



ISSN 1180-4335

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 15 April 2014

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mardi 15 avril 2014

**Standing Committee on
Government Agencies**

Committee business

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Travaux du 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
GOVERNMENT AGENCIESCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Tuesday 15 April 2014

Mardi 15 avril 2014

The committee met at 0905 in committee room 1.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We'll start the meeting. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This is the Standing Committee on Government Agencies.

When we adjourned last week, I had put a question on the amendment moved by Ms. Damerla to the motion by Miss Taylor. A 20-minute recess was requested and I adjourned the meeting. So now we'll take the vote, without any debate or amendment. We're going to vote now on the amendment that was moved by Ms. Damerla. Okay?

I'll just quickly read in the amendment. Ms. Damerla had moved as follows: "I move that the words 'all documents' be struck from the motion and replaced with 'only financial records directly related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives.'"

That was moved on April 1 and it was debated on April 8.

We'll now vote on Ms. Damerla's amendment. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed? The amendment carries.

Now we move back to the main motion that was moved by Miss Taylor. Everyone has a copy of it in their package; it's right here.

Miss Monique Taylor: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Miss Taylor.

Miss Monique Taylor: I would like to call the question, please, Chair.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, we'd like a 20-minute recess before the vote.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Before we do that, can I just get one thing done? It's a housekeeping matter. Before we resume debate on the main motion, could I have an agreement to quickly consider the subcommittee report that was before the committee, the subcommittee report dated Thursday, April 10, 2014? Would someone please move adoption of the report?

Miss Monique Taylor: I move adoption of the subcommittee report on intended appointments dated Thursday, April 10, 2014.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Thank you. Any discussion? Okay. We'll vote now. All in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The other thing is, should we deal with the extension of deadlines now? One more thing very quickly—it's a

housekeeping matter. There are a number of extensions because there are people who have applied for appointments, and I just wanted to deal with the extensions.

There are currently 11 intended appointees selected by the committee whose deadlines or extensions expire before our next meeting. We would require unanimous consent of the committee to extend the deadlines so that we may interview these individuals who were selected at a later date.

I'll just read out very quickly the people we need an extension for. I'll just go through them quickly.

Number 1 is Richard Patten, nominated as member, Ottawa Convention Centre Corp.

Number 2 is Egya Sangmuah, nominated as member and vice-chair, Landlord and Tenant Board (Social Justice Tribunals Ontario).

Number 3 is Jeff Kehoe, nominated as member and chair, Ontario Capital Growth Corp.

Number 4 is Mary Anne McKellar, nominated as presiding officer, Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal.

Number 5 is Ranjit Singh Dulai, nominated as member, Ontario Judicial Council.

Number 6 is Sarah Jacobs, nominated as member, Environmental Review Tribunal and Ontario Municipal Board (Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario).

Number 7 is Anne Golden, nominated as member, Metrolinx.

Number 8 is Iain Dobson, nominated as member, Metrolinx.

Number 9 is Andrew Glenny, nominated as member, Council of the College of Veterinarians of Ontario.

Number 10 is Ronna Hope Warsh, nominated as member, Council of the Ontario College of Teachers.

Number 11 is Shadi Sandra Katirai, nominated as member, Council of the College of Physiotherapists of Ontario.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadlines to consider the intended appointments of Richard Patten—do I have to read each one, or can we just read them all together?

Interjection.

0910

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti):—Richard Patten to May 16, 2014? Can we extend that one? Agreed? Thank you.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, no; it has to be unanimous consent, right?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. We don't have unanimous consent.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Egya Sangmuah to May 16, 2014? Agreed? Okay. That one has been extended.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Jeff Kehoe, nominated as member and chair, Ontario Capital Growth Corp., to May 16, 2014? Agreed? Thank you.

Do we have unanimous consent and agreement to extend the deadline for the appointment of Mary Anne McKellar, nominated as presiding officer, Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal, to May 16, 2014? Agreed? Okay.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Ranjit Singh Dulai, nominated as member, Ontario Judicial Council, to May 23, 2014? Agreed? Okay.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Sarah Jacobs, nominated as member, Environmental Review Tribunal and Ontario Municipal Board (Environment and Land Tribunals Ontario), to May 23, 2014? Agreed? Agreed.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Anne Golden, nominated as member, Metrolinx, to May 23, 2014? I heard a no. That's not extended.

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline—

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, just on that point: I'd be interested to know why the government members are refusing to extend the deadline for Anne Golden.

Miss Monique Taylor: And Richard Patten.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm happy to respond to you with a written explanation or an oral explanation after.

Mr. Frank Klees: Yes, please.

Interjections.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm happy to talk about it; we just got some briefing.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm sorry. Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm happy to respond to Mr. Klees. We don't want to extend them because we want them filled now.

Mr. Frank Klees: I'm sorry. I'm having a hard time hearing.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I said, we're opposing the extension because we'd rather have them filled now, right away, because there's work to be done at Metrolinx and we can't keep extending it.

Mr. Frank Klees: I would think that the work at Metrolinx could get done by extending the date. By not extending the date, you're essentially saying that you're willing to terminate Anne Golden's appointment.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No. What happens is that after a period of time, the person is automatically nominated as the tapped position. If we wait, say, until May 23, they are not appointed until May 23

when they come in front of this committee, if they appear that day.

Mr. Frank Klees: What we're saying is that the government is treating all of these other appointees differently.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Well, I think this is the second one where I heard a no. What happens with those people, if it's not unanimous, is that they get appointed after a certain period of time.

Mr. Frank Klees: What I would like some clarification on is, we have a list of appointees here. The government has taken a position on two appointees, Ms. Golden and Mr. Patten, different from the other appointees. I'm sure that these other appointees would be interested to know why the government is treating them differently. Are they not as important as Ms. Golden and Mr. Patten? If I was one of these appointees, I would be very concerned at the treatment I was getting from the government here. Perhaps Mr. Bartolucci—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I had Miss Taylor down first, then Mr. Bartolucci. Go ahead, Miss Taylor.

Miss Monique Taylor: I think that Mr. Klees makes a good point. It looks like some are being favoured over others, and we were just curious as to why we would extend some and not others. I would just really like clarification on that because it seems quite unfair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. Mr. Bartolucci?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: First of all, I don't think we need to provide any clarification at all, but, out of goodwill, we will.

The reality is that, obviously, it's necessary that these appointments be done as quickly as possible, and I go back to what I said four meetings ago: If we dealt with appointments first, we wouldn't be running into this type of nonsense. So I'm hoping that a motion is going to appear again that says, "Let's deal with intended appointments first and then deal with the rest of the business that this committee does," and we wouldn't be running into this quagmire that we find ourselves in. Thank you.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Mr. Klees.

Mr. Frank Klees: I believe it is very important that we have clarification, for the benefit of the committee as well as for the benefit of the individuals who are on this list, as to what the implications are of the extension not being granted for some and being granted for others. Perhaps we could get a clarification from the Clerk as to how this works and what will happen specifically to those appointees for whom the extension is not being granted today. What will happen to those, and how will those for whom the extension is being granted be dealt with?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Maybe I can answer it. People who are getting an extension are not appointed until the date—for example, May 23—

Mr. Frank Klees: I'm happy to have the Clerk give us this explanation, Chair. It may save you some trouble.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): For example, number 5, Ranjit Singh Dulai: If we agree to extend and they come to the committee—because otherwise the deadline runs out. So they can come to committee on May 23 and make their presentation, and then we can discuss the appointment at that time. If the extension is not granted, then they are automatically appointed, because, the way the rules work, there's a certain period of time. When the opposition parties, or even the government, call someone to appear before committee, the clock starts running, and that clock will expire unless we give these people an agreement to extend their deadline.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair, excuse me for interrupting you, but because I think we want this to be as nonbiased as possible, can we take Mr. Klees's suggestion and have the Clerk explain exactly what happens so that there won't be any semblance of bias here as we go on? I think it might be better if the Clerk did that explanation.

Mr. Klees?

Mr. Frank Klees: I think that that would be in everyone's best interest.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewoziecki): When a committee selects individuals for review by the committee off a certificate, the committee has 30 days from the date of that certificate to review the individuals, or else the committee in effect loses its opportunity to review the individuals—unless, by unanimous consent, the committee extends the deadline for review.

And so, to answer Mr. Klees's question about the implications, all the individuals on this list—the committee will not have an opportunity to review them. That is, it will not meet before the deadlines for consideration of these individuals expire. By not granting unanimous consent to extend the deadline, effectively the committee loses its opportunity to have that person before the committee for review.

Mr. Frank Klees: To be very clear, what has happened here, then, by the government members refusing to extend the date for Mr. Patten and Ms. Golden, is that the government has essentially said, "We will deny this committee the opportunity to review those potential appointees." Is that correct, Clerk?

0920

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair?

Mr. Frank Klees: No. Chair, I would like the Clerk to respond, please.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): And then we'll take you right after that.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewoziecki): Without unanimous consent, the deadline—in some cases, it's a deadline from the original certificate; in some cases, it was a deadline that had been agreed to by a previous extension—will simply expire.

Mr. Frank Klees: So essentially what the government has done here, by denying unanimous consent, is they have ensured that this committee will not have the opportunity to review the appointment of Mr. Patten and Ms. Golden. Is that correct?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewoziecki): The deadlines—

Mr. Frank Klees: Just "yes" or "no."

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewoziecki): Well, I mean, the deadlines within which the committee would be able to review will have expired.

Mr. Frank Klees: Yes. So by denying—Clerk, you're not—to Mr. Bartolucci's point, what we're trying to do is get a non-biased response, and now we have a Clerk who is refusing to give me a yes or no response.

Interjections.

Mr. Frank Klees: I don't want to pick a fight with the Clerk. Please. That would be so wrong.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): She has been giving a non-biased explanation.

Mr. Frank Klees: I know that. Chair, you know—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): It's in the standing orders.

Mr. Frank Klees: Just really, for once in 18 and a half years, I'm trying to get a straightforward answer on the record. I thought we might be able to achieve that here this morning.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm happy to give a black-and-white answer.

Mr. Frank Klees: I'm just going to try one more time for the record. By denying the unanimous consent to extend the date for Mr. Patten and Ms. Golden, the government has effectively denied this committee the opportunity to review those appointments.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: The answer is no, because this government has given the opposition—

Mr. Frank Klees: I'm not asking you.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: But I need to answer this, because you're implying, and I have to get this on the record—because the government has given the opposition multiple opportunities to have brought the appointee business forward and done all other business later—many, many times. Go back to the Hansard.

So the answer is, really, the opposition has denied itself the opportunity to review these appointments by simply not agreeing to review them when they were sitting here and playing politics. You really denied yourself that opportunity.

Some of these people have been extended twice. There has been absolutely no reason. We could have first reviewed them when they were sitting here, and we would still be discussing those motions. I have to respectfully submit that I think in this instance, perhaps unwittingly, the opposition has denied itself this opportunity, not the government.

Mr. Frank Klees: Let me ask this question, then: Why—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Through the Chair, of course.

Mr. Frank Klees: Through the Chair, of course, because I actually didn't direct my question to the honourable member to begin with. But through you, Chair, I would then ask for this explanation from the government: Why are you treating these two applicants differently from the others who are on this list?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Miss Taylor wants to speak.

Miss Monique Taylor: Thank you, Chair. I'm having a really difficult time with the explanations that I've heard from the government side as to why these people have been held up. We all know it to be true that the government has filibustered since December 3. That has held—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Can I get some order? I'm having trouble—excuse me. I'm having trouble listening to Miss Taylor.

Sorry. Go ahead.

Miss Monique Taylor: The government has continued to filibuster this committee since December 3. That has held up our appointments. Some of these appointments have still not had the opportunity to come before us. Yes, we have had a few appointees here that we weren't able to see, but we also extended their deadlines.

Possibly a coincidence, but the only ones who have been denied have been from selections of the third party so far, if you may have noticed. We take offence to that. We think that we have the right and the ability to have people come to this committee, and these people should have the right, when their time is here in committee, to be heard on behalf of this committee, not to have to sit in the back row while the government continues to filibuster with amendments and motion after motion after motion.

So if we want to talk about time wasted, I think it would be on the part of the government, not on this side of the table.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. This is what I'm going to do. I'm going to continue, because there's a few more to go. I'm looking at the clock—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: We're happy to reconsider all of them. If they want us to say no to all the extensions, we can do that. We just thought we'll say no to the ones where we need the work to get started. But if their big complaint is why a few and why not the others, frankly, we've extended all of them at least once.

You lost the right to review them when you played political games, as far as I'm concerned. So if your big concern is why these two and not all the others, we're happy to say, let's not extend any of them. If that's your only complaint, that's fine.

Miss Monique Taylor: The Ottawa Convention Centre is chomping at the bit, right? They're in urgent need.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: There's always urgent need.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We're getting, I think, subjective. Either we extend them or we don't. We can go back and forth. The bottom line is, if we don't extend them, they get automatically appointed, all right?

Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Iain Dobson,

nominated as member, Metrolinx, to May 23, 2014? Agreed? I heard a no.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I just wanted the record to note that the government is officially appointing Metrolinx board members without a review from this committee. It's especially concerning to me when the fact is that Metrolinx is out of control with its advertising spending. It would be great to view the new board members as to their views and how they'd tend to be correcting this problem going through Metrolinx—and also the fact that we're concerned about the secret agenda of the government instituting the gas tax. Appointing these people without a discussion at the committee level only plays further to the point that they are putting it behind to secretly import that tax into the community.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Ms. Forster.

Ms. Cindy Forster: Certainly, the third party would like to hear from Anne Golden in light of the transit announcement that was made yesterday to spend \$29 billion over the next 10 years. We would be more than happy to hear what Ms. Golden has to say about that spending, as well as about the plan in general.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, hang on.

Ms. Cindy Forster: Iain Dobson as well is from Metrolinx.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay, Mr. Bartolucci.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Mr. Chair, we're going around in circles now. We're just going to be repeating arguments and arguments.

Four weeks ago, I think, I said, why don't we deal with intended appointments? If you want to hear what Ms. Golden says, let's have the intended appointments before we have the stuff that we're doing. Then you'll be able to decide whether or not we're going to appoint her. It's a double-edged sword.

I cannot believe that we're wasting this much time on this. I think if, in fact, the order of business was switched dealing with the intended appointees, that would go a long way in ensuring that if you think there's something wrong with a particular agency, you have some control over those. Because you have the majority in committee work now, you have control over who you appoint and who you don't appoint.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): First Ms. Damerla and then Mr. Klees.

Just as Chair, I want to explain one thing. Once the person is selected to appear before this committee, the committee must consider that appointment within 30 days to deal with that appointment of either the third party or the opposition. If we don't deal with it within 30 days, we're asking for an extension to deal with it, adding another 30 days to it. If we don't agree to that, then they're automatically appointed. Those are the rules.

I'm not making them up; they're in the standing orders. So it's not biased.

I understand the arguments from both sides here, but the rules say that 30 days after selection, we get the chance to review them. Anne Golden: We selected her on a certain date—I have it in front of me—and then we didn't deal with her within 30 days. So either we get an extension or, if we don't extend, we automatically appoint—bottom line.

Interjection.

0930

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm sorry?

Mr. Frank Klees: Why didn't we deal with it within 30 days?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): They're going to say it's because we had to deal with—basically, either we do the 30 days, or we get an extension. All right? A lot of time has been spent in this room dealing with the motions and the amendments to the motions.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I just want to—

Miss Monique Taylor: It's called filibustering.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, Chair, it's not. I recall in the last session that Ms. Wong agreed to give up her 20-minutes when she was speaking to have a witness come up, and nobody on the opposition agreed. You're accusing us of filibustering, but we gave up our time to say that we will use the time that has been allocated to us to allow a witness to appear. I gave up our 20-minute recess. I was willing to say that the 20-minute recess may be used to allow another appointee to come here so that the committee could review them. It was again refused.

You guys refused every opportunity to listen to them, and now you're turning around and saying, "We're being denied this." I mean, it's just—you know. It is what it is.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. There are three more to go. That's all. If we can get through these three, we can go back to the debate.

Mr. Klees, go ahead.

Mr. Frank Klees: I find it most interesting, Chair, that the argument is now being made that the opposition has denied these appointees from coming forward, when the record will clearly show that it was the government that filibustered over the last number of months, through amendments to amendments, and refused to allow the business before this committee to come forward.

To me, actually, it now is very clear: What really was happening here is that the government was intent on ensuring that its nominated appointees would not appear before this committee and that it was their intention all along to appoint these people without the opportunity for the opposition to review them. Now we know the real reason behind this filibuster. This is appalling.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Let's get something done this meeting. There are only three more to go. Let's get them done.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, could I just respond to that? I think that the honourable member has—I'm just

not sure where you're drawing those conclusions from. I have gone on record saying that we have two responsibilities in this committee: to review the agencies that are put forward and also to review intended appointments. I've asked repeatedly that we divide our time in meetings to be able to address both businesses that we have before us as a committee. It was your choice, as opposition members, to deny that request which was put forward by the government repeatedly—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We're not going to agree here. There are three more to go. Let's get these appointments done, and let's move on to the motion by Miss Taylor, please. We can argue until the cows come home. All we're going to do is blame each other.

Okay, number 9: Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Andrew Glenny, nominated as member, Council of the College of Veterinarians of Ontario, to May 20, 2014? Agreed? I heard a no.

Number 10: Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of Ronna Hope Warsh, nominated as member, Council of the Ontario College of Teachers, to May 20, 2014? Agreed? I heard a no.

Number 11: Do we have unanimous agreement to extend the deadline to consider the intended appointment of—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm sorry; number 11 is not necessary. That's it with the appointees.

Now we move on to the main motion.

Miss Monique Taylor: Why isn't number 11 necessary?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): The Clerk has explained to me that that was already extended, number 11.

My apologies. The person we have to extend is Shadi Sandra Katirai, nominated as member, Council of the College of Physiotherapists of Ontario. The deadline expires April 20; we're looking to extend to May 20. Do we have unanimous consent to extend it until May 20? I heard a no.

So we're finished with that and then we're going to move on now to the motion by Miss Taylor. It's in our package. I don't think I need to read it out again.

Miss Monique Taylor: No, because it's amended now.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm sorry. The Clerk tells me I have to read it out. This is Miss Taylor's motion:

"I move that the Standing Committee on Government Agencies request from Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation the production of all documents related to the expenses of all Metrolinx board of directors and executive members between January 1, 2012, and March 18, 2014; and that these documents be produced within 30 days of this motion passing; and that responsive documents be provided in an electronic, searchable format."

There was an amendment that passed on the motion. The amendment that passed was by Ms. Damerla and basically the amendment was, “I move that the words ‘all documents’ be struck from the motion and replaced with ‘only financial records directly related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives.’”

That carried today. I just read out the main motion. Can we have a vote on this?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, sorry. Are we able to see the amended motion that we are going to vote on, and can we get a 20-minute recess? It probably makes sense that way.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I’ve been advised by the Clerk that the amendment is in order. The only thing that we need is a few minutes to write it out, and then we can do that amendment.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: So there is a 20-minute recess?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, not 20 minutes; just a few minutes for the Clerk to copy that. All right?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I’m sorry. What were you moving again?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Nothing. Right now, we just want to see the amended motion that we are going to vote on, that’s all.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All that Ms. Damerla is requesting is that the amendment appear with the main motion that was moved by—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: In the form of a motion.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, the main motion by Miss Taylor.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: The motion with the amendment in it; correct, Sylwia?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki): If the members don’t find it sufficient to have the two documents like that and would prefer it in one paper, then—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): She’s allowed to request that it’s all put together on one page. So we’ll take a five-minute recess so that can be produced on one document. We’ll just recess for five minutes. Thanks.

The committee recessed from 0939 to 0951.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay, we’re back in session now. Everyone should have in front of them a copy of the motion, as amended. Everyone has it.

I know, Miss Taylor, that you called the question, but the Clerk has advised me that I have to ask if there’s any further debate.

Miss Monique Taylor: Could we just have clarity on what the actual motion should read? As the Clerk pointed out when we put it together, there was some duplication in wording. My suggestion is that we take out “related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives” in the third line down.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): The third line down—you want to strike out the part, “related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives.”

Miss Monique Taylor: Right, because in the next line, it says, “related to the expenses of all Metrolinx....” Do you know what I mean?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I know what you’re saying. Do we agree to that?

Miss Monique Taylor: If we just take out “related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives,” all the rest of it flows together.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Mr. Klees?

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, I have a concern about that, because depending on how this is interpreted—the words “executive members” could be interpreted as executive members of the board as opposed to all executives of Metrolinx.

Miss Monique Taylor: I see what you’re saying.

Mr. Frank Klees: So I think—

Miss Monique Taylor: I’ll withdraw, then, Chair.

Mr. Frank Klees: —it will actually be more comprehensive by leaving it the way it is.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: But it makes no sense in English. It’s hard to follow.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I’m going to have to rule at some point in time, because I want to get going on this.

Interjections.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: No, he asked if there’s any further debate. There’s still some debate. We can solve everybody’s problem by putting in an amendment that everyone is in favour of. I think Ms. Hunter has that amendment, if I’m not mistaken.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. Let’s first agree on this. Is the wording fine, yes or no?

Mr. Frank Klees: I’m fine with it, because I think it’s more comprehensive. Without that reference, “related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives,” it leaves open to interpretation the words “executive members.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): So we’ll leave it the way it is. I have to ask if there’s any further debate. Ms. Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, I would suggest an amendment to clarify the language in this motion. I am proposing that we strike out “related to the expenses of all Metrolinx board of directors and executive members” and replace it with “and board of directors.” So the revised motion would read, “I move that the Standing Committee on Government Agencies request from Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation the production of only financial records directly related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives and board of directors between January 1, 2012, and March 18, 2014; and that these documents be produced within 30 days of this motion passing; and that responsive documents be provided in an electronic, searchable format.”

That’s how we would clean the language and be clear that we’re looking for the expenses of the executives as well as the board.

Miss Monique Taylor: Of Metrolinx.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Metrolinx, yes.

Miss Monique Taylor: Metrolinx board of directors?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: We do say “Metrolinx.”

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: We do say that.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes. We do say “Metrolinx executives and board of directors.”

Interjections.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: You want “Metrolinx executives and Metrolinx board of directors”? I’m fine with that.

Miss Monique Taylor: It’s your motion.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Would you like me to rewrite that?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): So you’d only add, after the word in the third line, “Metrolinx executives and Metrolinx board of directors related to the expenses of all”—I don’t know if it makes sense to me.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I’m rewriting it, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. Let her rewrite it and read it into the record, because I’m not sure what the change does.

Miss Monique Taylor: This is what happens when amendments are made on the fly.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We’ll just take a five-minute recess. The Clerk wants to make a copy of the amendment and how that affects the main motion. We’ll just take a five-minute break.

The committee recessed from 1000 to 1005.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Does everyone have a copy of the amended motion? Ms. Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I can read in the change that we’re making.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Do you want to read it into the record?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Go ahead.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that we strike the duplicative language in the motion related to the expenses of all Metrolinx board of directors and executive members and replace it so that the motion will now read:

“I move that the Standing Committee on Government Agencies request from Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation the production of only financial records directly related to the expense claims of Metrolinx executives and Metrolinx board of directors between January 1, 2012, and March 18, 2014;”—and then the motion carries on where the semicolon is.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Does everyone understand that?

Mr. Frank Klees: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Any discussion or debate? All right, so—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: A 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Ms. Damerla has asked for a 20-minute recess before the vote. That will effectively put us to—

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, I would just like, for the record, to let people know that once again, the government is at its games.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I can’t comment on that.

Mr. Frank Klees: Ms. Damerla has called for a recess, which precludes a vote and moves us on to the next meeting.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): She called for the 20-minute recess. That will bring us to 10:26. Unfortunately, the committee is adjourned until next week.

The committee adjourned at 1007.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 15 April 2014

Committee businessA-287

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Président

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury L)

Mrs. Laura Albanese (York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston L)

Mr. Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury L)

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest L)

Mr. Percy Hatfield (Windsor–Tecumseh ND)

Ms. Mitzie Hunter (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Mr. Jim McDonell (Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry PC)

Mr. Randy Pettapiece (Perth–Wellington PC)

Miss Monique Taylor (Hamilton Mountain ND)

Ms. Lisa Thompson (Huron–Bruce PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Dipika Damerla (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville L)

Ms. Cindy Forster (Welland ND)

Mr. Frank Klees (Newmarket–Aurora PC)

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

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Jeff Parker, research officer,
Research Services