



ISSN 1180-4327

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 2 April 2014

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 2 avril 2014

**Standing Committee on
Public Accounts**

Committee business

**Comité permanent des
comptes publics**

Travaux du comité

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES COMPTES PUBLICS

Wednesday 2 April 2014

Mercredi 2 avril 2014

The committee met at 0901 in room 151.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): I'll call the committee to order.

There was a motion that I believe Mr. Singh distributed last week. You have that version before you, but also I believe the NDP would like to move a motion that's similar but slightly different. I'll ask Mr. Miller to go ahead and move that.

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Last week we tabled a motion, but after consulting with the Auditor General, we would like to make some small changes so that the motion reads as follows:

I move that the Auditor General conduct a value-for-money audit on all security contracts (including the processes for awarding of those contracts) involving the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, the T02015 Pan/Parapan American Games Organizing Committee, the OPP Integrated Security Unit, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services and any security contractors for the T02015 Pan/Parapan American Games.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Would you like to talk about the motion?

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes, I can give you a little explanation of it. Following "on all security contracts," strike out the word "between" and replace it with "(including the processes for awarding of those contracts) involving"—it's an explanation of it. Directly following the "OPP Integrated Security Unit," add "the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services." Those are the changes.

Ms. Soo Wong: Can we get it?

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes, I passed it out. It's right there in front of you.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): You're just explaining the changes—

Mr. Paul Miller: I explained the changes from the original.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): —from the original, yes, which hadn't actually been moved; it was just distributed.

Any discussion? Mr. Balkissoon.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I just have a question of the Auditor General because I just want to make sure what,

in the motion, "value-for-money" would be. The contract has been issued. The performance is not going to be looked at. In my experience of doing a lot of investigative work at the city of Toronto, you cannot just look at the bottom-line dollar bid; you have to look at all the technical issues and how the ranking was done for those technical issues from one tenderer to another. If you could just tell me what you have as your vision of what you're going to go out and conduct here, I have no problem with that.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Auditor?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes, we're fine if the term "value-for-money" is included or excluded. It would be an audit of security contracts.

From my understanding, there is one finalized security contract, and that is signed by the OPP Integrated Security Unit and a private sector security contractor. There is a second one where an RFI has gone out from the Pan Am Games, so that process isn't completed.

The audit would look at the processes around the first one that's finalized and the accountability mechanisms in the contract. The second one would look at the process to date. That's what we would report on.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: So in the first one, you will look at all the specifications and the ranking, how the panel judged one tender against the other one, and offer your opinion or—

Mw. Bonnie Lysyk: We would look at the process. But I do know that they had a fairness monitor involved, so there is a fairness report on that first process. Obviously, we would look at that report as part of it as well.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Klees.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, I have what I think would be considered a friendly amendment that I'd like to put forward.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Frank Klees: I move that everything after the phrase—

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Sorry. You'd like it in writing?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Go ahead. Sorry.

Mr. Frank Klees: I move that everything after the phrase "and on all financial activity of the Pan/Parapan Am Games Secretariat" be added to the end of the motion.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Can we get a copy of that, please? We'll have a five-minute recess to copy the motion.

The committee recessed from 0906 to 0911.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): We'll come back into open session now. There was some discussion going on about the wording of the motion. Yes, Ms. Jaczek?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: What motion are we dealing with? Can we be clear? We have received a piece of paper, I understand, from Mr. Klees, adding a phrase to the original NDP motion. Is that what we're talking about?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Yes. We're talking about the change. We just had a recess so we could have Mr. Klees make what he thought was a friendly amendment to the original motion. That's what we're discussing now.

Mr. Paul Miller: Mr. Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Frank has the floor, so—

Mr. Paul Miller: Oh, go ahead. I was just going to save you some aggravation, but go ahead.

Mr. Frank Klees: Okay. I don't mind aggravation, actually. It's part of what we do here.

Clearly what we don't want to do is stymie the completion of this audit that the NDP is putting forward. We'd like to see that dealt with expeditiously. We would like to see the broader audit.

I was simply going to suggest that we reword this amendment to say that after the completion of the value-for-money audit on all security contracts, as noted above, the Auditor General complete a value-for-money audit on all financial activities of the Pan/Parapan Am Games Secretariat.

That allows us to get on with the initial intent that the member brought forward, but it sends a signal to the Auditor General that, when she has completed that, she has more work to do.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): That sounds like it's a separate value-for-money audit you're proposing. I would suggest that you'd need to table that as a separate motion and we'd discuss that another week. So if you want to, sometime today, get your motion together and distribute it, then perhaps next week we could discuss that motion.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): This amendment is out of order, then. We'll go back to the main motion. I believe Ms. Wong had the next—

Ms. Soo Wong: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. As a new member of this committee—now we're going back to the original motion from Mr. Miller; right?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Yes, that's correct.

Ms. Soo Wong: So first of all, Mr. Chair, through you to the auditor, as a new member of this committee, I need to know the number of reports the auditor is currently reviewing; what's the status of those reports; and what is the timeline she's prepared to present? Because this is now another report that she is going to be embarking on.

I just need to know the report she has in front of her, the priority orders and the timeline, because, as a new member, I have no idea what we're dealing with.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Thank you, Ms. Wong—

Ms. Soo Wong: No, no, I have a lot more questions. That's a first start; okay?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Well, why don't we start with question one first? Okay?

Ms. Soo Wong: Yes, okay.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Auditor? We'll just give the auditor a second.

Ms. Soo Wong: Yes.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: I don't have my notes in front of me, but I'll talk from memory. Right now we're working on 13 value-for-money audits with a reporting date of the beginning of December, as well as about 12 follow-ups with a reporting date at the beginning of December. That's our regular work that we're doing right now.

We have a special that we will be coming out with very shortly on OLGC; that was a committee request. The other committee request was winter roads. We have initiated a conversation with the ministry on that one. For that one, I believe, we committed to report next year. We will get back to the committee with a more concrete date on that one.

We also have been asked to look at CCACs. Again, that one we have not started. For that one, we will likely initiate discussion with the CCACs within about a month and a half from now. That will be reporting, again, in the new year.

We are looking at the teachers' labour contracts. That one we will likely be reporting in the fall of this year.

I know there's another one. Maybe that's it. One, two, three, four—there might be one more. I can't remember. There might be one more.

We have a team system in the office, so it depends on which teams free up and when in order to do it. For this one, if it stayed with the original motion, we would likely start on that within about five weeks and likely be able to report at the end of summer or early fall. I've already had discussions in my office around all of this work.

Ms. Soo Wong: Summer 2014?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes.

Ms. Soo Wong: Okay. So if the motion is approved by the committee, you anticipate the report coming back to the committee in summer or fall 2014.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Correct.

Ms. Soo Wong: As a new member, the other piece where I want to get some clarification on is, as part of the value-for-money reports, will you also be looking at the findings, recommendations or conclusions from the Fairness Commissioner on this piece?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes, for sure.

Ms. Soo Wong: Okay. Now, I know—as was probably reported today in the Globe and Mail—that there are outstanding municipal security contracts still under consideration, and that there is sensitivity to these potential contracts before the municipalities. How far is the scope

of this value-for-money contract review? Because I get that Mr. Miller's primary concern is the private contractors, but we now have municipal security contractors. Are you going to be looking at that? Because we're still not finalized.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: No. In prepping for the committee meeting today, I talked to the ministry and to the OPP in terms of the security contracts that we'd be looking at, and it would just be the ones that are being RFIed and RFPed outside of the municipal contracts.

Actually, my understanding is that there are two: There's the one that's been completed, and there is an RFI that was issued by the Pan Am TO2015 organizing committee just this past month. That is my understanding at this point of the scope of our review.

Ms. Soo Wong: In Mr. Miller's motion to the committee, he's asking for a value-for-money audit for all security contracts. What I'm hearing is—given the nature of the municipal security contract that's still outstanding, wouldn't it be appropriate for us to look specifically at the private contracts? Because at the end of the day, we haven't even finalized the municipal ones. How are you going to look at their contracts when you haven't finalized?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes. I guess we were interpreting the wording as all security contracts between X and X— involving these parties—and any security contractors, excluding municipalities. The wording “security contractors,” in our mind, excluded municipalities.

Ms. Soo Wong: All right. Given your comment, Auditor, I also wanted to ask for clarification in your value-for-money report. I'm going to be tabling an amendment to Mr. Miller's original motion, given your comment just now.

0920

I also want to get some clarification, because there is a lot of confusion about this Pan Am security, the value for Ontarians and what have you. Right now in the reporting, today in the Toronto Star—and I'm going to put it on record—“The final decision was a ministry decision,” said Superintendent Mike McDonnell, head of the ISU.” In your report on value for money, will you be looking at who made the decision? Because the statement here, it's perceived by the superintendent that it's the ministry. Will you be looking at that as well?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Usually, as part of something like this, we would look at the decision and the approval process.

Ms. Soo Wong: Okay. Given your comment, Madam Auditor, Mr. Chair, I'm going to move an amendment to Mr. Miller's original motion.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay, go ahead and move it. Then we'll need to get it in writing.

Ms. Soo Wong: Yes, absolutely.

I move that the Auditor General conduct a value-for-money audit on the private security contract between the OPP and Contemporary Security Canada for the 2015 Pan/Parapan Am Games.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay, we'll take a five-minute recess to get that printed.

The committee recessed from 0926 to 0928.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): We're back in session, then. I believe that—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Committee, we're back in session. Mr. Singh.

Ms. Wong, I believe you had a withdrawal of your motion.

Ms. Soo Wong: I understand, Mr. Chair, that I'm going to withdraw my amended motion. My colleague Mr. Balkissoon will read his amended motion to the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Very well. Mr. Balkissoon?

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just for committee members, Ms. Wong's motion—the amendment was written based on the previous motion that was tabled in front of the committee, and I just realized it. I would move that, in the motion by Mr. Miller, the word “all” after the word “audit on” be deleted, and then at the bottom of the motion where it says “any security contractors,” that that be deleted and substituted “Contemporary Security Canada.” It's pretty simple.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Any debate? Mr. Miller?

Mr. Paul Miller: One word: no.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: This is what the auditor explained she was going to do, so—

Mr. Paul Miller: No, she wasn't going to do that. Anyway, go ahead.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Maybe I need to hear from the auditor, because I got the impression that it was the contract that was already completed, and the ones that are under RFI will not be audited.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Can we have a clarification from the auditor?

Mr. Paul Miller: Just a point of order before you go.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Go ahead, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: What you've done is isolated it to one firm. There are other firms that were in the final group—

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: No, it's the contract with them and the bidding process—

Mr. Paul Miller: No.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Well, let her explain.

Mr. Paul Miller: You isolated it.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Okay. Let her explain. I'm willing to correct it.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Let's get an explanation from the auditor.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: The way I had interpreted the original motion, the motion that you had before you today and what we would do around that, is, we would look at the processes that are in place in those organizations to manage from the budgeting to the final awarding of security contracts—in this case, the one awarded. We would look at the interface between those parties with respect to the second contract, which is in an RFI state. We would look at how that figures into the total money

that has been allocated for security for the Pan Am Games.

By the time we started this audit, I guess I was thinking that there would be more progress on the second one that is under way and we would also be looking at the second one, because I just read it as being “all security contracts.” So we would get a handle on what it looks like with respect to security at the Pan Am Games.

I do understand that the organizing committee itself is the one that provides all the inputs into the RFIs for both of those contracts, in terms of how many venues there are, the time of operation, the assets that need to be protected, and so I viewed both of those contracts as part of this audit.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Even the ones that are not assigned right now? They’re going through the process.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes, because by the time we do this audit and by the time we finish it, I do believe they’ll be further along in that contract.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Balkissoon.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Well, Madam Auditor, with due respect, I don’t have a problem with what you’re saying you’re doing, because you need to audit the front-end processes. But I think the original motion leaves a lot of openings, and that’s my concern. So if we could take a 10-minute break, and you help us tighten it, that’s what I want to clarify.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Klees.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, I think it’s very clear that the auditor has a very good handle on the original motion and has explained to us that she understands it and that she believes she can deliver on the results of that motion.

I think what Mr. Balkissoon is trying to do is scope the intent of the original motion. We’re not prepared to accept that. I would ask you to call the question on the original motion so that we can deal with it.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: I didn’t just draft this without any input from the Auditor General and also through staff and research. This was done with the understanding of what would be involved to do this whole particular audit and what scope. This was not strictly my idea. I certainly used the Auditor General’s expertise and her staff to discuss at least how we would direct this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Balkissoon.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Chair, we have no problem with an audit being done, but from this side of the House, we want to clearly understand where that audit is going to go and what pieces will be audited. The way it is written, when you read it, it says “any security contracts for TO2015.” That could be unending. It could be until the games are finished.

I think we need, as the members on this side—and I hear Mr. Klees very clearly that I’m trying to scope it. Yes, I’m trying to scope it, based on what is done already and not what is going to come in the future.

I have no problem with the auditor doing the processes, because the Fairness Commissioner, which is part of government policy, was involved, and all the pro-

cesses rightly should be audited. I have no problem with that. But when you read “all” and “any” in legal language, there could be many interpretations. I think that when a motion is a motion, it needs to be accurate as to what the intent is. You don’t specify intent in debate.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Just a friendly reminder that we are debating your amendment to the motion, and also that the auditor, I think, has given some indication of how she is interpreting the motion of the committee.

Mr. Miller, and then Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Paul Miller: The point—maybe it can help you out—is that the auditor made it quite clear that this would probably be wrapped up by midsummer or fall, so it’s not a time-consuming situation.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: But that’s not in the motion.

Mr. Paul Miller: I’m taking her expertise.

Secondly, you’re trying to narrow it down to one company. That’s what you’re trying to do.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: No, I’m not.

Mr. Paul Miller: And there are more companies. One of the problems was with the bidding process and how they arrived at that company in the end. We want to know about the other companies, how the comparative analysis goes from the other companies. That’s what she’s trying to get to. By you limiting it to one company, you can’t go that way.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Well, if you go back to my question, Mr. Chair, my very first question to the auditor was to find out if she was going to be auditing the tender process and the judging of the tender process based on specs, based on all the other things that go into a tender—not just money. It was clearly explained that that’s what she would do. I would like to see the motion worded more clearly instead of the words “any” and “all,” because if we understand that it’s the current processes that are in place, we should say that. If we intend to review what has been done on the contract as it has been signed, I expect her to review the tenders that lost and the tender that won, and to come back and tell us that the Fairness Commissioner worked with the TO2015 team and whether they followed government policy or not.

I have a problem with the open-ended pieces that are on here, and I’m sure the auditor understands where I’m coming from. If my motion is problematic, I’m willing to take a 10-minute break, if it’s okay with the Chair, and work with the auditor to see if I could clarify that.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): We have a few people who want to speak first to the motion. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Just briefly, I think it is narrowing the scope down significantly, and I think that the Auditor General has mentioned that she has a good grip on the scope of it and has given us her interpretation of the motion, as it stands. I don’t see any problem with the original motion, minus the amendment. I think that Mr. Klees has already called for the vote; I would support that.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Miller?

Mr. Paul Miller: Call the question.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Ms. Jaczek?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: I would like to ensure that the motion that the Auditor General will be following is very, very clear. From our side, we have absolutely no difficulty whatsoever in an examination of the contract between contemporary security services Canada—I believe that is the name—and the OPP. Clearly, that is of primary interest, as we have heard it in the House, to Mr. Miller.

I do have concerns about examining a contract that is in the process of being evaluated. I would be very concerned that, perhaps, in some way, with the Auditor General asking questions, that would undermine that process. If it's somehow worded in this motion that it is limited to the process that is being undertaken between Toronto 2015 for the internal security within the venues—which is what I believe is the other contract, the other RFI that is out there now—we wouldn't have any difficulty whatsoever in terms of the fairness of the process. But we would want to make very sure that there was no involvement by the AG, in undergoing some sort of evaluation in the middle of that process, that might in some way either delay or there might be some issue in terms of being involved in that process. I can see if it was completed, but it's in the middle of a process here.

As far as we're concerned, we see one completed contract. I'm totally open to having a value-for-money audit by the AG on that contract that currently exists. I think what we're saying is that that is what we should be putting in the motion to make it very clear. It's not the AG's motion, as Mr. Klees pointed out; it is ours as a committee. I think that we need to consider the wording and be very clear on what our expectation is.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay, I think we're ready to vote on the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment? Okay. All those opposed? It's tied. I will vote as the Chair against the amendment to maintain the status quo, so it's defeated.

0940

Now we're back at the original motion. We're back on Mr. Miller's original motion, unamended. Any debate on that?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: Yes. It is our contention that this motion is vague. It does not give clear direction to the Auditor General. I will state again we're perfectly content with an examination of the one security contract that has been issued to date and we're totally open to the AG looking at that.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Did you wish to amend it?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: Sorry?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Did you wish to amend it?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: We would like a 10-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay, a 10-minute recess—

Mr. Paul Miller: I don't think they're allowed to call a recess.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): I think you're right.

Interjection: Call them back.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Sorry, hang on a second. I have to confer with my Clerk here.

I'm sorry, I didn't get the rules right there. My Clerk has just corrected me that you can't just call for a recess without having first at least moved an amendment, or some other reason. We're still debating the motion. I'll wait until you get all your members back before we call the question, in fairness to my mistake.

Mr. Frank Klees: Mr. Chairman, could we also have a recorded vote, please?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): We can have a recorded vote, yes, when the time comes, but I'm going to wait for all the government members to be back, seeing as I was the one who sent away the government.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, we're in session?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): We are in session.

Mr. Frank Klees: While we're waiting, I find it interesting that Ms. Jaczek continues to argue that there is not clear direction in the motion before us. We heard from the Auditor General—this is in the opinion of the Auditor General—that she has very clear direction, understands what the intent of the motion is and there is no confusion whatsoever.

I just would ask Ms. Jaczek why she would question the Auditor General's comments. Perhaps we could just, for Ms. Jaczek's benefit, call the question, because we know the Auditor General has told this committee now twice that she is very confident of what this motion is asking her to do, and she's prepared to do it.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): No, I will not call the question until the government member is back in the room because I did indicate that there would be a recess. Ms. Jaczek?

Ms. Helena Jaczek: Yes, just in response to Mr. Klees: Of course, I have every confidence in the Auditor General and the way she conducts her audits. However, being someone who likes very plain, simple language, without any unnecessary complications, I just simply feel that the motion should reflect exactly what the Auditor General intends to do.

Mr. Paul Miller: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Miller?

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you. With all due respect to the government, I think it's quite clear what we want. It may not be clear to your liking or what you'd like to see in it, but for us and the official opposition, it's very clear. The Auditor General is quite comfortable with it, so I'm not quite sure why you're resisting it. Well, I am sure why you're resisting it, but that's beside the point. That's another story.

The bottom line is that it's quite clear, quite straightforward, quite explicit, very clear, no problem, so I don't know why you're having a problem.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Mr. Balkissoon?

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Chair, no disrespect to the auditor—I have a lot of high regard for auditors. I’ve loved them. In fact, I’ve worked with them in all my political career. In fact, I think I survived politics because I clearly understand auditors’ role and responsibilities.

My problem is that I have difficulty with the English language and how it’s interpreted by various people. Truly, the auditor is here today. I trust she’s here, but you never know what will happen next month or the month after. I am not—

Interjections.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I’ve seen people take motions in my political career and interpret and twist them and do everything they can possible to get what they want later on. I’m just trying to be as clear as I can in simple English language that is specific, and I’ve always learned in politics—

Mr. Paul Miller: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Go ahead, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: Thank you. The bottom line is, we’re not responsible for them to have quorum. They’re responsible to have their people here and they’re delaying. We want to call the question.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): I will wait till 10 minutes are up because that’s what I had said.

Go ahead, Mr. Balkissoon.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I’ve learned in my political career—and I’ve got to tell you, I started from nothing to where I am, and I’ve learned the words “all,” “shall,” “may” and a few others are what you call the “hook.”

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, the hook’s not in there.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: And I’m concerned with the two words, where it says “all” and “any.”

Mr. Paul Miller: That’s not “shall” or “may.” Stall, stall—

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: And I’m being honest.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Did you want to make an amendment?

Mr. Paul Miller: Go ahead.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Are you accepting amendments, because I thought you said we have to vote when we were about to—

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): No, you can make an amendment to the motion.

Interjections.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Give me two seconds.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): For the benefit of the members, there are three minutes until our 10 minutes are up.

I’d like to get the committee back into session. Our 10 minutes are up. Mr. Balkissoon?

0950

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: Mr. Chair, I’ll make it simple then: I will delete the word “all” after the word “audit on” and replace it with “private security contracts.”

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): So the second line is what is being tendered: “private security contracts.” Okay.

Any debate on that? Explanation, Mr. Balkissoon?

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: I think that will clarify what the auditor says. I’m doing this last-minute, on the fly. I’m hoping that it will clarify what is actually going to be looked at because the auditor has said she would look at the front end of all the tendering processes—rightfully so. We have concerns about all the ones that are not completed, that are in the works. We would like her to look at the process, that it’s being followed, that government policy is being followed. Our concern is the ones that are in the works: that there be very little interference in the process, but at least looking at the administrative side is okay.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay. Perhaps I’ll ask the auditor for clarification on that. Auditor?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Could you ask your question of me again? I’m not sure I’m understanding what you’re suggesting.

Mr. Frank Klees: See, now you’re confusing things.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: You did say that you intend to look at the actual process that TO2015 went about doing security contracts. I have no problem with that because that is something that should be audited. I have no problem that they did follow process and include the Fairness Commissioner and that you would include the work of the Fairness Commissioner that staff was doing the appropriate work.

Our concern is all of those processes that are in place and are ongoing now with the municipal sector. In our discussions, we don’t want that process to be interfered with or delayed in any way based on your work on the administrative process of TO2015 following government policy on tendering.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Go ahead, Auditor.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: I can assure you that, when we conduct audits out of our office, we do not interfere with any processes that are in place that deal with decisions made by the government and by the ministries and that. That never comes into play in any of the audits that we do. My understanding, just to clarify the motion—and I had interpreted it as being “private security contracts”—

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: That’s why I’m clarifying it.

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: Yes. That was my original understanding of this.

Mr. Bas Balkissoon: So that’s why I changed the word “all” to “private.” So if you accept it, I hope Mr. Miller will be happy.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): I believe Ms. Wong wanted to make a comment.

Ms. Soo Wong: I believe my colleague Mr. Balkissoon is amending the original motion from Mr. Miller just to make sure that we heard what the auditor said earlier, that she will not be looking at ISU and the hosting municipalities’ contracts currently being reviewed, the RFI. Am I correct? That way, we want to be absolutely clear which firms she’s looking at.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Did you want to comment on it?

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk: The other contract that I understand is out there is looking for a private sector contractor. It's not a contract with the municipalities.

Ms. Soo Wong: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Any further debate on the amendment?

Ms. Jaczek, did you—

Ms. Helena Jaczek: No. I simply wanted to make sure that we were not looking at the municipal contracts, and that's the reason for saying "private."

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay. Mr. Miller, did you have any comment?

Mr. Paul Miller: If it's not in the body of the motion, then it's not part of it. Right?

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): Okay. Are we ready to vote on the amendment? All those in favour? Opposed? It's lost.

Okay. So we're back on the main motion put forward by Mr. Miller, and a recorded vote was asked for.

Ayes

Barrett, Gélinas, Klees, Paul Miller.

The Chair (Mr. Norm Miller): It's carried.

Thank you very much. We're done with that motion. We will go in camera to deal with report writing on Ornge.

The committee continued in closed session at 0955.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 2 April 2014

Committee business.....P-471

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chair / Président

Mr. Norm Miller (Parry Sound–Muskoka PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk PC)

Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk PC)

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

M^{me} France Gélinas (Nickel Belt ND)

Ms. Helena Jaczek (Oak Ridges–Markham L)

Mr. Phil McNeely (Ottawa–Orléans L)

Mr. Norm Miller (Parry Sound–Muskoka PC)

Mr. John O’Toole (Durham PC)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Bramalea–Gore–Malton ND)

Ms. Soo Wong (Scarborough–Agincourt L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Bas Balkissoon (Scarborough–Rouge River L)

Ms. Mitzie Hunter (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Mr. Frank Klees (Newmarket–Aurora PC)

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

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Mr. Rod Jackson (Barrie PC)

Ms. Bonnie Lysyk, Auditor General

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. William Short

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Ray McLellan, research officer,
Research Services

Ms. Susan Viets, research officer,
Research Services