and all the language to create fall prevention safety as a priority. You had it within your grasp and you did nothing. That's what we should be talking about in this House.

Certainly, there are a lot of people across the province who have said that the by-elections, actually, were kind of a job interview, if you will. When candidates go door to door, they go to that door with a set resumé. Our resumé was strong; your resumé had nothing on it. People like the fact that we are keeping the Liberals to account. It's shocking sometimes, actually, to hear the account.

1640

It's actually shocking, sometimes, to hear the PC caucus talk about how they're tough on the Liberals. Actually, I have a perfect example of how that's complete doublespeak from the PC Party—just this morning, the claim that the PCs are interested in getting to the bottom of the cost of the gas plant scandal. That's all they talk about: gas plant, gas plant. This very moment, the member from Welland, the honourable member to my right, introduced a motion in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts calling on the Auditor General to examine the money spent on determining whether or not that money was well spent. However, all the Liberal caucus members and all the PC members on the committee voted against the motion. The Liberal and PC coalition teamed up to stop the Auditor General from investigating, when we know that this Liberal government has a track record of low-balling the cost of energy and a long list of energy fiascos.

They talk about openness and transparency. When the Liberal members had a chance to vote for transparency, they did not do it, and when the PC caucus had a chance to do what they said they really wanted to do, they decided not to do it. I guess it was not politically expedient for them. Their leader has made a lot of noise, but he has shown yet again that he's stuck on the sidelines and his team can't get anything done. And I sense their frustration. The temperature in this place is rising on a regular basis because they are out of touch with what's actually going on in the province. It feels a little desperate.

While the PCs do little for the people of this province, New Democrats are getting results. We got results on the gas plant inquiry; we got results on worker safety—we're pushing that portfolio; the Financial Accountability Office—we will have credibility in a financial sense; forcing the government to invest in youth jobs; shortening home care wait times; and keeping the government accountable about watered-down chemotherapy drugs. The day will come when this government has to face the people of this province and explain the waste. We will stand up. We will say what we got for the people of this province.

Until that day, New Democrats will continue to fight for the people of this province. We will continue to bring the voices of people to this place, because that is what we were elected to do. We will continue to be respectful of this minority setting, this minority government.

For me, there's an opportunity here not only to point out the fact that you are spinning your wheels and that you are ineffective, but also point out the fact that people like the fact that we are holding you, the Liberal government, to account for the first time in 10 years. This is the way minority governments are supposed to work. Until that day, New Democrats will continue to get results.

It reminds me of the Tragically Hip. They're my favourite band, an iconic Canadian band. One of my favourite songs is called Wheat Kings. The best line in that song says "no one's interested in something you didn't do." This could be your theme song for the 40th Parliament in the province of Ontario. Feel free to use it; feel free to use it as you go forward into the next election. You wanted to talk about elections for the last two years, but you didn't want to talk about elections this morning in that media scrum. You wanted to talk about elections the day after you lost the last election, but now you're not so keen to talk about certain candidates within that context.

What we are doing each and every day in each committee is bringing the priorities of people to those committee sessions. We're not going to get tied up in the game-playing that has become the strategy and the plan of the PC Party. It hasn't been working for two years. I don't know why we're still in this House on this day, debating a motion that has literally nothing to do with the people of this province. It is not a confidence motion. It is not about confidence. For us, this is an opportunity to say to the people of the province that we are staying focused on the real priorities of the people of Ontario. We are not going to back down on that. I look forward to one day having a focused approach on jobs, on health care, on education and on the environment. That is what we should be doing in this House, and we're committed to doing that.

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

Hon. Jeff Leal: I'll just let everybody back in Peterborough know that it's a three-book speech today as opposed to a five-book speech, so that's quite all right.

First of all, I want to get on the record that, last Friday night, I got the opportunity to participate in three high school graduations in Peterborough: Adam Scott, Crestwood and my own high school, Kenner Collegiate. I just want to recognize the teachers, the administrative staff—and what a great crop of students. I tell everybody that the future is in good hands. When I visited those three high schools for their graduations last Friday night, all part of the Kawartha Pine Ridge public school board—a great school board doing great work on behalf of everybody in the community. So I just wanted to get that plug in for those three high schools this afternoon.

I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to rise today on the motion that has been put forward by my good friend the

Leader of the Opposition. We all know that all parties on all sides of this Legislature have a great responsibility to make this Legislature work each and every day, but I suspect that's not what this motion is all about. Some might say we're playing a little bit of gamesmanship this afternoon.

When you look at the record, the truth is that we've come a long way as a province. Our government continually addresses important issues by investing in infrastructure, investing in people and supporting a dynamic and innovative business climate in the province of Ontario.

When I get the opportunity to talk to our municipal partners—I spent 18 years in municipal politics, as a councillor in the city of Peterborough, from 1985 to the fall of 2003, when I was given the great privilege of representing the wonderful people of Peterborough riding. We all know that investing in infrastructure is important to us all. I remember, oh, so well that famous AMO meeting in Ottawa in 1998. The then very august Premier of the province of Ontario, one Michael D. Harris, gave the keynote address to AMO. I was at the back; Brian Horton, who was our administrative director—we were all at the back. We got up and heard the speech—I took my notes—that said that downloading and the changes that were going to be brought about were going to be revenue-neutral. Well, you know what? I grew up in the south end of Peterborough. I went to St. John the Baptist Elementary School and Kenner Collegiate. So I did my quick math and figured out that it wasn't going to be revenue-neutral.

Interjection: That dog doesn't hunt.

Hon. Jeff Leal: Yes, that's an old south-end Peterborough saying: "That dog doesn't hunt."

That decision, of course, created a deep hole across the province of Ontario. As I remind my friends, 43% of all the roads and bridges were downloaded in eastern Ontario, so we're working collectively, I might add, to get out of that.

Let me address Highway 407. That's a great one. Picture the Walmart man—we've all seen the Walmart commercial—who keeps rolling back the prices. Let's start—\$9 billion to \$8 billion to \$7 billion to \$6 billion to \$5 billion to \$4 billion. The Walmart man has a deal: \$3 billion that was sold off on an asset that was worth \$9 billion. The Walmart man was great that day. So \$9 billion rolled back to \$3 billion—a fire sale a few days before the June 3 provincial election. Mr. Speaker, I was a candidate in that election, so I know this all very well. Over that period of time, we've literally lost billions of dollars in revenue. But the Tory lawyers, in 1999—a very clever, very sharp group of lawyers—because when we took them to court to see if we could break the deal in terms of toll charges, we couldn't do it because it was an ironclad agreement for 99 years.

Mr. Speaker, people don't know this, but there are two Ontario Places in the world. There's one here in Toronto, and there's one in Madrid, Spain. The other Ontario Place—because they own the 407, those are the folks

who, every day, get the cheques from here in Ontario. They're drinking those very fancy drinks—I don't know about them in Peterborough—the ones with the little umbrellas, and they just down them each and every day because they're getting their cash flow from Ontario. Two Ontario Places: one in Toronto and one in Madrid, Spain. I recommend that people go and visit when they get the opportunity.

So we've seen that movie before, with all the downloading.

Since 2003, our government has invested some \$85 billion in public infrastructure projects—very important. More specifically, our government has invested in critical infrastructure for rural municipalities—our recent announcement, a \$100-million program.

I want to help the member from Nipissing. The other day, he gave me a wonderful project, and as I do with all my good friends opposite—I always make the commitment to try to help them out. I'm a good guy from Peterborough; everybody in Peterborough are good folks. So we're going to try to help everybody out with that infrastructure.

1650

Member from Nipissing, I hope to be with you when we cut that ribbon in the not-too-distant future. It's a good project.

Interjection.

Hon. Jeff Leal: There we go.

So what does this mean, our investment for residents in rural Ontario? It means 60 new schools for our children to learn in. It means four new hospitals and 70 family health teams that are taking care of—Mr. Speaker, what's the number?—458,000 rural residents, now to have access to primary care.

In terms of road-building, it means 6,700 kilometres of new roads. I know the opposition are very good at geography—that's building a road from Ontario to Alaska so that Sarah Palin doesn't have to look at Russia; so she can see Toronto. That's a very important thing to do. It means building more than 800 bridges so that people and businesses in rural Ontario can get to their destinations quickly and safely.

Our government—your government—understands how important infrastructure is to rural Ontario, and in the city, of course, my friend from Etobicoke–Lakeshore understands that it's subways, buses and streetcars. You name it; we can do it.

But in rural Ontario, the transit system is roads and bridges, so as part of our 2013 budget, our government dedicated \$100 million for critical infrastructure in rural and northern communities. It's a great program. The member from Nipissing knows all about it.

This year, funding will go towards 20 new projects totalling \$25 million—these are projects that are now approved based on their application to the MIII initiative of last year; providing \$4 million in capacity funding for 203 municipalities in asset management planning; and \$71 million in new infrastructure funding. Applications are now open. I tell my friends on all sides: Get those

applications in, because if they get an application in, we can start the process for approval, and then all of us together can be announcing good projects in ridings.

I heard loud and clear that we need stable, predictable funding, so we're working on that, along with my colleague the Honourable Glen Murray. We had consultations across the province. We met with over 500 municipal leaders who stressed to us the importance of having a consistent source of funding. It's very important, Mr. Speaker. You're a former municipal politician; you know what that's all about. That's why we're consulting widely to bring in, hopefully, a permanent program in the 2014 budget, which I know will be approved on all sides of this House. We're looking forward to that day.

The other thing I want to talk about briefly is that our government is working on health links to make sure that rural Ontarians receive the right care at the right time in the right place—very important. One of the ways we're doing this is through health links. Community health links represent a new way of thinking about health care delivery, about bringing together primary care, hospital care, home care, community, long-term-care providers, to ensure that high-needs patients aren't falling through the cracks.

This is an important statistic, and I want to get it on the record today. It's important to understand that in Ontario, the top 5% of highest-need patients, including seniors with multiple complex conditions or those suffering from mental health or addictions, account for two thirds of our health care budget. In many cases, this cost is because of duplication in services they receive and the frequent usage of these services. Health links is about turning the system around so that it's more important and responsive to patient needs. It's about breaking down silos.

Last week, I was in the wonderful community of Napanee. I always like to be travelling in eastern Ontario. I had the opportunity to be with my good friend the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. You want to talk about small businesses? I had the opportunity to see Vincent, and Vincent is a great small business owner. He has the dry-cleaning, he has the taxicab service and he has the coin laundry. I said to Mr. Yakabuski, “You don't need Costco when you have someone like Vincent providing those great services in Renfrew.” So I was in Napanee. It was a great day. I talked about the Salmon River Health Link. Our government is providing that community with \$60,000 to help plan and establish the business plan for their health link, and of course, in Ontario, we're setting up 37 of these right across our great province.

That's incredible progress, and as Minister of Rural Affairs, I'm very proud to say that these health links are right in the heart of rural Ontario and so important to the well-being of this province. The kind of health care links provide is best suited in rural Ontario to match their needs.

In rural Ontario, Mr. Speaker, as you well know—Bill Davis, a great Premier from 1971 to the fall of 1984,

always used to say that Ontario was still a province of small towns with big dreams, and I've always believed that. In rural Ontario, there's a sense of community. Organizations work closely together. People know each other, like the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke: He knows his neighbours and gets along with them very well. He knows what their needs are. That's so important in rural Ontario and, of course, we take care of each other.

This exciting program is just one of many under way across the province that seek to transform our health care system so it's more responsive to patients, and, of course, the number one priority, accountable to taxpayers. As a government, we know we must listen to the concerns of Ontarians, and that's exactly what we've been doing.

It's a three-book speech, not a five-book speech, so I've got to get to my conclusion.

To conclude, I'd like to recognize the progress our government has made—I just got the note that I'm getting the hook pulled on me. We focused on big things: health care, infrastructure and education. Going forward, our main priority will be to invest in people, invest in infrastructure and support a dynamic and innovative business climate. We believe there's only one Ontario, and each and every one of us is stronger when we all work together.

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

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I must tell you, it's going to be awfully difficult to follow such an eloquent speech from our friend across the aisle. He is right: There is one Ontario. Sadly, that Ontario is being led by a government at this particular moment that has not been truthful at all to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Shafiq Qaadri: “Accurate”; you can't say “truthful.”

Mr. Victor Fedeli: They have not been factual. I was going to say “corrupt,” actually. I can go as far as that.

For purely political reasons, we saw these gas plants cancelled. First we saw the gas plant in Oakville cancelled, followed by the gas plant in Mississauga. Now, you've got to remember that the gas plant in Mississauga was cancelled only days before the election.

We have worked very hard—our entire party has worked diligently—going through 150,000 documents to get to the truth. Why? Because we could not get the truth from the Liberal Party. They would not tell Ontario how much they had spent to cancel these gas plants, so we dug. You will recall, of course, that we needed the help of the Auditor General, the privacy commissioner and the OPP. What other scandal in Ontario has had that breadth and that depth of corruption and cost \$1.1 billion? This is an unbelievable, unprecedented scandal in Ontario.

The sad part of it as well is that the third party have been joining in on this government—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member from Etobicoke North.

Mr. Shafiq Qaadri: Yes, sir?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): You've been warned.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Thank you, Speaker.

So here we are with a government that has spent \$1.1 billion to cancel two gas plants to save five seats—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Final warning: If there are any more personal comments directed at this chair, the member will be removed.

Continue.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Thank you very much, Speaker. I appreciate that.

So let's just review some of the things that actually did happen.

We know that documents were concealed from the public. It started on day one, when the member from Cambridge asked a very, very simple question at the estimates committee: How much did it cost to cancel the two gas plants? The Liberal Party began the scurrying and the dance that began to conceal all these facts from us. Right away, we knew that something was wrong. We knew that something was not going to be right about this.

We never got the answer, so we had a contempt motion and began to get documents, but they even misled us about the documents. We got 36,000 documents, and 30 people on that side stood up and said, “You have all the documents.” Two weeks later, we had 20,000 more documents given to us. In later testimony, we learned from the Ontario Power Authority that they were directed by the staff of the Ministry of Energy to conceal those 20,000 documents from us, hoping that we'd never figure out that they were missing. But we did know that they were missing. This tells you the breadth and the depth of this scandal that faced us.

1700

Then we, through the committee, got to deleted documents. We actually coaxed out of somebody that they had deleted their documents, then destroyed the deleted documents and then destroyed the files so that we would never get to the truth of that. This is why the privacy commissioner had to be brought in. This is why the Ontario Provincial Police are still, to this minute, investigating this.

Then we found, as nefarious as we already thought it was, that the kingpin, Don Guy, and Dave Gene tried to influence the very Speaker's chair, to make sure that we never got to the truth. The only other thought I could share, Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I've been very lenient with the “not the truth” and some of the things you've said. I would suggest that you don't go down that road again, and you will withdraw that last comment.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I withdraw. Thank you, Speaker.

Let me just end my last couple of seconds here with the 2012 budget. Remember that the third party signed on and became the enablers of the Liberal government by backing that budget. Do you realize that the deal to send this gas plant down to Napanee, which added \$513 mil-

lion to this whole scandal, would never have happened had the enablers not signed on to the budget deal? We would not have been there. The third party is absolutely complicit in this.

Speaker, I stand beside our leader, Tim Hudak, in his motion, and I thank you for the time.

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

Mr. Jonah Schein: It's always an honour to stand up and speak on behalf of my constituents of Davenport. Today, I'm speaking to the Conservatives' opposition day motion. Unfortunately, I'm afraid this is a motion that will do little to help the people of my community or people anywhere in this province, because this motion is more political posturing, and it's more political posturing by a party that seems to have run out of good ideas a long time ago.

The topic of today's motion is whether Ontarians trust this Premier and this Liberal government. I think that's an important discussion, and I think the answer is fairly obvious. Speaker, I believe that in many ways and for many reasons the people of this province do not trust this government. I've talked about this before. The scandals, the mismanagement, the cover-ups: They erode the trust in our democracy; they alienate people across this province. But so do the kind of political games that the opposition is engaged in today, these self-serving theatrics.

This opposition day motion is a gimmick. It's self-serving. It's a gesture that does nothing to benefit the people of this province. Speaker, if you look at the standing orders, order 43(b)(vi), it's clear that this opposition day motion "shall not be a motion of want of confidence in the government." To break that down into regular language so that everyone at home can understand that, all that means is that this is not a confidence motion. It's not going to force an election in this province. This motion is non-binding. It does nothing to hold this government to account. It does nothing. It has little effect on what happens in this House now or in the future.

This motion is more of the same from a party that remains more interested in making noise on the sidelines than on delivering for the people who they're supposed to represent here. Speaker, we've seen this before. The official opposition plays games in this House. Last month, the PCs demanded that the Liberals repay \$1.1 billion lost in the gas plant scandal, but then they couldn't even show up in the House to vote for it on a Thursday afternoon. Members went off to play hockey and they left their constituents without a voice in this House.

This summer we saw the Conservative Party, we saw members make a big deal about demanding answers on the gas plant scandal, but then they voted to shut down hearings for the month of August so they could take an extended vacation. So while the PCs like to thump their chests and get excited and shout from the sidelines, they often follow up with little or no concrete action. They're all bark and no bite.

This motion here today—it's plain and simple—is more of the same that we've seen, and quite frankly,

more of the same is wearing people down. We know that our province does face huge challenges. Thousands of people are out of work. Thousands more cannot get good, meaningful work. The cost of living continues to go up in this province and our social safety net is frayed and broken, and we hear yet again this morning from the Environment Commissioner that this government continues to fail our province in protecting our natural environment.

Instead of facing these challenges, both the Conservatives and the Liberal government continue to play self-serving games in this House. Whether it's the power plant fiasco or the bill to support construction giant EllisDon or this pointless motion that is before us today, it's clear to all those who are paying attention at home and paying attention around the province that these two parties continue to put their own political interests first. That is disheartening to people across this province. Today's motion highlights the fact that people across Ontario have lost trust in this government, and I think, as I said before, that is quite obvious. We don't need a motion from the Conservatives to tell us that.

I think it's also true that people across this province have lost faith in government, period, and that's something that both you the Tories and the Liberals can take credit for. You've done it. You've successfully created so many crises in all parts of our government that it's hard for people to keep the faith.

Mike Harris, and now Tim Hudak, and all the neo-con rhetoric and the legacy of the Conservative cuts from the 1990s continue to hurt people in this province. They continue to hurt our public services and institutions and damage our collective faith in government.

In the 1990s, it was the Conservative cuts and their deregulation and lack of oversight that led to poisoned water in Walkerton. When that happens, people die, and people in this province lose faith in government.

The Conservatives' agenda of tax cuts for the rich and downloading costs and problems to everyday people leaves people poor. It has left people hungry, it has left people homeless, and people have died on the streets of this city. This brings people to lose faith in our government.

I'm sorry that the Liberals have been no better. While the Liberals are great at making people in this province think and believe they are going to do good things, they can't help but disappoint. People get excited when they see this government make announcements, only to be disappointed.

We see that this government likes to stand up and talk about how they're going to be the transit government, the transit Premier, the social justice Premier, the social justice government. All the headlines follow them along. People get excited. They say, "Finally, after 10 years, we believe this government is actually going to do something when it comes to transit." Then they retreat and do nothing.

People in my community met for years to talk about poverty reduction and were dragged from meeting to meeting and consultation to consultation. Nothing hap-

pened. This government releases report after report. They have panel after panel, and do nothing. People get excited by government announcements, and they feel proud when the government claims that our province is a leader. It's only later that they find out that behind closed doors this government cuts deals with their friends that leave us further behind.

Several times a week I hear this Liberal side boast that they spend the least of any province in the country. Congratulations. You invest less in our communities, less in our families, less in our children than any province across this country. Congratulations. You must be proud.

The Liberals continue to pursue their blind faith in deregulation and privatization, and it leaves them lurching from one scandal to the next. Without investments and proper oversight, who can be surprised that we don't have enough guards in our jails and that people die? The Conservatives scream to cut deeper, and all along, the people of this province lose faith in government.

Cancer patients in this province are given the wrong dose of chemotherapy, and people die. And the Conservatives yell about cutting more red tape. People lose faith in their government.

There is no regulation. There is no oversight of our child care centres, and so this summer we see kids die in our child care centres in Ontario. So people in this province lose faith in government.

1710

This government chronically underfunds our ministries. It crushes their ability to enforce the laws of the land, so our environment suffers and the species of this province die. It's miraculous that people even want to believe in their political leaders anymore. But it's clear that this government has exhausted all credibility. I think the people do want to believe in their governments. They want to believe that their governments are protecting their health, protecting their children and their environment. They don't trust this government or this Premier to deliver for them anymore.

It's the NDP that has done the hard work to earn people's trust, to hold this government to account for their mismanagement of this province and for the cancelling of Oakville and Mississauga gas plants. It's the NDP who understands that people of this province want to see real work being done in this Legislature and that they want to trust their government, and that if the government deserves that trust, they need to earn it.

Since the last election, our team, under Andrea Horwath's leadership, has taken a thoughtful and serious approach to the issues and the debate in this House, and we focused on delivering results for the people who elected us. We're not here to play games or to make noise on the sidelines. To be honest, why would we take our lead from a party that seems utterly out of touch with most Ontarians?

When I go out in my community in Davenport, the only people, the only party that's trusted less than the Liberal government of Ontario is the PC Party of

Ontario. The motion that they've asked us to debate today will do nothing to advance the interests of the people of Davenport. It will do nothing to advance the interests of people across this province.

We have a very different approach. We have a different leader. We'll continue to follow her lead, to work hard for Ontarians in the months ahead to make these positive changes. That's our plan. This party will huff and puff; I don't think they'll blow anything down except maybe themselves. We're going to do things differently here. Thank you very much.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate? The member from Durham.

Mr. John O'Toole: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to respond to our leader's opposition day motion. Really, I could thematically call this opposition day motion the question of trust. In fact, it's a very short time that I have. I look at it this way: First of all, if a person pulls the wool over your eyes, the first time, shame on them; the second time, we've caught on to the gimmicks that the government—they say one thing and do another.

I'm so disappointed because the gas plant typifies what happens. During an election, they'll say one thing, and after, do another. In this case here, they knew they made a mistake. Our leader told them that they had made a mistake on the gas plant locations, and for mean-spirited means and political outcomes, they cancelled the plant.

Just recently in my riding of Durham, they cancelled the new-build nuclear, as well as rendered the whole industry of nuclear energy in a very vulnerable state—uncertainty for investors and those people interested in going forward to build a strong, reliable production of energy sector in Ontario. My riding of Durham is just that sector, and it's caused uncertainty right from the regional chairman to the president of the university and to the workers in my community.

I have quotes here today, but I haven't been given enough time to actually put them on the table.

Bob Malcolmson, from the board of trade and the chamber of commerce for the Greater Oshawa Chamber of Commerce, said it was shameful. That's the word he used, so that's a pretty powerful word. The regional chairman said that this is undermining opportunities for employment in the community of Durham, and in fact affecting the tax base. The mayor of Clarington, whom I spoke with last week, was not even informed of the cancellation. The Premier sat beside him a week before at the luncheon and never mentioned it.

It's a shameful disregard for the leaders in our community and for the people of Ontario, and I have come to the conclusion that enough is enough. They can't be trusted. This government should be held to account. I certainly would want other people to talk to the issues as it affects their riding.

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

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: There are only a couple of comments that I have to make.

Firstly, since I've arrived here, the Liberals have always tried to spread the blame for taking those gas plants down and the huge costs involved in that. But the mistake wasn't taking them down; the mistake clearly was putting them up. There's only one group here that put them up, and that was the Liberals.

The problem I see with this is that if you don't learn from your mistakes, you're bound to make them again. I think that's exactly what's happening here. If they don't show any remorse, if they don't understand what has happened, then they're going to do it again, and that's a very costly bit of business for the taxpayers of Ontario.

To the NDP: Since I've been here, you've criticized the Liberals on every occasion. You've criticized them over the gas plants. You've criticized them over their spending in other areas. But in this situation, you are supporting them, which in effect means you're condoning what they've done. There again, for the residents of Ontario, that's not the best thing to do. You certainly cannot be condoning the actions of these people when you know how bad it is. I know you know how bad it is because you criticize them every single day.

Something has to happen here. You've got to understand that if we don't correct what has gone on, it will happen again.

Finally, to the Premier, what I would like to say is that the only thing between you and your government and that door is the shameful support of the NDP.

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

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I'm very pleased to join this debate this afternoon, because at the end of the day, this motion reads specifically, "It is the opinion of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that Ontarians no longer trust the Premier and the Liberal government." Speaker, there are so many examples of how people have lost trust in this government—over and above the gas plants; let's start there.

Just last week, there was a representative from OPA there testifying that there were four choices before Napanee that were delivered to the government for consideration. For whatever reason, they chose to absolutely ignore the recommendations of the OPA and go with the fifth choice, Napanee. It's actually a travesty because it's adding nothing but expense to the taxpayers. This is why people don't trust the Premier or their Liberal government.

As I spoke about in the House a few weeks ago, we had a family of seven in the riding of Huron-Bruce who couldn't afford their hydro bills, and electricity was cut off. They are blaming the Liberals' mismanaged energy scheme for that very reason. It is an absolute travesty that people and agencies that support these people are running out of dollars.

Just today alone, I was meeting with CFIB, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, as well as the home builders. There were some commonalities there. They all agree that there's only one pocket to draw from, and it doesn't matter whether it's the added tax that

they've introduced through the WSIB rates; it doesn't matter whether it's the burden of red tape and escalating fees to do business in the province of Ontario. Everybody from different corners is recognizing that people just don't have the dollars anymore.

Then, where do we start with their failed green energy scheme? People across this province are totally devastated by this mismanagement. I think it's pretty rich: I hope people realize that when the Premier and the energy minister say, "We're going to be listening to municipalities now with regard to the placement of industrial wind turbines," the reality is that they've got all the projects they need to realize 10,700 megawatts of power. They're not going to be looking for any new projects to come forward. So the fact that they're stating that they're going to start listening to municipalities on a go-forward basis is an absolute joke.

Then you marry that with the fact, which was brought to my attention by my astute seatmate, that one of the members of the Liberal caucus actually said today during debate—and this gentleman had his seat saved by the relocation of the Mississauga gas plant—that municipalities should have a say in where projects go. It begs the question of why what's good for one goose isn't good for the other gander. Municipalities across the province should have a say in where power projects go.

1720

I want to draw to your attention, in the minutes that I have here, that there was a document released at windpowergrab.wordpress.com. I share these numbers and these stats as a salute to the poor people who are being inundated with projects that are unwanted in their communities: Algoma, 609; Bruce, 827; Chatham-Kent, 629; Cochrane, 15; Dufferin, 246; Durham, 16; Elgin, 97; Essex, 312; Frontenac, 86; Grey Highlands, 156; Haldimand, 216; Huron, 521; Kawartha Lakes, 18; Lambton, 363; Lanark, 6; Leeds-Grenville, 6; Lennox, 78; Manitoulin, 204; Middlesex, 228; Niagara, 64; Nipissing, 48; Norfolk, 41; Northumberland, 30; Ottawa, 8; Oxford, 28; Parry Sound, 299; Peel, 5; Perth, 31; Peterborough, 3; Prescott, 15; Prince Edward, 195; Rainy River, 10; Renfrew, 100; Simcoe, 17; Stormont, 24; Sudbury, 1; Thunder Bay, 537; Timiskaming, 200; Toronto, 10—what happened to that one?—Waterloo, 10; Wellington, 73; York, 151.

Every single county that I just read off is home to unwilling host communities, yet as they exercise their voice, the Liberal government chooses to absolutely ignore them—except for Toronto, the Leslie Spit. What happened there? There's a community that spoke up again, and, son of a gun, they were listened to, and that project has gone off the rails.

When we talk about trust, we have to realize that this government has lost its moral compass, and we need a change in government. Tim Hudak and the PC Party will bring Ontario back to prosperity.

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

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I wasn't going to join in this debate. I didn't want to give it any credibility. I believe

it's a hoax, but my good friend from Etobicoke–Lakeshore threw down the gauntlet, and I feel like I have to respond, because I have a lot of respect for the member from Etobicoke–Lakeshore. I really do; I respect him as a person. But he's suggesting to the House that this is the NDP's opportunity to say that we don't have respect for the government, that they have no integrity, and we want to bring them down.

We don't need this pretend motion to say that. We do it on the New Democratic Party side every day in this House. Every question period, every debate, we're talking about the Liberals and the lack of respect that we have for some of their policies.

You can stand there and you can suggest that we have to support you. If you want to pretend—the great pretender party—that this is about integrity, then let's be honest with the people of Ontario: This is not a non-confidence motion. They're not going to rise on their integrity and say, "Yes, there's a confidence motion"—

Interjection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Member from Oxford.

Mr. Percy Hatfield:—"it's all smoke and mirrors."

Let's not pretend, for the people of Ontario, that this motion has any credibility whatsoever. It has none; absolutely none.

I came here to take part in meaningful debate. Sometimes I believe I'm off in Disneyland somewhere. You guys, when you stand up and you say to the people of Ontario, "This is real meaningful stuff"—what was it that Mr. Hudak said? This is the only tool, or the best tool that we have at our disposal?

Well, talk about tools. This is not a tool at all. This is a pretend motion. They say, "Maybe we'll get a headline. Maybe we'll take an opportunity to practise some of our lines for the next election." But nobody but the PC caucus is taking this motion seriously. Nobody in Ontario is taking this motion seriously.

If they had any chance of success, if I thought the members opposite were going to take it seriously and bring in a motion of confidence that we could seriously have a debate on—seriously have a debate on and take a vote on, it would be meaningful. What you have done is sit there on your hands and pretend to the people of Ontario that this means something. It means nothing. Your party means nothing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The member for Perth–Wellington.

Mr. Randy Pettapiece: Thank you, Speaker. That was quite a speech. I enjoyed that. I like to see emotion in the NDP, Speaker. I wish they had shown that same emotion when they helped kill the horse industry a couple of years ago.

They speak about all they got with this Liberal government. What they got was 9,000 or 10,000 people out of work, and that's a shame, because they wouldn't stand up for that industry. They went and voted with this Liberal government. We could have ended it right there, but no, you put your heads in the sand, you sat on your hands and you let that industry go down the tubes.

The last line in this motion says, "Therefore, it is the opinion of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that Ontarians no longer trust the Premier and the Liberal government." That's what this is all about. It's called trust. You people keep propping them up all the time; therefore, you must trust this government. That's what it says.

I had the opportunity, when I was a small child, to show horses. I showed at the royal winter fair a couple of times, and I showed at the CNE a couple of times. I built a bond with that horse, and one thing you didn't do with a horse is fool around with it, like try to trip it or whatever else, because that horse wouldn't trust you. That's exactly what's going on here. You cannot kick the legs from underneath an industry like these people and those people over there did and expect them to trust them again. That's what it's about. We do not trust them.

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

Mr. Rob Leone: Mr. Speaker, in the remaining minutes here, I'm pleased to join this debate and talk on behalf of the citizens of Cambridge and North Dumfries. I think as well of the voices of people in the ridings that are represented by members of the New Democrats, because I know that we visit those ridings. I hear the concerns that are expressed in my riding as well, that they simply do not trust this government.

I have sat here and listened to debate in this House already, and to hear the NDP denigrate the democratic process by calling this a pretend motion is an insult to this Legislative Assembly. The reality here is that this Legislature has an ability to express an opinion. In the opinion of the House, do we trust this government, yes or no? That's what this is about. I know that the members on this side of the Legislature, in the PC caucus, do not trust this government. I'm waiting to see what opinion the NDP has, if they really trust this government or if they don't. I want to see what they say. I want to see them stand up in their seats and say that they actually support this government.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the leader of the third party ask questions this morning in the Legislature. The first question: "Can the Premier explain why, then, Ontario ranks ninth out of 10 provinces when it comes to productivity growth?"

The answer to that question is because the NDP enables them.

The second question: "Since the Liberals were first elected, Ontario has lost 300,000 good-paying manufacturing jobs, and despite promise after promise, those good jobs have not come back.

"Today, 110 women and men who work at the Kellogg plant in London have learned that they'll be losing their jobs come January.

"Is the Premier admitting that the government's policy of no-strings-attached giveaways hasn't been working?"

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is maybe, but it will continue so long as the NDP enables them.

1730

The third question, Mr. Speaker: "Over the last 10 years of Liberal government, 300,000 good manufactur-

ing jobs have disappeared. Our province has the highest electricity rates in the country, the lowest productivity growth and an unemployment rate that is above the national average. The Premier still insists the plan is working while at the same time her actions seem to suggest something different.

“When are people like the women and men losing jobs in London going to see some real action from the Liberal government?”

The answer is, not until the NDP stops enabling them.

We have to have a process in this Legislature to express the opinion of this Legislature and whether we continue to have trust in this government. Each and every day, I stand in this Legislature on behalf of my constituents. I’m representing their concerns because they’re emailing. They’re saying \$1.1 billion were lost on politically motivated decisions to save some seats in the last election. They weren’t saving NDP seats; they weren’t saving Conservative seats; they were saving Liberal seats. And the past has a habit of repeating itself. In the next election, how much more money are they going to spend to save yet another Liberal seat? And the NDP, by simply continuing to prop them up, are waiting for that to happen yet again.

So there are certain questions that the NDP have to ask. Do they want an election or not? They should be standing in this Legislature and answering that question. Do they want and do they think that this is a corrupt government? Yes or no? We have not understood where the NDP stands on these critical questions, and they can say all they want—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I would ask the member from Cambridge to withdraw the one comment he made—the word.

Mr. Rob Leone: Withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

They say that the PCs are bad, but the Liberals are worse—or they’re not sure which is worse. But, you know what, Mr. Speaker? At the end of the day, it’s not about what I think or what the NDP think; it’s about what the people of Ontario think. What they’re craving for is an opportunity to have their voice heard on this matter: whether or not they have trust in this government, whether or not they have confidence in their ability to move forward.

The only way we’re going to be able to do that is to express our collective opinion in this Legislature. And they’re going to hide behind the fact that we can’t take down this government? But look at the pressure that we could put on this government if all of us in the opposition could finally have our say on whether or not we trust this government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Further debate? Second call for further debate. The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

Mr. John Yakabuski: It’s my pleasure to join the motion, the last—looks like I might be the last one of the official opposition today.

I want to start, obviously, by stating that we’re going to support this motion. This motion is about trust. It is about whether or not this government has lost the trust of

the members of this Legislature, and have they lost the trust of the people of Ontario.

I say to my friend from Windsor–Tecumseh: No, he’s right; this is not a confidence motion, because we can’t bring a confidence motion unless the government agrees to have a confidence motion. But if we as a collective body of legislators, I say to the member from Davenport—who agreed with us that he has no trust, that there’s no trust left in this government, and that the people of Ontario do not believe in this government and do not trust it. But if we do not, as a collective body, if we do not, as the opposition, stand in our place and say, “We agree with this motion”—there is nothing in this motion that the NDP can possibly disagree with. There is not a line in this motion. There is not a line in—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Maybe the member would like to go through me? Thanks.

Mr. John Yakabuski: I most certainly will, Speaker.

There is not a line in this motion that the third party can disagree with. My point is this, Speaker: If the members of the New Democrats—who have propped this government up through crisis after crisis and have ensured that more damage would be done to the people of Ontario—if they support this motion, there will be at least some moral obligation on the part of the government to recognize that members of this assembly, in the majority, have lost faith, do not have trust in this government. If we, as the majority, make that statement crystal clear to this government—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The next person who wants to play Ringo might have a problem with me.

Continue.

Mr. John Yakabuski: If we make it crystal clear that the members of this assembly, as a body, as the majority, say to this government: “We represent the people of Ontario. We believe absolutely that they no longer trust you. We can prove that what we say in this motion is absolutely true, that you have cost \$1.1 billion with your decisions to cancel gas plants, that the Premier is responsible for that”—and that the decision to cancel them was made at the 11th hour in the 2011 election to save Liberal seats. That has been verified by your former Minister of Finance Dwight Duncan.

So I say to the members of the third party that there’s one question you have to ask: Do you agree with what is written in this motion? Absolutely, because you say it over and over and over again in this House. You have an opportunity, in a few minutes, to stand in your place and say, “Yes, we represent people all across this province, and we are going to tell this government, as the opposition, that the people of Ontario have lost trust in you.” If we are successful today, then this government will be morally obliged, in my opinion, to bring a motion of confidence in the near future to this House and let this body determine whether or not they should continue to govern in the province of Ontario.

That is my ask of the third party. It is not a gimmick. It is not fun and games. Do you believe that the people of Ontario trust this government? I say, emphatically, no.

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

Seeing none, Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day number 2. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

I've heard a no.

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

I believe the nays have it.

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

The division bells rang from 1738 to 1748.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day number 2. All those in favour of the motion will please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Hudak, Tim	Nicholls, Rick
Bailey, Robert	Jackson, Rod	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Jones, Sylvia	Pettapiece, Randy
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Scott, Laurie
Clark, Steve	Leone, Rob	Shurman, Peter
Dunlop, Garfield	MacLaren, Jack	Smith, Todd
Elliott, Christine	MacLeod, Lisa	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	McDonell, Jim	Walker, Bill
Hardeman, Ernie	McNaughton, Monte	Wilson, Jim
Harris, Michael	Miller, Norm	Yakabuski, John
Hillier, Randy	Milligan, Rob E.	Yurek, Jeff
Holyday, Douglas C.	Munro, Julia	

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

Nays

Albanese, Laura	Dickson, Joe	McNeely, Phil
Balkissoon, Bas	Duguid, Brad	Meilleur, Madeleine
Bartolucci, Rick	Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Milloy, John
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Fraser, John	Moridi, Reza
Bradley, James J.	Gerretsen, John	Murray, Glen R.
Cansfield, Donna H.	Gravelle, Michael	Naqvi, Yasir
Chan, Michael	Hoskins, Eric	Oraziotti, David
Chiarelli, Bob	Jaczek, Helena	Piruzza, Teresa
Colle, Mike	Jeffrey, Linda	Qaadri, Shafiq
Coteau, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Sandals, Liz
Crack, Grant	Leal, Jeff	Sergio, Mario
Damerla, Dipika	MacCharles, Tracy	Sousa, Charles
Del Duca, Steven	Mangat, Amrit	Wong, Soo
Delaney, Bob	Matthews, Deborah	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Dhillon, Vic	McMeekin, Ted	Zimmer, David

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 35; the nays are 45.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): I declare the motion lost.

Motion negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller): The designated business for this afternoon having been completed, this House is adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 1751.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Tonia Grannum, Trevor Day, Anne Stokes

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

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
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	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough–Sud-Ouest	
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport Minister Responsible for the 2015 Pan and Parapan American Games / Ministre responsable des Jeux panaméricains et parapanaméricains de 2015
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiles et de l'Immigration
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Del Duca, Steven (LIB)	Vaughan	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Fife, Catherine (NDP)	Kitchener–Waterloo	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Fraser, John (LIB)	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
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
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hatfield, Percy (NDP)	Windsor–Tecumseh	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Holyday, Douglas C. (PC)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	
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 Economic Development, Trade and Employment / Ministre du Développement économique, du Commerce et de l'Emploi
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Hunter, Mitzie (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)	Brampton–Springdale	Chair of Cabinet / Présidente du Conseil des ministres Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Hon. / L'hon. Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	Minister of Rural Affairs / Ministre des Affaires rurales
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
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 Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Deputy Premier / Vice-première ministre Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
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
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland–Quinte West	
Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Moridi, Hon. / L'hon. Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Munro, Julia (PC)	York–Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Naqvi, Hon. / L'hon. Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham–Kent–Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, Hon. / L'hon. David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth–Wellington	
Piruzza, Hon. / L'hon. Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	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
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches–East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Hon. / L'hon. Liz (LIB)	Guelph	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation
Sattler, Peggy (NDP)	London West / London-Ouest	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock	
Sergio, Hon. / L'hon. Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea–Gore–Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward–Hastings	
Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto–Danforth	
Takhar, Harinder S. (LIB)	Mississauga–Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron–Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming–Cochrane	
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	
Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Agriculture and Food / Ministre de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Première ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement 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	Niagara Falls	

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉS PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Michael Prue
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak
Laura Albanese, Steve Clark
Mike Colle, Joe Dickson
Rob Leone, Amrit Mangat
Taras Natyshak, Jerry J. Ouellette
Michael Prue
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Kevin Daniel Flynn
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Soo Wong
Steven Del Duca, Victor Fedeli
Catherine Fife, Kevin Daniel Flynn
Douglas C. Holyday, Mitzie Hunter
Monte McNaughton, Michael Prue
Soo Wong
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Grant Crack
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Donna H. Cansfield
Sarah Campbell, Donna H. Cansfield
Grant Crack, Dipika Damerla
John Fraser, Michael Harris
Peggy Sattler, Laurie Scott
Jeff Yurek
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Lorenzo Berardinetti
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Rick Bartolucci
Laura Albanese, Rick Bartolucci
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Percy Hatfield
Mitzie Hunter, Jim McDonell
Randy Pettapiece, Monique Taylor
Lisa M. Thompson
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de
la justice**

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qaadri
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Phil McNeely
Teresa J. Armstrong, Steven Del Duca
Bob Delaney, Frank Klees
Jack MacLaren, Phil McNeely
Rob E. Milligan, Shafiq Qaadri
Jonah Schein
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod
Bas Balkissoon, Grant Crack
Vic Dhillon, Garfield Dunlop
Cindy Forster, Lisa MacLeod
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha
Todd Smith
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett
Toby Barrett, Lorenzo Berardinetti
France Gélinas, Helena Jaczek
Bill Mauro, Phil McNeely
Norm Miller, John O'Toole
Jagmeet Singh
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof
Donna H. Cansfield, Dipika Damerla
John Fraser, Monte Kwinter
Jane McKenna, Rick Nicholls
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof
Bill Walker
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Ted Chudleigh
Bas Balkissoon, Ted Chudleigh
Mike Colle, Vic Dhillon
Cheri DiNovo, Ernie Hardeman
Rod Jackson, Helena Jaczek
Paul Miller
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Select Committee on Developmental Services / Comité spécial
sur les services aux personnes ayant une déficience
intellectuelle**

Chair / Présidente: Laura Albanese
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Christine Elliott
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon
Cheri DiNovo, Christine Elliott
Mitzie Hunter, Rod Jackson
Sylvia Jones, Monique Taylor
Soo Wong
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

Continued from back cover

DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

Registered Human Resources Professionals Act, 2013, Bill 32, Mr. Dhillon, Mr. Prue, Mrs. Elliott / Loi de 2013 sur les professionnels en ressources humaines inscrits, projet de loi 32, M. Dhillon, M. Prue, Mme Elliott	
Third reading agreed to	4268
Correction of record	
Mr. Bill Walker	4268

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

4-H	
Mr. Ernie Hardeman	4268
Shine the Light on Woman Abuse campaign	
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	4268
Carefirst One-Stop Multi-Services Centre	
Ms. Soo Wong.....	4269
Ontario Drug Benefit Program	
Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	4269
Northern Ontario development	
Mr. Percy Hatfield.....	4269
Youth employment	
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti	4270
Remembrance Day	
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson	4270
Taste of Streetsville	
Mr. Bob Delaney	4270
Take Our Kids to Work Day	
Ms. Sylvia Jones	4270

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES / RAPPORTS DES COMITÉS

Standing Committee on Government Agencies	
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti	4271
Debate adjourned	4271

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

Workplace Safety and Insurance Amendment Act (Permanent Partial Disability Supplements), 2013, Bill 128, Mr. Berardinetti / Loi de 2013 modifiant la Loi sur la sécurité professionnelle et l'assurance contre les accidents du travail (supplément pour	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

invalidité partielle à caractère permanent), projet de loi 128, M. Berardinetti	
First reading agreed to.....	4271
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti.....	4271

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

Aboriginal veterans	
Hon. David Zimmer	4271
Crime Prevention Week / Semaine de la prévention du crime	
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur	4272
Medical Radiation Sciences Week	
Hon. Deborah Matthews	4273
Aboriginal veterans	
Mr. Norm Miller.....	4273
Crime Prevention Week	
Mr. Steve Clark	4274
Medical Radiation Sciences Week	
Mrs. Christine Elliott.....	4274
Aboriginal veterans	
Ms. Sarah Campbell	4274
Crime Prevention Week	
Ms. Peggy Sattler	4275
Medical Radiation Sciences Week	
Mme France Gélinas	4275

PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

Darlington nuclear generating station	
Mr. John O'Toole	4275
Taxation	
Ms. Sarah Campbell	4276
Air quality	
Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette.....	4276
All-terrain vehicles	
Mr. Michael Mantha.....	4276
Long-term care	
Mr. Jim McDonell	4276
Long-term care	
Mme France Gélinas	4277
Fishing regulations	
Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette.....	4277
Minimum wage	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo	4277
Wind turbines	
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	4277
Government services	
Mr. Michael Mantha.....	4278

Air quality

Mr. John O'Toole 4278

Home care

Mme France Gélinas..... 4278

Lyme disease

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson..... 4278

OPPOSITION DAY / JOUR DE L'OPPOSITION

Power plants

Mr. Tim Hudak 4279

Mr. Rosario Marchese 4279

Mr. Bob Delaney 4281

Ms. Lisa MacLeod 4283

Ms. Catherine Fife 4283

Hon. Jeff Leal 4285

Mr. Victor Fedeli 4287

Mr. Jonah Schein 4288

Mr. John O'Toole 4289

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday..... 4289

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson..... 4290

Mr. Percy Hatfield 4290

Mr. Randy Pettapiece 4291

Mr. Rob Leone..... 4291

Mr. John Yakabuski..... 4292

Motion negatived 4293

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 6 November 2013 / Mercredi 6 novembre 2013

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

School Boards Collective Bargaining Act, 2013, Bill 122, Mrs. Sandals / Loi de 2013 sur la négociation collective dans les conseils scolaires, projet de loi 122, Mme Sandals

Mr. Rob Leone	4247
Mr. Jagmeet Singh	4254
Hon. Liz Sandals	4255
Mr. Rob E. Milligan	4255
Ms. Peggy Sattler	4255
Mr. Rob Leone	4255
Second reading debate deemed adjourned	4256

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Monte McNaughton	4256
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4256
Mr. Todd Smith	4256
Ms. Catherine Fife	4256
Hon. Jeff Leal	4256
Mr. Rod Jackson	4256
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	4256
Hon. Michael Chan	4256
Ms. Sylvia Jones	4256
Hon. Reza Moridi	4256
Ms. Laurie Scott	4256
L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur	4256
Mr. Garfield Dunlop	4257
Ms. Peggy Sattler	4257
Mr. Mike Colle	4257
Mr. John O'Toole	4257
Mr. Jim McDonnell	4257
Mr. Monte McNaughton	4257

ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

Government accountability

Mr. Tim Hudak	4257
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4257

Government accountability

Mr. Tim Hudak	4258
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4258

Manufacturing jobs

Ms. Andrea Horwath	4259
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4259

Nuclear energy

Ms. Andrea Horwath	4260
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4260
Hon. John Milloy	4260
Hon. Bob Chiarelli	4260

Power plants

Ms. Lisa MacLeod	4261
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4261
Hon. John Milloy	4261

Cancer treatment

Mr. Percy Hatfield	4261
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4261

Youth employment

Ms. Mitzie Hunter	4262
Hon. Yasir Naqvi	4262

Pan Am Games

Mr. Rod Jackson	4262
Hon. Michael Chan	4263

Security at correctional facilities

Ms. Peggy Sattler	4263
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur	4263

Municipal development

Mr. John Fraser	4264
Hon. Linda Jeffrey	4264

Cancer treatment

Mr. Ted Chudleigh	4264
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4264

Ontario Northland Transportation Commission

Mr. John Vanthof	4265
Hon. Michael Gravelle	4265

Aboriginal affairs

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn	4266
Hon. David Zimmer	4266

Pension plans

Mrs. Julia Munro	4266
Hon. Charles Sousa	4266

Agri-food industry

Mr. John Vanthof	4267
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne	4267

Special report, Environmental Commissioner of Ontario

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac)	4267
-------------------------------------	------

Visitors

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac)	4267
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong	4267

Continued on inside back cover