



ISSN 1180-4386

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 19 April 2012

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 19 avril 2012

**Standing Committee on
Finance and Economic Affairs**

Healthy Homes Renovation
Tax Credit Act, 2012

**Comité permanent des finances
et des affaires économiques**

Loi de 2012 sur le crédit d'impôt
pour l'aménagement du logement
axé sur le bien-être

Chair: Bob Delaney
Clerk: Valerie Quioc Lim

Président : Bob Delaney
Greffière : Valerie Quioc Lim

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

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Thursday 19 April 2012

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES

Jeudi 19 avril 2012

The committee met at 0901 in room 151.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Good morning, everybody. The Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs will come to order, and of course it's in order.

Has everybody got themselves a cup of coffee? Tea? Juice? A glass of water? Hot breakfast?

Mr. Peter Shurman: Are you sending in a hot breakfast? Because if you are, I'll move that you send in a hot breakfast, if you want, and I'd like a 20-minute recess to consider that.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): So that bears to mind whether we're here for a long time or a good time.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Both.

HEALTHY HOMES RENOVATION
TAX CREDIT ACT, 2012
LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CRÉDIT D'IMPÔT
POUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU LOGEMENT
AXÉ SUR LE BIEN-ÊTRE

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit / Projet de loi 2, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2007 sur les impôts en vue de mettre en oeuvre le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): We are, however, here for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit. Please note that I will put the questions on consecutive sections that have no amendments together, but members may request a vote on each section individually, and I'll ask for a show of hands when you vote.

Prior to beginning, are there any questions and comments?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Yes, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Thank you very much, Chair. I think, in light of—this bill was put before the House back in December, before the budget was released. The budget vote, of course, is coming up next week. We're not quite sure what other deals may be done, or what bills may be appealed or amended or whatever, after the conversations and discussions that are going on behind the scenes. So,

Chair, I would move that we recess this committee until after the budget vote on Tuesday, April 24.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier has moved a recess. Is it the pleasure of the committee to have a recess?

Mr. Mike Colle: No.

Mr. Peter Shurman: I think that this is a legitimate item for consideration. The reason I asked, actually, a couple of weeks ago to be supplied with information on what the cost of this program would be was so that we would have some small idea of what the budgetary impact is going to be. We were originally given very sparse information: \$60 million in the year just ending. We were told that the dollars to cover the cost of implementation would be reallocations as opposed to new dollars. We have grave reservations about that, and we haven't even debated the budget bill, where we get into some items that relate to dollar costs. So I think that Mr. Hillier's motion is in order, and while the other side may not want to consider it, if you put the question, sir, I certainly would vote yes.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Prue?

Mr. Michael Prue: I have some difficulty, but I also understand what's likely to happen here today. The subcommittee reported, and the committee accepted, the subcommittee's recommendations. It was unanimous on all fronts that we proceed in the way that we are proceeding: that deputants would be heard two weeks and that there would be a two-week hiatus until today in order to allow motions to be brought forward, which were. Everything has followed right down the line that we said was supposed to happen. It ought to come as no surprise that we are here today, everyone understanding the implications of the budget.

But I am also mindful of the fact that, given that we have approximately one hour and a little bit, it is eminently conceivable that should a member or members wish to tie up this morning, we're not going to get there till the 24th anyway. So the reality is, we can either accede to this or we can talk to each other for the next hour without getting anything done, and I think that pretty much sums up what's going to happen.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Can I say one other thing?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Shurman, you can say anything you want.

Mr. Peter Shurman: In response to Mr. Prue, I understand, and we all understand, what he's talking

about. Having said that, the motion by Mr. Hillier is a legitimate motion referencing the subcommittee, and, yes, I'm part of that subcommittee. So we did agree to that schedule. However, I think it's reasonable to say that when we agreed to that schedule, we would have assumed that the budgetary difficulties inherent in getting this motion passed on Tuesday—or not—were not going to drag things out to the point where we were at April 24 before we found out what was going to happen to this budget.

For goodness' sake, people are screaming across at each other in question period on who's trying to create an election. I would hope nobody is—certainly not us. But until we know the fate of this budget—and in truth, the fate of this government—next Tuesday, what's the point?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay. Is there any—

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Ms. Piruzza.

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Just with respect to the discussions that we're hearing through Mr. Hillier's, Mr. Shurman's and Mr. Prue's comments with respect to recessing at this point, yes, it came forward in December. We had our debate. It has been brought forward to this committee, the subcommittee. This process has been known in terms of what the budget timeline is, so I don't know how it comes as a surprise today, or what this discussion changes in terms of what may or may not occur.

We need to continue to govern. We need to continue to move forward with respect to this. We've had our deputations. We had a number of individuals come forward in support of this. We need to move forward with this.

With respect to the questions regarding the cost, in fact, it has been fully costed, and this information has been provided. This adds no costs. If we look in terms of offsets, we know it's \$60 million. We know where it's coming from for this year. We know where it's going to come from next year. It is not new money. It is from within. That information has been provided, Chair.

I'm not sure, frankly, what their argument is with respect to recessing at this point, and I certainly vote against recessing at this point as I would like us to move forward so that we can continue to do what we need to do.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further comments? Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I think a great deal has changed, for the member. It should be self-evident that much has changed. What was agreed to in the subcommittee, or what have you—we know that there are significant discussions going on. We know that the debate for the budget and the vote will now be next Tuesday, which we didn't know previously.

So a great deal has changed. I think it behooves everyone here in this committee that we actually take some time to think, see what the results of that vote are, wait for that vote on Tuesday, April 24, and then reconvene the committee at that time to go through and pick up the process, depending on the results of the vote on April 24.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Any further discussion? Shall we call for the vote? All those—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I'd like to call for a 20-minute recess before we have the vote, please.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): There will be a 20-minute recess—I'm sorry?

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: I would support the request for a recess.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay. It's eight minutes after 9 o'clock. We will convene at 28 minutes after 9.

The committee recessed from 0908 to 0928.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee will please come back to order. We will now vote on the motion made by Mr. Hillier that the—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, could we have a recorded vote, please?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Recorded vote—that the committee adjourn until after the vote on the budget motion on April 24.

All those in favour, please raise their hands.

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Chair, sorry. With respect to this, given that the bells are ringing and we need to go upstairs, should we take another recess at this point and come back afterwards and have further discussion?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): No, we will recess closer to the vote, but at this point we will do this vote.

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Okay.

Ayes

Hillier, McNaughton, Shurman.

Nays

Colle, Dickson, Forster, Piruzza, Prue.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I declare the motion lost.

We'll now begin our consideration—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, in light of the bells ringing, I'd like to move a motion that—we do indeed want to have some discussions with our House leaders on this upcoming vote in 10 minutes—we recess this committee until after the vote.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier has moved that the committee recess until after the division bells on the motion to adjourn the debate. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I'd like to have a 20-minute recess before we have the vote.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier has requested a 20-minute recess. I would ask then that—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Order. As the division bells almost exactly coincide with the 20-minute recess requested by Mr. Hillier, I would ask members to please return promptly following the vote in the House to consider the vote on the motion proposed by Mr. Hillier.

The committee recessed from 0930 to 0957.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs will please come back to order. At the time we adjourned, Mr. Hillier had requested an adjournment until after the division bells on the recess. As the division bells are not ringing, the motion is therefore out of order.

We're now at consideration of section 1. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I'd like to put a motion on the floor here—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you're now out of order. We are now at section 1.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, I've asked to be recognized. Chair, I would expect that I am recognized by the Chair. You have not tabled—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are interrupting the Chair at this point. Thank you.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Then you'll let me finish the statement.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you will let me finish the statement that I was about to make.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order until I have finished. I will recognize you—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier—

Mr. Randy Hillier: There's an explanatory note being considered before section 1—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, there is clear, clear evidence that I requested to be recognized by the Chair. You cannot—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: You cannot dismiss—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I have requested—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): You have requested it, Mr. Hillier, and you're out of order.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, I am not. I am not out of order. I have asked—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, the Chair has ruled you out of order. You are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, you have failed to recognize that a member of this committee requested to be recognized by the Chair. That is an obligation of the Chair—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): No. Mr. Hillier, you have interrupted the Chair while the Chair was speaking—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, you did not recognize—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you interrupted the Chair while the Chair was speaking.

Mr. Randy Hillier: That is a fundamental responsibility of the Chair, to recognize a member of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you interrupted the Chair while the Chair was speaking.

Mr. Randy Hillier: And you have failed to recognize a member of this committee—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you interrupted the Chair while the Chair was speaking.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I am not going to let this one go. You are going to recognize a member of this committee when they speak.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you interrupted the Chair while the Chair was speaking.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I ask for you to recognize a member of this committee. I would like this committee to review this explanatory note before we go to section 1.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, your request is out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Then, we cannot go back to—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, your request is out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, it is not out of order. Demonstrate to me where it is out of order.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, your request is out of order and the Chair will not consider it.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Demonstrate to me where it is out of order.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): At this point—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Which standing order is it—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): At this point, Mr. Hillier, we are considering section 1.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, we are not considering section 1. A member of this committee has asked to be recognized by the Chair, and it is fundamental—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: —that before we get to section 1 we do the preceding explanatory note.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, your request is out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: So I'm not going to stop demanding that you recognize a member of this committee. I'm not going to stop.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, your request is out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, it is not out of order.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Chair, may I speak?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Shurman.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Thank you, Chair. My colleague is obviously upset about the fact that you don't want to consider the explanatory note. The explanatory note, as the Chair knows, is part of the bill. As such, before you go to clause-by-clause considering the subsections of the bill, it seems to me to be a reasonable request to consider the explanatory note. So I won't go back and forth with you, but I make that request respectfully.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Thank you, Mr. Shurman. Standard committee practice at this point is to consider the bill section by section. If you wish to consider the explanatory note, there will be a time for that. So we will go section by section, as is the standard practice in committees. At this point, we are considering section 1, and I ask, at this point, is there any discussion on section 1?

Mr. Randy Hillier: We are not considering section 1 until you've recognized my request, by the Chair, to review the explanatory note. It's not going to happen.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, I am advised that your motion is out of order. The explanatory note is not part of the bill and is not considered by the committee. The committee will now consider section 1, and I ask whether there is any discussion on section 1?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Excuse me, Chair. The explanatory note is a part of the bill, and it provides clarification for all those who come after us to understand what component parts are in the bill. I've requested—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you have been ruled out of order. And—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, no, you ruled me out of order because you failed to recognize me in the first place. You ruled me out of order because of your failing to recognize me. Your failing does not—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you have been ruled out of order, and there is no debate on the ruling of the Chair. If you wish to appeal to the Speaker, that is your prerogative. But at this point, Mr. Hillier—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, the Chair has ruled your request out of order—

Mr. Randy Hillier: You failed to recognize me, Chair. That's the failing.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): At this point, the committee will consider section 1, and I ask—

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, we will not consider section 1. I ask that you have the explanatory note—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I ask whether there are any comments on section 1.

Mr. Randy Hillier:—put on the table for discussion.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): If you wish to appeal a ruling of the Chair, Mr. Hillier—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, you failed to recognize a member of this committee—your failure.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): You may move to—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Your failure. Now, please, recognize the members of this committee when they speak.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you're out of order. If the committee wishes to appeal a rule—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, you failed in your duty to recognize a member of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): If the committee wishes to appeal a ruling by the Chair, the committee may so appeal.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I'll put a motion that we do not have confidence in the Chair of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier—

Mr. Randy Hillier: We do not have confidence in the Chair of this committee. I'd like that on the table, and have a recorded vote on the topic of your—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, you have failed to recognize a member of this committee. Own up to that failing, and let's have a vote on the confidence of this committee in your chairmanship.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, you remain out of order. Your request—

Mr. Randy Hillier: No, I am not out of order.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): At this point, the committee—

Mr. Randy Hillier: You are lacking confidence—this committee is lacking confidence in your chairmanship if you will not recognize the members of the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, no such motion is before the committee, and you are out of order.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I am asking that the motion be put on the floor that we lack confidence in your chairmanship.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I ask the committee: Shall the Chair's ruling carry?

Mr. Randy Hillier: No. A recorded vote. We'll have a recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Then let us clarify: When the Chair ruled Mr. Hillier's request for consideration of the explanatory note out of order, shall the Chair's ruling be appealed?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Yes.

Mr. Michael Prue: Sustained.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): All those in favour—

Mr. Peter Shurman: Just a clarification: What are you asking, Chair?

Mr. Michael Prue: I'm not sure.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay, let's clarify it. With regard to the Chair's ruling that consideration of the explanatory note is out of order, shall the Chair's ruling be appealed?

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Chair, can I just ask something? Can we have a 20-minute recess, please?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): At this point, you can have a recess pursuant to a motion, but the motion here is, shall the Chair's ruling be appealed?

Mr. Randy Hillier: It's in the standing orders that we can ask for a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): And you can ask for a 20-minute recess.

Mr. Michael Prue: Could I just seek some clarification? Since the 20-minute recess will take us well past the time, I would take it there's no reason to come back today.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): In response to Mr. Prue's question, the committee will then recess until this afternoon after routine proceedings.

The committee recessed from 1007 to 1401.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs will come back to order.

When we last were here, Mr. Hillier had requested that the committee consider the explanatory note of the bill. The explanatory note does not form part of the bill and is not considered by the committee. I have therefore ruled that request to be out of order.

The question before the committee before we recessed was whether it would like to appeal my ruling, as Chair, to the Speaker. I will now put the question.

Mr. Randy Hillier: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Recorded vote. Shall the Chair's ruling be appealed to the Speaker?

Ayes

Hillier, McNaughton, Shurman.

Nays

Colle, Forster, Piruzza, Prue.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I declare the motion lost. The Chair's ruling stands.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Mr. Chair, I have a motion here I'd like to table.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): We will now consider section 1 of the bill.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I have a motion here I would like to table.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I move:

Whereas the Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs did not recognize the honourable member from Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington; and

Whereas this was a dereliction of his duty, inconsiderate and inappropriate; and

Whereas, on account of this clear denial of the democratic rights of Mr. Hillier, the honourable member for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington has filed a point of privilege with the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

That the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs be adjourned until the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario makes a decision regarding Mr. Hillier's point of privilege.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee will recess for 10 minutes while the clerk copies the motion and considers the motion.

The committee recessed from 1403 to 1411.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee will come back to order.

Mr. Hillier moves that the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs be adjourned until the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario makes a decision regarding Mr. Hillier's point of privilege. Discussion?

M. Peter Shurman: Je dois demander, monsieur le Président, comme nous avons besoin d'une traduction de cette motion-ci, est-ce que nous pouvons avoir une traduction en français avant de faire une décision?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Attendez un moment, s'il vous plaît.

This committee stands in recess for 15 minutes, pending the availability of a translator.

M. Peter Shurman: Merci.

The committee recessed from 1412 to 1426.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay, ladies and gentlemen, let's bring the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs back to order.

Mr. Shurman will note that we have French translation.

M. Peter Shurman: Je suis très satisfait. Merci, monsieur le Président.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Bienvenue. The motion raised by Mr. Hillier has been declared out of order, as the committee cannot entertain a motion on something that has not happened.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Pardon? Explain this to me. The motion that has been tabled, you're saying, is out of order. The motion says that the committee be adjourned until a decision is rendered on a point of privilege that has been served notice on with the Speaker. Now, how can that be out of order?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I would note to Mr. Hillier that the point of privilege has not happened, and the motion has been declared out of order. I would suggest that the member consult standing order 121(a), and there is no debate on a decision of the Chair.

We will now consider section 1—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I'd like to—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): You are out of order, Mr. Hillier. There will be no debate permitted on a decision of the Chair.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, I think there's an important element—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee is now considering section 1. Is there any discussion on section 1 of the bill?

Mr. Randy Hillier: Yes.

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Chair, I'd like to bring forward a motion as well, please.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Yes.

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Given that we can't debate a Chair's decision, as you just indicated, in terms of the point of order on that issue, I'd like to bring forward a motion.

Whereas the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs met this morning for the purpose of conducting clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012; and

Whereas the Chair of the committee is charged with the responsibility of maintaining order in the committee and empowered to decide all questions of order; and

Whereas any decision of the Chair is not debatable and may only be appealed to the Speaker for a Speaker's ruling on the issue; and

Whereas the Chair of the committee ruled a motion put forward by the member from Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington out of order and the Chair's ruling was repeatedly challenged by the member; and

Whereas the member persistently disregarded the authority of the Chair and refused to heed the Chair's request to bring his behaviour into line with the rules and practices of the committee and, as a result, the committee was unable to commence the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 2 this morning;

That the committee direct the Chair to report this matter to the House, pursuant to standing order 121(d), to request that the Speaker name the member for disregarding the authority of the Chair and abusing the rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): And we will have a 10-minute recess while the clerk copies the particular motion.

The committee recessed from 1429 to 1457.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee will come back to order, please.

Mrs. Piruzza moved that the committee direct the Chair to present a report to the House, pursuant to standing order 121(d), to request that the House censure the member for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington for disregarding the authority of the Chair and abusing the rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

Discussion? Mr. Colle.

Mr. Mike Colle: You know, it's very difficult to understand, especially if you're a constituent in my riding or in any riding in Ontario where you have people that are very anxious to get to work, are looking for work as carpenters, electricians, handypersons—we've heard from the deputants here, the home builders' association and CARP, saying this will provide jobs in the homes of seniors who want to retrofit their bathrooms, who want to put in ramps. People are desperately saying, "Hey, listen, we could use this activity here, generated by this tax credit. It would put food on my table. I could employ maybe another helper here." It would basically allow people to pay their bills. I know people are very positive towards these types of programs. We've seen the federal program succeed and create jobs. This would also help do that.

So how do you tell people who are following this process, if you want to call it a process, where this bill is being blocked for whatever reason and you're stopping people from getting work? Then how do you tell the seniors?

This type of thing goes back for years. I was on city council. I remember I had a senior on Westmount Avenue—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair, should we not be speaking to the motion?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I believe Mr. Colle has the floor, and I'm sure he is going to get to the motion.

Mr. Mike Colle: As the motion says, we are seeing this obstruction of the business of this committee. And the obstruction of the business of this committee means that, like the seniors I was talking about on Westmount Avenue, where there was a husband and wife who were in their 80s and had a son who was basically totally disabled, who couldn't even get himself to the washroom, which was on the second floor—they desperately wanted to retrofit a room in the back of the house so they could put a bathroom on the back of the house so they wouldn't have to drag their disabled son, who was over 250 pounds—they were physically dragging him up the stairs.

I know I fought hard at that time to get a program at city hall where there would be some financial help, like this bill would do in part. There are seniors in all of our ridings like this. We know them. They want to do a retrofit so they can stay in their house or they can get to a bathroom.

So, here we are today, basically seeing the obstruction of this initiative, which will, again, employ people, and we all agree we need employment, especially small contractors. This is not going to be for the big operators; this is going to be for the ordinary guys with a truck, and girls with a truck, that do these kinds of jobs in homes and all over this province, and they're going to get a little bit more work. Then on top of that, as I said, we've got an aging population. We don't want to see them go to the old age homes. They want to stay in their homes as long as they can. So if we can encourage that type of activity, we're not only going to help seniors; we're going to employ people.

This obstruction that we're seeing here today, the blocking of the routine business of this committee—it's really difficult for our seniors and our working people to understand what we're doing here today, when we see this kind of premeditated, organized obstruction of a simple bill that has already gone through the processes, and why we can't get the job done so people can get the jobs and seniors can at least live in some dignity in the homes they want to stay in or the apartments they want to stay in.

This is what is happening here today, Mr. Chairman. It's very, very difficult to stomach, and it's very difficult to stomach for those workers looking for work and for those seniors looking for a bit of relief where they can stay in their homes or get to a bathroom that is accessible. That's what I have to say.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further debate? Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I'm sorry that Mr. Colle doesn't know how to explain what he does here and the parliamentary process to his constituents, but I am interested to see how the Chair has provided such latitude to Mr. Colle to debate the merits of the bill instead of speaking to the motion in any substantive way whatsoever.

But I will start by speaking to the motion. I'll start by reiterating from the standing orders, section 21(a), and 21(a) states: "Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

I'd like to just refer members of this committee to page 60 of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice by O'Brien and Bosc, and this provides a definition of privilege. "The classic definition of parliamentary privilege is found in Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament:

"Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively ... and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the general law."

O'Brien and Bosc goes on to say, on page 61, "The privileges of members of the House of Commons provide the absolute immunity they require to perform their parliamentary work while the collective or corporate rights of the House are the necessary means by which the House effectively discharges its functions...."

"The House has the authority to assert privilege where its ability has been obstructed in the execution of its functions or where members have been obstructed in the performance of their duties."

This has all come about because a member of this committee was being obstructed. The Chair, who is to be impartial and is to recognize all members of the committee, wilfully, intentionally and knowingly disregarded a member of this committee.

I'll go on to read, on page 67, again of O'Brien and Bosc, "In 1977, the Committee of Privileges re-examined the meaning of privilege and contempt, and the general thrust and conclusions of the 1967 report were reiterated in its report, later adopted by the House. The committee recommended that the application of privilege be limited to cases of clear necessity in order to protect the House, its members and its officers from being obstructed or interfered with in the performance of their functions."

Once again, clearly a member of this committee was wilfully being obstructed—wilfully. The Chair looked at me, saw that I was intending to lay a motion in this committee, and he purposely and knowingly refused to recognize myself. That is an obstruction of a member of this Legislature.

I will say to everybody here in this committee that if the Chair is allowed to callously and purposely disregard me and get away with it, he can do the same with any other member. That is unacceptable.

I'll go on to read page 75 of O'Brien and Bosc: "In its report on privilege, the special committee stated that the purpose of privilege was 'to allow members of the House of Commons to carry out their duties as representatives of the electorate without undue interference'.... The committee further pointed out that when matters of

privilege are raised, the member involved"—and this is an important one; it goes back to the first motion that I tried to table here that was ruled out of order—"cannot devote full attention to his or her parliamentary duties until the case is disposed of."

To reiterate, clearly the committee pointed out that when a matter of privilege—and I have indicated to this committee that a matter of privilege has been raised to the Speaker. "When matters of privilege are raised, the member involved cannot devote full attention to his or her parliamentary duties until the case is disposed of." It's clearly an indication that those proceedings, where that member is engaged in, ought to be recessed, suspended, adjourned until the matter at hand is dealt with. That motion was ruled out of order. Clearly, page 75 of O'Brien and Bosc thinks otherwise.

Page 82: "It is important to distinguish between a 'breach of privilege' and 'contempt of Parliament'. Any disregard of or attack on the rights, powers and immunities of the House and its members, either by an outside person or body, or by a member of the House, is referred to as a 'breach of privilege' and is punishable by the House."

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Chair? A point of order, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Ms. Piruzza?

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: It appears in this discussion, with respect to the motion, that Mr. Hillier seems to be persisting in needless repetition. In fact, if we look at the rules of debate, "a member shall be called to order by the Speaker ...

"(c) if he or she persists in needless repetition or raises matters...." He seems to be saying the same thing in different ways over and over again, so I believe he can come to a conclusion and finalize the points that he would like to make. He just seems to be making the same point over and over again, which is, I believe, needless repetition, when we're trying to get the business of this House done. It is more stalling on his behalf.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): While I appreciate the point of order raised by the member, Mr. Hillier is addressing the motion before the committee, and I'll rule the point of order out of order.

Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Thank you. Just to reiterate, standing order 109 grants me up to 20 minutes of discussion, uninterrupted.

Again, on page 82, "It is important to distinguish between a 'breach of privilege' and 'contempt of Parliament'. Any disregard of or attack on the rights, powers and immunities of the House and its members, either by an outside person or body, or by a member of the House, is referred to as a 'breach of privilege' and is punishable by the House. There are, however, other affronts against the dignity and authority of Parliament which may not fall within one of" those "defined privileges. Thus, the House also claims the right to punish, as a contempt, any action which, though not a breach of a specific privilege, tends to obstruct or impede the House in the performance of its functions; obstructs or impedes any member or officer of the House in the discharge of their duties...."

Once again, I was obstructed and impeded and prevented from the discharge of my duties by the Chair of this committee.

1510

Furthermore, page 109: “To find a prima facie breach of privilege, the Speaker must be satisfied that there is evidence to support the member’s claim that he or she has been impeded in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions and that the matter is directly related to a proceeding in Parliament.” Obviously, this committee is a direct proceeding of Parliament. Clearly, I was obstructed; clearly, I was impeded; and clearly, the Chair recognized my intention to table a motion and refused to recognize, in violation of standing order 21.

I will also say that section 121(a), which the member has raised this motion on, allows and provides for the Chair to call a vote to appeal his decision. The Chair, had he been in an impartial and unbiased manner, would have brought that to the fore far earlier than when he did. It was just a dogged determination not to recognize this member of this House and obstructing me in my duties. The Chair had the opportunity to put that to a vote, but he failed to do so.

I think the evidence is clear. The precedents, the conventions and the protocols are clear that, until this case is dealt with by the Speaker, this committee ought to stand adjourned.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further comments? Mr. Shurman.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Thank you very much, Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to comment for a little while on the motion by Mrs. Piruzza. I understand the reason for her motion, and I listened with interest to my colleague from Eglinton–Lawrence, Mr. Colle, talking about what he feels to be the urgency of implementation of this bill. I understand that there are legislative objectives of the government that include going forward, moving ahead with the implementation of Bill 2. And I understand, as the PC lead on this committee, what those objectives are, why the government wants to move speedily and what the purpose of this hearing was.

But I think that, given that you’ve opened the door to talking about the bill and talking about the proceedings in the same context, it’s reasonable for me to put on the table the fact that there’s a degree of embarrassment in the way that we have to behave in situations like this, just as there is—and we’ve witnessed it of late—in proceedings during question period. If we can’t walk the talk that was predominant back in the fall by way of collaborative engagement here in this place, then we have a very small toolbox available to us to do the job at hand.

Let me refer to the bill and let me refer to the motion in the same context. We debated the bill in second reading. It wound up here. As is well known, this party, on this side, doesn’t intend to support this bill, not because we have anything against seniors—I’ve got seniors in my riding, Mr. Colle, just as you do in Eglinton–Lawrence, and there is an urgency for them. In fact, I believe you and I share a common age group, and maybe I’m going to be a senior this year as well. So I’m not oblivious to

what the bill is about. I am very concerned, as was said in initial debate, about the fact that this bill is a very narrow effort and, in my view, a political effort on the part of this government. And by way of this government, this government is a government—and walking the talk—that so far has demonstrated on all fronts that it doesn’t want to engage us. It doesn’t want to listen to what we have to say when it comes to amendments. It doesn’t want to hear what we have to say on Bill 2. It wants to proceed as if it was last year, when you had 70-something seats in the House and you’re going to, by God, pass whatever legislation you want, and whatever we say be damned.

I don’t want to go too far afield, because I recognize that the Chair is extending some latitude, and I don’t want to take latitude and abuse it. But yesterday I debated the budget motion, and I talked about the fact that I’d been told—basically, I take it personally—that I never engaged, as finance critic, with the Minister of Finance to discuss items like this and their inclusion in the budget.

I’ve been told that, first of all, I didn’t properly engage in discussion. There was no discussion at his behest until mid-February, when he was printing the budget already. This was a fait accompli—no interest in what my party had to say. I’ve been told by the Premier in the House in response to questions that I’ve forfeited my right to even debate the budget. So now I’m—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Shurman, I just want to bring you back to the motion.

Mr. Peter Shurman: Okay, I’ll bring it back to this. So now the budget includes this bill. The dollars that this bill will expend come out of that budget and, in my view, could have been spread further afield. I don’t want to debate the bill, and I will bring it back.

Mr. Hillier has spent quite a bit of time, at this point, on concerning himself with and acquainting himself with a variety of commentaries on the procedures of Westminster, of the British parliamentary system, and with the standing orders. It’s probably fair to say, whatever one may think of my friend Mr. Hillier, that he has spent more time on learning these procedures than anybody else in our caucus, and so we’re happy to have him aboard today.

Our view here is not that we want to stop Bill 2 from ever getting back to the floor, because we know that ultimately Bill 2 will get back to the floor and it will go through third reading. Chances are, it will pass, with my party’s help or not. But we have every right to go into a committee, or to go anywhere else we deem fit, to put our points across and to say that you can’t look at us in the face and say we don’t have a say in the budget that encompasses this bill. You can’t look at us in the face and say that you can throw money away on something like Ornge and disregard the will of the House and not grant a select committee when it was voted by a majority. So when you come to committee and you talk about people who are beneficiaries at the other end of Bill 2, you have to take that into consideration as well.

We were voted in to represent constituents as well. I have probably the same percentage of seniors in Thornhill as you have in Eglinton–Lawrence. I’m concerned

for their welfare just as much as you are. I would like to speedily and expeditiously and very professionally come here and do my job. But you prevent that; you prevent it every step of the way. So don't be surprised when you come to a committee or you go into a chamber and hear bells ringing. That small toolbox that is available to us is the toolbox, being that it's the only one we have, that's going to be used. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Prue.

Mr. Michael Prue: Just to speak very briefly to this, I don't believe we can support this motion, and I don't think that it's doing any good to the Legislature or to the members of the Legislature by putting it forward. I would ask the member to consider withdrawing it, because in the end, all that is going to happen here is that you are asking that the Legislature take a look at what the member from Lanark-Frontenac—

Mr. Randy Hillier: Lennox and Addington.

Mr. Michael Prue:—Lennox and Addington is doing here in this committee. He has a responsibility, under the rules and procedures of the House parliamentary tradition, in opposition to question legislation, government motives, and to bring to the fore anything that he deems is appropriate. This has been the entire history of the parliamentary system. To put it in a nutshell, it is his job in opposition to oppose.

There are many ways to oppose. Some of it is very genteel, by pointing out the errors or suggesting alternatives; some of it is not. You can go into the Legislature—and there used to be a time when you would have dilatory motions. You would have people talking for eight and 10 hours. I think Peter Kormos, my former colleague from Welland, held the record once by speaking for four days on a motion, before that was outlawed. That was his job, his duty, in opposition, in order to stop a government bill that he thought was wrong or in order to draw attention to what was happening.

1520

Doing what you're doing, with all respect, is going against the parliamentary tradition and will not speed the passage of this bill. All it has done, in my respectful submission, is further delay what is happening here today. We will not be supporting it. We will not be supporting or voting—as a matter of fact, I don't think we're going to vote on this at all. Unless it's withdrawn, I expect there will be a 3-3 vote. I'm not sure what's going to happen with that.

But it is the position of the NDP that the bill should proceed. I concur with my colleague Mr. Colle that there are people who are waiting for this. I concur with my colleague Mr. Shurman that the Progressive Conservative Party, as the NDP, has the right to speak about the merits of the bill, to oppose when necessary and to use the tactics which are common to Parliament and parliamentary privilege. Having said that, the important thing is not to be debating what is before us here; the important thing is to get back to the bill.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Ms. Piruzza?

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Yes, I'd like to respond to the comments that were made with respect to this motion.

Frankly, we're not removing anyone's responsibility or disallowing input into this bill. In fact, this morning, what I expected when I came in here was to be able to go through this bill clause-by-clause. Here we are at 3:30 or whatever time it is, and we haven't started that yet. That is because of the disruptions that occurred this morning. I will not be removing this motion because I still believe that he was disruptive this morning.

They had the opportunity, just as you did and just as we did, in terms of bringing forward amendments to this bill. We all heard the presentations that were here a couple of weeks ago in support of this bill. If there are issues or if you wanted to bring forward amendments, those amendments could have been brought forward to this House so that we could have debated them as part of this bill.

The motion is directly in response to the member's behaviour this morning wherein he continually interrupted the Chair, even when his motion was reviewed with the Chair and the clerk to indicate that he was out of order. He continued to interrupt this House so that we were not able to continue with the business of this House.

A fair decision was made. The motion was out of order. The Chair was not being callous, which is what I heard earlier today. The Chair was not being callous.

In terms of removing this motion, I do not agree with that. Again, I am not removing anybody's right in terms of reviewing this bill, in terms of responsibilities of representing their constituents or representing their community.

We've all had that opportunity in terms of bringing forward amendments. Going clause-by-clause—that is when we can discuss our concerns or anything with respect to this bill. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further discussion? Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: So, Ms. Piruzza thinks my actions were disruptive, right? Now, she was recognized by the Chair and allowed to speak. I wonder what her comments and her thoughts and her views would be if she was not recognized by the Chair, and her ability to say her piece was denied. Is that something that I guess is okay with Ms. Piruzza: As long as she has a voice, then everything is acceptable? As long as the Liberal side has a voice and is recognized, then the system is working.

That's not good enough for me. It's not good enough for the constituents of Lanark-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington. I'm elected to be here to represent them and to speak out.

You may not like the tools that are at our disposal in the parliamentary system, but that's irrelevant. The tools are there. The standing orders are there. The parliamentary procedures and conventions are there. You might not like them, but I don't care. They're the tools that we have available, and I am going to exercise those tools when I believe that they need to be used.

So, once again I'll reiterate: The Chair saw that I was intending to table a motion and refused to recognize me, refused to even allow me to put a motion on the floor. Whether it was out of order or not, we don't know,

because I was refused to even table that motion. That is what is at the crux of the matter. I'll go back to what has clearly been identified as a parliamentary convention: that when there is a matter of privilege before the House, these proceedings be adjourned until such time as the Speaker rules on this.

Listen, this is not some little, minor, trivial matter. The Chair of a committee, just as the Chair of the House, must not only be impartial and be fair in his adjudication; he must be seen to be fair. What happened this morning cannot be deemed to be fair, when the Chair wilfully disregards a member of this committee.

If it can happen to me, it will happen to others. Right now, we have a Chair from the Liberals—from the government—in this committee. There are other Chairs in other committees. Do you want to allow and set a precedent that the Chair of any committee can wilfully disregard a member of that committee? I think if you're going to go down that path, if that's what you're looking for, then there are going to be a lot more disruptions, in your terms, than what you saw this morning.

The Chairs of our committees must recognize the members, and they must be seen to be fair and impartial.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further discussion? Mr. McNaughton.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Thank you, Chair, and I—

Mr. Mike Colle: Mr. Chair?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I'm sorry. Please forgive me. I didn't see Mr. Colle put his hand up, so I'll come back to you next time. Mr. Colle?

Mr. Mike Colle: Thank you. It is also a convention in the House and in committee that we respect the Chair and the Chair's rulings. You could imagine what mayhem there would be if there's constant challenging of the Chair to the point where, basically, the Chair is unable to conduct the affairs of the committee or the House. Basically, you're obstructing the Chair from doing the duties the Chairs have done for decades and centuries—so talk about convention.

I've been ruled out of order, as we all have, by Chairs. That's part of what we do here. We get ruled out of order, and generally speaking, we move on to another initiative, another tack. We don't personalize and all of a sudden start name-calling the Chair. We basically move on strategically to another approach.

That's the difference here. It has been a personal attack on the Chair, his integrity, because the member lacks the strategic skill to move on to another point of attack. I welcome his attempt to filibuster, etc. That's part of his job. I don't deny that. I'm saying, do that job, but don't blame it on some ruling the Chair made that Chairs make all the time. We're ruled out of order, and we move on. That's the way parliamentary procedure works. Just as Mr. Shurman says, I respect your job as being in opposition. I've been in opposition for many years myself. That's your job. I don't deny that you have a limited toolbox, and you have to do everything at your disposal.

But I think there is also an onus on us. We're on the government side, and we are trying to support an initiative that we feel is a worthwhile initiative. I think most people agree with that. So we're doing our job, too, to try and get this thing passed so it can help the seniors, so it can help create jobs. We have the right also to do whatever we can, in a parliamentary, civil fashion, to ensure that bills go through the processes, as determined by the House. It's not a procedure we determine unilaterally or the Chair determines unilaterally. The Chair is following the directions of the subcommittee. The Chair is following the processes of committees as set down by the Legislature, set down by the rules of order.

1530

There are both sides to this, and I'm just saying the bottom line here is, you can talk about the rules of order and we can defend our positions on the rules of order, but ultimately, I think what the public wants is for us to do our job. You are trying to obstruct, filibuster—that's fine, but it's also our job to ensure that a good initiative like this goes forward, and that's what we are trying to do, to the best of our ability.

The only thing I really object to is, as I said, this personal attack on the Chair, who has done what Chairs have done for decades, as I say. That's where I really find fault with the member's approach. He has personalized his attack on the Chair when he could have strategized in a different fashion and continued on his filibustering in a more, let's say, appropriate way. That's my two cents. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. McNaughton.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Well, thank you, Chair, and with all due respect to my colleague Mr. Colle, from the Liberals, what Ontarians want—and I know what people in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex want—is good government. Clearly, we're seeing this government speak with an arrogance of a government that has a majority government, and clearly, the people of Ontario elected all of us back to this Legislature to have more of a balanced approach.

I would recommend to my colleague and urge Mrs. Piruzza to withdraw her motion. I think that my colleague from Lanark-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington wasn't disregarding the authority of the Chair. He was doing his job—

Mr. Mike Colle: You weren't here.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Yes, he was.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Absolutely I was, sir.

Interjections.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Again, at some point, maybe when you're in government too long, you maybe lose touch—

Mr. Mike Colle: Well, I've been in opposition longer than you have, son.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: —with what's going on. But I think that this motion should be withdrawn.

You want to talk about obstruction. I am new here. I was elected on October 6, as you'll remember; I think I replaced one of your colleagues in the Liberal caucus. But I'm seeing obstruction all the time. I think it first

started with the vote after the election on home heating and taking the HST off of the home heating. The will of the Legislature was that that would be taken off home heating bills, and of course, your government, the Liberals, wouldn't abide by the will of the Legislature. Then, of course, we have the Ornge scandal and the select committee not being formed.

So we're seeing all kinds of obstruction and contempt, in my opinion, in the Legislature. We're doing our job to hold the government to account. I believe that's what my colleague here is doing today with this motion—

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): I'm going to remind you as well to come back to the motion.

Mr. Monte McNaughton:—from Mrs. Piruzza, and I think that it should be withdrawn, as my friend from the NDP said.

We're seeing obstruction all the time. When it comes to Bill 2, we're staring down a \$400-billion debt. We can't continue with more fiscal mismanagement on behalf of the government.

To conclude, I just think that the member from the Liberal Party, Mrs. Piruzza, should withdraw this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further discussion? Mr. Prue.

Mr. Michael Prue: At the risk—I don't want to delay this, because I really still think it should be withdrawn, but if it's not going to be withdrawn, it should be dealt with.

I did take some umbrage, although it was not directed at me, Mr. Colle, when you said, "I've been around here longer than you are, son." I think that that was a bit of a slight against a younger member. We often talk about ageism here—you know, call old people—but to denigrate someone because of their youth or their age, when he is simply speaking in a very respectful fashion, was not appropriate.

Mr. Mike Colle: Okay, sorry; I didn't mean to say "son." He's a younger member than I am, and I sometimes refer to young people in that regard. I'll withdraw the offensive remark of calling him "son."

Mr. Michael Prue: Okay, and I thank you for that, because I think what we need to do is we have to forget what we've done for years in majority governments, both as opposition, who routinely, all the time, opposed everything—and I did, because I've never been on the government side. Look, I'm the dean of the opposition, people. I've been here longer than anyone else and never sat on the government side. I'm it. I am. That's who I am.

When you are on an opposition side in a majority government, it's very easy to oppose everything. When you are on the opposition side in a minority government, you have to be a little bit more circumspect of your views. We are trying to get this Parliament moving. We're trying to do all of the correct things, the right things. Quite frankly, this motion is not going to make friends for the Conservative Party or the member.

We have a learning experience. If you want the bill to go through, and I know the government does, then I think there is going to have to be some give and some take.

The member has the right to be dilatory. The member has the right to try a filibuster or two if that is what he thinks is the appropriate action, and he ought not to be taken before the House on a motion of censure for doing what we have all done for many years.

But I would ask him, as I would ask government members too: Please, the people of Ontario want us to make this thing work. If we're not going to try to make it work, then they have every right to be disappointed in those who fail them.

Having said that, again, I ask that it be withdrawn. I ask that Mr. Hillier and all members do what is necessary to move this along.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Further comments? Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Just in response to Mr. Colle's comments when he referred to my activities this morning as constantly challenging the Chair, I'll say this: I know Mr. Colle has been here longer than I have as well, but I have never seen a Chair fail to recognize a member of a committee—not ever. It was not a case of the ruling out of order that was the issue; it was a case of the Chair failing to recognize a member. There's a significant distinction: not being recognized.

There has been some personal stuff said. Absolutely. I take it as a great personal affront to me that I was not recognized, and I would hope every member in this committee and every member in this House would feel in the same fashion if they were on that side of the equation, where the Chair failed to recognize your presence or your interest or your responsibility. So it is personal. This is upsetting. I've never, ever seen it.

Chairs make all kinds of rulings; that's not at issue. It's the recognition of a member. It was a unilateral decision by the Chair not to recognize me. It was an arbitrary decision not to recognize me. That is unacceptable in our parliamentary system, that a member is not recognized. I would hope and expect that the members of the government side would see and understand that distinction and the importance of being recognized.

I do believe if you want to move forward, if you want to show and demonstrate some willingness not to be calling people names and whatnot, withdraw that motion if you choose. But if you don't, I think it speaks volumes to everybody else here that arrogance is continuing on the government side, that they still believe they are a majority government, that they can use a sledgehammer on any problem and try to dismiss the opposition as if they are irrelevant to this institution. I've got another message: We're not irrelevant, and you can take out as many sledgehammers as you want. We are going to be heard, and there ought to be recognition each and every time a member of this committee wishes to speak.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Ms. Piruzza?

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: Just a final response to the comments that have been made: Again, I'll reiterate that, in fact, as we've seen this afternoon, everybody does have the opportunity to speak and you are being recognized by the Chair. The point of privilege in terms of our

discussion this morning was not what we were currently debating.

In terms of moving forward, I would be willing to remove this motion. But again, I do reiterate that we are not taking away. And just as you were saying that you're embarrassed by having to use some of the tools at your disposal, that somehow we have been arrogant in terms of not listening to you—we have, in fact, allowed quite a bit of discussion on this point this afternoon and we are moving forward with that.

I would suggest that we are not being arrogant with this. In fact, when you speak to rules of order, when you speak to procedural, then you have to look at all of them. We can't be selective in terms of procedural orders. It does also say that we need to respect the Chair. Certainly, that's what I was doing with respect to the motion as well: showing respect to the Chair in terms of the decision that he made this morning, again, in an impartial fashion, after conferring with the clerk, in terms of his order this morning.

At that, I will indicate that we will withdraw that motion so that we can move forward to the clause-by-clause.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The motion has been withdrawn. We are back to discussion on section 1 of the bill.

Mr. McNaughton, did you have a comment on section 1 of the bill?

Mr. Monte McNaughton: Sorry, I just want to add one more comment. Just so I have it on the record about what my friend Mr. Colle said about me, I take it quite offensively that he did call me "son." I want to put on the record that I think that was a bad choice on your part. Would you apologize?

Mr. Mike Colle: Yes.

Mr. Monte McNaughton: I thank you for that.

I just think that this is the underlying disrespect that we're seeing from the government, and I'd like to have that on the record.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Comments on section 1 of the bill? Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: I'm tabling a motion here. I'll read it into the record.

Whereas the constituents of the honourable member from Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington make their budgetary decisions based on posted costs of all products and services they choose both to purchase and not to purchase; and

Whereas the idea of price is fundamentally necessary in all economic calculations, public and private, in both revenue and expenditure; and

Whereas these principles are equally valid across the province of Ontario; and

Whereas there is currently no process for the costing of public bills tabled with the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

Whereas there is currently no mandate and no legislative requirement for the costing of bills tabled before the Legislative Assembly;

I move that the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario recommends that the NDP amendment to Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012, section 2, adding the subsection (3.1) be fully costed by an independent auditor before the clause-by-clause reading continues.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier, if you would give us your motion, this committee stands in recess for five minutes while we consider the motion.

The committee recessed from 1544 to 1556.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): We are back. Mr. Hillier has moved that the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario recommends that the proposed NDP amendment to Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012, section 2, adding the subsection (3.1), be fully costed by an independent auditor before the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill continues.

Discussion? Mr. Hillier.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Thank you, Chair. I think it's pretty intuitive, what the purpose of that motion is, and that is to know what the costs of our decisions are—that the committee make informed decisions and know what the full costs of programs and amendments are before we vote on them.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay. Mr. Prue?

Mr. Michael Prue: Unfortunately, I cannot support this amendment. I've just read this. This is an addendum to section 2, and all section 2 says is, "Any other information that may assist the individual in determining whether he or she may qualify for a tax credit." So a person phones up the ministry and asks, "How do I fit into this tax credit? I want to put in" whatever repair they want to make, and Mr. Hillier is requesting that this be costed.

There is no way of knowing how a cost would be involved. Surely, someone who picked up the phone, someone who was answering an email, could look at whatever request was being made by a senior, or a person acting on behalf of a senior, and determine what fits or what doesn't fit. The cost would be negligible except to provide training to those who answer the phone or who answer by email. I don't see any rationale to this at all.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Okay. Ms. Piruzza?

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza: No comment. I would recommend that we call the vote on the motion.

Mr. Randy Hillier: Speaker, I'd like to have a 20-minute recess before the vote.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): Mr. Hillier has requested a 20-minute recess. The committee will reconvene at 18 minutes after 4.

The committee recessed from 1558 to 1624.

The Chair (Mr. Bob Delaney): The committee is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1624.

CONTENTS

Thursday 19 April 2012

Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012, Bill 2, Mr. Duncan / Loi de 2012 sur le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être, projet de loi 2, M. Duncan	F-19
---	------

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga–Streetsville L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Teresa Piruzza (Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest L)

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga–Streetsville L)

Mr. Victor Fedeli (Nipissing PC)

Ms. Cindy Forster (Welland ND)

Mr. Monte McNaughton (Lambton–Kent–Middlesex PC)

Mr. Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre L)

Ms. Teresa Piruzza (Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest L)

Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York ND)

Mr. Peter Shurman (Thornhill PC)

Ms. Soo Wong (Scarborough–Agincourt L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Mike Colle (Eglinton–Lawrence L)

Mr. Joe Dickson (Ajax–Pickering L)

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

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Mr. Victor Fedeli (Nipissing PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Valerie Quioc Lim

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Bradley Warden, legislative counsel