



ISSN 1710-9442

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 6 May 2013

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 6 mai 2013

**Standing Committee on
Justice Policy**

Members' privileges

**Comité permanent
de la justice**

Privilèges des députés

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 JUSTICE POLICY

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE

Monday 6 May 2013

Lundi 6 mai 2013

The committee met at 1208 in room 151.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Thank you, colleagues. I call the meeting to order—the Standing Committee on Justice Policy. As you know, we're here for writing the interim report.

Before we begin, I would just like to welcome Mr. Leone back; we wish both baby and mother all health.

With that, the floor is now open, and I understand we're going to be going through page-by-page analysis of the interim report. I would invite opening comments or direction.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Sure, go ahead. You may introduce your report.

Mr. Jeff Parker: All right. As instructed by the committee, we've prepared the report, a summary of witnesses for the first 25 witnesses that have been heard by the committee. We've got up until April 30, because that was the last witness. They are organized chronologically rather than thematically. I don't believe we had any direction from the committee on that, but that's what we chose to do for simplicity's sake. I suppose that's about all we have to say, because it should be fairly straightforward. We welcome your comments.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Hard copies were couriered to everyone's constituency offices, so we naturally assume that you've devoured and digested the report by this a.m., and now the floor is open for any corrections, additions, objections and so on.

Mr. Peter Sibenik: I might add, Mr. Chair, that different research officers will speak to different summaries because different research officers prepared the summaries. But it'll be fairly seamless if you just go through it page by page.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Do you want the research officers to go and flag what sections—why don't we start that and give folks a little time. Yes, Mr. Delaney? Go ahead.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, first of all, I'd like to compliment the research officers on coming up with a very readable document as a result of the testimony offered by the witnesses. While the government will have a number of suggestions, these are mostly in the vein of clarifications, in many cases adding something that the witness

said that might make the intent of the testimony clear. I'm sure some of the others will have some suggestions as well. At this point, we don't have a procedure on how to do it. Should we just propose a paragraph and make a suggestion as to what might be helpful to be added?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): All right, Mr. Delaney. Well, the committee certainly accepts your compliments about creating a readable report, a readable document. That necessarily implies that many documents from the government are not readable, but in any case, I think we might just want to go by a witness-by-witness analysis here. So witness 1, as you'll recall, is Peter Milliken. His testimony summary is on page 1. As I said, we are now going through page-by-page analysis and would welcome you to do so.

Mr. Rob Leone: Mr. Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): Yes.

Mr. Rob Leone: For the sake of some clarity, I would like to be reminded what the instructions were in terms of creating—since I presume I was here when that happened, what were the instructions given to the researchers in terms of writing that?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): I have no problem with repeating that. I would just probably hope that you might have gotten that from your own caucus. In any case, go ahead.

Mr. Jeff Parker: When we met, first in subcommittee and then as ratified by the whole committee—Tamara, I'm not sure of the date on that. It was decided to report back to the House by May 21. The committee decided to issue an interim report and that interim report would be made up of witness testimony up until and including May 2. So this is simply a summary of the testimony. There are no recommendations—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qadri): And the official document, item 5 of one of the subcommittee reports was, "That the interim report will be broken down by witnesses, as follows:

—a summary of testimony respecting the tendering, planning, commissioning, cancellation and relocation of the Mississauga and/or Oakville gas plants; and

—a summary of testimony respecting the Speaker's finding of a prima facie case of privilege." And there are some other items, more organizational, around that.

Mr. Peter Sibenik: That's why each witness is organized under two subheadings: number one dealing with the involvement of the Mississauga and Oakville gas plants,

and then the second subheading will be disclosure of documents. So if witnesses had something to say under either of those, there will be two separate sections for each witness.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): There's also, as you'll recall, a time constraint, meaning interim report issued, interim report approved, reporting to the House, translated into French etc.

All right. I believe the report is now overwhelming the committee. Do we need to do something?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Should we start?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Please.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any comments on Mr. Milliken's summary, which is more or less pages 1, 2 and a couple of lines beyond that?

Mr. Peter Sibenik: Mr. Chair, if I could say something.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes.

Mr. Peter Sibenik: On page 2 of the draft report, if I could alert the committee to the first full paragraph beginning with the word "after." Towards the end of that paragraph, there's the statement, "Had this deal not been reached, Speaker Milliken would have ruled that there was a prima facie case of privilege." What Mr. Milliken actually says is that there would have been a breach of privilege. What I'm suggesting is to take out the words "prima facie case" and replace it with "breach of," which is what is in the actual committee Hansard.

Now, the difficulty that I have with that is that the Speaker doesn't make a finding of privilege; at the end of the day it's the House that makes that determination. So I may have accidentally slipped those words in there thinking that the Speaker's role is just to make a prima facie ruling. But when I looked at the record again over the weekend, he did say "breach of." Whether it was a slip on Speaker Milliken's part, I know not. But what I'm suggesting is that that line should read, "There was a breach of privilege."

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I think you're ascending to a legal stratosphere there, so I'll accept that. In any case, go ahead.

Any other comments? Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Could you give us the full sentence, then? "Had this deal not been reached"—

Mr. Peter Sibenik: "Had this deal not been reached, Speaker Milliken would have ruled that there was a breach of privilege."

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I don't have a problem with that.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Okay. Any other issues on Speaker Milliken? Going once? Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Just before that, I'd like to suggest that there be a separate heading for each witness, summarizing whatever their recommendations might have been going forward.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: We didn't ask for that, did we?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Well, many of them offered it, and we often said—all three of us have said, "If you were doing this again, what would you have done differently?"

or "What would your recommendations be?" or "How could we improve this?" In one form or another, we've all asked them that.

Let's see if we can summarize—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I'm just being advised that that's the kind of redirect that will not really be followable in the timelines that are so far established.

Mr. Bob Delaney: I'm sorry?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): It can't be done in time.

Mr. Bob Delaney: That's better.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Ms. Albanese?

Mrs. Laura Albanese: Isn't it really an important part of this committee to make recommendations to the House in regard to energy infrastructure in the future?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I think we've already given instruction, summarized the testimony. The testimony is summarized. We can argue about whether it reflects it accurately—not that I think there's anything egregious, but there are places where I would modify things, as Mr. Sibenik has done. But if they made recommendations in their testimony, it's reflected in here.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I agree.

Ms. Karen Hindle: Mr. Delaney, by and large, any of the recommendations that were made by the witnesses would be found in that first section, "Involvement with the Mississauga and/or Oakville gas plants." Typically, it would be found towards the end of that section, at least for those witnesses that we prepared.

Mr. Bob Delaney: That was evident in the drafting. I guess the essence of my suggestion was whether or not in the report we could highlight those things that, as you point out, are by and large present in the drafting and say, "These were their recommendations," and in so doing enable the reader to focus on that quickly.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): This redirect of further itemization of recommendations can be done, but it needs the will of the committee. I'm sensing, at least from the two parties to my left, that that's not the case, so we will bypass that.

Are there any other issues regarding Mr. Milliken?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: In the second-to-last paragraph, page 2, the one that begins with "If the minister ultimately complied," may we please add Peter Milliken's quote on the subject of contempt? He responded to a question of whether the matter of contempt should be resolved if the minister had complied with the Speaker's ruling, and I think this quote is germane to it. He said, "If he complied with the demand for production of the documents, I would have thought it would have, yes.... If he complied, I don't know why there would be a breach. I don't understand that." That was one of the more important things that he said. Can we put that in the report?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Since it's a direct quote, that seems quite reasonable. It's not subject,

really, to interpretation by any parties. Any objections or issues there, gentlemen?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): Do you know what quote it is? Do you know, Hansard, what page—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Can you cite the quote, Mr. Delaney, so we can show folks fast?

Mr. Bob Delaney: I don't have the page number; I'm sorry. It was toward the end of his testimony. The sentence would read, "If he complied with the demand for production of the documents."

1220

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. So we can obviously search that out. That's fine.

Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I'd like to hear the exact quote and, frankly, the question that led up to it.

Mr. Bob Delaney: The question was whether the matter of contempt should be resolved if the minister complied with the Speaker's ruling. Mr. Milliken said, "If he complied with the demand for production of the documents, I would have thought it would have, yes ... If he complied, I don't know why there would be a breach. I don't understand that."

Mr. Taras Natyshak: What's the following sentence?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Well, that was it. That was the end of the thought.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: No, but—the folks who have the transcripts can tell us what the following sentence is.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I mean, we're looking for context here, Mr. Delaney. I mean, we can cherry-pick out of the entire Hansard—

Mr. Bob Delaney: No, I'm not trying to cherry-pick here. I'm just trying to put in something that I thought was germane to the issue.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Can no one look this up electronically? Instantly?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Okay, fine. We'll return to this issue. Any other issues on Mr. Milliken?

Mr. Bob Delaney: No, we're good.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Okay. So I take that after the resolution of this particular issue—the addition of the quote or not—then Milliken is essentially sealed.

Bruce Sharp: pages 3 and 4.

I think, just to remind the committee, as I'm sure you're going to say, Mr. Delaney, I don't think Mr. Sharp provided his, as I recall, the costing—itemized costing and so on—although we did, I think, write twice for that information. In any case, Bruce Sharp: Any issues? Yes, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, in the course of asking him questions, I asked Mr. Sharp a series of questions that asked whether or not he had ever worked for or consulted with or spoken to a number of different agencies. It would be important to summarize those and to note that Mr. Sharp had no involvement in these files and had not worked with the OPA, the ministry, TransCanada Energy or any of the other proponents.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. I'm sensing agreement there on the other side, so accepted.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Any issues with Bruce Sharp? Further?

Mr. Bob Delaney: One more, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes?

Mr. Bob Delaney: In the paragraph under "Involvement with the Mississauga and/or Oakville Gas Plants": Toward the end of his testimony, Mr. Sharp made mention of the fact that his calculations were based on, and I'm going to use his words, "documents publicly available." He also referred to some of his work as ball-park estimates, which he said wouldn't be certain until the plant was operational. But can it be noted that his calculations were based on "documents publicly available," to use his own words, at the time he did his estimate?

Ms. Karen Hindle: Mr. Delaney, on page 3, at about the middle of the page, right underneath the title "Involvement with the Mississauga and/or Oakville Gas Plants"—in this second sentence, it says, "Based on documents publicly available at the time of his testimony...." Is that sufficient? Or would you like more—

Mr. Bob Delaney: No. That is, in fact, sufficient for this purpose. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Great. Any issues with Bruce Sharp? Gentlemen? Yes? No? Bruce Sharp—okay; Bruce Sharp's sealed.

Mayor Rob Burton.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Chair, I have one.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Somewhere in my questioning—now, I received this document at home on the weekend, so I wasn't able to go back to the transcripts from my home. Somewhere in the transcript, I asked the mayor how many times he met with the Premier, and I'd like that question in Hansard put in here, please.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough.

No issues, gentlemen? Ladies?

Mr. Bob Delaney: With Mayor Burton? Yes. One.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That's fine, but with Mr. Fedeli's issue, here.

Mr. Bob Delaney: No, no. That's fine.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Okay, good. Next, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, on page 5, at the bottom of the page, after it says that Burton and C4CA "secured promises from all parties to stop the plant," I'd like to add a quote from Mr. Burton. He said: "We enjoyed expressions of support from all parties, including Mr. Tabuns, and we appreciated the support of all parties. We were particularly encouraged by the strong statements" of "MPP Ted Chudleigh." May we add that quote, please?

Ms. Karen Hindle: Mr. Delaney, can you please repeat the beginning of that quote?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Okay. "We enjoyed expressions of support from all parties, including Mr. Tabuns, and we appreciated the support of all parties. We were particular-

ly encouraged by the strong statements that MPP Ted Chudleigh” etc.

Ms. Karen Hindle: Thank you, Mr. Delaney.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Once again, seeing this is direct quotes from Hansard, I think that’s probably allowable without much discussion.

Yes, gentlemen?

Mr. Rob Leone: Given the instructions of the committee, I’m not sure what the other parties have in relevance to this whole debate. I was inclined to say “strike the paragraph,” in the sense that you say, “Oakville residents, through its town officials and C4CA, secured promises from all parties...” I’m wondering why that’s relevant to what this committee’s been tasked with, essentially.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That’s actually a separate question. This is a summary of testimony and that’s what the gentleman said.

Mr. Rob Leone: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That’s what this is. It’s a summary of what the gentleman said.

Mr. Rob Leone: I’m asking the question, then. I mean, this is supposed to be a summary of what—when the committee has been instructed with two things, which are the release of documents, the disclosure of documents, and the estimation of costs. What relevance does it have to even talk about what, I would imagine, are very irrelevant issues in terms of what the other parties have suggested?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I appreciate your question, but I would just repeat again, item 5 of the subcommittee report. This is a summary of the testimony, what the individual said while at this committee. That’s what this is, and that reflects it.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Summaries are nice if you want a condensed version of the activities of this committee, and they’re efficient in terms of trying to find some key points. But ultimately, the complete volume of testimony that’s appeared before this committee should be taken as gospel. I don’t understand—again, I’m new to this committee and this process, Chair. Summaries are one efficient method—but Hansard, in its full, complete, the volumes of it, should be taken as the full content of what’s happened here at committee. And in an era—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): We 100% agree, and for those who’d like to wade through the entire volume of Hansard, more power to you.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Chair, my question is: Okay, we’ve got dozens of pages here, they’re double-sided and that’s efficient as well. But we live in a digital era where I can’t imagine someone shouldn’t be able to access, on the periphery of this summary, the full content identified as what has happened at this committee.

Can we do something in that sense, where we say, “Yes, this is the summary, but this is the actual full content of the document”? It’s searchable—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Actually, it’s perhaps a good idea. If you’d like a flag, perhaps at the very beginning, with the website tracking etc., with dates and so on—

Mr. Taras Natyshak: As a note to reader—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That’s fine—as a note to reader. I think that’s quite reasonable. Do you want it specified, for example, per witness, per date and so on?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I’d love to have discussion within the committee that says, yes, we’ve summarized it, but if you want to have every word accessible, it exists here, it’s specified, it’s searchable—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Understood. I’m just asking from an efficiency point of view. Can we put a single flag at the beginning of the entire report or do you want it per witness?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I defer to the members of the committee for—

1230

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Can I just speak to that, Chair. When you go on, you can see it basically itemized, if I remember correctly. The date, the names—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough, all right.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: They’re basically there in a sort of table of contents.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): So a single flag at the anterior end of this thing—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Pomanski): At the end or the beginning?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Beginning.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Yes, the beginning.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): And the digital site—once, not per witness.

Mr. Jeff Parker: We can put a range of dates, so that anyone looking at the report can know that if they start on March 7, they can go from March 7 through to May 2.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. Now, have we exhausted the all-parties issue for Mayor Burton?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: By not adding what Mr. Delaney is asking for?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Actually, the other way around: by adding.

Mr. Rob Leone: Mr. Chair, I’m going to go back to my original point: We could sit here all day debating what should go in this—

Mr. Taras Natyshak: We will.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): This is a votable issue. If we need to go to a vote, we’ll vote now.

Mr. Rob Leone: I’m going to make my point, at least, that we could be here all day to say that we want to add a quote here or a quote there. I would like, in the same vein, as we’re adding things to this document and taking some of the things out—certainly that would be a judgment call that I would make upon reading this document and the summary of the testimony as I remember it. We could be here all day doing that. But the point is, do we want to be that nitpicky? That certainly is obviously the prerogative of this committee to decide, but we’re now being asked to add quotes in because this person said this, but we’re not really sure about what the context

is because we don't have the volumes of Hansard that the Clerk has.

I just don't think we can do an adequate job saying what should be in this document or outside this document if you're trying to be very particular about what should be included or what shouldn't be. Certainly, I imagine that the quotes that Mr. Delaney wants to include are to reinforce an argument that he's trying to make and his party is trying to make, and he's certainly in his rights to do that. But I would also want the same sort of courtesy extended to me: that if I don't want something included in this report, we avoid including it.

So if that's the game that we're going to play today, we're going to be here for a very long, long time, and I—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That's fine. Mr. Leone, first of all, the committee is very pleased to be here all day, and beyond, if necessary. Secondly—

Mr. Rob Leone: To infinity and beyond.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri):—this is a votable issue, so it has to be done by the will of the committee. Thirdly, the committee will extend to you all courtesies; if you want things added or subtracted, bring them forth.

Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, we are going to make what amounts to on average one to three short mostly-additions per witness. In the context of the volume of testimony, we feel that they are reasonable mostly-additions. They don't add significantly to the length of the report, and we feel that the points made are germane. We welcome our colleagues to do the same thing.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Sure. I would just also, once again, advise the committee: These are not quotes from any committee members—or, by the way, external bodies or organizations or people. These are quotes from the witnesses themselves, made in this room, so that's quite acceptable.

Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Mr. Chair, I'm not going to support the inclusion that Mr. Delaney is putting forward. I think the whole line of argument the government is using is one meant to obscure what happened here. We've got a summary of this testimony, and here I'd disagree with Mr. Leone; I'm going to just say leave it in. There are going to be more substantial issues that we're going to wrangle on in the course of this document, but I have to say that the government's strategy is neither transparent nor open. It's meant to obscure what happened in all of this.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough. So leave as is, or do I need to go to a vote here?

Yes, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: I'd like to discuss this. Peter, that's not it at all. We are not trying to do any of the things that you have alleged. We're dealing with a report that is a first draft, and one that we think is going to be a clearer draft, through what we have made every reasonable endeavour to distill down to small insertions—and, I believe, in virtually every case, the exact quote from the witness.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Leone?

Mr. Rob Leone: Again, the point here is that we can be nitpicky on the testimony. Certainly, in Speaker Milliken's testimony there were some quotes that we could have pulled out to include in this document as well. The point here is simply that—and to Mr. Tabuns's point, the only point I'm referencing about removing a paragraph is that if we're going to be playing games, I'm prepared to play them as well.

But this isn't the way I think that this committee should be conducting itself. I could go find quotes on all these witnesses that support a position that we would want to take, but we decided as a committee, as I recall and as has been mentioned, to do this in a fair and impartial way, to come up with a summary of testimony as has been outlined. I'm frankly in support of what Mr. Tabuns has said and I won't be supporting the addition to this quote.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fine. Are you supporting the removal of that paragraph which you said earlier?

Mr. Rob Leone: No, I'm going to withdraw that.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fine. Do I take it that as it stands, we leave it—unless I need to go to a formal vote on that.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): As it is. We're not adding the quote, not removing it.

Mr. Bob Delaney: I think it misses something important said by Mr. Burton that many other people have said, and I would like to add that very brief quote to the report, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Understood. I will now take that as a vote. Gentlemen, ladies, I would now invite you to please vote. If you would like to add the inclusion of Mayor Burton's extra testimony as cited by Mr. Delaney and read into the record, would you please vote now in the affirmative. If you are against that, would you please vote now. Fine. That issue is now dispensed with.

Is there any further issue with Mr. Burton? Mr. Burton, going once? Burton is more or less sealed.

Mr. Wallace: This is now page 6 and beyond. Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: I'll draw members' attention to page 9. It's paragraph 3. I'll refer you to after the line that begins, "The redacted portions were unrelated to the request." It's important to note that Mr. Wallace followed up his testimony and sent a letter to the committee on April 8. After having reviewed all the redactions, in his letter he states—and this is the part that I think is important—"I wish to confirm for the committee my continued belief that good-faith efforts were made to provide the information responsive to the committee's order and that the redactions removed only information that appeared to be unrelated to that order."

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney. By citing that quote, are you suggesting to unite it to this report?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Yes, and in the interests of full disclosure, he did provide the committee with a copy of the unredacted records to show the committee that the redactions did not withhold information responsive to the request.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That's excellent. Are you suggesting that we should add this to the report?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Yes, please.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. All right, that's now before the—I take it that's a “no,” gentlemen?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: No for me.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Yes, that's a no.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Is that any different from “No, that's a yes”?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Yes, that's a no.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Again, to advise the committee, that letter was not officially part of the testimony, though I suppose it could be regarded as a continuation. That was really not part of the mandate. I think the researchers avoided documents received post-testimony, just to be clear.

All right. I will take that as a firm “no” from the majority of committee.

Are there any other issues with regard to Mr. Wallace?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Chair, I want to move a motion, and I don't know the proper procedure. Do I just do it?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): You might want to submit it in writing, preferably legible and/or typed, if possible.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Well, I don't have a typewriter here; that tells you my age.

Mr. Rob Leone: It's a pretty clear motion, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: It's about 10 words.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Well, we don't take verbal motions, gentlemen.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Are the motions in order? All right. You may move that motion.

1240

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Chair, I move to accept the interim draft report as is.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. The motion is before the floor. It's open for discussion.

Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Chair, I have two amendments to that. The first is that on page 25, “Ms. Jenkins' allegations in her October 3, 3012, memo”—we just need to correct that date.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I am informed, logically so, that that amendment is out of order as it essentially defeats the purpose of the original motion, as in accepting as is, and simultaneously editing defies the laws of gravity. So I would ask that—

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Then if Mr. Fedeli would withdraw for a moment, I will make a motion to amend this document.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Withdrawn, temporarily.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Understood.

The floor is now open for amendments, but this is not requiring a motion. This is what we're doing here—amending, editing, upgrading this report. So I don't think we actually need a motion for that. That's what we're here to do in the first place.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Mr. Chair?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I would suggest we return to editing now.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Well, then, I am going to move a motion.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): We would need it in writing.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I am going to move that—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): In writing, Mr. Tabuns, please.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: A fair request, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): And I might suggest the floor is open to all committee members for similar motions and amendments.

Mr. Bob Delaney: While Mr. Tabuns is doing his motion, which I appreciate—Chair, we spent a considerable amount of good-faith time with this. We are not producing suggestions that are unrelated to our joint task here. The amendments that we're proposing are intended to clarify not merely what the witness said, but to further our attempt to produce a document that accurately summarizes the testimony that we heard as of the end of April, and we've made some very serious ones. They are concise. They're simple to understand, and in each case they serve to amplify the point made by the witness.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney. Your points are noted. I would invite you to inspire the committee with the same viewpoint.

Mr. Natyshak?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Chair, for the record, Mr. Parker, who has headed up the task of condensing the testimony here and summarizing, is indeed an independent, third-party vérificateur of our committee testimony here. Is that correct?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): One assumes.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: And is fully capable and competent of summarizing the content of the testimony here?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Absolument, mon ami.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I feel that as well. I am confident in what he's put together for committee, and I would say that given that, and despite the efforts put forward by the government, we should accept his report as complete and fulsome and with all good intent.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I believe that is the reason we are here today: to read, verify and add to or subtract from the report.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Aside from any typos that we do encounter throughout.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, I grasp where Mr. Natyshak is coming from, but, as he himself points out, despite the best efforts of the research staff, they found, admittedly, a typographical error, but an error of fact. I pass no judgment on the skill and the qualifications of the researcher. What we've done is to try to help them do a better job on our behalf. We are not making frivolous statements. Each request that we'll make of the committee is a concise, accurate request where we're either going to use the witnesses' own words—and not very many of them—and we would just like to be able to have our committee members listen to what we think is going to make this a better document. There is no other agenda.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I think Mr. Parker is overwhelmed by the vote of confidence and would like to weigh in.

Mr. Jeff Parker: First, just on the record, this was actually a work of six different researchers across: both table research and the legislative research service, so I thought we should get that on the record. I'm not here to take credit or blame for this en masse.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: You'd be a good politician.

Mr. Jeff Parker: The second thing is that we are here to serve the committee. So whatever the committee decides in terms of changes or not changes, that's what we're here for. We have no problem with no changes; it's entirely up to you.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Mr. Peter Sibenik: Mr. Chair, if I could also add: There are a number of typographical errors in the document, as Mr. Tabuns pointed out. There may be a few others. So whichever way the committee decides to go on this, just have that in the back of your mind, if you could, please.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Fedeli.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Thank you. When does this document cease being confidential?

Mr. Peter Sibenik: Well, it is before the committee at the present time. It's a committee exhibit at this particular point. We're going through it right now and we're in open session, so—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: So it's no longer a confidential document?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I think so; we're in open session.

Mr. Peter Sibenik: We're in open session, so I would say so.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I'm not entirely reassured by, "I would say so."

Mr. Peter Sibenik: If we could wait, perhaps, until the committee Clerk returns, and then—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Okay. I wasn't sure who would have the final wording on that.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right, gentlemen, ladies, we will now—we've, I think, officially dispensed with Mayor Burton. I believe we're waiting—Mr. Tabuns, is it your motion that we're waiting for?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes. It's being word-processed and brought forward.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. Well, I would suggest we wait, unless there's any other comment.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Can we go on to other parts of the report?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I would suggest that we—depending on what the motion states, Mr. Delaney, I think I likely need to wait for it.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Okay.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I have a question, then, Chair, while we're navel-gazing. May 1, the letter to you from Peter Wallace: There's an underlined sentence down at the bottom.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: When do we deal with that?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Again, the Clerk and I were discussing that. We're deciding what to do, whether—for example, as we did similarly with the OPA and Infrastructure Ontario documents—we'll give you a kind of receipted version of it.

Anyway, let's just address the first question. Do you want to just repeat the question?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I have two questions. Number one, when does this cease becoming a confidential—for committee use only—document?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): As soon as it gets reported to the House by the Chair.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: So it's still, today, a confidential document for MPPs' exclusive use?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): Yes.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: That's number one. Number two: In the letter of May 1 to the Chair from Peter Wallace, there's an underlined sentence. I would ask that the committee consider keeping the information confidential.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): We received documents again last week. These are just the cover letters. Again, we still need direction on these documents as well.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Is that the large one-inch document that we received?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): No, this is another one.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: We don't have this one yet?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): I have this, but this is—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Do we have this?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Poman-ski): No, just the hard—because we need direction from the committee how we're going to deal with confidential documents. So I'm just providing—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I understand.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): So, receipted confidentiality, a room with a view, for staff only etc.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Yes; I understand.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. Motions are being typed up.

We're returning to Mr. Milliken. The quote that was cited has now been located. Peter, do you want to just read the quote for us?

Mr. Peter Sibenik: Yes. This is at pages 22 and 23 of the committee Hansard for March 7. The questions that I'm going to quote here are from Mr. Delaney. The responses are by Mr. Milliken, and here it goes. Question: "September 24, 2012, was the deadline provided by the Speaker for that production, and the minister claims that he complied with that deadline.

"Let's start off with one question. The minister ultimately complied. Shouldn't that end the matter?"

1250

Answer: "If he complied with the demand for production of the documents, I would have thought it would have, yes."

Question: "In your experience, would you find it counterproductive, then, for there to be a finding of contempt based upon an order with which the minister ultimately complied?"

Answer: "You mean after the minister complied, there was a finding of contempt?"

Question: "Yes."

Answer: "Oh. I guess if he complied, I wouldn't have thought there'd be a further argument, but I'm"—and then he was cut off at that point. So it's a question as to: Do you want that whole quote?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Fedeli.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Considering that there was a second, third and fourth document dump, it's obviously apparent that the minister did not comply.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Leone?

Mr. Rob Leone: That notwithstanding, I believe, if we look earlier in the Hansard, Speaker Milliken did note that he knew very little about this very issue. Hence, taking this and talking about hypotheticals is part of the problem with trying to take quotes out of context. Unless you have that context, you can't really provide a fulsome portrayal of what has happened, and I think that the researchers have done their best to try and avoid that. That's the issue that I think we're dealing with here.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. I take it that the will of the committee majority expressed is not to include these quotes.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, to the point just raised by Mr. Fedeli and Mr. Leone—and let's use Peter Milliken's own words: "I can see why you might have delays in getting chunks of documents because others were found that hadn't been located when the initial search was made or were in some other office or some other filing cabinet or somebody forgot about them and didn't produce them."

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: And Chair, it may be added that Mr. Milliken was a Conservative witness.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney. All right, let's bring closure to this particular issue. If needed, I'll go to a vote. Do we wish to include this particular cited quotation by Mr. Milliken? I'll take that as a firm no or a majority no.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, can I have a vote on that?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right. We'll vote on this particular issue: the citation or inclusion of the quote cited by Mr. Delaney of Mr. Milliken. Those in favour?

Mr. Bob Delaney: And a recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): A recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Albanese, Delaney, Del Duca.

Nays

Fedeli, Leone, Natyshak, Tabuns.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. That is therefore not included, as the negative side wins on that. We'll now move to Mr. Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that the date "October 3, 3012" on page 25 be corrected to the real date. I think we're getting ahead of ourselves with this report.

Mr. Jeff Parker: We're forward-thinking.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: That's how long it's going to take to pay it off.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: You're an optimist.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I'm advised that we are supposed to be following chronologically, or at least by order here, the testimony and the additions and subtractions.

Secondly, because this is essentially typographic and obviously and clearly an error, it does not necessarily require a motion. So I would suggest that we either accept that ruling or we can move to it. It's the will of the committee.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Just so I'm clear with your remarks, can we assume, those of us here, that that date will be corrected whether we move a motion on it or not?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I think that's reasonable.

Mr. Jeff Parker: We're happy to correct whatever typographical errors there are in the text, so long as they don't affect the meaning—commas, periods, dates—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fine. So that one's clear. That's a simple date, putting us a millennium ahead. So we'll leave that.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: So Mr. Fedeli's earlier motion, which he withdrew and which he intends to bring back—

there is no difficulty when he brings back acceptance of the report with correction of that date?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): That is a very good question. I think, technically speaking, there should probably be an amendment to that motion for that contingency of typographical errors.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Well, I have attempted that, if you will remember, but if you're ruling now that you'll accept that amendment—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Actually, Mr. Tabuns, your motion was not that. Your motion was very specifically to edit a particular issue. It was not merely to correct typographical errors.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I thought it was to correct that date, sir, but that being the case—

Mr. Rob Leone: He's saying all typographical errors that would be included.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Fine, okay.

Mr. Rob Leone: That's what we should move an amendment on.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Okay.

Mr. Rob Leone: Am I clear, Chair, on that?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes. Now, we can have that motion back from Mr. Fedeli, either in the body of the motion, this issue of typographical errors, or as an amendment—as you wish.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Mr. Chair, before—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Tabuns, you do have another motion. Are you filing this now?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes, I move that the report contain a list of documents requested from witnesses and received.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right, that seems reasonable. Mr. Delaney?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Again, please?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Tabuns, again, please?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I move that the report contain a list of documents requested from witnesses and received—which is consistent with questions that you've asked as well.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right, do we have that all on file?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Just as a question of clarification: a list of documents requested from witnesses—the presence or absence of a comma is actually important here. Does that assume that we will see a list of documents not received and also received?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Actually, that's a reasonable question, despite the sighs over there.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: I am assuming, Mr. Chair, that there will be a table which will show documents requested and documents received. One can deduce from absence of commentary that a document hasn't been received.

Mr. Bob Delaney: In other words, it will be noted if a document requested has not been received—

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Correct.

Mr. Bob Delaney:—but there will not be an absence of the reference to the document if the document has not been received?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): So, fine, “received” and “not received”—both included, for clarity.

Mr. Bob Delaney: I'm good. I understand.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Understood. Is the motion acceptable to the committee? Do we need to officially vote—a friendly amendment kind of thing? All right, the motion is now accepted. So, Mr. Tabuns, we thank you for your addition.

Mr. Fedeli, if you'd like to move your original motion, with due respect to the typographical errors, you are welcome to do so.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I think my page is missing there.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): A page is missing.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: It had my handwritten note. I guess I could probably remember it. I move that we accept the interim draft report, with typographical errors corrected, as is. “As is” wouldn't quite be with typographical errors.

Mr. Steven Del Duca: “As will be”—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: “As will be.”

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): In any case, are we accepting this motion as in order? Do we need it written out better etc.?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Mr. Fedeli, we will do the writing for you in this case. Will you just please restate it one more time?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I move that we accept the interim draft report, with typographical errors corrected—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Period?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: Period.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough. That motion is now in order and is now before the floor—and will, by the way, essentially conclude the committee hearing today. In any case, go ahead, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: It is a debatable motion, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes, of course.

Mr. Bob Delaney: It makes the presumption that we know at this point all of the either factual or typographical errors, or indeed whether there's an unintended editorial judgment. For example, I can refer to one which may be an unintended editorial judgment. On page 13, paragraph 1, in the drafting the language says “much-needed background”. Is it the intent of the researcher to make that “much-needed” value judgment, and should in fact the summary make a judgment on whether or not the testimony was needed?

So I understand where Mr. Fedeli is going, but the government came here prepared to offer all of these things to make that a stronger report, and I might point out that if we had just gone through the points, we'd be pretty much finished by now.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney. We still have a motion before the floor. The floor is open for discussion, debate, comments on this motion: once again, to accept the draft report with typo-

graphical corrections. Are there any further comments on that motion?

Interjections.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Call the question, Chair.

Mr. Jeff Parker: Okay, we just would need clarification on this motion, because we've had two more substantive changes made in the course of this committee meeting up until this point, one of which was to note to the reader at the beginning of the document to include Hansard; the second being that there would be an inclusion of a quote from Hansard in Bruce Sharp's testimony referencing questions working with, I believe, the OPA, that Mr. Delaney spoke about. So we have two substantive—

Ms. Karen Hindle: Mr. Fedeli, you had included—asked to include the discussions with the Premier.

Mr. Jeff Parker: Sorry, the third one. So we have three substantive corrections already made. Would this motion override those or would they simply be taken as done?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): The point is good. I think, for clarity, the issue of the list of documents received, not received—that stands. So that is to be included in the final draft.

And the first quotation you mentioned from Bruce Sharp: I think the committee accepted that. So let's go with that.

What was the third one?

Mr. Jeff Parker: The third one was Mr. Fedeli's comments on a conversation with the Premier, with Mayor Burton—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tamara Pomanski): How many times he met with the Premier—Mr. Burton—

Interjections.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: That was accepted—

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I see. I believe that's been accepted as well, so those stand. Are there any further issues, comments, before we move to the vote on this motion?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, can I have a look at the motion on paper, please?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Yes, you may certainly have a look at the motion on paper. We will, in order to do so, take a ten-minute recess.

The committee recessed from 1302 to 1314.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. The committee is back in session. I understand, Mr. Fedeli, you're going to withdraw the first motion and then represent the second, updated—

Mr. Victor Fedeli: I am. This one sounds so much more intelligent. Thank you, Clerk.

I move that we accept the interim draft report as already amended to this point, subject to the correction of typographical errors by the research officer(s).

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Fedeli. Are there comments, issues with reference to this? Once again, with acceptance of this motion, I'd just advise the committee that we'll essentially end the duties of the committee for this day.

Yes, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, I would like to propose an amendment to Mr. Fedeli's motion.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, and we welcome it in writing, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Okay. Let me just read it, then. In between the words "typographical" and "errors", to insert "and factual," and after that, to add one sentence, which is, "Each caucus may submit a list of such suggested inclusions or changes."

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): By when?

Mr. Victor Fedeli: It won't matter.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): It depends on the vote, Mr. Fedeli. It's democracy.

Mr. Bob Delaney: By the end of today.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): By the end of today. Mr. Delaney, can you read it again, please?

Mr. Bob Delaney: I move that Mr. Fedeli's motion be amended by (1) inserting the words "and factual" in between "typographical" and "errors," and (2) to add the sentence, "Each caucus may submit a list of such suggested inclusions or changes by 6 p.m., May 6, 2013."

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough. That amendment stands before the committee. I take it that, in terms of the consideration of these inclusions/subtractions submitted by each caucus, you're essentially empowering research officers to make that decision?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Chair, I am suggesting that each caucus can submit to the research officer a list of suggested changes that are based on correcting the text or correcting factual errors.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you, Mr. Delaney, for restating that again. I'm asking: You're allowing research officers to make that determination?

Mr. Bob Delaney: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough. So, the amendment is understood by committee members? The floor is open for comments on the amendment.

Mr. Rob Leone: Can I ask, Mr. Delaney: In terms of when you say, "MPPs' offices," what are you talking about specifically?

Mr. Bob Delaney: How do you mean, "MPPs' offices"?

Mr. Rob Leone: You mean MPPs' offices and their staff?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I don't believe he used either of those phrases.

Mr. Bob Delaney: I don't recall using those phrases.

Mr. Rob Leone: I thought I heard that.

Mr. Victor Fedeli: What did he say specifically?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): "Each caucus," which means each party.

Mr. Rob Leone: I believed he said "MPPs' offices." I withdraw, then.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I believe he didn't.

Mr. Rob Leone: I'm sure Hansard will tell us that one way or another. Someone said it. Katch heard it.

Interjections.

Mr. Rob Leone: And by “caucuses,” do we mean simply caucus members or caucus members’ staff?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Well, I think, Mr. Leone, that’s hopefully relatively clear. Each party.

Mr. Bob Delaney: Okay. Make it 6 and whatever it was I first said. If I said “6,” it’s 6.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fair enough. Do committee members understand the amendment to this motion, as read? Fine. So, one addition, “and factual,” plus this business about the caucus suggestions, which, by the way, will be received by 6 p.m. today.

Are there any further comments or issues with reference to this amendment to Mr. Fedeli’s motion before we vote on the amendment? Mr. Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: No further comment. Go to the vote, please.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Fine. Those in favour of Mr. Delaney’s amendment—

Mr. Bob Delaney: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Albanese, Delaney, Del Duca.

Nays

Fedeli, Leone, Natyshak, Tabuns.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Thank you. The amendment is not carried.

We move now to the main motion, Mr. Fedeli’s, which has already been read into the record. Unless there are further comments, we’ll proceed to the vote. Those in favour of Mr. Fedeli’s motion will please vote in the affirmative now. Those opposed? That amendment carries. That, de facto, is—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): I see. There are just some last-minute housekeeping issues, which run as follows:

Shall the draft report, therefore, as amended, carry? Carried.

Who shall sign off on the final copy—the Chair or the subcommittee?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: The Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Shall the report be translated?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Shall the report be printed?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Shall I present the report to the House?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Incidentally, there is an opportunity: If there are dissenting opinions on any issue, they will be included in an appendix to the report if duly received by the Clerk and the Chair.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: By when?

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): Good question. You’re looking at 48 hours.

What does that mean specifically—at 6 p.m. Wednesday?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Shafiq Qaadri): All right; now it’s 24 hours, so, end of day tomorrow. Dissenting opinions, if any, will be included in the report in an appendix.

All right. Are there any further issues or comments? We congratulate you on the adoption of your interim report. Committee is now adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1321.

CONTENTS

Monday 6 May 2013

Members' privileges JP-387

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Shafiq Qadri (Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

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

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

Ms. Teresa Armstrong (London–Fanshawe ND)

Mr. Bob Delaney (Mississauga–Streetsville L)

Mr. Steven Del Duca (Vaughan L)

Mr. Frank Klees (Newmarket–Aurora PC)

Mr. Jack MacLaren (Carleton–Mississippi Mills PC)

Mr. Rob E. Milligan (Northumberland–Quinte West PC)

Mr. Shafiq Qadri (Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord L)

Mr. Jonah Schein (Davenport ND)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Victor Fedeli (Nipissing PC)

Mr. Rob Leone (Cambridge PC)

Mr. Taras Natyshak (Essex ND)

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Mr. John Yakabuski (Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Tamara Pomanski

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Karen Hindle, research officer,
Legislative Research Service

Mr. Jeff Parker, research officer,
Legislative Research Service

Mr. Peter Sibenik, table research clerk,
Journals and Procedural Research Branch