



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 39th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 39^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Tuesday 1 June 2010

Mardi 1^{er} juin 2010

Speaker
Honourable Steve Peters

Président
L'honorable Steve Peters

Clerk
Deborah Deller

Greffière
Deborah Deller

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

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 :

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.

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 1 June 2010

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 1^{er} juin 2010

The House recessed from 1800 to 1845.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Government order 17. Further debate?

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: It's a pleasure to join the debate on the proposed Post-Secondary Education Statute Law Amendment Act, 2010.

Obviously the intent of this legislation is to give the choice to students and to give protection to students who choose to use the private career college route as a means to obtaining skills and the education they need to enter or to change the sort of work that they're engaged in or to enter the educational system.

The amendments strengthen the ability of the government to shut down those people who have proven themselves to be unscrupulous and unauthorized educational organizations. The idea is to prevent them from taking advantage of any international or even Ontario students who are perhaps considering using their services.

The amendments we have before us are designed to ensure that post-secondary education programs offered here in Ontario are of the highest quality available and they meet the standards of excellence that I think all members of the House want to see in our educational institutions.

Introducing the legislative amendments that are proposed today certainly supports and backs up our Open Ontario plan that's going to create new opportunities for jobs and growth within the economy, and it's going to raise the number of Ontarians with post-secondary education to the 70% that we know we need to make our mark in the global economy.

The PSECE Act actually came into effect in 2001, and that was to expand access to degree programs, improve student protection and implement quality assurance for the new degree programs that institutions were offering. This act actually allows private institutions from both inside and outside Ontario, public out-of-province institutions and colleges of applied arts and technology that we're all familiar with to apply to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities to offer degree-granting programs.

The act also created the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board, which has implemented rig-

orous quality controls that protect Ontario students from those institutions that have developed a reputation as simply being degree mills. However, it seems that a number of organizations have decided to challenge the Post-Secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act and the government's ability to ensure the quality of Ontario's post-secondary education brand, which is of the highest quality. For example, some organizations have set up an office—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn: I'm to sit down now, Speaker; is that right?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Ms. Smith has moved government motion number 17. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

"Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I request that the vote on government order 17 be deferred until deferred votes," and it's dated June 2, 2010.

Vote deferred.

1850

TIME ALLOCATION

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Ms. Smith has moved government order 14.

Further debate?

Mr. Norm Miller: I'm pleased to have an opportunity to speak to the time allocation motion on Bill 191, *Far North Act*. Unfortunately, the way it works these days—

Mr. Jim Wilson: What a way to run this place.

Mr. Norm Miller: As the member from Simcoe–Grey just said beside me, "What a way to run this place." It was the fact that we in opposition have no idea what bills—and I say that the opposition House leader might want to stay around for a few minutes. We have no idea what bill might be called at any given time. So, as a result, as the opposition we don't necessarily have our critic here to be able to speak to the bill. So we just have to get up and, unfortunately, it really affects the quality of the debate when our critic's not here, when we don't know what bill's going to be called and we have to just stand up and start speaking off the cuff.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Why don't you tell us the agenda?

Mr. Norm Miller: It would be nice. As was mentioned on a point of order by the opposition House leader, there is actually standing order 56, and I think I should refer to standing order 56, as a matter of fact. Standing order 56 states, "Before the adjournment of the House on each Thursday during the session, the government House leader shall announce the business for the following week." That seems pretty darned clear to me, that the government House leader on Thursday before the next week outlines the business for the following week.

I note that the member for Carleton–Mississippi Mills, when the Progressive Conservative government was in power—I'm getting lots of notes handed to me here from my associates—pointed out that when he was government House leader, they followed that. It's pretty clear. It says they "shall announce the business for the following week." Not only that, he also had courtesy for the opposition. If there were new bills introduced on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, he wouldn't call them for debate until after the caucus on the following Tuesday, so he'd give the opposition a chance to actually look at the bill, get a briefing and get a bit of time to discuss it.

That is certainly not the case now. We get situations where the bill is introduced on the Monday, they have the briefing Monday afternoon and it's debated Tuesday morning before we've even had an opportunity to caucus it. The unfortunate part of that is that there's just not a chance for the opposition to do some research, to prepare, to increase the quality of the debate.

Unfortunately, the reason we are sitting here this evening—and I gather we're sitting to midnight again. We sat till 12:30 last night, and it might be 12:30 this evening as well for the government members. The reason we're sitting is because—the opposition was working with the government. We thought we had an agreement with the government on a programming motion. In fact, we went under that agreement for a week where we wouldn't be having any night sittings.

All we asked for—it was a fairly simple request—was one afternoon, a couple of hours for an opposition debate on the HST, so that there'd be a vote of all the members on postponing implementation of the HST to after the next election because, in the 2007 election, as the member from Sudbury would know, there was no discussion about implementing the HST. I don't remember seeing that in any Liberal brochures at all.

Interjections.

Mr. Norm Miller: It was not in the Liberal brochures.

Unfortunately, we're sitting till midnight this evening, and because of that, in protest, the opposition has been forced to use some tactics to draw things out a bit. So, Madam Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Miller has moved adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1855 to 1925.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Miller, Parry Sound–Muskoka, has moved adjournment of the debate.

All those in favour, please rise to be counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed, please rise to be counted by the Clerk.

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 8; the nays are 34.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I declare the motion lost.

The member for Parry Sound–Muskoka.

Mr. Norm Miller: Madam Speaker, that was close.

I'm pleased to continue debate on the time allocation motion on Bill 191, An Act with respect to land use planning and protection in the Far North. This bill—it's interesting—was put out after first reading. Before any debate, it travelled around the north a bit—I think two of our members went along on those committee hearings—and from what I understand, especially the First Nations population is quite opposed to the bill and would like to see further consultation on the bill before it goes forward. I do have a letter from Grand Chief Stan Beardy from the Nishnawbe Aski Nation on his concerns, which I will try, if I have time, to get on the record.

I did have the opportunity, a year and a half or so ago, with our past leader, John Tory, who was interested in the Far North, to go with Grand Chief Stan Beardy. We chartered a plane and flew out of Thunder Bay up to Fort Severn, the most northerly community in Ontario, on the coast of Hudson Bay. We spent half the day there and learned about the situation there. I can tell you it's a pretty desperate situation. They were using a temporary school, with really very few recreational facilities—some very enthusiastic young teachers. It was just about the start of the school year; I think it was late August when we were there. A pretty challenging situation in that particular community, with really not much economic opportunity, and that relates to this bill, because I think the Far North First Nation communities are looking for economic opportunity.

We then flew with Grand Chief Stan Beardy from Fort Severn down to Webequie, which is in this now often talked about Ring of Fire—at that point I don't think I had heard too much about it—where this big chromite ore discovery has been made. It's in a ring, and Webequie is at about the centre.

At that time, especially a year and a half ago, all kinds of diamond drilling activity was going on. The First Nation community was benefiting from that, with a lot of joint ventures; a really different picture than Fort Severn. The day I happened to be there with John Tory there was a festival going on and there was bustling activity around the band council. We met with the chief. It really was quite good to see all the activity going on—quite a different scene from Fort Severn—and that was because of the economic activity that was occurring.

1930

Hon. Rick Bartolucci: Who was the chief? Do you know his name?

Mr. Norm Miller: The member for Sudbury is heckling me from across the way, asking me if I remember the chief. I do recall that unfortunately the chief wasn't re-elected, so it's now a different chief than was previously there. But there was a lot of activity going on there and quite a positive attitude in the community because of the Ring of Fire and the diamond drilling etc. that was going on.

Unfortunately, with this Far North bill that the government is bringing in, first of all, the First Nations communities are not in favour of it so far, and I would like to get on the record a letter from Stan Beardy if I have time—I know I don't have a lot of time. I'll just summarize a bit of it to point out his concerns: May 5, so a quite recent letter, to Premier Dalton McGuinty; the Minister of Natural Resources, Michael Gravelle; the Minister of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry; and Chris Bentley, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

He begins: "To begin my communication with you, I would like to start out by saying that First Nations in Nishnawbe Aski Nation (NAN) have a say on what happens on their homelands and that anything that may happen on their homelands will require their free, prior and informed consent. First Nations want to secure economic opportunities for their communities and future generations"—that's the point I was trying to make in my story about my day-long trip up there—"and also have a sacred responsibility to the Creator to care for the land. First Nations have always determined their uses of the land and will continue to do so. Bill 191 conflicts with these principles and approach to the land, therefore I have been asked by the First Nations in NAN to send you the following message.

"As Bill 191 continues to be considered for second reading in session 2, Parliament 39 in the Ontario Legislative Assembly, the First Nations in NAN would like to remind you and other members of Parliament that they oppose the bill as it is currently written"—oppose the bill as it is currently written.

"NAN First Nations have been consistent in their opposition to the bill since it was first read and carried on June 2, 2009. NAN First Nations continue to oppose the bill even though the Standing Committee on General Government reviewed it and made amendments on October 22, 2009."

He wrote a long letter; I'm sure I won't have time to get through the whole letter so, unfortunately, I won't read it. But they did pass a resolution.

Interjections.

Mr. Norm Miller: I see the government members think this is funny, but this is very serious if you're in the Far North.

"Whereas the government of Ontario introduced new laws, such as Bill 191, the Far North Act, while Nishnawbe Aski Nation (NAN), in good faith, was undertak-

ing its obligations under the letter of political agreement (LOPA) and the Oski-Machiitawin (OM) process;

"Whereas Ontario is preparing to table Bill 191 for second reading in the Ontario Legislature during the spring of 2010;

"Whereas this time frame presents a challenge to NAN First Nations that wish to have input into any revisions prior to second reading"—that is the crux of the matter, really, because we are discussing a time allocation motion, and the time frame is one of their major concerns.

I would say that this time allocation motion is not as bad as many of the other ones we're seeing this spring. It actually doesn't force it through in a day or two. It's going to allow for some input over the summer in a few northern communities in June, and then it gets referred back in September. So I would say to the First Nations communities that they would want to make sure they have their say, and hopefully the government will listen to their concerns with this bill, because they do have a lot of concerns.

I think northerners have a lot of concerns. Unfortunately, the north has been in large part abandoned by this government, because the interest groups that have the ear of the Premier at the current time are some of the very strong environmental groups. So groups like Environmental Defence and Rick Smith have a direct line into the Premier's office, and that is why we're seeing bills like Bill 191 coming through, despite the objection of the aboriginal communities and despite the fact that the government has been talking about its new relationship with First Nations communities. They are very clearly opposed to this legislation, and yet the government is ramming ahead with it.

I would say, from my past experience as northern critic, that one thing that is very clear is that northerners feel that decisions are all made in Toronto and it's very Toronto-centric decision-making. No matter where you go in the north you hear that a lot, and they feel isolated. That's probably why I've been learning in recent days about a new political party that's being created in the north, because despite the fact that there are government members from the north, it doesn't seem to matter. There are just way more southern Ontario members and way more Toronto members. As a result, despite their concern about having different policies for the north, it is ignored.

I don't have much more time, so I would like to quickly summarize the February 13, 2010, Northern Mayors Task Force, which in its executive summary points out that the government needs to:

"Develop provincial policies that support resource-based and emerging industries as well as promote the relocation of provincial ministries/agencies to northern Ontario"—that point was actually in the PC Party platform in the last election;

"Create a sustainable livelihood approach, based on economic and environmental considerations, for the management of northern resources;

“Improve northern highways, assist with municipal road challenges and support the expansion of alternatives to road transportation.”

They go on to point out in the background how they’re really concerned with some of the legislation that the government is bringing in, like the Endangered Species Act. They go on to say, “One of the key issues with respect to the Endangered Species Act is based on the designation of the woodland caribou as a threatened species and its subsequent conservation plan. This is yet another example ... where consultation, concrete scientific data and northern Ontario needs were absent in the decision-making process. The potential impacts and issues of the conservation plan are as follows”—and they go on to list them in great detail. They are really concerned with that.

At the time that bill was passing through the Legislature, Mr. Ramsay was the Minister of Natural Resources. I would say he felt at that time that the Endangered Species Act—and he certainly communicated it here in the Legislature and in letters—would respect the Crown Forest Sustainability Act. The government ended up breaking their word on that so that it doesn’t respect that.

Unfortunately, I’m out of time. In protest for the fact that the government—

Mr. Jim Wilson: Doesn’t tell us anything.

Mr. Norm Miller: —doesn’t tell us what legislation is going to be debated, despite standing order 56, and the fact that they wouldn’t allow us to have one afternoon of debate on the HST, which they didn’t even mention in their past election platform, I move adjournment of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Miller has moved adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say “aye.”

All those opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. It will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 1937 to 2007.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Miller, Parry Sound–Muskoka, has moved adjournment of the House.

All those in favour, stand to be counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed, please rise and be counted by the Clerk.

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 8; the nays are 33.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I declare the motion lost.

Ms. Smith has moved government order number 14. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say “aye.”

All those opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

“Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I request that the vote on government motion number 26, time allocation on Bill 191, be deferred.”

Vote deferred.

TIME ALLOCATION

Hon. Ms. Smith: I move that, pursuant to standing order 47 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 68, An Act to promote Ontario as open for business by amending or repealing certain Acts, when the bill is next called as a government order the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment and at such time the bill shall be ordered referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs; and

That the vote on second reading may be deferred pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

That the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs be authorized to meet for two days of public hearings in Toronto, and for two days for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, on dates provided for in a schedule of meeting dates agreed to by the three party whips and tabled with the Clerk of the Assembly; and

That the committee shall report the bill to the House no later than Monday, September 13, 2010. In the event that the committee fails to report the bill on that day, the bill shall be deemed to be passed by the committee and shall be deemed to be reported to and received by the House; and

That, upon receiving the report of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, and at such time the bill shall be ordered for third reading; and

That, when the order for third reading of the bill is called, two hours shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill, apportioned equally among the recognized parties. At the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That the vote on third reading may be deferred pursuant to standing order 28(h); and

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

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Ms. Smith has moved government notice of motion number 28.

Debate?

Mr. Randy Hillier: It is quite interesting that here we have a bill in front of the House called Open Ontario and they’re closing off debate. That’s just the oxymoron of the Liberal Party. I guess that really is the oxymoron: Here we have a socialist party pretending to be a liberal party.

There is so much that is incredible. Here is an omnibus bill. It affects 10 different ministries, and there’s no time to discuss, no time to debate and, of course, no notification that we’re going to be debating this bill this

evening. However, I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture would love to be here at this debate as she puts the thumb down on farmers in this province with her Open Ontario bill.

Mr. Bruce Crozier: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: We don't note people's absence from the Legislature.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I didn't say she was absent.

Mr. Bruce Crozier: You said the Minister of Agriculture would like to be here.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I believe he was right; you did make reference. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I apologize for the error of my ways.

Mr. John Yakubuski: You mean she's not here? Pardon me, Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): This is not a point of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I look forward to the Minister of Agriculture engaging in this debate on Bill 68 because I'm sure she will want to clarify to all the farmers in this province why she is taking away compensation for livestock predation in this province.

There has been so much information and public awareness in the last year over wolves and coyotes preying on and devastating livestock, and Open Ontario is going to close off compensation for farmers for livestock losses due to wolves and coyotes. I want to ask this question to all the members of the Liberal Party: Is that what you think is going to open the doors for Ontario, to take away a long-standing practice in this province of helping and assisting farmers who have lost livestock due to predators? This is what this Liberal government is all about: Say one thing, do another; promise one thing, do something else; make an oath—well, I'm not allowed to use that word when you break an oath. But anyway, that is just one example of the Open Ontario plan of this Liberal government.

There's also an interesting schedule in there for the Ministry of Labour under the Employment Standards Act. I find this quite interesting. Under the Employment Standards Act, the employment standards officers and the labour relations officers have complete and absolute immunity for their actions and their errors. I'll give you this example. A labour relations officer or an employment standards officer cannot be compelled into a civil action, cannot be compelled or allowed to give evidence in a civil action. What is this all about? Why is this Liberal government saying that our public service, our bureaucrats, cannot be compelled to provide evidence in a court of law? What are you protecting them from? What are you hiding from the people of Ontario? Why is it that public servants under the Ministry of Labour will not now be allowed to attend court in a civil action? There's something a little fishy, and it ain't in Denmark; it's right here in Queen's Park when we see these deceptive little ideas coming through these omnibus bills.

I think we also want to talk about how this government is on autopilot, absolutely on autopilot. The idea of political representatives overseeing the administration of government is lost on this Liberal government. We saw it with Bill 43, which we debated earlier, and we're seeing it in this one here as well, where the provincial government is saying, "Bureaucracy, do what you may. Do what you want. There will be no political oversight from the Liberal government." I think the people of Ontario demand and expect some level of oversight and some level of management by their elected representatives. But no, this government is very, very content to just allow the bureaucracy to run the machinery of government.

There is a little change in the Conservation Authorities Act in this bill. Previously, before this bill, a conservation authority could not dispose of crown land that it was granted without the minister's approval. Now, with this slight little change of ink, conservation authorities no longer need the minister's approval. They can dispose of crown land, the crown land that this government is a steward of for the public of this province. They're just going to say, "Mr. Bureaucracy, you can do what you like with it. You don't have to come back to the Legislative Assembly. You don't require any oversight. We allow you and we expect you to just dispose of that money, dispose of those properties in any way that you like." Now, isn't that interesting?

Isn't it interesting that this government—and we saw another good example of that today in the Auditor General's report. I want to read just a wee little bit from the Auditor General's report on the OLG today, because I think this really represents a government on autopilot: "In January 2008, OLG applied to be exempted from the MBC travel directive. Its rationale was that as an arm's length agency..." However, the OLG never got a response back from the Minister of Infrastructure.

Interjection: The former minister.

Mr. Randy Hillier: The former minister; I think he took a dive somewhere along the line.

However, the OLG requested a minister of this government for a ruling on their expenditures. But they never got an answer from this Liberal government. So what did the OLG do? The OLG said, "We didn't hear back from them, so it must be okay if we spend \$60,000 a year on cars. It must be okay if we give people \$24,000 in allowances."

A total abdication of their responsibilities is what we have seen from this government, a total and complete abdication. We saw the total and complete contempt for this Legislative Assembly as we debated Bill 191 this morning. I started off this morning debating Bill 191 time allocation, we then debated time allocation on Bill 43 and now we're debating time allocation on Bill 68. Nobody from this Liberal government notified the parties that this bill was going to be up for debate. They never identified that there was going to be a time allocation motion—absolute contempt for democracy but a total embrace of bureaucracy by this government.

We have seen time and time again—we've seen it with Bill 43, and we're seeing it with Bill 68—that the law-abiding people of this province are put under the thumb of this government, the law-abiding people are disregarded by this government, and with the people doing wrong, this government turns its back and turns a blind eye. That's what we see. We've seen it with the HST—total contempt. We see more and more regulations, and here, of course, we have the pocket edition of regulations for Ontario—3,500 pages. I challenge any Liberal member: Show me how deep your pockets are that you can put this book in it, your pocket edition of 3,500 pages, half a million regulations. Now we see more. The book keeps getting bigger and bigger. With every level of contempt that they show this Legislature, the regulations get thicker and thicker and our economy gets worse and worse.

We have seen the contempt with the HST, where they reneged on a deal with the House leaders that we could discuss and debate the HST. They're too cowardly to have a fulsome debate on the HST, too cowardly to have a debate on any bill, and they hide behind a time allocation. Then they have the contempt to not even discuss with the House leaders what they're bringing in.

I have no choice but to call for a motion to adjourn this debate until this Liberal government has the balls to stand up and talk and discuss in a fair and reasonable fashion.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Hillier has moved adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House to support this motion?

All those in favour will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. There will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 2024 to 2054.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Hillier has moved adjournment of the debate.

All those in favour, please rise and be counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed, please rise and be counted by the Clerk.

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 5; the nays are 29.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: So, Bill 68—I'd like to put a little bit of perspective and context for the people who are watching this evening. Twelve hours ago, at 9 o'clock this morning, we were debating time allocation and closure on Bill 191. Then we debated time allocation and closure on Bill 43 and now, 12 hours later, 9 o'clock this evening, we have a bill that has been put forward in front of the House here without notice, Bill 68, called the Open Ontario act. Of course, it is the time allocation bill on this Open Ontario act. In 12 hours, this Liberal government has managed to put in three time allocation bills. That

must be a record, and I'm glad that people will be seeing just what they think of Open Ontario.

I think it's important that we also demonstrate to the people of this province that this bill—152 pages of legalese by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade—was first introduced into this House on May 17. May 17 was the first reading. Now, less than two weeks later, it's a time allocation.

If the minister was truly honest with the people of this province, if the minister was truly honest with the people in this House, they would look at this bill that affects 10 ministries. If they really wanted to be honest and to achieve certain results, this bill should have been broken down into 10 bills, one for each of the ministries affected.

But no, that is not the Liberal way. It's not the socialist way of this governing party. This idea that an omnibus package of 10 ministries will be dumped in and will be disposed of in less than two weeks is another example of their contempt for this Legislature and contempt for democracy in this province.

Again, this Open Ontario act: When the minister does respond to Bill 68, I would like her to explain to the people of Ontario why employment standards officers cannot be compelled to go into a court of law on a Ministry of Labour action. Let me read this directly from the act; this is on page 132:

"Labour relations officers, etc., not compellable;

"(3) A person referred to in subsection 1"—that's the employment standards or labour relations officer—"is not a competent or compellable witness...."

Isn't that interesting? They're saying that a bureaucrat, an employee of the Ministry of Labour, "is not a competent or compellable witness in a civil proceeding or a proceeding under this act respecting any information given or obtained, statements made or received, or records or other things produced or received under this act."

I really want to hear from this minister why she believes that a person employed as an employment standards officer or labour relations officer is not a competent witness in a civil proceeding. I think everybody in this province wants to know. Why is that person protected and shrouded and hidden from the public scrutiny of the courts in their actions? Why is that? Why is an employee of the public service deemed by this Liberal government not to be a competent or a compellable witness?

2100

Then I want the Minister of Economic Trade and Development to go, later on today or whenever she has an opportunity, to schedule 1 of the act, on page 14, and I want her to explain how the changes in this bill on page 14 are going to improve the lot of farmers in this province. What doors is she opening on page 14 when she says in this bill that if you have a calf that is killed by a wolf, if you have some sheep or lambs that are killed by a wolf, if you have chickens that are killed by a coyote, you no longer have any compensation from this Liberal government?

Now, of course, you might have some justification other than the fact that it is this Liberal government and their Ministry of Natural Resources that has allowed the wolf and coyote problem to expand in this province. Their Ministry of Natural Resources refuses to do anything about the growing problem of wolves and coyotes. Then, as a Liberal solution, they're going to take away the compensation for farmers who are bearing the brunt of this.

Laughter.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Now I know the member from Winnipeg might think this is funny, but maybe he doesn't have farmers in his riding. I do, and I know there are many people in this House who have farmers who earn a living from their livestock in this province.

I know the member from Sudbury may not think it's important that people are losing their earnings, their livelihood, from predation, but people on this side of the House understand that our role is to represent our constituents' concerns.

This is their Open Ontario. This is their Open Ontario plan.

As I mentioned earlier, this government clearly is on autopilot. I don't know if there's a minister on the opposite side, I don't know if there's a minister within this Liberal government who actually understands the role and responsibility of oversight and what the concept of oversight is for their ministry. They're just so willing, so confident to provide all the legislative authorities to the bureaucracy and discount political oversight.

Again, I'll refer to page 9 of the Auditor General's report today on the OLG. We know he found all kinds of untoward practices and abuses of public finances under the OLG.

Of course, the OLG is one of those arm's-length Liberal agencies that they just love to create. They're actually going to be creating a few more under this act. I haven't even begun to talk about the new agencies.

Anyway, in 2008, the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., that agency, requested from the Minister of Public Infrastructure—a direct request: “Minister, we want to have an exception on our expenditures.” The answer was silence. The Minister of Public Infrastructure either was unable to make a response or didn't care to make a response and didn't do anything. Of course, the OLG, after making a request and not getting a response—this is the typical Liberal solution: “Well, if I asked for something and I don't hear back, then it's automatic that I get it”—right? That's what the OLG said: “We asked for an exception, but the minister was too busy to respond, or the minister didn't care, so we'll just take the exception anyway. That will allow us to drive \$57,000 cars each year at public expense.” That's page 9. I'm sure the ministers on the opposite side would love to see it.

But what I find incredible is this is not an exception. This is the rule with this Liberal government. So often we see just no interest by a minister to take responsibility for their ministry, no interest at all to take interest or concerns about their ministries. Just give it off, put it on

autopilot: “We've got the keys in the ignition. The bureaucrats are running the ship,” and that's okay with the Liberal Party. The ministers will collect their money, and who cares when the ship, or the car, hits the rocks? They just don't care.

Interjection.

Mr. Randy Hillier: The minister from Sudbury would love to go hunting, I guess. All he's talking about is hunting.

Anyway, we have seen that this is again one of the things that is so obvious with the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party reminds me of that old adage that there is nothing more deceptive than the obvious facts. This is a deception of this Liberal Party: “We'll call it an open door act, but then we'll close the door on farmers, we'll close the door on labour, we'll close the door on the conservation authorities, we'll close the door on development in this province—but we'll call it an Open Ontario act.”

We see, in this, more and more regulations coming through—and of course that was another Liberal promise. Does everybody remember McGuinty's promise? “For every new regulation we bring in, we'll get rid of a regulation.” That was another oath from the Liberal Party.

Mr. Robert Bailey: Are they in that book?

Mr. Randy Hillier: This is the book. In 2004, this book was 2,000 pages in length—2,000. It's now 3,500 pages. So much for getting rid of one regulation for every new one that they bring in. This book has doubled in size: half a million provincial regulations, and they're by this Liberal government. That's the pocket edition—the pocket edition: 500,000 regulations.

Let's just put this in perspective: Half a million activities are regulated by this Liberal government—half a million. I challenge each and every one of those members, I challenge them as a collective, to come up with half a million activities. They can't think of half a million activities by the whole bunch of them, but that's half a million activities that require a licence, that require an approval process, require a permit, require a delay in time. Half a million activities are now regulated by this government. And when you go to ask the minister, he says, “I don't know.” He shrugs. The minister says, “I'd rather go deer hunting than deal with my ministry.” That's what we get from this Liberal government. Now, I don't mind deer hunting at all; I actually enjoy it as well. But I know that you do your work first, before you go on the hunt.

Anyway, we have seen on and on and on this Liberal government using rhetoric and using words to disguise the reality. The reality in this act is that more and more doors will be closed in Ontario. More and more doors will be closed to opportunities, will be closed to business, will be closed to freedom, and will be closed even for discussion within this chamber. That's what they're doing: closing off discussion and debate in this chamber. That's what this Liberal government is all about, and it's nothing less than deceptive to call this an act to open the doors of Ontario. It is nothing more than creative, imag-

inative gallimaufry and mendacity. This Liberal government needs to get a handle on a few fundamental concepts.

2110

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I'd ask you to withdraw the last comment you made.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I withdraw.

Anyway, it really is disgusting to see that this Liberal government is prepared to bring regulation after regulation after regulation and suffocate and strangle opportunities in this province. I guess the ultimate hypocrisy is also—

Interjection: You can't say that either.

Mr. Randy Hillier: The ultimate oxymoron of today is—

Interjection: Drop the "oxy."

Mr. Randy Hillier: It would be out of order to drop the "oxy," I believe.

Anyway, this morning we debated Bill 191, which will close off a quarter-million square kilometres of land in this province. A quarter-million acres of land will become the park of destitution and poverty in northern Ontario. It will close off any opportunities for development in hydro, roads, forestry, tourism, mining; close all that off, and at the same time they bring out a bill that says, "We're open for business." They close up the big barn doors and then they say, "We're going to open up a little crack with this one."

We know that any donkey can knock down the old barn doors. It takes somebody with some competency to build a door. Clearly, the people of Ontario know what's happening: They're knocking down the barn doors but don't have the competency to build something.

A quarter-million square kilometres, over 100 million acres of land—gone. No opportunities in the north when they bring in their Open Ontario act. I'd like the people of Ontario just to contemplate, just to think—and maybe the Liberals would like to think this evening as well. Think about this: If our province—we go back in time, go back to when this province was first being settled. If we had a government of the same ilk as we have today, a government that said that half the land is prevented from being developed, half the land is going to come under public control, a public park, what would our province look like today? What would our country be if we had a government of this mindset back in the early days of settlement of this country? Would we have a country at all? Would we have a province? Obviously not. Nobody would have come here if the government had said, "It's off limits. You can't come here. There are no opportunities. The door is open for you to leave and go somewhere else. The door is closed for all people to come and find wealth and prosperity in this province."

We know that this country, this province, would never have begun if we had a government of this attitude and ilk in our early days. We know that this Liberal government, if they are given the opportunity—we'll go back to a lower standard of living. We've already seen it. This engine of Confederation called Ontario has now become

the caboose. We now have have-not status; we're now a have-not province. We are on Confederation's rolls of welfare under this McGuinty Liberal government.

So what do the Liberal ministers say? They say, "Who cares?" Pan the camera on the Liberal benches and see the ministers chuckling over there when we talk about 300,000 people who lost their jobs in manufacturing, when we see unemployment rates higher than the national average, when we see troubles and problems and a lowering standard of living, and the Liberals say, "Well, I get my paycheque every month. Everything must be good. Right? I get my paycheque every month. Liberal life is good." But we know that the people of Ontario cannot, will not stand for this tax and grab and spend government. Their days are numbered. Bills like Bill 68 are going to be the ones that put the nail in their coffin.

There is no way people will accept this government on autopilot, this contempt for our democracy, this loss of our democracy. There is no way that people will continue to accept just a total abrogation of ministerial responsibility. Of course, there is no greater example of their failure, no greater example of their contempt, no greater example of their broken promises, no greater example of their tax-and-spend ways than the HST, and no greater example of their contempt for the people of this province.

When they break their promises, when they break their oaths, when they break their deals with the House, when they refuse to allow a motion to be discussed on the HST, they hide, they run, they cower away—

Interjection.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Other than the Minister of Revenue; he just is handcuffed and really can't say anything. But we know that they cower under—

Interjections.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I understand the Liberals have woken up at 9:15 on this night-sitting night. It's good to see there's some blood flowing over there for a change. Other than their creative and imaginative use of vocabulary, they have become awake now as well.

We have seen the contempt for this House. We have seen—

Mr. Jim Wilson: The House leader should resign.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Yes. Well, I'm not allowed to make reference to—

Interjection.

Mr. Randy Hillier: She's not here.

Anyway, it is clear that this Liberal government does not want to face the music of the people of this province. They do not want to face debate. They don't want to face the music that they're about to face. For 12 hours today, we have debated time allocation closures, time allocation bills, and for the balance of this session, I imagine that's all we're going to be doing: time allocation. There's no concern, no regard and no respect for parliamentary debate, no respect for House leaders' negotiations, and no respect for providing the opposition with a timely indication of what bills are coming up. Time allocation: That is what comes out of this Liberal government. Time allo-

cation—nothing more, nothing less, other than their rhetoric.

I know that the people of Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington and my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative Party have such a level of disdain for this Liberal government's actions that I move a motion to adjourn the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Hillier has moved adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

The division bells rang from 2120 to 2150.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Mr. Hillier has moved adjournment of the House.

All those in favour, please rise and be counted by the Clerk.

All those opposed, please rise and be counted by the Clerk.

The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller): The ayes are 8; the nays are 31.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): I declare the motion lost.

Further debate?

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Don't change your dial. This is really me. It's 10 o'clock at night in the Ontario Legislature and I'm really here debating this—

Interruption.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Oh my God, Madam Speaker, that's my daughter. Natalie Bisson, if you just called me, you got me in trouble.

I want to say I was looking forward to having an opportunity to speak to this particular bill. I take it we're debating the Open Ontario bill, right? As whip, I know these things.

I've got to say to my friends across the way, I know that you're all saying, "We're just going to make things better in Ontario and we're just going to open things up for foreign investment to happen here in Ontario and we're going to make it easy for multinationals to come in and do business in Ontario." I want to say, you're doing a great job. You guys are doing an amazing job. You're giving the Xstratas of this world the opportunity to do what they would not dream of doing under any other government.

Xstrata said, "We're going to close down a refinery and smelter in the city of Timmins." Normally, they would not do these things lightly, because they would worry that the government of Ontario would say, "Hold it. You're closing what? You're closing a prime industry in Ontario? What can we do to help keep the doors open?" Xstrata said, "We pick our fights. We picked our fight well." We've got Dalton McGuinty with Open Ontario, and their idea that they don't want to get in the way of business, and we're just going to let them do it.

We're going to tell Xstrata that it's okay to shut down a smelter and refinery in the city of Timmins and move

all those jobs to the province of Quebec and leave Ontario workers in the communities of Timmins, Smooth Rock Falls, Matheson and Iroquois Falls high and dry when it comes to employment and, more importantly, the opportunities that Xstrata presented to the businesses of the northeast region. This government said, "We're open for business. We want to let the multinationals do what they've got to do." They said to Xstrata, "Please, don't forget to turn off the lights when you leave Ontario."

So I say to the government across the way, if you're saying you want Open Ontario as a policy, you have a funny way of showing how Ontario is open. I would think that a government in Ontario would say they are going to do what has to be done to work with workers, to work with communities and to work with the private sector in order to determine what needs to be done to make sure we have a strong economy here in Ontario and that we have an ability to provide the robust economy that we have to have in this province to provide, yes, the private sector with the ability to make a profit, but also to give—

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): There is too much noise.

Member for Timmins–James Bay.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Madam Speaker, I know you weren't saying I was making too much noise. I think you were saying everybody in the House was making too much noise, just to be clear.

Interjection.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: My good friend said that was just a call.

I just want to say that the government says "Open for business"; all I'm saying is the job of this Legislature and the job of the government of Ontario, simply put, is to say, "What can we do to create the conditions that allow the private sector to make a profit in Ontario, that allow them to do it in a way that's sustainable to the environment and does it in a way that is sustainable to the economy and gives workers and businesses the opportunity to prosper in this province?"

What did the government do?

Interjection.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: No, I'm a social democrat. You Conservatives have never known. You Conservatives don't even understand what an economy is about. It's social democrats who understand this stuff. We understand there's a balance between the private sector and the workers in the communities, and you have to have that dynamic of what goes on between those three parties to make things work. There's a fourth party, and that is government. Government could be used as a tool to help the economy along.

So I say to my friends across the way, the McGuinty Liberals, yes, you want to open Ontario, but you've got a fine way of showing it. You've allowed a company named Xstrata—you've said, "You can pick up shop in Ontario, out of the city of Timmins, you can close your plant down, you can leave and go produce in Quebec—and by the way, when you mine the copper in Ontario,

take it with you. Add no value to it in the province of Ontario.” Can you imagine Ralph Klein in British Columbia, can you imagine Danny Williams in Newfoundland, can you imagine any Premier in this province who would say, “I will allow foreign multinationals to come into Ontario,” or their province, to take the natural resources from the ground and move them out of their province and add value to them outside their own province? Shame on you, Open Ontario for business. You’re not opening Ontario; you’re closing down opportunities for people here in Ontario.

If you travel south down Highway 144—my good friend France Gélinas will know the town well; she lives there—in the communities around Sudbury—you’ve had how much now, 10 months?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Eleven.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: For 11 months we’ve had a strike out at Inco—now it’s called Vale Inco. What we have there is a company that has decided, “We’re a multinational come from afar. We’ve come from Brazil. We’re going to come to Ontario and tell workers and tell communities, ‘You know what? Your pension’s too rich. We’re going to take your pension that you worked hard to get over a period of years; we’re going to take it away from you.’ We’re going to say that any new employee who is hired at Vale Inco is not going to have a defined pension plan as your fathers and your brothers did, as they’re hired there now.”

What does this government do? That’s what they did: the sound of crickets; absolutely nothing. Why should we allow a foreign multinational to come and set up shop here in Ontario and say, “We are going to change on its ear the social contract that exists with the workers in Sudbury with Vale Inco and the community and the workers of the city of Sudbury”?

In addition to that, the government says, “It’s okay. We’re not going to intervene,” when Vale Inco says, “We’re going to change the nickel bonus.” I want to say to my friends across the way and I want to say to people in northeastern Ontario, and specifically I want to say to the people of Sudbury, who benefits when workers have a nickel bonus? Who benefits? Who gets the money from that nickel bonus? It’s every small business in the community of Sudbury and in the region.

Those workers, through the United Steelworkers, went and negotiated a nickel bonus at the table when times were weak, when the company wasn’t making money, and the union said, “Listen, we understand you’re having a tough time and we want to help Inco” at the time “to survive and become a stronger company. So rather than negotiating wages, we’re going to take what’s called a nickel bonus. If the price of nickel goes up, we make money. If the price of nickel goes down, we make no money.” That way, the profit was tied to the wages of the workers.

What an innovative idea from the Steelworkers. They didn’t say, “Give me 5%” or “Give me 4% per year,” or “Give me 3% per year.” They said, “We get it. We’re Steelworkers. We understand. We need to have a strong

company that makes money.” The Steelworkers made an agreement with that company that said that when the company makes money, the workers make money.

So along comes Vale Inco, another multinational. They walk into Sudbury and they say, “We’re going to turn NAN on its ear and we’re going to take away the benefit that the workers have negotiated that says, ‘When Inco makes money, the workers make money.’” And what does this McGuinty government do? Nothing. The sound of the crickets is going again.

The government had an opportunity to get involved in this and say, “Don’t come into Ontario and expect that you’re going to turn this thing on its ear. You have a responsibility as a corporation in the city of Sudbury to make sure you run a profitable organization, but that those profits are shared with the workers and they’re shared with the community of Sudbury and area.”

Shame on the McGuinty government for their Open Ontario policy that says, “We’re going to allow the Vale Incos of this world to come in, and allow them to gut the collective agreement by taking away the defined pension plan that workers have fought for in the city of Sudbury for years and take away the nickel bonus workers have fought for.”

2200

I say again, you know what? The nickel bonus—I’ve heard some people in city of Sudbury and others say, “Oh, those workers were getting too much money with the nickel bonus.” But how many years did they go without increases because the company wasn’t making money, number one. Number two, when the workers were making money on the nickel bonus, where did they spend that money? They spent it at the car dealership. They spent it at the Quiznos. They spent it at the clothing store. They spent it at the building supply store. They spent their money in the community; the profits that came from the ground in Sudbury as a result of the mining at Inco were spent back into the community. What a novel idea. And this government says that we’re open for business? Oh, yeah, let the multinational walk in and do what they want.

Now the government says, “Oh, don’t worry. Everybody should be happy in northern Ontario. We’ve got the Ring of Fire.”

Mr. Paul Miller: Ring of what?

Mr. Gilles Bisson: The Ring of Fire—and I’m not talking about what happens at times. I’m talking about the Ring of Fire in my riding, which is in northeastern Ontario, north of Marten Falls, south of Peawanuck, west of Attawapiskat and east of Sandy Lake. There’s an area where there’s huge mineral potential for chromite, copper and other metals that are abundant in that particular area.

The government is saying that our future in the north—even though Xstrata shut down their smelter refinery and moved to Quebec, and even though we allowed Vale Inco to gut the collective agreement and take money out of the community of Sudbury by way of money they’re picking out of the pockets of workers—they’re saying that our saving is going to be the Ring of Fire. Well, my God.

What a saving we have in northern Ontario. We have yet to develop good policy when it comes to resource policy in this province that says, number one, if you're going to mine in Ontario, you're going to process that ore in Ontario. The companies involved in the Ring of Fire and Xstrata said it directly to the Premier at the cabinet table, as I sat there with the minister of mines, as I sat there with the heads of Inco, with Mayor Tom Laughren, with the coalition and the Premier of Ontario. They said that there will be no processing of ore in Ontario. It's all being shipped out of this province. So you say to yourself, why would you allow natural resources in this province to be extracted if we in Ontario are not going to benefit from those natural resources? Open for business? Open Ontario? You're talking about the raping and pillaging of our economy.

In northern Ontario, we've only got really one big thing going for us. It's not Rick Bartolucci, I can tell you that right now. It's not Dalton McGuinty. It's the natural resources that we're lucky to have. If we can't add value to the natural resources in this province, my friends, there is not a heck of a lot left, because everything else that derives from northern Ontario comes out of the natural resources industry.

I say to my friends on the other side—and I want to say this with all due respect, because I have great respect for any member who has the fortitude, strength and willingness to run in a general election and be elected under whatever banner. We're all honourable members, and I don't try to say in this House that you're bad people because you're doing what you're doing. All I'm saying is, you don't get it. You need to understand that what the people want from their government is a government that stands up for them, a government that says Ontario is first and will always be because the government of Ontario will make sure that in the end we do what is right for this particular province. So I say to my friends across the way: Open Ontario?

The latest is—and I did a question here in the House today. The government probably thinks it's not a very big thing. My good friend Peter Shurman would understand that, as a good Conservative, a good business person. We had a system in this province for years where school bus operators would go negotiate with the school boards for the contracts to pick up the kids across the province. Who does that process favour? Locally grown businesses, mom-and-pops that go out and buy one bus, and then they make it two, they make it five, they make it 10, and eventually they become the Ron Malettes of this world and others, who operate businesses in our community where they buy buses, which means to say that they're buying equipment mostly built in Ontario, they're hiring people in our communities—they've got mechanics and drivers—and they spend the money that they get from the benefit of those contracts in their local communities. I'll tell you, what a good idea.

But this government has said, "We're going to turn that on its ear. We're going to change the process in this

province to one where we're going to have a request for proposals, where anyone can bid on any contract."

You know what? On the surface, that sounds quite democratic. It sounds like—oh my God—it might even make sense. But who has the ability to bid on these RFPs? Is it the mom-and-pop operation that operates one or two buses? They don't have the capacity to bid on RFPs, so who, in the end, is going to get all these contracts? We already know, because if you take a look at what has happened in places where they ran the pilot project with the RFPs, 90% of the bus routes have gone to the large bus companies that are not even owned by Canadian people; they're companies run out of the States and England. I don't have a problem with foreign nationals coming in and investing in Ontario, but I want some rules. I want to make sure that in the end, there's going to be some benefit for the people of Ontario.

In this particular policy, what are they doing? They're saying to family-owned businesses that have operated in this province for the last 20 or 50 years, "Too bad, so sad, you're gone. If you're not able to compete with the Laidlaws and the larger companies of this world, too bad. You're gone."

What is the job of government? Is the job of government to look out for the big guy all the time? I think the job of government is to allow the small guy to have a chance to say, "One day, I too will share in the benefit of the economy of Ontario."

I say to the government across the way: Open for business? Who's opening what to whom?

Hon. Sandra Pupatello: We're open for business—

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Oh my God. Sandra Pupatello, you're back from some junket.

Excuse me, Speaker. I want to apologize. I want to withdraw that, because that was really uncalled for. The exuberance of being here at 10:07 at night is overtaking me. I've got to say to the minister across the way, I'm not going to say for one second that we should not have a minister of international trade and I'm not going to say for a second that that minister shouldn't travel to other countries to do business, and I'm not going to say for a second that we shouldn't be looking for foreign investment. But I want conditions. I want to know that when people like Samsung come and invest in Ontario, it's going to be to the benefit of locally owned businesses who are trying to make a good profit as a result of hard work in this province.

I look at the FIT program through the Ministry of Energy that went through the whole process of giving out electricity contracts as a result of green energy. Is green energy a good idea? Absolutely; I think it's a great idea. Nobody in this House disagrees. But who are the ones benefiting through the FIT contract? Is it the locally owned companies that are winning on the FIT contracts?

I've got organizations—and the minister knows it—that have tried to start projects in their communities and they're being frozen out by the large multinationals because the process is set to give the large multinationals a hand up, and a hand down to locally owned businesses.

Has the program not given any business to locally owned businesses? Absolutely not. Some has gone to them. To Minister Duguid, who's responsible: There are some contracts with First Nations and others that I'm willing to admit have benefited local communities. I'm not going to say it's completely void, but look at the percentage: The vast majority of projects under FIT have been given to whom? Not First Nations, not locally owned businesses, not even Ontario-owned businesses, for the most part. They're foreign multinationals.

Again, I want to say to the minister of international trade: Should we block investment? Absolutely not. But I want to have a level playing field where a business that operates in Ontario is able to compete with the multinational in a way that they can benefit too. It shouldn't be about the multinational being the only one who gets the benefit and the local entrepreneurs who get frozen out.

Our job in this Legislature is to assist the local entrepreneur. Our job is to help Ontarians dream the dream that one day they too can find their way through this economy and make a profit, get rich and build a stronger economy for Ontario, a better life for them and their family and the people who work for them. Who better to do it but this Legislature and the Ontario government? So I say to my friends—

Hon. Rick Bartolucci: It's not "I have a dream"; it's "I have a nightmare." I am an NDPer.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: I've got Rick Bartolucci, who's now a New Democrat. My God, the world is coming to an end. My God, I moved a few people. Sometimes it's amazing what happens in debate.

I know, Madam Speaker, I've got about two minutes; one minute, I'm being told, and people are counting it down. I want to say to you, be aware of what you are doing. We need to ensure that at the end of this process Ontario comes out on top and the people in the province are the ones who benefit from the economic opportunities existing within this province. Are there opportunities?

Absolutely yes. Can people build and dream for a better economy? Absolutely yes. But I want those people to be Ontarians, as much as possible, who benefit in this economy. I want this Legislature and this government to do the things that need to be done to encourage, to support, and do the things that need to be done so that people in this province can dream a better dream of tomorrow and build what needs to be built as a strong economy that as much as humanly possible is driven by Ontarians, is owned by Ontarians and is profited from by Ontarians, so that we, at the end of the day, can build a better province.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): The time has expired.

Ms. Smith has moved government notice of motion number 28. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

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

"Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I request that the vote on government motion number 28, time allocation on Bill 68, be deferred."

Vote deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Orders of the day.

Hon. Monique M. Smith: We have no further business, Madam Speaker. I move adjournment of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro): Ms. Smith has moved adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

This House stands adjourned until 9 of the clock tomorrow morning.

The House adjourned at 2212.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Steve Peters

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

| Member and Party / Député(e) et parti | Constituency / Circonscription | Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités |
|---|---|---|
| Aggelonitis, Hon. / L'hon. Sophia (LIB) | Hamilton Mountain | Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs |
| Albanese, Laura (LIB) | York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston | |
| Arnott, Ted (PC) | Wellington–Halton Hills | Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle |
| Arthurs, Wayne (LIB) | Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est | |
| Bailey, Robert (PC) | Sarnia–Lambton | |
| Balkissoon, Bas (LIB) | Scarborough–Rouge River | |
| Barrett, Toby (PC) | Haldimand–Norfolk | |
| Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB) | Sudbury | Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels |
| Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB) | London West / London-Ouest | Attorney General / Procureur général |
| Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB) | Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest | Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones |
| Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB) | Scarborough–Guildwood | Minister of Health Promotion / Ministre de la Promotion de la santé |
| Bisson, Gilles (NDP) | Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James | |
| Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB) | St. Catharines | Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement |
| Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB) | Etobicoke–Lakeshore | Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse |
| | | Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine |
| Brown, Michael A. (LIB) | Algoma–Manitoulin | |
| Brownell, Jim (LIB) | Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry | |
| Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB) | Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre | |
| Caplan, David (LIB) | Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est | |
| Carroll, M. Aileen (LIB) | Barrie | |
| Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB) | Markham–Unionville | Minister of Tourism and Culture / Ministre du Tourisme et de la Culture |
| Chiarelli, Bob (LIB) | Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean | |
| Chudleigh, Ted (PC) | Halton | |
| Clark, Steve (PC) | Leeds–Grenville | |
| Colle, Mike (LIB) | Eglinton–Lawrence | |
| Craitor, Kim (LIB) | Niagara Falls | |
| Crozier, Bruce (LIB) | Essex | Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée |
| | | Deputy Speaker / Vice-président |
| Delaney, Bob (LIB) | Mississauga–Streetsville | |
| Dhillon, Vic (LIB) | Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest | |
| Dickson, Joe (LIB) | Ajax–Pickering | |
| DiNovo, Cheri (NDP) | Parkdale–High Park | Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative |
| Dombrowsky, Hon. / L'hon. Leona (LIB) | Prince Edward–Hastings | Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation |
| Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB) | Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre | Minister of Energy and Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Énergie et de l'Infrastructure |
| Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB) | Windsor–Tecumseh | Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement |
| | | Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances |

| Member and Party / Député(e) et parti | Constituency / Circonscription | Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités |
|--|---|--|
| Dunlop, Garfield (PC) | Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord | Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle |
| Elliott, Christine (PC) | Whitby–Oshawa | |
| Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB) | Oakville | Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail |
| Fonseca, Hon. / L'hon. Peter (LIB) | Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville | |
| Gélinas, France (NDP) | Nickel Belt | Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement |
| Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB) | Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles | |
| Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB) | Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord | Minister of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry / Ministre du Développement du Nord, des Mines et des Forêts |
| Hampton, Howard (NDP) | Kenora–Rainy River | Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de l'opposition officielle |
| Hardeman, Ernie (PC) | Oxford | |
| Hillier, Randy (PC) | Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington | Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario |
| Horwath, Andrea (NDP) | Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre | |
| Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB) | St. Paul's | Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration |
| Hoy, Pat (LIB) | Chatham–Kent–Essex | Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario |
| Hudak, Tim (PC) | Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara- Ouest–Glanbrook | |
| Jaczek, Helena (LIB) | Oak Ridges–Markham | Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles |
| Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB) | Brampton–Springdale | |
| Johnson, Rick (LIB) | Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock | Third Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu |
| Jones, Sylvia (PC) | Dufferin–Caledon | |
| Klees, Frank (PC) | Newmarket–Aurora | |
| Kormos, Peter (NDP) | Welland | |
| Kular, Kuldeep (LIB) | Bramalea–Gore–Malton | |
| Kwinter, Monte (LIB) | York Centre / York-Centre | |
| Lalonde, Jean-Marc (LIB) | Glengarry–Prescott–Russell | |
| Leal, Jeff (LIB) | Peterborough | |
| Levac, Dave (LIB) | Brant | |
| MacLeod, Lisa (PC) | Nepean–Carleton | |
| Mangat, Amrit (LIB) | Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud | Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée |
| Marchese, Rosario (NDP) | Trinity–Spadina | |
| Martiniuk, Gerry (PC) | Cambridge | Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario |
| Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB) | London North Centre / London- Centre-Nord | |
| Mauro, Bill (LIB) | Thunder Bay–Atikokan | Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones |
| McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB) | Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud | |
| McMeekin, Ted (LIB) | Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough– Westdale | Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités |
| McNeely, Phil (LIB) | Ottawa–Orléans | |
| Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB) | Ottawa–Vanier | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales |
| Miller, Norm (PC) | Parry Sound–Muskoka | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales |
| Miller, Paul (NDP) | Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek | |
| Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB) | Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre | Minister of Research and Innovation / Ministre de la Recherche et de l'Innovation Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités |
| Mitchell, Hon. / L'hon. Carol (LIB) | Huron–Bruce | Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales |
| Moridi, Reza (LIB) | Richmond Hill | |

| Member and Party / Député(e) et parti | Constituency / Circonscription | Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Munro, Julia (PC) | York–Simcoe | Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative |
| Murdoch, Bill (PC) | Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound | |
| Murray, Glen R (LIB) | Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre | |
| Naqvi, Yasir (LIB) | Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre | |
| O'Toole, John (PC) | Durham | |
| Oraziotti, David (LIB) | Sault Ste. Marie | |
| Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC) | Oshawa | |
| Pendergast, Leeanna (LIB) | Kitchener–Conestoga | |
| Peters, Hon. / L'hon. Steve (LIB) | Elgin–Middlesex–London | Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative |
| Phillips, Hon. / L'hon. Gerry (LIB) | Scarborough–Agincourt | Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre délégué aux Affaires des personnes âgées Minister Without Portfolio / Ministre sans portefeuille Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement |
| Prue, Michael (NDP) | Beaches–East York | |
| Pupatello, Hon. / L'hon. Sandra (LIB) | Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest | Minister of Economic Development and Trade / Ministre du Développement économique et du Commerce |
| Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB) | Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord | |
| Ramal, Khalil (LIB) | London–Fanshawe | |
| Ramsay, David (LIB) | Timiskaming–Cochrane | |
| Rinaldi, Lou (LIB) | Northumberland–Quinte West | |
| Ruprecht, Tony (LIB) | Davenport | |
| Sandals, Liz (LIB) | Guelph | |
| Savoline, Joyce (PC) | Burlington | |
| Sergio, Mario (LIB) | York West / York-Ouest | |
| Shurman, Peter (PC) | Thornhill | |
| Smith, Hon. / L'hon. Monique M. (LIB) | Nipissing | Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement |
| Sorbara, Greg (LIB) | Vaughan | |
| Sousa, Charles (LIB) | Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud | |
| Sterling, Norman W. (PC) | Carleton–Mississippi Mills | |
| Tabuns, Peter (NDP) | Toronto–Danforth | Deputy Third Party House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint de parti reconnu |
| Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB) | Mississauga–Erindale | Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux |
| Van Bommel, Maria (LIB) | Lambton–Kent–Middlesex | |
| Wilkinson, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB) | Perth–Wellington | Minister of Revenue / Ministre du Revenu |
| Wilson, Jim (PC) | Simcoe–Grey | First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée |
| Witmer, Elizabeth (PC) | Kitchener–Waterloo | |
| Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB) | Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest | Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports |
| Yakabuski, John (PC) | Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke | Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle |
| Zimmer, David (LIB) | Willowdale | |

**STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
COMITÉ PERMANENTS ET SPÉCIAUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Robert Bailey
Robert Bailey, Gilles Bisson
Jim Brownell, Kim Craiton
Bob Delaney, Garfield Dunlop
Amrit Mangat, Phil McNeely
John O'Toole
Clerks / Greffiers: William Short (pro tem.), Sylwia Przedzdziecki

Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs / Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques

Chair / Président: Pat Hoy
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Laura Albanese
Laura Albanese, Wayne Arthurs
Toby Barrett, Kevin Daniel Flynn
Pat Hoy, Norm Miller
Glen R Murray, Charles Sousa
Peter Tabuns
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

Standing Committee on General Government / Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales

Chair / Président: David Orazietti
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Helena Jaczek
Bob Chiarelli, Steve Clark
Helena Jaczek, Kuldip Kular
Dave Levac, Rosario Marchese
Bill Mauro, David Orazietti
Joyce Savoline
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité permanent des organismes gouvernementaux

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod
Laura Albanese, Michael A. Brown
Donna H. Cansfield, M. Aileen Carroll
Howard Hampton, Ernie Hardeman
Lisa MacLeod, Leeanna Pendergast
Jim Wilson
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Douglas Arnott

Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de la justice

Chair / Président: Lorenzo Berardinetti
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Leeanna Pendergast
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Ted Chudleigh
Mike Colle, Christine Elliott
Peter Kormos, Reza Moridi
Leeanna Pendergast, Lou Rinaldi
David Zimmer
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité permanent de l'Assemblée législative

Chair / Président: Bas Balkissoon
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Yasir Naqvi
Bas Balkissoon, Bob Delaney
Joe Dickson, Sylvia Jones
Amrit Mangat, Norm Miller
Yasir Naqvi, Michael Prue
Mario Sergio
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tonia Grannum

Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent des comptes publics

Chair / Président: Norman W. Sterling
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Peter Shurman
M. Aileen Carroll, France Gélinas
Jerry J. Ouellette, David Ramsay
Liz Sandals, Peter Shurman
Norman W. Sterling, Maria Van Bommel
David Zimmer
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé

Chair / Président: Michael Prue
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Paul Miller
David Caplan, Kim Craiton
Jeff Leal, Gerry Martiniuk
Paul Miller, Bill Murdoch
Michael Prue, Lou Rinaldi
Tony Ruprecht
Clerks / Greffiers: Trevor Day (pro tem.), Sylwia Przedzdziecki

Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de la politique sociale

Chair / Président: Shafiq Qadri
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Vic Dhillon
Vic Dhillon, Cheri DiNovo
Rick Johnson, Sylvia Jones
Jean-Marc Lalonde, Ted McMeekin
Shafiq Qadri, Khalil Ramal
Elizabeth Witmer
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

Select Committee on Mental Health and Addictions / Comité spécial de la santé mentale et des dépendances

Chair / Président: Kevin Daniel Flynn
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Christine Elliott
Bas Balkissoon, Christine Elliott
Kevin Daniel Flynn, France Gélinas
Helena Jaczek, Sylvia Jones
Jeff Leal, Liz Sandals
Maria Van Bommel
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Susan Sourial

CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday 1 June 2010 / Mardi 1^{er} juin 2010

ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

Time allocation

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn..... | 1873 |
| Vote deferred | 1873 |

Time allocation

| | |
|-----------------------|------|
| Mr. Norm Miller | 1873 |
| Vote deferred | 1876 |

Time allocation

| | |
|-------------------------|------|
| Hon. Ms. Smith..... | 1876 |
| Mr. Randy Hillier | 1876 |
| Mr. Gilles Bisson | 1881 |
| Vote deferred | 1884 |