



ISSN 1180-4319

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 41st Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 4 March 2015

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 4 mars 2015

**Standing Committee on
Regulations and Private Bills**

Draft report on regulations

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

Rapport préliminaire
sur les règlements

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 REGULATIONS
AND PRIVATE BILLS**

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

Wednesday 4 March 2015

Mercredi 4 mars 2015

The committee met at 0905 in committee room 1.

DRAFT REPORT ON REGULATIONS

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Good morning, everyone. It's good to see everyone here. The Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills will now come to order.

We are here today to resume consideration of the draft report on regulations made in 2013. You should all have a copy of that draft report. Please note that this is draft number 3 that should be in front of you.

Today we are looking at the Ministry of Transportation, regulation 169/13 on page 8. If all of you will turn to page 8. Just make sure you're on the right pages. Again, it's the Ministry of Transportation, regulation 169/13 on page 8.

As you will see before you, there are three possible recommendations. I'm going to ask Tamara Hauerstock, our legislative researcher, to go over the issue again and to walk all of us through the options that are presented in the report.

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: Good morning. Again, we are on page 8 of draft 3. This is a regulation made under the Highway Traffic Act. It's O. Reg. 169/13, and it falls under the Ministry of Transportation.

This regulation relates to school buses. What the regulation in question did was incorporate an outside standard by reference. It did not have the words of the standard in the regulation itself. It referred to them and brought the standard into the regulation in a drafting technique that we call incorporation by reference.

Under the Legislation Act, when this is done, the outside document is brought into the regulation as it stands on the day the regulation is made. This is known as static incorporation. The regulation that we commented on did not incorporate it in a static manner. It incorporated it including changes to be made in the future. This is known as rolling incorporation. Under the Legislation Act, when this is done, the act in question—in this case, the Highway Traffic Act—is required to specifically permit that.

When we wrote to the Ministry of Transportation, we noted this problem. We reported on it in the first draft of this report and the committee invited a representative of the ministry to provide us with more information. If you

look at page 9 of the report, the underlined paragraph, the black-lined paragraph, just summarizes briefly what the ministry told us. They indicated that the ministry's view is that rolling incorporation is impliedly permitted given the nature of the act, the subject matter and the Canadian Standards Association as the standard-maker.

What we have now, immediately following that paragraph, are three possibilities for the committee's consideration. Looking at possible recommendation number 1, that would be that the committee recommend that the Ministry of Transportation take steps to amend the regulation to comply with the requirements of the Legislation Act.

The next recommendation, recommendation number 2, would be that the committee recommend that the ministry take steps to bring forward a bill to amend the Highway Traffic Act to ensure that the regulation complies with the requirements of the Legislation Act—in other words, that the Highway Traffic Act be amended to expressly allow for the rolling incorporation of this type of document. Although the ministry has told us that it's implied, this would make it express, clearer.

The third possibility, which is not a recommendation but an observation, would be that the committee takes note of the issue, but does not make a recommendation at this time.

0910

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Okay. Thank you, Tamara.

So we have three options on the table, and I think the best way to proceed here is to discuss each of them individually. I want to make sure there's no confusion about which options we are discussing and what's on the table. Does everybody with agree with that possible route, that we'll just start out by discussing each of the three options? Okay?

MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Just sort of hearkening back to the previous debates on this, when we're looking at possible recommendation 1 as compared to 2, so I can remember exactly what we're talking about here, when the ministry came and talked to us, they said that they interpreted this to allow them to have rolling incorporation in terms of this incorporation by reference. But the reason this even comes before us as a question is because we don't see it as—it's static incorporation. So as the

conversation happened before, the ministry said that it would have to go before the court to decide whether it was static or rolling, actually. Is that correct? Do you remember that conversation?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Can I ask the legislative researcher? Go ahead, Tamara.

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: I don't remember them saying that specifically, but I believe what they may have been referring to was that, in their view, it is implied in the Highway Traffic Act, but until a court makes that specific determination, there are different ways of interpreting it.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Right. Okay. So we've got a section of the Highway Traffic Act. Is that right in this case, or—that it can be interpreted one of two ways?

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: Yes. What the ministry told us was that although the act does not specifically state, "Ministry, you may incorporate outside standards, as amended, from time to time," the ministry believes, given the circumstances, the topic, the fact that the Canadian Standards Association is the body that made the standard, that in this circumstance, what they have done is permissible.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Okay. And—

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): If I may just also interject here, just bring us up to speed in terms of memory, but clarify—I understood that this has occurred before, this rolling incorporation.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I can't hear you.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): I'm just saying that I understood that the rolling incorporation and this particular thing had occurred before. Is that correct, Tamara?

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: In this regulation?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Yes.

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: I'm not sure.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Okay.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I think—not to speak for others in the room, but my feeling over the past couple of debates is that we all agree that rolling incorporation that allows for a constant update as the standards change is the safest way of doing business when we're talking about our buses and our kids, so that we all—we know that rolling incorporation would be the best option.

So what we had talked about before—back to possible recommendation 1, which says that if we followed this, it would be a matter of telling them they have to stick to static incorporation or static reference or whatever it's called and that it can't be regularly updated, that would sort of be contrary to what their recommendations were, and our understanding of what's best practice and safest. Is that—

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: What the ministry told us was that if they stuck to the static method of incorporation, each and every time that the outside standard was changed or updated, they would be in a situation where they would have to update their regulation.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Okay. Thank you, MPP French. MPP Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Thank you very much, Chair. I think this is pretty commonplace with outside documents being referenced and that rolling incorporation just makes for life to be easier for everyone.

I think the important thing here is you want to have clarity in our laws so that there is no confusion for those people who may need to have a judge or an adjudicative body make a determination. So I think it's pretty clear that for now and for the future—because we know that these standards will continually evolve, and let's not jeopardize the public—we recommend the legislation be altered to expressly grant the statutory authority to include that rolling mechanism.

Number 2 would be the way to dispense with this: Recommend to the ministry that they be given express statutory authority to do this so that the laws would never have to be subject to a judicial review and interpretation.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP Hillier. MPP McGarry.

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Thank you very much, through you, Chair. Certainly I think we all, around this table, recognize that school bus safety and incorporating regulations in a very quick manner once they are made by the Canadian Standards Association is paramount to our children's safety. All of my children have been bused to and from school for many, many years—decades, in fact—and this is very, very important.

From what I understand, when there is an outside agency—much like the member across the way has suggested—the Canadian Standards Association as an outside body keeps updating the regulations. The way that it's written right now, this is implied explicitly for this particular regulation on school buses and it allows us to update that regulation immediately.

My extreme discomfort over sending it back to be reworded is that each and every time one of these regulations takes place, it's about a year's delay until it's actually passed, and that's unacceptable. For myself, both options—recommendations 1 and 2—are not going to be acceptable; option 3 is.

I don't want to see a delay of any time; I still have children riding the bus. I do know that the Canadian Standards Association is the outside agency that the Ministry of Transportation has been working with for many, many years. I don't see an issue right now; we've not had an issue to date. It's explicitly implied that these regulations will be adopted in rolling incorporation, and the MTO has many such agencies that do add into our regulations.

I do not want to see a delay by a year by having to adopt new wording. Anyway, that's my two cents' worth.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP McGarry. MPP Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Actually, I don't think you quite understand what is happening here. Recommendation 2 would expressly grant authority for that change without coming back to the Legislature. It would be express statutory authority, not inferred, not implied. It would be expressed so that as soon as a standard altered, an outside

document altered, the regulation is automatically updated. So there is no delay under recommendation 2.

I think the important part to understand here is to bring clarity if the matter is ever adjudicated by either a tribunal or by a court. This is not just about school buses; this is about any outside reference standard, so the court does not have to come back and make a determination if the authority was implied or inferred, or if it carries weight. Recommendation 2 tells the court that it is the desire of the Legislature that we grant this continuing authority.

If your argument is that you don't want to have a delay in having those standards incorporated in the regulations, then recommendation 2 is the only one that satisfies your objective.

0920

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP Hillier. MPP Walker, I believe, and then MPP French, and then back—

Mr. Bill Walker: Yes. I just want to continue where my colleague—I think my concern with what I heard from Ms. McGarry is that there's not going to be anything there. Maybe legislative research can clarify if I'm wrong, but if they take this as a recommendation and they work on it, if it was to take a year, the existing regulation stays in place until this one would change it. So I don't know what the big concern would be, and I'm not certain why any member of this committee would not want to make an improvement that has been recommended to us. All of the government is going to look bad if there's something that's implied or inferred but at the end of the day we had the ability to change it so that no one was in non-compliance. I firmly believe number 2 is the way we need to go. It cuts the administrative bureaucracy down the road and it puts us back in compliance with what is expressly worded in the legislation, as opposed to the potential of an interpretation.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP Walker. MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Thank you. When there's the opportunity to interpret—while in this case it's a positive interpretation that we all agree is for the benefit of all, next time that's not a guarantee, because there could be a situation where they don't want to keep up with the standards because it's cumbersome and there's nothing that says they have to.

When you're dealing with “implied” and “interpreted,” that makes me extremely uncomfortable. I think as a committee, and certainly as research, it's been pointed out that there's a spot here where it isn't concrete, it isn't definite. We have found—I'm going to use the term “loophole,” but we have the opportunity here to make a recommendation to the Ministry of Transportation to, as it says here, “take steps to bring forward a bill” that is going to fix the problem. It's going to go to the actual Highway Traffic Act and say, “This needs to be tightened up or allow for rolling incorporation so that this regulation 612 of R.R.O. 1990 complies with that.”

My understanding is, and please clarify, that with recommendation number 2 we're not sending the regulation

back saying, “Fix it. Make it comply with what's current.” What we're saying is, “Hey, take a look at this section here that can be tightened up for future reference and would allow for this current regulation that we're already allowing to continue to be in compliance going forward.” Is that a correct interpretation?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Tamara Hauerstock.

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock: Recommendation number 2 would not touch the regulation. What it would do is recommend that the act itself be amended to expressly permit the rolling incorporation. So it would make express what the ministry has already told us is impliedly permitted and it would make that clear.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: If I can just finish that point—thank you—I would like to go on record as saying I value this report and I have appreciated research's input and guidance, because, as I've said before, I'm new to this and learning. But I also want to go on record as saying I'd like to be a part of a committee that when we identify something to fix, we actually take the initiative to solve that problem. I know what we had seen the last time with the suggested motion that gave a slap on the wrist and a suggestion of “Please, going forward” rather than fixing a problem. I don't want that to be the constant—the constant path forward here is to recommend that they don't do it again next time. I'd like to actually be part of a committee that solves problems and takes recommendations from research as we have the opportunity. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP French. I'm going to go to MPP McGarry.

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Thank you very much, Chair. Again, I do want to point out that the Canadian Standards Association and MTO are in contact a lot, and any regulations that come through regarding school bus safety go through MTO right away.

I'm quite comfortable with the fact that this is done in MTO a lot of times. The Highway Traffic Act is very complex. To my colleague's comment, I do understand the issues and am very comfortable with leaving the recommendation as it is.

Rolling incorporation is, again, utilized frequently. It's explicitly implied in this particular regulation. So I would like to now call the vote, Chair, if I may.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, Chair, I have a comment.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): I'm sorry, but MPP McGarry has the floor and then MPP Lalonde. We're going to go in order of people's requests.

Still more discussion, MPP McGarry?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Yes. May I call the motion?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): I think we need a little more discussion, MPP McGarry.

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: All right. Put me back on the list, then. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): MPP Lalonde.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Well, I've been in and out of this committee, and I do agree with my colleague

in terms of—Mrs. McGarry, when you talk about clarity and ensuring the safety of our children, from the recommendation of the transportation ministry when they came, the implied notion makes it way safer. So when I look at the Canadian Standards Association and our relationship with them, I do believe that ensuring the safety of our kids is what we want in this committee, and making sure that it is done as quickly as possible. I also feel very comfortable myself with recommendation number 3.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): MPP Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I'm going to take a step back here. We have in our standing orders set guidelines. Those guidelines were developed by the Chief Justice of the High Court of Ontario. During the 1970s, we had a royal commission inquiry into civil liberties in this province. You can get a copy of it up in the library.

The chair of the royal commission was a fellow named James McRuer. He developed these standing orders. With this particular regulation that we're looking at today, number (ii), that the "regulations should be in strict accord with the statute conferring of power"—it is not in strict accord. It is, as the ministry says, implied, but it is not in strict accord. Number (iii) in the standing orders in what this committee does says, "Regulations should be expressed in precise and unambiguous language"—precise and unambiguous. That is the reason why this regulation has been flagged by this committee. It is not precise, and it does create some ambiguity. Recommendation 2 deals with those two specific elements so that it puts the regulation in accord with the statute and it is in precise and unambiguous language.

If you go with your proposed do-nothing approach and reject the work and the thoughtfulness of legislative counsel, you're putting yourself in a position—and you're talking about the law here now. We're talking about creating the law. What you're doing is, anybody who is engaged in this activity will be able to make a defence in a court of law that what they needed to do was ambiguous—and it will be a good defence.

If you truly have the safety and security of kids on school buses in mind and if you understand the law, then option 1 will satisfy that, but it will be a continual change updated, having to come back to the Legislature; recommendation 1 would always have to come back to the Legislature whenever the CSA standard was changed. Recommendation 2 allows it to be automatically updated.

Let's not presuppose that anybody here is more knowledgeable and more thoughtful than a royal commission that spent many years—and of the best legal minds in Ontario and, indeed, this country—came up with direction on how this Legislative Assembly could do its job better. Thank you very much.

0930

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP Hillier. Before I go to you, MPP French, I do want to clarify something because of a comment that you made, MPP Hillier. You're referring to the fact that laws

are going to be changed and so on. By amending the Highway Traffic Act that this regulation is underneath, we are actually, and I would like some clarification about this, really taking a broader step to actually change an act and really change the law. I think that this committee needs to understand on some level what that actually means, because this is one specific regulation that has used implied permitting underneath it. By amending the entire act based on this regulation, we are opening, I think, the door to some extent for other things that may come forward that this committee is not considering now.

So I do want everybody here to understand that proposal number 2 is actually suggesting that we amend the entire act as opposed to looking at this specific recommendation. That's the way I understand it. Since you were talking about changing laws, I think it's important that this group understands that.

MPP French?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Thank you. So I think we all reject recommendation 1.

Recommendation 3: If I'm to sort of follow the line here from the other side or from the government that number 3 keeps things as is, the implied rolling incorporation: status quo. It keeps it as it is.

My understanding, as has been confirmed by research, is that recommendation number 2 does that same thing. It's not changing the regulation. It continues as is, status quo. Things are safe; we're moving forward. But it adds a layer in where we take steps to bring forward a bill to amend the Highway Traffic Act and therefore address the root of the issue.

My understanding, and I'm not trying to be contrary to the Chair, but what you just said about your interpretation of this section, that we actually would be amending—I would like to clarify that we are recommending; we're not amending. We are recommending to the Ministry of Transportation, "Hey, we found a problem. We're recommending that you take the steps necessary to fix it." We can't, as I said last week, say, "Thou shalt." We don't have that power in this room.

So options 2 and 3 are the same thing. The regulation doesn't change; it continues as is. Rolling incorporation is implied. Everything stays the same. Kidlets are safe on buses. That's great. But we're saying, "Since this could be a problem in the future, we're recommending you take steps to bring forward a bill." The Ministry of Transportation, in their expertise, can say, "Nope, not gonna." We can't force anyone's hand; we can make a recommendation.

So I don't understand how we could possibly not take number 2 when it's not adding to anyone's workload. The Ministry of Transportation might be unhappy that someone is suggesting they do something else, but I think in good conscience this is not just about buses; it's about what comes down the road and future implications and interpretations, that we cannot guarantee that they will be positively interpreted and implied for the future safety. So I'd like to be on record as saying that I recommend number 2.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP French. MPP McGarry?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Thank you very much. I appreciate all the comments in the room regarding this. We are dealing with regulation 169/13 on this. I also know that we have heard from the legal team at MTO. MTO as a ministry is very, very used to implied rolling incorporation of changes to regulations, especially with the school bus safety and from the Canadian Standards Association.

I'm very comfortable that MTO and their legal team are comfortable that on this particular regulation, 169/13, it is fine to leave as is and to continue the implied rolling incorporation. This reduces the time that it takes to change the regulation. I'm quite comfortable and would like to call the vote on possibility number 3. It's not a recommendation, but an observation: "The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time."

Mr. Mike Colle: Motion to vote on the floor?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Motion to vote on the floor.

Mr. Mike Colle: I'm ready to vote.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): MPP Walker.

Mr. Bill Walker: I still have a further concern. Because I think if we do accept number 3—

Mr. Mike Colle: There's a motion to call the vote on the floor.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No. The Chair had recognized—

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): No; I apologize. Actually, the researcher was talking to me. I apologize.

Mr. Bill Walker: But I had my hand in the air even before the last speaker spoke—

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): No, it's true, MPP McGarry did have a recommendation on the floor. We will call a vote on that. I apologize, MPP McGarry.

Mr. Randy Hillier: What will be the vote?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: I just read it out.

Mr. Randy Hillier: What is the wording of the vote?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: I just read it out.

Mr. Randy Hillier: What is the motion that we've got?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: I just read it out.

Mr. Bill Walker: I can't vote on something I don't understand.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): MPP McGarry, can you clarify what it is that you're putting on the table?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: I will. I'm happy to, thank you very much. Possibility number 3: "The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time."

Mr. Bill Walker: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Is everyone ready to vote?

Mr. Bill Walker: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Recorded vote. So, clarifying, we are voting on possibility number

3: "The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time." I'm just going to consult with the Clerk for a minute.

Everybody can see, actually, option number 3 on page 9 of draft number 3.

Again, I just want to make sure that everybody does understand what we're taking the recorded vote on, possibility number 3: "The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time."

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Point of clarification, or information, or something?

So we'll vote on possibility number 3, as worded, and then can I call a vote for recommendation number 2 after that? I don't know the process here. Can anyone call a vote for anything at any time? Because I don't know what I'm asking really; I just want a vote on number 2.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): The Clerk has clarified for me that if possibility number 3 passes, it basically says "takes note of this issue but makes no recommendations." So essentially the Clerk is advising me that that means that recommendations number 2 and number 1 are negated.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: So we couldn't vote on them just to have on the record?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): No.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Point of order.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Yes. Point of order?

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: Point of order: I do have a motion on the floor.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Yes. Thank you, MPP McGarry.

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry: I will call the vote.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Yes, MPP Hillier?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Can I see the substitution slips for anybody who is not a member of the committee who may be voting on this motion?

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): I'm just consulting about whether or not this is something we can do when we're in the middle of a vote.

Mr. Randy Hillier: We want to recognize who is legitimate to vote.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): The Clerk advises me that she does have the substitution slips in her hand and all of the members who are present are able to vote. Of course, MPP Hillier, as we know, you are here as an observer and you will not be voting.

Mr. Mike Colle: Oh, I thought he was a voting member.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, no.

Mr. Bill Walker: Just knowledge.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): All right. We're calling the vote now. All those in favour—this is a recorded vote—of possibility number 3: "The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time."

All of those in favour, please raise your hands—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Twenty-minute recess? I called for a 20-minute recess.

Mr. Mike Colle: He's not a voting member.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): No. And we're in the middle of a vote. I'm sorry, MPP Hillier; you should have mentioned this before the vote was called.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): You did not request a 20-minute recess before the vote was called in a recorded vote.

Please go ahead, Clerk.

Ayes

Colle, Lalonde, Mangat, McGarry.

Nays

Bailey, French, Walker.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you very much, everybody. It carries. Recommendation number 3—"The committee has taken note of this issue but makes no recommendation at this time"—carries.

MPP Walker?

Mr. Bill Walker: Madam Chair, I would like it noted in the record that I'm concerned that we have taken the action that we have, because this regulation is now going to come back in the next review, I would suggest, because it still stands outstanding. The member who said that we're slowing things down and we're taking time and it's making all of this extra work—we're now going to have this exact same issue come back to this exact

same body next time and we're still not going to be following the standing orders.

I'm very concerned that we've done this whole process—we've had an ability to change legislation for the betterment of Ontario and it hasn't happened as a result of the actions of the government.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you very much, MPP Walker. MPP French?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I would like to be on the record as saying that I am very uncomfortable to be part of a process—this is now twice that we have recommended nothing, that we have taken no action, that it has been strictly, "Going forward, please do better next time." I would like to be on record as saying that I hope in the future we will value the recommendations as put forward by our research team, that we appreciate—

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): Thank you, MPP French. We are going to move forward now.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Madam Chair, I'd like to place a motion before the committee.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): I'm sorry, MPP Hillier. You cannot move a motion without a proper substitution slip.

Mr. Mike Colle: I move adjournment of the committee.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): MPP Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: I move adjournment.

The Chair (Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris): All those in favour of adjournment? All those opposed? Motion carried. Adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 0942.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 4 March 2015

Draft report on regulations T-45

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Chair / Présidente

Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris (Halton L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Mrs. Kathryn McGarry (Cambridge L)

Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest L)
Ms. Jennifer K. French (Oshawa ND)
Mr. Monte Kwinter (York Centre / York-Centre L)
Mrs. Amrit Mangat (Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud L)
Mrs. Kathryn McGarry (Cambridge L)
Ms. Indira Naidoo-Harris (Halton L)
Ms. Daiene Vernile (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre L)
Mr. Bill Walker (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Mike Colle (Eglinton–Lawrence L)
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Ottawa–Orléans L)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Mr. Randy Hillier (Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Tamara Hauerstock, research officer,
Research Services