



ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

Second Intersession, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario

Deuxième intersession, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 30 April 2002

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

Mardi 30 avril 2002

**Standing committee on  
government agencies**

Intended appointments

**Comité permanent des  
organismes gouvernementaux**

Nominations prévues

Chair: James J. Bradley  
Clerk: Tom Prins

Président : James J. Bradley  
Greffier : Tom Prins

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

### **Copies of Hansard**

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

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

### **Renseignements sur l'Index**

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

### **Exemplaires du Journal**

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
3330 Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W  
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  
3330 Édifice Whitney ; 99, rue Wellesley ouest  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400 ; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES  
ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX**

Tuesday 30 April 2002

Mardi 30 avril 2002

*The committee met at 1007 in room 151.*

INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

DAVID ANGUS

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: David Angus, intended appointee as member, Ontario Place Corp board of directors.

**The Chair (Mr James J. Bradley):** I'll call the meeting to order, for the purposes of Hansard and our committee. We will commence immediately with the appointments review. The first will be the intended appointee as member, Ontario Place Corp board of directors, David G. Angus. Mr Angus, you may come forward. As I know you would be aware, you have an opportunity to make an initial statement, should you see fit, and then you'll be questioned by each of the political parties represented on the committee. Welcome, sir.

**Mr David Angus:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. I would like to take the opportunity to indulge the committee with a few words, primarily about my background. I grew up in Thunder Bay. I am the proud father of six children. I originally started my professional career as a teacher. I spent some time in government and then, latterly, have become a partner in a public relations firm, which also has public affairs and a unit that does an extensive amount of procurement and procurement support.

Throughout my professional career, we have been involved in a number of organizations in providing support for them to help them grow. I might just mention a few of those: we've worked with the Ottawa Senators, the Montreal Expos, the WWF, Toronto 2008, the Royal Conservatory of Music and the Royal Botanical Gardens. During that process, I think we've been fairly successful in supporting a number of those organizations, although many of them actually found themselves in some difficult times.

I think as you grow a business and raise a family, you spend some time and reflect on giving back to the community. Over the last number of years, I've found myself with the opportunity to give back to the community and the city of Ottawa.

I'm proud to say that I've been asked to participate and am involved in the Ottawa Hospital Foundation board. As you know, raising money and seeking new partnerships for hospitals is not an easy challenge, and I've found the opportunity to do that. Also, the museum

of natural science and nature in Ottawa is going through some challenging times and I have been able to contribute in, I think, a positive way to that organization.

I do look forward to the opportunity to work with the board at Ontario Place and contribute and help that organization grow. I've been involved over the years peripherally with Ontario Place. I'm happy to say that when Ontario North Now opened I participated in that opening. I was involved in the establishment of the Molson Amphitheatre. We were involved when Ontario Place looked to try to extend their season with the international boat races. We've also worked with organizations in terms of the tobacco legislation when Benson and Hedges were involved with the fireworks in terms of the prestige that brought to the organization.

When I look at Ontario Place I see that it has often been on the leading edge of demonstrating some leadership through the province. It was one of the first organizations to bring a waterslide to Canada; the IMAX theatre; the amphitheatre; also, as a former educator, the fact that as it looks to meet changing economic times, it's getting involved in educational promotion and looking to attract more participation through education sponsorships and having the schools participate in the area.

As a board member, I feel very honoured that I was asked to serve on the board. I know that it's facing a number of challenges. One of the members of this committee in the past has had something to say about the future of Ontario Place and finding new partners. As I've looked at its mandate and some of the challenges, I think my background is suited to finding new partnerships and new relationships to continue to have the organization flourish and prosper. I do appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, sir. The rotation now goes to the government.

**Mr Bob Wood (London West):** We'll waive our time.

**The Chair:** The government has waived its time. We'll move to the official opposition.

**Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** Good morning, Mr Angus. I'm curious to understand how it is you have come to be an intended appointee to the Ontario Place Corp.

**Mr Angus:** I'd like to think that it's some recognition of some of the activity I've done in and around the city of Toronto in representing a number of organizations and

that I have actually, as I've tried to indicate, participated with other groups and agencies in terms of supporting Ontario Place. I would hope that it was perhaps a recognition of some of the effort I've put forth that my limited talent may be recognized.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** So am I to understand that you have been invited to offer your name to participate, or did you respond to an ad in the paper?

**Mr Angus:** No, I didn't respond to an ad in the paper. I was actually invited.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** You were invited by whom?

**Mr Angus:** By the government of Ontario.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** By what office?

**Mr Angus:** By the minister.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** By the Minister of—

**Mr Angus:** Tourism.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** So he personally contacted you and indicated—

**Mr Angus:** His staff did.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** It's important, I think, because this is a matter of public record. I think it's important for the people of Ontario to understand how individuals who consider their interests on such corporations arrive there and that really it is a position that should be open to any Ontarian because it does consider the interests of all Ontarians. Given that you are from Ottawa, it's curious that you would want to participate in a corporation that focuses its attention on a facility that is located in Toronto, although I certainly I appreciate the provincial nature of—

**Mr Angus:** I think you've hit the nail on the head. Even though I'm from Ottawa, it's a provincial organization. Even having lived in Thunder Bay, as I indicated, I was still sort of involved in it in terms of the northern community. So I don't see it necessarily as that I'm from one jurisdiction or another. I see that I can bring some perspective from other regions to something that I believe since 1971 is a pretty valued part of this province.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I think that's valid. I come from another part of the province but have visited the park with my family on many occasions. I'm just curious—you've indicated that over the years you have had some particular experiences with Ontario Place—if you would explain for the committee in what capacity or how you had occasion to be involved in those ventures or initiatives.

**Mr Angus:** It's been through, as I say, Ontario North Now. Having been a resident in Thunder Bay, I was very interested in that in terms of the development and promotion of the north. As a teacher, I actually saw it as an opportunity to promote an important region in the province—I think it's a fairly major corporation—to finding opportunities for people I've worked with over the years to engage and help participate in what I think is a growing business.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Is it safe to assume that it was when you were with the Office of the Prime Minister of Canada that, for example, you were involved with the

opening of the Molson Amphitheatre and the venture with Benson and Hedges?

**Mr Angus:** No. When I was involved with the Prime Minister's office, I had no real engagement with Ontario Place at all. It's been through private activity.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I see. I do appreciate that.

You may comment on the presentation that has been made by various individuals and some members of this government that Ontario Place should be privatized totally.

**Mr Angus:** Whether it's held in public trust, and it currently is—it's always a challenge between finding the balance of public support for an institution that does, obviously, hold the name of the province. I see an opportunity to find new partnerships and new relationships with people in the private sector to make it a very strong, viable tourism attraction.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Is that a yes?

**Mr Angus:** Yes. Not yes to privatization, but yes to some of the things I'm talking about.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** So it's not yes to total privatization?

**Mr Angus:** No. Obviously, that's a decision of the government that as board members we'd have to discuss. Obviously, I'm not prepared at this time to make a yes or no to that specific question.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** You're absolutely right that it is a decision of the government. I'm sure, however, that members of the government, people at the ministry and the minister's staff would probably consult with people on the board as to whether or not they would be inclined or open to the consideration of the privatization of the park. So I think it's important that the people of Ontario might understand today if you would have a particular inclination or leaning on that particular topic.

**Mr Angus:** I don't think it would be fair for me at this point to make any decision one way or the other. I haven't been privy to any of the financials of the organization. I've been privy, obviously, to some of its activities, but I find myself today not in any position to make any judgment one way or the other. I think I accepted the responsibility of being on the board—with the permission, maybe, of this committee—that we try to make the thing grow, be viable and not necessarily have to have all that discussion around whether it should or shouldn't be privatized.

**The Chair:** Mr Gravelle.

**Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North):** I have a number of questions. One thing that's very clear from your resumé is that you were quite proudly associated with the Progressive Conservative Party, in a variety of aspects, from a very young age. I presume that would mean you are still fairly well connected now to the party. Would that be the case?

**Mr Angus:** When Sheila Copps asked me to help out with the Haida program—I'd like to think that I have more of a public persona than just simply what party—

**Mr Gravelle:** The reason I'm asking that—and I'm certainly not meaning it to be rude in any way at all,

other than the fact that I think with that kind of connection, you would have some insight as to the direction the government is going. Obviously you've had very good connections from a young age, and that carries on. So that leads me to follow up a little bit more on the whole sense of what direction the government is taking. A member of our committee, Mr Wood, has made some comments about this previously, in terms of privatizing Ontario Place. I guess I'm wondering whether you have discussed this with people inside the party and the government related to the direction the government is going to take.

1020

**Mr Angus:** No. To this point I really haven't.

**Mr Gravelle:** But you do strongly believe there should continue to be some public support for this?

**Mr Angus:** Whether it's held in the public trust and the board members continue to be appointed by the crown or some ongoing attachment to the people of Ontario, I think that continues to be somewhat important. But I think it should continue to become a viable, sustainable operation and not necessarily dwell on the public purse. I would be surprised if—

**Mr Gravelle:** I'm a little confused, though. I'm trying to get a real sense of it. Are you saying that you would oppose full privatization?

**Mr Angus:** I think I said that I'm not—at this point I haven't had any real understanding of the books, what the circumstances are to understand. I know its history but I don't find that I'm in a position one way or the other to comment as to what its future should be, other than to try to continue to make it viable.

**Mr Gravelle:** Yes. There has been a decline in the number of people that have been going to Ontario Place, and there may be a number of reasons for that, but that would have some impact on the subsidy as well. What are your thoughts in terms of the decline in attendance? Obviously there have been some attractions such as the Molson Amphitheatre, which is pretty wonderful, I must admit. I think it's great. But what impact do you think that decline has in terms of the government's decision?

**Mr Angus:** There's obviously been a change and I don't know what the view of the current cabinet, current minister, current Premier, current caucus would be with regard to that, but I think I've indicated that I do believe there are some challenges that face Ontario Place. There are challenges that face any crown operation in terms of its sustainability and viability. When there are other public pressures, I think it's incumbent on that organization, and I hope to participate, to make it viable, to seek new partnerships and ways and means to grow the attendance, whether it be through some of the educational programs that have started, new partnerships with other sports and entertainment organizations or whatever.

**Mr Gravelle:** Would you lobby, then, when you're in the advisory position that you'll be in, for continual support from the province? Is that a position that you would be taking?

**Mr Angus:** For one thing, I've never sat at the board table. At this point the chairman has never asked me to take on a role, whether it would be, as you say, lobbying or whatever, to either protect it in terms of its ongoing funding or not. I think that I've been asked because of my background and, frankly, my interest to participate, and those are decisions that we'll have to deal with on an ongoing basis.

**Mr Gravelle:** Mr Chairman, do I have a little time left?

**The Chair:** You have one minute.

**Mr Gravelle:** I want to ask you about why you left Thunder Bay. You felt migration's a huge problem in the north and you sound like you still love the north—

**Mr Angus:** If you'll give me a 30-second response, I really haven't. We still work with the university, we still work with Thunder Bay Hydro, we still work with some other organizations in the city of Thunder Bay.

**Mr Gravelle:** Yes, I'm aware of that, actually, but we always want to keep our people there.

Tell me, there are a lot of Angus families in Thunder Bay. Which Angus family are you from?

**Mr Angus:** I'm from the Angus family that was connected to the university that has also left the community.

**Mr Gravelle:** Would that be Jim Angus, then?

**Mr Angus:** Yes.

**Mr Gravelle:** Yes. Great guy. Thanks very much.

**Mr Angus:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We now go to the third party.

**Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie):** I'm interested as well in why you would have responded to the minister's or his staff's invite to join this board. What would they have said to you, given that you're obviously a fairly busy guy out there working in your own business? What was it that they wanted you to bring, what was it that they wanted you to do and what is it that you think you yourself can do on this board?

**Mr Angus:** I've addressed some of those issues. I'd like to think that in my family life I've been successful and in my business life I've been successful and it's time to put back into the community, whether, as I said, it's the hospitals, museums or other things that I've been involved in. I'd like to think that I've worked with a number of organizations that have been in similar circumstances to those of Ontario Place that are looking for partnerships or looking for creative ways to raise profile and I would hope it would be a recognition and an understanding of that in my background that brought me here today.

**Mr Martin:** But nothing specific. You didn't, in your conversation with the minister's staff, talk about what particularly and specifically you might be able to do that would improve the lot of Ontario Place or contribute in some positive way?

**Mr Angus:** I think I've indicated I've got some ideas, whether it be season extension or different partners that can be brought in. There are all sorts of people in the sports-entertainment facilities looking for new partners, as was the Molson Amphitheatre, and I hope that over

time maybe we can bring some of those thoughts and ideas to the board.

**Mr Martin:** As director and owner of Strategic Relationship Sources, who are your major contracts with?

**Mr Angus:** Primarily the federal government. They're going through a complete rethink of how they buy information technology services. That organization has had a number of engagements with the federal government; in fact, there have been several departments that have actually looked to that organization to restructure their procurement.

**Mr Martin:** Who are your contracts with under Communications Strategy?

**Mr Angus:** Again, that company is headquartered in Montreal and primarily does a fair amount of work with the government of Canada and private sector organizations.

**Mr Martin:** So you seem to be fairly well attached to government and its sources of money for the work that you do, and have been actually for quite some time, if I look at your resumé here.

**Mr Angus:** I think we have a good understanding of public policy and public policy process issues.

**Mr Martin:** But you've not worked in anything much other than that, except for a year back in 1976-77 when you taught school up in Thunder Bay. Is that correct?

**Mr Angus:** Yes. Most of my adult life has been in the public sector, either working with it or making representations to it.

**Mr Martin:** And this is sort of an extension of that, a continuation of that?

**Mr Angus:** I think to some degree, whether it's, as I said, a hospital or a museum or Ontario Place, that I do have an understanding of what it takes to promote the private sector. In my public affairs life we don't do government work unless it has been charity, or on a non-fee basis.

**Mr Martin:** Is there any kind of remuneration that comes with this appointment?

**Mr Angus:** To be quite truthful with you, I'm not sure. I didn't take it for fees; I took it because I think that it's a way for me to contribute back into the community, which I said earlier.

**Mr Martin:** Mr Chair, could I ask the legislative researcher if he knows if there's any remuneration that goes with this appointment?

**Mr Andrew McNaught:** I don't know.

**The Chair:** We don't offhand, but we will be able to obtain that information fairly quickly.

**Mr Angus:** Maybe you could let me know.

**Mr Martin:** OK. Actually, that's probably about all the questions I have. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for being with the committee.

My Conservative friends here—when you're in the chair, of course, you're totally neutral. My friends would know. But I notice the Hunt Club and the Albany Club were both mentioned in there. We plebeians can only dream of entering the hallowed halls of the Albany Club

and the Hunt Club, and Mr Angus is a member. I admire him.

**Mr Angus:** Maybe I should point out to the honourable member that I did spend one year residing in the city of St Catharines as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, sir, for being with us today.

**Mr Angus:** Thank you. I'd like to add Ontario Place to that list too, by the way.

1030

#### BRENDA NOBLE

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Brenda Noble, intended appointee as member, Council of the College of Nurses of Ontario.

**The Chair:** We move now to our next intended appointee, who is Brenda Noble, intended appointee as member, Council of the College of Nurses of Ontario. You may come forward, Ms Noble. As I know you'd be aware, you have an opportunity to make an initial statement, should you see fit, and then the members of the committee will have an opportunity to ask you questions. We'll be commencing with the official opposition in this particular case. Welcome to the committee.

**Mrs Brenda Noble:** Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to appear before you today. With the exception of two years, I have lived in Ontario for my entire life and have experienced first hand the evolution of health care in this province. It is my understanding that I would sit on this college as an ordinary citizen who can bring the insight, concerns and experiences of regular, everyday people to the table.

I am married. I have two grown children and have lived in Kitchener for 41 years. When my children were young, I stayed at home and got involved in volunteer work. My family has always been involved in volunteer work. My parents raised me to believe that contributing to your community was a duty, and I have tried to fulfil that duty throughout my life.

My biggest contribution has been to the Girl Guides of Canada. This is an organization I first joined as a seven-year-old, and I will be forever grateful for the things that it gave to me. When I became an adult, I was anxious to give something back to Girl Guides. As a volunteer, I was privileged to spend 18 years working with young girls, teaching them leadership and life skills and to appreciate our natural environment, and watching them grow into responsible adults.

I have also volunteered in a small way with the local Boy Scouts, the Federated Appeal of Kitchener—now the United Way—the Kiwanis of Twin Cities and at St Mary's hospital on the geriatric ward.

I have been a lifelong political volunteer. As a young woman, my father gave me the constitutions of the three major parties and said I must choose one. He said I couldn't complain about the government if I didn't get involved, so I did. As a member of the Conservative Party, I have participated in many campaigns, municip-

ally, provincially and federally, and have been a riding president. I have worked as a constituency assistant for an MP and an MPP, where I had to deal with a wide variety of public concerns and individual interests. In this capacity, I developed skills that I believe will be assets to the College of Nurses: sound judgment, the ability to manage complex issues and good interpersonal skills.

When I decided to retire from full-time employment, I was interested in finding some small way of continuing to serve my community. I expressed this interest to the Public Appointments Secretariat. I got a call in March of this year from a staff member at the Ministry of Health asking me whether I would be interested in sitting on the College of Nurses. As someone who has an interest in health care, I indicated I would be pleased to do this.

While I have some small knowledge of the workings of the College of Nurses, I don't pretend to be an expert. I have read some material sent to me outlining its function. I wish to assure you that I will learn all I can and I will make sure, if appointed, that the time I spend on the council will be productive. I will bring the practical experience of a senior reliant on quality health care and of a mother who has raised two children and who knows the value of a skilled professional nurse.

I believe that nurses are the cornerstone of our health care system. I hope that by being a member of the college, I can help ensure the continued quality of the nursing profession.

**The Chair:** We commence our questions with the official opposition.

**Mr Gravelle:** I think your work for the last five or seven years for Mr Wettlaufer and Mrs Elliott, particularly at the constituency level, does give you an interesting insight and I'm curious to follow that up from the point of view of some of the restructuring process that has taken place in our province. Obviously one of the things that happened, particularly just after the beginning of the Conservatives' victory in 1995, was a restructuring process where there was a cutback in funding to hospitals, and nurses were laid off. Then there was a re-thinking of that position and more money was put into the system.

From your perspective in terms of what you heard at the constituency level, what did you learn? I appreciate your comments about the nurses being the cornerstone and I sure agree with that too. I think they are vital and I think there have been some real morale problems with them. But from that, did you, at your constituency office level, get a lot of reaction to what was going on then, and how did you respond at that time on behalf of the member?

**Mrs Noble:** The reaction was varied. I didn't presume to answer for him; Mr Wettlaufer was always very good about answering his constituents and was usually always available to us to give them answers. So that was the route we took in our office. We gave his answers.

**Mr Gravelle:** Were there a lot of concerns expressed, though, at the constituency level? Certainly, there were in my office. We heard a great deal about that.

**Mrs Noble:** As I said, they were varied. We had some good and some not so good, and you just handled both as they came in. I would have said that those for the good probably exceeded those for the less good.

**Mr Gravelle:** There's certainly no question in my mind, and I'm sure you agree, that almost everyone agrees that nurses play such an extraordinarily important role in the health care system—not just in the hospital system but obviously very much there. We certainly have a need for greater support. The fact that more nurses are being put into part-time positions, that more nurses are of an age where they're closer to retirement as opposed to new nurses coming into the system, really discourages us. I'm curious, presuming your appointment does go through, what position you'll take in that regard in terms of the college.

One of the points that has been made by the Ontario Nurses' Association is that the public members need to be more tuned in to the system. Do you feel that, because of your experience and because of your background, to some degree you will be more tuned in to what is crucial in terms of nursing in the province?

**Mrs Noble:** Yes. I have several friends who are emergency nurses in the hospital, and I spoke to them before coming here to ask them what they thought about my even coming here, and they were quite pleased. They felt that there should be someone in the level—and actually, these were both Girl Guides as well, that type of background. They felt I would be fair, that I would look at things very carefully.

In a constituency office, as you know, you're non-partisan. You have to be. You get all kinds from all walks of life and you cannot be political at all. I feel that would be the same way I would handle anything on the board. I would just have to look very carefully at everything.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Good morning, Mrs Noble. Thank you very much for coming. If you received the background that we received—I presume that you did—you are aware of the HPRAC report, the Health Professions Regulatory Advisory Council. So you are aware of that report very clearly indicating there could be problems with members who sit on the college who don't have a science background.

You've indicated that you have come to the role, you're considering the role, as a regular, everyday person on the committee. You've indicated that you've contacted friends who would see you as a fair and unbiased person. While I think that has some value, I am concerned because it has been indicated by the Ontario Nurses' Association that we are talking about a regulatory college that considers situations and issues of a scientific nature. We are in the province in the year 2005, you are aware, going to require our practising nurses to have more qualifications.

Obviously, it's a field where there are significant advances. So I would suggest that members on the college should also be required to have some understanding and knowledge of the levels that are required to be a nurse and so on. The Ontario Nurses' Association recommends that more extensive orientation, training and edu-

cation be developed for public members, and that would be you. You indicated that you would be prepared to do whatever you had to do. Are you prepared to be in-serviced in that way? It's not just reading a few pamphlets or documents; I would suggest it might include some schooling.

1040

**Mrs Noble:** You are saying "schooling." It was my understanding that they wanted people who were not professionals or in the medical profession, that they wanted outside ideas and concerns rather than strictly professional nurses. I understand they have quite a few on the council as it is.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** When you say "they," you mean the members of the government who appoint the members to the college. That's what they are looking for. That's who you refer to when you say "they."

**Mrs Noble:** Yes.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I agree that was the intention, but what the HPRAC report has highlighted is that some of that membership can be problematic in terms of the college actually fulfilling its mandate. The Ontario Nurses' Association, made up of people who are regulated by the college, is suggesting that even the public members should have some in-service to understand the requirements of nurses in their role so they can perhaps make better-informed decisions at the college level. My question to you again would be, would you be prepared to make that kind of commitment to in-service and education programs that would assist in that way?

**Mrs Noble:** I'm always willing to learn and to take whatever courses are necessary to be part of something or other. I'd have to wait to see exactly what the college decides or what the nursing association decides to do. I can't really answer that up front and say yes, definitely, because I have no idea what it would entail. I'd prefer to see what you're talking about with them, just exactly what the nursing profession has in mind.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I'm talking about what the Ontario Nurses' Association is recommending.

**Mrs Noble:** I would prefer to see exactly what they had in mind, what their intention is. Would they want this now? Would they want someone to go back to school? I have no idea what it would be leading to.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Can you appreciate the argument they're making, though?

**Mrs Noble:** I can appreciate it; yes, I can.

**Mr Gravelle:** Could I ask you one more question, Mrs Noble? Your resumé indicates that you are presently still working for Mrs Elliott. Is that the case?

**Mrs Noble:** Yes.

**Mr Gravelle:** Do you think it's appropriate for you to be working for a member of the government who is also now a minister and sitting on this position?

**Mrs Noble:** No.

**Mr Gravelle:** You don't think it is appropriate?

**Mrs Noble:** No, and I will resign.

**Mr Gravelle:** Oh, you will?

**Mrs Noble:** Definitely.

**Mr Gravelle:** That's what I wanted to clarify.

**Mrs Noble:** I only work one day a week.

**The Chair:** We now move to Mr Martin.

**Mr Martin:** Thanks for coming this morning. The first question I have is around your interest in this appointment. What is it that you think you bring specifically that connects to some of the challenges that face nursing in the province at the moment?

**Mrs Noble:** I can only bring my personal experience with nurses. I have a child who is a cancer survivor and I myself am a heart attack survivor. I spent a year in the hospital after a very serious car accident. Those were my personal experiences with a nursing career. I appreciated every moment that I was there. I hope I can bring the skills that I've learned in my lifetime through Girl Guides and other volunteer work and from my personal life. I think I'm fair and honest and I think that will help me.

**Mr Martin:** Those are certainly good things to be bringing to a board of this sort. What's your understanding of how a self-governing health profession college works? What is its role in your estimation and understanding?

**Mrs Noble:** I understand that they administer the professionalism of the nursing association. They're self-governing, as you said, and the college looks to their integrity to make sure that it's intact always. The two friends I had who were telling me about the College of Nurses said that they really appreciated having the college there because it kept them professional.

**Mr Martin:** Are you indicating by that that there's a problem in terms of the professional conduct or standards?

**Mrs Noble:** No, but we're all human, and sometimes you need someone there to guide you.

**Mr Martin:** Can you give me some examples of things that might be a problem or a concern where nursing and nurses are concerned?

**Mrs Noble:** Well, I've read a few things but I really couldn't comment on them because I don't know enough about them. I'm sure that, like everything, they've had their small problems and they've needed help along the way.

**Mr Martin:** What are the biggest challenges right now, in your mind, facing nursing?

**Mrs Noble:** Nurses?

**Mr Martin:** Yes.

**Mrs Noble:** Probably getting more nurses. I would think that would be a big challenge. I hope that part of the college work will be finding out why we're not interesting young people.

**Mr Martin:** Do you have any thoughts or ideas on why we're not?

**Mrs Noble:** No, I don't. I haven't delved into it enough or done enough research, but it would interest me to find out.

**Mr Martin:** What are your friends saying to you about that?

**Mrs Noble:** They are in their fifties, so they're rather concerned as well.

**Mr Martin:** How are they finding nursing at this time? What are the issues they see?

**Mrs Noble:** One is, as I said, in emergency, and she loves it, actually. I've never heard anything negative from her. She's quite happy in what she's doing.

**Mr Martin:** OK. Those are probably all the questions I have. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr Martin. We go to the governing party. Do you have any questions?

**Mr Wood:** We'll waive our time.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms Noble. You may step down.

In answer to the question that Mr Martin directed to the committee regarding the Ontario Place board of directors, the chair's per diem is \$140, vice-chair \$120 a day, and regular members \$105 a day. One would presume, I think, that there would be expenses. In case you were worried that Mr Angus would have to incur expenses flying in from Ottawa for the meetings, I would think committees would have routine expenses of those kinds. So that's the answer to your question.

#### JOSEPH DE MORA

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition and third party: Joseph de Mora, intended appointee as member, Cancer Care Ontario.

**The Chair:** We'll move to the next individual, Joseph A. de Mora, intended appointee as member, Cancer Care Ontario. Mr de Mora, you may come forward. As you are aware, you have the opportunity to make an initial statement to the committee and then there will be questions directed to you by members of the committee if they have any, and they usually do, in my experience. Welcome to the committee, sir.

**Mr Joseph de Mora:** Thank you, Mr Chair. First let me say that I feel honoured to be here to be considered for appointment to the board of Cancer Care Ontario. I've worked in health care for about 30 years, so I intended to give you just a little bit of background on me personally and perhaps a few words on why I think I would enjoy having this opportunity to serve.

I grew up in a military family. My father was in the Canadian military, so we travelled a fair bit and, as it happened, most of my schooling was in Europe. I came back to go to university in Montreal and do a graduate degree in Alberta.

I've worked for the last 30 years or so exclusively in health care, with experience in a number of different places. I started in Hamilton, working with the medical centre. I moved from there to the Toronto Western Hospital and held a series of positions until I was offered a position as executive director in a psychiatric hospital in the Maritimes. My responsibility there, as appointed by the government, was to convert that institution from a public institution under government to one with a board, and to go through the process of accreditation and affiliation.

Following that, I was in Kingston. I spent five years in the early 1980s in Kingston in a vice-president position and left there to become, again, the CEO of a hospital in Kitchener. I was the president of the Kitchener-Waterloo hospital.

#### 1050

While I was there and enjoying it and I think having a productive time, I was recruited to start work internationally, and I then spent the next 10 years working internationally, first in Karachi, Pakistan, working with the Aga Khan organization, and then later in Nairobi, Africa, responsible for both acute care hospitals and community health clinics and for advising the Aga Khan, his council and board on policy with respect to health care through Karachi. I worked with the Aga Khan for seven years, came back, and worked then in eastern Europe. Finally, before coming back to Canada, I worked for a venture capital company in private sector health care in the Far East for a year and a half.

I came back almost five years ago now to be responsible for the restructuring of the three hospitals in Sudbury. I was the first CEO of the new regional corporation there, Hôpital régional de Sudbury Regional Hospital, and my job there was to bring the institutions together and to initiate a construction program for a new hospital.

I was there for three years and then moved to my current position as president and CEO of Kingston General Hospital. In that position, I am again responsible for looking at restructuring, and also for the development of a new building program there.

I should say that in virtually all of those positions, including those abroad, I was involved in the delivery of care to cancer patients, and it was that which primarily motivated me to be interested in this particular appointment. I feel very strongly that there is a need for services for cancer patients and that those services are integrated within the health care facilities that exist. I believe we have a lot of work to do in this area and that perhaps my experience in this country and others might be of some assistance in helping sort through some of the decisions that have to be taken as we go forward in this in the next little while.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, sir. We commence our questions this time with the third party.

**Mr Martin:** You are obviously a very busy person and, if appointed to this board, will become even more busy. I don't think there is anybody who lives in Ontario today and who has either been affected by or has been reading reports on the issue of cancer and cancer care needs who doesn't understand that there's quite a challenge. Why would you want that position, given everything else you are doing and the busyness of your life?

**Mr de Mora:** I think, sir, for a number of reasons. First of all, we are a host hospital for the Kingston Regional Cancer Centre now, so in my current role I am responsible for helping to deliver cancer care for in-patients. The issues that patients bring to me and to the

board are significant in terms of my involvement at the present time.

I've always believed that, as the CEO of a hospital, one has an obligation to look beyond the operational responsibilities and to look at policy development. I believe the development of policy in cancer in Ontario is important, and therefore, both from the point of view of it affecting us directly and in some way helping to form the policy, it's a worthwhile investment of time.

**Mr Martin:** You don't see, given the very competitive nature of the province now in terms of different regions needing resources and having to go to the public purse for that, that you might be in a bit of a conflict there at all?

**Mr de Mora:** No, I don't believe I would be in conflict there. The decisions on resource allocation are primarily those of the ministry at the moment, and, as I understand it, the direction that we will be following in cancer care, at least the direction that is going to be considered, is one similar to that which exists now for some of the other priority programs in the province with cardiac care and so forth. Those allocation decisions really are made based on need, based on volume, based on cost, and are decisions that are made on evidence based on need at the Ministry of Health level.

**Mr Martin:** Given your recent experience in Sudbury and the very troubling and huge debate and struggle that happened over the perceived, and I think real, inequity in terms of the level of care provided to cancer patients in southern Ontario going to Thunder Bay or out of province and the care that the resource provided to northern patients who had to travel, does that not indicate to you that there is a bit of a problem out there in terms of where money is allocated, how it's allocated and who gets it, and would that in any way speak to perhaps a conflict of any sort now that you're in Kingston? Actually, the second part of that question is, what was your position on that when you were in Sudbury?

**Mr de Mora:** Let me speak first to the first question. I believe you put your finger on probably the most significant problem in Canada, not just Ontario. The whole issue of access to health care is now under debate, and considerable attention is being paid by federal—Senator Kirby in Ottawa—and various provincial groups as well.

The whole concept of the Canadian health care system and access really has to be defined, because clearly across the country there are significant issues with respect to access, depending on where those populations exist. That's also true in this province. I don't believe it's only in the north; I believe we also have some work to do in rural populations in terms of how we provide access to services. I do think, though, that we have to define what that access means, and there is certainly a high expectation by our public in terms of how readily available services are.

I don't believe that my position, moving from Sudbury to Kingston, puts me in conflict. The eastern part of the province as well as the western part of the province has issues of access, and certainly I don't believe my view on access has changed at all. I believe it's one of the most

important things we have to resolve. So I don't believe I'm in conflict in that way.

In terms of my own personal view, I was there when that issue was initiated with Mr Lougheed, and again I think it's a very significant problem in the province as a whole as well as in the country. I think the issues are different, though. My understanding is that the two programs are different. One was initiated primarily for re-referral of patients, which is a significant problem. The other was initiated at a different time in order to provide access to northerners.

In resolving that problem we have to be very careful. I think it opens up the issues of patients not just in the north but elsewhere in terms of what provisions should be made for travel and accommodation for those travelling from Haliburton to Peterborough or from Renfrew to Ottawa and so forth. I think it's a systemic problem. I did agree with the changes that were made to increase the travel grant for northerners in particular, because I believe they do have more significant issues with respect to distance, particularly in winter, and I understand that continues to be reviewed.

**Mr Martin:** Suffice it to say, adding to what you just said about distance and weather and geography, that we don't have the variety of offerings either. If you are in Peterborough, you can go to Ottawa or you can go to Toronto, and you have your own hospital. If you're in Sault Ste Marie, you really have Sudbury. As you know, that's three hours away on a good day. There are some significant difficulties there. We were promised a bunker in the Soo, probably when you were in Sudbury, and we still don't have it.

How are we going to resolve these issues? What are you going to bring to the table by way of advice or ideas that will resolve some of this? I was talking to our head oncologist on Sunday at the airport, flying back to the Soo, and listened to him and Dr Spadafora at a big fundraising function in the Soo a week ago. They're exhausted, and they don't have the resources, they don't have the equipment to relieve any of that exhaustion. What are we going to do?

**Mr de Mora:** That's a good question, and again I believe that question is now being asked through much of Canada and is primarily the subject of review by Mr Romanow and Senator Kirby and others. I'm not certain there are enough resources to satisfy health demand in Canada at the moment, and I'm not quite clear what we're going to do about it.

On a specific basis, in terms of access to services in this province, there's been a fairly rapid escalation in the cost of provision of those services and, I think, a demand that is concurrent with the rise of the need for new facilities.

**1100**

I guess what I can bring to the debate and to the issue is somewhere close to 30 years of having to make those kinds of decisions and trying to find ways of meeting demand with the resources that are available and by mustering arguments that more often than not, I believe,

have been successful in getting new resources. I don't believe it's just an issue of money, though. As you pointed out, there's an issue of manpower, and that's a lot more difficult to resolve over time. I think some of the steps that have been taken in this province and others to increase medical school enrolment, and hopefully at some point to look at finding ways to retain and attract new nursing people in the province, are where we need to go. So we have to find ways of doing that.

**Mr Martin:** I would suggest that another answer might be to expedite the recognition of foreign-trained doctors. We've got thousands of them, from what I'm told; I've been researching this because we have a need in the Soo big time. They're out there driving taxicabs and doing all kinds of things other than practising in the profession for which they've been trained. We're not talking trained in exotic places; we're talking trained in Britain, for example.

I just wanted to maybe get a little bit more personal for a second. Sudbury at the moment is under review in terms of its budget. I believe activity was stopped on the building of the new hospital because of overruns in budget. Did you have any hand in that before you left?

**Mr de Mora:** I accept responsibility for everything I did when I was there. I left there around 18 to 20 months ago. At the time I was there, we had a deficit. Actually, when I went there we had a deficit and we were able to attract some new and additional funding. The bottom line is that restructuring is expensive, and I think experience has shown over time that additional resources have to go in. I'm not current with the information now, but I believe they've taken some steps in recent times to look at what can be done to reduce costs. But there are costs attached to bringing three hospitals together, especially if those hospitals were rather small at the time and have now moved to one corporation.

In terms of the building program, I'm not aware of its current situation. When I was there, it was in its early phases and the cost estimates were different than they are now.

**Mr Martin:** Just to maybe cut you some slack and to invite some comment, I know from the information you gave us in your resumé that the Sudbury hospital, the new one, is trying to run an operation of 700 beds with a budget of \$170 million, whereas Kingston is, I would say, probably a little bit more comfortably running a hospital of some 450 beds with a much larger budget of \$186 million. Why that very serious discrepancy, do you think?

**Mr de Mora:** First of all, you have to take into account what Sudbury is actually spending, and I think you'll find it's more than that. Second, I think you'll find there are differences in the kinds of services that are provided. On one hand, Kingston is a teaching facility, so there are additional costs attached to the training of students and the conducting of research. Also Kingston has probably been more fortunate than Sudbury has in being able to attract people and has been able to expand some of its programs in different ways.

You should also know that the actual number of beds in an institution is really no longer reflective of the scope of operation of an institution. There is certainly a large movement these days toward looking at ways of providing care in other settings—I don't mean just home care but within the institution itself and day procedures and so forth. So it doesn't always give the same picture as the number of beds. But I would agree that there is a difference between the two, as there is between many hospitals in this province and others.

**The Chair:** That concludes your questions, just when you're—

**Mr Martin:** Just getting into it.

**The Chair:** I know. It always ruins it. We go to the government caucus.

**Mr Wood:** We'll waive our time.

**The Chair:** The government has waived its time. We now go to the official opposition.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Good morning, Mr de Mora. So many questions and so little time. First of all, I'd like to inquire: you are the CEO of Kingston General Hospital. Will you continue in that role should you be appointed to Cancer Care Ontario?

**Mr de Mora:** It would be my intention to do so, yes.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** When you left the hospital in Sudbury, was there a deficit and, if so, what was the amount?

**Mr de Mora:** There was a deficit, and as I recall it was in the order of magnitude of \$14 million, thereabouts.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Is there a deficit at Kingston General Hospital?

**Mr de Mora:** There was a deficit last year somewhere in the range of \$8 million to \$9 million.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Was there a capital deficit in Sudbury when you left?

**Mr de Mora:** I believe there was a small one when I left.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Is there a capital deficit in Kingston?

**Mr de Mora:** Not at the moment.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Do you anticipate there might be?

**Mr de Mora:** It's hard to say. The billing program hasn't begun yet, and I'm not certain what the final allocations will be.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** You indicated that with your 30 years of experience you have found ways of meeting demands with the available resources—these are your words I copied. How do you intend to capture that deficit in Kingston where you are right now?

**Mr de Mora:** I think there are several ways. There are a number of things that are taking place now, looking at ways we can improve the efficiency of service within the institution. That primarily means how can we get patients care faster—how do we make certain that once they are admitted, their surgery or other procedures occur more quickly in their stay, and how can we bring all the systems of the hospital together to make sure that X-rays are provided on the file faster than they were before—

and when patients are ready to be discharged that they are able to be discharged without delay, those sorts of things, and frankly also in looking at the resource base and seeing whether there's a legitimate argument for additional resources.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** That would suggest the system would be underfunded at the present time.

**Mr de Mora:** That would suggest that in our case I believe we have a case to be made for additional resources.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** You say it your way; I'll say it my way.

Are you aware that it was revealed last week that the government has paid over \$60 million in taxpayers' money to private, for-profit companies for health care facility services in the province of Ontario? These are for-profit companies that trade on the stock exchange in Toronto.

**Mr de Mora:** I believe this province has had for-profit health care companies for several decades. I can think of one or two that have been around for some considerable time. I'm not certain of the magnitude.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** But were you aware that \$60 million in taxpayers' money has been directed to those for-profit companies?

**Mr de Mora:** Actually, I thought it was higher than that. If you take into account Extencicare and a few other companies, I think you'll find it might be even higher than that. I'm not sure of the ones that were covered in that study, so I can't really comment.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I can give you some names if you'd be interested, but I guess the point of my question is, when we have a public health care system in Ontario that is underfunded and yet we have a government that is directing taxpayer money to private, for-profit companies, I'd like to understand what role you might have as the chief executive officer in a public institution to lobby for more money for the services that you must provide within your community.

**Mr de Mora:** First let me say that I think the two are different. This province and others have had a tradition for a long time of looking at the provision of some services by private companies—for a long time. I believe that is likely to continue. I think there's a difference, though, between private delivery and public funding. In most cases—in virtually all the cases that I'm aware of in this province—the public funding system is still the system that's used to fund those companies, and therefore they have to abide by the same kinds of terms and conditions and standards and so forth that others do.

The issue in terms of competition, I think, is one that has to be considered carefully, because these days public sector institutions are in competition not only with the private sector but with other public sector organizations. Health is almost always in competition with education and both with the environment. So the whole notion of allocation of resources is a difficult one and, as you know, it's one that is currently under debate federally and within a number of the provinces.

I'm not certain how it's going to be resolved, frankly. I do think we need to find some solutions that go beyond just money to resolve the issues, but I'm not clear yet where that will go.

1110

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** How much time do we have left, Mr Chair? I know Mr Gravelle has some questions.

**The Chair:** You have until 11:17.

**Mr Gravelle:** I want to return, if I may, to the issue of the re-referral program and the northern health travel grant. I'm sure you are aware that all the northern members were fighting very vigorously for equal treatment for northerners in terms of travel. It is something that we've been doing for some time—certainly in Sudbury, led by Rick Bartolucci, and working very much with Gerry Lougheed. I'm curious as to what your position was at the time this was out there. Were you supportive of that campaign for equal treatment when that re-referral program was put in place?

Of course, what offended us so incredibly was the fact that—and I'll use Thunder Bay as an example—we had people sitting in the Northwestern Ontario Regional Cancer Centre beside people from southern Ontario who were receiving 100% of their funding. They were getting their airfare paid for, their hotels, their accommodation and meals and everything else. It was certainly something that upset us. In fact, the Ombudsman, Clare Lewis, declared that this was discriminatory. I'm curious as to what your position was, because you were in Sudbury at the time. What was your position on that? Did you take a position publicly?

**Mr de Mora:** As I indicated before, I was then and am still concerned about issues of access. I did believe, though, as I do now, that the two parameters are different, that the issues that relate to re-referral involve people going to different countries, and that incurred additional costs. I did believe, and it subsequently occurred, that there should have been a change in the northern grant in order to allow costs to be covered both for a return trip and for higher mileage.

I don't think it's as simple as trying to compare, though, the northern grant with the re-referral program. I think it does raise the whole issue of what costs should be covered by the public purse when patients have to travel a distance for care. I think you have to look at under what circumstances that should occur and find ways to deal with it.

I think the northern population, as I say, has significant access issues and it's true that patients from the northern part of the province incur a considerable expense to get to Sudbury. I was pleased, therefore, when some of those changes were made to the mileage program. But I don't think it's as simple as comparing those two programs.

**Mr Gravelle:** Did you take a position on this at the time? Certainly, it was clearly discriminatory in terms of what happened. It wasn't just people going to Thunder Bay or Sudbury; it was people having to go down to Toronto themselves and not having accommodation paid.

I think we were successful to some degree in getting the government to increase the northern health travel grant, but it still doesn't deal with hotel and food. I'm just curious as to your position at the time.

**Mr de Mora:** It's my understanding that at the same time, patients who had to travel to Toronto from other parts of the province not in the north were also in the same situation. As it happened, I was just in the process of leaving at the time that occurred so I really didn't get a chance to comment publicly at the time. Had I, I would probably have said what I've just said.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** If I could just follow with one more question?

**The Chair:** Yes, you can.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Mr de Mora, you've indicated that the deficit at KGH is between \$5 million and \$6 million.

**Mr de Mora:** It was \$8 million to \$9 million last year.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** What about this year?

**Mr de Mora:** It's not certain yet. The funding announcements haven't been made yet.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Would you be able to explain why in the Kingston Whig-Standard it's reported that the deficit is \$19 million?

**Mr de Mora:** I would. The \$19 million relates to the current year, and that's a projection based on an assumption of no additional revenue. We haven't yet been told what the revenue is, so that projection is based on the assumption that there will be no additional revenue. I think that's unlikely.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** So your projection of \$8 million to \$9 million is that there is going to be additional revenue.

**Mr de Mora:** No. The \$8 million to \$9 million was based on the year ended, and we know for certain what it was. For the \$19 million, the year started on April 1, and that projection was given on February 1 in response to a need to try and sort out what the provincial requirements would be.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** The understanding within the public in your community, however, is that there is potentially a \$19-million deficit at KGH.

**Mr de Mora:** If we got no additional resources, it would be in that order of magnitude.

**The Chair:** That completes your time. I know it always gets exciting at a certain period of time when we're asking questions, and the ogre who sits in the chair has to cut everybody off.

**Mr Gravelle:** You are that, in essence.

**The Chair:** The member for Thunder Bay notes that I'm an ogre from time to time.

Thank you very much, sir, for being with us today. You may step down.

#### JOHN MELADY

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: John Melady, intended appointee as member, Custody Review Board and Child and Family Services Review Board.

**The Chair:** Our next intended appointee is John Melady, intended appointee as member, Custody Review Board and Child and Family Services Review Board. You may come forward, sir. Welcome to our committee. As you would be aware, you have an opportunity to make an initial statement. Subsequent to that, there will be questions directed to you by members of the committee, and we will commence with the governing party at the conclusion of your remarks. Welcome, sir.

**Mr John Melady:** Thank you very much, Mr Chairman and members of the committee, for permitting me to speak to you today about my intended wish and desire to be on both of these boards: the Child and Family Services Review Board and the Custody Review Board.

I'll just give you a little bit of my personal background. I was born in Windsor, Ontario, moved to Toronto at the age of five, grew up in Toronto, went to school in Toronto and then started teaching high school in Kapuskasing, Ontario, where I stayed for five years as a teacher of English and mathematics in grade 9 as a start. I remember one year—math and English and some history.

Then I moved to Aylmer, Ontario, and taught there for four years, where I embarked on a guidance and counselling program with Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. They came to London, Ontario, to educate us and we attended classes there. I spent a residency in Detroit. I survived Detroit. I guess that's not too funny, but at the time it was pretty hot there. Anyway, I survived that and I stayed in Aylmer for four years.

My parents were ailing in Toronto, so I moved back to my roots to be close to my family. I reside today in Mississauga, Ontario.

I am desirous of being on these committees, first of all as an outlet for my abilities and my intellectual capacity. I need to be doing something. As you can see in my short resumé there, I'm involved in part-time work with GSC Services, a show company. I work at the national trade show, for example, greeting and meeting people, telling them where to go in an information way. I've also worked for the Princess Margaret lottery and sold tickets at the kiosk at the Princess Margaret, just down University Avenue here, and also looked after a house that they are currently going to raffle off, in about a month or so.

That's a little bit of my background. I'd be glad to entertain any questions that anybody may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, sir. We commence our questioning with the government party.

**Mr Wood:** We will waive our time.

**The Chair:** We will move to the official opposition.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Good morning, Mr Melady. Could I ask you, what do you think of the Young Offenders Act?

**Mr Melady:** You've started off with a tough question. I don't know the Young Offenders Act in very much detail. I am aware of it from my briefing notes and I think it has pluses and minuses. There's always room for improvement. I would have a better idea of what those improvements are if and when I get on this committee.

I'm sure there are strengths and weaknesses behind it. I think it's a valid try to overcome the present violence that we get reported every day in the youth area in the province.

1120

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I certainly appreciate your answer. I wouldn't expect that you would have an intimate knowledge or understanding of the act, but certainly within our communities there are perceptions. Some people think it's far too lenient and it enables young people who would be in criminal situations to get away with a lot. Then there are others who believe that it unduly penalizes young people. I was just wondering if you had an inclination or an opinion about the Young Offenders Act.

**Mr Melady:** The Young Offenders Act has been put in place by the federal government and, as you know, with all legislation, there are opinions on it. My opinion of the Young Offenders Act is that right now it is suitable but subject to improvements. I think it's a valid attempt to try. I know that the police forces and certain other groups of people are against some of the items in there. I think some of those items are valid and will likely be looked at in the future by legislators.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Can I ask you what you think of boot camps?

**Mr Melady:** You certainly can. I think that was an attempt at a strict disciplinary way to handle youth. I'm not sure, personally, if that's the total answer, because at one stage of the game they need to get on their own and they need some opportunity to grow as people. You can't strictly enforce everything. You have to allow for a certain amount of human freedom. However, in certain cases, that freedom has to be deprived.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I'm sure with your experience as a teacher, you would appreciate that while discipline is certainly very important, sometimes—I guess for me the proof is in the pudding. If there are statistics that can demonstrate that when an individual participates in a boot camp experience, it actually does remediate the behaviour of the individual, then perhaps it is justified. Are you familiar with any studies that would support that idea?

**Mr Melady:** I am not familiar with any of the studies, I'm sorry, but I would agree with the point you're making that if it's working, that's a plus for that type of solution.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Are you aware that young offenders in Ontario are detained in provincial correction facilities?

**Mr Melady:** Yes, I am.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Do you think that's an appropriate accommodation for young offenders who have been charged?

**Mr Melady:** I think it's one accommodation and I think it's appropriate depending on the young person involved and depending on the circumstances. Then there are other ways of handling the situation; that type of home where there's less custody as they try to bring them

along. That has a place in the system too. As the person grows, we try to remediate the situation. It's a very difficult situation, as you know.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Have you had an opportunity to visit a young offenders' section at a penal institution?

**Mr Melady:** No, I haven't, but in the past I've been in what used to be called the Guelph reformatory. I've been there. I've also been to the Don jail to visit when I was in social work; not visiting a friend or anything like that but, still, it was a visit. I had six months after I finished university in social work, mainly in criminology, at which time I decided to go into teaching and entered the faculty of education in the fall. I thought at that time, being an idealist, if I become a teacher, maybe I can prevent some of these young people I see in the Don jail and the Guelph reformatory—maybe I can prevent it. I've since mellowed those views somewhat. I mean, I'm not quite the idealist I used to be.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** Do you have concern at all that when young offenders are placed in a correction facility, and it has been presented that really that is a crime school, if they were not a criminal when they went in, they could be when they came out because they could learn a lot of tricks in there?

**Mr Melady:** I've heard that and I'm not sure the statistics on how much they learn—I'm sure there is some learning going on there, which I've heard. But hopefully we try to rejuvenate the 10% or 15% or 5% or 20% we can. The others, unfortunately, we can't do much about. We can still try, but I see that in some cases there's not much space there.

**Mr Gravelle:** Good morning, Mr Melady. These are two very important review boards; there's no question about that. I'm not sure that I heard how it was you came to have this appointment offered to you. I think it's very important that people have very much a certain skill set and you said you were looking for an outlet for your skills. As much as I appreciate that, I thought, "Gee, I'm not sure that's exactly what I want to hear somebody say who's going to be sitting on this." I would hope that you would be telling us indeed that you feel your background was very appropriate.

How did this appointment come forward to you? Because I am very conscious of how important these boards are.

**Mr Melady:** I worked in a campaign for Mr Carl DeFaria, and in the course of working for him he suggested to me that I have the talents and abilities—I've worked with youth—to serve on such a board involving youth in a big way. So I gave it some thought and I got in touch with him a couple of months later, saying that I would certainly be interested; it would represent a new and pleasant challenge to me. Hence I have reached this far.

**Mr Gravelle:** Have you done some research, sir, as well in terms of the Child and Family Services Review Board? The largest number of cases that come forward are the emergency secure treatment facilities where appeals come forward to that. Are you aware of that, and

what attitude will you take toward those particular hearings? If you can talk about that a bit, because clearly this is very serious stuff and serious situations are brought forward. What attitude can you bring toward that?

**Mr Melady:** I'm aware of the emergency secure treatment, that kind of thing, and I think I could bring a good sense of judgment to any situation and treat these people in a compassionate, fair and just way on the committee. I have not done that much research. I certainly am willing to become well-informed on such facilities and make a thorough study of them to apply my effectiveness on the committee.

**Mr Gravelle:** Give me your thoughts also, if you may, Mr Melady, on some of the pressures that are being faced by children's aid societies. We certainly have heard a great deal about them related to some specific cases lately. One of the things that I think should concern all of us is that, while the government will say invariably, "We put more money into the system," there is a very clear sense that there is so much paperwork involved in the work that people at children's aid are doing that indeed they're not able to spend nearly enough time working with the families and with the children they are there to protect. As I say, there have been some very public cases that have come out. I would like to know what your thoughts are in terms of the government's support for children's aid and, quite frankly, the support for residential treatment programs as well, and residences.

I'm the critic for community and social services and I'm very conscious of the lack of resources that are out there. So I guess in essence I'd like to get your thoughts on that and what position you would take related to the lack of resources.

**Mr Melady:** I would certainly support adequate funding for the children's aid societies. I am aware that the children's aid societies' caseload is apparently very high and they have become so scattered in their approach that there is less and less time to spend on individuals in the system. That's all I'm aware of as to the intimate workings of the children's aid. My opinion is that the government should supply adequate funding for such services, because these people are going to be adults in the future.

1130

**The Chair:** That concludes the amount of time allocated to the official opposition. We go to the third party.

**Mr Martin:** I note by your resumé that at one time you were a teacher and have some background in guidance and counselling, which I think should serve you well in this role, should you get appointed. However, my question revolves around your more immediate activities since retiring. It seems that none of them are involved in the area that you worked at for quite some time in your life.

Is there any particular thing or issue that has jumped out at you, that has piqued your interest and encouraged or pushed you to actually seek and accept this appointment?

**Mr Melady:** I have always been interested in youth, not only personally. I have two children of my own and

three grandchildren. I am always interested in youth; that's obvious from my teaching career. I taught English, which is a subject that I really felt I could reach young people with, in view of the intellectual and emotional challenge of the subject, and the way it relates to them as people, as persons. Overriding my life is an interest in young people and that's an issue that I'm very concerned about. Hence, I'm applying for this board.

**Mr Martin:** There are no red flags out there for you that have piqued your interest in the last year or two, or that have been part of the reason for you?

**Mr Melady:** I'm interested in the Young Offenders Act, all these kinds of things. I'm interested in the way laws apply in certain situations. I have been down to the University Avenue courthouse as kind of a hobby, to keep myself informed in how law is applied to human beings in the human situation. I have many and varied interests in quite a number of areas but with a focus throughout my life on young people.

**Mr Martin:** The responsibility for this board has been expanded in the last while to include, for example, appeals under the Intercountry Adoption Act. What do you know about that?

**Mr Melady:** I don't know much about it, sir, but I would be willing to learn more about it, of course. I know about the Safe Schools Act and those situations, but I don't know anything about what you just mentioned, the Intercountry Adoption Act.

**Mr Martin:** OK, Moving on to the next one you just mentioned, the Safe Schools Act, 2000, what's your view and opinion on that?

**Mr Melady:** I think the intent of that Safe Schools Act is very valid, because to have effective learning you have to have a safe environment in which young people can learn. Anything that can make the schools safer within the reasonable bounds of law I am certainly all for.

**Mr Martin:** OK. Those are all my questions, Mr Chair.

**The Chair:** That now concludes the questioning. Thank you very much, sir. You may step down.

**Mr Melady:** Thank you very much, Mr Chairman and committee.

**The Chair:** The committee will now consider the intended appointments. We have four to consider.

The first appointment is David Angus, intended appointee as member, Ontario Place Corp board of directors.

**Mr Wood:** I move concurrence.

**The Chair:** Mr Wood has moved concurrence. Is there any discussion?

**Mr Martin:** I just wanted to state my concern re this appointment. We have a gentleman here who has been at the trough for most of his professional life—a good Tory at the trough, I might say. Here we are again, going to appoint him to another public board that, yes, may not pay him a whole lot of money—I believe it's \$105 a day.

**The Chair:** The figure was \$105 a day; presumably expenses as well.

**Mr Martin:** And assuming expenses. Did we get any word on the number of days it might sit in a year?

**Mr McNaught:** Yes. The latest information we have is that the full board meets once per month. In addition to that, committees will also meet, but we don't have figures on that.

**Mr Martin:** So we have this gentleman now able to probably expense a trip to Toronto from Ottawa at least once a month, probably to dine at the Albany Club while he's here and meet with other individuals in the community, perhaps to further his own professional or personal agenda.

So with all that in mind, and the development of a somewhat cynical nature here as we watch every other week the appointment of more and more friends of the government, members of the Conservative Party, many of them already at the trough and being introduced further to that concept, today we have three members of the Conservative Party, some of them more forthcoming than others in terms of their affiliation.

I frankly have no difficulty—I think we're served well to have many active and committed members of all political parties involved in government. But as I look at the overwhelming number coming before this committee and being appointed to agencies, boards and commissions of significant influence in the province, I have a concern that we're not maintaining the level playing field or the balance that I think is required if we're going to provide good public service and oversee good public service in this province. So I won't be supporting this particular appointment this morning.

**The Chair:** Any further comment?

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** What I had hoped I might hear from the individual this morning, particularly as a father of six, was that he wanted to be on the Ontario Place Corp board because he loved the place, that he loved it and he took his kids there regularly and he thought it was a venture worth supporting. I didn't hear that, and I am rather of the mind of Mr Martin, that this appointment will enable, at the taxpayers' expense, Mr Angus to visit the Albany Club here in Toronto on a monthly basis, if that's how often the committee meets. So I was very disappointed. I had some hope when I read the resumé, particularly when I came to understand that he had a family. He talked about professionally having been at the opening of the amphitheatre, but he didn't talk about all the wonderful parts of that facility that families and individuals and taxpayers of Ontario can enjoy, and that's definitely what I expected. So for those reasons, I will not be able to support this intended appointee.

**Mr Gravelle:** Let me add my note of irritation as well, Mr Chair. This has the ring of perk about it, and nothing much else. Mr Angus showed no particular interest in, or was certainly very vague in his response to, exactly what the future of Ontario Place was. As my two colleagues have said, it just looks like it's one of those little perks you get for being a supporter of the party. I don't think Mr Angus, in that sense, will be bringing anything very specific to the board, so I will also not be supporting this appointment.

**Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre):** I think Ontario Place is a facility that needs some help to make it more competitive with other tourist venues in the province and elsewhere. I think Mr Angus has demonstrated through his track record significant skill sets in terms of marketing, communication, promotion and public relations that clearly Ontario Place would have a great need of input on. Therefore, that is one of the main reasons why I think he should be appointed, and I will support it.

**1140**

**The Chair:** Any further comment? If not, I have a motion from Mr Wood. All in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The next appointment is Brenda Noble, intended appointee as member, Council of the College of Nurses of Ontario.

**Mr Wood:** I move concurrence.

**The Chair:** Mr Wood has moved concurrence in this appointment. Any comment? It will be Mr Martin, first of all.

**Mr Martin:** I just wanted to say that here's a woman who was very forthcoming in her political affiliation and place of work, very much a Tory, and probably does some really good work in her various capacities. I think it will probably be a good appointment, but it just troubles me that in the context of so many of these Conservative, Tory appointments week after week, it seems we can't find other people out there to add some balance to the input and persuasion and advice that government will get from these very important overseers of the public activity of this province. But I'll support this one this morning.

**Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe):** Mr Chair, I certainly canvass regularly for people looking for appointments. People come in to the office. I've not found any good Liberals or NDP who will admit that they belong to the Liberal Party. If you know of any, I'll certainly be happy to take their resumé in my constituency office.

**The Chair:** Thank you for the kind offer, Mr Mazzilli. I'm sure that members of the committee will contemplate taking up your offer should they deem it appropriate.

Any further comment? If not, all in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The next intended appointee is Joseph A. de Mora, intended appointee as member, Cancer Care Ontario.

**Mr Wood:** I move concurrence.

**The Chair:** Mr Wood has moved concurrence. Any comment?

**Mr Martin:** Yes. However qualified and well-intentioned this appointment may be, I think he's going to have conflict of interest from the minute he gets appointed. I know the battle that's being waged for more money in health care—and cancer care in particular—is a very important one and he would probably be as good as any in making the case. But when it comes down to, then, how that money gets allocated to the various regions of the province, given what we've seen over the last two or three years in this province re the inequity, particularly where northerners are concerned, I'm very, very sensitive

to that issue and want to make absolutely certain that we have every advantage, or at least we're playing on a level playing field when it comes to getting the resources that we need to provide that care to my constituents and the constituents of that wonderful part of the province called northern Ontario.

We've been waiting in Sault Ste Marie for five years now for a bunker that's been announced probably five times that we still don't have. And if we don't get it soon, we're going to have the doctors, who are trying valiantly and desperately to keep what we have running in that place, exhausted and not available to us any more.

So I'm going to vote against this one because I think there's potential there for conflict, and I don't want to put that in the way of those resources being fairly allocated in the province.

**Mrs Dombrowsky:** I as well will be voting against this appointment, particularly because Mr de Mora has indicated he is the CEO of Kingston General Hospital. He indicated in his remarks that he would continue in that role, which in my opinion, particularly given its financial difficulty at the present time, the one at the present time and the one that is anticipated—I would suggest that if there are no additional resources, it's going to be in even greater financial difficulty, as the Kingston Whig-Standard report, possibly a \$19-million deficit. I believe that situation should demand all of Mr de Mora's attention and energy. I think the community that Kingston General Hospital serves deserves that.

I have concerns as well with some of the comments he made with regard to private health services. I have some question about whether or not he might be of a mind that some of the resolutions to the problems in the area of cancer care might lie in the private sector.

He's also indicated that he has 30 years' experience managing facilities and making sure they are able to operate within their resources. I really didn't get the distinct sense that Mr de Mora was inclined to lobby for more resources, even when he acknowledged that if they don't get additional money from the province this year, KGH is going to face a \$19-million deficit. I think we, as a province, need to understand that there is definitely a need for more resources in those particular areas.

He left the Sudbury community in a situation of deficit. I know we have colleagues in that area who are very concerned and disappointed. I believe that Mr de Mora's energies would be best placed totally focused on managing Kingston General Hospital.

**Mr Gravelle:** I'd like to request a recorded vote, if I could. I want to make a comment or two as well.

Certainly, I won't be supporting Mr de Mora either. There's almost no way to explain, other than to the northerners who are listening, the extraordinary feeling of discrimination that was resulting when the re-referral program was put in place—and it disturbed me—which certainly did allow people 100% funding for travel to receive care. As much as we were sympathetic and happy that they were able to receive the treatment, it was so

incredibly upsetting to northerners who had to travel for cancer treatment of their own and were not getting that same thing. Mr de Mora's response, in essence, was a defence of the government's position throughout this process, even though they were consistently told that they were wrong by the Ombudsman and by all the constituents we have in northern Ontario—up in Thunder Bay, my area. Mr Bartolucci, as I said, led the fight in Sudbury in a very profound way. So I was very disturbed by his response and his lack of support for it.

I'm sorry we didn't have more time to ask some questions related to the restructuring of Cancer Care Ontario, because I have some real concerns about that as well. I would have liked to have the chance. Regardless, I think there's ample reason to not support Mr de Mora's appointment.

**The Chair:** Any further comment? If not, I'll place the motion. There was a request for a recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Johnson, Mazzilli, Spina, Wood.

#### Nays

Dombrowsky, Gravelle, Martin.

**The Chair:** The motion is carried.

The next intended appointee is John Melady, intended appointee as member, Custody Review Board, and Child and Family Services Review Board.

**Mr Wood:** I move concurrence.

**The Chair:** Mr Wood has moved concurrence in this appointment. Any discussion, first of all?

If not, all in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

That concludes the intended appointments.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**The Chair:** There is another matter of agency review proposals. This was the issue specifically related, I think, to the community care access centres, an issue raised by Mr Gravelle and Mr Martin. Mr Wood had considerable discussion on this. Do you have a report for us, Mr Wood?

**Mr Wood:** Yes. We are working on a position. We haven't received all the input we need yet. We understand this is a matter that has to be dealt with as quickly as possible. I hope to have something at the next meeting of the committee.

**Mr Martin:** I just want to impress on Mr Wood the critical nature of this exercise. There are literally hundreds of people across this province getting cut off or reduced, in terms of the care they get. The move by the government to, in a hostile takeover action, remove a significant number of executive directors and members of boards across the province—it seems to me that we need to get at this, so we can find out the rationale behind that and just exactly how that's affecting the delivery of care.

1150

I know in my own community, I released a press release yesterday from my own office indicating that in Sault Ste Marie, the Algoma Community Care Access Centre is actually going to be sending back between \$700,000 and \$800,000 to the government this year, and yet we have a waiting list for home care as long as your arm, some of them very critical and of a very alarming nature. I didn't raise this last year, but I read that last year there was a surplus of \$465,000. This is horrendous.

I know, and there are cases noted in the report—because the reporter did a good job of investigating—where people are in pretty desperate straits. They are not getting the money they need and yet there's money there, in some instances. I know some other areas like Sudbury, for example, because they're not following the edict or the dictate or the letter of the law where the legislation and the regulations are concerned, that are spending way over their budget, trying to meet the need, because the need is there. We know the need is there in the Soo but they're not spending it. They're trying to do it in Sudbury and they're going way over. There's a problem here.

I'd like to say to Mr Wood that we really need to get at this and get to the bottom of it so that the constituents of all of our communities can be satisfied and confident that they are in fact going to get the care they need when they're sick, because they have, I believe, a legislative right to that in this country and this province and they're not getting it. If we can do anything here to shed some light on why they're not getting it and what the issues really are, I think it behooves us to do that.

**The Chair:** Any other comment?

**Mr Gravelle:** Just very quickly. I certainly look forward to Mr Wood's final report to us. The one thing I want to say, which makes it all the more important that we do a review of the community care access centres, is that I was startled to discover, when we got into the new fiscal year, that the Thunder Bay community care access centre, for one, is not receiving any increase in funding at all. The caseload is up. Certainly the number of clients in need is continuing to rise. Even though they received a cutback last year, that is not even being increased at all as well. That truly surprised me, to tell you the truth, because I thought, based on the concerns that were expressed last year by the agency, the public and members such as myself and my colleagues here, there would be at least an increase to reflect those increased needs.

I guess my point is that in light of that decision—I can't speak for other agencies—I would hope that Mr

Wood would be inclined to help us have this review come forward at some point when the House is in session.

**The Chair:** Any other comments? If not, we will take that as a report from Mr Wood and the reaction to that report. We will consider this matter further at the appropriate time.

Speaking of the appropriate time, and looking at the next meeting of this committee, it may be that the Legislature will be in session. My friend Mr Mazzilli always asks these questions. I was with some people the other day who couldn't believe that the Ontario Legislature hadn't been in session since mid-December and they were eager to see all of you back on television with your most important comments on a variety of issues. They're eager to get to see the question period. They didn't know the House hadn't been back since December. Maybe Mr Wood, who has some good information from time to time from the government, could help us out in that regard.

**Mr Wood:** I have to defer to the most senior member of this committee. He would have the most experience and could give us good insight as to when the House might resume. I think that actually might be yourself, Mr Chair.

**The Chair:** I was thinking of that. No one phones me from the government House leader's office to tell me when the House is going to resume. I can report to the committee that we have completed all of the reviews that the government has sent to us. So the next meeting will be either when the House is back in session or, if it's delayed further for some reason, we will have the subcommittee establish a date. It appears right now, however, we're cleared of our business and we'll be able to sit when the House resumes, hopefully very soon.

**Mr Wood:** I would be satisfied that the committee meet at the call of the Chair, after consultation with the members of the subcommittee.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr Wood, for your help in that regard.

**Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex):** Just think of all the influence you have.

**The Chair:** Mr Wood is very co-operative with the Chair of this committee. I shouldn't say that too loudly because sometimes that reverberates in the wrong places.

**Mr Wood:** It could cause you problems.

**The Chair:** Me or you, one of the two.

Thank you very much, members of the committee, for being with us this morning. See you next meeting.

*The committee adjourned at 1155.*



## CONTENTS

Tuesday 30 April 2002

<b>Intended appointments</b> .....	A-419
Mr David Angus .....	A-419
Mrs Brenda Noble.....	A-422
Mr Joseph de Mora .....	A-425
Mr John Melady.....	A-429
<b>Committee business</b> .....	A-433

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

#### **Chair / Président**

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines L)

#### **Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord L)

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines L)  
Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington L)  
Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord L)  
Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex PC)  
Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie ND)  
Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe PC)  
Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa PC)  
Mr Bob Wood (London West / -Ouest PC)

#### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mr Joseph Spina (Brampton Centre / -Centre PC)

#### **Clerk / Greffier**

Mr Tom Prins

#### **Staff / Personnel**

Mr Andrew McNaught, research officer,  
Research and Information Services