



ISSN 1180-4319

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 2 October 2013

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 2 octobre 2013

**Standing Committee on
Regulations and Private Bills**

**Comité permanent des
règlements et des projets
de loi d'intérêt privé**

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 REGULATIONS
AND PRIVATE BILLS**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES
RÈGLEMENTS ET DES PROJETS DE LOI
D'INTÉRÊT PRIVÉ**

Wednesday 2 October 2013

Mercredi 2 octobre 2013

The committee met at 0902 in committee room 1.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Good morning. Will the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills come to order?

The items on the agenda are as follows:

- Bill Pr18, An Act to revive Kingsgate II Limited;
- Bill Pr19, An Act to revive Kingsgate III Limited;
- Bill Pr20, An Act to revive Kingsgate IV Limited;
- Bill Pr21, An Act to revive Westmount Ridge Associates Limited;
- Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists;
- Bill Pr24, An Act to revive Senchura Holdings Ltd.

SENCHURA HOLDINGS LTD. ACT, 2013

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill Pr24, An Act to revive Senchura Holdings, Ltd.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Members of the committee, the applicant for the Kingsgate bills is going to be a few minutes late. I suggest we start with An Act to revive Senchura Holdings Ltd. No objections?

Would the applicant introduce himself for the purposes of Hansard?

Mr. Ronald Reim: Yes, good morning. My name is Ronald Reim. I'm a solicitor. I'm here with the applicant, Mr. Fred Berofsky.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Does the sponsor, Mr. Prue, have any comments?

Mr. Michael Prue: Yes, my very brief comment: I would ask that the committee favourably consider this bill. It is a relatively routine matter and will allow business to commence on a property in Beaches—East York.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Okay. Does the applicant have any comments?

Mr. Ronald Reim: No, there are no comments, sir.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Okay. Are there any interested parties in this room who want to speak to the matter?

Are there any comments from the government?

Any comments from any other committee members?

Are the members ready to vote? Great.

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

Done. Thank you.

**ONTARIO INSTITUTE
OF PROFESSIONAL AGROLOGISTS
ACT, 2013**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Colleagues, in light of the fact that the proponents for Kingsgate are still not here, I propose we move on to Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists. Mr. Hardeman will be sponsoring this bill. Would Mr. Hardeman and the applicant please come forward? I would ask the applicant to introduce himself for the purposes of Hansard.

Mr. Terry Kingsmill: Good morning. My name is Terry Kingsmill. I am registrar of the Ontario Institute of Agrologists.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Do you, Mr. Hardeman, have any comments on this?

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am introducing this bill on behalf of the Ontario Institute of Agrologists, and I am pleased to be sponsoring this bill. It will legislate that only members of the Ontario Institute of Agrologists in good standing can use the “professional agrologist” designation.

This bill will only impact those wishing to use the title of professional agrologist. It will not in any way limit the ability of others in the sector to continue to practise, and I think it's very important that I put that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Does the sponsor have any comments?

Mr. Terry Kingsmill: Yes. Mr. Chair and members of the standing committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists. I wish to begin by stating an appreciation for the comments, support and insights from all across the agrology sector: from those in government and multiple ministry jurisdictions, from business and academia, Mr. Hardeman, of

course, for his support, and all who served as part of our stakeholder consultation process in the preparation of this bill.

For over 50 years, the OIA mission has been to protect the public by registering and certifying the competence of those practitioners who are qualified within the jurisdiction of the act and contribute toward building consumer confidence in Ontario's agriculture, agri-food and agri-environmental sector. Through this bill, the Ontario Institute of Agrologists seeks to better advance the proficiency of its registered and certified member-practitioners serving society.

How do they do this? Through enhanced member adherence to the new national standards of practice: rigorous competency and educational requirements to join the OIA, ongoing continuous learning and competency enhancement, member utilization of sound scientific methods and principles, as well as accountability to the consumer. Specifically, the intent is that it only applies to those who meet national entry criteria and voluntarily choose to be registered and certified members of the Ontario Institute of Agrologists.

It is identified in the bill, in the clearest possible language, that this bill does not affect, restrict or interfere with any right of any person who is not a member of the institute to practise. There is no mandatory element or wording that makes certification, licensure or designation mandatory in the province of Ontario through this bill.

Second of all, the bill will not serve to add to the legislation on the books in Ontario. This bill serves to repeal and replace the Ontario Professional Agrologists Act, 1960, an old and out-dated act that challenges the OIA to enhance the qualifications of its registered member and even builds membership predicated on those with a degree in agriculture from the Ontario Agricultural College granted by the University of Toronto.

Today, the work of OIA-certified practitioner members goes beyond traditional agriculture, beyond crop-input supply businesses, feed mill operations or providing advice to farmers. Over the past 50 years since our 1960 act was passed, a number of changes have occurred in the agrologist members' traditional specialized space, specifically in areas of evolving consumer interest such as resource stewardship and food quality assurance, where OIA members do provide scientifically sound services and competency-based expertise.

The bill also responds to the need to formalize the "technical agrologist" designation to provide an entry to certification for today's college graduates.

0910

We seek to build on over 40 years of being in existence and, through the bill, be able to better demonstrate an industry-driven commitment to ongoing professional development and training. As a result, this act will recognize the training and expertise of Ontario's professional and technical agrologists and will help our agriculture industry by ensuring that anyone using a protected title meets national competency requirements.

In particular, we wanted to make sure that this bill did not impede on the membership of any other agricultural-based organization. In fact, OIA members and their employers are often joint members with other ag organizations and businesses as well as corporate sponsors of many different ag organizations.

Quite simply, it is undeniable that individuals and the companies that employ them recognize the importance of designated OIA members in practice and demonstrate a clear industry need, support for and value in OIA certification and registration. This bill serves to articulate broad stakeholder support for certified agrologists in all areas of practice. It contains a provision reserving certain designations and titles for the exclusive use of members of the OIA.

The bill does not make it an offence to call yourself, let's say, a professional agronomist or a professional fertilizer applicator, as examples. However, this bill does make it an offence for unauthorized persons to use the cited designations and, of course, company titles as a means to deceive the public by holding out that they are certified members of the institute. The OIA, through this bill, would have the authority to pursue a legal avenue against those who misrepresent themselves as a registered or certified member.

Simply, this bill seeks to help our agriculture and agrology sectors by ensuring that anyone using a nationally recognized title meets national standards of qualification assurance, can achieve labour mobility and is completing ongoing education. To be clear, there is nothing written or implied in this bill that would make it mandatory for an OIA certified member to perform any service or function.

Members of the standing committee, you should know that, in Canada, each province has an agrology institute and an agrology act. Historically, each provincial Legislature has passed and revised its act as deemed appropriate. It is an important element of our legislative system that an avenue for private bills exists whereby private legislation initiated by an organization such as the OIA, if passed by the Legislative Assembly, would provide the legislative sanction that cannot be obtained under general law.

On behalf of the OIA's board of directors and the approximately 600 members of the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists, I appreciate your consideration of the merits of Bill Pr15. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you very much. Are there any interested parties in this room who want to speak to this matter? If you would come forward, sir, and introduce yourself. I should have said you have up to five minutes to speak.

Mr. Dave Bутtenham: My name is Dave Bутtenham, CEO, with the Ontario Agri Business Association. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to make this submission to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills as it relates to Pr15, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists.

As mentioned earlier, my name is Dave Buttenham. I'm CEO for Ontario Agri Business Association, a voluntary not-for-profit trade association that represents the collective interests of crop input supply businesses, country grain elevators, feed mills and allied businesses operating out of some 509 locations across the province of Ontario. Member firms of OABA provide essential products and services to Ontario's 57,000 farmers and are committed to serving the needs of this important segment of the Ontario economy. A number of those services are provided by professional staff members, including nutritionists, agronomists, and feed and crop technical sales staff.

In order to effectively serve the needs of the agri-food value chain, it is imperative that agribusinesses employ staff at all levels who are knowledgeable, well-trained and professional in their specific duties and responsibilities related to crop production, livestock and poultry production and grain and oilseed handling and merchandising. Throughout Ontario, the agribusiness sector employs competent staff who work closely with all segments of production agriculture to maximize plant and animal production with a direct emphasis on food safety, food quality and environmental sustainability. In addition to formal education accreditation, OABA is a strong supporter of the certified crop adviser, the certified crop science consultant, certified animal health representative programs and other professional organizations.

Since 1960, OABA acknowledges that the Ontario Institute of Agrologists has been authorized to issue the title of "professional agrologist" to qualified persons in Ontario. It should be noted that, over the past 30 years, there have been several unsuccessful attempts by OIA to pursue mandatory right-to-practise legislation that would regulate agrologists and the practice of agrology in Ontario. Over this period of time, OABA has been consistent in its opposition to the mandatory nature of OIA right-to-practise regulatory proposals.

There has been considerable change in the agri-food sector since 1960, and OABA appreciates the current challenges OIA is facing as a membership organization. During a meeting with OIA on April 3, 2013, OABA was advised that the primary reason for pursuing passage of this bill is to ensure that only OIA members use the PAG designation. To achieve this objective, it is respectfully submitted that there are alternative approaches available to OIA that could potentially yield the same results and do not include the creation of a specific act. Bill Pr15 is clearly focused on the operational and governance needs specific to OIA and does not establish any broader benefits to stakeholders in the agri-food industry or to the citizens of Ontario.

OABA would submit that professional and technical staff operating in the agri-food sector should be free to choose which professional organization and accreditation best meets their needs, the needs of their employer and, most importantly, the needs of the customers. OABA agrees with the Canadian Certified Crop Advisor Association that there is no basis to support the position that

individuals who hold a generalized professional agrologist designation are better educated or more knowledgeable in providing services in the agribusiness sector than those who choose to belong to a different professional organization representing their specific area of focus or expertise.

While the Ontario Agri Business Association does not oppose the efforts of OIA to improve its organizational effectiveness and governance through this private bill, OABA continues to have concern with the potential that passage of this private bill could serve as a conduit for OIA to revisit its pursuit of right-to-practise legislation or mandatory membership, and that is something that OABA will simply not support. Thank you very much.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. Any other interested parties who'd like to speak?

Sir, you have up to five minutes, and please introduce yourself first.

Mr. Clare Kinlin: Thank you. My name is Clare Kinlin. I'm currently the vice-chair of the Canadian Certified Crop Advisor Association. I am a certified crop adviser, employed by MacEwen Agricentre located in eastern Ontario. Thank you for the opportunity to make a presentation to the standing committee regarding the bill, An Act respecting the Ontario Institute of Professional Agrologists.

The CCA program is a voluntary program, administered locally in 38 jurisdictions throughout Canada and the United States. There are programs in India, Mexico and Argentina and new programs set to launch in seven more countries. There are currently 13,327 active CCAs, and there are over 500 CCAs in Ontario. Our association oversees the program. The CCA board of directors consists of representatives from both federal and provincial governments, agricultural research, agribusiness and practising CCAs.

In order to become a CCA, individuals must meet certain standards which include exams to demonstrate the command of science and principles involved in crop production, experience minimums and demonstration of the ability to apply the knowledge they possess, and continuing education to ensure they keep current on research and practical application.

Since the 1960s, the OIA has been authorized to issue the title of "professional agrologist" or PAG to qualified persons in Ontario. We understand from OIA that they face challenges ensuring that only their members use the title, and that is the reason they are pursuing the passing of this bill. However, we are unclear how this bill will assist them in enforcing the use of the PAG designation. There are other approaches, such as incorporating as a non-profit, which would achieve the same results.

0920

Our association is opposed to any kind of legislation that would lead to right-to-practise regulations and mandatory membership in OIA or any other associations, either now or in the future. That is our main concern with this bill: the potential of regulations to be added or

amendments made that would require an agronomist to become a PAg.

We believe that agronomists should be free to choose what professional organization and accreditation best meet their needs, the needs of their employer and, most importantly, the needs of their customers. The ag industry has changed, and we are highly specialized for our customers.

There are already professional organizations with specific areas of practice; for example, engineers and veterinarians. In Ontario, there are also certified crop advisor programs, certified science consultant programs and certified animal health representative programs. In addition, the agri-business sector has developed the designation of “professional applicator” to identify those individuals who have a combination of experience and knowledge in the application of crop protection products and fertilizers.

There is no basis to support the position that individuals who hold a generalized professional agrologist designation are better educated or more knowledgeable in agronomy than those who choose to belong to a different professional organization representing their specific areas of focus.

In summary, the Certified Crop Advisor Association does not oppose the OIA attempting to better monitor its members, but we are concerned should the act lead to right-to-practise regulations or mandatory membership in OIA or any other organization in the future.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you, sir. Are there any comments from the government? Mr. Kwinter.

Mr. Monte Kwinter: Mr. Chair, we’ve already heard from OABA and the CCA, and the professional agrologist title is clearly focused on the operational and governance needs specific to OIA and does not establish any broader benefits to stakeholders in Ontario’s agri-food industry or the citizens of Ontario. It will lead to an increase in red tape, and by making them a regulated profession, businesses would then be required to use licensed agrologists. This could add to the cost and regulatory burden for normal farm business. The government is committed to reducing regulatory burdens faced by businesses, and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food has consistently advised against the regulation of the agrology profession.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any other comments from government on this matter? There are none?

Other members of the committee?

Mr. Bill Walker: Just a point of clarification: My understanding is that, if you use something like a veterinarian, this gives a designation and allows the OIA to then have some teeth if they’re using it inappropriately. It’s to have some teeth in it; that’s what I was led to believe when we were having a discussion on this. I struggle with why this isn’t a good thing or why it’s not consistent with all the other practices out there. If either of the two gentlemen could give me a bit more clarity, because other than your two documents that I’ve seen today, I

haven’t heard any opposing views. I’d like to understand that a little bit better.

Mr. Dave Buttenham: Our opposition is not to the use of PAg and the enforcement of that PAg designation for those who meet the accreditation. Our opposition to this is probably based on the fact that discussions have taken place with respect to mandatory right to practise, which would mean that only those individuals who hold a PAg designation could offer advice to production agriculture or to customers. That is our concern.

Most recently, in Ontario Farmer, which is a rural-based publication, yesterday the words “mandatory” and “right to practise” came up, and it was indicated not at this time. Our concern is that we do not want this piece of legislation to lead to the next step, which could, in fact, be mandatory right-to-practise legislation, because that is something that we adamantly do not feel is in the best interest of the industry.

Mr. Bill Walker: I think the other point of clarification would be to have a response from the other side. Again, I get what you’re saying if that’s where they’re going. That certainly wasn’t led to in the discussions I had, and the point is that right now someone can go out and say, “I am a PAg,” and there’s nothing they can do to enforce that and say, “You’re not.” There are people out there who would misuse and abuse that situation. So my sense would be that by allowing this designation—what they’re asking for is there. If there’s a second step, that needs to be discussed. I just want to make clear that that’s kind of how I’ve been going down the road.

Mr. Dave Buttenham: I think we want that clarity that we’re not pursuing that particular movement toward mandatory right-to-practise legislation. We have no opposition with the bill as it stands today, as long as that is the beginning and the end of where this stands.

Mr. Bill Walker: Chair, if I could ask you another point of clarification?

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): If you couldn’t. I noticed Mr. Hardeman wants to respond as well. If you’ll let him respond, and then you can make your—

Mr. Ernie Hardeman: Mr. Chairman, that’s why I made my opening comments: I want to make it quite clear that, in sponsoring the bill, I don’t disagree with the presentations that were made. But I think we should all remember the presentation that was made by the applicant, which says that the purpose of this bill is to prevent others from being able to use the Ag designation, not to change the Ag designation at all. It’s strictly to restrict it so only the people who are registered with the institute, and members of the institute, can use the designation.

If I could just answer in the debate the question from the Ministry of Agriculture. This is not creating more and new regulation; it is just changing and putting a restriction in the existing legislation to prevent others from using the designation. This bill is drafted—and we spent a long time doing that draft—to accommodate the concerns that were expressed by the other organizations, that it isn’t going in that direction. Because that’s how they failed last time, and they realized that’s not the thing.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you, Mr. Hardeman. Mr. Walker, you have another question?

Mr. Bill Walker: Just two points of clarification. One I think Ernie has just answered, that it's not a creation of a new act. This is an update of a 1960 act. Fifty years have gone by. I think it's relatively expected that we would review it.

The other point is particularly for Mr. Buttenham. I'm a new legislator so maybe I stand to be corrected here. As I read it now, there's nothing changing allowing that right to practise. If they came with something like that, that would require further review, another debate, another whole context of discussion. My context right now is we're only talking about what's in the act, and I would be prepared currently to support that. If there was a change or an expectation, then that would have to come back through and have a fulsome debate.

Mr. Dave Buttenham: And I think the purpose is—

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Okay.

Mr. Dave Buttenham: Oh, sorry.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Sorry, sir.

You made your statement. Was there information that you wanted?

Mr. Bill Walker: Yes. I would like Mr. Buttenham to just clarify his position to that.

Mr. Dave Buttenham: I think the purpose of us is to go on the record to say that we are opposed to mandatory right-to-practise legislation. At this particular point, we want to ensure that the House is fully aware that we are opposed to that, so that is the purpose of us appearing before committee this morning.

Mr. Bill Walker: Right, and not opposing the current—

Mr. Dave Buttenham: Not opposing the current private bill that stands before you.

Mr. Bill Walker: Thank you for that clarification.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. I'll take the proponent, and then I'm going to go to Mr. Vanthof. Sir.

Mr. Terry Kingsmill: Again, to clarify, there's no desire, there's no intent, this is not the time, this is not a slippery slope toward anything to deal with or discuss or require mandatory licensure. It is very clearly expressed that it will not restrict or interfere with anybody being able to do the doing.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. Mr. Vanthof.

Mr. John Vanthof: Thank you all for coming. Having read the documentation and looking over the past of this, from our position, we were looking at this as basically a housekeeping matter, a big housekeeping matter, mind you. I would really like to thank OABA and the crop advisor association for coming and bringing their point of view because it puts it on the record for everybody. Definitely from our corner, it's not perceived as the start of the slippery slope, and having you put that on the record will make it very clear for everyone. We can support the bill as it stands.

I've been a legislator for a short time, a farmer for a long time, and I think we have to be careful too that, on the ground, this isn't used as, "We're legislated and the other guys aren't." That will have some bad ramifications if that happens.

0930

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Okay. Thank you, Mr. Vanthof. Are members ready to vote?

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall section 4 carry? Carried.

Shall section 5 carry? Carried.

Shall section 6 carry? Carried.

Shall section 7 carry? Carried.

Shall section 8 carry? Carried.

Shall section 9 carry? Carried.

Shall section 10 carry? Carried.

Shall section 11 carry? Carried.

Shall section 12 carry? Carried.

Shall section 13 carry? Carried.

Shall section 14 carry? Carried.

Shall section 15 carry? Carried.

Shall section 16 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

Thank you. The bill is carried.

Thank you very much for attending this morning and presenting the case.

KINGSGATE II LIMITED ACT, 2013

KINGSGATE III LIMITED ACT, 2013

KINGSGATE IV LIMITED ACT, 2013

WESTMOUNT RIDGE ASSOCIATES
LIMITED ACT, 2013

Consideration of the following bills:

Bill Pr18, An Act to revive Kingsgate II Limited;

Bill Pr19, An Act to revive Kingsgate III Limited;

Bill Pr20, An Act to revive Kingsgate IV Limited;

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive Westmount Ridge Associates Limited.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Now we go to consideration of the bills related to Kingsgate and Westmount Ridge Associates. Ms. Armstrong will be sponsoring the bill. Ms. Armstrong, you have come forward; the applicant, as well. I would ask the applicant to introduce himself for the purposes of Hansard.

Mr. Peter Quigley: Mr. Chairman, my name is Peter Quigley. I'm a lawyer, and I'm agent for Michael Arnsby, who is the principal and shareholder of Arnsby Property Management, one of London, Ontario's larger companies, and very reputable, who has brought this application in connection with four different companies that were voluntarily dissolved inadvertently.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Ms. Armstrong, do you have any comments?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Yes. Good morning, Chair. I'm here today to support these private bills, from 18 to 21. The bills have been proposed to revive the corporations. The corporation was voluntarily dissolved under the direction of their accountant at the time. The principals of the corporation were not aware that the corporation had been dissolved until they had entered into a contract to sell the property that had precipitated this application. So they're here now to revive the companies in order to sell that real property that originally they weren't aware was part of dissolving the corporations.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Quigley, you did make comments when you introduced yourself. Do you have anything more you want to say to the committee?

Mr. Peter Quigley: No. All I'll say is that there are four separate corporations, each of the corporations facing the same issue. Each of them had remnant properties that were still held by those corporations when they were, unfortunately, voluntarily wound up. We need to revive those corporations in order to dispose of those properties.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Are there any interested parties in the room who want to speak to this matter?

Are there any comments from the government?
From other committee members?

Mr. Bill Walker: Chair, just as part of my general education, being a new legislator, I find it interesting. Maybe the Clerk could just—how does somebody wind up a corporation without the board of directors being involved? In here somewhere, I read that the secretary, I believe, secretary-treasurer or someone, wound these corporations up. It's just a point of clarification.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Quigley, can you speak to that?

Mr. Peter Quigley: Well, the normal process would be that when a company is basically being wound up, you would file articles of dissolution. In this case, though—or sorry; that's if there are no assets and there are no creditors. Another way it can happen is if a company doesn't file its corporate returns, then the ministry can basically wind up the corporation. However, where a company files articles of dissolution and does it voluntarily, under section 244 of the Business Corporations Act, basically, if that is done on a voluntary basis, then it's not a matter of reviving it through a simpler procedure, which is filing articles of revival. You must actually go and get a bill passed, get an act of the Legislature passed, to revive a corporation.

Where there are assets in the corporation, which in each of these four cases there was, the legal effect is that the property escheats to the crown, so the crown becomes the owner of that property and the custodian of that property. It is reversible, but it is necessary to proceed the way we have, proceeding to four separate acts which

will revive each of those corporations and put things back as they previously had been. That's how it happened, and that's why we're here this morning.

Mr. Bill Walker: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Your questions are satisfied? Great.

Are members ready to vote? Okay.

Bill Pr18, An Act to revive Kingsgate II Limited:

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

Now, the next bill, the process is remarkably similar.

Ms. Armstrong, any further comments?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: No, no further comments.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Quigley, you've introduced yourself. Do you have any further comments?

Mr. Peter Quigley: No. I just want to make a comment and make sure that I get it on the record. I really want to thank Tamara Pomanski there for helping walk us through this process. Her assistance, and also of the legislative counsel, was just invaluable. I want to make sure I say that on the record.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Thank you. Any interested parties in the room who want to speak to this part of the four-parter? No.

Any comments from government? Not seized with the issue today? Okay.

Members of the committee? Good.

I assume you're ready to vote?

Bill Pr19, An Act to revive Kingsgate III Limited:

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

Bill Pr20, An Act to revive Kingsgate IV Limited. I'm going to assume, Ms. Armstrong, that you have said what you need to say.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Yes, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Quigley, I assume you have said what you need to say.

Any interested parties in the room on this matter? Apparently not.

Any comments from the government?

Questions from other members of the committee? No.

Are members ready to vote? You're a hardy group.

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

Bill Pr21, An Act to revive Westmount Ridge Associates Limited. Ms. Armstrong, any comments on this last one?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: No comment.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Mr. Quigley?

Mr. Peter Quigley: My only comment is to thank Ms. Armstrong, London's hardest-working MPP, for helping us out on this.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): I will allow that comment.

Any interested parties that want to speak to the bill or to comment? None.

Comments from the government?

Questions from committee members?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns): Ah yes, I can tell you're getting restless out there. Are the members ready to vote? Good.

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the preamble carry? Carried.

Shall the title carry? Carried.

Shall the bill carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Carried.

The bill is passed.

Thank you, members of the committee. Before I say anything final, I'll check with the Clerk.

We are done. This meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 0939.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 2 October 2013

Senchura Holdings Ltd. Act, 2013, Bill Pr24, Mr. Prue.....	T-33
Mr. Ronald Reim	
Ontario Institute of Professional Agrolgists Act, 2013, Bill Pr15, Mr. Hardeman.....	T-33
Mr. Terry Kingsmill	
Mr. Dave Buttenham	
Mr. Clare Kinlin	
Kingsgate II Limited Act, 2013, Bill Pr18, Ms. Armstrong; Kingsgate III Limited Act, 2013, Bill Pr19, Ms. Armstrong; Kingsgate IV Limited Act, 2013, Bill Pr20, Ms. Armstrong; Westmount Ridge Associates Limited Act, 2013, Bill Pr21, Ms. Armstrong.....	T-37
Mr. Peter Quigley	

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Chair / Président

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. John Vanthof (Timiskaming–Cochrane ND)

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)
Ms. Dipika Damerla (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville L)
 Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)
Mr. Randy Hillier (Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington PC)
 Mr. Rod Jackson (Barrie PC)
Mr. Monte Kwinter (York Centre / York-Centre L)
 Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)
 Mr. John Vanthof (Timiskaming–Cochrane ND)
 Mr. Bill Walker (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Michael Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Ms. Teresa Armstrong (London–Fanshawe ND)
 Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)
Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Tamara Pomanski

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel