ISSN 1180-4319

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Second Session, 40th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Deuxième session, 40e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 16 April 2014

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 16 avril 2014

Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills

Comité permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé

Chair: Peter Tabuns
Clerk: Valerie Quioc Lim

Président : Peter Tabuns
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:

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 :

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.

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

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Wednesday 16 April 2014

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES RÈGLEMENTS ET DES PROJETS DE LOI D'INTÉRÊT PRIVÉ

Mercredi 16 avril 2014

The committee met at 0900 in committee room 1.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): The Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills will now come to order. Our first item of business is the appointment of the subcommittee on committee business. Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: Mr. Chair, I have a motion to put before the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Please.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that the Clerk, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 177, MPP Salary Freeze Act, 2014:

(1) One day of public hearings on the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee followed by one day of clause-by-clause consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting;

(2) Advertisement on the Ontario Parliamentary Channel, the committee's website and the Canadian NewsWire;

(3) Witnesses are scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis;

(4) Each witness will receive up to five minutes for their presentation followed by nine minutes for questions from the committee members;

(5) The deadline for written submissions is 3 p.m. on the day of public hearings;

(6) The research office will provide a summary of the presentations by 5 p.m. on Friday of the same week following public hearings;

(7) The deadline for filing amendments with the Clerk of the committee be at 12 noon on the day preceding clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Members of the committee, we have an agenda. It's up to you whether you want to proceed on this now or hold it down until later in the meeting. Ms. McKenna?

Mrs. Jane McKenna: Yes, can we hold it down?

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Okay. Is that the consensus? Okay.

So I'll go back to the agenda. I understand we have a motion. Mr. Vanthof?

Mr. John Vanthof: I move that a subcommittee on committee business be appointed to meet from time to time at the call of the Chair or at the request of any member thereof, to consider and report to the committee on the business of the committee;

That the presence of all members of the subcommittee is necessary to constitute a meeting; and

That the subcommittee be composed of the following members: the Chair as Chair, Mr. Fraser, Mrs. McKenna, and Ms. Fife; and

That substitution be permitted on the subcommittee.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Is there any discussion on this? There being none, shall the motion carry? Carried.

DRAFT REPORT ON REGULATIONS

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Now we move on to the draft report on regulations made in 2012. Research officer Andrew McNaught will introduce the report and we will follow through with him. Mr. McNaught?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Good morning. I'm Andrew McNaught of the legislative research service. Today I'm here as counsel to the committee. As the Chair indicated, we're here to consider a draft report on regulations made in 2012. You should have a copy of that report in front of you.

As I suspect not all of you are familiar with the regulations review process, I'm just going to begin with a quick overview of the committee's regulations mandate. That mandate is set out in section 33 of the Legislation Act and in the standing orders. The act and the standing orders provide that the committee is to examine the regulations made each year under Ontario statutes. In conducting this review, the committee is to ensure that regulations were made in accordance with the nine guidelines set out in the standing orders. You should have in front of you a copy of the standing orders.

These guidelines reflect legal principles that are recognized in most common-law jurisdictions. Over the years, the two guidelines that have been most frequently cited in committee reports are guidelines (ii) and (iii). The effect of guideline (ii) is that there should be clear authority in the enabling statute to make a regulation. Guideline (iii) provides that regulations should be expressed in clear and precise language.

The committee's mandate specifically excludes any consideration by the committee of the merits of the policy or the objectives of a particular regulation. In other

words, the committee is to consider only the narrow legal principles that are set out in the committee's guidelines.

I just forewarn you that the draft report deals with specific sections of regulations and that the discussion in the report concerns issues that are somewhat technical and legalistic. They do not concern the merits or policy underlying the regulation.

Finally, the Legislation Act requires the committee to report from time to time its observations, opinions and recommendations.

I'll just quickly run through the chronology of events in the regulations review process. As I'm sure you know, regulations are made by cabinet, a minister, or other body authorized in a statute to make regulations. The regulations are drafted by ministry legal branches in consultation with the Office of Legislative Counsel at the Ministry of the Attorney General. The regulations are then filed with the registrar of regulations and become law on the date they were filed or on another date specified in the regulation. The regulations are then published on the government's e-Laws website and in the Ontario Gazette.

The lawyers/research officers at the Legislative Research Service then read the published regulations, to assess compliance with the nine guidelines set out in the standing orders. We flag potential violations of the guidelines and write letters to the ministry legal branches responsible for the regulations in question. We then consider the ministry responses, and where we believe a regulation continues to be problematic, we include it in a draft report. Once the draft report is ready, it goes to the committee, and that's where we are today.

I just have to begin by making a disclaimer. You'll see from the cover page that my colleague Tamara Hauerstock conducted the regulations review and wrote this report. She is unable to be here today, so I'm filling in on short notice. I'll do my best to answer any questions you might have.

Beginning on page 1, we have our standard introduction, explaining the role of the committee and what the report covers. Next is a section on statistics for the years 1993 to 2012, and that sets out basic statistics on regulations filed in that period. You'll see that over that 20-year period, the average number of regulations filed each year was 582. And 448 regulations were filed in 2012, so we're below the 20-year average for the year covered by this report.

Pages 3 and 4 then set out some statistics for regulations made in 2012.

On page 5, we have "Regulations Reported." This section is the substantive part of the report. It discusses regulations we have identified as possible violations of the committee guidelines. As noted in the opening paragraph, we reviewed the 448 regulations made in 2012 and wrote letters to 11 ministries raising questions about 24 regulations.

After considering the ministries' responses, we've decided to report nine regulations under guidelines (ii) and (iii), which are the two guidelines I mentioned earlier. Regulations are reported under the ministry responsible for them.

In the middle of page 5, under the heading "Ministry of Agriculture and Food," we discuss three regulations for which this ministry is responsible.

The first is a regulation made under the Grains Act. This is perhaps a relatively unknown statute, but I'll just note that it generally requires all grain dealers and elevator operators in the province to be licensed, and requires that they pay grain producers and owners within specified timelines.

In 2012, the general regulation under that act was amended to provide for deferred payment contracts between grain producers and grain elevator operators and dealers. My understanding is that these amendments were made to allow grain producers to take advantage of certain income tax rules. Don't ask me to explain what those rules are, but that's the rationale.

0910

The 2012 amendment also provided that where the owner of grain and the grain elevator operator enter into a deferred payment contract for the storage of grain, the owner will be deemed to have received compensation and the ownership of the grain will be deemed to have been transferred at the time the two parties entered into the deferred payment contract. We were unable to find explicit authority in the act to make a regulation that deems compensation to have been made in these circumstances.

As we set out on page 6, the ministry has pointed to three regulation-making powers in the act as possible authority for the deeming provision. However, we're taking a strict position, I guess, in saying that while there might be a good policy underlying the deeming provision, there needs to be more explicit authority in the act.

Our recommendation at the bottom of page 6 is that the ministry take steps to bring the regulation into compliance with the regulation-making powers in the act.

Do you want any discussion on that point, or can we move on to the next—

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Is there any discussion on this? Is the recommendation that's set out here acceptable to the committee? Do I need to be any more formal than that?

All those in favour of this recommendation? All those opposed? Carried.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: The next regulation reported is at the top of page 7, and this is under the Animal Health Act. The issue we're raising here is very technical. I'll try to be as brief as possible.

The purpose of the Animal Health Act is to provide for the protection of animal health and to establish measures to assist in the prevention of hazards associated with animals that may affect animal health or human health. One of the protective measures in the act is that the minister and/or the Chief Veterinarian for Ontario may order the destruction of animals where they pose a public health hazard.

In addition, the minister may authorize the payment of compensation to the owners of animals that have been destroyed, and as well, the minister may refuse or reduce compensation in the circumstances mentioned in the act and in additional circumstances that may be prescribed in the regulations.

The regulation at issue here sets out eight additional circumstances in which the minister may refuse or reduce compensation to animal owners. However, in our view, the regulation cites the wrong section of the act as the authority to make the regulation. We believe another regulation-making power should have been identified. You can read the discussion, if you like, on page 7, but in a nutshell, the ministry appears to agree with us, as it has said that it will consider recommending amendments clarifying the statutory authority to make the provision in question when the regulation is next brought forward for amendments.

Nonetheless, we're still recommending at the bottom of page 7 that the ministry amend the regulation so that it refers to the proper regulation-making power in the act.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any questions or discussion? Mr. Walker.

Mr. Bill Walker: Just a point of clarification, Mr. McNaught: When that goes to the ministry, if they choose to disregard what you're saying, do we just go through another loop with the same old thing again?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: No. The committee's mandate is to make recommendations. At the end of the day, the ministry can choose to take the advice or not.

Mr. Bill Walker: Okay.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Your colleague Mr. Hillier wanted us to have more authority than that, but that's for another day, I guess.

Mr. Bill Walker: I would probably concur with my colleague. I think we go in circles an awful lot.

Mrs. Laura Albanese: Sorry—so it's different from, let's say, the public accounts committee, where the Auditor General will go back after two years and basically see if the recommendations were adopted by the ministry?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: In fact, at the end of the report, we do have an update on previous recommendations and actions that have or have not been taken in response to our recommendations. If the committee wishes, we can continue to do that. The committee's mandate provides that all regulations, regardless of when they were made, stand permanently referred to the committee. The committee is free to go back 10 years and look at a recommendation, if you like. That's a decision the committee has to make.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Further questions? Is the recommendation acceptable? Carried? Carried.

Mr. McNaught.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: On page 8 is a regulation under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002. This is the third regulation we're reporting under the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. The issue here concerns the Legislation Act, 2006. This is the act that sets out the rules governing the publication, citation and interpretation of Ontario statutes and regulations. Section 62 of the Legislation Act provides that a regulation may incorporate an existing document by reference. For example, a regulation might refer to a map published by the Ministry of Natural Resources or a technical document relating to drinking water quality. One of the rules of incorporation by reference is that both the current document and earlier versions of the document that were incorporated by reference must remain readily available to the public.

In 2012, the general regulation under the act was amended to update certain documents that were incorporated by reference. For example, the regulation as amended now refers to the nutrient management protocol for 2012 instead of the nutrient management protocol for 2009. However, our search of the ministry's website did not locate all the versions of the reference documents, as required by the Legislation Act.

In response to our inquiry, the ministry said that the reference documents are, in fact, now posted on the ministry's website. So in this section, we're simply reporting that the ministry has addressed our concerns. Accordingly, we're not making a specific recommendation here.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Walker.

Mr. Bill Walker: Not to be pedantic, but just for clarification again: When you say that, Mr. McNaught, you have gone and made sure that they are there? Or you've just accepted their response that they have done that?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: I personally haven't done that. I'm sure—

Mr. Bill Walker: But you're trusting your colleagues have done that?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: My colleague did do that, yes.

Mr. Bill Walker: Thank you very much.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): There is no recommendation here. We'll move on to the next section.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: In the middle of page 8, under the Ministry of Infrastructure, is a regulation made under the Places to Grow Act, 2005. That act provides for the identification and designation of growth plan areas and the development of strategic growth plans for those communities. At issue here are regulations that establish transition rules for the period following the coming into force of the act.

One of the prescribed transition rules provides that applications relating to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe that had been initiated prior to the coming into force of the act would be continued after the act took effect. In prescribing these rules, the regulations made several references to policies. However, the policies were identified by number only, and there was no description of what the policies actually were. We raised this as a possible violation of the committee's third guideline, which requires that regulations be written in clear language.

In response to our inquiry, the ministry explained that the policies referenced in the regulations are policies

under the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. In fact, the ministry said that the regulations have subsequently been amended to more clearly identify these policies. So again, the ministry has addressed our concerns, and the committee will not be making a specific recommendation here.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Unless there are questions, we'll go on to the next section. Mr. Nicholls.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Mr. McNaught, I was just curious. I get a little edgy, I guess, when I see "Ministry of Energy," and then we talk about growth plans. What I'm wondering—

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Sorry, it's the Ministry of Infrastructure.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure?

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): At one point, they were—

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: I'm afraid I'm not aware of the history of that title.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: You were correct. You did say "Ministry of Infrastructure," and I just thought it was an oversight.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: No.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Okay, so it's not that. Okay.

When you talk about a growth plan, can you describe for me what you mean by a growth plan?

0920

Mr. Andrew McNaught: This is land use planning, so it sets certain rules for development. Beyond that, I'm not an expert on that.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: That's fair.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: But it controls land use planning in the designated area.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: When I saw the word "energy" tied in with that, I got a little concerned. I was thinking of windmills and turbines and growth plans for those.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: I think that's another act.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Questions satisfied? We've gone through that.

Next, the Ministry of Government Services.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Right. On page 9, under "Ministry of Government Services," is a regulation under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, otherwise known as MFIPPA. This act, as you probably know, creates a right of access to general information held by municipal institutions and the right of access to records containing personal information held by municipal institutions.

Under the act, a request for access to information must be made in writing. However, the regulations dealing with access-to-information requests require that an access request must be in writing, as required under the act, but, in addition, the regulations require that an access request must state that it is being made under MFIPPA.

We were unable to find authority in the act to make regulations imposing this additional requirement. The ministry's explanation is that the requirement to specify that a request has been made under the act is necessary in order for the municipality to distinguish between formal FOI requests and informal requests. The significance here is that certain provisions of the act apply to formal requests but do not apply to informal requests.

The ministry argues that cabinet's authority to prescribe forms for the purpose of the act is sufficient authority to require that access-to-information requests identify the act under which the request is being made. Our position is that the authority to prescribe forms is not broad enough to impose this additional requirement. Rather, there should be explicit authority in the act to do this.

So our recommendation at the bottom of page 10 is that the regulation be amended to remove the requirement that an access-to-information request must state that it is being made under the act. That's the recommendation.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): And "the requirement that a request for correction of personal information be in writing...."

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any questions or discussion on this recommendation? There being none, shall it carry? Carried.

Mr. McNaught?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: On page 11, under "Ministry of Labour," there's a regulation under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. The regulation at issue here requires employers to take measures to limit the exposure of workers to specified hazardous biological or chemical agents in accordance with criteria set out in a table in the regulation, or, if the hazardous agent is not listed in the table, in accordance with criteria set out in a document published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. That regulation is incorporated into the regulation by reference.

So as with the regulation discussed earlier under the Nutrient Management Act, the question here is whether the regulation meets the requirements of the Legislation Act with respect to incorporation of documents by reference. Again, the Legislation Act requires that when a regulation incorporates a document by reference, the minister responsible for the regulation must ensure that the documents are readily available to the public, including all previous versions of it.

We were unable to locate these documents on the Internet. The ministry is arguing that it meets the public availability requirement by posting tables on its website containing some but not all information from the incorporated documents. We pointed out that these tables posted by the ministry come with a disclaimer that the public should not rely solely on the tables. So our position is that the Legislation Act requires that the full version of documents incorporated by reference, not summaries of those documents, must be publicly available. That's our recommendation at the bottom of page 11.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any questions for Mr. McNaught? Any comments on this? Shall the recommendation be carried? Carried.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: At the top of page 12, under "Ministry of Natural Resources," is a regulation under the Endangered Species Act, 2007. Just by way of background, the Endangered Species Act prohibits the killing or harming of threatened or endangered species, and it also protects the habitats of threatened or endangered species. The regulation at issue here contains descriptions of protected habitat, and one of these descriptions refers to a document published by the Ministry of Natural Resources. Specifically, it refers to the document as it "may be amended from time to time." Again, we're questioning whether the regulation meets the requirements of the Legislation Act regarding incorporation of documents by reference. In this case, the rule under the act provides that a regulation must refer to a document as it read at the time the regulation was made. In other words, the regulation should not refer to a document that may change over time. This is known as rolling incorporation. We question whether a reference to a document as it "may be amended from time to time" violates the Legislation Act's prohibition against rolling incorporation.

The ministry points out that the rules in the Legislation Act apply unless a contrary intention is indicated in the enabling statute. In this case, they're saying that, when looked at as a whole, the Endangered Species Act indicates an intention to allow rolling incorporation of documents. We're taking the position that, if the Legislature had intended to allow rolling incorporation, it would have stated this explicitly in the act. As it turns out, the ministry, last December, amended the regulation by revoking the reference to documents that could be amended from time to time. So, as the ministry has addressed our concern, we're not making a recommendation here.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any questions before we move on? There being none, Mr. McNaught.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: On page 13, under "Ministry of Northern Development and Mines," we're raising two issues in regard to a regulation under the Mining Act. The first issue concerns exploration permits issued under the act. Subsection 78.2(3) provides that a person carrying out prescribed early-stage mineral exploration activities may not carry out any such activity unless the person has obtained an exploration permit from the ministry.

The regulation prescribes the early-stage exploration activities that require an exploration permit, but then goes on to give directors of exploration plans and permits at the ministry discretion to require exploration permits in certain additional circumstances. We were unable to find authority in the act to make regulations granting ministry directors discretionary power to require exploration permits. Our recommendation, in the middle of page 14, is in effect that the regulation be amended to remove the discretionary authority given to ministry directors.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any questions or comments on the recommendation before you? Shall it be carried? Okay, I see nodding of heads, I hear at least one "carried." Good, thank you.

Mr. NcNaught.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: The second issue we raise in connection with this regulation, in the middle of page 14, also concerns exploration permits, but in this case concerns the terms and conditions that may be attached to permits. The regulation-making authority in the act authorizes regulations prescribing standard terms and conditions for exploration permits. The regulation made under this authority prescribes those terms and conditions, but then goes on to give ministry directors discretion to waive any of these terms or conditions. Again, we were unable to find authority in the act for making a regulation permitting directors to waive terms and conditions on exploration permits.

0930

The ministry argues that the list of terms and conditions in the regulation is expressly made subject to a director's discretion to waive those terms and conditions. In other words, they're saying that the director's authority to waive terms and conditions is itself a term or condition of an exploration permit.

Our position is that standard terms and conditions should not become standard only if a ministry director chooses not to waive them. The authority to do that should be stated explicitly in the act, so our recommendation on page 15 is that the regulation be amended to remove the discretionary authority given to ministry directors.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. Any questions? Mr. Nicholls?

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Just a quick question, Mr. McNaught: What you're suggesting here is that discretionary decisions are taken away from the director—

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Are given to the director.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Are given to the director?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: Yes.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: In the first recommendation, which we talked about earlier, was it taken away from the director?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: No, it was also given.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Also given, then? Okay. All right.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: We're saying that you have to have authority in the act to give them that discretionary power.

Mr. Rick Nicholls: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Any further questions or comments? Shall this recommendation carry? Carried.

Mr. Andrew McNaught: All right. So, in the middle of page 15, under "Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities," we're raising two issues in connection with a regulation under the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009.

The first issue concerns the role of the Ontario College of Trades in determining the apprentice-to-journeyperson ratios for skilled trades. For this purpose, the act authorizes the board of governors at the college to make regulations prescribing the number of apprentices who may be

sponsored or employed by a person in a trade in relation to the number of journeypersons employed.

However, the board has made a regulation that deems journeyperson candidates, which is a class of workers somewhere in between apprentices and certified journeypersons, to be apprentices for the purpose of the apprentice-to-journeyperson ratios. Again, we could find no authority in the act to make regulations deeming journeyperson candidates, who are individuals not mentioned in the act, to be apprentices for the purposes of the apprentice-to-journeyperson ratios.

Now, the ministry points out that, if journeyperson candidates are not deemed to be apprentices, then these individuals would be able to practise compulsory trades outside of the ratio requirements. In the report, we're acknowledging this policy issue; however, we're acknowledging that the act contemplates only two classes of individuals: apprentices and journeypersons.

So we're recommending that the ministry take steps to ensure that there is authority in the act to make the regulation. I guess, in effect, we're arguing that the act needs to be amended to allow for designating journeyperson candidates. That's the recommendation on page 16.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Any questions or comments on this recommendation? Shall this recommendation carry? Carried. Thank you.

Mr. McNaught?

Mr. Andrew McNaught: The last issue, you'll be glad to hear, starts at the bottom of page 16. It concerns a requirement under the act that workers must have a Certificate of Qualification to be employed in certain skilled trades. For this purpose, the act gives the board of governors of the Ontario College of Trades authority to make regulations prescribing standards, qualifications and other requirements that must be met in order to obtain a Certificate of Qualification.

Now, the regulation made under this authority provides that applicants for a Certificate of Qualification must meet prescribed standards and qualifications. However, the regulation also provides that an applicant does not have to meet these requirements if the applicant can provide "proof that is satisfactory to the registrar" of the college that the applicant has qualifications and experience that are equivalent to the prescribed requirements.

It was not clear to us whether the phrase "proof that is satisfactory to the registrar" means that the registrar is to decide that the qualifications and experience presented by the applicant are equivalent to the prescribed requirements, or whether this means that the registrar is to decide if the applicant has presented sufficient evidence that he or she has met the equivalent qualifications and experience.

We raise this as a possible violation of the committee's third guideline which, again, requires that regulations be expressed in clear language.

At the top of page 17, we indicate that the ministry is, in fact, somewhat sympathetic to this concern. They've said that they will be approaching the college about making a clarifying amendment.

The last recommendation at the bottom of page 17 is that the regulation be amended—in effect, that's my reading of the recommendation anyway—to clarify exactly what the role of the registrar is with respect to assessing equivalency of qualifications and experience.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. Are there any questions or comments on this recommendation? There being none, shall it be carried? Carried.

Shall the draft report, including recommendations, carry? Carried.

Who shall sign off on the final copy of the draft? The Chair or the subcommittee?

Interjection: Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Chair. Shall the report be printed? It shall.

Shall I present the report to the House and move the adoption of its recommendations? Agreed. We're done with that item of business.

Mr. Fraser, we go back to your motion.

Mr. John Fraser: That's great. I think the Clerk has a copy of the motion. Does everybody want a copy of that? Has everybody got one?

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): I think everyone does have a copy.

Mr. John Fraser: Everybody has a copy?

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): And you've read it out loud, so it's in Hansard.

Mr. John Fraser: I think it's pretty straightforward. We passed second reading on Monday this week. I think we should move forward and get this thing done. It's fairly simple and straightforward. I don't know if anybody else has any other comments.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Can I just have clarity? When you talk about the one day of public hearings followed by a day of clause-by-clause, you're talking about separate days?

Mr. John Fraser: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): All right.

Mrs. Jane McKenna: That's what I was just going to ask, myself, if it was separate days. Okay. That's fine. But I would also like to say that we're looking forward to bringing this bill into committee so that we can look at ways to incorporate aspects of a broader public sector wage freeze into the bill in an attempt to further reduce the cost of government to the taxpayers.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Any other comments? There being none, all those in favour of the adoption of this motion? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

The committee stands adjourned until our next regularly scheduled meeting.

The committee adjourned at 0938.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 16 April 2014

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Chair / Président
Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente
Ms. Catherine Fife (Kitchener–Waterloo ND)

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)
Ms. Dipika Damerla (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville L)
Ms. Catherine Fife (Kitchener–Waterloo ND)
Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)
Mr. Monte Kwinter (York Centre / York-Centre L)
Ms. Jane McKenna (Burlington PC)
Mr. Rick Nicholls (Chatham–Kent–Essex PC)
Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)
Mr. Bill Walker (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants
Mrs. Laura Albanese (York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston L)
Mr. John Vanthof (Timiskaming–Cochrane ND)

Clerk / Greffière
Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim

Staff / Personnel
Mr. Andrew McNaught, research officer,
Research Services