



---

ISSN 1488-9080

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**  
Second Session, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**  
Deuxième session, 37<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Monday 18 June 2001**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Lundi 18 juin 2001**

**Standing committee on  
justice and social policy**

**Comité permanent de la  
justice et des affaires sociales**

Committee business

Travaux du comité

Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001

Loi de 2001 sur la sécurité  
des cavaliers

Chair: Toby Barrett  
Clerk: Tom Prins

Président : Toby Barrett  
Greffier : Tom Prins

---

### **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.

### **Copies of Hansard**

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

### **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.

### **Exemplaires du Journal**

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
3330 Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W  
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  
3330 Édifice Whitney ; 99, rue Wellesley ouest  
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  
JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

Monday 18 June 2001

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE  
ET DES AFFAIRES SOCIALES

Lundi 18 juin 2001

*The committee met at 1539 in room 151.*

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**The Chair (Mr Toby Barrett):** Welcome, everyone, to this regular meeting of the standing committee on justice and social policy for Monday, June 18. There are two main items on the agenda. The first item arises from the most recent vote in the Legislature with respect to Bill 58. I would just briefly throw out to the committee, with respect to Bill 58, that this committee will be considering the ambulance bill tomorrow, and two questions arise: when should we begin our proceedings, and secondly, any suggestions on a deadline time for any amendments to Bill 58? I understand the bill is time-allocated tomorrow. We would commence clause-by-clause at 4:30 in the afternoon.

**Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** Do you know, Mr Chair, whether the government is planning to introduce amendments?

**The Chair:** I don't have that information as Chair.

**Mrs McLeod:** I don't think we could expect amendments at this point before noon tomorrow, but I hope it would be possible to table amendments by noon so that we have some sense of what we're looking at. Had you thought it might be possible to get them in sooner?

**The Chair:** Perhaps hoping a bit sooner. The clerk has informed me they need some time to deal with the amendments and get them in order for our consideration.

**Mrs McLeod:** We're going to be in committee here until probably later this afternoon. I don't think it's reasonable to think we could have them in for 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. I'm not the critic, but I know we have amendments to propose. I don't know whether there's been any prior notice given to the caucuses to say we have to have amendments in by a given time. If not, I think we need to allow at least the morning.

**The Chair:** I can discuss with the clerk how much time they would require in the afternoon to get them in order, if that was possible. I'll take that under advisement.

**Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina):** Does the clerk have suggestions in terms of a reasonable time?

**The Chair:** I could ask the clerk.

The clerk has advised me that 12 would probably be OK, to give them time to pull things together.

Any other comments with respect to the deadline for amendments?

**Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South):** I was just going to suggest that the inquiry is really to be heeded by all of us, as members, to deal fairly, logically and responsibly with whatever the amendments are from any member of the committee. So are you now saying the amendments will be circulated after 12 o'clock or by 12 o'clock?

**The Chair:** That's my suggestion. I have not made a final decision, as Chair. I'm just asking for input.

**Mr Marchese:** What are you recommending, Margaret?

**Mrs Marland:** I may not be here tomorrow; I'm only subbing in this afternoon. But I just want to say that I think the request is reasonable, if it's feasible for that to work, if the deadline is to deal with the amendments tomorrow.

**The Chair:** On the second item, I would like some feedback with respect to the start time. Normally this committee meets at 3:30.

**Mrs McLeod:** Sorry, I do have my hand up about the timing. If the amendments are in at 12 o'clock, how soon would it be possible to circulate them to committee members?

**The Chair:** I could ask the clerk.

**Clerk of the Committee (Mr Tom Prins):** It depends on the volume, but we should be able to turn them around quite quickly. We'll just photocopy them and send packages out to the members.

**Mrs McLeod:** From our perspective, this is a very important piece of legislation. It's one we very strongly feel needs to be amended, and we weren't very excited about the fact it was going to clause-by-clause so quickly without there being any hearings on it. But given the fact that that's what we've been handed, I do think it's important that we have enough time to at least see what amendments the government may be proposing.

**Mr Marchese:** So, Lyn, should we perhaps be proposing 11 o'clock as a deadline? Would that work for you?

**Mrs McLeod:** I don't know what's feasible. I think noon is possible, to circulate copies of the amendments to the committee members hopefully by the time the House resumes at 1:30. Then we don't have any choice but to start right after orders of the day, do we?

**The Chair:** We have a choice of start time. If we felt there was considerable discussion required, we need not start at 3:30. We could start earlier tomorrow; certainly not during routine proceedings, but we could start at 10 o'clock in the morning.

**Mr Marchese:** At noon.

**The Chair:** I don't think it would be possible to get them that soon, unless the deadline for amendments was 9 am. The clerk could possibly turn them around by 10.

So that's the second question. I'm asking for any advice. I'll just make mention of the resolution put forward by Minister Ecker, and I'll just read: "... the committee be authorized to meet in the morning but not during routine proceedings, and that the committee be authorized to meet beyond its normal hour of adjournment, until completion of clause-by-clause consideration."

**Mr Marchese:** Except it's a problem in terms of the amendments. We don't know whether the government has amendments, and obviously we need some time for the opposition parties to present amendments, so we can't meet in the morning.

**The Chair:** I guess we have two moving targets as far as start time and the deadline for amendments. Any input you have with respect to adjusting those accordingly would help me in making a decision.

**Mrs McLeod:** I come back to my earlier question. I realize you don't have information about whether the government is tabling amendments, but presumably if the government is tabling amendments, they are ready to go. If the government could make those amendments available to us at 9 o'clock, I think it would be highly desirable to meet in the morning in order to look at the government amendments, and we could get our amendments tabled as soon as possible after 9.

**The Chair:** Oftentimes in committee, amendments sprinkle in over time. But I feel, for administrative reasons, it would be better to have all the amendments at the same time, to set one deadline for all amendments.

**Mrs Marland:** Do both the opposition parties have an amendment or amendments?

**Mr Marchese:** Yes.

**Mrs Marland:** So what is the government doing?

**Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough):** Just a comment: why don't we sit tomorrow morning?

**The Chair:** Any further suggestions?

**Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's):** The point here is that we want to have as much notice and debate time as possible. If we're getting the amendments at 9 am, then the more time we have to debate them, the better. If that means us meeting tomorrow morning, that's fine. But we have to get some notice here so we can work on it, as opposed to getting them at the same time the meeting is called. I would ask that the variables be that we have as much time to debate it as possible and that we're given notice of these amendments as soon as possible.

Yes, the opposition has amendments. We want to see what the government amendments are, of course, since if there is some overlap, then there is no need to reintroduce

them, or if there are amendments to the amendments, then we'll have some idea of what changes we might want to propose.

**The Chair:** Any other input for consideration?

**Mr Stewart:** As you know, the government caucus doesn't meet tomorrow morning, but because of the importance of the bill and getting amendments in as quickly as possible and getting on with this, they will meet tomorrow morning. It will not cause a problem, if the opposition is so agreeable.

**The Chair:** Any further thoughts? Any further discussion?

**Mr Marchese:** It would be good to hear your thoughts, Mr Chair.

**The Chair:** Off the top, I have heard 9 am as a deadline for amendments and meeting at 10. I have heard a number of times.

**Mr Marchese:** I suspect we would be prepared to meet at 10 too, if that's the case.

**Mrs McLeod:** My reluctance is that at this hour in the afternoon I'm not sure I can reach the people who need to put amendments in front of the committee by 9. We could easily have the amendments there by 10; I'm sure of that. I just think 9 o'clock is difficult at this hour of the afternoon. If we could be comfortable meeting at 10 and tabling the amendments at the same time, I would certainly be happy with that.

**Mrs Marland:** I think that sounds reasonable.

**The Chair:** Anything further?

**Mr Stewart:** I think the government could agree to that.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Shall we complete that discussion? I'll declare that order of business closed.

1550

## HORSE RIDING SAFETY ACT, 2001

### LOI DE 2001 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES CAVALIERS

Consideration of Bill 12, An Act to increase the safety of equestrian riders / Projet de loi 12, Loi visant à accroître la sécurité des cavaliers.

**The Chair:** For our next order of business, we are discussing Bill 12, An Act to increase the safety of equestrian riders. More specifically, we will be conducting clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

We will first be dealing with section 1 of Bill 12. Before I call the question, is there any debate on section 1? I see no amendments to section 1. Shall I put the question?

**Mrs McLeod:** I realize this is clause-by-clause, but do I understand that Mrs Molinari has a further amendment to be tabled? Could we ask to see that amendment and know what section it applies to?

**Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill):** It should be in your package in front of you.

If I could, Mr Chair, maybe it would be beneficial—

**The Chair:** Mrs Molinari, you have indicated this is in our package?

**Mrs Molinari:** Yes.

**Mrs McLeod:** These are government amendments. I have an amendment to paragraph 3 of subsection 2(1)—

**The Chair:** Would page 4 be the new amendment?

**Mrs McLeod:** It's always a question of whether or not we're working from old or new packages.

**Mr Marchese:** It's these amendments in the package, right, Mrs Molinari?

**Mrs Molinari:** Yes, it should be in the package in front of you. It should be the fourth one. It's subsection 2(5) of the bill.

**Mrs McLeod:** What page is it?

**Mrs Molinari:** Page 4 is the new motion.

**Mrs McLeod:** Got it. Thank you very much, Mr Chair. That does clarify it for me.

**The Chair:** This would be the only new amendment since we last met.

Going back to section 1, shall section 1 carry?

**Mrs Molinari:** Before we begin with clause-by-clause, I don't know if this is an opportunity, or at another time, to address some of the points that were raised at the last meeting and some of the ways they've been addressed. Either we go clause-by-clause and I can address them when the time is appropriate, or I can make some initial comments now or at the end, whatever you like.

**The Chair:** You may wish to make some initial comments now, to better prepare us to vote.

**Mrs Molinari:** A number of concerns were raised at the last meeting. I have received some input from the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services. Some of the issues were around the Technical Standards and Safety Act, whether or not this meets with that regulation.

The ministry's response to that is that the TSSA does not regulate this area. The current Amusement Devices Act and regulation governs the operation of amusement devices which are defined as a machine, contrivance, structure, vehicle or device. In other words, only mechanical amusement devices are caught by the legislation. In addition, the regulation expressly excludes live animal rides from its operation. This definition and exemption have been carried forward into the proposed amusement devices regulation under the Technical Standards and Safety Act, 2000.

I can have copies of this for the members if you'd like. So that addresses the TSSA.

Some other comments that were raised had to do with the concern over head lice. We've called a number of establishments—batting cages and go-carting—that also use helmets. For the record, I would like to state what some of those do. I could highlight Goodwood Kartway in Stouffville: all the helmets are sprayed with disinfectant for lice. Santa's Village in Bracebridge: they're cleaned and disinfected at the end of each day. What I am trying to highlight here is a number of other safety-type sports that also use helmets. Niagara Go-Karts sprays

with disinfectant—RNC is the name of the product; it's a daily lice spray.

Wildwater Kingdom also cleans and disinfects them at the end of each day. At Formula Kartways in Brampton, they're sprayed with antibacterial, and this I found interesting: as an added precaution, all riders must wear a disposable plastic shower cap under the helmet. So this is not something that's new, where helmets are passed on from one rider to another. There are also other organizations that do that.

The issue around the pony rides: I believe everyone on the committee has received a letter from one of the presenters last week that talks about some of the concerns with the pony rides and the safety factor with those also being required to wear helmets.

I have a letter from the Canadian Pony Club that says they have some 4,000 members across Canada and are also part of the worldwide network of pony clubs. They talked about safety as an integral part of their program: "Our members are not allowed to partake in any mounted activity unless they are wearing properly fitting riding helmets which meet the standards and properly fitting footwear with heels." That's just to highlight some of the pony organizations and pony clubs that are already taking these types of precautions.

So when we're looking at the amendment that will be coming in the next little while, the Liberal amendment that talks about setting some regulations to exclude some establishments, it's important to note that we're going to be looking at excluding some of those through an order in council so that not to exclude putting it in the legislation would exclude all of them. Some are already in the process of doing that, so it wouldn't make sense to exclude those that are already doing it by virtue of feeling that it's a safety issue.

There are some that by reason of amusement park and other areas—we got letters from one pony club that say that each child is assisted by an adult and they're actually on a carousel. So these might be the ones that would be excluded in a regulation, providing that it's properly researched, and they would in fact merit an exclusion because of the safety factors that they already are taking into account in these organizations.

I wanted to put that forward, that the concerns that were raised were investigated, and this is some of the feedback that I received. I believe that the amendments that are coming forward are going to cover some of the concerns that were raised; also the one where there is an establishment, that the owner of the establishment not be responsible for those that are renting on that establishment. It's covered in one of the amendments. Also, one of the amendments covers the issue of competition. This legislation was never intended to include competition, but it was brought to my attention that nowhere in the actual bill was it excluded, so there is an amendment coming forward today that will exclude competition.

With that, I think I've covered all of the concerns that were raised. I believe that in passing the amendments that

are going to be coming up we've really done a thorough research, and we can proceed with passing these amendments.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion?

**Mrs McLeod:** Mrs Molinari's comments give rise to a number of questions. They probably relate specifically to the motion that I will be making for an amendment in section 2 of the bill, Mr Chair, so I'd be happy to take your direction in terms of when you would like me to raise those questions for the record. Would you like me to hold them until we actually get to that particular amendment?

**The Chair:** Let's do that discussion under section 2.

Shall I put the question on section 1? I'll ask for a voice vote. I don't think we need a recorded vote, unless there's a request for it.

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Section 2 of this bill: I understand there are a number of amendments. Is there a motion?

1600

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that subsection 2(1) of the bill be amended by striking out the portion before paragraph 1 and substituting the following:

"Responsibility of establishment

"(1) No owner or operator of a horse riding establishment shall permit any rider under the age of 18 years to ride any horse boarded by the rider in the stables of the establishment or transported by the rider to the establishment unless the rider has and is correctly using the following equipment in the manner that it was designated to be used."

**The Chair:** Any discussion on this amendment?

**Mr Marchese:** What are the changes?

**Mrs Molinari:** It's adding "or transported by the rider to the establishment."

**Mrs Julia Munro (York North):** Just for clarification, in the last part that was read to us, the wording was changed from "designed" to "designated," I believe, and I wondered if that was just an error.

**The Chair:** The very last part of the sentence?

**Mrs Munro:** Yes, the very last couple of words.

**The Chair:** My understanding of the last phrase is "that it was designed to be used." Is that correct?

**Mrs Molinari:** My apologies. It's "designed." That's the intent.

**Mrs Munro:** I assumed it was, but I thought I better—for the record.

**Mr Marchese:** You must have been a teacher in your past life.

**Mrs Marland:** And a good one.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on this amendment? I wish to call the vote on this amendment to section 2 that is contained on page 1. Shall this amendment carry? Carried.

Further motions of amendments?

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that paragraph 2 of subsection 2(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"2. Hard soled footwear with a heel of no less than 1.5 centimetres."

**The Chair:** Any discussion on this motion?

**Mrs McLeod:** I'm not going to oppose the amendment, because I think it does clear up some of the specific concerns that were raised around the original wording. I do want to just point out, however, that I think this particular section, as much as the issue around the wearing of helmets, is a reason for looking at the whole issue of the pony ride kind of thing. We did discuss this. These are not regular riders, these are not people going trekking; these are kids who come with their running shoes on and are riding a pony at the fair. So the requirement for the footwear becomes a real concern, as much as the helmets, and I just want to make that point because, when we get to the issue of whether or not there can be exclusions, I think we need to look very seriously at the restrictions this would put on pony ride operators.

**Mrs Marland:** Maybe someone has the answer to this question: Based on my experience with seven grandchildren at those kinds of rides, generally I have only seen ponies tethered. I haven't seen them free-riding. Often they're attached to some apparatus that leads them around. Is that the case or is my experience limited?

**Mrs McLeod:** Based only on my grandchildren's experience—Margaret, we're exchanging grandchildren stories here—there's a place called Puck's Farm, which is in Julia's riding. Nobody would question the establishment in any way at all, but you get on a pony there and it is led by either the operator of the farm or by a parent. So they're not actually tethered, they're not going around a circle, but it's a very controlled kind of ride.

**Mr Marchese:** Mr Chair, "properly fitted" was dropped. There's some agreement, obviously. Is that correct?

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes.

**Mr Marchese:** It seems reasonable, but there must have been a reason not to include it, I'm assuming.

**Mrs Molinari:** "Properly fitted" seemed to be redundant. I think it was actually your member who raised that as an issue: what's properly fitted? It's left to interpretation.

**Mr Marchese:** But it's not redundant. It may have been left to interpretation, but it's not redundant.

**Mrs McLeod:** I think "hard" and "smooth" were redundant.

**Mr Marchese:** They were contradictory, but I'm not sure they're redundant.

Anyway, as long as the member raised this issue and he is happy with it, that's fine.

**Mrs Molinari:** According to my recollection—I wouldn't want to accuse Mr Kormos of saying something that he didn't say—it was raised and there was agreement that this would be an amendment that would be suitable.

**The Chair:** Is there anything further?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair:** I don't know whether Hansard is picking up all this or not.

Is there any further discussion on this amendment?

We have an amendment by Mrs Molinari. It's on page 2. Shall I put the question?

Shall this amendment on page 2 carry? Carried.

Any further amendments to section 2?

**Mr Marchese:** Here's where the redundancy happens, Tina. I see the redundancy in 3, where you have "suitable" and "properly fitted." That's redundant.

**Mrs Molinari:** Yes, we're going to remove that.

**Mr Marchese:** Right, because you've got "properly fitted" already. There it is.

**The Chair:** I see an amendment on page 3. Does someone wish to make a motion?

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that paragraph 3 of subsection 2(1) of the bill be amended by striking out "Suitable."

**The Chair:** Any discussion on this amendment?

**Mr Marchese:** It's reasonable.

**Interjection:** Suitable.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion?

We have a motion from Mrs Molinari on page 3 for an amendment. Shall I put the question?

Does this amendment carry? Carried.

Are there any further motions for amendments to section 2?

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Same

"(5) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to riders participating in horse shows or competitions."

**The Chair:** Any discussion on this particular amendment?

**Mrs McLeod:** I'd like to ask Mrs Molinari to give some background to tabling the amendment.

**Mrs Molinari:** This is the one that was raised as an issue during the hearings, during the discussion by all the members that it was covering the dressage and some of those areas of competition where riders are also judged on their appearance and on the costumes they wear. The bill was never intended to cover competition, and since it wasn't specific anywhere in the bill that it was excluding it, this amendment excludes those competitions from the bill.

**Mr Marchese:** Mr Kormos obviously spoke to this.

1610

**Mr Bryant:** I would ask Ms Molinari if you could talk a little bit about what the bill means by "riders." I think we both know what it means, but we haven't defined "riders" in the bill. I know that you mean more than just, say, equestrian—I guess—and dressage riders. Perhaps you could elaborate a bit just so there's, again, no confusion as to what we mean by "riders." You haven't defined what "riders" is in the bill. Is "riders" limited to particular types of competition? What do you mean by "riders?"

**Mrs Molinari:** Those riding a horse who are in a competition; a rider of a horse in a competition.

**Mr Bryant:** I guess we're satisfied that in the absence of any definition of "riders" there's going to be no confusion as to what this is.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on this point or any other points? Mr Bryant, is that complete? Mr Marchese.

**Mr Marchese:** My sense, Michael, is that you don't need to define "riders" if those who are participating in horse shows would be excluded, right? It's the horse show that's relevant, so whoever is riding in a horse show is excluded.

**Mr Bryant:** Riders.

**Mr Marchese:** Riders, in a horse show.

**Mr Bryant:** We'll get to the elephant, camel and pony issue in a moment.

**Mrs Marland:** I just wondered if I could have, Mr Bryant, a clarification of your question, not that I don't understand what a rider is. Are you understanding now, then, that the bill pertains to anyone on horseback or riders—I'm really following up on Mr Marchese's question too. Is anyone on horseback a rider? If they're not in competition or they are in competition, are they still not riders, and do we need a clearer definition of who the bill refers to?

**Mr Bryant:** There is a category which has been excluded and there's a very good reason for that. I think Ms Molinari has attempted to explain the reason. But at the same time we're excluding categories which are, I think, not otherwise covered under the bill. There is reference to riders in section 104.1 in section 4 of Bill 12, which refers to riders of a horse on a highway and so on. I'm not suggesting that we change this particular provision. Just so that there is no confusion in terms of the way this act is implemented, I hope that the person who sponsored the bill and sponsored the amendment could explain what the meaning of the provision is, but I take it from her response that it's apparently self-explanatory and there isn't going to be a problem.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on this amendment?

**Mrs McLeod:** I do want to just clarify, because I know that Mr Kormos raised the issue of dressage and that's why you've gone back and looked at it. I appreciate that fact, and you've been informed that dressage was not specifically excluded from the bill. I have a little bit of a concern with the way the amendment is worded, because by saying that subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to riders participating in horse shows or competitions, it seems to have an implication that it may apply to riders generally, which I think is Ms Marland's question. In fact, the only place where the bill refers to riders is when they're riding on highways, which is what we all thought this bill was about to begin with and where there was absolutely no disagreement.

I guess, first of all, it points to the complications that can arise from something seemingly simple when it goes beyond the stated intent, which was to make sure that 18-year-olds were not riding on highways without helmets on. But I just ask, is there now a confusion about whether or not the bill would apply to riders who are not in competition, and does that broaden the definitions under section 1, which says that the bill applies only to horse

riding establishments and operators of those establishments and does not deal with riders at all?

**The Chair:** Any response, Ms Molinari?

**Mrs Molinari:** I will attempt to respond. When it was brought to my attention that there was a necessity to exclude competitions from the bill in the form of an amendment, this amendment was drafted through legislative counsel. Legislative counsel assisted in drafting the original bill, so I take their counsel on this amendment, that it would cover the intent we're trying to cover, that is, exclude competition riders from the legislation.

**Mrs McLeod:** It clearly does that. I wonder if we could ask counsel's view as to whether or not, by eliminating one category, excluding one category of riders, it therefore seems to indicate that other categories of riders are somehow encompassed by this bill.

**Ms Susan Klein:** I don't think so. It simply exempts the riders from those provisions. You're right, the provisions do not impose obligations on riders, and I suppose the more technical way to have written it would have been, "does not apply in respect of riders participating in," or, "does not apply to horse riding establishments that are conducting horse shows or competitions." I thought it was clearer to understand just to say, when we're talking about riders here—the riders don't have the obligations, the owners and operators have the obligations, but they don't have those obligations with respect to these kinds of riders. So if you're holding a competition at the Circle X ranch, which otherwise would be a horse riding establishment, for that competition they don't have the obligation on those riders.

**Mrs McLeod:** So there are some establishments that would have qualified under this that are now, essentially, for this purpose, being excluded.

**Ms Klein:** It's just carving them out from that. Nobody is brought in by this. It simply carves out from subsections (1) and (2) those particular kinds of riders who don't have to have the helmet, just the footwear.

**Mrs Marland:** Is there a way of clarifying this so we know that the bill is only pertaining—obviously if we're talking about establishments, we're talking about where riders are paying a fee for the opportunity to ride. Is that the only area that is defined in the bill? If indeed we're talking about horse shows—perhaps somebody has this answer, and maybe Ms Klein has it—do we know that in horse shows everybody owns the horse that they're using, or might there be examples of where people have horses at horse shows on which people under 18, young people, can compete? They are in a horse show but they are using somebody else's horse.

I think the direction of this bill is excellent and I think it's important to make sure that, when we're through with the amendments, it isn't a bill that is difficult for people to understand. I guess the neat thing about being subbed into a committee is that obviously, because I haven't been involved in this, I'm hearing some things for the first time and frankly I'm being very open about the fact that some of it isn't clear and some of it is open for the

potential of being contradictory unless we clarify it and nail it down.

I think if it's nailed down that horse shows—for all I know, and maybe you know: do horse shows set their own rules for competition? Do they allow commercial owners, Tina, into horse shows, where other people's horses are used and therefore it's the same as if you're at the country fair?

**Mr Marchese:** Margaret, maybe we have some experts in the audience.

1620

**Mrs Marland:** Well, there will be different kinds of businesses. That points up the fact, frankly, that we need to cover all those different arrangements if we're really going to succeed in protecting the young riders. I'm 100% supportive of protecting these young riders, I just want to make sure that when we have this opportunity to do that, we know it will work for all kinds of riders.

**Mrs Molinari:** I'm sensitive to my colleague's comments. I'm sure when you don't have the benefit of having been part of all of the hearings, it's difficult to be here and try and pick up where we've all been. There were presentations to this committee. We had hearings where some of the experts were here and responded to some of the questions.

Mr Chair, as a matter of fact, one of the presenters is here today. With your permission, we would ask her to answer some of the technical questions. I believe the answer to the question is that it varies from establishment to establishment, but if there are some questions the member needs to get a comfort level on, Marcia is here and I hope would be willing to answer some of the questions.

**The Chair:** Would the committee be amenable to very briefly recalling one of our previous witnesses?

**Mr Marchese:** Does that include a horse riding establishment individual? Is that what we're talking about?

**Mrs Molinari:** Yes.

**Mr Marchese:** There are a number of people back there, right? Who are we talking about here?

**Mrs Molinari:** The one who would be able to respond to the question that's being asked. I believe Marcia Barrett would—

**The Chair:** Mr DeFaria, any comment on that?

**Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East):** Mr Chair, this is clause-by-clause. What we could do is have a short recess and have this done by the member directly with the people, instead of going back into hearings again.

**Mr Bryant:** Just to respond to that, the point of this exercise, at least from my perspective, in terms of trying to get some explanations on the record, is that they be on the record. The reason defining this issue of competition is important is because, as the government knows, there is an Olympic bid. The Olympic bid includes the argument that we have our act together here and, among other things, we're not going to create laws that are going to make it impossible, for example, for dressage competitors to compete in the Olympics, because in dressage



they are not going to wear the helmet. So we want to make sure we get the competition part right.

I would think that having an off-the-record conversation would defeat that purpose. If we are very clear as to what it means and we explain on the record what it means, then I think it means that nobody can make any objection as to what precisely the meaning is. As you know very well, it's not going to be definitive just because we've defined it here in this committee. But I would say either we're going to address the matter on the record or we're not, or there's no point in doing it, unless we want to have the members come back and repeat what was just explained to us.

I don't see any problem with having someone who has some expertise in this issue address that particular clause. At the same time, I'm sensitive to Ms Molinari's concerns that we move ahead with this bill.

**Mr Marchese:** But Mr DeFaria raised a good point. Rather than opening it up for hearings again, if the government needs to get some clarification, then you move a recess for five minutes or so and that should do it. Then you will feel better about whatever it is you want to put on the public record.

**Mrs Marland:** I agree with Mr Bryant. We're not going through hearings again.

*Interjection.*

**Mrs Marland:** No, excuse me, I heard Ms Molinari say that someone in the room can give us some clarification to the points that have been raised, and that's all we need. I don't know whether we have staff or the public, but if there's somebody in the room who can answer the questions that have been raised, I think it's helpful to have it defined.

**Mr Marchese:** But I think Mr DeFaria is correct. We don't tend to do that, in terms of asking for clarification from someone in the public, so if you want to recess for a few moments, that would be appropriate, I think, right?

**Mrs Marland:** But with respect, we don't tend to go through amendments and not have it confirmed what exactly the amendment is saying.

**Mr Marchese:** I'm not sure about that.

**Mrs McLeod:** That would be a perfect world.

**Mr Marchese:** Yes. Often it could be raised and we're not given that opportunity usually. Why don't we just recess for a few minutes? Don't you want to do that? We're wasting a whole lot of time.

**The Chair:** I'm going to call a five-minute recess.

*The committee recessed from 1625 to 1634.*

**The Chair:** Could we continue with any further discussion on this particular amendment to section 2.

**Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre):** Excuse me, Chair, that is amendment number?

**The Chair:** This is found on page 4.

**Mr Kormos:** I appreciate this amendment. Horse shows are competitions. I appreciate the intent of it. It's reasonably broad-based and I suppose that's a good thing. But it concerns me that the government—because it is a government motion, I believe; am I correct?—can come up with this amendment but it can't come up with

an amendment that excludes pony rides and incidental boarding at stables. This is really problematic.

Look, Ms Molinari has tried her best, and I spoke with her very quickly before we came in here. Unless and until somebody can commit this government to regulations which are going to exclude the mom-and-pop pony operators, and which are going to deal with what I call the incidental stable owners—and you know what I mean. I mean somebody other than a full-fledged commercial stable or, more importantly, somebody other than a riding range—no, not a riding range. What do they call these, where you go and rent a horse to ride around, where it's not your horse?

I think maybe that's the distinction. When people are on their horses it should be their responsibility regarding a helmet. When I'm on somebody else's horse that I am renting, then I appreciate there can be some onus on the person who is renting me the horse to make sure I wear a helmet. But heck, if I'm riding my own horse, granted I'm well over 18, but if I'm 17 and I'm riding my own horse, or one of my parents' horses, the person who boards that horse is on the hook, and I don't believe that's what was originally contemplated, neither by the coroner's jury nor Mrs Molinari when she initially moved the bill.

It has to do with commercial riding stables. That's what they're called, commercial riding stables. The bill's intention is good. The bill should pass. Like everybody else here—Mr Bryant and Mrs McLeod and I'm sure all the Conservative members—I do not want to see young people out on horses rented at riding stables not wearing helmets this summer, for Pete's sake. Obviously we're into the season; I presume we're into the season. I do not want to see that happen, but it's going to be very difficult. I'm not going to jeopardize the Careys and their livelihood, or the Atkinses down in St Anns, Ontario, and their livelihood, because of the inability of the government to come up with some adequate amendments.

I can't blame Mrs Molinari, because I think she did her best, but somebody in the government has failed her dramatically. I don't blame Mrs Molinari at all, but she got failed by somebody in the bureaucracy somewhere. Everybody knew what the issues were. The government House leader's office knew what the issues were and what the concerns were, and I don't think I'm unfair in suggesting that Mrs Molinari was sensitive to those issues. Mrs Molinari appeared to understand the concerns that were raised about the mom-and-pop pony operators, the non-commercial stables and certainly the dressage horse shows or competitions. I hope that will include dressage and similar things.

But heck, we've got to have somebody here who can speak for the government, I say to the Vice-Chair, I say to the members of the committee, I say to the parliamentary assistant. I don't think that's an unreasonable request. Don't do it for the opposition members. We want this bill to pass. We want people under 18 who rent horses at riding stables to be wearing helmets, and I agree

that the gist of the bill will achieve that, but my goodness, we don't want to put the Careys out of business.

Since these committee hearings, I have had a chance to sit and talk to them a couple of times. These people are the salt of the earth. These people have worked hard all their lives and they're not 30 any more—I don't think they'd mind me saying that—just like the Atkinses, down in St Anns, in Niagara region. Do you know what they own? They own their little piece of land and some ponies. That's it. That's their life history. They're not making big bucks by any stretch of the imagination, but they're making money, they're paying taxes and they're honest, straight people. I'm confident all of you share that view with me. I don't want these people getting busted because on their little ponies—heck, I don't even know how many feet high they are; three and a half feet high on a good day, I suppose, and I don't know how many hands. I don't want them getting busted and fined because of a kid who is propped up on one of these ponies, where the kid is almost—I've seen these pony operators. The pony operator's one hand is around the back end of the kid and the other hand, in most cases, is leading the horse by the bridle or, in the case of the Careys, the horse is attached to a little mini-carousel so the horse can't wander off or go anywhere it isn't supposed to. This is not the intent of the bill.

I tell you, Chair, I'm going to be asking, as is my right, when the vote is called, for a 20-minute recess.

1640

**The Chair:** Further to your discussion, did you wish to ask one of the ministry staff to come forward? Did you have a question for government—

**Mr Kormos:** Please. How many of them are here? Everybody's here. I'd like somebody to explain why we can come up with an amendment for the dressage issue, to whit, riders participating in horse shows or competitions, but we couldn't come up with a simple amendment to address the mom and pop, the Careys, or the Atkinses down in St Anns, and their small investments, their lifetime of work. These aren't young folks any more. They're not going to go out there and start all over again. This is it for them. You shut them down and this is it. So, come on, let's have the ministry staff up here responding to that question. I pose it in sincerity.

**The Chair:** Further to that, could I ask ministry staff to join us?

**Mrs Munro:** Excuse me, Mr Chair, the staff who are here are Ministry of Transportation staff. We're here to speak to the two MTO amendments.

**Mr Kormos:** My apologies. The parliamentary assistant is quite right. I don't have any quarrel with the Ministry of Transportation end of this. I haven't heard any concern about people under 18 riding horses on highways wearing helmets. But you see, Mr Carey is never on a highway with his little three-foot-high pony. So my apologies. It's unfair to ask the staff that.

**Mrs Marland:** Mr Kormos, you said when it comes to the vote, you'd be asking for a 20-minute recess. Do you

not have a full complement of members at the moment, or are there two? Are there two NDP members?

*Interjection.*

**Mrs Marland:** What does he mean by that? Mr Kormos, you said when it comes to voting that you will be asking for a 20-minute recess.

**Mr Kormos:** Yes.

**Mrs Marland:** What standing order will you be using for that?

**Mr Kormos:** It's in there. But perhaps we might have a five-minute recess now, with unanimous consent? I know you—

**Mrs Marland:** No, no, just a second. We just had a five-minute recess, with respect, before you came in. I think we need to move forward one way or another. Normally, a 20-minute recess in the standing orders is requested in order to get our members in to vote. I know from 10 years in opposition. But we have the full complement now, I think, of opposition members, don't we?

**Mr Kormos:** Let's just carry on. The clerk is checking.

**Mrs McLeod:** My understanding is we're still on amendment 4, which I believe is the one—Mr Kormos quite rightly had me raise the concern about dressage, and we had some discussion on that before Mr Kormos returned.

I have some really significant concerns that I wanted to speak to in moving the motion that comes next, which is my motion on the regulation issue. If we're going to be taking recesses, perhaps I could table my questions now so that we could achieve some progress in dealing with all the questions with one recess, so we don't come back to deal with motion 5 and end up with another recess. Shall I proceed to ask my questions and make them now, retroactive, in response to Mrs Molinari's opening comments?

**The Chair:** I think I should check with the clerk because you're suggesting we leave—

**Mrs McLeod:** I think Mr Kormos is raising a number of questions that may not be as directly related to the amendment that's before us as they are to the amendment which is to come next. I'm not sure whether Mr Kormos would like to move on to amendment number 5 and then have a whole series—

**Mr Kormos:** OK. No quarrel. In any event, since Tony Martin was substituted for me, I can't vote on this committee anyway, even though I'm a regular member of the committee.

**Mrs McLeod:** Who is Rosario substituting for?

**Mr Kormos:** Rosario is substituting for Tony Martin. Was he voting?

**Mrs McLeod:** Not yet.

**The Chair:** Mrs McLeod is suggesting we stand down the motion on page 4 and go on to the motion on page 5. We would need unanimous consent to move forward.

**Mrs Molinari:** There are still concerns on motion 4.

**The Chair:** We would come back to motion 4.

**Mrs McLeod:** I'm not asking to stand down motion 4. I thought there was probably agreement around the

amendment on page 4 and we could move to the amendment on page 5, where I think Mr Kormos's questions have been really directed.

**The Chair:** I might have missed that. You're suggesting I call the vote on this amendment?

**Mrs McLeod:** Yes.

**The Chair:** OK. I so notify the committee. I wish to call the vote on the amendment on page 4, to amend this motion. I'll call the vote. Shall this amendment carry? Carried.

We have a further motion.

**Mrs McLeod:** I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Regulations

"(5) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations,

"(a) exempting from any requirement of this section,

"(i) any class of owners or operators of horse riding establishments, or

"(ii) any class of horse riding establishments; and

"(b) prescribing conditions for the exemptions."

Those of you who were here at our last meeting will recall that I put forward this motion as a way to try and move the bill forward, recognizing the fact, as Mr Kormos has also said, that all of us believe that the intent of the bill is one of protecting young people and that we don't want to see that intent impeded. But we have concerns over a number of issues that I think came as somewhat of a surprise to all of us around this table in terms of who gets caught under "horse riding establishment" and those who are boarding horses.

There are three specific groups that have been identified, one being the pony rides, the second being the establishments that board horses but aren't responsible—those are private arrangements; they're not responsible for hiring the horses out—and the third being those who are riding in dressage, and we've just had the discussion about that and the amendment passed to exclude that. But as Mr Kormos noted earlier, although an amendment has been brought forward by Mrs Molinari to deal with the performance issues, there has been no specific amendment brought forward to deal with either the pony rides or those who board horses and are not hiring the horses out. I'm concerned about the fact that we've had an amendment that deals with only one part of this bill, and I'll wait perhaps until Mrs Molinari is able to respond.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We'll—

**Mrs McLeod:** May I just pose my question to Mrs Molinari? I was addressing the fact that in the course of our day's hearings we heard three specific concerns: the pony rides, the establishments that board horses but don't actually hire them out and those who are riding horses in dressage, and we've had the discussion and the amendment on the dressage issue. When I moved this motion it was to attempt to ensure that the bill could go forward, and I acknowledged I was putting it forward in good faith that the government shared the concerns that were being expressed around the table. My faith has been

somewhat eroded today in a couple of ways, because we've had an amendment dealing with one of those three areas but we don't have an amendment dealing with the other two areas. For me to proceed with this motion, it would be very important to know and to have on record whether or not the government is prepared to look at the issue of pony rides and those who board horses, even though no amendments came forward today. That's my first question and concern.

The second concern that I have is a straightforward question as to why there were no amendments on these two areas, as opposed to just the performance area today.

**1650**

The third is that if this amendment proceeds—and I believe, as the mover of the motion, I could withdraw the motion—my concern now is that I don't have any idea who is responsible for even making recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I'm a little bit concerned that a motion that's been put forward in good faith in order to move forward a private member's bill may be being supported only as a way of getting rid of the concerns, with no intention or no capability of government to deal with it. We've had it clearly recognized that the Ministry of Transportation, which is the only ministry participating and providing advice to this committee on this bill, is here specifically and understandably because of the clause that deals with highways. They have said they're not involved in any of the rest of this bill.

We asked at both of our last meetings for information as to what other ministries would be affected by the bill, would have some say in the bill and presumably would have some future responsibility in the bill. All we've had is a limited succession, mostly saying, "It's not ours. We have nothing to do with it." So I don't know who this bill is going to be directed to in order to make regulations. That, I believe, has to be clarified before this motion can proceed.

I'm willing to proceed with the motion, I'd like to see the bill go ahead, but I'm not prepared to put forward a motion that's not truly being supported in the good faith with which it was originally tabled. For me to know that, I need to know whether there's a serious willingness to look at these two issues that have been raised and not addressed, why the two issues were not addressed in an amendment, along with the amendment put forward today, and thirdly, if the motion proceeds and there is an act of faith for government to deal with these issues, who is responsible and will make recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor. Failing responses to those questions—I'm not intending to delay but I think they're reasonable questions and I'm not prepared to proceed with the motion until I have some response to that.

**Mrs Molinari:** I'd like to make a suggestion. I am sensitive to the comments about how to ensure that regulations will in fact be in place to cover some of the issues that have been raised. I'd like to suggest that we go with the other amendments—I'm not sure this is the wording—from the government, the Ministry of

Transportation amendments, and not conclude the full amendments at this time until I can respond to some of the concerns that have been raised. So we will keep this Liberal amendment to a future time when I can address some of the concerns. But in the meantime, I think the ones that are here are pretty much straightforward and we might be able to pass these. Then we can come back and only have to deal with the Liberal amendment that has to do with regulations. Hopefully at that point in time we'll be able to have some responses to some of the concerns.

**Mrs McLeod:** Those responses would be forthcoming before we actually took a final clause-by-clause vote?

**The Chair:** That would be my understanding.

**Mrs McLeod:** I appreciate that and I'm quite happy with that. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I think we're assuming discussion on another day on this clause?

**Mrs Molinari:** We will have to, Mr Chair, because I will need to endeavour to discover which ministry will be taking responsibility for seeing this through and the regulations.

**The Chair:** I would ask, then, for unanimous consent to stand down this motion.

**Mrs Marland:** Are we standing down the whole bill?

**The Chair:** No, just this motion. Do we have a subsequent motion?

**Mrs Molinari:** Could we continue with the rest of the amendments, so that when we come back we will only have the Liberal amendment to address? This is the one that raises a number of concerns and questions that need to be responded to before the committee is comfortable with proceeding.

**The Chair:** Yes. So we are essentially standing down this amendment to section 2.

Are there any further amendments to section 2? Seeing none, we go on to section 3.

Are there any amendments to section 3? Seeing none, I wish to put the question with respect to section 3. Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Section 4:

I open up for discussion on section 4 or motions for amendments.

**Mrs Molinari:** I will put the amendment forward and the parliamentary assistant for transportation will address any questions and speak on the amendments.

I move that paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection 104.1(1) of the Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 4 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"1. A helmet that complies with the requirements under the Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001.

"2. Footwear that complies with the requirements under the Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001."

**The Chair:** Thank you for that motion. Discussion on this amendment?

**Mrs McLeod:** I appreciate the fact that the amendment removes some of the concerns about the specificity of using the American society's model, the British model, but I think it begs the same question as I raised about my own motion, and that is, who is now

responsible for determining what the requirements are under the Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001? As I understand it, we may have just struck out the requirements.

The requirements that are there in 2(1): as worded, the amendment doesn't refer back to those, and those requirements don't apply to riders, as we determined earlier.

**Mrs Munro:** Mr Chair, if I might just respond.

The comment that you made secondly, I'm not sure. The first, section 2 of the bill, point 1, does outline those requirements. We did amend point 2, which is the footwear, but the helmet part is still standing. So in this point it's just to remove the references in the Highway Traffic Act and simply refer to them by the way in which they are described in this bill. They're described in the bill in section 2.

**Mrs McLeod:** The immediate problem with wording, just in terms of clarity: I think what's intended—I don't want to put legislative counsel under the gun here. But then we're now talking about a helmet that complies with requirements outlined—my problem is, we've just had a long discussion about the fact that section 2 of the bill doesn't deal with individual riders; it deals with establishments and operators of establishments. So how clear is it that in striking out the specific requirements for riders riding on highways—if the wording is clear, I'll set it aside. It just sounded to me as though under this section it might be anticipated that there were going to be new requirements developed under this act to apply to riders on highways.

**Mrs Munro:** Mr Chair, if I might just respond to that. There is the notion, and we heard this by one of the presenters a couple of weeks ago when asked, had helmet design changed over the 20 years or so that he had been involved, and he said yes—the intent here is certainly, as you mentioned, to be able to provide an opportunity to respond to new, safer riding helmets and footwear. The reason for that would be that you wouldn't have to then make amendments in the Highway Traffic Act to go along with the changes that would come along should there be changes in the safety requirements.

1700

**Mrs McLeod:** How does the wording that was originally in the bill under 104.1 differ from the requirements under 2(1)?

**Mrs Munro:** I believe it's the same.

**The Chair:** Mrs Molinari, do you want to—

**Mrs Molinari:** I might be able to help here. What this says is that the actual American Society for Testing and Materials and the British Standards Institution, which are the specific brands of the helmet, are covered in section 2. This basically says that it meets with the requirement under the Horse Riding Safety Act, which means it's already covered in section 2 of the act. So it's being repeated here. My understanding is that the Ministry of Transportation felt it needed just a line saying that it complies with the act, which is already stated in the previous section, so it didn't need to be repeated here.

**Mrs McLeod:** For the sake of clarity, I would have preferred to see it repeated and amended in the way in which 2(1) was amended, but that's fine.

**The Chair:** There's one issue I would like to raise. We have one amendment that has been stood down for further information. Depending on what is discovered with respect to that amendment, does that affect the rest of this bill? I guess I'm questioning how much further we should go with this. Is there a change that may occur there that would cause changes in other sections of this legislation?

**Mrs McLeod:** I think it would have if the answer to my last question was different, but I think as it stands, probably the only section where we need to have a ministry identified as responsible is for the referral for regulatory changes.

**The Chair:** Mrs Molinari, did you have a comment on that?

**Mrs Molinari:** Just to say that I don't think we need to discontinue dealing with the rest of the amendments. I think we can continue with these amendments even though we stood down the previous one.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on this amendment to section 4? OK. Committee, I will put the question to section 4. Shall this amendment to section 4 carry? Carried.

Any further amendments?

**Mrs Molinari:** Mr Chair, I would like to withdraw the amendment listed on page 7 because of the previous amendment that just carried. There's no need for this amendment at this time.

**The Chair:** With respect to section 4, any further amendments?

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that section 104.1 of the Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 4 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Rider to identify self

"(4) A police officer who finds any person contravening subsection (1) may require that person to stop and to provide identification for himself or herself.

"Same

"(5) Every person who is required to stop by a police officer acting under subsection (4), shall stop and identify himself or herself to the police officer.

"Same

"(6) For the purposes of this section, giving one's correct name and address is sufficient identification.

"Same

"(7) A police officer may arrest without warrant any person who does not comply with subsection (5)."

**The Chair:** We have an amendment, page 8, to section 4. Any discussion on this amendment?

**Mr Bryant:** Just a question. I presume there is a search and seizure involved in this, that police are stopping people and asking them for questions and arresting them. This, I presume, has gone through the charter of police and the ministry and this is pretty standard?

**Mrs Munro:** Yes, it is. The amendment obviously ensures that police can effectively enforce the provisions of the bill and it parallels the existing requirement in the Highway Traffic Act.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on this amendment? Shall I put the question? Shall this amendment on page 8 to section 4 carry? Carried.

Any further amendments to section 4? Seeing none, shall section 4, as amended, carry? Carried.

Moving on to section 5: are there any motions for amendments to section 5?

**Mrs Molinari:** I move that section 5 of the bill—

*Interjection.*

**Mrs Molinari:** My understanding is that we're withdrawing this last amendment.

**The Chair:** OK. With respect to section 5, are there any further amendments?

**Mrs McLeod:** I would ask that this section also be set down until we can get the responses for regulatory changes. Depending on the answer we get on whether or not there are to be exemptions made through regulation, I think, assuming that the government were to call this bill for third reading and proclaim it, the 90 days might be too limiting in terms of regulatory changes.

I appreciate the fact that section 4 in the amendment was to have been separated out so that the issue of riders under 18 riding on the highways could come into effect immediately, but I also understand that because she made the amendment that makes section 4 dependent upon section 2, we can't really do section 4 separately, which is why I would have supported the amendment she withdrew.

All that being said, I would just suggest you stand it down until we know what our timelines are likely to look like.

**The Chair:** We have a suggestion to stand down section 5.

**Mrs Molinari:** Just a question, and that's with the possibility of returning it as an amendment.

**Mrs McLeod:** I just think that once we get the clarification on regulatory changes and who's responsible, we might have a better sense of whether 90 days is an appropriate timeline. You might want to, in the meantime, revisit—I don't whether you can even do that—the amendment. If you were to have included—instead of worrying about duplication of print—the regulations under section 4, then your amendment that would have had section 4 come into force immediately would have been in order and that part of the bill could have proceeded quickly. I'm not sure if you want to just pull back and leave it at that.

**The Chair:** So we're not withdrawing section 5; we're standing it down. I would have to ask for unanimous consent to stand down section 5 for a future date. Agreed? Agreed.

In my opinion, I don't think we can continue with further business. We should continue with the title, but we certainly cannot pass the rest of the complete legislation.

Any further discussion before I draw this meeting to a close?

**Mrs Molinari:** Just a question. What are the timelines to come back? This committee is meeting again tomorrow with government business, Bill 58. So we would set a date for a future meeting to continue with this bill?

**The Chair:** With respect to your question, we can also touch base with members and get back to you on that.

Any further business or any further discussion?

**Mrs Molinari:** So we're going to touch base with members to get back to me on whether or not this bill is going to be discussed again in the next couple of days?

**The Chair:** When the best timeline is to reconvene.

**Mrs Molinari:** OK. There is a general commitment of the committee that we reconvene within the next short while, before we recess?

**Mr Bryant:** Just to confirm Mrs Molinari's desire, we in the opposition certainly want this bill to pass as soon as possible. We need to have Mrs McLeod's concerns addressed. The subcommittee needs to meet in order to

set a date so that we can get this on before the recess; then we will do that. I think it's really going to be up to the government House leader as to the timeline, but of course the subcommittee will meet and set a date so that we can come back, if need be, next Monday.

**The Chair:** I would think next Monday.

**Mrs Marland:** The point Mr Bryant has just made was the point I was going to make. I think that before this meeting adjourns, there should be a request or a motion from a member of the subcommittee requesting the House leaders to agree to schedule this committee for next week to proceed. Otherwise, if it's not scheduled now and if it's not perceived as being within the domain of the Chair to call a meeting, then we need to have it confirmed that there will be a request to the House leaders to have a meeting.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mrs Marland. As Chair I see this committee meeting next Monday, unless there is emergent business that we're not aware of.

Further discussion? I declare this meeting adjourned.

*The committee adjourned at 1712.*



## CONTENTS

Monday 18 June 2001

<b>Committee business</b> .....	J-31
<b>Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001, Bill 12, <i>Mrs Molinari</i> / <b>Loi de 2001 sur la sécurité des cavaliers</b>, projet de loi 12, <i>M<sup>me</sup> Molinari</i></b> .....	J-32

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND SOCIAL POLICY

#### **Chair / Présidente**

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant PC)

#### **Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East / -Est PC)

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant PC)

Mr Marcel Beaubien (Lambton-Kent-Middlesex PC)

Mr Michael Bryant (St Paul's L)

Mr Carl DeFaria (Mississauga East / -Est PC)

Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa West-Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest-Nepean PC)

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre / -Centre ND)

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan L)

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill PC)

#### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South / -Sud PC)

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie ND)

Mr R. Gary Stewart (Peterborough PC)

#### **Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes**

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre/ -Centre ND)

Mr Rosario Marchese (Trinity-Spadina ND)

Mrs Julia Munro (York North / -Nord PC)

#### **Clerk / Greffier**

Mr Tom Prins

#### **Staff / Personnel**

Ms Susan Klein, legislative counsel