



ISSN 1180-4335

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 25 March 2014

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mardi 25 mars 2014

**Standing Committee on
Government Agencies**

Agency review: Metrolinx

Intended appointments

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Examen des organismes
gouvernementaux : Metrolinx

Nominations prévues

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT AGENCIESCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Tuesday 25 March 2014

Mardi 25 mars 2014

The committee met at 0904 in committee room 1.

AGENCY REVIEW: METROLINX

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Good morning and welcome to this meeting of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies. When we adjourned last week, the committee was debating an amendment, moved by Ms. Damerla, to the motion by Mr. Marchese. We'll continue that debate during the last hour of today's meeting. I have asked the Clerk to schedule one appointment today and that we consider it as our first order of business. After that, we'll return to the debate.

Our intended appointee today is Michael Gallagher.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Mr. Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I'm sorry, we did not agree to that. We were in a debate; we're still on debate on the motion. So I'm a bit puzzled by the order of things. We cannot do that until we, as a committee, agree to that.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I just want to explain that. My role is to make sure two things: that we get appointments through, and we're backed up quite a bit on appointments. I only scheduled one so it would be done in 30 minutes, and then we'd have an hour—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I understand your sentiment, but we need to deal with the other matters that are before us before we actually deal with other matters, and the committee has to agree with that. I don't think that you can unilaterally do that.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. There's one appointment here, and that's it. We have an hour.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: If the appointment is here, I sympathize with that individual. I'm even sorry that we have to deal with this. But we have a motion that we have yet to deal with. There's still another amendment to the amendment that we are debating. Unless they withdraw that so that we can move on with the other business, I'm not sure what to say.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): There are two aspects to this committee. There are the appointments, and then we're reviewing agencies, boards, committees. I just think it's important to get one through for today. It leaves us an hour.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Mr. Chair, I really do appreciate that, but we have seen an incredible reluctance on

behalf of the government members to deal with the motions that were before this committee. They have debated amendments for quite some time, and they still have another amendment to the amendment. You cannot simply say, "There's the business of the committee, but I have decided to bring an appointee because that is also the business of the committee." You simply cannot, on your own, do that. You can't.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I've consulted not just with our Clerk, but with the Clerks' department, and they have all agreed to the fact that I have the inherent right to secure the progress of business of a committee as Chair. It's part of my job. I didn't schedule three today, only one, because we're getting backed up. We have an hour to debate this motion and just one appointment, because I think we have to move to the appointments. I didn't schedule three; just one. I would like to do that one appointment, as Chair.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I'm not sure the other members have anything to say. I've already indicated that I understand what you're trying to do, but you cannot facilitate the problems of the governing party by deciding on your own to fit in an appointment. You cannot.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes. I have discussed with the Clerks' department. As Chair, I have the inherent right to deal with appointments as well as with the debate that's been going on since December on your motion. I'm not trying to stall it; I just want to deal with the one appointment, and then we'll get right back and try to speed up the debate and deal with it. If we need to, we can start an hour earlier next week and not put any appointments. You can spend next week from 8 till 10:25 debating this motion. But I would ask the indulgence of the committee to allow one appointment to be dealt with.

Mr. Klees.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, here's what concerns me about this: What concerns me about this is that essentially, you are accommodating a strategy on the part of the government members of this committee to drag on the debate has now gone on at great length.

0910

Chair, you know, and all of us here know what the strategy of the government members of this committee is. I think it is highly inappropriate for you, as the Chair, to support them in their partisan manipulation of this committee. I feel embarrassed for Mr. Gallagher. We would like to get this on as well, but I hope that Mr. Gallagher

understands that we have a responsibility to the process here as well. This has nothing to do with wanting to delay him. I know that his time is valuable as well.

But I want to register with you that in all the time that I have been here in the Legislature, in 18 and a half years, I have never experienced the Chair of a committee taking this step to essentially support a partisan manipulation on the part of government members of a committee and the business of a committee. You may well have the authority to do it; I'm simply saying that I believe it's wrong for you to do this. I think that you are setting a precedent here. I don't know when the next time is that we can expect you as Chair, or any other Chair, to essentially say, "Well, we're going to suspend this. It doesn't matter what the order of business is. It's my will, as the Chair, to interfere or to take over the agenda."

I don't like it. I'd ask you to reconsider, because I think the implications are far-reaching. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Ms. Taylor.

Miss Monique Taylor: Thank you, Chair. I have to agree with the speakers before me. When I saw this on the agenda, I was quite concerned, as well as confused, because I believe that we had spoken of this at this table, saying that we didn't support having people come before us until the matter that we had at hand was dealt with.

You mentioned that it is your inherent right to make these decisions, but it is also your inherent right to collapse debate, which you could have already done, and we could have moved through this process, and we could be seeing folks like Mr. Gallagher come before us. I think it's very unfortunate that he's here today and having to be put in the middle of this debate. It's not fair to his time. I apologize for the time that you've taken to come here today, but this isn't what we have spoken of previously.

You had also mentioned that we would be having a subcommittee meeting to deal with this and to have our House leaders talk about that. I didn't get an invitation to a subcommittee meeting, and we could have dealt with this at that time. I think it's really unfortunate that we've all been put in this position now.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Just for the record, there are 14—he's the 14th person—who are waiting to be appointed.

Mr. Frank Klees: Tell them that. Tell them to stop their filibustering of this committee. We could have them all here and deal with all of them.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): What I have to do here is balance the two duties that I have. One is to deal with the nominations, and we've got 14 of them now piled up; and secondly is to deal with the review of agencies, boards and commissions and so on. So all I'm asking you to do—I spoke to the Clerk, and I decided, through her; we discussed it—is deal with one appointment and then spend an hour. We have spent a long time on this motion, but we'd just like to get one appointee through.

Mr. Bartolucci.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Thanks, Chair. I go back to my wanting to introduce that motion. If the committee had seen that motion as being in order, we wouldn't be having this discussion. We'd either be dealing with Mr. Gallagher right now or we would be moving into the amendment to the amendment to the amendment etc.

Here's what I don't like: You've made a ruling, Speaker. They have offered their opinion, but they haven't challenged the Chair. I would hope that they would respect your opinion because it's based, I guess, on advice that you've received with regard to moving forward with this one appointment and then we were going to go back to the business. You can't delay the business, folks. We have this one appointment and then we move into Mr. Marchese's motion. It's that simple. Why are we wasting everybody's time? It's now 17 minutes—

Miss Monique Taylor: That's rich.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: It's not rich. You know what? All of you are members of other committees. I happened to have been subbed in on a committee last week where I saw a blatant attempt on the part of the opposition to waste time at committee. If they think we're wasting time, none of us are pure here; that's for sure.

What I'm suggesting is if, in fact, that's your ruling, let's move on so that we can get the appointment out of the way and then deal with Mr. Marchese's motion. Anything else and we're just wasting time talking for nothing.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Just like right now.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Right on, and just like we were since 9 o'clock.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We're getting a speakers' list. We could have been halfway through this appointment—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. I have Ms. Damerla down first and then Mr. Yurek; then I have Mitzie Hunter and now I have Mr. Holyday. We could have been done by now.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: All I want is to get on the record to say we are not trying to delay anything. All we have ever asked for is that we give our civil servants adequate time and clear direction as to what we are asking. That has been the only goal of this side of the committee, this side, the government. So I take some exception to the mischaracterization and I just wanted that on the record. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I have Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair, I move to postpone the consideration of the question.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: What question?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Is that a motion? I thought my motion was out of order.

Mr. Frank Klees: Chair, I have a message here from Mr. Gallagher, saying that after observing what's going on here, he would prefer not to proceed with the appointment.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I have discussed this now with the Committee Clerk. We had the agenda set and, as Chair, I can set the agenda. I'd like to carry on with the appointment. Maybe the opposition parties won't be using their 10 minutes.

Just a quick question: Mr. Yurek, we have in front of us the agenda. What exactly are you moving with regard to the agenda?

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I'm moving that this will postpone the agenda item, and then we'll be allowed to move on to the next order of business.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): There are two items on the agenda.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Hang on. I've got three other speakers on this.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Yes, yes, let's go through the speakers. If you don't mind—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): You're on the list.

0920

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Yes. This agenda is improper, Mr. Chair. That's my argument, when I get there.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We haven't dealt with the agenda in front of us today. As Chair, I have the right to deal with the first item and then move on at 9:30 and deal with the debate. So I'm going to have to rule that out of order.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I'm challenging that ruling, Mr. Chair. Get through the speakers—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I think it's better if we get an explanation from the Clerk, because we've been trying to sort this out.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Mr. Yurek moved a dilatory motion, which would have the committee move to the next item of business. My understanding at this point, though, is that the Chair has not yet called an item of business, so the committee is still discussing its agenda. A motion moved at the right time would have the effect of disposing with the item that it's considering and moving onto the next, but my understanding is that we have not yet gotten to the point where we are considering the first item of business. It appears to me that this is a general discussion on the agenda itself.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. What I'm going to do is start the agenda, and then, Mr. Yurek, you can move your motion—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): —to start the agenda going.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: No, Mr. Chair, you cannot do that. I want to argue that last week we debated this very thing. We debated this very thing, where we said we had an item on the agenda and we could not move to any other business until we dealt with that agenda. What you have done today is set the agenda on your own, contrary

to the discussion and the agreement that we had, with the Clerk's advice, that you simply could not do that. You unilaterally cannot do this, Mr. Chair. You are fixing a political problem that is not your right to do.

The way you might have dealt with this is to simply say to the government members: "You have gone too far in trying to stall—forget stall—in trying to deal with the motion." If you had said, "We're going to end that debate," that would have been a reasonable thing for you to have done. But to simply come today and set the agenda, and say, "It is my responsibility to hear other reviews," because that is equally important—you cannot, on your own, do that. The committee decides that business, not you. You are making a mistake as a Chair and it will affect your neutrality, I suggest to you.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I discussed this with the Chair last week, and we decided to put one person on the agenda—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Sorry, you discussed it with what Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I discussed it with the committee Clerk; I'm sorry.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Which Clerk? This one?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, this Clerk, present today. We put one person on the agenda and left an hour to discuss the motion.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I know. You're repeating the same things and I hear you, but my point to you is that you don't have a right to do that.

Interjections.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair, can we have a 20-minute recess until you people decide which way you're going? And we'll move forward, because we're here watching you and the Clerk speak to each other.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: It's you who haven't decided.

Miss Monique Taylor: We could have done so many things by now. It could be over.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: We could have finished Mr. Gallagher by now.

Miss Monique Taylor: You have been filibustering since December 3.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: You guys are filibustering; we're just watching.

Miss Monique Taylor: Since December 3, you've been filibustering. Please don't give me that argument; it's not going to work. It's not washing over.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: If anybody watched the proceedings this morning—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair, I ask for a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Wait a minute. Hang on. As far as the recess goes, I'd have to ask for unanimous consent for the recess.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: No. No, you don't.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I heard a no. Okay, I heard a no.

Here's what I'm going to do: If there's no will to proceed with the first item on the agenda, what I need is for someone to switch or go to the second, and we'll go back to the first item after that. Do I have a motion—

Interjections.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Is Mr. Yurek's motion in order?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): It wasn't moved at the right time—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Okay. If we tell him when to move it, is it in order?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Yes.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Okay. And then we deal with this as a new motion. Is that what we do—and all the ramifications of that?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Mr. Yurek, you're going to have to raise your motion to switch order on the agenda, here.

Miss Monique Taylor: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Miss Taylor, yes.

Miss Monique Taylor: With the Clerk's advice, is it possible that we could amend the agenda to change the positioning so that we can go into the debate and then come back to Mr. Gallagher, if we have time after?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): What I'm going to do is move to the second item on the agenda and then come back and deal with the appointment.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: But we're not going to be able to deal with that today unless, of course, we get through the main motion. And by the way, once we get through the main motion, there's a second motion and a third that we still have to deal with—so that you remember.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I remember, but did you actually table those? I forget; that was back in December.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Exactly. So we move from one to the other.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): According to the Clerk, they haven't been moved yet.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I moved all three.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): You moved the first one—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: I submitted all three, and you have to move one at a time. So I moved the first, and then you follow to the second and third.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We have two items on the agenda. We can deal with the 9:30 issue, the debate on the amendment, but then we have to go back to the selection. It was a selection of the official opposition regarding Michael Gallagher. It wasn't selected by the third party; it wasn't selected by the government.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: It doesn't matter where the selection comes from. We have to agree, as a committee, to do that. If we get through the first motion, we might decide that we could agree to have one or two appoint-

ments dealt with; we could decide that. But we first have to get through the main motion that's before this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay, but the Clerk has advised me that the main motion is the only motion that's been tabled for this committee.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: All right. My point was that I submitted all three. You deal with one motion at a time and then you follow with the next one. But once we deal with the main motion, this committee might decide that we have time to do other reviews.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right, but right now, there are two items on the agenda.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, Ms. Hunter.

0930

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, I believe I was also on the speakers' list. I would like us to move forward. We've been talking about the order of the agenda for half an hour, in which time we could have actually dealt with Mr. Gallagher. If we're all in agreement to begin, as the Chair has advised, with the 9:30 item, we would then move to the other item on the agenda, which is Mr. Gallagher. What we're talking about here now—I don't see the point of that. We need to complete the business that's on the agenda today.

As my colleague Ms. Damerla has said, our focus, in asking the questions that we've asked and in talking about this, is a normal part of our business here at committee. It's to seek clarity on what is before us. It's to ensure that we give clear direction to the agency so that they can provide the information that we need as a committee. That's what we've been talking about in terms of the course of this debate, and I think that we need to get on with the business of today's agenda. There are two items, and we should be able to do that.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: There's only one item on the agenda. We'll discuss the other item as soon as we finish the first, the main motion.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I do have something to ask for clarification.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. You're on the list.

Mr. Holyday, go ahead.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As you know, I'm new to this process and certainly new to this committee, but I guess over the last month—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Excuse me, Mr. Marchese. I can't hear Mr. Holyday, who's beside me.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Excuse me, Mr. Marchese. Mr. Holyday wants to make a few remarks.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, over the last month I've felt a little embarrassed

by the actions of this committee. I think it is apparent what is happening, and I think that all who are here with an open mind will clearly see what's going on. The fact is that a legitimate motion was put by the NDP. The motion was debated and debated and debated, and then amended and amended. Some people on the government side—as a matter of fact, all of them, I think—took 20 minutes each and went around the circle umpteen ways to Sunday, and then put amendments and did the same thing over and over again. That has put off the business of this committee, including Mr. Gallagher's appointment. I think that it's high time we got down to the business of this committee and quit this circling around and stalling.

I don't think that the government can continue in this way without looking and acting irresponsible. Therefore, they should get on and deal with this motion. Whether they like it or don't like it, let's get a vote on it and get it out of the way, and get on with the legitimate business of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. I want to take the vote or just move on, but I have—Mr. Marchese, you spoke, right? I have Ms. Damerla and then Miss Taylor.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: And Mr. Bartolucci.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: And Mr. Bartolucci, at some point in time—10:15, 10:30; I don't care.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. I'm just looking for some clarification. It is my understanding that if you want to change the order of the agenda, a motion has to be filed, and it is my understanding that you cannot file a motion while there's another motion on the floor, so I'm a little confused as to how we are proceeding. I just needed some clarification on that. I'm going to respectfully ask: Let's just get on with the agenda as set by the Chair, and then—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: The agenda was already set. The Chair cannot set a different kind of agenda. The Chair, on his own, cannot set a different agenda. That is what I'm arguing with the Chair. There's only one item, and that's the debate on the amendment. That's the only item before us. We'll discuss the other item that the Chair has put after we deal with the other amendment.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I'm not sure how the committee proceeds. Were you directing your comments to the Chair or to me? I wasn't quite clear, Rosie. But that was my question. We're looking for some direction.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes. I have spoken to other Clerks beyond our committee. I have spoken quite a bit with our committee Clerk, but I've spoken to other committee Clerks as well as those who sit at the table. They have made it very clear to me that I have the inherent right to secure the progress of the business of the committee, and if it sounds like the majority of the members here want to proceed with the second item and hold back the appointment, then I'm going to allow the second item, the debate on the motion, to go first, and when that finishes—hopefully today—then we'll deal with the appointment in front of us today.

So instead of continuing this debate ad nauseam, can we at least finish off the debate on this motion of Mr. Marchese's, and then after that, Mr. Marchese, can we go back to the appointment?

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: In all due respect, you're being inconsistent as the Chair. You have let the government side go ad nauseam on their motion of the debate, and now you're saying that Mr. Marchese's valid point, with respect, if you can actually set the agenda or not, is an ad nauseam debate that we should end. You're not consistent, Chair, and I request that you become consistent as Chair of this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, I have the inherent right to decide what items to deal with, and there are two aspects to this committee. There's the review of the boards and commissions, which we've done—we've reviewed several boards and commissions—and then there's the appointment of people.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Sorry, Mr. Yurek. I want to explain this to you.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Well, he's not going to be able to listen when he's got someone whispering in his ear.

Mr. Yurek—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm just going to wait for—okay.

Mr. Yurek, I have the inherent right to decide and to balance the interests of this committee in terms of appointments as one aspect and then dealing with reviewing agencies and boards. We have reviewed several agencies and boards since I've been Chair, and we've also dealt with some appointees.

We've spent the last period of time since December dealing with this motion. Now, the Clerk and I have decided, after much discussion, to put one appointment on here, which we would have finished by now. If it's the will of the majority of this committee to set aside the 9 o'clock item and move to the 9:30 item, if that's the majority view, then we'll move to the 9:30 item and leave the 9 o'clock item for after the debate on the motion. So can we please move forward and debate—

Miss Monique Taylor: Yes, let's move forward, Chair—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. All right. Now, at the last meeting, the—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I just want to explain one thing. At the last meeting, I think Ms. Damerla had put forward an amendment to the motion. Now, Mr. Bartolucci, I don't want to cut you off—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: You already have, but that's all right.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm just explaining that she's moved that, and I want to continue that debate. But go ahead.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: I just want a very simple question answered by you and by Sylwia. Okay? The agenda has been set. Does the Chair have the right to set the agenda? Yes or no? Because if the Chair has the right to set the agenda, it can't be challenged by anybody and we've wasted 40 minutes, which I said a week ago when I moved my motion that we're going to end up doing this. So it's simple: Does the Chair have the right to set the agenda? Can it be challenged? Yes or no—to both those questions—and then we can move on. Move on, get Mr. Gallagher over with, and then we'll go back to the amendment. But we're wasting time. We've wasted 40 minutes, and it's not us who wasted it.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'll ask two questions. I have the right to set the agenda, but if it's the will of the majority of this committee to move to item 2 and put back item 1, then we'll deal with number 2. I understand that—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: This way, you regain a little confidence from the other two parties. Mercifully, you're on the right track.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, but what about due process? Because what is the—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Due process?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, let's—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I take objection to that. I really do.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: What due process are you talking about?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, Rosie, that is uncalled for. I am sorry.

0940

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. So we're going to deal with the debate that was still being dealt with last Tuesday. We'll set the appointment down, and we'll deal with the discussion that was finished last week.

Mr. Frank Klees: She's challenging the Chair.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, no. I'm just asking a question, Chair. My only question is: If the agenda is set, does it require unanimous consent to change it, or is it just majority will? That's one. And two: Do we need a motion on the floor to change the agenda, or can it just be changed? I'm just asking what the process is.

Mr. Frank Klees: The Chair can do whatever he wants. You just heard him.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): The Chair sets the agenda, in consultation with the Clerk, but the Chair also has the discretion to change the two items if it's the will of the majority of this committee, which I think it is. So let's continue—and hopefully finish—the debate on the amendment to the motion by Mr. Marchese.

I think, Ms. Damerla, that you had moved the motion last time—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): So let's continue with that debate right now.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, my question remains, though: To change the agenda, do you not need a motion?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, I don't need a motion.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Unanimous consent.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Well, it's also the will of the Chair. So I think that it's quite clear—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Chair, do you need unanimous consent? I ask that question because I think I know the answer to it.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No, I don't need unanimous consent.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Can you ask them for some advice about that?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I did. I spoke to the committee Clerk, and I've also spoken to other members of the clerks' department. I have the right—if it's the will of the majority, which I think it is—to move on with the debate that was being discussed last agenda. I'm going to move on with the debate.

Ms. Damerla, I think you had the floor last time, and you were introducing a motion.

Miss Monique Taylor: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Miss Taylor.

Miss Monique Taylor: Did we not take a 20-minute recess before the end of the last session, because we called the question?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, that—

Miss Monique Taylor: There have been so many sessions on this. I'm kind of confused.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, well, let's—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): One second. Let's hear her motion again.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Did you want me to just read the motion out?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, please.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I believe, Chair, that I don't have a copy of that motion handy—

Miss Monique Taylor: Really?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, but we'll get it to you in a minute.

Interjection.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Actually, no, we do.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. Just for everybody's information, you have a package in front of you, and the motion is in that package.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Okay. Chair, I am just going to read our amendment. I move that “and the Ministry of Transportation” be struck from the motion, and replaced with “and only documents that pertain to Metrolinx within the Ministry of Transportation.”

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Sorry, is that—do we have a copy of that?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: It's attached.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: It's attached.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: It's the last page of your agenda.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. Any further debate? It's on the very last page of the package.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair, I move that the question now be put.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. Mr. Yurek has put forward that the question now be put. In my opinion as Chair of this committee, there has been enough debate on this motion, and I am going to allow the question to be put.

All those in favour of Mr. Marchese's motion as amended?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: No, it's the amendment.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): My apologies. It's just a bit technical here.

All those in favour that the question be put, as moved by Mr. Yurek?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, but I was just told that we have to take a vote.

Those against putting the question?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, we're ready to vote, but I did want to correct the record.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): No. We're in the middle of a vote.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Yes, I've asked that. All those in favour of the question? All those against?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: It's on the amendment?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: It's on the question being put.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): That the question be put. All those in favour of that? All those against that? Okay. That carried, that the question now be put.

Shall Mr. Marchese's motion, as amended—

Mr. Jeff Yurek: It hasn't been amended yet.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: But we're voting on this amendment at the moment, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): The entire motion—the original motion, Mr. Marchese's motion, as amended: All those in favour? Opposed? Mr. Marchese's motion, as amended, has carried.

Can we move on now to the—

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Yes.

INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

MR. MICHAEL GALLAGHER

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Michael Gallagher, intended appointee as member, Workplace Safety and Insurance Board.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. We're moving on now to the selection of the official

opposition, Mr. Michael Gallagher. Mr. Gallagher, can you please come forward.

Miss Monique Taylor: See? Wasn't that easy? Good morning, Mr. Gallagher. How are you?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Good morning. Beautiful day.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): All right. Mr. Gallagher, just to explain to you, you can speak as long as you want, up to—after 10 minutes, we rotate and the three parties can ask you questions. If you want to go forward, the Clerk will keep time, and you can speak for up to 10 minutes, so please go ahead. Any time that you speak will be subtracted from the government side. Please proceed, and good morning.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Good morning, Chair Berardinetti, and members of the committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you. It's a great privilege to be here before you to speak to my intended appointment to the WSIB. I'm not concerned about the delay, as I understand that the business of the government is very important and I respect the process that you have to undertake to do the government's business.

I would like to explain as briefly as possible—because you have, I believe, my CV in front of you—to give you as much time for questions as possible, why I'm qualified to serve on the board of the WSIB.

I have been a labour leader in the Ontario construction industry for 18 years. I've been elected five consecutive times to the top position of my organization. Operating Engineers Local 793 is a provincial organization but also encompasses parts of Nunavut.

I sit on three boards of the union. We have a \$1.8-billion pension fund and we also manage a training trust fund and a health and welfare fund. Those are all jointly trusted with management and labour, and I understand the requirements of working on a trust and the fiduciary responsibility that's involved when managing the money of our members who contribute. I believe that my experience on these boards certainly will help me with respect to the contribution that I would like to be able to make to the WSIB.

I understand that the board of the WSIB has quite a challenge before it with respect to the unfunded liability, which I believe was at about 50% with respect to that fund, although there has been some progress made by the board, and I commend the chair, Elizabeth Witmer, for spearheading that change. I understand that the unfunded liability was reduced by \$2 billion, from \$12 billion to \$10 billion, in just over a year. I think that good work needs to be continued, although there are a number of challenges that are before it.

0950

When I was first elected to the manager of the operating engineers, I had been the labour relations manager for the local for a number of years. I first started working for the union in 1987 as a business agent, for which I travelled all over the province representing members. I was

selected within my organization and promoted to the position of labour relations manager.

In about the mid-1990s, our local had run into some financial difficulties because of the economy of the time and we entered into a period of international supervision, following which I was elected as the business manager, following supervision.

I understand the challenges of an organization that is in financially difficult times. I was able to manage our organization over the next 18 years, to oversee its growth almost double the members we had when I was taking over. We currently have 13,000 members out there.

I also understood the challenges that face trustees with respect to pension funds. As we all know, in 2001 and 2008, pension funds right across North America became quite challenged, including our own, because of the turmoil in the markets. Despite that, we've been able to manage the liabilities on that plan so that we have not had to reduce the benefits that are paid out to the members and reduce the solvency issue with respect to that plan.

Last year, in 2013, I received the great honour of being awarded the Roy A. Phinnemore Award, which is the highest award given in the construction industry for health and safety. I know there were probably many others who could and should have been recognized as well, but I found it to be a great privilege to receive that honour.

I have always worked very hard on behalf of the members on issues of health and safety, and the construction industry is one area where we have to be particularly attuned to the challenges that that sector provides.

I believe that my experience in construction—I do not believe that there is anybody on the board right now representing labour who can speak to the specific challenges that exist within the construction industry because of the high mobility and seasonal nature of the work. So I believe that I will be able to bring that perspective as an individual who started work in construction when I was 16 years old, working in the utilities sector, moving on to the heavy road and sewer and water main construction. I have worked right across this country, including building highways in Alberta in camp jobs. I do know what takes place in the construction industry, and I know the risks that are involved with respect to workers.

I'm encouraged by the current enthusiasm or determination of the chair of the board on the issue of prevention. Most recently, Elizabeth Witmer, chair of the board, appeared at the IHSA, which is the successor to the Construction Safety Association of Ontario, a body that I was chair of for one year in 1994-95. I found it quite interesting that when Elizabeth Witmer appeared before the IHSA to the construction industry, she talked about youth at risk and initiatives that are taking place on prevention and working with the chief prevention officer, George Gritziotis, to reduce accidents in the first place so that they don't come before the board, and I certainly would be in a position to support that.

With our own organization, the operating engineers, we became a compulsory trade in 1978. In fact, we were the last compulsory trade to be declared under a Conservative Bill Davis government. The minister of training at that time was Bette Stephenson, I believe—and education. That decision was very, very wise because we are now world leaders in Ontario in terms of training heavy equipment and crane operators. We're recognized around the world. It used to be that a crane-related death due to operator error happened every 11 weeks in the province of Ontario—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Mr. Gallagher, you have about a minute left.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Yes—now, that has been reduced by about 80%. That's because of investment in training. I believe that type of experience can be applied in other sectors of the construction industry.

I am running out of time and I don't want to take away any time from the government or the members of this committee to afford themselves the opportunity to ask me any questions about my experience. So at this point, I'd like to wind up and afford the members of the committee the opportunity to question me on my qualifications.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. Last time we did an appointment, the Conservatives went first, so the third party goes first for questioning—up to 10 minutes.

Miss Monique Taylor: Ten minutes?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): You have up to 10 minutes. Yes, Miss Taylor.

Miss Monique Taylor: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Mr. Gallagher, for being here with us today. Again, I apologize, but you know what? You were a really good strong-arm and helped us push that through. Thanks for sticking it out and for being here with us today.

I'm quite interested in the fact that you come from labour; you come from a unionized environment. You know the importance of WSIB coverage. In Mr. Arthurs's report, it said that employers that are not covered are getting a free ride because they do not contribute to the health and safety functions of the WSIB and the ministry. What are your thoughts on that, on having a broad coverage of workers across the province paying into WSIB?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I believe that's the direction that the government has gone in with the WSIB, where the independent operators were recently included with the exception of home renovation, which I think was still excluded. But that, according to the numbers I heard from the paperwork that I had looked at from Elizabeth Witmer, has added 90,000 more covered individuals by covering the independent operators.

Personally, I think that that is a good move. I believe that the more people who are covered, the more affordable it is for all of the participants in the industry. I believe that was supported by the unionized construction industry as well. I think that's moving in the right direction.

Miss Monique Taylor: Okay, so that's the construction industry, but we still have so many sectors across this province that are not, to my knowledge, being covered. We've heard from developmental service workers who are not covered under WSIB, and they're really at severe risk in different circumstances. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Construction is my area of expertise. I can't claim to understand the service industry. But if you follow the logic of it I believe what I've been saying is that the more coverage, the better. There are always going to be circumstances where it's inappropriate for somebody to be covered because they are perhaps a CEO of a company or are not at the same risk. But I do believe, generally speaking, that the more coverage there is, the better it is for the board and for all payers.

Miss Monique Taylor: I'm happy to hear you say that. I hope that you use your ability of sitting on this board to push that state forward.

I'm looking at the financial update that we received from research. It said that there was an operating surplus in 2011-12 because—the improved figures are due to the new medical strategy and return-to-work programs. That, to me, is very troubling because I know in my constituency office back in Hamilton, I'm hearing from folks who should be getting WSIB and they were not getting WSIB because new overseeing doctors were speaking over what their family doctors had been saying for years. Now we're finding that people are being cut off under different circumstances. They're not getting the medications they used to get. They're not getting the treatment they used to get. This is more injury to an injured worker. What are your thoughts on this?

1000

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Well, again, speaking with regard to our own experience, my organization has a department that is well populated with staff to handle appeals and applications of members for WSIB. One of the biggest changes that has been made that I think is positive and that we support as an organization is the worker reintegration project, which is to assist workers to return to the workplace with their previous employer without a loss in any wages.

In construction, which I can speak best to, it has been a little bit of a challenge for us to get them back to their previous employer after the six-month mandatory period expires, so then we end up—there's a lot of acronyms, it seems, in WSIB. We end up in the SO department, which is suitable other type of occupation.

I'm in favour of making sure there are no gaps and no workers end up not getting the coverage they should otherwise have, and also that careful calculations are made for widows, for example. After a worker has passed away, if there's a recalculation that ends up having them lower the amount of money they receive, I think that's very troubling, especially when you look at things like mesothelioma, an occupational disease which has a latency period of 20 years or more. That worker might

have been actually working their last number of years when they were sick, so I think that has to be considered.

Miss Monique Taylor: On the return to work, do you think that the WSIB board should have the right to overrule a doctor's—what's the word?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Assessment.

Miss Monique Taylor: Assessment. Thank you.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I understand that, first off, it goes through the WSIAT, which is another panel that considers the appeals at some point. They must get the advice from their own doctor-practitioners and whatnot on any particular case.

I think the job of the board is to ensure that the system is well managed and that the coverage is complete for people who are injured or become sick.

Miss Monique Taylor: I'll just say thank you for your time today. I appreciate the fact that you come from a union background and that you know the plight that injured workers in this province feel. I hope you will use that to the advantage of injured workers in this province because we know they've definitely been feeling the brunt of the misuse, I think, of WSIB funds, and that has put us in the deficit that they're in. So thank you.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Thank you very much. Should I be fortunate enough to receive the appointment, I will do my very best.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Thank you. Since you spoke for 10 minutes, the rotation will—that consumes the opportunity for the Liberals to ask questions, and we then move for 10 minutes—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: The only thing we want to say is that we certainly support this appointment and we thank you for your years of experience that you're bringing to the WSIB, especially so that it's going to reflect the unique challenges of the construction industry. If the appointment goes through, we just want to say thank you for the effort you'll expel.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Thank you very much. We'll move to the official opposition: Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Thank you, Chair. Thanks, Mr. Gallagher, for coming out today. Just a few questions to ask. It's obvious that we're not on the same page with regard to WSIB and Bill 119, which causes the independent contractors and owners to pay into the WSIB. We're not on the same page, and now these employer groups or the owners themselves no longer have the option of going to their own private insurance to get better coverage than they do with the WSIB.

I just want to know how you're going to make sure that the WSIB becomes a place where people who are entitled to benefits do get a fair and transparent process and it's quick and very effective. How are you going to deal with that now that we have people on WSIB who really have no choice but to be there?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Well, should I be appointed to the board, I'll be one board member bringing my own experience to bear, through all my adult life in the con-

struction industry. The board obviously has some challenges before it. One of the biggest challenges is the unfunded liability, I think, which is at 50%, but they have reduced it by \$2 billion in the last couple of years.

I know that the construction industry anyway, and COCA, for example, had taken the position, I believe, that they were expecting a larger increase to the rate premiums than what actually occurred. The rate increases were, I think, 2.5% and 2% in 2011-12, 2012-13, and then in 2014 there was a rate freeze, I believe.

I would be working with the committee to find the solutions to deal with the unfunded liability, but at the same time to make sure—I think everybody is on the same page with wanting to make sure that the compensation system survives.

In the Harry Arthurs report, he had mentioned that at 50% funded, it was at a tipping point, in terms of the compensation system, so I don't think there's anyone who wants that tipping point to go the wrong way. So they have to continue the work laid out in the Harry Arthurs report, and I believe there was another report, the Douglas Stanley report, that came up afterwards, and it really talked about that the rate system itself has to be looked at. There are 156 rate groups, and perhaps there are too many.

In the last 15 years, coming out of the Harry Arthurs report, it said that there was \$2.5 billion—so going back to around 1995—that was given back in rebates to employers, versus surcharges. I don't think that that's really appropriate at a time when there's an unfunded liability, so I think that whole issue of the rate groupings has to be looked at.

Even speaking from the employers' side that I've talked to, what they want is certainty. In the construction industry, for example, when you're bidding on a job, you need to know exactly what it is that you have to pay the workers, what all your costs are and everything else, when you're putting in a bid on the job. It's not helpful to know that you might have a rate swing of 35% between a surcharge or a rebate. So I believe that there is some work that still needs to be done there.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Further to your response to the third party with regard to mandatory WSIB coverage for, basically, owners and independent contractors, are you in favour of expanding that outside of the construction industry into other industries throughout the province?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I would have to really say that that's not my area of expertise and that I would have to go with an open mind. But, having said that, in the construction industry—I was on the board of the Ontario Construction Secretariat, and we found that the underground economy was about \$2 billion a year in the residential sector, and I think they have somewhat left that, even with some of the changes, by leaving home renovation excluded. And now you have also, I think they call them temporary employment agencies which are out there. They're sometimes given more at-risk types of work, it came out in the report. So I don't think we want to off-load those employer responsibilities.

It's something I think I would have to keep an open mind about and get up to speed on and understand a little bit better when it's outside of construction.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Okay. You're talking about home renovation, but I'm talking about your average pharmacy owner, your mom-and-pop convenience store owner. Are you for expanding it into that type of operation, the small business of Ontario?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I understand what you're saying, but personally I believe that the more payers there are, the better it is for everybody who is part of the system. Otherwise, the burden is unfairly put on one sector, one industry or one group of people. So if there is a cost that happens, there has to be some coverage for people if they do get injured or something happens to them so that they're not free riders.

1010

Mr. Jeff Yurek: However, if they're not paying into the system, they can't get access to WSIB; therefore, they wouldn't be free riders. Right?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Somebody is going to have to pay society in some way or another for the person who has become ill or sick or injured.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Most people carry their own private insurance. They're paying into a system where they wouldn't be the free riders, because they would—

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I understand what you're saying, but I also believe that the best system is the government system.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Do you have any questions, Doug?

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: How long do I have?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Right now you have about three minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Doug will have it.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: I have a couple of questions. WSIB premiums are a significant component of the cost of labour, and bringing them down is an essential part of attracting jobs to Ontario. What priority level would you assign to premium reduction, among other policy objectives?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: I don't believe that premium reduction can really occur until after the unfunded liability is dealt with completely. When you're at 50% unfunded liability, it's not appropriate, in my judgment, to be reducing premiums.

Speaking, again, about construction, right now we're going through the most sustained period of economic activity and growth that we've had in a very long time: almost full employment with many, many trades. I believe that that would be the time to ensure the financial well-being and health of the WSIB. Naturally, though, we want to have a cost-effective system, so I don't think that premiums should be increased gratuitously. They need to be maintained in order to keep the competitiveness of the employers out there bidding on work.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Do you think that an educational component or some method of trying to reduce injuries in the workplace might lead to premium reduction and we might be able to actually meet a couple of goals?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Thank you for your question. I do believe that the board is in the right direction with respect to that right now. They've already seen that some costs have initially been lowered as a result of work reintegration and returning workers to work as quickly as possible. I believe that prevention is another part of that. I feel very, very strongly about prevention and I think that training, in the experience we've had, is the best way to eliminate errors happening. In our trade, operator error was reduced by 80% by having compulsory certification and mandatory training.

My experience in construction is that young workers are the most vulnerable, because when they go out on the job, they're most eager to please and they sometimes get themselves into trouble.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Thank you very much. My last question: Since 2007, the local, of which you've been the business manager, has given in excess of \$53,000 to either the Liberal party or Liberal leadership candidates. Can you verify that or is that inaccurate?

Mr. Michael Gallagher: It might be low. To be honest with you, we do participate in the political system, as employers do, and we always make sure that any donations that we make are within the provincial election rules. I wouldn't desire to go over that.

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday: Thanks very much.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Thank you, Mr. Holyday. That now ends the time for questioning. Mr. Gallagher, that concludes the time allocated for this interview. Thank you very much. You may step down.

Mr. Michael Gallagher: Thank you very much to all parties that questioned me as well.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): We'll now consider the concurrence for Michael Gallagher, nominated as member, Workplace Safety and Insurance Board. Will someone please move concurrence?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: I move concurrence in the intended appointment of Michael Gallagher, nominated as member of the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Thank you. Any discussion? None? All in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

Miss Monique Taylor: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Miss Taylor, I had Ms. Damerla down just a moment ago, but go ahead.

Miss Monique Taylor: I move that the Standing Committee on Government Agencies request from Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation the production of all documents related to Metrolinx advertising between January 1, 2012, and March 18, 2014; and that these documents be produced within 30 days of this motion passing; and that responsive documents be provided in an electronic, searchable format.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Are you just reading the second motion?

Miss Monique Taylor: I'm putting forward this motion.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: Is this a new motion?

Miss Monique Taylor: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): It is. The only thing is, the motion that I have in front of me that was filed by Mr. Marchese—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Oh, okay. That's fine.

Do you have copies of that motion?

Miss Monique Taylor: Yes, I do. I'm prepared, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Then we'll got to you next.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Actually, the order that you called us in would have made a big difference, because I'd like to call adjournment of the meeting.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Quit questioning the Chair.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: You guys did it all morning.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No, I just want to call adjournment.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Can you please say that again?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I just said that I had asked for recognition first because I wanted to call for adjournment, but now I don't know if you can entertain that.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): This committee usually goes till 10:25, so there are about seven minutes left—

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: We haven't seen the motion—

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): It's being distributed right now.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: —so can I ask for a recess, then?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Let's first distribute the motion.

I just want to remind members that it goes till 10:25. My watch is about 10:16 right now, so we still have about nine minutes left in this meeting. I want to make sure everyone reads the motion.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Okay. Mr. Bartolucci has moved adjournment of this meeting.

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: No.

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Adjournment or a recess?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): I'm sorry. Ms. Damerla has moved adjournment of this meeting. I'll just call a vote. All those in favour of adjournment? Opposed? That motion does not carry.

Miss Taylor, did you want to speak on anything else?

Mr. Rick Bartolucci: I asked for a recess so we can spend some time talking about this. Is that in order?

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): It's in order, but is there agreement for a recess?

Mr. Rosario Marchese: Actually, normally when they ask for a recess, you usually grant it.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti): Is there agreement? Okay. That carries. We're recessed, and we'd actually be adjourning, then.

Thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1018.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 25 March 2014

Agency review: Metrolinx.....	A-251
Intended appointments.....	A-257
Mr. Michael Gallagher.....	A-257

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Président

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury L)

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

Mr. Rick Bartolucci (Sudbury L)

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest L)

Mr. Percy Hatfield (Windsor–Tecumseh ND)

Ms. Mitzie Hunter (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Mr. Jim McDonell (Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry PC)

Mr. Randy Pettapiece (Perth–Wellington PC)

Miss Monique Taylor (Hamilton Mountain ND)

Ms. Lisa Thompson (Huron–Bruce PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Dipika Damerla (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville L)

Mr. Douglas C. Holyday (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)

Mr. Frank Klees (Newmarket–Aurora PC)

Mr. Rosario Marchese (Trinity–Spadina ND)

Mr. Jeff Yurek (Elgin–Middlesex–London PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Jeff Parker, research officer,
Research Services