



ISSN 1488-9080

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 37th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 11 June 2001

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 11 juin 2001

**Standing committee on
justice and social policy**

Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001

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

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 11 June 2001

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE
ET DES AFFAIRES SOCIALES

Lundi 11 juin 2001

The committee met at 1601 in room 228.

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 (Mr Toby Barrett): I call the committee to order.

Mr Peter Kormos (Niagara Centre): On a point of order, Mr Chair: I request a five-minute adjournment. That requires unanimous consent, of course.

The Chair: For purposes of discussion?

Mr Kormos: It might facilitate the progress of this afternoon's proceedings.

The Chair: OK, a five-minute recess.

The committee recessed from 1601 to 1609.

The Chair: Welcome, all. We're continuing discussion of Bill 12, An Act to increase the safety of equestrian riders. Today is clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Mr Kormos: I move that this bill be deferred for further consideration by this committee.

The Chair: What time period are we referring to? We've just had a five-minute recess.

Mr Kormos: I understand that, sir, but I'm moving that the bill be deferred to be returned to the committee at the direction of the subcommittee.

The Chair: Is there any further explanation for the committee?

Mr Kormos: That motion being on the floor?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr Kormos: Thank you, sir. I want to make it very clear that the New Democratic Party and certainly myself, as the member of this committee, support the intent of the author of this bill and we would be pleased to assist her, as sponsor of this private member's bill, in the passage of the bill as it reflects the recommendations of the coroner's inquest jury as the result of the tragic death of a youngster off a horse, without adequate helmet and under circumstances, as I understand them, that led the jury to make the recommendations it did, including that horses in what I colloquially call riding stables, where you go and rent a horse—I have no quarrel with the

proposition that those riding stables should be obligated to provide appropriate safety gear.

I should explain that in subcommittee there was some impetus to have this bill go forward with no hearings whatsoever or with no witnesses whatsoever. Ms McLeod was at that subcommittee meeting, I was there, Ms Molinari was there of course, and there was the Chair. There were people who said no, we should have some hearings. Quite frankly, horse riding is not part of my world, is not part of my universe, although I know it's very popular with so many people in so many ways.

To that end I'm very grateful—but it also revealed something about the danger of not being more careful about how we approach these things—that Ms Molinari then helped select presenters for the mere one day because, among others, it drew forward the Careys and Mr and Mrs Atkins from down in St Anns, where I come from, and it raised some issues about the bill. The bill is not a long bill. I understand that. It's a relatively brief bill. But it raised some concerns. Without the input from those people—I'm incredibly grateful to those people—I hadn't considered some of the ramifications of the bill and its impact on small business people like the Careys, like the Atkins down where I come from, its impact on what I regard as the very foundation of the horse racing industry. That's something that wasn't addressed by presenters last week, but I should raise it now, which is what my motion to defer is all about.

Down where I come from, and I suspect in other people's ridings too, we have people raising racehorses and training them who are not the mega-million-dollar racehorse owners. More often than not, these people work at their regular job 40 or 50 hours a week or however much, and then tend to their farms, with their stables and their racehorses, after hours and on week-ends. One of the things they do to subsidize their small farms, with their stables—because horses, whether you're an owner or otherwise involved with them, are an incredibly expensive proposition. It's not called the sport of kings for nothing.

Horses are incredibly expensive, so what these small racehorse farm operators do is rent out two or three stables on their farm to other horse owners, people who live in the city, people who keep horses for any number of reasons: for their kids, or they do dressage. I met a young woman who does dressage over the weekend and she explained to me—I'll get into the fact that dressage

riders wear, as part of their costume, this top hat, which is not a hard hat; it's a traditional part of that very specialized sport. But it's other equestrians also. Some people keep horses just for the pleasure. They like them and they want to ride them on the weekend. Others show them. Others train them to do all these sorts of things that horses are trained to do.

The problem is that my small—I'm sure almost everybody in this room has these folks in their riding. Maybe Mr Bryant doesn't; I don't think Mr Bryant has any stables in his riding, but he's got a lot of horse people who are using these out-of-town stables. Do you understand what I'm saying? So I'm boarding my horse at De Chellis's place in east Welland, down toward Cooks Mills. De Chellis is well known on the racetrack circuit. He raises and he also trains racehorses. He's been quite successful but not extremely wealthy. If he boards my horse, if he rents a stall to me, and I take my niece or my nephew or my kid or whoever to that farm on Sunday, the owner may not even be there. He may be doing his overtime shift over at Atlas steel or Page-Hersey to make the money to pay for the mortgage on his ranch, or his little farm; I call it a ranch.

He's not there. I go and take my horse out of the stall, put my kid, niece, nephew, whoever, who is under 18, on the horse and that child gets hurt by not wearing a helmet, and the owner of that farm is on the hook too, as I understand the bill. He's liable under this provincial offence for not ensuring that that youngster riding the horse has a helmet, and also—there are others on this committee who can speak more effectively about this—that statutory obligation creates some new tort liability. Now understand, I'm a fan of tort, but I don't think people anticipated what was really going to be happening here.

Ms Molinari, I've got to tell you, has been very responsive during my conversations with her last week and during our conversations earlier today. I also spoke with other members of this committee, specifically Ms McLeod, and Ms McLeod has been very astute in her response to this bill. I've read, for instance, a proposed amendment.

I think we've got to be extremely careful about creating legislation that's going to hurt small people, that is going to target people who were never intended to be targeted. I know what the comments were by some of the presenters last week, that, "Yes, even the Careys with their little ponies and their carousel should have helmets." If people are prepared to legislate that sort of activity out of existence, then let's debate that, because that's what you're talking about.

The fact is that the Careys or the Atkins in Welland—the Atkins had two ponies at Sunset Haven, the seniors' home, yesterday, family day. We do it every year at Sunset Haven and we do one at Rapelje Lodge too. They had two little ponies there. Each pony has a person guiding the pony. The pony's only yea long, and one hand is holding the rein of the horse or the bridle, whatever it is, and the other one is virtually holding on to

the back or the butt of the kid who's sitting on the horse. I'm not going to at this point suggest that the Atkins or the Careys should—that the coroner's inquest jury recommendations were contemplating the Atkins or the Careys in terms of putting helmets on those kids riding the horses. The Careys have developed an innovative little technique that seems to be all their own about how to keep a kid on a horse, and fair enough, so be it.

I think we'd better be very careful. What I'm concerned about is that it doesn't just end with the Atkins and the Careys, or with my small stable operators down in Niagara who board horses to supplement the income, or offset the expense rather, of their farms. There could well be other groups. That's where I raised the issue of a young dressage rider, a young woman who rides dressage.

There are other people here, and we should have witnesses about that, but that's the highly stylized type of horse riding—am I correct in that? It's traditional, it's historical. The horse does special things. They do it at Exhibition Place during the Royal Winter Fair. I know they do it there. Part of the exercise is very disciplined. It's international. Canadians compete in that. Part of the exercise is wearing the uniform, including, apparently, a top hat, like an old silk top hat. This young woman said, "No, it would be absurd." I suppose change happens, but she said it would be silly to put on the helmet that's being contemplated rather than the traditional top hat.

I don't know whether this committee wanted this helmet bill to extend to dressage riders and competitors, like at the Royal Winter Fair, in the stadium, in the Horse Palace down the road here at the Exhibition. If I'm wrong, somebody's going to correct me, because they always do, but clearly the attempt here is to ensure that commercial riding stables like the ones I went to a few times as a kid—we would ride our bicycles down to Cooks Mills at the very east end of Welland. There were a couple of riding stables there. It was like going bowling. A group of us would ride our bicycles down there, 8, 9 or 10 years old, and rent a horse. They'd help you up on the horse.

Mr Garry J. Guzzo (Ottawa West-Nepean): That was Fort Erie.

Mr Kormos: No, I was too young.

The horse wouldn't gallop. The horse was a big, fat thing and knew its own way. It took you out on a little path and back to the barn. I'm sure there are sportier horses that people rent. I'm inclined to agree that any riding stable like that, that rents out the horse such that the rider of that horse has sole control—do you see where I'm making the distinction?

1620

My comment is that with the Careys' horses, the rider, the little six-year-old or seven-year-old kid sitting on the back so grandpa and grandma can take snapshot after snapshot or video them, does not have any control over the horse. The horse is being controlled by the people running the event. The kid's just sitting there either thrilled or terrified, depending. You've see them. You

know what's happening. The kid's either hysterical and screaming, "Get me off this thing," or the kid's screaming because the parents want to take him off. But that child is not riding the horse. The child is sitting atop it, but it is not riding the horse. It is not telling the horse to go, turn left, turn right, what have you.

It seems to me that what we want to target is scenarios where people under 18 are riding a horse in the bona fide sense of riding a horse, exercising total control of it. They are alone on the horse. They've got the reins. They've got the stirrups. They're the ones who tell the horse to go, stop, if that's what you tell a horse, I don't know. They're the ones who give the horse those instructions or orders. They're the ones who go off into the fields, or riding paths, I suspect, in tourist areas. There's terrain—I know out west in BC and so on they have riding paths where you go up into more exotic country.

It seems to me that those are to be the targets of the legislation, but the legislation embraces those and a whole big field beyond that. Ms Munro, who is the PA to the Minister of Transportation, whose input into this has been very fair and helpful to everybody—I hope to everybody; it certainly was to me. When Ms Molinari and I spoke together last week after the last committee meeting, Ms Munro was there, certainly on one occasion. Ms Munro is just from the Ministry of Transportation, as I understand it. She will correct me if I'm wrong. She can give approval or non-approval from MTO. That's the small part of the bill that talks about riding a horse on a highway, which I suppose is the only place MTO has jurisdiction; the only time the Highway Traffic Act applies is when you've got a horse on a highway.

But we haven't heard from economic development, for instance, or from the ministry of tourism and rec, which would seem to me to have a very critical interest in this. We haven't heard from carnival operators. Maybe I'm just out of date, and maybe it doesn't happen in small town carnivals any more, but the people like Conklin who take carnivals around to small-town Ontario, like where I'm from, as I recall used to have these same kinds of pony ride operations. Heck, they've got mechanical rides that are far more bouncy and insecure than any horse would ever be and there are no helmets there. That maybe raises a whole kettle of fish and I'm going to have a bunch of carnival operators mad at me for suggesting it.

I'm asking to adjourn this. I do not want to see the bill scuttled. The bill is based on some sound premises. I think that even the people with concerns about the bill, even the Careys, would agree with the general thrust of the bill. When people are going out to riding stables where they've got independent care and control of a horse, requiring those youngsters to wear a helmet, and more importantly, requiring that stable to provide the helmet or to ensure the person is wearing it—I don't think people like the Careys who operate Pony Rides—that's the name of their business—or the Atkins down in St Anns are saying, "No, do away with that." I think they're agreeing. They understand. These people have been horse people for a long time. Nobody's objecting to the thrust of the bill.

I would very much have preferred if we could have agreed on consent to simply set the bill over because with all due respect—I read the motion, that if the bill is adjourned, I trust it will be put forward—I appreciate that it was an attempt to do—well, it's an attempt to do what it's an attempt to do—but I'm concerned because it hands it over to regulation and that scares the daylight out of me. Do you understand when we say "exempt people by regulation"? That means it never comes before the Legislature. It happens, effectively—again that's just the nature of the beast—behind closed doors. Nobody gets a chance to provide input on so-called regulations.

I'd appreciate some advice from research, legal counsel, what have you, because I'm worried about a bill that defines something in the body of the bill—in other words, who's covered; that's what this bill does—and then has, by exemption, regulations. I think it's a sloppy way to write legislation. Usually you use regulations to do other things; for instance, to define classes referred to in a bill. To create a broad definition in a bill and say "other than those exempted by regulation" seems to me—because the broad definition, insofar as my modest recollection of how this works is concerned, is it has to be interpreted pretty broadly, unless it is in itself strict and narrow, but then the exemption, if it's an exemption, has to be interpreted very narrowly, very conservatively. That creates real problems too.

We don't want to create more problems; we want to solve a problem. I'm onside in that regard. I want to help solve a problem. With all due respect to Mrs Molinari, I'm eager to do it today, tomorrow, whenever, but I suspect that if the purported solution, with all due respect, is the regulation exemption solution, it's not a solution, it creates trouble.

Then I'm also worried, because how long do the Careys have to wait for that regulation? They have no guarantees. I'm sorry, but if you put these folks out of business for a year, you put them out of business forever—they're finished. People like the Careys, people like the Atkins—they're just two of what I'm sure are many family-run operations, mom-and-pops here in Ontario—are an integral part of our agriculture industry. They're the people who buy the feed. They're the people who keep small-town grain stores operating, the co-op mill and so on. They are, aren't they? They're the ones who do that stuff. They're the ones who are the last line against corporate farming and, in many cases, simply the abandonment of farming so that we buy all the stuff we eat from down in California.

These people are at the front line of the agriculture industry. They're good folks. They've worked hard, for lifetimes. They haven't got the money to hire high-priced lawyers to do challenges and stuff like that. They've worked too darn hard, the Careys and Atkins and others like them—I know these people. You've been in their homes, Chair. I know you know them from down in the neck of the woods you come from.

The Chair: Mr Kormos, I think our 20 minutes are pretty well up.

We have a motion to defer this bill. Further debate?

Mr Morley Kells (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): My own personal view is that I'd rather defer than do anything in haste, because we all know from experience that if you get something on the books, it's very difficult to amend it or get it off the books.

Before I go on, I would like to point out the obvious: Bill 12 stands in the name of my colleague. She has given this, as you know, considerable time and has spent, I guess, as much time as anybody could on interviewing and trying to find just exactly the solution, if I could call it that, to the problem. Before the government side would sort of jump in haste to support the deferral, we wonder exactly how long we're deferring for and for what gain.

We're not here to quarrel with the arguments or the points made by the honourable member, but the bill has had a considerable history. I think the point about the MOT's amendments is well taken. A bill, if it's going to be an efficient bill, has to solve all the problems that may be attendant upon what we're trying to do.

As you know, Chair, we could defeat this deferral and then we'd have to listen to the arguments over again, and maybe at a somewhat higher pitch. What we would like to do, if the Chair and the other members would indulge us, is call for a five-minute recess, if that's possible, so we could discuss it among ourselves, and then we'd be pleased to vote on the deferral motion.

The Chair: I'll just indicate to the committee that I do have a request from Ms McLeod for further debate, and then could we—

Mr Kells: Sure, that would be fine.

The Chair: Secondly, to answer your question, Mr Kells, as I understand, Mr Kormos's motion is to defer this bill and the time period until further consideration by the subcommittee.

Mr Kells: You want to defer it to the subcommittee?

Mr Kormos: Yes, sir.

Mr Kells: That's fine.

Mr Kormos: On a point of order, Mr Chair: I would consider friendly amendments to that motion, to the terms of it. If you can be more creative than I am, God bless.

Mr Kells: I hear the honourable member. What we're trying to do here, if I may speak for the members who brought this bill forward, is get some solution here, get something on the books. But it has been a while, and we're quite prepared, I do believe, to take a little longer and get it right. So that would be the position we're probably going to take, but I'd like to discuss it with the members of the committee.

The Chair: I would like to turn to Ms McLeod and then consider the five-minute recess.

Mrs Lyn McLeod (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): I'll restrict my comments to the issue of adjournment. I guess my questions are around the time frame. I'll be quite frank. I share many of the concerns that Mr Kormos has outlined. I think those came as insights for the committee in the hearings. I don't think they were issues that were unaddressed in terms of the presenters who were support-

ive of the bill. So there's clearly a difference of opinion as to whether or not those issues should be addressed in the legislation. But I share Mr Kormos's concerns based on the input that we heard and feel that with more time we would be able to determine whether or not there should be some substantive changes actually included in the bill.

My concern, though, about length of time for deferral and how soon we could deal with it is that I, quite frankly, believe that the substance of the bill is necessary. I believe it needs to go ahead. I would be really concerned if we delayed the bill to the point where we went into the summer recess and into the fall and there was any accident, God forbid, that might have been prevented if we had been able to move this legislation through more quickly. That's one of the issues that gives me some pause.

I know we seem to be arguing; it's unusual for opposition and government to maybe be taking different views on this, and it's not a different view. I just would like to know whether or not we can deal with some of the concerns about being too hasty in not dealing with the issues that were raised by Mr Kormos and still be able to get this legislation potentially passed in an amended form in order to deal with the summer riding.

The Chair: I'll just draw to the attention of the committee that we did receive a memo from Carolyn Barnes, a research librarian, which pointed out some press material, and secondly it dealt in part with the question of how ministries would be affected by this legislation. I just draw that to the attention of this committee. This committee is recessed for five minutes.

The committee recessed from 1634 to 1642.

The Chair: Thank you, committee. We have a motion on the floor. Further debate?

Mr Kormos: I'd like to amend that motion so that the motion would read that Bill 12 and its consideration be adjourned to Monday, June 18 at 3:30 pm or at the commencement of orders of the day, whichever occurs first.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Kormos. Any further debate?

Mr Kells: That would be the only order of business.

Mr Kormos: Quite right, and that that be the only order of business.

The Chair: Further debate?

Mrs Tina R. Molinari (Thornhill): Are we debating now the deferral and the amendment to the deferral on—

The Chair: We're debating a motion to defer this bill until Monday, June 18.

Mrs Molinari: In consideration with my colleagues and some of the concerns that have been raised, as long as I'm assured that the bill will come back before the committee and that this committee will give it due consideration before the House rises, then I'm prepared to support this deferral. But, Mr Chair, I want to stress the importance of having this bill passed. This is not a bill that was just introduced and discussed the last few months; it's a year and a half that this bill has been circulated across the province of Ontario. It has been

circulated across many stakeholders, and we've heard some of the stakeholders come to the hearings and we are receiving letters from others who are now finding out that the bill is in fact close to passage. My concern for this bill is to ensure that it is passed within a short period of time. I'm prepared to support the amendment, providing that there is a date, and I understand that the amendment is to defer it to June 18.

Mrs McLeod: I will certainly support it, but I think the work of the subcommittee can only be effective if it's clear that we're going to have some indication, some very clear indication from the government, as well as from Ms Molinari, as to which of the exemptions would be recommended to be built into this bill. I put forward an amendment as a way of trying to save the bill before the summer in the hopes that there would be good faith that the government was not intending to catch Carey's Pony Rides or the racehorse operators who board horses or now the dressage groups. It's very seldom that you'll hear me say on the record that I was going to take the government at face to be able to do this, but as I said earlier, I felt it was important that we find a way to get the bill passed for the summer.

Now that the subcommittee is meeting to further consider these issues, it's absolutely imperative that we have clear answers from the government as to how this bill should be amended to exclude the groups that they feel should not be included, and if they're not prepared to make those recommendations, we need to know where we go. Because otherwise we'll be back basically to today's point in time.

Mr Kormos: I feel compelled to respond to the sponsor of this bill. Look, it wasn't the opposition parties that waited until April 25 to present it, it wasn't the opposition parties that determined when it was going to have second reading, it wasn't the opposition parties that drafted it. What the opposition parties did do during subcommittee was insist that there be some modest amount of hearings, and quite frankly, had the opposition parties not done that, Ms Molinari, your preference of having no submissions would have prevailed and people like the Careys and people like other pony ride operators would never have had an opportunity to raise this issue.

You didn't anticipate this issue. None of your people anticipated the issue of the private pony rides, small entrepreneurs across this province. None of your people anticipated the issue of horse race people across the province with their small stables. None of your people anticipated the issue of dressage. So please be careful about how you try to be critical and make implications about what opposition members are doing. I resent your comments in the context of opposition members having tried to be very co-operative with you in making sure this bill is pursued. So—

Mrs Molinari: Point of order, Chair—

Mr Kormos: No, I've got the floor.

The Chair: Point of order? Yes.

Mrs Molinari: I would like the member opposite to clarify exactly what I said that is leading him to suggest-

ing that I was making any comments about my work with the opposition.

The Chair: That is not a point of order. Mr Kormos and then Ms McLeod.

Mr Kormos: But it does warrant a response, and that is that Ms Molinari says, "Oh, this bill's been floating around for 12 months. It's a surprise that all of a sudden these issues are being raised." Obviously the bill wasn't being floated around among the right people in the right circles. Obviously the Careys hadn't heard about the bill until it was brought to committee and they became conscious of it. Obviously the Atkins hadn't. So don't play that game, Ms Molinari. I'm not responsible, nor is any other opposition member responsible, for this bill not being passed sooner. The fact is that the rather flawed drafting of the bill—and again, I have no interest in ascribing fault, but you've raised the issue—and the failure to adequately contemplate all of the people it's going to impact is what has caused the delay from this week. So, please, let's move on.

I expect the government to present amendments that will meaningfully address people like the Careys, because I don't want to see them put of business. I'll do anything I have to to prevent them or the Atkins from being put of business, to prevent people like Mr De Chellis and others like him down in Niagara with their small race horse operations from being put out of business, and quite frankly to protect the interests of dressage riders and similar equestrian types who clearly weren't part of your consultation and hadn't received adequate notice of the bill. They expressed surprise, and it was only as a result of that one afternoon of hearings that they had any concerns about the bill.

Nobody in the opposition parties is blocking this bill, nobody is delaying it. We raised these concerns last week and the fact is that you came here empty-handed today. The matter could have been dealt with today had amendments been considered and prepared. All you've got today is the Ministry of Transportation, and quite frankly I take his position as it stands because it deals with horses on highways. But there was nothing produced by you or the government that addressed the concerns that were raised at the last committee hearing, and quite frankly were raised with you in conversation subsequent to that. So please—

The Chair: Further debate on this amendment to the motion?

Mrs McLeod: I just think for the record we should recognize that to the best of my knowledge, in fairness, the government referred it to committee—belatedly, I agree. My criticism has been that this committee had not been well used for other significant legislation which could have been before this committee. But I do think it was the government that referred this particular bill to the committee and it was the government that recommended hearings. I don't think any of us anticipated some of the concerns that were raised at the hearings, so I'm glad the hearings were there and I'm glad that we heard the concerns.

The challenge now is that we need—I'd like to think that we all feel the same challenge, which is to deal with those concerns that were raised at the same time as we find a way to move forward on the substance of the legislation. Hopefully the subcommittee meeting—in that spirit and with the support of the government taking quick action to respond to these issues, we can still get this bill passed by the end of the session.

The Chair: I wish to put the question. Bear with me. I'll attempt to—

Mr Kormos: Recorded vote.

The Chair: I'll attempt to describe the amendment. The amendment is a motion to defer this bill until Monday, June 18, and that it be the only order of business. Is that our understanding of this amendment?

Mrs McLeod: Was it not going to the subcommittee?

Mr Kells: Deferring it to the subcommittee, and then the honourable member amended it to bring it back on June 18 as the only order of business.

The Chair: Yes, no subcommittee in this amendment.

Mrs McLeod: So the government reports directly to this committee with amendments? Is that the intent?

Mr Kells: I would suggest that the government would be back here with amendments to reflect the discussions we've had today. We will have been counterproductive if we don't do that.

Mr Kormos: If I may, it's not quite into the vote yet, I'm hoping that sometime before next week Ms Molinari discusses this matter with the opposition members, and of course her own people, hopefully shows us the amend-

ments, and this matter can proceed relatively smoothly next Monday. However, failing that, I've made a commitment to the Careys, I've made a commitment to the Atkins down in my community, I've made a commitment to racehorse people, that I will keep.

The Chair: Shall I put the question?

Mr Kormos: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair: Shall the amendment to the motion carry? All in favour?

Ayes

Bryant, DeFaria, Guzzo, Kells, Kormos, McLeod, Molinari.

The Chair: I declare that amendment to the motion carried.

Shall the motion carry?

Mr Kormos: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bryant, DeFaria, Guzzo, Kells, Kormos, McLeod, Molinari.

The Chair: I declare the motion carried.

I declare this order of business closed.

The committee adjourned at 1652.

CONTENTS

Monday 11 June 2001

Horse Riding Safety Act, 2001, Bill 12, <i>Mrs Molinari</i> / Loi de 2001 sur la sécurité des cavaliers, projet de loi 12, <i>M^{me} Molinari</i>	J-25
---	------

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

Mr Morley Kells (Etobicoke-Lakeshore PC)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Mrs Julia Munro (York North / -Nord PC)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr Tom Prins

Staff / Personnel

Ms Susan Klein, legislative counsel

Mr Avrum Fenson, research officer,
Research and Information Services