

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

FT-7

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

FT-7

**Select Committee  
on Financial Transparency**

**Comité spécial de  
la transparence financière**

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament  
Monday 29 October 2018

1<sup>re</sup> session  
42<sup>e</sup> législature  
Lundi 29 octobre 2018

---

Chair: Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria  
Clerk: Valerie Quioc Lim

Président : Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria  
Greffière : Valerie Quioc Lim

### **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:

<https://www.ola.org/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

### **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 416-325-7400.

---

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

ISSN 2562-0452

# CONTENTS

Monday 29 October 2018

Committee business..... FT-135



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**SELECT COMMITTEE  
ON FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY**

**COMITÉ SPÉCIAL DE  
LA TRANSPARENCE FINANCIÈRE**

Monday 29 October 2018

Lundi 29 octobre 2018

*The committee met at 1324 in room 151, following a closed session.*

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** The Select Committee on Financial Transparency is now open. To start, I'll just leave it open for some comments.

Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Thank you. I generally don't need a red light for when to speak, but I thought I should, in this circumstance.

As a starting point, we just came out of closed session, and I know that Mr. Chair will make some comments with respect to that.

One issue that came up in closed session was with respect to the documents that we have all received, and whether or not those should be part of this committee and presented openly to the public, or whether they would be held confidential. I noted at the time that we really should be having that conversation in open session, so we should probably start by discussing that aspect.

I can certainly indicate that on behalf of myself and our side here, we believe that they should be public documents for the public to be able to see, and we do not think there's anything confidential about those documents.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you, Mr. Romano.

Ms. Fife?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Perhaps the Chair or the Clerk can give greater clarification as to the agencies that have requested confidentiality and the documents that are in question. That would be helpful.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I'll let the Clerk speak.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim):** Three entities—IESO, the Independent Electricity System Operator, and Ontario Power Generation and Ontario Energy Board—have made requests in their transmittal letters that certain or all documents be kept confidential for certain reasons, and that's in the letters as well.

It is up to the committee to decide whether to keep them confidential, as in only the members of the committee can see them—or at least at the moment, and then make a further determination later on. So it is a committee decision.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Any further comments? Ms. Fife?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** We received massive amounts of documents on Friday. The first document to be read was 1,500 pages in its entirety. In the past—for instance, with the gas plant investigation—what was the protocol or precedent with regard to that process around confidentiality?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Ms. Lim?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim):** I believe it was that there were some documents that the committee did treat confidentially at first and then, later on, decided to make some or all public, or requests were allowed for some redactions before they made it public. That's to the best of my recollection at the moment.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Ms. Fife?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Is the rationale from OPG, IESO and OEB around personnel commentary with regard to the documents? What rationale was given? Is it litigation or pending litigation? I think that we just need more information before we make a decision.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I can read you a quick paragraph from the letter from the IESO, and then I'll highlight a paragraph which is relevant. It starts with this:

“The USB enclosed contains commercially sensitive and confidential information of the IESO and third parties in items 4 and 6. This commercially sensitive and confidential information includes, but is not limited to, banking information of third parties and the IESO, and settlement data of local distribution companies. The IESO respectfully requests that the committee maintain the confidentiality of these documents and not to disclose them publicly.”

That was the IESO.

From Ontario Power Generation, contained in the letter dated October 25, 2018—just the highlighted quote—it says, “In both cases, we would urge the select committee to keep this information strictly confidential. Should the committee determine that it is necessary to disclose such information in its report or otherwise, OPG respectfully requests that it be provided with a reasonable opportunity to identify information that should be redacted.”

It doesn't specifically say what information.

In the Ontario Energy Board letter, dated October 25, 2018, the highlighted paragraph is:

“In order to respect the committee’s deadline, it has not been feasible for the board to segregate or specifically identify privileged, confidential or personal records. The board respectfully requests that the committee not publicly disclose any of the records without allowing the board an opportunity to responsibly advise the committee on whether such disclosure would result in a loss of privilege, a violation of confidentiality or a breach of privacy.”

These letters are with the committee. As well, they’ve been sent out.

Ms. Fife?

1330

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** These agencies have requested, for personal privacy reasons, that they would like it to be to and fro. If we read the documents and we think it’s important that they’re made public, then we would have to go back to them and say, “We think that this is important to the work of this committee,” and that would be a to-and-fro.

Ultimately, the committee does have the right to make those documents public, right? Seeking clarification from the Clerk—

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes, it does.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** At the end of the day, we have the ultimate say, but I think the agencies wanted a process in place.

The government has already indicated that they want all documents made public. They have the majority at this committee. I think that we’re willing to be reasonable with regard to some of the privacy concerns on this side, but we’re interested to hear the rationale from the government as to why they want to see all the documents all made public all at once.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** As a starting point, everyone who was asked to present documents to this committee did so knowing that we were a committee created by the House that was an open committee, and that this process was a very public process—as a starting point.

Secondary is that all those parties who produced documents for the purposes of this committee’s mandate did so with the right to withhold any information they considered to be confidential in nature and the right to vet any information they presented to us so that it could protect any sources that were confidential or any material that they deemed to be confidential.

They had lawyers. They had access to all of the information they needed and resources in order to be able to make those determinations. It is not up to this committee, as a committee of the public, to have to determine what is, on a case-by-case basis, considered confidential in that particular third party’s eyes or not. It’s not for us to weigh that. The information has been presented to us. We believe that that is all public information at this stage.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Further comments? Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Thank you, Chair. The reason I asked about the gas plant investigation is that that actually proved to be a fairly successful process whereby these agencies actually released information to the committee; we looked at the information. If there were any concerns around privacy, commercial sensitivity or potential litigation by the sharing of that information, that was decided in, sort of, a mutually respectful way.

I don’t disagree with Mr. Romano that the lawyers are doing very well throughout this process, and they will continue to do so. I’m just saying, as New Democrats, we are willing to protect the privacy of some parties if it potentially would prevent future litigation down the road. Unless you have made it through all of those tens of thousands of documents already, I’m not sure that we know that there is not the potential risk of litigation. We would just err on the side of caution. But I understand the government has their position and they can move forward with that position.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Vanthof?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** If I could ask the Clerk to find us some information on how, in previous select committees where documents were demanded, the documents were handled. Because I do have concerns as well with third parties who might not have anything to do with the proceedings of this committee, who might be bidding on a separate contract, who might not be involved at all, because the committee didn’t give these entities a whole lot of time to produce documents—or if this was, from their part as well, a document dump, there might be people caught who had nothing to do with this process. I just want to know how it was handled in previous committees.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Ms. Lim?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim):** If not specifically select committees—I know Ms. Fife has mentioned a previous review, when the committee has received quite a great deal of information and when entities have requested to keep some information confidential. The committee has sometimes decided to say, “Yes, we will keep this confidential.” There are times when the committee did make the determination to disclose things publicly or because it went into the committee’s report. I do recall there were times when the committee has said that the entities can redact certain information so that it can be made public, just redacting very specific and maybe personal information in those documents.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Further comments? Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I don’t want to belabour this. To put the onus on the committee, especially in light of the volume of documents—and we are to the tune of almost a million or more documents—to put the onus on the committee to be in the position to vet every one of those documents I think is a much bigger problem, and then we end up in a constant back and forth as well with the different third parties saying, “Well, this is confidential.

That's not confidential. This is allowed. This isn't allowed." At the end of the day, they held the obligation when they provided those documents to us, and I would probably leave it at that point. I don't think it's the onus of this committee to be able to measure the confidentiality of those specific documents. That was up to the parties that released them.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Ms. Shaw.

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** I guess, on that last thing that Mr. Romano says, I would like clarification. If there's something in this document that violates—there's a personal information and privacy act of Ontario. If there's something in there that's violating that, whose onus is that to ensure? Is it the entity providing the document? They've asked us to keep it private to perhaps prevent a violation of the personal information and privacy act. If we release it, who then is responsible for having potentially violated that act? Would it be us or would it be the entity providing the documents?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I believe the committee does have the parliamentary privilege aspect—even some of the information that we share before the witnesses come before us. So I believe we have the jurisdiction on that.

Ms. Lim, would you like to comment further on the parliamentary privilege aspect?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioic Lim):** Yes. Basically, the committee has the authority or the power to ask for these documents and to say that they are public. So it is under privilege regs.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Just one last point. I think it's important to state that the committee members are going to get all the documents. We are, because that's what we've called for. The question that we're debating is whether or not we share those documents publicly with the media or others. That's the decision point. It's not about what access to information we have.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Well, I think we've probably said all the arguments in favour and against. We, at the end of the day, believe in a very transparent process. We believe that this should be transparent to the public. It is the public that we received our mandate from to proceed with this committee, and we believe that it should be transparent.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Mr. Vanthof.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I would be much more comfortable if we had representatives from those three organizations to actually explain why they're so concerned, before we proceed. If they have a valid point, I'd like them to express it.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you.

**Interjection:** Ms. Park has a question.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Sorry, Ms. Park.

**Ms. Lindsey Park:** I think they had an opportunity when they were writing to the committee to express their

concern. We've read their concern, and our arguments are based on what they've submitted to the committee.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Mr. Baber.

**Mr. Roman Baber:** Also, all productions made have been made subject to the law. In other words, the Auditor General has confirmed to us that working papers are withheld, and in fact, we understand that those are withheld largely. So there's no non-compliance here of any sort. Everything that's been produced to this committee is produced in order.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Vanthof.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I think we have exhausted this argument. I would just like to put on the record that if I was a company doing business in this province and I realized at some point that, through no fault of my own, I was bidding on something and that this could become part of a public document that my competitors could look into—because we don't know. I haven't read the million-plus documents. I would be concerned, as a company, if all of a sudden my documents, my bid, could be thrown open. The third parties might have nothing to do with the global adjustment smoothing. You've made your point clear. It's odd that the NDP is standing up for people making bids, but as a businessman, I would be a bit concerned. Anyway, you have the power to do this.

1340

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** To Mr. Vanthof's point: I think you raise a good point. I think you're right. But that information of that nature should never have come to this committee based on the requests of the documents that we requested. It was the job of the people disclosing the documents. They could not pass the buck, so to speak, on us, as this committee, to determine what ought or ought not to be part of a public record. It was known this was a public committee, and I think on that basis there's absolutely no reason—you raise a valid concern, but it shouldn't have been produced if that was the case.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Vanthof.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I don't think we're that far apart. The issue is, though, there are a million-plus documents. We're going under the assumption that no one who's producing these documents made a mistake and that no one who is involved in the energy sector, in a highly competitive sector—that we're the only ones who are going to be interested in what's in those documents. In a system of checks and balances, we are taking away one of the checks. As long as we're cognizant of that—that's the issue.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Baber.

**Mr. Roman Baber:** Mr. Vanthof, to your comments: First of all, whenever you do business with a government, there's an anticipation by each of the ministries that there may be a freedom-of-information request, number one.

Second of all, when you do business with a government, there's a public interest expectation that there be some transparency.

So while I take your point, I don't necessarily agree with it entirely.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Further comments? No?

There is no direction on the floor with regard to a motion of sorts, but we do need some direction with regard to the letters of the IESO, OPG and Ontario Energy Board.

Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I would move at this time, Mr. Chair, that the Select Committee on Financial Transparency produce or make available for production the materials received.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** In regard to IESO, OPG and Ontario Energy Board?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Yes, those particular materials received in connection with the mandate of the committee.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I wouldn't say "produce," but "be made available for production upon request to the public."

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Is there understanding between the committee members what the motion carried was?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Just for clarification: The million copies of the documents thus far that we've received from this committee are, with this decision, going to be made available for public consumption?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Those are already public. These are the ones—

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** The documents that IESO, OPG—they are not.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Those are not.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** They are not. That's what we're debating here.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes, that's exactly what the entire—

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I just want to be clear. So that's what's going to happen. That's what we've been debating.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes—and with the other documents that have been produced, except for the ones that we mentioned. So IESO, OPG, Ontario Energy Board—the three letters that we had are the ones that are currently not—

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** That's what we're debating.

So Mr. Romano has moved that, in spite of the concerns that have been raised by the agencies, the documents will come to the committee members and that committee members can then make them public. That's right.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I'll just read—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Sorry, Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Documents wouldn't be turned over by committee members. There is a process through the committee itself, correct? I would have thought that that would be the appropriate protocol. I don't think it's up to myself or Ms. Fife or anyone to say, "Here you go."

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes, if documents are made public then anyone that asks the office has a right to review them.

Mr. Downey?

**Mr. Doug Downey:** I guess it could be a point of order; I'm not sure.

I'm not sure that we need a motion on this. They've requested it. We're not saying yes. We just move forward, unless—what would the Clerk need to just move forward?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I'm sorry—just a motion so we have clear direction.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** Okay.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I'll repeat what I believe the motion is. Mr. Romano has moved that documents from IESO, OPG and the Ontario Energy Board be made available publicly. Mr. Romano?

*Interjections.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Sorry, Mr. Romano. My apologies.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** It doesn't need to relate specifically to these three items. I would say that any documentary evidence produced to this committee—any relevant material produced to this committee is fair to be disclosed.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Everything else was made public. The only reason we had these three in discussion was that they had specifically asked. The Clerk just needed some direction on that.

We can continue to debate the motion. Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Just for clarity, and I think to Mr. Baber's and Mr. Downey's point, I don't think we need to specify anything other than to say: If we received it, it can be disclosed.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you, Ms. Fife?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** That was already understood, right? All the documents that this committee has received are public documents. The reason that we have to debate this is because these three agencies have expressed concerns about these documents being shared publicly. That is why this debate was even necessary in the first place.

We've raised our concerns about not having a process which was followed in previous committees. Those concerns still stand. We understand the government wants to put a motion on the floor, as they should, because thus far, this committee is operating like the Wild West. We need a protocol, we need a process, and it needs to be understood by everybody. That's all.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Again, Mr. Chair—I understand your concerns that are being raised by the opposition and Ms. Fife in particular. We're saying "all documents." "All" definitely covers the three that we talked about. "All" is an easier way—so that we're not coming back and having this conversation again.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Ms. Park?



**Ms. Lindsey Park:** Just for the record, I think it would be helpful to talk about the volume of documents we're talking about. How many pages are we talking about here? It's not three documents. My understanding is, it's thousands. Can you clarify for us, Chair?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** There's quite a bit. I don't know, specifically, the amount of pages. But yes, we are talking about a high volume of documents here.

The motion on the floor is in regard to the IESO, OPG and Ontario Energy Board, but—

**Mr. Ross Romano:** No.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I'm suggesting that every document that has been produced to this committee would be available publicly—period.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Okay.

**Mr. Roman Baber:** And will be produced.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Yes, upon request.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Would you like to withdraw the earlier motion, then?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Yes. I will withdraw the previous one.

Just by way of background, again, to be clear on this: We cannot be the gatekeepers here as to what can or cannot be permitted. If it's produced to us, it's public. It's not the mandate of this committee to be the gatekeeper or to serve a gatekeeper function over those documents. That's why we're just simply referring to all documents. That covers everything we've talked about today and any future considerations that may arise. I think that makes it very clear to third parties producing documents or tendering anything before this committee that it will be made public. We're not bearing the onus.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you, Mr. Romano. The previous motion, then, is withdrawn. Can I ask you to put forward the new motion?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I would move that the Select Committee on Financial Transparency make available all documents tendered in the course of the committee fulfilling its mandate—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Ross Romano:** To the public. "Make available to the public."

1350

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Just for clarification, that's all documents received made "available to the public"?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Yes.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Does everyone understand the motion? Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I do. The reason that we started this debate, though, was because the Clerk asked us to specifically address the concerns with OPG, IESO and OEB, because they did not want to make all of their documents public. Also, with regard to the select committee

having oversight over the public nature of these documents, we also heard from the Clerk that the gas plant committee engaged in a very open and transparent but also cautious process around the sharing of public information.

The committee is going to get all of their information. We are going to be able to do our jobs. The point of the question came from these agencies, who expressed concerns around the sharing of commercially sensitive and private information to the public, not to the committee, but to the public. The government has now said that all documents, regardless of the concerns from OPG, IESO and OEB, be shared publicly. So that's the motion that we are debating.

Our concerns, which we already articulated, still stand. The ones from MPPs Vanthof and Shaw around privacy and around commercial sensitivity still stand, but the government has a motion on the floor—I don't know if it's been seconded. We want our concerns recognized in this process, as we have the right to do so.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you, Ms. Fife.

Just for clarification, once again, Mr. Romano has moved that all documents received by the Select Committee on Financial Transparency be made available publicly.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Just one little question—I'm a practical guy: How? If the public is going to demand these documents, that's fine. The majority are public now. If we're going to pass that, and we get 50 requests for those documents—and some of these documents are in hard copy—how are they going to be provided and by whom?

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** The Clerk's office will facilitate the providing of all documents provided to the committee.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Or some.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Because you could get some pretty big requests. I actually want to get something done here and not create a whole bunch of—again, as a business person, I know you have bidding with the government and you had a transparent process, but bidding for energy contracts is also a highly competitive process. So to just throw past bidding wide open—I'm not sure. I want to get to the bottom of everything you guys want, but I also want to maintain business confidence in this province, and I'm not sure that this is a good way to do it.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Baber?

**Mr. Roman Baber:** I move that the question be put.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Sorry?

**Mr. Roman Baber:** I move that the question be put.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** I'll still allow some debate to happen. That's a closure motion. If anybody wishes to say anything—Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** This is just repeating what has already been said. Mr. Vanthof has raised a very good point, but none of that type of material ought to have ever been produced to this committee to begin with. It is not this committee's mandate to worry about what is

confidential or not confidential. If it was produced to us, then it was deemed relevant by the sources that produced it to us, and therefore it should be made public. Nothing that was irrelevant should have been produced to this committee. It is not up to us to determine what is or is not confidential in those third parties' eyes; it is up to them to make that determination before they turn it over to us, and that determination has already been made. This is all public material at this stage. I think the debate—again, if it was a relevant concern, if we had asked for material that was commercially sensitive, that would be a different story. We did not ask for it; therefore, it should not have been produced.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you, Mr. Romano.

Ms. Shaw, and then we'll come back to—

**Ms. Sandy Shaw:** It's my understanding that, when these documents were called for, it said in the request that nothing shall be omitted, nothing shall be redacted, nothing shall—so you're saying that the onus was on these entities to omit some of this sensitive data, but the very request that we put to them forbid them from redacting and from omitting any of the information. So that argument doesn't really hold.

I'm also ready to vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Baber.

**Mr. Roman Baber:** Yes, it does, Ms. Shaw, specifically also because it's within the bounds of the law. Working papers have not been produced and information that's privileged has also not been produced. There is still some governing legislation of which the parties to which the order applies were able to avail themselves.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Further debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. The motion is carried.

Further questions or business? Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I would simply move at this time that we reconvene tomorrow to discuss a motion for witnesses. There has been some discussion surrounding that, but my friends have indicated a desire to have a sub-committee meeting before we tender our motion for witnesses. We are prepared to do so to work together with the official opposition to arrive at a list of witnesses before officially voting tomorrow.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Mr. Vanthof.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I would agree, considering that this motion for witnesses was produced at the end of the closed session. We have had absolutely no time to think about this, so we're looking forward to trying to get this resolved.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Is the committee—oh, sorry. Mr. Downey?

**Mr. Doug Downey:** No, it's a different topic, when you're done with this one.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Okay. Is the committee agreeable to meeting tomorrow at 3 p.m.? Agreed.

Further comments? Mr. Downey.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** Just by way of practice, I understand time constraints, but I think three times in a row I've come into big chunks of paper on my desk. If there's any way, when they're available, to send an email to say that they're available to pick up, it would give me a chance to read before the meeting itself.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** They were sent by email, Mr. Downey, I believe, as well.

**Mr. Doug Downey:** Okay. I'll confirm with the Clerk which address that went to. Thank you.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Any further questions? Thank you very much. Committee is now adjourned until tomorrow at 3 p.m.

*The committee adjourned at 1358.*



**SELECT COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY**

**Chair / Président**

Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria (Brampton South / Brampton-Sud PC)

**Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

Mr. Doug Downey (Barrie–Springwater–Oro-Medonte PC)

Mr. Roman Baber (York Centre / York-Centre PC)

Mr. Doug Downey (Barrie–Springwater–Oro-Medonte PC)

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Mrs. Robin Martin (Eglinton–Lawrence PC)

Ms. Lindsey Park (Durham PC)

Mr. Ross Romano (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria (Brampton South / Brampton-Sud PC)

Ms. Sandy Shaw (Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest–Ancaster–Dundas ND)

Mr. John Vanthof (Timiskaming–Cochrane ND)

**Clerk / Greffière**

Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim

**Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Ian Morris, research officer,  
Research Services