

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

# STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

## **FIRST INTERIM REPORT: STUDY OF THE REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE PRECINCT**

1<sup>st</sup> Session, 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament  
1 Charles III

ISBN 978-1-4868-6876-6 [English] (Print)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-6877-3 [French] (Print)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-6878-0 [English] (PDF)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-6879-7 [French] (PDF)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-6880-3 [English] (HTML)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-6881-0 [French] (HTML)

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

The Honourable Ted Arnott, MPP  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Sir,

Your Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs has the honour to present its Report and commends it to the House.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jennifer French".

Jennifer K. French, MPP  
Chair of the Committee

Queen's Park  
March 2023



# STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS MEMBERSHIP LIST

1<sup>st</sup> Session, 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament

JENNIFER K. FRENCH  
Chair

MATTHEW RAE  
Vice-Chair

JESSICA BELL

GRAHAM MCGREGOR

DAWN GALLAGHER MURPHY

SAM OOSTERHOFF

MIKE HARRIS

AMARJOT SANDHU

CHRISTINE HOGARTH

STÉPHANE SARRAZIN

TED HSU

JAMIE WEST

MONIQUE TAYLOR regularly served as a substitute member of the Committee.

---

CHRISTOPHER TYRELL  
Clerk of the Committee

NICK RUDERMAN  
Research Officer

MICHAEL VIDONI  
Research Officer

JOANNE MCNAIR  
Table Research Clerk



---

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS WITH THE DEPUTY CLERK AND DIRECTOR OF PRECINCT PROPERTIES BRANCH	1
Heating System	2
Designated Substances	3
Information Technology	3
Security and Access	3
TOUR OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUILDING AND MEETING WITH PRECINCT PROPERTIES BRANCH OFFICIALS	3
TOUR OF THE PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT AND MEETING WITH MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT	5
The Committee's Reflections on the Tour	5
The Need for a Full Decant	5
Non-Partisanship and Parliamentary Oversight	6
Project Management and Engagement	6
Project Planning, Implementation, and Trade-offs	7
Meeting with Members of Parliament	7
COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON RENOVATIONS TO THE FEDERAL PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT	8
Consultation and Connectivity	8
Effective Governance	8
Effective Communication and Resourcing	8
Stewardship and Lessons Learned	9
RECOMMENDATIONS	9
APPENDIX A: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE REGARDING STUDY ON THE REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE PRECINCT	
APPENDIX B: WITNESS LIST FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS	
APPENDIX C: CHRONOLOGY OF RENOVATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE PRECINCT	
APPENDIX D: SELECTED PHOTOGRAPHS, LEGISLATIVE BUILDING	



## **INTRODUCTION**

The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs (Committee) is pleased to present its first Interim Report on the Rehabilitation and Restoration of the Legislative Precinct.

On November 24, 2022, the Committee adopted a subcommittee report pursuant to Standing Order 110(g) to conduct a study on the lifespan and deficiencies with the building systems in the Legislative Precinct and the need for rehabilitation and restoration (Appendix A).

The Committee held public hearings on the rehabilitation and restoration of the Legislative Precinct on November 29, 2022, and February 9, 2023. The Committee also toured the Legislative Building and met with Precinct Properties Branch officials on December 6, 2022, toured the federal Parliamentary Precinct on February 8, 2023, and met with Members of Parliament on February 9, 2023.

This report begins with an overview of public hearings held with the Deputy Clerk and the Director of the Precinct Properties Branch of the Legislative Assembly. It proceeds to provide an overview of a tour of the Legislative Building and the meeting with Precinct Properties Branch officials. This is followed by a summary of the Committee's tour of the federal Parliamentary Precinct and meetings with Members of Parliament, and its public hearings on the renovations to the Parliamentary Precinct.

## **COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS WITH THE DEPUTY CLERK AND DIRECTOR OF PRECINCT PROPERTIES BRANCH**

On November 29, 2022, the Committee heard from Deputy Clerk Trevor Day and Jelena Bajcetic, Director of Precinct Properties Branch. The witnesses had been invited to brief the Committee and take questions on the current state of the Legislative Building, and to discuss the need for restoration or rehabilitation. The following summary was prepared with reference to *Hansard*.

Mr. Day gave a brief overview of the challenges in maintaining the building, particularly its aging mechanical, electrical, and life and fire safety systems which are at, or are approaching, the end of their service life. He stated that a full rehabilitation of the building and grounds would allow for "much-needed upgrades to meet modern safety, security, environmental, and accessibility standards and to make the building once again functional for generations to come."

The Committee heard from Ms. Bajcetic about renovation projects in the 1990s, which included a roof replacement, masonry and window repair, and some mechanical, fire safety, and accessibility upgrades. More recent rehabilitation projects from the past decade include "the full excavation of the perimeter of the building to upgrade the foundation drainage, additional elevator upgrades, various life and fire safety upgrades, washroom upgrades related to accessibility, a five-year masonry and window maintenance program, and the addition of the screening facility."

However, the Committee was told that a 2012 historic structures report noted many more deficiencies in the building, including,

- a lack of total fire sprinkler coverage;
- inefficient and obsolete steam-supplied radiators;
- a reliance on original piping (some from 1893), which is difficult to upgrade since it is encased in masonry and insulated with asbestos;
- limited or insufficient power supply to various equipment and certain parts of the building;
- vast quantities of redundant and hazardous cabling, much of it in congested cableways and difficult to remove;
- inadequate emergency power for the building; and
- lack of smoke management systems for interconnected floor areas.

These findings were confirmed in a follow-up technical review of the building's various systems. Notably, the Committee heard that the "overall determination of the studies also concluded that the best option, from a technical, budgetary and timing perspective, was that a full decommissioning should take place." Further, the process, which could take as much as eight years, proposes to replace all major systems in the building, including "fire protection for all floors, electrical and IT distribution throughout the building, full plumbing and domestic water distributions, and full HVAC, heating and cooling with controls throughout the entire building."

The Committee was not provided with a cost estimate at this time, but Ms. Bajcetic indicated that a new master plan for the rehabilitation would need to be prepared to inform the work, as the previous one (1991) was out-of-date. Mr. Day noted that normally, Assembly expenses are approved by the Board of Internal Economy, but that given the scope and potential cost, the project may be undertaken in cooperation with the Ministry of Legislative Affairs.

Specific building issues that were raised in the hearing are discussed in more detail below.

## **Heating System**

The Committee heard about the difficulties in maintaining an outdated heating system. Currently, the Legislature has a steam-supplied radiator system, which was described as being "inefficient" by today's standards. Moreover, Ms. Bajcetic noted that repair parts are becoming increasingly difficult to source, and that custom manufacturing may be required in the future to keep the system running. Pipe leaks and breakage are increasingly likely, and many parts of the system are difficult to access and repair; further, the Committee heard that there are few companies qualified to service systems of this kind.

## Designated Substances

The Committee heard that the building has a considerable quantity of designated substances (harmful chemicals, defined in regulation), which would require abatement. These include asbestos (which was used for fire resistance), lead (in paint and plumbing fixtures), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs; used in various applications, such as electrical devices). Their presence has hobbled even basic renovations or repairs, because the substances need to be abated prior to other work being completed. The difficulty and cost of their removal was one of the reasons cited for a full decommissioning of the building, rather than an incremental rehabilitation.

## Information Technology

The Committee was told about the challenges in upgrading and maintaining critical information technology (IT) infrastructure. In particular, wire conduits and other pathways are difficult to access, and in many cases are over capacity from decades of “haphazard” upgrades. Further, with designated substances found throughout the building, even minor IT improvements can become costly, since abatement work is often required. As it is likely that IT infrastructure would need to be further upgraded in the future, Ms. Bajcetic told the Committee that having accessible cable pathways would be a “main goal” of the rehabilitation.

## Security and Access

The Committee heard about the need to balance security and access at the Legislature in future rehabilitation plans. Mr. Day said that “the idea is that we’re happy when people are on the front lawn—that means the place is working—but we do realize that measures have to be put in place to ensure that the system continues . . . unobstructed, and that all Members . . . feel safe in the jobs that they do.” He stressed the importance of people being able to see how their legislature works; while the need for enhanced security measures is an unfortunate aspect of the modern world, they should be accommodated in a manner that is unobtrusive yet effective.

## TOUR OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUILDING AND MEETING WITH PRECINCT PROPERTIES BRANCH OFFICIALS

On December 6, 2022, the Committee toured key parts of the Legislative Building to better understand the myriad maintenance, repair, and safety issues. The tour was followed by a meeting with Gary Martin, Senior Project Management Consultant; Darryl Switzer, Technical Specialist and Trades Supervisor; and Julia Harris, Project Coordinator, all with Precinct Properties Branch. The areas of the building examined by the Committee were:

- first floor, East, West, and North wings; Centre Block – grand staircase;
- second floor – Room 212;
- East Wing attic, telecom room, and main steam supply;
- West Wing basement – corridor ceiling;

- Centre Block – basement masonry shaft; and
- the sub-basement electrical vault.

The Committee again heard that many parts of the building do not meet current health and safety, fire and other code requirements. In some cases, the measures in place are inadequate; in others, they have been compromised in order to accommodate the installation of other systems, primarily the cabling required for technology upgrades throughout the building. As noted earlier, in other areas of the building, fire safety and other measures are inadequate—for example, the lack of complete sprinkler coverage on the first, second, third, and fourth floors.

The Committee saw that access to many systems, including electrical, plumbing and others, is often very difficult. The original chases (voids in the building designed for services) that accommodated the heating, electrical, and plumbing requirements were not designed to handle additional or upgraded building system infrastructure. This has resulted in inadequate clearance around electrical and other equipment. Many, if not most, of these spaces do not meet current Building Code requirements.

The Committee was shown many examples of bundled cables in spaces that are difficult to access (see Appendix D). Although it has been removed when it was possible to do so, there is a considerable amount of legacy cabling remaining throughout the building, much of which is unorganized, redundant, or with an unknown purpose. New cabling requirements have often been met in haphazard ways (e.g., by cables run through air vents or around radiators, by punching holes through floors and walls, etc.) Existing cable trays are beyond capacity.

The Committee learned that the buildings' systems (e.g., mechanical, electrical, heating, plumbing, etc.) are approaching—and in some cases, are past—their end of service life. Other systems, such as sanitary and storm drainage do not meet current Building Code requirements. Electrical service is distributed throughout the building using rooms not intended to be proper “distribution closets.” There are currently 14 such closets, all at capacity, with some providing service to multiple floors. The emergency power system is nearing capacity: the addition of critical Legislature infrastructure (e.g., the Chamber and Committee Rooms) has meant that the services supported are over and above required life loads for emergency power. Many areas of the building present significant heating and cooling challenges.

The Committee was shown how program requirements present a significant challenge, and there is a lack of space, services, or flexibility in construction to facilitate providing additional accommodations and services. For instance, the building's design presents numerous challenges in meeting the level of accessibility required for compliance with the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*. There is also a chronic lack of space for storage and staging, requiring items to be regularly relocated or stored in hallways (see Appendix D, Figure 9), and the shipping/receiving area is inadequate.

Finally, the Committee was informed of the numerous environmental concerns that exist. As noted earlier, these include the presence of various designated substances such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), lead paint, and asbestos in the plaster, insulation, some flooring materials, and in the fire protection sheeting between floors. Moisture buildup in some parts of the building, for example the north pavilion basement of the West Wing, is also of concern.

## **TOUR OF THE PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT AND MEETING WITH MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT**

The Committee travelled to Ottawa, toured the federal Parliamentary Precinct on February 8, 2023, and met with Members of Parliament and held public hearings on February 9, 2023, to gain a better understanding of the approach taken to renovating the precinct and to assess any lessons that might be applied to the rehabilitation and restoration of the Legislative Building. This complex, multi-stage sequence of renovation efforts has been ongoing since the Long-Term Vision and Plan (LTVP) was first developed in 2001.<sup>1</sup> In 2018, renovations to West Block, including the construction of the Interim House of Commons Chamber, and the Senate of Canada Building, were completed, and Centre Block was closed for extensive rehabilitation and restoration work.

On February 8, 2023, the Committee visited the Interim House of Commons Chamber in West Block and Centre Block, actively under construction, and permanent home to Canada's House of Commons and Senate. The Committee also visited the recently renovated Wellington Building and Sir John A. Macdonald Building (both located on Wellington Street, with façades on Sparks Street), which house parliamentary offices, a branch of the Library of Parliament, and facilities for parliamentary meetings and functions. The tours were led by Darrell de Grandmont, Director, Centre Block Program, House of Commons; Lisette Comeau, Senior Strategist, Architecture; André Dupuis, Program Manager, Occupancy Program; Jennifer Garrett, Director General, Centre Block Major Rehabilitation, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC); and Kathryn Elliott, Program Manager, West Block.

### **The Committee's Reflections on the Tour**

The Committee recorded their impressions of the tour during a committee meeting on February 9, 2023. Committee Members expressed thanks to those who provided the tours, commenting on the excellent work that they observed, and agreed to send letters to express their appreciation. Members also identified a number of key lessons gleaned from the tours, and from the experiences shared with them by those who conducted the tours.

#### *The Need for a Full Decant*

Based on their experiences on the tour, the Committee underscored the impracticality of piecemeal renovation work, and the need to decant completely

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Services and Procurement Canada, "[Planning for the Future of the Parliamentary Precinct campus.](#)"

to an interim location in order to undertake the required rehabilitation and restoration work.

A related issue, raised by Committee Members, pertains to the importance of enabling projects to allow for a continuity of access expected by parliamentarians and the public. On this point, Members drew attention to the way in which access to the eight Books of Remembrance, whose traditional home is in Memorial Chamber in Centre Block, has been maintained in a purpose-built Room of Remembrance in West Block.<sup>2</sup>

Change management was also identified as a key consideration during the process of relocating to an interim chamber. The Committee heard that working with parliamentarians and parliamentary staff, and letting them know what to expect, was a crucial element in successful outcomes.

#### *Non-Partisanship and Parliamentary Oversight*

Members drew attention to the importance of non-partisanship to the success of the Parliament Hill Rehabilitation Project. One Member highlighted the fact that the project began under a Liberal Government, was continued under a Conservative Government, despite the recession of 2008, and continues under a Liberal Government. That Member stressed that the creation of a vision plan that is revisited periodically provides a level of stability that allows these sorts of projects to proceed to timeline.

At the same time, Members drew attention to the importance of the parliamentary oversight. One Member drew attention to the regular committee appearances undertaken by Jennifer Garrett, Director General, Centre Block Major Rehabilitation, to illustrate the way in which different mechanisms of political oversight can interact with project management to ensure that elected and accountable Members are involved with navigating major decisions. The Member indicated that examples of such decisions include establishing the appropriate balance between heritage conservation and functionality for key areas of the Parliamentary Precinct.

#### *Project Management and Engagement*

Members underscored the importance of selecting the most qualified project managers to oversee and manage the construction process, through the use of head-hunters, for instance. Other Members highlighted the importance of in-house management of this type of project, with one Member stressing the need to avoid P3 (private-public partnership) structures. Members noted that keeping project management in-house would allow for nimble decision-making and would help with outcomes related to both cost and timelines.

A Member also drew attention to the importance of engagement with the Indigenous community, heritage groups, and the public. Members noted the importance of consultation with parliamentarians and parliamentary staff, including those working in security and IT, in order to design spaces that are safe, accessible, and effective for parliamentary work. Another Member

---

<sup>2</sup> The Books of Remembrance “record the names of every Canadian who died in service to our country” (House of Commons, “[Room of Remembrance](#)”).

particularly stressed the importance of including Indigenous art and perspectives as part of the rehabilitation and restoration initiatives.

### *Project Planning, Implementation, and Trade-offs*

Members raised a variety of notable points related to project planning and implementation. Several Members drew attention to the partnerships established between the Parliamentary Rehabilitation Project and Algonquin College and Carleton University, indicating that these sorts of projects represent valuable opportunities for training in the skilled trades. Members also stressed the importance of careful planning and consideration regarding the timing of procurement and need for nearby storage facilities. More broadly, Members suggested the need to carefully weigh wants versus needs, and to grapple with the potentially inevitable trade-offs inherent in design and planning choices.

## **Meeting with Members of Parliament**

The Committee also met with their federal counterparts on the House of Commons Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in an informal meeting on February 9, 2023. The Committee heard that soliciting input directly from legislators is a crucial ingredient in a successful decant to an interim legislative chamber and the rehabilitation and restoration of permanent legislative buildings. At the same time, the Committee was told that the views of architects, project managers, and others who work with the materials in question have insights that should be heeded.

The Committee was told that practicality and functionality are crucial in designing legislative spaces, and that architects and project managers may not fully appreciate the needs of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff. For instance, the uses of a committee room, the acoustics required, the needs of Members with young families, requirements for small pre-committee rooms, the distance between caucus meeting rooms for different parties, and the frequency with which Members might need to take private phone calls, might not be immediately obvious to those who do not work in legislatures. In effect, architects and project managers might be more inclined to see these spaces from an aesthetic rather than a functional point of view.

Similarly, the Committee was told that input from clerks, interpreters, parliamentary security, and other parliamentary staff regarding how spaces are used is important at an early stage.

The Committee also heard about the structures for political oversight of the renovations to the Parliamentary Precinct. A working group of MPs and Senators was created in 2020 to give closer attention to the details of these projects. The working group does not hold public hearings and tends to be more informal than parliamentary committees (with respect to the allocation of speaking time to different parties, for instance). All recognized parties are represented on the working group, whereas the two Independent and two Green Party Members are dealt with directly by House Administration. Regular monthly or bimonthly meetings with project managers allow MPs to provide input into changes in plans. The Committee heard that the working group structure tends to depoliticize debates surrounding the renovations.

## **COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON RENOVATIONS TO THE FEDERAL PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT**

The Committee also held public hearings on February 9, 2023, and heard from two witnesses on the renovations to the Parliamentary Precinct: Stéphan Aubé, Chief Information Officer, House of Commons, and Susan Kulba, Director General, Real Property, House of Commons.

### **Consultation and Connectivity**

The Committee heard that consultation with a variety of partners, including the Senate, the House of Commons, and the Library of Parliament, as well as Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC), was key to the project's success. The Committee was also told that the LTVP set in place "a common approach and a clear path," and that when plans extend over timelines a decade or more, it is important to break the project down into smaller pieces (i.e., five-year rolling investment plans). The Committee also heard that the project is about more than facilities; it is also about the Parliamentary Precinct Campus more broadly (e.g., tunnels that allow for the circulation of goods between buildings, and other forms of connectivity).

### **Effective Governance**

The Committee heard that strong cross-institutional governance was a key element to the success of the project. Ms. Kulba drew attention to the parliamentary working group (referenced above), that allows the witnesses to consult Members, assess their needs, inform them, and design and implement an appropriate and suitable program of work. Governance is also provided by PSPC, the Senate, the House of Commons, the Library of Parliament, Parliamentary Protective Services, and other stakeholders. Frequent meetings occur between the witnesses and ministerial staff: Ms. Kulba indicated that meetings occur on a weekly basis with an Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM), and on a biweekly basis with a Deputy Minister (DM). The Committee heard that these characteristics of program governance, which result in authoritative decisions being issued on a regular basis, keep the project proceeding at an expeditious pace.

### **Effective Communication and Resourcing**

Ms. Kulba also drew attention to the importance of effective communication and resourcing. With respect to communication, Ms. Kulba indicated that "PSPC is really the entity that deals with public communication," whereas the House of Commons ensures that Members are kept informed about the progress of the project and ensures that Members are familiar with the interim facilities. With the Centre Block project, Ms. Kulba indicated that an integrated project delivery model had been adopted. This approach involves bringing together the PSPC team; House of Commons, Senate, and Library of Parliament representatives; the design consortium team; and, the project management team in a single office. Co-locating these different experts, including dedicated architects, interior designers, and project managers, ensures that parliamentarians' needs are met.

## **Stewardship and Lessons Learned**

Lastly, the Committee heard that responsible stewardship in a parliamentary setting involves finding a balance between heritage preservation and modernization; between security and openness; between the requirements of a workplace and those of a public venue; between budget and scope; and between quality, design, and schedule. Ms. Kulba suggested that carefully calibrating a balance between these different considerations is the key to a successful project.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1) There is a clear and demonstrated need for a timely decant and comprehensive restoration of the Legislative Building.
- 2) Plans to proceed with any restoration project should be brought to this committee for review.
- 3) The government, in cooperation with the Office of the Assembly, should develop and propose a project framework which would include input, oversight, and involvement of parliamentarians and Assembly officials.
- 4) The government should consider using all tools available including legislation to set out an appropriate governance structure that respects the independence of the Assembly and oversight by parliamentarians while leveraging provincial ministries' and crown agencies' expertise in large-scale infrastructure projects.
- 5) A restoration project should incorporate best practices and lessons-learned from other jurisdictions which have undertaken comparable projects.
- 6) A restoration project should seek to preserve the heritage elements of the building while improving accessibility, functionality, safety, and security.



---

**APPENDIX A:**  
**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE REGARDING STUDY**  
**ON THE REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE**  
**PRECINCT**

- (1) That the committee conduct a study of the lifespan of and deficiencies with the building systems in the Legislative precinct and the need for rehabilitation and restoration; and
- (2) That the committee meet on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, from 9 a.m. to 10:15 a.m., and that the Clerk of the Assembly and the director of the Precinct Properties branch be requested to appear to brief the committee and take questions on the current state of the building and discuss the need for restoration or rehabilitation of building systems or the building as a whole; and
- (3) That the committee request that the Clerk and director of the Precinct Properties branch provide the committee with a list of appropriate staff who may be able to provide the committee with relevant testimony to assist the committee in its study; and
- (4) That the committee meet on Thursday, December 1, 2022, at 1 p.m. to tour the entirety of the building and that the Clerk of the Committee arrange for this tour; and
- (5) That the committee meet on Tuesday, December 6, 2022, from 9 a.m. to 10:15 a.m., and that the assembly staff suggested by the Clerk and director of Precinct Properties branch be invited to appear to make depositions, and for question and answer on those depositions, with allocation of time to be determined by the Chair; and
- (6) That the Tuesday, December 6, 2022, meeting occur in closed session if needed; and
- (7) That the subcommittee on committee business meet on Monday, December 5, 2022, to develop and recommend to the committee further business related to the study.



---

**APPENDIX B:  
WITNESS LIST FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS**

<b>Organization/Individual</b>	<b>Date of Appearance</b>
Trevor Day, Deputy Clerk of the Legislative Assembly	November 29, 2022
Jelena Bajcetic, Director of Precinct Properties Branch	November 29, 2022
Stéphan Aubé, Chief Information Officer, House of Commons	February 9, 2023
Susan Kulba, Director General, Real Property, House of Commons	February 9, 2023



**APPENDIX C:  
CHRONOLOGY OF RENOVATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE  
LEGISLATIVE PRECINCT**

Parliament-Session and Date Tabled	Source	Title of Report	Main Recommendations Pertaining to Restoration or Renovation
30-1 Dec 1975	Ontario Commission on the Legislature (Camp Commission)	<i>Fifth Report</i>	The Fifth report dealt with a number of matters, one of which was "The Legislature of Ontario and its Physical Environs." The Report described the Legislature as "old-fashioned," "shabby in places" and even "depressing." The Commission did not investigate the mechanical/electrical or other infrastructure aspects, but focused more on the building's aesthetics, functionality and the need for significant upgrading if only to accommodate the televising of proceedings, and the inadequate and uneven allocation of space for Members, staff and the Press Gallery. The Report stated that it would be necessary to "consider restructuring or rebuilding" the place and recommended a major alteration in Queen's Park on the basis of obvious need.
30-4 9 Feb 1977	Select Committee on the Fourth and Fifth Reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature	<i>Final Report</i>	A major up-grading of the building and Chamber should be undertaken to bring it up to a standard that befits the Legislature and meets the needs of Members.  A detailed study should be undertaken to assess the feasibility of structural modifications to the public galleries.
33-2 10 Feb 1987 (The report is not debated and died on the Order Paper with dissolution of the 33 <sup>rd</sup> Parliament.)	Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly	<i>Report on Proposals for the Restoration of Ontario's Parliament Building</i>	That a special committee of the House, chaired by the Speaker and the Chair of the SCLA and composed of one member from each of the parties in the House, be appointed to supervise and coordinate the restoration of the Parliament Building.  That an historic structure report similar to the one conducted in Harrisburg, PA, be commissioned immediately as a preliminary step to the preparation of a comprehensive restoration plan.
34-1 15 Dec 1988 (Report debated and adopted March 2, 1989.)	Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly	<i>Report on the Process for the Restoration of the Parliament Building</i>	Establishment of a Special Committee on the Parliamentary Precinct to develop, approve and supervise and coordinate the implementation of a programme for the restoration, renovation, rehabilitation, cyclical maintenance and use of the Parliament Building and grounds. (Note that the Special Committee was constituted on March 2, 1989. The Committee retained the services of Julian S. Smith, Architect & Associates, to assist in the development of a restoration master plan.)


Parliament-Session and Date Tabled	Source	Title of Report	Main Recommendations Pertaining to Restoration or Renovation
35-1 N/A	Julian S. Smith, Architect & Associates	<i>A Time for Renewal – Restoration Master Plan for the Ontario Legislative Assembly building and grounds</i>	Draft of restoration plan received by Special Committee on the Parliamentary Precinct on February 6, 1991.
35-1 June 20, 1991 (Report tabled, debate adjourned, never adopted.)	Special Committee on the Parliamentary Precinct (note: this committee was reconstituted in the 1 <sup>st</sup> Session of the 35 <sup>th</sup> Parliament but was not reconstituted at the start of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> session.)	<i>Restoration Proposals for the Parliament Building</i>	That the House approve in principle the draft restoration master plan; and The restoration of the Parliament Building proceed in in the matter outlined in the report.

Source: Table Research Office.

---

**APPENDIX D:  
SELECTED PHOTOGRAPHS, LEGISLATIVE BUILDING**


Figure 1: Cable Trays Filled Beyond Capacity - Typical



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 2: Lack of Cable Management Organization System; Vast Amount of Unidentified Legacy Cabling - Typical



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---


Figure 3: Cable Installation in Wall Vents



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 4: Congested Vertical Raceways - Typical



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 5: Cable Installations Near Radiators - Typical



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

Figure 6: Masonry Shaft, Existing Fire Damper was Compromised by Decades of Cabling



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 7: Masonry Shaft, Disorganized and Unidentifiable Cables throughout Shaft and Ceiling Spaces throughout Basement



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 8: Water Infiltration within the Electrical Vault; Failure in Roof Construction



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 9: Abandoned Telephone Panels and Primary Distribution Cables are Inaccessible for Removals



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 10: Original Main Steam Supply to the Legislative Building



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 11: Main Steam Distribution Piping



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 12: Original Eight-Inch Diameter Main Steam Isolation Valve, Limited Access for Repairs and Would Result in Major Disruption of Services



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

---

Figure 13: Concealed Cables Running in Vertical Vent Shafts between Floors without Fire Stopping - Typical



Source: Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

