

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

FT-8

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

FT-8

**Select Committee  
on Financial Transparency**

Committee business

**Comité spécial de  
la transparence financière**

Travaux du comité

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament  
Tuesday 30 October 2018

1<sup>re</sup> session  
42<sup>e</sup> législature  
Mardi 30 octobre 2018

---

Chair: Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria  
Clerk: Valerie Quioc Lim

Président : Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria  
Greffière : Valerie Quioc Lim

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

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

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7400.

---

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



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

ISSN 2562-0452

# CONTENTS

Tuesday 30 October 2018

Committee business..... FT-141



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**SELECT COMMITTEE  
ON FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY**

**COMITÉ SPÉCIAL DE  
LA TRANSPARENCE FINANCIÈRE**

Tuesday 30 October 2018

Mardi 30 octobre 2018

*The committee met at 1500 in room 151.*

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Good afternoon. The Select Committee on Financial Transparency will now come to order. To start, I just wanted to get some clarification—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Okay. Let's just start with committee business, if there are any members who would like to discuss. Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this time—and I believe, Madam Clerk, you have a copy of the motion—I'd like to move that the Select Committee on Financial Transparency call on the following individuals to appear before committee as witnesses: first,

—Bruce Campbell, Kim Marshall, Terry Young and Peter Gregg from, or formerly from, the independent service operator—

**Mrs. Robin Martin:** Electricity.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Sorry—the independent electricity service operator, or IESO, and that they appear as a panel; next,

—Gadi Mayman and Ronald Kwan from the Ontario Financing Authority, and that they appear as a panel; next,

—Jeff Lyash and Ken Hartwick from Ontario Power Generation, and that they also appear as a panel; next,

—Andrew Teliszewsky, the former chief of staff to the Minister of Energy; and lastly,

—Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne, and Bert Clark, former president of Infrastructure Ontario, and that they appear as a panel.

Further, that each witness or group of witnesses be scheduled to appear for two hours and 30 minutes; and

That the IESO panel be scheduled to appear for up to five hours; and

That each witness or panel be given up to 10 minutes for an introduction; and lastly,

That the timing of questioning be split evenly between the two recognized parties.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Ross Romano:** My friend has pointed out to me that I may have used the word “service” earlier under IESO; it should be “system.”

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** So just to clarify once again, the last line of the first bullet point should be “systems,” not “service.”

**Mr. Ross Romano:** That is correct.

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

**Mrs. Robin Martin:** System. One electricity system.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** “System,” my apologies. Thank you.

Mr. Romano has moved a motion. Any discussion? Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I guess I just have a question for the government around how they came to land on these particular witnesses. We were given this list yesterday out in the hallway. We have, obviously, put forward some other names as well for consideration. So I'm just looking to the government side for rationale as to why these people, why this time and why they are selected as together. For instance, Ed Clark and Bert Clark are, according to your motion, scheduled to come to committee.

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Thank you for the question, Ms. Fife. The reasoning was, as was discussed with Mr. Vanthof yesterday in the series of conversations which were not considered a subcommittee meeting. In the effort of transparency and working together toward having this list, as the opposition is well aware, and for the benefit of the record, we devised a very informal process together, whereby we had requested from the opposition side, as the government side, a list of witnesses they wished to have called. We received, shortly before our last meeting, a list of seven names. Off that list of seven names we have approved four of those names, which are before the committee at this time. The list of names that we have agreed to was in conjunction with the consultation of that list provided by the opposition.

Specifically why some are in the order they are in: We have discussed that in our informal conversations. There is the goal that certainly some of the group would appear best as a panel; for instance, obviously the members of the IESO and various others on the list. There is an interest of time within the work that we do here that we have to bear in mind.

Clearly, while there are members of the panel sitting together for a two-and-half-hour or a five-hour period of time, we can still, as members, direct our questions to any one individual. In the interests of making the best use of the time we have, it seems quite reasonable under the circumstances, from our perspective, to have those panel members appear together.

Certainly if a member of this committee wishes to ask a question of one individual of the panel specifically, they have the right to do so for the entire duration of their time, and they can certainly direct questions to that one individual and direct only that that one individual respond. That is fully within the scope of the authority that we have here. That was the reasoning why we decided to proceed in the fashion we did.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** We know how to ask questions of people. We know that we can ask questions of one person or another person or pose the same question to all people. The point is, the fact that you have Ed Clark, the former adviser to Kathleen Wynne, and then Bert Clark, the former president of Infrastructure Ontario, appear as a panel together—I'm simply asking for a rationale as to why you would have this father-and-son duo show up to the select committee as it pertains to the mandate from this Legislature.

I'm still seeking clarification. If the government doesn't have an answer or a rationale, that's fine to say, but it strikes me as more than a timing issue and a shortage of time, because, quite honestly, this select committee could go on forever. You just have to state that that's what you wanted to do.

Again, there doesn't seem to be any clear rationale why Ed Clark and Bert Clark are showing up at the select committee together on a panel. It makes no sense to me.

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

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Just for the record: From our perspective, when the committee was originally launched, at first we approved a group of witnesses, along with their meeting times, to kick-start the committee because of time constraints. We have had several informal discussions. Each time, we have made it very clear that we were looking for some type of process.

In our last informal discussion, I even gave examples of how committees in other cases chose their witnesses. They were very amicable discussions. I think it's pretty obvious that we aren't in agreement with how the committee is proceeding to pick witnesses. For instance, we gave a list of seven names which weren't, in our opinion, of a political nature. The government, as is their prerogative, because the government at the end of the day has the majority in the committee, says, "Well, you should be happy because you got four." If it's the prerogative of this committee to actually look into fiscal transparency of how this province should run in the future, that's not really the answer I was looking for.

The question was, "Why do you think these people would be beneficial?" When I got the answer, "You should be happy; you got four," that was more the government speaking than trying to make the committee move forward. That's the impasse we have come to.

1510

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Well, a number of issues there to respond to. I don't want to belabour this but, firstly, to Ms. Fife's point: I did answer the question. You made some comments that this committee can go on forever. Well, no, it can't go on forever, and I'm not going to use language in that fashion. We have a definitive date that we must come to a conclusion by. If, by chance, that needs to be extended, certainly that is something that we can do and that is the prerogative of the committee. But we have a duty to the people of Ontario to provide answers, to obtain some truth for them, and we intend to do that in a timely fashion. We are not going to extend this forever while we go on—not to use slang here—wild goose chases.

Now to Mr. Vanthof's point that there was someone from the government side using the terminology, "You should be happy; you got four": That is not a fair characterization, and you know that, sir. That is not what was said in our discussions—certainly not by me or anyone else from the government side. The comments that were in fact made were that you provided us a list of seven. We agreed to include four on this list. We agreed to include a fifth at a time down the road before this committee concludes. That's five out of seven.

You have not provided any indication as to why you felt those other witnesses, the two we did not agree to call—you have not provided us any information as to why you wanted those witnesses, what their relevance would be. I'm sorry, but at the end of the day someone has to be a gatekeeper here to ensure that the conversations remain relevant.

You have not, in any way, provided any information to us as to how you would like the process to work, just simply that you want a process. It's not fair to continue to beat the drum without any kind of melody here, so, please, if you have something constructive to say, we are very open to listening and we have tried to work together on that.

Further to Ms. Fife's point, there was also the issue that was raised about—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Am I still too close to the mike? Yes? Sorry.

The issue of timing is certainly a relevant one, but at the time that these witnesses were first tendered, there were some informal discussions surrounding the nature of the witnesses and what the opposition was looking to obtain out of those witnesses. There was a discussion surrounding privatization, and those two witnesses—both Clarks—related to that issue. It makes sense to include them at the same time.

I will repeat what I said earlier: While those members of the panel are there, you can direct your questions to whatever member of the panel you so wish to ask your questions of. No one restricts any member of this committee's ability to ask questions of only one member or in whatever order they so choose. That is the direction we've determined, and unless you can provide us with some real, concrete information as opposed to just simply ideas and complaints, we would be happy to consider those in a constructive way.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** With respect, Mr. Romano, I don't need any lessons from you on how to ask a question. My question still remains unanswered as to why you want the father-and-son duo of Ed Clark and Bert Clark to attend. Your commentary doesn't pass the test for us.

To the point around process: We would not be having this discussion about how certain witnesses are being called and the selection process if these conversations were not happening out in the hallway. It shouldn't be "who said what and at what time." All we have asked for is a formal process and asking the government side to consider the witnesses we have put forward as well.

The subcommittee meetings to date have been a complete and utter failure because no decisions get made at those. Mr. Romano insists on keeping this a very informal process. Well, if this committee is to have any credibility at all, then we need to be open and transparent in the way that the committee is operating.

To that end, I'll be moving a motion to amend the original motion that's on the floor, and I'd like to do that right now, Chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Go ahead, yes.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I move that the motion be amended as follows: That we strike the last bullet in the second paragraph and replace it with the following:

"Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne;  
"Bert Clark, former president of Infrastructure Ontario;  
"Mayo Schmidt, former CEO of Hydro One; and  
"Paul Dobson, acting CEO of Hydro One."

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Perhaps in light of the amendments here or the recent amendment, maybe we could take 10 minutes, Mr. Chair, just for some discussion.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Does committee agree to take a recess?

Ten minutes. The committee will recess till 3:25. Thank you.

*The committee recessed from 1515 to 1524.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** The Select Committee on Financial Transparency is now in session and we'll continue debate on the amended amendment that's been put forward by Ms. Fife. Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I'm just going to ask that my previous comments be applied to the debate that we're having on the amendment. If those are accepted, I would be prepared to proceed to vote at this time.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** What are you talking about? All the commentary that you had prior to the amendment being put on the floor?

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Well, why can't you state those comments now?

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I don't know that everybody needs me to repeat everything I already said previously. I would just ask that those comments apply to the amendment as well.

I'm prepared to proceed to the vote.

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

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I would just like to put a few things on the record specifically regarding the requests for witnesses in the informal process. At no point did we ask for reasons why you selected witnesses. That's why we didn't in return, nor were we asked to, give reasons why we would pick Mayo Schmidt or Paul Dobson.

To Mr. Romano's comments regarding a future time, yes, he said that perhaps we would have one of our picks at a future time—again, through lack of a process. I would like to make it very clear that at our last informal meeting, I gave two examples of how the government had a process for picking witnesses.

With those issues, personally, I'm ready to vote on the amendment. I would like a recorded vote.

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I'm prepared to proceed.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I have to say that the comments Mr. Romano made prior to the amendment being put on the floor don't altogether make sense for where we are right now. The reason that we, as New Democrats, have put forward Ed Clark and Bert Clark as separate witnesses to be called, and the rationale for why we were calling Mayo Schmidt, who is the former CEO of Hydro One, and the acting CEO of Hydro One, Paul Dobson, directly relate to the mandate of the committee.

I know that we're all trying to look at the work that we're doing here through that mandate, but obviously there is an inconsistency to how people are being called and why they are being called. I think that this lends itself to the need to have a formal process.

We have asked for this before. I think that formal process should actually, for the purposes of clarity, indicate why people are being called to the committee. I really, genuinely don't feel that that is too much to ask. This is a public committee. It costs money to run this committee. I think that the public at large, for those who are actually interested in this committee, would want to know why, for instance, Mayo Schmidt—who had been a huge player, if you will, in the Fair Hydro Plan—has not been called to the committee. I truly don't think that is too much to ask.

With that said, let's vote on the amendment as it's on the floor.

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

Ms. Fife has moved—

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I asked for a recorded vote, just to confirm that.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Oh, yes. We have received the request for a recorded vote.

Ms. Fife has moved an amendment to the motion. Are the members ready to vote?

**Ayes**

Fife, Shaw, Vanthof.

**Nays**

Baber, Downey, Martin, Park, Romano.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** The motion is lost.

Now we'll be going back to the main motion. Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I take it that the main objection is the two additional witnesses that we wish to call to the committee. If the government side of the House is willing to entertain having Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne, appear as an independent panellist, and then Bert Clark as an independent witness as well, we'll remove Mayo Schmidt and Paul Dobson in order to get this done.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Just to be clear, we're debating again the original—

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I moved an amendment to the motion that's on the floor. I move that the motion be amended as follows: That the last bullet in the second paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following:

“—Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne;

“—Bert Clark, former president of Infrastructure Ontario.”

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Further debate on this? Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I'm prepared to proceed.

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

Ms. Fife has moved an amendment to the motion. Any discussion? Are members ready to vote? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. The motion is lost.

We'll be moving back to the original motion that was presented by Mr. Romano.

Mr. Romano?

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I'd like to amend my previous motion, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** You can't amend your own motion. Someone else can amend the motion.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Okay.

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

**Ms. Lindsey Park:** I'd like to move an amendment to the motion on the floor. I move that the motion be amended as follows:

That everything after and including the last bullet in the second paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following:

“—Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne;

“—Bert Clark, former president of Infrastructure Ontario;

“and that each witness be scheduled to appear for one hour and 15 minutes.”

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. If we could get that in writing, we could recess for another 10 minutes, if the committee is agreeable.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** Perhaps it might be easier to provide a written copy.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes, if you could provide a written copy, we'll recess for another 10 minutes, if the committee is agreeable. The committee will return at 3:43.

*The committee recessed from 1533 to 1544.*

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** The Select Committee on Financial Transparency will now come to order.

I don't believe we got the motion ready that Ms. Park had moved for amendment. Ms. Park?

**Ms. Lindsey Park:** Thank you, Chair. All the members of the committee have had some discussions off the record. I think it's most appropriate—I'd like to withdraw the motion on the floor.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Motion withdrawn.

**Ms. Lindsey Park:** And I'd like to seek the unanimous consent of the committee to reconsider the last motion that was put forward by Ms. Fife.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Do we have unanimous consent? Thank you.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Do you need me to read it into the record? Yes.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Somebody has to move it again; my apologies.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I move that the motion be amended as follows:

That the last bullet in the second paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following:

“—Ed Clark, former adviser to Kathleen Wynne;

“—Bert Clark, former president of Infrastructure Ontario.”

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** It's my understanding now that Ed Clark that will appear separately, Bert Clark will appear separately and that we will be able to deal with them in their independent capacities with regard to the mandate of this committee.

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** That is correct. And the timing from the original motion would remain as two hours and 30 minutes for every member or every panel, with the exception of IESO, which would be scheduled for five hours. Then the remaining part of questioning being split between the two recognized parties—that all remains intact.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Further discussion? Are members ready to vote? Shall the motion carry? The motion is carried.

We're back to further debate on the main motion, as amended. Further debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall the motion carry? The motion is carried, as amended.

Further business? Mr. Romano.



**Mr. Ross Romano:** Yes. I'd like to move, at this time, Mr. Chair, that the Select Committee on Financial Transparency does not allow the documents submitted by the Independent Electricity System Operator, Ontario Power Generation and Ontario Energy Board to be made public at this time, and that the committee give the IESO, OPG and OEB one week to determine which documents they feel are commercially sensitive or privileged and permit them to request that the committee keep those documents private.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Just to clarify, Mr. Romano: Basically, the third-last sentence—it said, “one week to determine which documents are commercially sensitive”—

**Mr. Ross Romano:** “Are commercially sensitive.” I may have thrown another word in there.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Yes, I think you might have thrown another word in. So we'll disregard the original—

**Mr. Ross Romano:** “Which documents are commercially sensitive or privileged and permit them to request that the committee keep those documents private.”

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Thank you. Mr. Romano has moved a motion. Any discussion? Ms. Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I take it that this is in response to the letter that we just received from IESO today. It says, “I am writing to express a significant concern about the committee's decision on October 29, 2018, to make public disclosure of the documents produced by the IESO in response to the committee's October 4, 2018, motion.”

It goes on to say: “Since learning of the committee's order to release the documents, the IESO began reviewing documents produced to the committee to identify non-responsive third-party commercial information. We have discovered that confidential and commercially sensitive information that could jeopardize the IESO's very important relationship with electricity sector participants has been disclosed to the public by the committee. Release of this information publicly may damage the commercial interests of entities that do business with the IESO and who are vital contributors to Ontario's economy.”

I guess this is a question for the Clerk's office: This was raised in debate yesterday. At what time yesterday were the documents released publicly?

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

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioic Lim):** I don't have the exact timing. But because the motion did pass yesterday, some of the documents provided by the IESO have been made available publicly. I think we did send a correspondence or a memo out to the committee informing them of which sets or batches of documents were made public.

1550

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Okay. So they are recommending a process.

Actually, this was a topic of conversation with our caucus members yesterday because we had members who

had sat on the former gas plant committee. At the time, it was Mr. Bisson. He said that the process that the gas plant committee underwent is that documents would come to the committee. One set would be fully exposed—everything from account numbers to chequing and personal banking information, even. Then there would be another set that would be redacted of that information.

Is that the intention of the government side of the House, to go through that process, or are you still trying to figure that out but you just want to put everything on hold for the week?

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** In response to the question, the reasons that we set out yesterday when determining that the materials ought to be disclosed remain our position. In light of the letter we have received, we are prepared to grant that one week so that these other organizations—and we have included OPG and OEB in that discussion—have that opportunity of one week to confirm what materials they feel should not be disclosed. That is the extent of the debate, from our perspective. We are prepared to grant that one week for those parties to ensure that no materials that they consider to be sensitive or privileged will be disclosed.

At this time, I'm prepared to move this matter for a vote.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** That's all fine and good for Mr. Romano to declare that debate is over; however, this actually should be concerning for many of us. The letter goes on to say, “Release of this information publicly may damage the commercial interest of entities that do business with the IESO and who are vital contributors to Ontario's economy.”

Aside from requesting that we reconsider making the decision on a go-forward basis—and I've just asked that question of the government: I take it that you're still considering what the best way to proceed is, or if you still stand by your original position that releasing all these documents to the public is the right of the committee to do so, regardless that it may damage to IESO and the vital contributors to Ontario's economy. Is this really the position of the government? Those documents went public yesterday. We have no way of evaluating who has those documents and what, if any, damage will happen as a result of that decision.

I am curious, from the government's perspective, how you wish to proceed with trying to manage or do some damage control based on the documents that were released yesterday.

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

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. I am a bit—I don't know what the word is. I'm just a farmer. The last time we met, I said, “Don't you think you should be worried about how you're rushing these guys to release all this documentation, that something in there might be

commercially sensitive in a very competitive market?" I had a whole panel of lawyers saying, "Oh, no, no, no. This has to be done right now, for the people." Now: "Oh, wait a second. Oh, yeah."

Come on. We're looking to actually do good things for all Ontarians. I believe some of the members across the way accepted our argument but went ahead anyway. Now we're saying, "Okay, but we're only going to give them a week." Well, do you know what? How about we just let everyone do their job instead of rushing people?

I distinctly remember saying, "Our system is built on checks and balances, and we are one of the checks. Perhaps we should hold off on this." So now we're going to be a check for a week, right? We have access to this information. I have faith in the committee members that they have the wherewithal and the judgment to determine what should be released from these organizations or not. I question that, actually, after this was rammed through last time, despite that we were giving the red light.

Now it's a yellow light; now it's a caution light. I'm somewhat relieved that there has at least been some recognition that we are dealing with people's personal information and we are dealing with information that is commercially sensitive, which the government was just willing to throw out—not "willing"—which the government has thrown out. Not "willing"; "has."

**Interjection:** Closing the barn door.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes. So let's make that clear: The government has released all this information. So now we're trying to—well, we're trying to get the horse back in, and then close the door.

Thank you, Chair.

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

**Mr. Ross Romano:** I do not agree with any of the misrepresentations with respect to comments we made yesterday or today.

I'm prepared to proceed with the vote at this time.

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

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Well, fortunately, we have Hansard. So you can disagree with it, but we have Hansard.

You said yesterday that the people deserve to see all of this, and you didn't even recognize the risk in doing so. Now you've put a motion on the floor saying that we're just going to take one week to consider the letter that IESO has written to us. So I guess I also have a question for the government side or for the Clerk, because the OPG and the Ontario Energy Board also had expressed some concerns as well: Do we have any correspondence from those agencies asking for us to be more cautious in the distribution of the one million pieces of paper that we've already received thus far?

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

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim):** There's no further correspondence, aside from the ones that were emailed on Friday and distributed yesterday from the other two entities.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Okay. Thank you.

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

Are members ready to vote? Shall the motion carry? The motion is carried.

Further business?

For scheduling issues: Should we start scheduling for next week during the constituency week, or the week after? If we could just get some clarification from the members of the committee. Mr. Romano.

**Mr. Ross Romano:** We should resume the week after constituency week. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria):** Is the committee agreeable to that?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Yes.

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

*The committee adjourned at 1558.*



**SELECT COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY**

**Chair / Président**

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

**Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

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

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

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

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Mrs. Robin Martin (Eglinton–Lawrence PC)

Ms. Lindsey Park (Durham PC)

Mr. Ross Romano (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

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

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

Mr. John Vanthof (Timiskaming–Cochrane ND)

**Clerk / Greffière**

Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim

**Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Nick Ruderman, research officer,  
Research Services