



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 7 April 2014

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 7 avril 2014

**Standing Committee on
General Government**

Pan/Parapan American
Games review

**Comité permanent des
affaires gouvernementales**

Étude portant sur
les Jeux panaméricains
et parapanaméricains

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 GOVERNMENT**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES**

Monday 7 April 2014

Lundi 7 avril 2014

The committee met at 1410 in committee room 2.

**PAN/PARAPAN AMERICAN
GAMES REVIEW
PAN/PARAPAN AMERICAN GAMES
SECRETARIAT**

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to welcome members of the three parties, the committee members, as well as the Clerk, legislative research and Hansard. This afternoon, we will be discussing the Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat. This afternoon, we have with us the deputy minister, Steven Davidson.

Today, the format is five-minute introductory remarks by Mr. Davidson, followed by 25 minutes of questioning from the three parties, starting with the NDP, followed by the government side, followed by the Progressive Conservatives, the opposition. Following the 25-minute line of questioning, there will be a subsequent 10 minutes available for use by the three parties.

Having said that, I just wanted to make some clarifying statements. I understand Mr. Brad Blair, the deputy commissioner from the Ontario Provincial Police, is here with us this afternoon. We'd like to welcome him as well. I would caution all members of the committee, or make them aware, that procurement for security contracts does not fall within the scope of this particular committee and, as such, we'll be watching the line of questioning very closely from the table and from the Chair's perspective.

At this point, I would like to pass it on to Mr. Miller. I believe you will be the one starting—

Mr. Paul Miller: They're not doing—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Oh, sorry. The five-minute introductory remarks by Mr. Davidson. Thank you very much.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I wanted to get Paul in right away.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I'll be brief.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you and welcome.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Thank you very much, Chair, committee members. Good afternoon. I appreciate the invitation to appear again before the committee and the opportunity to provide a brief opening statement.

I'm very pleased to be joined today, at my invitation, by my colleague OPP Deputy Commissioner Blair, who will be able to respond more directly than I can to questions the committee may have about security planning for the games.

As you know, I was appointed deputy minister for the Pan/Parapan Am Games Secretariat in July of last year, and I'm also the Deputy Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

I note that I have provided copies of some materials to the Clerk, which I believe have been distributed to you, and the deputy commissioner and I may refer to those from time to time in responding to your questions.

As you know, the 2015 Pan/Parapan Am Games will be the largest international multi-sport games ever held in Canada. The large scope and scale of the games means that effective planning and delivery requires collaboration amongst multiple partners.

The responsibility to stage and deliver the games rests of course with TO2015, the games organizing committee. TO2015 is an independent, not-for-profit corporation, accountable through its board of directors to its government funders and sport stakeholders, those being the Canadian Olympic Committee and the Canadian Paralympic Committee. This is a typical delivery model for all major international multi-sport games.

Ontario, as a typical host jurisdiction, is also responsible for making investments within our areas of jurisdiction to ensure that citizens and visitors can enjoy the games in a safe and secure environment, that traffic continues to flow and that public health is protected. Ontario is also investing in celebration and legacy initiatives to ensure an enhanced and lasting benefit for the games.

To avoid duplication and to leverage existing capacity and expertise across government, Ontario has concentrated some host jurisdiction responsibilities within the Pan/Parapan Am Games Secretariat, or P/PAGS, which I lead and which reports to Minister Chan, and vested lead responsibility for other specific functions in ministries where capacity and expertise in those areas already exist. So we have a somewhat decentralized model for planning and delivery, and coordination and collaboration are thus absolutely critical.

Responsibilities concentrated in P/PAGS include:

- oversight of the province's \$500-million investment in TO2015's budget;
- planning and direct delivery of key elements of the government's celebration and legacy strategy;

—coordination with other levels of government, including negotiation of service agreements with municipal partners; and

—coordination with other provincial ministries with planning and delivery lead in their areas of responsibility.

Key amongst these, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services oversees the OPP-led integrated security unit, or ISU, which is responsible for securing public safety during the games.

The Ministry of Transportation is responsible for planning and managing the operation of the regional transportation network during the games. Last month, MTO publicly released its games transportation strategic framework, which was developed in partnership with host municipalities and transportation agencies, and it is working closely now with those municipalities and agencies on detailed delivery planning.

Significant progress continues to be made as we head into the final 15 months of preparation before the games. As always, the interplay between the detailed operational planning of TO2015 and the province's planning in our areas of responsibility continues to be critical and iterative, with the one informing the other.

This morning's launch by TO2015 of the call for volunteers for the games is another sign that the games are rapidly approaching and present a tremendous opportunity for everybody to get involved.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear. I look forward to your questions.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Davidson. We appreciate the opening remarks.

We'll move to the NDP: Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, gentlemen, Mr. Davidson and Mr. Blair.

On March 17, Saäd Rafi stated that the TO2015 Pan/Parapan Am Games would require 20,000-plus volunteers and that that would be the "highest recruitment of volunteers in Ontario's peacetime history." My question is, how do you plan on ensuring that 20,000 people will volunteer, and what is the backup plan should you not meet that number?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Thank you very much for the question. The call for volunteers, I think, is really the turning point in our lead-up to the games. This is where we really launch in a way that raises the public awareness in a manner that hasn't been done before. This is the call for invitations to people to understand the games and all that they will bring to the province, take pride in our role as hosts and contribute through their time and effort.

The target of 20,000 compares quite favorably to the volunteer attraction for other games, and I'm—

Mr. Paul Miller: That's fine. I get your point there. Could there be additional costs, and who will authorize those costs?

Mr. Steven Davidson: TO2015 has tremendous confidence that they will achieve the 20,000-volunteer target.

Mr. Paul Miller: But the cost for the volunteers—there's a cost attached.

Mr. Steven Davidson: The cost for the volunteers, to train the volunteers, to outfit them and teach them, is all within TO2015's budget.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay.

When you were here on November 20, 2013, you stated, "To deliver its responsibilities, TO2015 has a games delivery budget of \$1.4 billion, made up of contributions from the federal and provincial governments, municipalities, universities and games' revenue." What does the contract for the provincial portion of these monies require as a value for dollars with respect to the games security, and from what ministry does this money flow, to whom, and how?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me explain the security budget. TO2015 is responsible, as I said in my opening remarks, for direct delivery of the games. The province is responsible for a suite of responsibilities that ensure that the environment exists for successful delivery by TO2015. That includes the transportation planning, but also public safety/security planning.

As I also said in my opening remarks, in developing the provincial governance structure for the games, there was a desire to not duplicate or replicate skill and expertise that exist in other parts of government. That expertise exists in the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, and it is their responsibility, through the integrated security unit, to lead the development of that. Equally, the budget then also resides with MCSCS, not TO2015 and not P/PAGS.

1420

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, we may differ on that, the following of the dollars.

On November 20, you also said that, "All host jurisdictions typically invest in significant legacy initiatives to ensure a lasting benefit for the games, and they also make investments in essential services to ensure citizens and visitors can enjoy the games in a safe and secure environment...."

Please explain what falls within the requirement of a "safe and secure environment," and how is that achieved, and by whom, if you are not involved in the security?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Maybe this is a good point for me to invite my colleague to speak a little bit more specifically about what the planning for protection of public safety looks like. But if I could just distinguish between two aspects of security—and I don't want to introduce a point which may confuse, but I think it's important. MCSCS has responsibility for public safety security. TO2015, as the games organizing committee and the body responsible for the delivery of the games also has responsibility for securing its own assets. So there is a portion of TO2015's \$1.4-billion budget which is to support its responsibility, just as TIFF would or any organizer of a big sporting event or cultural event would want to secure its games room, its equipment, its inventory, its broadcast centre, any of its physical assets. The line drawn, though, is assets versus people, and so

MCSCS' and the province's role is the focus on people and public security.

Mr. Paul Miller: You further stated that, "The secretariat has three main areas of responsibility: providing oversight of the provincial investment in TO2015's budget"—which would include security—and "coordinating games-related activities of other provincial ministries...."

I want you clarify to me exactly how the secretariat coordinates other provincial ministries. You said: "coordinating other provincial ministries." As such, what level of responsibility do you have for their activities?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Right. So, consistent with—and we'll just continue with the example of security, if you will.

Mr. Paul Miller: That's fine.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Consistent with MCSCS and my deputy counterpart having responsibility for public safety security planning, my role and the secretariat's role with respect to coordination is ensuring that the security planning that's being undertaken by the integrated security unit under the purview of MCSCS is fully informed by the operational planning decisions being made by the games organizing committee. So one way that we help ensure good coordination is to ensure that there is good real-time flow of information from the games organizing committee as they make on-the-ground, potentially high-impact decisions—

Mr. Paul Miller: That would include security, I would assume, anything that's going on with that too.

Mr. Steven Davidson: It would include venues, venue selection, scheduling—

Mr. Paul Miller: Protection of venues?

Mr. Steven Davidson: No, but I would draw a line. So TO2015 has its own responsibility for securing its own assets, but TO2015 does not have responsibility for ensuring that the public safety is protected.

Mr. Paul Miller: But who would protect those assets? You said that you have responsibility for securing your own assets. Who will protect those assets?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Assets held by TO2015—

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm asking a direction question: Who will protect those assets?

Mr. Steven Davidson: TO2015. They will ensure that their own assets are protected.

Mr. Paul Miller: Through what procedure? Through police, security?

Mr. Steven Davidson: No. My understanding is—

Mr. Paul Miller: Assets have to be protected.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. My understanding is that they will secure the services of private security services to enable them to do that.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. Thank you. What is the reporting relationship for all Pan/Parapan games security; that is, what is the hierarchy for all security for the games? Who has the final decision on any exceptional measures being taken by that body?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I think I will defer that to my colleague.

Mr. Brad Blair: Sure. Could you kind of describe for me what you see as exceptional measures?

Mr. Paul Miller: If there's a loop in what's happening, maybe there's some individuals we weren't expecting to visit us and things like that—

Mr. Brad Blair: Oh, I see.

Mr. Paul Miller: —and also to protect our assets.

Mr. Brad Blair: As we've explained, the OPP is the lead agency in terms of our integrated security unit, joined by our eight partner law enforcement agencies where the games are being hosted, and also by the RCMP for a particular component around internationally protected persons and for accreditation. In terms of making those decisions, it would be made by the ISU in terms of the response.

Mr. Paul Miller: Is CSIS playing a role in this?

Mr. Brad Blair: Not to my knowledge, as of yet.

Mr. Paul Miller: As of yet; okay.

On the secretariat's website, it states very clearly that "Ontario is responsible for athlete, visitor and resident safety as they participate in the games," and that "updated budgets for security and transportation are typically released 12 to 18 months before large international multi-sport events. We will release revised projected costs"—you do—"for security, and budgets and plans for transportation as they become available."

We started off at \$113 million; we're at \$239 million. This leads me to believe that the secretariat has a significant responsibility for the games' security, particularly its budget. Could you clarify that for me?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Certainly. The language on the website, I think, refers to the province, so areas of provincial jurisdiction. Security is absolutely one of those. The role of the secretariat is to ensure good coordination amongst those responsible for security planning and those responsible for delivering on the games, ensuring that there is good real-time communication of those planning activities and associated costs, which we've done—I know that you know—through a couple of technical media briefs. One of the documents that you have in front of you is the most recent table showing the current projected costs of those areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Paul Miller: TO2015 has issued an RFI for venue security. How does that impact the security oversight for which the secretariat website says it has responsibilities? How will that security staff relate to other enforcement and security, and ultimately, through what hierarchy do they report?

Mr. Steven Davidson: That's the asset protection that is the sole responsibility of TO2015. It's TO2015's assets that are being protected, so this the piece that is their responsibility that I referred to first. If you draw a line between assets—things—that's the responsibility of the organizing committee; they are procuring those assets and they're responsible for protecting them. People and public safety are the responsibility of the provincial level of government, delivered through the ISU.

Mr. Paul Miller: I never heard about this until recently, but my understanding is that there could be another

contract for the interior of the games. The exterior security has been launched, and now I'm hearing that there could be more money and costs associated with interior security, possibly protection of assets or individuals dealing with those assets. Is that true? Could there be more costs attached?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Those would not be incremental costs—

Mr. Paul Miller: But there is another contract coming for internal security. Is that correct?

Mr. Steven Davidson: TO2015 has just completed a request, an RFI leading to an RFP process, I understand, for procuring the security services that they will need to undertake their responsibilities for securing their assets—

Mr. Paul Miller: Is that included in the \$239 million?

Mr. Steven Davidson: No, it's included in their \$1.4 billion—their responsibilities, their budget. Provincial responsibilities—the list of provincial investments.

Mr. Paul Miller: Dovetailing on that, why does TO2015 have an additional security role and responsibility from the secretariat and the ISU?

Mr. Steven Davidson: It's separate and apart. I wouldn't call it "additional" because it is not related to the security of people. It has nothing to do with public safety, which is the exclusive purview of the provincial level. Just as I said, any deliverer of a big event will likely have assets associated with the delivery of that event, and they, through their normal course, ensure that those are secured overnight.

1430

Mr. Paul Miller: On the secretariat website, it also has a section for Pan Am/Parapan Am Kids, which states that the government of Ontario and TO2015 have created this program. Once again, it's clear to a reader that this is a joint venture and holds joint responsibility for the government and TO2015. Additionally, the website indicates that the secretariat has an actual responsibility for Pan/Parapan Am Games events, actions and security. As each individual group within the games claims their responsibilities, is this confusing the system? And what additional costs for duplication of work is built into the overall budget?

Mr. Steven Davidson: The Pan Am Kids initiative is a multi-party initiative. So it is not simply the involvement of P/PAGS and TO2015, but municipalities across the province. Increasingly, school boards across the province and programmers of after-school programming are getting involved in delivering the Pan Am Kids program, which is an opportunity for school-age children to participate in both Pan and Parapan sports, where they wouldn't otherwise have that opportunity.

That's the focus and intent behind that program—very, very diffused across multiple delivery partners.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. I guess my next line of questioning is for Mr. Blair. What role have you played in writing the RFP, the applicant review process, the applicant elimination process and the awarding of private security contracts to Contemporary Services Canada?

Mr. Brad Blair: So me, myself, personally?

Mr. Paul Miller: Or your organization.

Mr. Brad Blair: Our organization, obviously, has been very involved in terms of determining the scope of the creation of the RFP. Certainly, in terms of our consultation with a number of security consultants, including KPMG, our law enforcement partners in other parts of the world who have recently undertaken—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Sorry to interrupt, Mr. Blair, but I think the question's out of order.

Mr. Paul Miller: Why, Mr. Chairman?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Because the question relates to the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, as the budget does fall under that particular ministry. So I'd ask you to rephrase—

Mr. Paul Miller: But with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, the RFP is part of the overall budget for the games. So how can that be a conflict?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The RFP falls under the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Any lines or questions directed regarding that line of questioning—

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, with all due respect, it's right here on the slips you handed out. It's right here in the budget: security, ISU. It's right here on the handouts you gave out.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I understand that, and—

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, then, how is it not part of the line of questioning? It's right here: ISU, security.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The deputy minister had quoted, "Key amongst these, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (MCSCS) oversees the OPP-led integrated security unit ... which is responsible for securing public safety during the games." So as such, anything related to the procurement and costs associated with the security fall under the MCSCS and—

Mr. Paul Miller: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we just discussed with the deputy minister about the assets involved in the games and the protection of the assets. You didn't stop me there when I asked who was taking care of the protection, and he explained it very well. Of course, the commissioner said a bit too. So this security/ISU situation, this category, which falls under games funding partner contributions by public dollars, should certainly fall under the auspices of a security budget, which falls under TO2015 plus the ministry, because they are dealing with public funds. This says right here, "Municipal services, security, transportation"—this is all part of the overall picture.

So I don't know who's making the decision that doesn't fall into the category of questioning. Who's making this decision: the Clerk's office, you or the Liberal Party? Who's saying this is not kosher?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): We have to follow the standing orders, and in this particular—

Mr. Paul Miller: This is not part of the standing orders—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Now, Mr. Miller, I'm trying to explain. You asked a question. So under stand-

ing order 111, our committee does not have the authority to review the operations of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, which is assigned to another committee for the purpose of such study. Matters that fall outside the responsibility of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Pan/Parapan Am Games Secretariat therefore fall outside the scope of this particular committee's authority to review them, and security is one of those matters.

Mr. Paul Miller: Mr. Chairman, I'll respect your decision—certainly under protest, because I don't know who made this decision; I'm not quite sure. I'm sure somebody did over there. Actually, frankly, with all due respect, it's not your decision to decide what falls under the purview of correctional services. It's up to the line of questioning, or if the Clerk has told us that these questions may be, if challenged. But the bottom line is, they didn't say we couldn't ask them. So I'm assuming that any committee runs through the Clerk's office. Is that correct?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): My responsibility is to ensure that the standing orders from the House are followed, and under this case, standing order 111 clearly states that the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services does not fall within the realm of this committee's responsibility. There are other avenues that can be utilized, such as justice policy, to answer your questions. But this committee's not—

Mr. Paul Miller: Didn't we just talk about Pan Am Kids and the strategy for that and the money involved?

Interjection.

Mr. Paul Miller: And the Ministry of Education? Does this fall under this purview too? Or do none of the ministries fall under this purview?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Under this particular line of questioning—

Mr. Paul Miller: What are we worried about? What are we hiding here? What are we worried about this line of questioning for?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): My responsibility is to ensure that standing order 111 is followed, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. I'll move on with my questions, then. I hear you, but I'm not quite sure where you're going with it.

If you had a limited or no role, according to the Chairman, then why are you here this afternoon? Why am I questioning you? As a security expert, why are you here, if I cannot question you about security? That's confusing.

I guess my next question may fall out of line, too. What level of security check is done for each company that responds to the RFP? What level of security?

Mr. Brad Blair: Before the awarding of any contract for private security, they have to have a licence and be in good standing in the province of Ontario. They have to be licensed to provide security services.

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you. Isn't this the same company that was fined \$49,000 and the OPP charged them for operating in Ontario without a licence?

Mr. Brad Blair: They had applied to provide security services without a licence.

Mr. Paul Miller: They did, and they were charged. It's my understanding that there were some problems in Vancouver, too, but you probably don't have that information.

Mr. Brad Blair: I'm not aware of that.

Mr. Paul Miller: Don't you find it a little unusual that the OPP, which charged a company and fined them for not operating properly in Ontario, now have—well, according to the government, you picked them, and then you're saying that the government picked them, so I'm not quite sure who picked them. But the bottom line is, somebody picked them. Don't you find it a little unusual that you'd be picking a company that you fined?

Mr. Brad Blair: Right. I didn't have a chance to respond to who had picked them, but we did lay a charge and they subsequently paid their fines. They did provide security services, as you're aware, during that time and were properly licensed to do so. They had applied to provide security services without having a licence in the province of Ontario. That's what the regulatory violation was about.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. With your expertise and experience, you would find it very unusual that a company of this category or this capability, who have done other events throughout the world—certainly, that would have been part of their normal planning, to make sure they were licensed properly to operate, would you not say?

Mr. Brad Blair: I can't speak to the specifics around what was going on at the time. Obviously, there was an expedited need for security services at this time. They had applied without the licence, and they were subsequently charged. They did provide the services and were licensed to provide those services. In the present-day context, the important piece is, they were licensed and a company in good standing.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. When Mr. Rafi was at the committee last month, he stated that he was not involved in the selection process for security and yet has issued a request for information for venue security. Can you explain this to me? Why is he—

Mr. Brad Blair: That would be a separate request for a different set of security requirements—

Mr. Paul Miller: But he wasn't involved, he said.

Mr. Brad Blair: —that would be outside of this security request.

Mr. Paul Miller: But he wasn't involved, and now he's asking for information. That's a little unusual.

What assurances do Ontarians have that, this time around, the foreign-owned private security company will ensure proper licensing and that properly trained security guards with Ontario experience will work at these games?

Mr. Brad Blair: We have a recruitment plan that they'll be providing to us as the oversight body, the OPP and the ISU-led security planning group, and we will be doing our due diligence to ensure that they meet the benchmarks as per the contract, as time goes on, around

recruitment, training and hiring. There are benchmarks that are included in the contract.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Miller, just another reminder: I'm trying to be as fair as possible—

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, I'm trying to be as delicate as possible. It's hard under these rules, but I'll try.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. The company, as we have discussed, had serious problems, for which you charged them, with licensing. The \$81 million that was awarded them for this contract—is that a fixed number? Or could there be some flexibility depending on the demands of the games as we go?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Miller, my apologies again, but these are specific questions regarding security and procurement. They do not fall within the scope under the standing order—

Mr. Paul Miller: So can we safely say that we can eliminate my next question, Chairman, which says, “Can you discuss the relationship between the integrated security unit, ISU, and TO2015?”? Would that be in order?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I think that one would be in order?

Mr. Paul Miller: Oh. Well, we have some flexibility.

So, can you discuss the relationship between the integrated security unit, ISU, and TO2015?

Mr. Brad Blair: Certainly. We're involved, almost on a day-to-day basis, in terms of their planning. Of course, for us to provide security services, we need to understand what is going on during these planning phases, and hence, we are dealing with our associates at TO2015 on a daily basis to ensure that we're in step of keeping up with the planning that's ongoing to ensure that security services are aligned with the planning.

1440

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you. TO2015 doesn't want a games event that is so buttoned-down that you can't access it, while at the same time, I'm sure you don't want a games event that is so wide open that there's a security challenge. Do you know what individual ministry organization is responsible for striking that balance?

Mr. Brad Blair: That would be a commitment that we have made in ensuring that these games are carried out in the way that I think the residents of Ontario would like to see. We'll ensure that we strike that balance.

Mr. Paul Miller: What ministry would you work with?

Mr. Brad Blair: Well, it's actually going to be our response, as the ISU, led by the OPP. That will be determined by us and the appropriate security needs, based on the security threat and a whole bunch of other factors. But our intent is to ensure these games are open and accessible and enjoyable.

Mr. Paul Miller: With every security-related decision that the ISU makes, there is an associated cost, obviously. How early in the decision-making process for security-related costs do you correspond with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and TO2015?

Mr. Brad Blair: In terms of the accountability mechanisms that are built in? Well, we sit monthly on what's called SBOC, the Strategic Budget Oversight Committee—MCSCS and P/PAGS—and we participate as the OPP too. So we have ongoing conversations around these types of issues.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay. You've said that the ministry for security—the Chairman was concerned about me dipping into their area. And now we have the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Miller. Your time is up.

We shall move to the government. Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. Welcome again, Deputy Davidson, and welcome, Mr. Blair. Thank you so much for being here. I'm going to address my questions generally and either of you can answer as you think is appropriate.

I'm just going to begin by saying that you've heard the minister say time and time again—and this government say—that these games are the most transparent ever. Deputy, would you be able to comment on that?

Mr. Steven Davidson: The government has taken a number of steps to ensure that there is transparency in the planning for these games. One of the fundamental decisions taken at the beginning of the process was to bring the games organizing committee under the purview of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. To my knowledge, if you're talking in relative terms, that is an unprecedented step for a games organizing committee. But in addition to that, TO2015 does, of course, post its quarterly financial statements on its website.

The government, for its part, has undertaken a commitment to periodic media technical briefings, of which there have been two. The first was back in the late fall, and the purpose of that predominantly was to provide an overview of the planning under way for the games, the roles and responsibilities which, as we know from discussions, are multiple in terms of the myriad of partners that are coming together to deliver the games—a focus of that being on clarifying those respective roles and responsibilities, particularly between the games organizing committee and the province and its host jurisdiction responsibilities, and to provide an overview of the budget for the games. So that was the focus of the first technical briefing.

The second technical briefing, in March of this year, focused on two pieces. In addition to an overall update on the state of planning for the games, it talked at some length around the transportation strategic framework, which is the responsibility of the province, working with municipal partners and transportation agencies. That was one focus of that brief. The second was to provide information and respond to questions with respect to the security planning. As I recall, about two weeks prior to that technical briefing, there had been a communication around the change in the planning number for security.

So, across a range of particular initiatives, the government is, I think, making a strong effort to ensure transparency for the games.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So to just clarify, nobody asked the government to bring the games under FIPPA. It was an initiative of the government voluntarily, and it's unprecedented in the Canadian history of games. Would that be correct?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I can't speak to what factors might have informed that decision taken by the government at that time. I wasn't in my current role at that time, so I don't know. But certainly, the fact is that the decision was taken to bring them under FIPPA and that was done.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. I'm sure you've heard some of the claims that the opposition has been making in the past few months, most recently in question period on Thursday of last week. The member from Barrie has asked the minister about boat limousines and water taxis that were being made in a shipyard in the US. Has any money been spent by the provincial government on boat limousines and water taxis?

Mr. Steven Davidson: To my knowledge, no money has been spent by the provincial government or TO2015—with whom we consulted—on boat limousines.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So if you're saying that the government hasn't, then how do you square the claim that is being made by the opposition?

Mr. Steven Davidson: All I can say is, I have no knowledge of any expenditures on boat limousines.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So then what you're saying is that the claim is not accurate.

Mr. Paul Miller: That's not what he's saying.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I'm saying that I have no knowledge of any expenditures on boat limousines.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. How about the mascot for the games touring different countries? I believe that the member from Barrie had asked TO2015 CEO Saād Rafi whether Pachi had been flying to Russia and the Caribbean because there were pictures of it on Twitter. Could you comment on that?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I do know that life-sized Pachi has not travelled to China. Pachi is out across the province making appearances and generating enthusiasm for the games as a mascot would do, but I'm under the understanding that he or she has not travelled to China.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So, again, you can't substantiate that claim.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Well, I can say that Pachi did not travel to China.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. This morning, there was a very exciting announcement: the kickoff of our volunteer engagement. As Mr. Miller said, it's going to be the largest number of volunteers that we are going to harness in peacetime in Canada. I did not know that, but that just makes me feel really proud. It was a moment that really stirs you up. Wow. That's a huge undertaking, so congratulations. I can tell you that folks in Mississauga are very excited, so I'm really looking forward to the rollout so that we can get volunteers engaged. So tell me a little bit about our volunteer engagement plan and why it's so critical to these games.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me preface my comments by just emphasizing that the volunteer piece is very much a part of TO2015's responsibility for delivering the games. Just as any games organizing committee would, they are looking to attract a significant volume of volunteers to participate in many different ways in delivering on the games. Some of these volunteers will perform leadership positions working with teams. Others will be doing other operational activities. Some will be directing traffic with those big thumbs. There's a whole range of responsibilities and functions that volunteers can perform. I know certainly TO2015 is very motivated to attract a diverse array of Ontarians to participate in whatever way they're able or interested in helping us host a tremendous games.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I have some questions around security, so I'm just going to begin by asking Deputy Blair. Thank you for being here as well. If you could just speak a little bit to your experience.

Mr. Brad Blair: My personal experience—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes.

Mr. Brad Blair: —in terms of 28 years as a provincial police officer having served across this province? I've served in numerous areas in the province of Ontario, from a front-line officer from our most remote communities to our anti-rackets section that investigates frauds out of our general headquarters to our municipal contract policing area in the Ontario Provincial Police. I was the executive lead in implementing the recommendations from Ipperwash and was tasked with creating the OPP's Aboriginal Policing Bureau. Most recently, prior to this job, I was the regional commander of central region, the busiest region in the province of Ontario, and I had the privilege of doing that until I took this job in late November.

1450

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you so much.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Damerla, if I could just interject for a second there. We have to make sure that we stay focused on the mandate of the committee. Any security-related questions from either party, from here on in, I'm going to be ruling out of order and asking for either a rephrase or a change.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Mr. Chair, I'm going to seek your indulgence on one thing. There was some questioning around CSC, a private security company, that the opposition was allowed to ask. I would like to be able to ask my question so that we get a full picture. I will not go to procurement, but in the past, also, I've heard questions around the budget. I will be very mindful of not going into procurement, but I would like the ability to ask questions related to the original line of questioning.

Mr. Paul Miller: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Point of order.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'd like the ability too, but I got cut off.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I provided you with quite a bit of leniency, and I'm just trying to reel that in. I'm trying to be as fair as possible. I'd like to remind all

members also to direct the questions to the actual witness. If Mr. Davidson would like to pass the questions off, that's his prerogative as well. It's my responsibility to make sure that the line of questioning falls within the mandate of standing order 111.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I will endeavour to do that. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you, Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Deputy, there has been a lot of media attention around the security budget increasing to the latest estimate of \$239 million. The opposition—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Damerla, can we stay away from security, please?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I do need your indulgence here. Can I at least ask questions around—the company's name, I believe, is CSC, the private security company. Questions were asked around the licensing, or lack thereof, and I think it's very important that I be allowed to ask questions that clarify and give context to the scenario that was depicted through Mr. Miller's line of questioning.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much for the question. I did provide, perhaps, a little bit too much leniency to the NDP on this particular issue. Any questions related to security do not fall within the mandate of the committee, according to standing order 111. I'm trying to be as clear as possible. The Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services is not under our mandate to review, and security is their responsibility.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I'm going to respect your ruling, but I do have to say that it's unfair that the opposition side of the story, through their line of questioning, was allowed and now we don't get a chance to give context to that. I do just want to put that on the record. Give me a few seconds to collect my thoughts and I'll continue to ask questions that are not security-related.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So no questions at all around security? Can we ask about the role of the ISU? We have somebody from the OPP here who is well-versed in it and can clarify for the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Security matters are the responsibility—I think, as Chair, I've made that clear previously—of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. The OPP falls under this particular ministry. Our mandate here is limited to the review of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat. So please stay as focused as we can. I will be cautioning members as we move forward. It's clear that we, as a committee, have to follow the rules of standing order 111.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, can I just ask what has changed? Because questions around the increase in budget, at least—not the nuts and bolts of the security, but questions around why the security budget increased from \$113 million to what it is today—have been enter-

tained in the past. I'm just curious as to why we can't entertain them now.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): If you direct your question to Mr. Davidson and it relates to security in that particular sense, that is acceptable, but once we get into the details of contracts and contractors, that does not fall within the scope.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Fair enough. Okay. So I'm going to be asking around the rationale. Thank you, Deputy, and thank you, Chair.

Deputy, we've heard in the media quite a bit about the security budget increasing to the latest estimate of \$239 million from the original \$113 million, when the bid was first made. Could you tell us what that increase is about and why it came about?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Sure, I'd be happy to. If we begin with the \$113 million that was the original estimated security budget, the genesis of that is twofold: One, PASO, the Pan-American Sports Organization, which is the body that holds the franchise for the Pan Am Games—under their legislation, under their act, it's a requirement that a bid contain a budget for security. There isn't a similar requirement for, say, transportation, but there is for security. So there needed to be a budget for security in the province's bid, but of course, at that time, there had been no planning for the games, so there was minimal information available in terms of the actual operations of the games to inform the construction of the security budget estimate. Based on the best information available at that time, \$113 million was the number arrived at. Subsequent events and planning proceeding has informed the revision of that number. In the fall of last year, at the original technical brief, that number was \$206 million, and now up to \$239 million. The jump to \$239 million is the direct consequence of the results of the procurement undertaken by the ISU. I will speak about the procurement from the perspective of P/PAGS and our role in oversight and coordination.

The interest on the part of the secretariat—and our responsibility is to ensure that all undertakings done with respect to the games are done in accordance with appropriate, applicable rules. In the case of the ISU's and MCSCS's procurement of private security services to support the securing of public safety, my knowledge of the process is that it was undertaken in conformity with the government's procurement rules, which are contained in the procurement directive. There was an open, competitive process. MCSCS, as is normal in major procurements, secured the services of a fairness commissioner to make determinations along the road and provide advice in terms of the construction of the process and then, finally, at the conclusion of the process, provide a final report with an assessment of the process and its conformity to applicable rules.

I have no direct knowledge of the evaluation that was undertaken. My knowledge is that the evaluation was done in accordance with the rules. I would add that my knowledge of the process undertaken in this case is that it's consistent with the multi-stage process in assessing a

complicated procurement, which is that the team of qualified assessors first takes a look at mandatory requirements, then takes a look at rated criteria, and then takes a look at the results of a presentation. It assesses those three and then, finally, goes to an unveiling of cost. So the reason for this underlying—and here, I'm talking very generally about the government's procurement rules, which were applied as they needed to be in this case. The financial piece is kept sealed through the first three stages of the procurement process, and then, finally, when a short list of qualified service providers is determined, the envelopes are opened to reveal the cost. That number is fed into more or less a formula, and there is a successful bidder at the end of that process.

My interest, as the deputy responsible for oversight coordination, is to ensure that in this process, as in others, the rules are followed. As I think you would be aware, the fairness commissioner has delivered to the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, which has provided a copy to me, an unqualified attestation by the fairness commissioner that the process was followed.

1500

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So, essentially, the original \$113 million was just a guesstimate to be put in as part of the application package, and it was always understood that as we got closer to the event and really got things moving, the budget would evolve. Would that be fair?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I would agree with the second part of the statement, that it was always anticipated that that original number would not stand, and that as planning proceeded, it would need to be revised. I didn't participate in the construction of the original number, so I'd be hesitant to call it a guesstimate. As I said, I think a better way—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Well, an estimate—

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. It was informed by the best information available at the time, which was very limited.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: And this is pretty typical for any games anywhere in the world—whether it's Sochi, whether it's the Vancouver Olympics—that the budget for the security is going to evolve depending on circumstances and as you get closer to the games and the ground realities become more clear.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I would imagine that that's the case. This is the first games that I have worked on, so I don't have direct knowledge of others. But again, as I would say, the PASO act requires an initial security budget. I think it's reasonable that a budget for security constructed at that early date, given the high degree of interdependence between security planning and on-the-ground games delivery operational planning, that inevitably it would evolve, I would think, in most circumstances.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: You know, Deputy, I'm not a security expert, but even I as a layperson can say that when the bid was first put into place five years ago, since then we've had certain events like the Boston Marathon, the unfortunate incident that took place, threats at the

Sochi Games. So, obviously, over a five-year period, the risks around a particular set of games can change, and that would, again, dictate what the final security budget might be.

Mr. Steven Davidson: As a layperson, I would share your view, but I would defer to my colleague to talk more specifically. One thing I might ask my colleague to speak to, if it's within the bounds of the committee, is to talk about the changing environment within which the procurement for private security services was undertaken, because I think there are—I have a layman's understanding of some of the external factors that have evolved over the last little while. So if the deputy commissioner could speak to those, I would refer to you.

Mr. Brad Blair: The environment that we found ourselves in in 2012 was that the RFI for the procurement was being developed at the same time as the London Games were taking place. At that point, there wasn't the learnings that are available for London and the failing of private security in providing security to those games. Subsequently, as a result of what has come from that experience, what has come from Guadalajara, what has come from the experience in Glasgow that is taking place as we speak and of course added to it our own experience—these are all the things that were contextual in terms of determining what our needs would be moving forward.

You've talked about the things that may or could drive security costs. Obviously, the most important one would be the threat level, the threats associated with these particular games. At this time, we would say that the threats to these games are low, but a change in that threat level would change the demand for security response.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. That really clarifies why it went from \$113 million to \$239 million. So there's a difference between characterizing it as, "Oh, my God, this is such a shock," versus "This was something we always anticipated"—that it wouldn't be crystallized at \$113 million, that the budget would evolve: (1) the ground realities; and (2) the changing climate of threats. Is that fair?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. I would say that it's a fair statement that it was anticipated that the security budget would evolve as there was more specific information available about the on-the-ground delivery of the games.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you so much for clarifying this for the entire committee, particularly my friends in the opposition, because they've had some trouble with this concept.

With that, Chair, I will end my line of questioning for now.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. You had two minutes left, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to start off firstly by asking just a couple of questions on volunteers, if I could. There are 20,000 volunteers. Are any of the volunteers actually paid volunteers?

Mr. Steven Davidson: No. My understanding is that the call for volunteers is a call for people to volunteer

freely of their time to participate in the games. In exchange for that, they'll have training with respect to whatever activity they're asked to undertake. One point I would make is that all volunteers will receive training in accessibility issues and service provision. So there is a certain set of skills that will be part of training provided to all volunteers, but it is unpaid.

Mr. Rod Jackson: In the provision for volunteers, is there provision for taking on a certain number of volunteers with disabilities?

Mr. Steven Davidson: The goal is certainly to invite people of varied abilities and aptitudes to participate. I can't answer whether there is a particular goal attached to that, because this is the responsibility of TO2015. But I know it is absolutely a priority for TO2015 to encourage the participation of as many Ontarians across all our diversity. So absolutely, there will be roles for people with accessibility challenges.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Has anyone in the secretariat or, to your knowledge, in TO2015 cross-referenced with the Ministry of Labour to make sure the new rules regarding unpaid interns don't apply when you're talking about employing volunteers?

Mr. Steven Davidson: TO2015 is certainly obliged to conduct its business in compliance with all relevant legislation and applicable government directives, so my expectation is that they are absolutely doing this. But I would emphasize that these are volunteers; these are not unpaid internship positions. Volunteers, in this context, are similar to, say, the army of motivated, committed volunteers that every year turn out to help support the Toronto International Film Festival. These are people freely volunteering of their time to pitch in however they're deemed most valuable.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Yes, and the world needs more of them, for sure.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes.

Mr. Rod Jackson: And I agree.

Recently, there have been, in the efforts to recruit volunteers, a lot of incentives that have been put in place for them. A couple of them would be maybe—I'm looking at the OSAP forgiveness and programs like that. Not only that, but there are costs to train them, outfit them, feed them, transport them, insure them. There are a lot of peripheral costs around having volunteers. Has that been figured into the total budget?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Absolutely. I'll talk about the OSAP piece separately, but the cost of recruitment of volunteers, training of volunteers, outfitting volunteers, ensuring that they're hydrated, all of that, is all fully within TO2015's \$1.4-billion games delivery budget.

The OSAP piece is a provincial investment which is being funded through the core budget of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. So there isn't an incremental cost for that; that is being absorbed within TCU's budget.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Okay. Do you know if there are any background checks that are going to be performed on volunteers who will be dealing with the public?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I would refer the specifics to my colleague, Mr. Rafi. But certainly my understanding and expectation is that all applicable rules and check requirements will be fully deployed here.

Again, this is TO2015's area of responsibility, but I do understand that there will be a variety of functions performed by volunteers, and I would anticipate that the level and nature of checks would conform to the nature of the activity that the volunteers were being asked to perform.

1510

Mr. Rod Jackson: Right. So if you're working with kids, you're going to have a higher level of security required.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Absolutely.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Can you tell me how many people are currently working with the secretariat?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Our FTE limit, our full-time equivalent limit, is 58, so that's our allocation. At any one time—I can get you the point-in-time number for today, but we do, from time to time, as we're able, supplement that with students over the course of the summer. This is a tremendous, huge, diverse project to work on, so we try to encourage student placements as best we can. That would occasionally, for a period of time within a fiscal year, take us over. But we also manage vacancies from time to time, and so it's quite possible that now, where we sit in March, we may actually be under the 58. I'd be happy to get you the real number, but we're always in that zone of our limit.

Mr. Rod Jackson: I understand that with a complement of that size, it's going to vary by a few on either side.

In your secretariat, I noticed that there are a few people who are seconded from other ministries. Is there anyone there who is seconded from the MC—

Mr. Steven Davidson: MCSCS?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you. Yes.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I believe there may be. I can't tell you for sure right now, but I can certainly find out. I would say, just generally, that the recruitment for the secretariat has been to encourage as much participation in this great project as we can. So many of the positions are staffed by people whose permanent positions are actually within the secretariat, but a variety of positions are filled by people who are on secondments, whose home positions are in other ministries across government, and they could be attracted to the P/PAGS job because they bring a particular expertise or they just bring a particular interest and they're wanting to diversify their skill base. This is a great opportunity. We have folks seconded from a whole variety of ministries.

Mr. Rod Jackson: I just asked because I think, Chair, if there is someone from the MCSCS—sorry, am I getting that right? All these acronyms—would it not be prudent, then, to ask questions of the secretariat, considering that there are people representing that ministry in the secretariat?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I would think that you could make the request for them to appear, whom-

ever, before the committee, and ask appropriate questions relating to the Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Could I just add a point on that?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Certainly.

Mr. Steven Davidson: An individual seconded from one ministry to another ministry has, in fact, a new employment contract with the new ministry, so that person could be doing something related to the business of its home ministry or, more likely, not. I would just say that not knowing who has been seconded, they may very well be working on something entirely different. But I can find out.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Understood.

Sorry; just give me one quick second here, because I do have a question. We had to rejig our questions because a lot of them were security-related and apparently we're not going to be able to ask those questions today.

You've referred to the strategic budget oversight committee. Correct?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. The commissioner did.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Who are they? Where do they come from? What do they do? Who's on it? All those sorts of things.

Mr. Steven Davidson: One of the assistant deputy ministers in the secretariat represents P/PAGS on it, but I'm not directly involved, so you may wish to speak in more detail.

Mr. Brad Blair: The co-chair of that is our ADM, our CAO of our ministry, MCSCS. Also, finance committee is represented there. The OPP sits on that oversight committee also.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Okay. So there is a representative for the secretariat on that committee, and that's the committee that oversaw the procurement process.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I draw a distinction between the function of that body, which is in respect to financial oversight and tracking, and the security expertise that is drawn from MCSCS and the ISU and partner municipal security forces. There isn't an overlap between responsibility for security planning, based on expert knowledge and experience, and the budget tracking, which is the numbers that are informed by decisions taken by the technical experts.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Okay. I think I got that. The secretariat has a budget oversight role with the games, right? There's a financial accountability role with the secretariat. There is such a parsing of responsibilities here, so some of it is a little bit hard to follow. I understand it's a huge undertaking, so that's not a critique; that's just a fact.

What kind of role did the secretariat play in overseeing any procurement process—we're talking about several different ministries—whether it's education, whether it's health, whether it's MCSCS? Where does your oversight start and end with that coordination?

Mr. Steven Davidson: That is a really important, fundamental question. Oversight by the secretariat—the responsibility that the secretariat has for oversight of the

budget related to the games—is oversight over the province's \$500-million investment in the games organizing committee, which, of course, is complemented by investments from other funders, which brings them to \$1.4 billion—so working very, very closely with them to ensure that risks are identified, that appropriate mitigation strategies are in place, and keeping a watchful eye to ensure that TO2015 is able to deliver the games within their budget. That's the primary oversight responsibility of the secretariat.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, there is in Ontario a somewhat decentralized model with respect to areas of expertise that already exist in government, and the most critical are transportation and security. Rather than duplicate and replicate those within a single central secretariat, those were left where they were, with responsibility to leverage all of those resources, all of that expertise and experience, so that the planning, both for security and for transportation, is informed by those experts.

The oversight role that P/PAGS plays with respect to those responsibilities is different than the direct oversight role we play with respect to the province's investment in TO2015.

Each of those line ministries has its own responsibility for developing the best advice to government with respect to planning and associated costs. We play a coordinating role in that, but I don't exercise oversight over my colleague deputy of transportation or community safety and correctional services. They're separately responsible for that.

Mr. Rod Jackson: I think I understand. But to clarify, what I think you're saying is that we have a line here, for example, for health that is zero. We know it's not going to be zero; the Ministry of Health is going to fill that number in at some point or another.

Mr. Steven Davidson: We show health because there are absolutely responsibilities at the provincial level that are going to be performed by the Ministry of Health to ensure that public safety is protected during the games, and that health care is accessible during the games.

What is shown on here are any incremental costs; that is, costs that are above a ministry's base budget. In order to be fully transparent around the province's investments in the games, we've identified those.

Transportation's planning range right now of \$75 million to \$90 million is the resources that they are projecting to require above their budget. Health is not currently projecting any incremental need. They are exploring every way that they can deliver their responsibilities from within their base budget.

I'd just make the more general comment that this is a massive undertaking that the province is fully deploying across all of government. There's very much an all-of-government approach and direction out to all my colleague deputies to look at ways where we can support and enhance the success of the games. Health is a very particular function, so we've put it on here, but everybody is trying to do what they can to contribute.

Mr. Rod Jackson: How much time do I have, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ten minutes.

1520

Mr. Rod Jackson: All right. I think I'm getting it. Things that happen in transportation are in the transportation budget. The security budget, the health budget and probably a couple of other ones that I'm missing in there—those particular ministries have responsibility for oversight over those things. We have at least three or four different ministries involved in oversight over their own ministry. Who is responsible for the overall coordination and oversight for all those things put together?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me answer it this way, if I can answer by way of an example: If we also look down this list of provincial investments, there's the \$22 million and \$20 million for legacy, and celebration and promotion activities. That is, as you're aware, a bucket comprising initiatives by a number of ministries. In that case, P/PAGS played a leadership role in pulling together the best ideas from across ministries, and P/PAGS took the lead on going forward to the treasury board with a proposal for a whole-of-government approach to promotion, celebration and legacy. That was a case where P/PAGS played the lead.

With respect to the others, we play an indirect role. Our role is to ensure that as the Ministry of Transportation comes forward with its plan and associated cost or the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services does the same, we, all together, are presenting a coherent face to the treasury board and the cabinet to help them make decisions around the government's investments in the games. Where P/PAGS doesn't have authority and responsibility over transportation and security, we absolutely do have a responsibility to ensure that the government is presented with a coherent set of advice where each part is informing the other. Coming back to the role in coordination, ensuring that information is being shared by one part whose decisions impact on another, is one of the most critical roles that the secretariat plays.

I appreciate the question and I appreciate how awkward it is that I'm not able to say, "Oh, well, P/PAGS is in the lead and in the chair on all of these decisions." It is more distributed, but we try to play an effective coordinating role to ensure that the decision-makers, who are the treasury board and the cabinet, are able to do so in a way where the world makes sense.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Yes.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Given how many players there are—one of the comments I made at the beginning was just on the multiple partners that are going in, and we're just talking about the provincial level of government. The federal government has a role and municipalities are playing a significant role.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Yes. I guess, in terms of providing a coherent message to what's going forward with the budget and with the operations of the games, it falls on the secretariat, although the decisions and responsibilities don't. That would make Minister Chan responsible for a

coherent assessment to cabinet and the public of what is going on with the games and games spending and games organization and operations—a fair assessment?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. Minister Chan's confidence to his colleagues in cabinet will be—let's use the example of security. While the minister and the minister's secretariat have no direct involvement in the expert assessment of, say, in this case, a procurement contract, but more broadly, in security planning, my job is to advise the minister, with the help of my colleagues in the line ministries, that due process has been followed and that the right level of competence has been brought to bear in either developing advice or options or making operational decisions so that he can convey that confidence to his colleagues.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Okay. You answer to Minister Chan?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. Minister Chan is actually the minister responsible for the Pan/Parapan Am Games, but also the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport. He's got two hats and so do I.

Mr. Rod Jackson: On two counts, yes. I know that my colleague has a couple of questions that she'd like to ask, so I'll pass it on to Gila.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Martow.

Mrs. Gila Martow: What makes me nervous is, I like to know that there's one person in charge, because we've always seen in the newspapers that when things go wrong, which invariably—you know, things don't always go perfectly. I'm not saying—with the Pan Am Games, I think we're all secure that they'll run quite well. Our nervousness is over the rising costs. But who's responsible? If I can just reiterate what my colleague said, ultimately we don't want to hear, "Well, I was only in charge of this, and they were in charge of that." Everybody says somebody else was in charge.

I'm going to bring up something that I think we've all seen at festivals, events: It's always a problem with access to the washrooms. Women always say there's not enough washrooms; disabled people say they couldn't get into the washrooms; the washrooms didn't work. I hope we're planning for that and that we're not saying, "Well, there weren't enough portable washroom trailers available." A lot of times, games and festivals fail because people hear that there aren't enough washrooms and they don't want to go.

Also, people have trouble with getting there from the parking lot, if they park their car, or they wait for trains if there are trains available, but people have to wait five trains, and by then they've missed whatever event it was they were going to because they couldn't get on to the train. So I would like to see a comprehensive plan that we're getting more GO trains and we're getting more subway trains because, personally, when I have to take the subway home on the Yonge line, I could be standing there waiting for a couple of trains before I get on. I can't imagine how it's going to be in terms of public transit. On trains, people are standing, taking the train out to Oakville on the GO train.

Then there was a mention of unsigned internal contracts. I'm wondering if unsigned internal contracts for security, if the \$230 million, which I would like to mention sounds like it's more than the entire Winnipeg Pan Am/para games budget—if the security has to be so high, maybe we can't host these kinds of games. Maybe with the terrorist threats in the world, every big event—like, the G20 is always going to be a target for either terrorism or protestors. There's nothing we can do about it. It's the nature of the world right now. Maybe it's unwise or unrealistic to consider hosting these types of events on the world stage if security costs are going to be just so exorbitant and security is going to be so difficult that people have to have their bags searched, their knapsacks searched, and they miss whatever it was they were going to by the time they get through the security lines.

Thank you.

Mr. Steven Davidson: That's quite a few—several questions. I—

Mrs. Gila Martow: Well, I wanted to make sure I got all mine in. I can repeat if I need to.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I'll just start at the top. In terms of who's on first, what we have been talking about is how we coordinate decision-making and responsibility for the provincial host jurisdiction responsibilities. Remember, TO2015, the games organizing committee, is the entity that was established to put on the games, so they have direct delivery responsibility. They have the games expertise. They are staffed by people who have worked on other games, who really understand the business of putting on a games.

So operational issues such as availability of washrooms, ensuring that those are accessible, that people can find their way around within a venue, is all very much within the set of responsibilities that TO2015 has.

Mrs. Gila Martow: And is there one person's name who is ultimately responsible?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. You have already heard from Saäd Rafi, who is the chief executive officer of TO2015, and the Honourable David Peterson is the chair of the board of TO2015.

So a separate, incorporated, not-for-profit entity receives a transfer from the provincial government of \$500 million, is receiving \$500 million from the federal government, has a target of \$253 million, I believe—no, sorry, \$153 million—of self-generated revenue to be achieved through partnerships and ticket sales and other retail.

So that is TO2015: multiple partners supporting their delivery of the games.

The issue of congestion, though, is one that does—that segues into the areas of provincial responsibility.

1530

The province, if we think of it as almost a wrap-around—we have areas that are within our jurisdiction that could not be devolved out to an organizing committee. Ensuring that a games route network is mapped out and appropriately signed—and the use of high-occupancy vehicle lanes—is not something that could be

mandated by the organizing committee. That falls within the purview of the provincial government.

Just as the security planning being undertaken under the direction of the ISU, the transportation planning is being led by transportation experts at the Ministry of Transportation who are fully seized with the challenge of ensuring that people—games participants, athletes, officials, but also residents, visitors to the province—are able to get around the metropolitan area in a way that allows them to do what they need to do.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I provided an extra minute there, so I think I was fair enough.

We'll move to the third party: Ms. Sattler.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I wanted to follow up a little bit about the security budget. I thought I was clear during your responses to Mr. Miller, but then I actually became less clear when you were responding to Ms. Damerla.

I understand that the TO2015 original bid budget included \$113 million for security.

Mr. Steven Davidson: That's correct.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: But in your response to Mr. Miller's question, you distinguished between security of assets versus public safety, so the additional \$126 million is for public safety, and that is being overseen by MCSCS.

My question is, was the original \$113 million always only directed to securing assets, with no sort of thought to the public safety component of the security budget?

Mr. Steven Davidson: In fact, exactly the opposite. I do apologize if I have confused the committee in introducing the asset security responsibility that TO2015 has at the beginning. I did that because I know that they are in the midst of a public procurement exercise, and so I wondered whether that would be of interest.

But let me emphasize that the responsibility of the province is to ensure public safety, the security of people. The security of assets is a much, much smaller undertaking. It is similar to the responsibility, as I've said, of any organizer of a big event that is going to have assets on-site to help deliver the games. So whether it's a band and they've got band equipment or, in this case, a sporting event, they're going to have sporting equipment. All that is, you know, how do they secure those assets overnight when they're not in use?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: So this table, then, says that the TO2015's operating budget included the \$113-million security budget, but you're saying that that was actually to be directed toward public safety, not the TO2015 assets?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes, so the carve-out of \$113 million within the overall \$1.4 billion budget that I've talked about is with respect to public safety. There is additional budget within the \$1.4 billion that will enable TO2015 to deliver its responsibility to secure its own assets.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay. So does the total \$239 million, with those two components, cover the RFI for securing the assets, the internal—

Mr. Steven Davidson: No, I'm sorry. Let me try again. The \$239 million is public safety, public security, the purview of the integrated security unit. What isn't separately carved out here is the part of TO2015's budget that will enable it to secure its own assets during games time, so that's what they're procuring for now, and that's—I don't have the figure now—in the single digits.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: So the \$239 million is just public safety, and then there's an additional component for securing assets that is part of the overall—

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes. It's not additional; it's within the \$1.4 billion.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: It's already built into the TO2015 budget.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Yes.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay.

Mr. Miller, did you want to—

Mr. Paul Miller: Thanks. So we can safely say that the budget was at \$113 million, and that was just a rough number they were throwing at the committee at the time to secure the games, for security. We bumped it up. It's gone up \$126 million since then, to \$239 million for security, and now you're saying that the internal asset security that we've been hearing about lately is part of the \$1.46 billion that they already have in place, so there will be no additional cost to the \$239 million.

My question to you and to the commissioner is this: We're at \$239 million. You apparently have a contract with that company that was under question before. They're at \$81 million, I believe the number was. Can you say today that that \$239 million is dead set? The \$239 million is not going to increase closer to the games, after the games or during the games? Is \$239 million the final number? Because you've already said that the other additional asset protection is included in the \$1.4 billion that TO2015 has. There will be no more costs than the \$239 million: Is that what you're telling me?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me defer to my colleague, but before I do, let me just emphasize that \$113 million for public security is already within the \$1.4-billion budget for TO2015. The incremental required above that is \$126 million, which brings us to the \$239 million that is the projected number right now for the cost of securing the public.

Mr. Paul Miller: "Projected number." Okay. My question was—you're not answering my question.

Mr. Steven Davidson: No. I'm going to defer to my colleague.

Mr. Paul Miller: My question was: Is that all she wrote? Is that the bottom line? Are there going to be any more additional costs for security? You've explained the internal to me; you've explained the external. Is that it? Can the commissioner say that that's where we're at, or are there going to be some more surprises?

Mr. Brad Blair: First of all, it's deputy commissioner, but thank you.

Mr. Paul Miller: Sorry; deputy commissioner. I gave you a promotion.

Mr. Brad Blair: Right now, based on our assessment, \$239 million is the number. There are a couple of drivers. The caveats are that the cost contribution agreements with the municipal police services are yet to be concluded, so that is a consideration. Secondly, it's the threat level. That could change, which could drive cost.

Mr. Paul Miller: So you're saying that the contracts with the municipal police departments or their costs have not been included, or they have been included at a level, but they could increase, depending on the usage and the amount of manpower and things. So what you're saying to me is, maybe there could be a caveat. The \$239 million could go up.

Mr. Brad Blair: Those are estimates and those are the two considerations, I think, that we put into it.

Mr. Paul Miller: Mr. Davidson, could you explain, with all due respect to the deputy commissioner: Why did you invite him today if we can't discuss internal security problems or potential—I think we've dabbled a little in it, and I'm glad he's here, but why was he invited today to sit with you?

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me be very clear: The deputy commissioner is here at my invitation. The reason that I invited him was not to in any way breach the standing orders and the bounds of jurisdiction of this committee, but I did feel that the deputy commissioner could be helpful in helping me to explain the secretariat's role in coordinating the responsibilities of other accountable, responsible ministries. That was it.

Mr. Paul Miller: What I'm concerned about is, I had people from the procurement group here for questioning a couple of weeks ago—and this is procurement; this is contracts, finances, everything. They said that they didn't have anybody sitting on the Parapan 2015 committee; they didn't have anyone reporting back to them what transpired in that.

I found that highly irregular, because if I was running a games of this magnitude, I'm assuming that I would want the police there, I'd want the minister or deputy minister there, I would want the procurement people there, I would want any athletic people to represent the athletes, the village that's being built, the construction people. Why are these committees operating independently of each other and why is there no coordination between the ministry, the police and the committees? Why aren't they all sitting together? Because if the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing—and I've seen a lot of that in the last few weeks, or at least they claim they don't know what's going on—I really don't understand how you can run something this big with, as was mentioned earlier, "Well, I don't handle that," or, "Oh, no. We're not involved in that." I've been getting a lot of that. It's really scary, because everyone should have a handle on this when you're operating at that level.

1540

Can you explain to me why you don't have representatives on that committee, or if you do, and why the police aren't on that committee, and why I'm getting bits and pieces? I don't get that.

Mr. Steven Davidson: Let me be clear: The security budget oversight committee that the deputy commissioner referenced earlier does have representation from the Pan/Parapan Am Games secretariat, finance and MCSCS. So there is an oversight around the budget of security with representation from across. I'll let my colleague speak to the broad representation within the integrated security unit itself, because that is a forum for all the partners.

Mr. Paul Miller: When he does answer that, I've got one little item I'd like you to answer, too, while you're answering that. Who has the authority to deny or alter any Pan/Parapan Games security plan due to high cost or any other reason?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Apologies, Mr. Miller. Over time—thank you very much.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm on overtime?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Fifteen seconds over. Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. Deputy, I'd like to pick up where Ms. Sattler left off on the issue of which costs fall under where. So bear with me, because I hope that, once we go through this a second time, it will be all very clear.

Toronto 2015 recently—I think back in March—issued an RFI for security. Is that part of the \$239 million? I'm guessing the answer is no.

Mr. Steven Davidson: No.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Okay. So I've got that right. So it's not part of the \$239 million. So what is it part of?

Mr. Steven Davidson: That is for them to procure private security services to fulfill their responsibility to protect their assets during the games.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So it's part of the \$1.4 billion.

Mr. Steven Davidson: It is part of their \$1.4-billion overall budget.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So it's already accounted for.

Mr. Steven Davidson: It's already accountable. It's not incremental. It's not new.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: It does not affect the \$239 million. Thank you very much.

I also heard Mr. Miller ask a few times if we could crystallize and say that "\$239 million is the most we are going to go." I just wanted to ask, in terms of being responsible for security, if we as a government were to say, "Well, that's it. We're going to be fiscally so accurate that we're never going to go over \$239 million," and meanwhile the risk environment has changed, what would the fallout be?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I'll defer to my colleague.

Mr. Brad Blair: Let me clarify that. The responsibility for providing the security to these games rests within the policing environment, within the ISU, led by the Ontario Provincial Police. That's within our purview, and it's our responsibility. So any of the costs associated with that are costs that we have to justify, and we're more than willing to do so and coming forth on an ongoing basis to have these conversations.

As I said earlier, there were a number of drivers that may change these costs. There were a number of drivers that may reduce these costs, in terms of our planning principles. Our peer review is ongoing. We expect to be coming back to the technical briefings, providing updates on an ongoing basis up until the time of the games.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I heard Mr. Miller press for, "Can we crystallize this at \$239 million?" But in the past I've heard Mr. Jackson say that \$239 million was not enough. Meanwhile, I heard Ms. Martow today suggest that we're spending too much on security. So I'm hearing so many different things from my friends on the opposite side of the House. Perhaps you could just clarify for me one more time: How do we decide what the right number is for these games?

Mr. Brad Blair: We have very comprehensive planning principles that have been put in place. We have all of our partner agencies, with their planning experts. We do peer review. For example, for each venue, we would create a security plan. That would go through a process where the peer review is done by everybody, and, at the end of the day, we would agree to say, "Yes, these are the planning principles that we agree to in terms of the security level based on what we know." Those are refreshed on an ongoing basis, so there are always opportunities to change the security plan. It's very much a living document in terms of the environment that we exist in. Those costs are reflective of the planning that has gone into this, which is very comprehensive, and we'll continue to do so. Again, as I say, at the end of the day, that falls upon us. It's our responsibility operationally.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. Deputy, I also heard Ms. Martow say that the security budget for the Winnipeg games was much lower. Perhaps you could give me some idea as to why it was lower.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I have no direct—

Mrs. Gila Martow: The whole cost.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry, the whole cost of the Winnipeg games was less than our security budget.

Mrs. Gila Martow: Right.

Mr. Steven Davidson: The scope and scale of the Winnipeg games itself were much, much smaller than Toronto.

The 2015 Pan/Parapan Am Games has a really large geographic footprint. I think it's about 10,000 square kilometres, spanning about 15 or 16 municipalities, from Minden, Caledon, Hamilton, Welland and Toronto out to Ajax and Oshawa, so it is logistically a very, very complicated undertaking.

That decision was made right at the start. I was not involved in this file at that time, but certainly my understanding is that there was a direct intent to expand the benefit and opportunities for participation in the games as broadly as possible.

As we have seen—and now I can speak from the perspective of my personal experience as deputy of the secretariat—that does add significantly to the complexity in terms of delivery of the games. Whether it's transpor-

tation planning or whether it is security planning, these are a large, complex games, so I would draw a contrast to the Winnipeg games just in that general way.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So, essentially, it's apples and oranges, and you can't compare the two because the scale is different, the geographic footprint is different, and I'm going to guess there has been some inflation as well since the last games.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I can't speak to the specifics of the differences—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: The drivers.

Mr. Steven Davidson: —in security drivers. My colleague could, if you wished, perhaps.

Mr. Brad Blair: The context is 1999. Secondly, it's Winnipeg, and the scale of the games—these games are significantly larger, in doing the comparison. Those games are somewhat smaller than what we are going to experience in 2015 here.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: What I've heard today is that some members think we should freeze the security cost, some are saying it's too much, and others are saying it's too little. So I think it's best to leave it to the experts, and the politicians should stay out of what the figure should be. That's my take-away. Thank you so much.

I do have a question for the Chair, though.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Your time is up. I'm just kidding.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, there has been a lot of confusion today about the use of MCSCS documents, witnesses etc. in this committee. As I have tried to ask questions myself—while my colleague on the other side was able to ask questions on that issue—I could not provide clarity to those questions, as a member of government myself, with questions of my own. Could we get the Clerk to please clarify on record, for the committee members, why the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services cannot be heard at this committee?

I have a follow-up question as well, just to make sure I get it in. The official opposition requested that we hear from someone from the security branch from the MCSCS, but how would that be possible if this committee does not, by virtue of the standing orders and direction from the House—how can this be so—

Mr. Paul Miller: Chair, a point of order.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. A point of order from Mr. Miller.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Can I not finish?

Mr. Paul Miller: Listen, that information was already put out. The Clerk's office already told us their concerns. We have challenged that decision—obviously, by today's participants—and they are working that out as we speak. So they cannot ask for a decision from the Clerk's office on what ministries can be involved, and what can't be, while we are discussing the procedure and whether this falls within the criteria and the direction that you, as the Chair, and this committee would like to take. They're asking for something that hasn't even been decided upon, so we can't possibly deal with that.

I don't know where they are going with this, but until you have a decision, Mr. Chair, you cannot release information to suit that particular party.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you for your point of order.

Ms. Damerla, you still have two minutes left.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. I believe Mr. Miller will have a better understanding of where we are going if he would let me finish. Anyway, I lost my train of thought here.

I just need to know why we couldn't ask the question—if the Clerk could clarify—and also some clarity around, if the Ministry of Community Safety, MCSCS, is not part of this committee's mandate, then how can we bring them forward?

So I'd like answers to both. Thank you.

1550

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. I'll respond and I'll repeat what I had indicated earlier.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry, Chair; I wanted the Clerk to clarify.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I think the Clerk is asking me to respond, so I will. It was my responsibility to make a ruling. I did have discussions with the Clerks' office prior to the meeting. As such, having reviewed the mandate of the committee, standing order 111, I came to the conclusion as Chair, which was within my right—as can be challenged, of course—that the committee does not have the authority to review any of the specific operations of a ministry. The standing order has not allowed us to review—and in this particular case, the ISU, the OPP, fall under the mandate of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. It's important that we respect the standing orders provided to us by the House, and as such I've ruled on that. Feel free to take the action that's required.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I respect that, but I do feel it was unfair to the government to allow the opposition to ask those questions and not allow us. But I just will leave that.

On the other issue, which was the official—if I could get an answer on part (b) of my question.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Well, thank you very much. As I had indicated earlier, perhaps, as Chair, I was a little bit too lenient at the start. It is what it is. When I realized where all this was going, I decided that I would use my authority to bring it back into scope. As such, the ruling was made.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: My question was around: The official opposition has requested that we hear from someone from the securities branch from MCSCS. How would that be possible if this committee does not have the authority by virtue of the standing orders?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): That, I'm not aware of at this particular point. The time is up, so we'll move to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you. I would be pleased to hear from somebody from the secretariat who has been

seconded from the MCSCS, if it's prudent. We can make that determination at a later date.

Mr. Steven Davidson: But they would be speaking as an employee of the secretariat, not as an employee of MCSCS.

Mr. Rod Jackson: And it may not be prudent if their work with the secretariat doesn't have anything to do with security anyway. In which case, we would not be interested in talking to them, probably, unless their responsibilities are related in some way. I just wanted to clarify that, Chair. To clarify a further mischaracterization: In the past, I was very concerned that \$113 million was not a realistic number, and that it wasn't enough—not so much that I wanted it to be more, but I just didn't think it was realistic. I was pretty sure it was going to come out to be more. My concern was: What was that number going to be? That was borne out when the number increased to \$239 million. So my concern was borne out and it has come to fruition. That's the real characterization of those comments going back in the past, to clarify for the record. Thank you, Chair.

Deputy Minister, can you give me an idea of what ministries are represented on the board? I know you may miss a couple, but just give us a flavour of what ministries people have been seconded from to join the secretariat.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I can't give you a comprehensive list, and in fact—

Mr. Rod Jackson: You know what? Fair enough. If you can undertake to supply that list to the committee, that would be good enough.

Mr. Steven Davidson: I would say that, from my perspective, and the reason that I can't answer you from the top of my knowledge, is that when somebody is appointed to a position, whether they're appointed to it as their permanent home position or as a seconded employee, that is their position. So what's more relevant to me and to the organization is: What experience do they bring from whence they came, not what is their home position, because some people can be on a secondment for many years of their career.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Understood.

Have any new roles been created as the games have progressed closer to game time? Are you moving and adding different people with different skill sets as we come closer? Is that part of the plan?

Mr. Steven Davidson: In terms of the staffing complement of the secretariat?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Yes.

Mr. Steven Davidson: There's a certain amount of coming and going. This is a multi-year project. Some who joined at the beginning are moving on to other opportunities—

Mr. Rod Jackson: Natural attrition and change.

Mr. Steven Davidson: —so there's a certain level of natural attrition. Are we skilling up differently? What I will say is, I have asked—I think you're familiar with the rough organizational structure of the secretariat. There are three divisions, each headed by an assistant deputy

minister. What I've asked each of the ADMs to do is to look at: As the organizing committee and as we as the host jurisdiction move from a couple of years of strategic planning into real, on-the-ground operational planning and delivery where we need to be able to move quickly as the pace escalates, are there any adjustments or changes that each of them sees in their divisional set of responsibilities? Is there any change in the talent and expertise and skill and experience that they need within their division? A little bit of continuous improvement kind of approach—but we are at a pretty critical juncture right now of shifting gears into lead-up for delivery, so I've tasked each of them with doing that and to come back to me very, very quickly with a sense of what their needs are now, up to games time.

Don't forget: Post-games, there will be some accounting, reporting, auditing, all of that kind of typical games activities. What will we need after that? So that's how we're looking at our staffing and resource needs right now.

Mr. Rod Jackson: That actually leads into my next question, and you partially answered it. How long do you suspect the secretariat will remain in place after the games are finished? Will they be overseeing certain of the legacy projects? If they do continue into the après-games area, for how long and in what role?

Mr. Steven Davidson: It's difficult for me to talk in terms of the life of the secretariat. Originally, the responsibility for government support of games delivery was within the Ministry of Health Promotion and Sport. Then, when that ministry was dispersed across health and tourism, culture and sport, and then part was carved out into its own stand-alone secretariat—that's the model we have right now, but that's ultimately a political choice made by the Premier in terms of how her cabinet will be structured. That's the organizational model we have right now.

What I can speak to is the functions and responsibilities that are going to continue. Absolutely, post-games, there will be a wind-down happening at the organizing committee, some responsibilities that the provincial government will have with respect to that. There will be an audit responsibility and many other administrative responsibilities. Disposal of assets—there may be a role for the province to have. So whether it continues as a stand-alone secretariat is not really my authority to speak to, but there will absolutely be post-games responsibilities.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Okay. How much time, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Three minutes, 35 seconds.

Mr. Rod Jackson: I just have one question I want to leave you with, then. It's actually the last question the NDP asked but didn't get under the wire, but I want to hear the answer to it, too. Who has power to veto any decision for the security and transportation for any reason?

Mr. Steven Davidson: I will defer that to my colleague.

Mr. Brad Blair: In terms of the security, as we said, we described the ISU as a joint group of people that are

involved in the planning. So any decisions around the security budget and the operational planning eventually come to me, to a certain extent, if they can't resolve it at that integrated security unit level.

Mr. Rod Jackson: And for transportation?

Mr. Steven Davidson: For transportation, the strategic transportation framework is the piece of planning that we have right now. That is approved by the Ministry of Transportation, but I would say, the financials associated with delivery of the plan remain the government. So the treasury board will approve expenditures against that responsibility, but the plan itself, the strategic framework, is the responsibility of the experts within MTO right now, turning that into on-the-ground local delivery plans, which are being worked out in collaboration with municipalities.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you.

1600

Mrs. Gila Martow: I already got a little nervous when the deputy minister said that he wasn't involved initially when the decision was to involve so many municipalities. I think it is a nice thing to involve all those municipalities. Obviously, I live in York region, so that's out of the Toronto core area. It's nice to involve Markham and Hamilton. But I'm wondering who was responsible for making that decision to involve all of the municipalities. Did they consider the added security costs?

I want to mention one more thing while I have time. We're calling for 20,000 volunteers. Are we also calling for perhaps some of the security personnel and the first responders who normally earn overtime, extra pay, to say, "You know what? We will volunteer some of those hours that we're going to have to work overtime, just like everybody else is volunteering." I don't think that we should have a system where the average Joe Schmo is supposed to volunteer their time for free in exchange for a t-shirt and a bottle of water, and in the meantime our first responders and our security personnel in the province can't volunteer some hours as well.

The main question is, who made that decision to involve all these municipalities?

Mr. Steven Davidson: The initial decision-making around the construction of the provincial bid was made by the province and the bid organizing committee, which was called BidCo at the time. As I've said, I wasn't personally involved, so I actually don't know what the decision-making mechanics were as to who would have had final authority on that determination. But that was a fundamental planning decision made in constructing the provincial bid. That's the best answer I can give you on that today.

In terms of the use of volunteers for functions such as public security, I think I'll defer to my colleague to speak to that. What I would say first, though, is that TO2015, as the organizing committee, is putting on a games. Their call for 20,000 volunteers is for people with non-technical skills to come out and participate and be part of hosting these games.

I'll stop there, and you can talk about security.

Mr. Brad Blair: The piece I really want to talk about is the accreditation of the volunteers. They will be accredited like the games athletes, like the private security personnel, so have comfort that the same accreditation process will be applied to everyone who is going to be participating in these games.

In terms of the volunteers, obviously, with private security, they have to be licensed and trained. Our expectation is that with 20,000 volunteers—that's a huge multiplier in terms of our ability to provide security, with them being the eyes and ears and participating, like all the residents of the province of Ontario do on a daily basis, in assisting us with public safety. We look forward to having that interaction and, hopefully, interacting with them in terms of the things that they should be looking for that would key them to interact with a private security member or a police officer to say, "Hey, I don't think that's right, what I just saw there." We look forward to that multiplier.

Mrs. Gila Martow: Are police officers being asked to volunteer? That was my main question.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much. Your time is up.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Point of order.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Yes, a point of order.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: I share Ms. Damerla's comments about the need for clarity around the MCSCS line of questioning, because we heard through the responses today that the TO2015 games operating budget, which you said the standing orders do direct this committee to look at, included the money for public security. I think, since public security is being delivered through MCSCS, that this committee should have the right to ask questions about how that public security is being delivered.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you for your point of order. TO2015 is not a government agency. The government does provide a portion of their funding for them to operate. As such, anything related to that does not fall into the purview of this particular committee.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: So the P/PAGS group is the only thing—we're not allowed to ask questions about TO2015 and their mandate and operating budget?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I understand that there have been questions asked in the past and there will continue to be, but when it comes to security issues that fall under the purview of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, those do not.

Mr. Paul Miller: Point of order.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Miller, point of order.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm a little confused because this committee had the procurement people here a couple of weeks ago, and procurement means contracts and hiring people to do things, whether it be through—they're obviously connected to 2015 because we're using public money and tax dollars, so I don't understand your ruling when we had procurement people here answering questions two weeks ago, and we have these gentlemen here today—one from the police and one from the ministry.

How can you ask questions of anybody if you're excluding one of the major groups that are involved in the games? It doesn't make sense. What's the difference if I ask a question on this committee or any other committee about the cost of security? I don't know how this committee can be limited when you're having people come to make presentations and you can't you ask them a line of questioning.

This does not fall, in my humble opinion, under 111. This does not. We're challenging that. We're going to continue to challenge that decision because we don't think it is right. We will continue to ask our line of questioning, because we believe the decision that was made by whoever is incorrect. Any decision involving public funds or money should be able to be asked on any committee in this Parliament—any committee—when it comes to money, because it's the taxpayers' dollars that this government is spending on the Pan Am Games.

I can't believe that we'd be excluded—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair?

Mr. Paul Miller: It's my dime, thank you.

I don't see how we can be excluded from asking questions about taxpayers' dollars from any committee in this building. It's an absolute disgrace that we're excluding important questions that fall under the jurisdiction and the auspices of the Pan Am Games. Even some of the things you're refusing to let me ask fall on the very leaflets you guys have handed out to us. So you can't select and pick what you want to talk about. That's ridiculous. We will continue to go after this; we're not going to let it go.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, point of order.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Thank you very much.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'd like clarification from Mr. Miller. When he refers to the "procurement people" in his question, who was he referring to? It's not clear to me.

Mr. Paul Miller: There were two people from government procurement—I don't have their names in front of us. They sat in front of you and talked about it, so I don't know how you could forget about it. It was only two weeks ago.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I just wondered who you were talking about.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm sorry, I don't have their names in front of me, but I'll get them for you if you want their names.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, I wasn't sure of the context—I did not realize you were talking about presenters.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Thank you very much.

Just let me try to address some of the concerns. Each party has the privilege of choosing the route that they want to in the future, but the mandate of the committee, according to standing order 111, is "That pursuant to standing order 111, the Standing Committee on General Government immediately initiate a study and review of the 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games and the Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat, as it relates to the mandate, management, organization or operations of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, with particular emphasis on financial issues, budgets and expenses of the 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games and the Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat, in an effort to determine whether or not the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport effectively exercised their role into the oversight of the 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games."

I've clearly ruled that the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services does not fall under the mandate of this committee, and, as such, that is the way it is.

Mr. Paul Miller: Look, with due respect, they gave \$500 million. What do you mean it doesn't fall under this?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I'm not saying—

Mr. Paul Miller: With all due respect to you, you just read out the mandate. You're telling me that they should be part of it. Security is a huge part of these games, and we should be able to ask questions of anybody about the costs of security.

There it is right there—\$500 million, TO2015.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): And the way the committee is structured, there is another opportunity for another committee that has the authority and the mandate to question the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to do so.

Under this particular committee—

Mr. Paul Miller: With all due respect, this is a stall tactic and it's unacceptable.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you for your comments. Any further discussion?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Davidson and Deputy Commissioner Blair, for coming before us, and I thank everyone for their participation this afternoon. This meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1610.

CONTENTS

Monday 7 April 2014

Pan/Parapan American Games review.....	G-603
Pan/Parapan American Games Secretariat	G-603
Mr. Steven Davidson	
Mr. Brad Blair	

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Président

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

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

Ms. Sarah Campbell (Kenora–Rainy River ND)

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

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

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

Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)

Mr. Michael Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

Ms. Peggy Sattler (London West ND)

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

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

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Rod Jackson (Barrie PC)

Mrs. Amrit Mangat (Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud L)

Mrs. Gila Martow (Thornhill PC)

Mr. Paul Miller (Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Anne Marzalik, research officer,
Research Services