



ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 39th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 39^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 14 September 2010

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mardi 14 septembre 2010

**Standing Committee on
Government Agencies**

Intended appointments

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Nominations prévues

Chair: Ernie Hardeman
Clerk: Katch Koch

Président : Ernie Hardeman
Greffier : Katch Koch

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT AGENCIESCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Tuesday 14 September 2010

Mardi 14 septembre 2010

The committee met at 0905 in committee room 1.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): We'll call this meeting to order. First of all, I apologize for starting late. I thought we would maybe try and see if we could have all three parties present to start the meeting. We have appointments, or interviews, this morning, so we will proceed with the other issues that we have to deal with.

I first of all want to say thank you for being here this morning, and I hope you all had a good summer. We hope, going into this session, that we will all have a productive time serving on this committee between now and the winter recess.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Our first order of business this morning is the subcommittee meeting of Thursday, June 10, 2010.

Mr. Michael A. Brown: Mr. Chair, could I move the reports of the subcommittee on business dated Thursday, June 10; Friday, July 2; Thursday, July 15; Thursday, August 5; and Thursday, September 9?

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): You not only can move the first one; you can move all those, Mr. Brown.

All those being moved, do we have any discussion on any of the committee reports that are before you? Hearing no discussion, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

MR. IAN FRASER

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Ian Fraser, intended appointee as member, South East Local Health Integration Network.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): We will proceed with the interviews this morning. The first interview today is Ian Fraser as intended appointee as a member of the South East Local Health Integration Network. Mr. Fraser, if you would come forward. We will provide—any one of those chairs, yes.

Mr. Ian Fraser: Any one of these hot seats in the front of the room?

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Whichever one you sit down at is the one the lights will come on at.

Mr. Ian Fraser: It lights up. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): You have this thing: You're electrifying.

We will provide you with an opportunity to make an opening statement. Upon the conclusion of the opening statement, we will then allow opportunities for each party to ask questions as it relates to your presentation. We'll have 10 minutes for each party to ask questions, and that will conclude the interview.

So with that, Mr. Fraser, we thank you very much for coming in this morning and we look forward to your presentation.

0910

Mr. Ian Fraser: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the members of the committee for this opportunity to present myself here this morning.

Welcome back. I hope you've all had a good summer and are ready, as well, for an exciting term ahead.

I do appreciate the decision that this committee made last May to extend the deadline for this interview and allow me the opportunity to come before you today. I'm very pleased to be here.

As you may have learned from my application, I am a consultant in philanthropy and I serve a wide variety of client organizations across the not-for-profit sector on matters of fundraising, governance, strategic planning and communications.

I began my career as a development officer at Kingston General Hospital in 1983, later serving as a hospital vice-president responsible for the programs of the KGH Foundation and the hospital's many public relations activities. During this time, I pursued my certified health care executive credential through the college, as I thought it was important to understand, in my role as a development officer, the principles on which our health care system in this country was founded and, I believe, continues to operate. I felt that it was important if I was to make the case effectively with prospective donors as to why they might wish to consider supporting the hospital with a voluntary contribution. So setting the context for the system was important and it was something perhaps unusual at the time for development officers, many of my colleagues, who saw themselves in a more narrowly defined role. I wanted to understand and appreciate the issues from the get-go as we looked to build a health care system in this country.

In 1995, I returned to Queen's University, my alma mater, to serve as its director of development, where I

assumed responsibility for the institution's fundraising programs.

In 1999, I joined with other health care colleagues to establish the Fundraising Network, a fundraising consultancy providing strategic counsel to institutions and charitable organizations, primarily in higher education, health care, community services and the arts across Canada. It was in this role that I first became familiar with the concept of local health integration networks when they were first introduced into Ontario in 2006. I was aware of the efforts that were being made at the time and previous to this time to address system integration issues all across the country in respective provinces—each of them, of course, highly varied, but nonetheless with a similar goal: to try to develop a system that was integrated within the province and, I hope, by extension, beyond the province's boundaries, so that overall we could develop a comprehensive system in this country.

As a health care executive, I understood the importance of that undertaking and watched with interest, as I believe it was and still is important to keep focused on a better strategy for planning, coordinating, integrating and ultimately funding the health care system, the delivery of services within the system at the local and regional levels, and, hopefully, to do so in a manner that's still consistent with the abiding principles of the Canada Health Act.

Ideally, services of high quality, delivered safely and reliably to patients as close to home as reasonably possible—I'd like to underscore that: as close to home as reasonably possible—is both a worthy goal and a challenging objective. We understand that, I think, within this room, and I think that beyond this room, increasingly, people are understanding it, but given Ontario's geographic and demographic characteristics, there is more work to do to help people appreciate the complexity and the challenge of addressing this issue. I believe that the LHIN structure, well implemented, can deliver on the promise of a truly integrated health care delivery system and achieve that national goal.

Over the years, I believe I've learned some things of some importance—the importance of building relationships built on trust and mutual respect. Reshaping the health care services in a local or regional setting is not easy, and it's increasingly complex, given the evolving changes of technology, the evolving demands of an aging population—so many varieties of issues to be considered. But ultimately, whatever is done must be done, in my frame of reference, on the basis of integrity, and the LHIN and those who are among the leadership of the LHIN must be trustworthy. So building a trustworthy model is critical, in my view, to future success in this area.

The other thing I've learned as a fundraiser is the importance of effective communications. In my view, the public as a whole does not yet fully understand or appreciate the role and the potential value of the LHIN structure as it's currently conceived. It's one area that I hope I can, in a modest way, help to address as a board member.

I'd like to say something about why I chose to seek this appointment. Beyond my decision to respond to a

newspaper ad, which I saw in the paper earlier this year, I do believe in the importance of volunteer service and community care—giving back to the community in which one resides. No doubt this is a direct consequence of my professional work, working with committed and capable volunteers in many organizations across this country. But I also give credit to growing up in St. Catharines in the family of a family physician and an active Rotarian, who set the standard in this regard.

In my view, local health integration networks were created to help facilitate the management of a very complex, increasingly challenged health care system in this province. While in some ways they are still embryonic as a governance structure—and therefore, I think, still subject to remarkable scrutiny, and appropriately so—I do believe in the importance of integrating the delivery of health services, and trust that with my qualifications and experience, I can play a meaningful role in advancing that objective in southeastern Ontario. It's why I chose to apply, and it's why I'm pleased to be here with you this morning.

I thank you for your interest and for your consideration.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much for your presentation. We'll start the questioning in this round with the government caucus.

Mr. Michael A. Brown: Good morning, and thank you for coming to see us this morning.

We are very impressed with your credentials. We think that you will provide us with a good, sound view of the way that the health care system in the province, and particularly in your area, needs to work. That's the reason, of course, for the LHINs: One size doesn't fit all, and the LHINs can provide service to the areas that they're in in the most appropriate fashion.

Thank you for putting your name forward. We will be supporting you in the vote.

Mr. Ian Fraser: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much.

The official opposition.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Fraser, for also putting your name forward.

As you know, my party, without prejudice to the witnesses themselves or the appointees, hasn't been voting in favour of LHIN appointments as a general rule, so don't take it personally if that happens again today.

Mr. Ian Fraser: I understand.

Mr. Jim Wilson: But you are well qualified, and I certainly appreciate the fact that you have the requisite experience for the LHINs. We just have a problem with LHINs.

That brings me around to—you touched on the point of the accountability of the LHINs to the public. You mentioned that perhaps the public—and you're quite right—doesn't understand what they're trying to do, what their purpose is and why they have to spend so much money. Do you want to just take the opportunity to elaborate on how you're going to assist the public or assist the LHIN in that regard?

Mr. Ian Fraser: I guess it would begin, Mr. Chairman and Jim, with understanding the issues myself. What I have learned in the process of preparing, through the application process, is the complexity that the organizations are charged with.

I think that, in theory, the concept of creating a governance structure closer to where the services are provided is highly important. While we might agree that, much like democracy, it's not perfect, it's better than many of the alternatives we could consider. So I choose to take an optimistic view and believe that good and considered decisions have been taken to establish this direction, and we should give it time to prove itself. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't watch with care and ensure that the ultimate objectives, as set out by the government, ultimately accountable to the minister, are well advanced.

But I think that to assume that it can be up and running so effectively in such a short time is optimistic at best, and I would like to try to play a role in helping to advance it, because I believe it is a worthwhile endeavour.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Along the same line, what experience can you bring to the LHIN, given that you were vice-chair of the hospital board, which was, I guess, one of the largest recipients of funding from the South East LHIN?

0920

Mr. Ian Fraser: On a point of accuracy there, I want to clarify that it wasn't the role of vice-chair; it was the role of vice-president of the hospital. I was in a staff role, but I had the privilege of working with some very capable volunteers at that level at the time. As you may know, things have evolved in the last 15 years, both in the system and within the structure in Kingston.

What I've learned from travelling across this province is that I perceive that, as noted earlier, each geographic area is different. The demographics are different. The service requirement issues vary widely. It's about understanding, I think, based on facts and based on a knowledge-based approach, what we require in south-eastern Ontario to not only deliver the current needs but to anticipate the emerging needs.

I believe that from two perspectives—my background and experience working in a hospital, I hope, will add value, although I recognize that I will need to become current on some of the issues under discussion, but equally, what I'm seeing happen in other LHINs across the province. Perhaps I can bring that perspective to the table, as I have had the opportunity to listen, appreciate and hear some of the strategies that other areas of the province have undertaken and considered, which may inform the conversation in our area.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Thank you. What are some of the greatest challenges that you can think of facing the South East LHIN at this time?

Mr. Ian Fraser: Beyond its geographic breadth and width, which was self-evident?

Mr. Jim Wilson: It's true.

Mr. Ian Fraser: Because that is a concern I have. Even as we talk about local and regional, I still feel it's a huge geographic scope to try to address such a wide variety of concerns. Notwithstanding that, I recognize it's a common issue across the province.

More specifically in the areas of service, I see two areas that are of concern. One, we can list perhaps upwards of 10 priorities that have been identified by the board in its next three-year plan that speak to specific areas of accessing primary care: wait lists for getting physicians, reducing wait times in ERs and so on. I think those are legitimate issues that warrant being addressed, consistent with the province's priorities but equally to improve the experience of accessing health care services by the citizens of our region.

Where I think the nuance is in that, in my observation—and it's not based on fact—is at the interface between the institutions, the community-based services, the rural and urban considerations as people must travel perhaps long distances to come and access the care they need. Have we done a good job making those processes work well? I think there are process issues, as I've observed what happens—certainly as I think about Kingston specifically, but I'm aware beyond Kingston and across the region. It's little things that don't get conversation, like, "I can't find parking at the institution," or, "I need to get there for a prescribed time and I don't know my way around the community," things that really adversely influence the experience of people.

I guess I come a little bit with a fundraiser's hat on that. If people have those kinds of issues at the front door, they're less inclined to be generous when we need them to support a capital campaign for the equipment that we need and the new facilities that need construction. So it all is of a piece, and I'd like to hope that I can bring some of that view to the discussion even as we deal with critical issues of priority around services.

Mr. Jim Wilson: It's interesting that you mention parking. I just had a meeting with the family council of one of my local long-term-care facilities, and that was their number one issue.

Mr. Ian Fraser: It's an amazing issue.

Mr. Jim Wilson: They wanted new stripes on the parking lot, so I was out painting them on Saturday.

Just in your work as executive director for the Charitable Gift—

Mr. Ian Fraser: —Funds Canada Foundation?

Mr. Jim Wilson: Yes. Maybe you could tell us what that entails, and will there be any conflict with the many charities that you'd be dealing with under the LHIN?

Mr. Ian Fraser: I don't think so, because that organization—it's a client relationship that we have, and I serve in that role really as an objective of advancing philanthropy in this country. But we're really a behind-the-scenes-positioned organization to the national banks: RBC, CIBC and others. We help facilitate the charitable giving of clients of financial institutions through their advisers and facilitate, then, the donor's interest in giving to a wide variety of organizations across the country. We

don't influence their decisions; we're neutral in terms of their interests. It's developed locally.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Okay, thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): That concludes the interview this morning, and again, we thank you very much.

Mr. Ian Fraser: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): It was a long-anticipated wait. Thank you very much for coming in and sharing your experiences with us this morning.

MR. RON CARINCI

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Ron Carinci, intended appointee as member, Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Our second interview this morning is with Ron Carinci, member, Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.

Mr. Ron Carinci: Good morning.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Mr. Carinci, thank you very much for coming in this morning. As with the previous delegation, we will offer you the opportunity to make an opening statement. After the opening statement, we will then have questions from the caucuses, this time starting with the official opposition, for 10 minutes. Each party will be allotted 10 minutes to question you, and hopefully at the end of that we will all be the wiser and that will conclude the interview. So thank you very much for coming in, and I turn the floor over to you.

Mr. Ron Carinci: Thank you and good morning. If I'm shaking a little bit and holding my nose, it's because I'm freezing. So if I'm rubbing my hands, it's not because I'm nervous; it's just because I'm cold.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Me too.

Mr. Ron Carinci: I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak with you this morning regarding my proposed appointment to the board of the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.

I was born, raised and educated in Toronto. I attended the University of Toronto and Osgoode Hall Law School. Education has always been a priority to me. I was particularly proficient with numbers, and as such was awarded the Ray Lawson scholarship in commerce and finance. Continuing my education, I attended Osgoode Hall Law School. The combination of legal and mathematical skills formed the foundation of my most prominent strength, which is my ability to identify, analyze and assess risk by reducing problems or strategies to their basic components. This skill has proven successful for numerous corporations that I represented during my legal career of over 15 years and currently in my role as chief operating officer.

The OLG's three core values are integrity, respect and accountability. I believe in and have followed these core values throughout my career. An unyielding adherence to these values is what makes them most effective. It may sound like a difficult task, but as Clayton Christensen

wrote in the Harvard Business Review, life is one unending extenuating circumstance and it is much easier to hold your principles 100% of the time than it is to hold them 98% of the time. Adherence to the core values of integrity, respect and accountability generates client trust and those can be the very factors that drive profit. I have provided my clients with these values on a consistent basis throughout my career, and that has been the cornerstone of my success.

Furthermore, providing clear vision and processes maintains a profitable equilibrium. When an executive team and employees are provided a vision and procedures, but more importantly a true understanding of their basic components and how they yield success, then they will be embraced and followed by instinct. At that time a true corporate culture has been created.

These core values also extend to my family life and are as important to my wife, Adriana. My two daughters, Julia and Alana, attend an International Baccalaureate World School. All IB learners strive to be knowledgeable thinkers who are principled and reflective. These attributes are considered to provide the children with a competitive and socially responsible advantage.

Community involvement is also an important aspect of their education and our family beliefs. I currently serve on the board of directors of the Jays Care Foundation. The foundation has been empowering children and youth in need, inspiring them to make positive choices.

The OLG is facing an exciting and challenging time and I look forward to the opportunity to serve the government and the community. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you. And with that, we'll go to the PC caucus.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Carinci. Thanks for putting your name forward. How did you hear about the position? Were you recruited, or did you just apply on your own accord?

Mr. Ron Carinci: Well, I read in the newspaper when the appointment of Paul Godfrey was announced. I had worked with Paul in my capacity as counsel for Rogers Communications and as a member of the Jays Care Foundation. I had congratulated him on the appointment and asked, if there was any help, if he ever needed it—and he directed me to the public secretariat's office, and I made my application through that.

0930

Mr. Jim Wilson: So you're a bugger for punishment, basically, eh?

Mr. Ron Carinci: Basically.

Interjections.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Can we put that off the record?

Urbacoon group of companies, I gather, are major industrial-commercial developments, from what—

Mr. Ron Carinci: Yes.

Mr. Jim Wilson: The OLG gets involved in some major capital developments, too. Have you ever done work for them?

Mr. Ron Carinci: Not in my experience at the company for four years now, I haven't seen anything, no. We

are currently doing work with the government in different areas. Ontario Realty Corp. is an example. We're doing their head office at Jarvis and Dundas, and the Keele and 401 project, the hospital—we're doing the infrastructure work at that location.

Mr. Jim Wilson: All right. But you've carefully thought through whether there would be any conflicts of interest going forward?

Mr. Ron Carinci: I don't believe there would be.

Mr. Jim Wilson: What do you know about the gaming industry in general? Any experience in the past at one of the different sectors that it runs?

Mr. Ron Carinci: I've never represented anyone in my legal career, but I have represented corporations all the way from manufacturing to telecommunications to financial industries. I've made it my business to learn their business to make myself more effective.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Any thoughts on online gambling?

Mr. Ron Carinci: Online gambling is an important aspect of the gambling industry. I understand that the OLG will be undergoing a 12- to 18-month research program to investigate how it would work. I believe that it would take that amount of time to be able to ascertain.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Are you familiar with the recommendations that have come out of the KPMG audit of the lottery corporation's processes or the report of the Ombudsman of Ontario? Have you reviewed those reports?

Mr. Ron Carinci: What I do understand from those two reports basically was with respect to insider wins and having to deal with customer complaints along those lines. They made various recommendations which, from what I understand, have been mostly implemented on how to deal with insider wins.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Okay. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, sir.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Mr. Brown?

Mr. Michael A. Brown: Thank you for putting your name forward. I believe you to be a valuable member of the board, provided we provide confirmation today, which I can assure you the government members are quite willing to do. So thank you, and we look forward to your good work on the board.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much for your presentation. That concludes the interview.

I have one question for clarification. I notice that on your application it was for a full-time position. The information I have here is that the appointment is for a part-time position. You're aware of that?

Mr. Ron Carinci: Yes, I do know it's a part-time position, not a full-time position.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you. With that, we thank you very much for coming in and for sharing your insight with us. We look forward to dealing with it following all the interviews this morning. We wish you well for your future endeavours.

Mr. Ron Carinci: Thank you.

MS. DIANE GEE

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Diane Gee, intended appointee as member and chair, Public Sector Compensation Restraint Board.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Our third and final interview this morning is Diane Gee as a member and chair of the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Board.

Diane, obviously you've been watching the process, and you knew exactly to take the chair at the appropriate time, the one with the light on. We thank you very much for coming in this morning. As with the other delegates, we will offer you an opportunity to make an opening statement. On completion of that, we will have the rotation of the caucuses, who will get 10 minutes each to ask any questions they may have on your presentation, and then that will conclude the interview.

With that, thank you again for coming in. The floor is yours.

Ms. Diane Gee: Thank you very much for inviting me here today. It's my pleasure to be here.

I thought I would just give you a brief overview of my educational and professional background, set out for you the appointments that I currently hold and then explain to you how it is that I came to be nominated for this particular position.

I have a BA in political science from the University of Toronto and an LLB from Osgoode Hall Law School.

I began my professional career by working as an associate in a law firm that specializes in employment and labour law, and I worked exclusively in the areas of employment and labour law until I was appointed to the Ontario Labour Relations Board as a vice-chair in 1994. In 1994, I was appointed to the board as a construction industry division vice-chair and I worked in that capacity until 2002, when I returned to private practice. I returned to private practice, again, on management side, practising exclusively in the areas of employment and labour law. I became a partner at a law firm until I left in August 2007. I then became the vice-president of labour relations at Loblaw's and I remained there for one year, until I was appointed back to the labour board—this time, though, as the alternate chair.

I received two appointments at that time, and it was the common practice for that to happen. I was appointed the alternate chair of the labour board, but I was also appointed to chair the Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal. That was consistent with a practice that has been developing amongst adjudicative tribunals in this province, to try to cluster agencies to take advantage of the resources and the personnel and save costs. So I was given two appointments; however, as you obviously assume and are aware, that comes with one salary.

I served in that capacity until the chair of the Ontario Labour Relations Board was appointed to the bench. That happened quite recently, in May of this year. When you're appointed to the bench, you must immediately

leave your position. Given the suddenness of the chair's departure, I was asked to serve as the interim chair at the Ontario Labour Relations Board. As matters currently stand, I chair the Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal and I serve as interim chair of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. Those are my two current appointments.

This particular board, as you're well aware, is a new board. It is being created by a new bill. I was asked by the Deputy Minister of Labour to give a reference for an individual who was being considered to be appointed chair of the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Board. I gave my reference, but I also couldn't resist commenting that I found it ironic that in a piece of legislation designed to save money, we were at the same time creating a new board and appointing new people—especially in an environment where adjudicative tribunals were in the practice of clustering and sharing resources, sharing expertise. I shortly thereafter got a message back saying, "Well, that's fine. So does the labour board then have an interest in recommending somebody to fill the position, if that's your view?" And I did recommend somebody, and I got the message back, "Would you be interested in doing it?" Perhaps that was as a result of the fact that I had already educated myself about the bill, the legislation, what the jurisdiction of the board was and had already given the matter some thought.

So I said, "Yes, I would be interested in serving." I understood the position wouldn't require a great deal of work. Given the position that I already filled, I had the resources readily at hand to create the rules, the practices, the documents, the application forms etc. that would be required. I could do that quite readily. I didn't expect the number of applications that would come before this board to be considerable, and I hope I'm right in that. I also fully expected, as the legislation anticipates, that other vice-chairs would be appointed, so it wouldn't be entirely on my shoulders.

That being the case, I did file an application, and I am now here today before you for consideration.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much. With that, we'll start the questioning with the government.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: I just want to say thank you. Labour law is very complex, isn't it? My involvement for many years was with the school board sector, and certainly, when you say someone's a bear for punishment, labour law would do it for me. So thank you, first of all, for putting your name forward.

Thank you for also thinking about the fact around clustering, how important that is, and the fact that we could bring together that expertise through you or through someone as opposed to creating, yet again, another agency or another sector that we'd have to, again, pay for.

0940

Also, probably what you'll do, if all things go according to Hoyle here around the appointment, is you'll probably give this a very thoughtful approach in terms of how you can actually do this better, because you will

have some time constraints, you will have some opportunities to bring other interests to the table in your capacity at the labour board.

I think what you've done is a very thoughtful approach to how this could be done. I just want to say thank you for bringing your name forward, and we certainly will be supporting you.

Ms. Diane Gee: Thank you very much.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much. PC caucus, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Ms. Gee, thank you very much also for putting your name forward for this new board. I'm not quite sure what it does. I guess it was created under the Public Sector Compensation Restraint to Protect Public Services Act, 2010. I gather from our notes that the board decides whether a particular employee is constrained by the act or covered by the act.

Ms. Diane Gee: The board has extremely limited jurisdiction, and that's why my anticipation that there'd be little work at the board. The board only has the jurisdiction to determine whether or not, first, an employer is covered by the act, and if so, whether an employee is covered by the act. Obviously that issue would only come to the board if there was debate about the issue.

Mr. Jim Wilson: But if we're going into a period of restraint, and if people don't like restraint, don't you think they might flood the system with at least testing whether they're covered by the restraint or not?

Ms. Diane Gee: Again, this is one of the advantages of using existing adjudicators and existing tribunals. I think the labour board at least prides itself on being what we call a modern adjudicative tribunal in that we're constantly trying to deal with an ever-increasing caseload expeditiously, using what we call modern adjudicative techniques. Often we will deal with things in writing. We'll say, "Okay, set out your full case with all of your documents attached in writing." We pick those files where the decision will largely be determinative of a large number of other files that we see existing in the system. So I think if there's any flooding that takes place, we at least have the resources and the experience to deal with it.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Okay. Again, not knowing very much about how this is all going to work, is it possible that you would be dealing with a case or cases involving a particular employer in your job under the labour relations board and also have to adjudicate in your new position?

Ms. Diane Gee: Yes, and that's true of the Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal as well. That's common.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Common and accepted, I guess.

Ms. Diane Gee: Yes, it is. As a matter of fact, years ago there was thought given to not just clustering these agencies but actually making them one umbrella organization, because the issues that would arise under these various pieces of legislation often intercept, and it was thought years ago to just combine them all into one for that very reason.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Deal with all the issues at once.

Ms. Diane Gee: Yes, exactly.

Mr. Jim Wilson: Okay. Thank you again.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you very much for your presentation. We will consider the concurrence, with the appointments of this morning following this.

Again, we thank you very much for coming in, and we wish you well in your future endeavours.

Ms. Diane Gee: Thank you very much.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Maybe the question would just be, do you make a list of all the boards that you could put under one umbrella?

Ms. Diane Gee: Certainly.

Mr. Jim Wilson: I think that was our idea, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): That concludes our interviews this morning.

We'll now deal with concurrences. We'll first consider the intended appointment of Ian Fraser, intended appointee as a member of the South East Local Health Integration Network. Can we have someone to move concurrence?

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: I'll so move.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): You've heard the motion. Further discussion? If not, all those in favour? Opposed? The motion's carried.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: Do you want a recorded vote? I guess we should on all of these.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): It does require that you say, before the question is put, that you would like it recorded.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: I apologize. I thought there was a comment made earlier that all votes would be recorded, so I just made the assumption they would be, but I'll ask for each before.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Next is to consider the appointment of Ron Carinci, member for the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. We have a motion to concur with the appointment.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: A recorded vote, Mr. Chair, please.

Ayes

Cansfield, Carroll, Johnson, Pendergast.

Nays

Wilson.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): The motion is carried.

Our third consideration is the intended appointment of Diane Gee, member and chair, Public Sector Compensation Restraint Board. Motion to concur?

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): You've heard the motion. Discussion?

Ayes

Cansfield, Carroll, Johnson, Pendergast, Wilson.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): The motion is carried.

That concludes dealing with the concurrences and with all those who were interviewed this morning. Thank you very much for that. It looks like we were able to do it in slightly less time this morning than we had previously anticipated.

Is there any further business of the committee?

Mr. Jim Wilson: Did you deal with subcommittee reports?

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Yes, we did.

Mr. Jim Wilson: How did you deal with the subcommittee reports when no member of the opposition was here?

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): There's no requirement of any particular party being here. We must have a quorum of the committee, and we had a quorum.

The next meeting will be at 8:30 Tuesday morning, September 28.

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: At 8:30?

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): At 8:30, yes. That way, we can have one extra interview in it, as our number of applicants is growing. So in the interests of time, we'll start a half an hour early with the interview.

With that, we'll adjourn the meeting.

The committee adjourned at 0946.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 14 September 2010

Subcommittee reports.....	A-63
Intended appointments.....	A-63
Mr. Ian Fraser.....	A-63
Mr. Ron Carinci	A-66
Ms. Diane Gee.....	A-67

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Président

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Lisa MacLeod (Nepean–Carleton PC)

Mrs. Laura Albanese (York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston L)

Mr. Michael A. Brown (Algoma–Manitoulin L)

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Ms. M. Aileen Carroll (Barrie L)

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River ND)

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Ms. Lisa MacLeod (Nepean–Carleton PC)

Ms. Leeanna Pendergast (Kitchener–Conestoga L)

Mr. Jim Wilson (Simcoe–Grey PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Rick Johnson (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock L)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Katch Koch

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Larry Johnston, research officer,
Legislative Research Service