



ISSN 1180-5218

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 29 April 2013

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 29 avril 2013

**Standing Committee on
General Government**

Subcommittee reports

**Comité permanent des
affaires gouvernementales**

Rapports du sous-comité

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENTCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES

Monday 29 April 2013

Lundi 29 avril 2013

The committee met at 1413 in room 228.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): We'll call the meeting to order: the Standing Committee on General Government, Monday, April 29.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): We have the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated April 22. Mr. Bartolucci.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Okay, we're going to do the short one first. I think that's what we've agreed on.

Your subcommittee on committee business met on Thursday, April 18 and on Monday, April 22 of this year to consider the method of proceeding with the review of the Aggregate Resources Act, and recommends the following:

(1) That the committee Clerk send a letter to each House leader requesting that a motion be brought forward in the House authorizing the committee to continue the review of the Aggregate Resources Act begun in the first session of the 40th Parliament; and

(2) That the committee Clerk, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized, prior to the adoption of the report of the subcommittee, to commence making any preliminary arrangements necessary to facilitate the committee's proceedings.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Questions, comments, debate?

Ms. Jones?

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Unless I missed something, on Thursday in the House unanimous consent was given for your first point about the ARA review; is that right?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Right.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Yes.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Okay. So that's part's done. So we're voting on something that has already happened.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: No, not really. We're reporting the committee's finding.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Part 2 actually said I had permission to go ahead prior to the adoption of this report and write to them. So we did. It would mean a lot to me if you would pass this now, saying that I had the permission to write to them to make all that—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): It's a technical, logistical problem.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Oh. So if I want to make—all right; I'll stop.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): I'm sure you're in support of the Aggregate Resources Act.

Any other debate? All in favour? Mr. Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: Not now.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): That's the next one.

All in favour? Carried.

Okay. The next item is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Wednesday, April 24. Mr. Bartolucci.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Thanks very much, Chair.

Your subcommittee on committee business met on Wednesday, April 24 of this year to consider the committee's schedule, and recommends the following—and there are 11 of them:

(1) That the committee meet on Wednesday, May 1, and Monday, May 6, 2013, for the purpose of public hearings on the auto insurance study.

(2) That the committee Clerk, with the authorization of the Chair, post information regarding public hearings on the auto insurance study on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly website and Canada NewsWire.

(3) That witnesses be scheduled in accordance with the previous practice of the committee regarding the auto insurance study.

(4) That the Chair seek the authorization of the House to meet outside of the committee's regularly scheduled meeting times on Wednesday, May 8, and Monday, May 13, 2013.

(5) That, subject to the authorization of the House, the committee meet on Wednesday, May 8, and Monday, May 13, 2013, in Durham and Hamilton for the purpose of public hearings on the traffic congestion study.

(6) That the committee Clerk, with the authorization of the Chair, post information regarding public hearings on the traffic congestion study on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly website and Canada NewsWire.

(7) That witnesses be scheduled in accordance with the previous practice of the committee regarding the traffic congestion study.

(8) That the committee meet on Wednesday, May 15, 2013, for the purpose of considering Bill 11, An Act to

amend the Ambulance Act with respect to air ambulance services.

(9) That, subject to its referral from the House, the committee meet on Monday, May 27; Wednesday, May 29; Monday, June 3; and Wednesday, June 5, 2013, for the purpose of report writing on the review of the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA).

(10) That, subject to its referral from the House, the research officer provide the committee with all outstanding research documents on the previous review of the Aggregate Resources Act by Monday, May 20, 2013.

(11) That the committee Clerk, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized prior to the adoption of the report of the subcommittee to commence making any preliminary arrangements necessary to facilitate the committee's proceedings.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Mr. Colle, I understand you have an amendment?

Mr. Mike Colle: Yes, I have a motion to strike out parts 4 and 5 and replace it with, "That the committee meet on Wednesday, May 8, and Monday, May 13, 2013, in Toronto for the purpose of public hearings on the traffic congestion study."

Do you want me to explain it?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Everybody have a copy?

Mr. Mike Colle: Do you want me to speak to it?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Let's just get it around first.

Okay. Comments, Mr. Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: Yes, just briefly: I know that in the subcommittee we discussed this in an attempt to get out and do some travel on days the House is sitting, and we thought we would try to go east and west. The suggestion is here that perhaps on those days we could invite people really from the western part of the GTA, Hamilton, and the east, Durham and beyond. If they could partake, with an emphasis that they could partake in these committee hearings by teleconference with that invitation, we'd do that by being here, rather than trying to get out there when the House is still sitting, which could be problematic.

1420

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Further debate?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Could I propose—the idea was to ask the House leaders to see whether they would approve us travelling. Could we not say that we would ask for approval to travel on those two days and, failing that, that we would then have our work here at Queen's Park and do it by teleconferencing to the extent that we can?

Mr. Mike Colle: Yes.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: We could proceed with the request that we had made and hope that the House leaders agree, and if there's disagreement, then we—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Can I allow the Clerk to comment on that?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Sure.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Because I think that discussion did take place, and logistics might be a problem.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Prior to the amendment, we were trying to figure out how we were going to work this. Should this subcommittee report pass, we'd be sending a letter immediately to the House leaders saying, "We need permission."

However, for scheduling purposes, we could make sort of temporary arrangements, but we would need to hear back by Thursday afternoon by the absolute latest, to really make this happen. Advertising, in the meantime, would be void of location—"The committee intends to meet on these two days"—and we would tell people, when they call in, what the current situation is and what we're awaiting.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Could we not, each of our caucuses, engage our House leaders and let them know right away so that they could get together and solve this ASAP? We could all undertake to do that?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): I have Ms. Cansfield and then Ms. Scott.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Well, actually, the House leaders would have to meet together because they all have to agree.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: No, I understand.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Meeting independently—I mean, you could do that, but they still ultimately have to meet, so that means it has to be scheduled, and the budget is on the 8th. I really don't see going to Durham or wherever it is you want to go—I don't think that's going to happen.

Interjection.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Sorry. Because of the budget, there will still be discussions going on in the House; that's what I meant. The budget will come down on the 2nd, which is a Thursday. Then on the Monday, there's going to be just the one, presumably, discussion by the Leader of the Opposition. Then the House collapses, and then we start debate or whatever. It makes no sense, personally, to do this.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Scott?

Ms. Laurie Scott: I agree with what Ms. Cansfield has just said about the budget and the travel. I think that it's wiser—I know some members aren't going to like this—that we fall back to constituency week, if we could, for travel. It just makes more sense. We know we're not here. We don't know when the votes are for the budget. We don't know when the discussion times or debate times are.

It's Hamilton and it's Durham, so I don't know who is travelling with what committees, but it's not too, too far away. It's not like going to northern Ontario for constituency week, where you've got to do the night-before travel.

Interjections.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Anyway, I'm just scared to get locked into a date. We don't know for sure with the budget and the timeline that it's in, so I would prefer not

to be locked into the dates that were recommended before, because they might change, and it does have to go to House leaders for this discussion about travel at all. I'm scared to get locked into dates.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Plus we're trying to do a lot: aggregates, plus transportation.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Oh, God, yes.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: So the suggestion is that we get approval to meet during constituency week? Is that what you were saying?

Ms. Laurie Scott: Yes, to travel during constituency week is what I would recommend, but—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Excuse me, Chair. So are you amending the amendment to say let's remove (4) and (5) and put in a request—excuse me—to move that numbers (4) and (5) be struck out and replaced with a general ask that we travel on constituency week? Is that what you're saying? Do you have to make that amendment to the amendment, or—

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Yes.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Let me check with the Clerk, because if we want to do it constituency week, do we still have to ask the House leaders?

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: We still have to have agreement.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Basically, what we have here is that the original subcommittee is on the floor. We have an amendment to strike (4) and (5) and replace with something. If you're going to amend that, then the "something" that we would replace it with, instead of "here in Toronto on the 8th and the 13th," would be two days—

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Two days of committee travel—

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Two days of travel during the upcoming constituency week. So you would be amending the amendment to pull out everything after "on Wednesday, May 8." It would meet during two days; that was it. It's not even Toronto. So, "the purpose of public hearings on study" would be—everything in the middle there—"The committee would meet"—you would strike out "on Wednesday, May," and it would be "for two days during the constituency week."

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Do we have a backup plan in case that doesn't work?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Then it will be June.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Okay. Any debate on the now amendment?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Just a second. Ms. Campbell had her hand up.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Can we possibly have a five-minute recess? I don't want to draw out proceedings. I'd just like a five-minute recess on this.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): No problem. We're recessed for five minutes. We'll reconvene at 25 to three.

The committee recessed from 1426 to 1429.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Campbell, do you have a comment or shall I proceed?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No, I'm fine, thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Okay. Ms. Jones, you have a correction.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: No, I can't do that yet.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): We've already got two on, so we've got to work our way backwards.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): All right.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: We're voting on the amendment to the amendment?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Yes, so Ms. Jones has moved that we strike out that.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: But you don't want that until after we vote on the other parts, right?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): That's right.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Are we taking it as a friendly from Mr. Colle? Is he accepting?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): We've got to work our way backwards.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): We'll take the amendment to the amendment by Ms. Jones, and it reads—

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): By Ms. Scott.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Scott, sorry—to strike out everything between "meet" and "for" in the motion by Mr. Colle, to change it to read "for two days during the constituency week." All in agreement? Carried.

Now we'll vote on the amendment itself, as amended. All in favour? Carried.

Now we're going to take the subcommittee report. Ms. Jones.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Chair, I would like to make an amendment. I move that point 10 be amended to change the date to Tuesday, May 21, because Monday, May 20, is Victoria Day, so that's a holiday.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Everybody heard the amendment? All in favour? Carried.

Ms. Scott, you had something you wanted to ask?

Ms. Laurie Scott: I do have a question. On point number 1, it says, "That the committee met on Wednesday, May 1 and Monday, May 6, 2013, for the purpose of public hearings on the auto insurance study." I was thinking that that was report writing, but it is public hearings? I just want to clarify that.

Interjection: Yes.

Ms. Laurie Scott: So notice has already gone out, right? Because it's this week. Okay. Just originally, I had thought it was report writing, so it's not report writing. That's cool. I just wanted to clarify that. That's cool.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Okay. The subcommittee report, as amended—

Mr. Mike Colle: Just one point of clarification here: During constituency week, this committee is going to meet three times?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Two.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: No, just the two dates.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): No, two dates.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Hearings. We're going to have it here and—

Mr. Mike Colle: No, but then the aggregate resources—

Interjection.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: That's just so we have it over the constit week.

Mr. Mike Colle: Oh, we're going to receive it. Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Okay. Can I take the standing committee report, as amended? All in favour? Carried.

Before we adjourn, we have some information from the research officer.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: Thank you, Chair. I've distributed a background memo. I will change the "Monday, May 20" after the fact.

What the memo does is it sort of tries to bring everyone to the same page. It gives you a brief synopsis of what we did before. You see on page 2—I won't read all this into the record—it reviews what went on when we dealt with the ARA before, the motion and the eight days of hearings and what have you.

Page 3 brings you up to date with respect to the motion that was passed in the House last Thursday.

The next section, "Key documents," gives you a sense of some of the key documents that we will be preparing. Some of them you've seen various versions of before, but we have to bring them up to date and add various aspects of what went on in the previous consideration.

The next section is "Existing background documents." What I've done there—I don't know what the full membership is going to be when we get into the ARA, so what I've done is outlined what I use—and I was generous. I didn't include everything—this is sort of my background file—but I pulled out some of the key things that you may want to have at your fingertips. If some of the links don't work, you can call my office and we can provide the documents to you, but you probably don't need them now; we need them in three weeks when we get into the report writing discussion.

Some of the key things are the ARA itself. On the first day of hearings, the MNR distributed a very useful set of slides. They gave a presentation subject to being invited, and I think that that package of slides, overheads—it's about 20 pages—is a very good synopsis, with maps and tables of the current administrative framework that MNR exercises to administer the ARA.

One of the issues was aggregate recycling. The current act does not make provision for it, so I reviewed some of the issues that were raised in the last set of hearings. Ms. Jones recently introduced a private member's bill on the matter, so that's flagged there. During the previous set of hearings, I made reference to—because some of you have not actually been involved around the Leg here in a committee writing process—the report of the alternative fuels committee, which I had a major hand in writing. I don't collect royalties, though. But anyway, I really think

in all sincerity that that report is a very good model. There's a link provided.

The committee, of course, was an all-party committee, and we reached—"we" I'm using more with reference to the parties and the committee members. We worked very hard to reach consensus. There were 141 recommendations, and they were all unanimously agreed to. We did, in camera, engage in some pretty intense debates, but we did reach a consensus viewpoint. There are 141 recommendations in that report. I think they've had a major influence in the intervening 10, 11 years on government policy in the field of renewable energy.

That's an example of a report where I submit that the committee process was very useful and successful, and it has had an influence on government policy. I would presume that the committee wants to do the same with aggregate. If you have questions—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Jones.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: I think this is great. In terms of the existing background documents, I'd also like to suggest that you include the sections of the Planning Act particularly related to the provincial policy statements. I think that in terms of framing our discussion, that would be helpful for members to have.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: And the ministry, I think, has come out with an updated version of the provincial policy statement.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Yes.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: So I can make that available to you.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Thanks.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Further comments? Mr. Marchese.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I think Jerry's suggestion of looking at the alternative fuel sources report is a good one, and I think it might be useful for us all to look at. I'm going to be looking at it. Thank you, Jerry.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Mr. Colle.

Mr. Mike Colle: I just think it might be—is it possible, even before the 20th or whatever it is, or even on the 20th, to give us sort of the key decision-making points, where we're going to have to—like on tipping fees—not tipping fees but the—

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Levy.

Mr. Mike Colle: —levies.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: The levy. Yes, the fees.

Mr. Mike Colle: About the framework on that. That's obviously one thing—recycling is another area of serious consideration—about protecting farmland. If we can get that framework about key decision-making points, we might get focused a little sooner, because there's just so much material, especially for some of the new members. If we get started in those areas, we can get to the crunch of the review and the report. And then is it possible—when you did the alternative fuels, there was no minority report or dissenting—they agreed on everything? Okay. I was just wondering, in many of these reports, there's always a minority report or—no?

Interjection: No.

Ms. Sylvia Jones: No, there wasn't one—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: He's saying it's some. There are, but—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): If you work on consensus, there wouldn't be.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: From a staff perspective—and all the members of that committee, three of whom still sit in the House. You can chat with those fellows. I have to say that the committee—we made a very serious effort to come up with a consensus report. Some of the members, Mr. Gilchrist, whom you might remember—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Yes, we do.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: —Mr. Bradley, Ms. Bountrogianni—we had some pretty prominent MPPs, and—

Mr. Mike Colle: You're saying we're not prominent and they were?

Mr. Jerry Richmond: Of course, you're very prominent.

The committee and the members—the Chair was Dr. Doug Galt, who was a veterinarian. The committee made a very serious effort to reach consensus, and we did. Behind the scenes, we had some lengthy debate, but we managed to reach—by we, I mean the committee; we, as staff, of course followed the committee's directions—complete consensus on 141 recommendations.

1440

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Mr. Marchese?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I agree. If we can come to consensus on this report, I would prefer it, and hopefully we can.

Jerry, I think you've got a good sense of some of the major items we're going to be dealing with, right? Otherwise, we could sit as a subcommittee in advance and talk about those major themes, but I suspect Jerry is going to do that.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: In response to Mr. Colle's point, I'm going to be away on vacation the next week and a half. The arrangements were made long before the ARA resurfaced.

But what I will be able to do is flag the key issues. I would prefer to do that when we finish the complete summary. Before I walk you through that, we had a summary in the last round that covered half of the hearings. Because of the prorogation we didn't complete that work because we were given direction to cease and desist, but we will have before you in a few weeks a complete summary. I'm prepared, before we get into that, to highlight and walk you through some of the key issues.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Jones?

Ms. Sylvia Jones: Yes, I would like to stick with—the reason we asked for Jerry's info for a week during consti was so that we all individually would have that opportunity to study and pull out the stuff that we had heard. Obviously, for new members, there's going to be a lot of background material, but I'm confident that you will see some consistencies—when it's compiled—about what we heard. I'd like to actually not presuppose any outcomes in terms of what we want to focus in on, and allow you to do that compiling first.

Mr. Jerry Richmond: I think once we see who the new membership is, who will be assigned, I'm certainly willing to help the new members get up to speed. I think some of the other members who were heavily involved in the previous hearings can also do that too. I think we'll be in pretty good shape.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Okay. Trevor has some input.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Sorry, not on this; on another issue. Last meeting, in terms of the auto insurance, we were going to kick whether or not to invite GISA to the subcommittee, and we didn't cover it in subcommittee.

Interjection.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): GISA.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): An organization.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): We just didn't cover it in subcommittee. It was one of those things.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: So take it back to the subcommittee, and let them decide. It shouldn't be decided—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Do we have the date set for the hearings?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): That's fine. That's not a problem.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: But if I could: At subcommittee, then, there should be the opportunity, because the idea was that there were two different perspectives based on two different analyses of actuarial and data collection, which are two different perspectives, and both of the folks should be invited back so we don't have a distorted perspective on the data.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Sorry. Could you repeat what we had asked them to do?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Last time we were meeting on auto insurance there was a suggestion that we invite GISA to come before the committee. At that time, the committee said, "You know what? We'll let the subcommittee deal with it, and we'll put it off."

The subcommittee did meet. I didn't raise it with the committee. We are meeting again on auto insurance for two days, but a decision has not been made in that vein, whether or not to invite them.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Sorry. We're continuing with the hearings and we have a list of people. I think we should just leave it that way.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): Okay. Well, that was just for the committee. It was something that was overlooked in subcommittee.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Do we have room in those two days that are coming up this week for witnesses on auto insurance?

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): As it is right now, the first day, because it's 40 minutes a thing, we have people to fill the first day. The second day would depend on who's responding.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Okay. Well, I'd just like to get back to our point person on your question, and then—

how can we do it? Do we have to have a subcommittee meeting? Can we just do it by phone? I guess we're all here anyway. We could just have a quick—

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): I can send out an email and just poll the subcommittee as to—

Ms. Laurie Scott: So there's room on the second day, Rosario, for more people.

Interjection.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Yes, but there's still room in the schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): The first day is booked; the second is not. It was raised, so it's just a matter of inviting them, unless there are objections.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Chair, Sarah wants to speak.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Ms. Campbell?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: I think we should invite them, but—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Mr. Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: I know I had asked that GISA be invited. That's all that was discussed the other day, but I also wanted to invite my autobody repair guy, Rocco Delorenzo. He is a prominent—he's been in the autobody repair business for 40 years, and he wants to come and talk about auto insurance from the real man's perspective.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: He can come as a deputant; is that correct?

Mr. Mike Colle: He doesn't know about this procedure, but if you send him a letter, he'll come.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Just ask him to call the Clerk. There's room, obviously. He can come as a deputant.

Mr. Mike Colle: Rocco Delorenzo of Ryding Auto Body on Castlefield.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): You're going to have to tell him to call me.

Mr. Mike Colle: He wants to come and talk about auto insurance.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Tell him to call the Clerk.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Whoa. I have Ms. Scott.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Well, I thought you put your hand up.

Ms. Laurie Scott: I was just saying that I think there's a procedure here, right? The member has to call the person who wants to appear before to tell them to call the Clerk, or else we can't—

Interjection.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Yes. Is that okay, Mr. Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: I'll work it out somehow.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Well, okay. You should do the right process there, for the Clerk's sake.

Mr. Mike Colle: If we're inviting GISA, I said why don't we invite Rocco?

Interjections.

Ms. Laurie Scott: It's a different organization. If we can just get back to it, because I think there's another organization. Ms. Cansfield has been trying to say the name, and I just couldn't hear; I'm sorry.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: What occurred was that there was a presentation that was made, and in that presentation there were two perspectives. GISA is the insurance industry's data collection body, so when they aggregate their information it's based on data collection. Then there was Mr. Cheng, who presented similarly, but from an actuarial perspective. Of course the figures didn't mesh because you've got two different—but obviously GISA appealed to some people more than the actuarial did, and I'm just saying that I think all members should have an opportunity to question both and to hear both as to how that rationale was done. We can go back and invite the actuary for how he collected the data, that GISA did exactly the same thing.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: What we have is two days to hear from more deputants. If he would like to come, I think he should be asked to come and speak as a deputant rather than us inviting him as a special guest—

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: It was you who made the suggestion. It was Mr. Singh who made the suggestion for GISA.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: When did he make that suggestion?

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): At the last meeting.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: At the last meeting, so all I'm asking for is—

Mr. Mike Colle: No, no, I asked for GISA to come. It wasn't—

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Mr. Singh raised it, and Mike said—

Mr. Mike Colle: —and I said, "Let's bring GISA here." It was my suggestion to bring GISA here—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I have no recollection.

Interjection.

The Clerk Pro Tem (Mr. Trevor Day): What if I just poll the subcommittee and see what they'd like to do?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Yes, let's poll the subcommittee.

The Chair (Mr. Bas Balkissoon): Okay. Anything else? We're adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1448.

CONTENTS

Monday 29 April 2013

Subcommittee reports G-121

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Président

Mr. Bas Balkissoon (Scarborough–Rouge River L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Mr. Bas Balkissoon (Scarborough–Rouge River L)

Mr. Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury L)

Ms. Sarah Campbell (Kenora–Rainy River ND)

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Mr. Mike Colle (Eglinton–Lawrence L)

Mr. Rosario Marchese (Trinity–Spadina ND)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Mr. Todd Smith (Prince Edward–Hastings PC)

Mr. Jeff Yurek (Elgin–Middlesex–London PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Sylvia Jones (Dufferin–Caledon PC)

Mr. Rick Nicholls (Chatham–Kent–Essex PC)

Clerk pro tem / Greffier par intérim

Mr. Trevor Day

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Jerry Richmond, research officer,
Legislative Research Service