



ISSN 1180-5218

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 41st Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 1 June 2015

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 1^{er} juin 2015

**Standing Committee on
General Government**

Infrastructure for Jobs
and Prosperity Act, 2015

**Comité permanent des
affaires gouvernementales**

Loi de 2015 sur l'infrastructure
au service de l'emploi
et de la prospérité

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
GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES**

Monday 1 June 2015

Lundi 1^{er} juin 2015

The committee met at 1401 in committee room 2.

**INFRASTRUCTURE FOR JOBS
AND PROSPERITY ACT, 2015**

**LOI DE 2015 SUR L'INFRASTRUCTURE
AU SERVICE DE L'EMPLOI
ET DE LA PROSPÉRITÉ**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 6, An Act to enact the Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act, 2015 / Projet de loi 6, Loi édictant la Loi de 2015 sur l'infrastructure au service de l'emploi et de la prospérité.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I'd like to call the meeting of the Standing Committee on General Government to order. I'd like to welcome every member of the committee, the Clerk's office, legislative counsel, Hansard and ministry staff. We're here this afternoon for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 6, An Act to enact the Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act, 2014.

Are there any questions or comments concerning the proposed act at this time, or any one particular section? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I feel at home already in this committee. There are so many easily pronounceable eastern European surnames all around that it makes me really feel very much at home.

Seriously, though, just very briefly, I wanted to remark on Bill 6, the Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act. I'm very proud about the work that we're doing on infrastructure. This government is making unprecedented investments across Ontario: \$130 billion over the next decade in roads and bridges, public transit, hospitals, schools, post-secondary education and other key parts of the infrastructure our province needs.

This bill is going to help us to do that work more efficiently and more smartly. It's going to assist our government in laying out a framework where the broader public sector will be in a better position to prioritize the projects that need to move forward first. I hope that it will depoliticize some of the infrastructure decision-making processes that we have by having strong frameworks in place.

We know that investments in infrastructure generate massive economic benefits. In the short term, about \$1.14 on every dollar that we spend on infrastructure is returned as an increase to gross domestic product. But in

the longer term, that is tripled or even more, because of the ability that that infrastructure gives to people and businesses across this province to become more productive and more effective and help grow our economy.

I'm very happy that this bill, if passed, will assist this government in long-term planning. It will help create more opportunities for apprenticeships with a variety of trades throughout the province. It will increase the quality of the design of infrastructure throughout the province by adding more value to it.

We've heard from a number of stakeholders through this process. Many of the concerns they have raised, I believe government amendments will address. It speaks to the collaborative nature of the infrastructure process that we have right now in this government that we work with our partners in the broader public sector, and with all of our partners who help deliver infrastructure throughout the province.

I'm looking forward to the clause-by-clause consideration, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Milczyn.

Any further questions or comments before we start? Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: If we're using this time to make prepared statements, I guess I will ad lib one in the sense that this bill, as aspirational as it is, is not necessarily required for the government to proceed with prudent procurement policy within the government.

There's nothing that prohibits the government from making a long-term plan or creating a long-term plan. They've staked a lot of ground on infrastructure spending. However, it has most recently come to light that, when identifying important measures of infrastructure spending and procurement policy—the Auditor General has identified over the last nine years \$8.2 billion that has been essentially wasted within their P3 model through Infrastructure Ontario, as well as the fact that in this fiscal year, the government has yet to apply for any matching funds through the New Building Canada Fund, which would partner through federal revenue on important infrastructure projects, similar to what has been done in other jurisdictions, like Alberta and Saskatchewan.

We are supportive of the fact that the government is putting some importance and some priority on infrastructure. However, when it comes to actual value for money and prudent fiscal management, we would obviously have some issues with the way that they have

gone about building our infrastructure and prioritizing our infrastructure. That being said, we look forward to discussing the amendments that have been proposed before the committee. I certainly appreciate the testimony that has come before us in this committee.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I would like to take this opportunity, prior to getting down to work with regard to the amendments in clause-by-clause: Today at 4 p.m., the amendments that have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and I as Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto. At that time—if we make it till 4 o'clock—I shall allow for one 20-minute waiting period, pursuant to standing order 129(a). What I have just mentioned is according to the order of the House concerning Bill 6.

Thank you very much, everyone. We shall move to section 1. There are no amendments.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: A recorded vote on this section, please.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There has been a request for a recorded vote on all sections and all amendments.

Shall section 1 carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 1 is carried.

We shall move to section 2. There is PC amendment number 1. Mr. Yurek?

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following definition:

“‘acceptable recycled aggregates’ means aggregates, as defined in the Aggregate Resources Act, that are not newly produced and that are not materials obtained from the demolition of a building;”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: We brought this motion forward from MPP Jones’s private member’s bill, Bill 56, An Act to prohibit certain restrictions on the use of aggregates in performing public sector construction work. The definition that we put forward was not objected to by any of the parties during clause-by-clause of Bill 56. This would ensure that construction bids would not be rejected on the sole basis that projects use acceptable recycled materials.

I think the government should prove that they’re good environmental stewards like they do say. They should have no problem accepting this definition going forward, and I look forward to their support of our motion.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Milczyn?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I certainly appreciate the sentiment of the motion. We certainly support the principle. We have some concern with the definition that is being proposed. The Ministry of Natural Resources is conducting a review right now of this issue, and they will be bringing a definition and regulations forward.

1410

So while this is something we support in principle, this definition is premature, and I believe there are government amendments later on that address the principle involved here.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Just for clarification: I wonder if Mr. Milczyn can clarify government amendments built into the amendments that we’re about to see.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: There are—let me take a look. *Interjections.*

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I hear “number 6” is what you’re being told.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Yes, number 6. My apologies. It’s not a government amendment. There is an opposition amendment—and we will actually be supporting that one—motion number 6.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Anything further, Mr. Natyshak?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I just want to contrast both amendments, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion?

Okay. There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Natyshak, Yurek.

Nays

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): PC motion number 1 is defeated.

We shall move to government motion number 2 in your package: Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that the definition of “infrastructure” in section 2 of the bill be amended by adding “social housing” after “hospitals” in the portion before clause (a).

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much. Any further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We heard witnesses at the committee the other week speak about the importance of including social housing in infrastructure. It’s obviously, over many generations, something that was built up in partnership between the national government and the provinces. We do agree that it is important infrastructure, so we think it’s important to actually define it as such within this act. It may also help us in securing some federal funding if the federal

government chooses to re-engage in the provision of social housing.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion?

There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There being none opposed, government motion number 2 is carried.

We shall move to the section.

Shall section 2, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Yurek.

Nays

Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 2, as amended, is carried.

We shall move to section 3. We have new paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 under PC motion number 3: Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following paragraphs:

“2.1 Infrastructure planning and investment should take into account the size of the provincial debt and the government’s ability to balance the provincial budget.

“2.2 Infrastructure planning and investment should recognize and incorporate principles of effective procurement, tendering and contract management.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Any further discussion on PC motion number 3? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I suggest that we not support these amendments. The first one is essentially already contained in the legislation. The ability of the province and the broader public sector to pay for infrastructure needs to be taken into consideration.

The second point, though, “incorporate principles of effective procurement, tendering and contract management,” is very broad. It’s unclear as to any specific direction that that’s requiring the government to undertake. For that reason, I suggest that we not support it.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Unfortunately, these two amendments need to be put forward because this government has a history of being unable to balance a budget, let alone take debt consideration in hand with their out-of-control spending. I think, unfortunately, they need a little hand-holding going forward. These two amendments will help the government on the way to ensuring that we have infrastructure planning and processing going forward, but

at the same time, we watch out for what our children and grandchildren will be paying for down the road.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion on PC motion 3? There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Thompson, Yurek.

Nays

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): PC motion 3 is defeated.

Mr. Natyshak, point of order?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Thank you very much, Chair, for the point of order. This is a first for me. I erred in my previous vote on section 2 of the act. I voted against the section. I was following along as we were proceeding on the third motion. I thought we had called for motions. I simply want to let the record show that I voted erroneously and I certainly would have supported section 2 of the act.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): It is within a member’s right to correct their record, whether verbal and/or voting record, so we appreciate you making those particular comments.

We shall move to government motion 4, which is a new paragraph, 5.1. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“5.1 Infrastructure planning and investment should ensure that the health and safety of workers involved in the construction and maintenance of infrastructure assets is protected.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Speaker, this is a principle that’s well-enshrined throughout Ontario law, but I think it’s very important that we stress in this bill that, as we build infrastructure, we’ll do everything within our power to ensure that work sites across the province are safe and that our workers are safe. I think it’s an important principle to enshrine in infrastructure legislation.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I would just like to remind members that although I am quite flattered by the fact that on occasion I get called Speaker, there is only one Speaker of the House. I am the Chair. Thank you for that.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I apologize.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Natyshak?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Did I call you Speaker?

Interjection.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Okay, sorry.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): It usually happens once a meeting.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I used to call him other things.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I hope that's captured by Hansard.

Chair, we definitely, within the NDP caucus, support this amendment. Infrastructure and planning should recognize health and safety standards of workers. Unfortunately, the government's record in terms of prioritizing health and safety and workers' health and safety is quite poor.

According to the WSIB statistical report, on-the-job fatalities have an alarming increased rate, by almost 40%, over the last five years. Each year more than 80 workers die in traumatic workplace accidents; 300 more workers die an even slower death as a result of occupational disease; and over 200,000 are maimed or seriously injured on the job.

The Arthurs report, which was commissioned in 2010, has yet to see any of its key recommendations implemented, and the Dean report, which I had submitted to, or testified in front of, prior to being elected, was commissioned over five years ago and made key recommendations for vulnerable workers and has yet to see any of those key recommendations implemented.

1420

That being said, we hope that this is the impetus in which the government finally takes action on the part of workers in construction and infrastructure projects in the province of Ontario and, more broadly, workers around the province. So we certainly support this amendment.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Natyshak. Any further discussion? There being none, I shall call the vote on government motion number 4.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There being none opposed, I declare government motion number 4 carried.

I shall move to government motion number 5, which is a new paragraph, 8.1. Mr. Dickson.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): You're welcome.

Mr. Joe Dickson: With a capital C.

I just have a question in reference to the vote on section 2. The different levels that I've been at, as long as you recognize the potential of an error on a vote, there is an opportunity to adjust the vote in the minutes.

Now, I understand you made a point, and I'm sure it will be shown in the minutes. I just want clarification. Would it not be possible to show that he voted in favour of section 2? The logic always was, and you and I as mayors and councillors and so on and so forth—immediately when he did it, he kind of looked and he realized that he was thinking it was a section and a motion, when in fact it was the section itself. If he could have stood on the table and done a dance, he would have done it right then and there, to rectify that simple verification that

that's the way he intended to vote. So I'm asking the question again: Is there no way of showing that as being revised?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Once a vote is taken, specifically with a recorded vote, it's impossible to change that particular vote. I believe Mr. Natyshak has adequately expressed his position in that in a point of order, which I recognized and accepted as a point of order. So I think that is the mechanism that we would utilize to continue to move forward, respecting the fact that, yes, on occasion we do make errors in committee, but, at this particular level, there is nothing to go back to change a recorded vote.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Final question, then, Mr. Chair: Is there an opportunity for a recorded vote later in the meeting where he could revisit that?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I would suspect that, had this not been an order of the House under time allocation with very specific ways to move the clause-by-clause forward, there could be an opportunity at the end to maybe reintroduce a section, but at this particular point we have to continue to move forward.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Okay, that's fine. And that applies to anyone?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Correct.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Good. Particularly, though, MPP Natyshak—did I get it right?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Chair, I just want to thank my colleague Mr. Dickson for his indulgence and recognizing that I did make a little mistake, and I'm sure I'll have no problem explaining it to the electorate, given the Hansard notes, that I did make a mistake. They appreciate when somebody makes a mistake and they immediately correct themselves. But I do appreciate, of course, your intervention and your experience in this House. Having seen many of these, I'm sure you've seen votes gone ways that folks didn't intend to vote—

Mr. Joe Dickson: No, I saw you, and, under a different level of government, you would have had the opportunity immediately to re-vote.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Such is a learning experience that I will carry with me as a newer member, and I'll endeavour to never make the same mistake again.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Thank you for your latitude, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I'd like to thank Mr. Dickson for bringing that particular issue forward. I would like to finish section 3 here, and then I will perhaps help to clarify what has transpired with regard to section 2 once we're done section 3. Is that fair enough? Okay. So we'll continue.

Government motion number 5—I forget where we're at now. Did we pass that one, Madam Clerk?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): It's a new paragraph, 8.1, government motion number 5. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“8.1 Infrastructure planning and investment should promote accessibility for persons with disabilities.”

Mr. Speaker, we’re approaching the 10th anniversary of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. It’s important that everything we do enshrine the principle of universal access.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion on government motion number 5? There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There are none opposed. Government motion number 5, adding new paragraph 8.1, is carried.

We shall move to PC motion number 6, new paragraph 9.1. Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“9.1 Infrastructure planning and investment should endeavour to make use of acceptable recycled aggregates.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion?

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I just want to reiterate what I mentioned in our previous motion that was struck down: This motion is brought forth by MPP Jones, based on her previous private member’s bill, Bill 56, An Act to prohibit certain restrictions on the use of aggregates in performing public sector construction work.

I think it’s good for the environment, but it also helps create jobs in other industries as well. Hopefully, we’ll get this motion passed.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): We’ll go to Mr. Milczyn and then Ms. Thompson. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: The government will support this amendment. It is good, sustainable environmental practice to do this. It’s a good amendment.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I think that’s great. MPP Jones will really appreciate your recognition of her private member’s bill as well.

I was just going to point out that you had supported it in the previous session, so thank you for your consistency in that regard.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on PC motion number 6, adding a new paragraph, 9.1.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): PC motion number 6 is carried.

We shall move to government motion number 7, adding new paragraph 9.1 of section 3. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“9.1 Infrastructure planning and investment should promote community benefits, being the supplementary social and economic benefits arising from an infrastructure project that are intended to improve the well-being of a community affected by the project, such as local job creation and training opportunities (including for apprentices, within the meaning of section 8), improvement of public space within the community, and any specific benefits identified by the community.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Chair, this is also something that we heard from witnesses during the committee hearing—that when making major investments in infrastructure in communities across the province, this gives rise to opportunities to create jobs for local residents, to create training and apprentice opportunities for youth and others in those communities.

Based on individual communities’ needs, there might be the ability to leverage other community benefits, whether it’s streetscape or urban design, or whatever the specific case in an individual circumstance might be.

It’s just smart planning, when you’re spending tens of millions, hundreds of millions, or billions of dollars on project, that you can extract additional benefits from that.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I come from Windsor and Essex county. Statistics Canada, last month, reported that unemployment in Windsor climbed to 11.5%, the highest unemployment rate in Canada despite there being one of the largest infrastructure programs happening in the history of the country, which is currently ongoing, the Herb Gray Parkway, which will eventually lead up to the international crossing that will apparently be named the Gordie Howe bridge, according to Stephen Harper and the Conservative government, who have naming rights exclusively to that international crossing. However, despite the fact that the project is, all told—I mean, the Herb Gray Parkway is \$1.8 billion. The new bridge will be in the order of the same magnitude, so it’s a massive infrastructure project, yet we still have an unacceptably high unemployment rate.

1430

We heard testimony at this committee from community advocates and those who work within the promotion of community benefits calling on the government to have a specific plan that includes dialogue and a pipeline to the government with those community groups to ensure that community involvement and community benefits thresholds were met through infrastructure planning and through the initiation of infrastructure. This pays lip service to what we heard at committee here. It says the

words “community benefits,” which I had—if you go back in the Hansard—warned those who were at committee here that that’s all they would get, that they would say inherently infrastructure projects provide a community benefit. But I would suggest and argue that without a specific strategic plan, the government will undoubtedly miss its mark in having that triple-net benefit that we know infrastructure projects can provide.

That being said, we support, of course, the intent and the idea and the concept around community benefits. We know they exist, but without a specific plan to accentuate them, my concern is that the government will, once again, miss its mark in accelerating and magnifying the impact for communities.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you, Mr. Natyshak.

Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: While I appreciate the member’s concern about ensuring that community benefit agreements actually are secured, the intent of this amendment is to put in place that as a principle, as a lens through which all infrastructure spending will be viewed.

In fact, this government, on the Eglinton Crosstown project, has undertaken—and I believe the agreements are already signed or just about to be signed—a number of community benefit agreements for that project. It’s an evolving body of practice. We will see more of this throughout the province. But it’s important to understand that it’s going to be done on a project-by-project basis. Each project might be unique, each community might be unique, and it can’t be a one-size-fits-all rule to apply this with.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on government motion number 7.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Government motion number 7 is carried.

Of course, we do have amendments to section 3. Is there any further discussion before I call the vote on the carrying of section 3, as amended? There being none, shall section 3, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 3, as amended, is carried, which takes us back to section 2. I believe it would be appropriate, as Chair, to ask the committee for unanimous—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The member could ask the committee for unanimous consent in order to

reopen that particular section and request perhaps some discussion and/or a secondary vote on that particular section.

Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Well, thank you very much for your indulgence, Chair. I’m learning a lot here today at committee in clause-by-clause. I will indeed take your counsel and that of our distinguished Clerk, and I will ask for unanimous consent to reopen the vote and to retake the vote in order for me to correct my record in which I erroneously voted against section 2. I am most definitely in support of section 2. I’ll ask for the support of my colleagues at this point.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Natyshak has requested unanimous consent to reopen section 2. Does the committee provide that unanimous consent?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I don’t hear anything other than yeses, so I will take the opportunity to reopen section 2, which, of course, was amended.

Is there any further discussion? I believe Mr. Natyshak has already put his position forward. So I shall call for the vote on a reopened section 2, as amended.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 2, as amended, is carried again.

Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Thank you very much to my colleagues who have been so gracious as to allow me to correct my record. I guess all I can say is I owe you one. Thanks so much—appreciate it.

Interjections.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: Mark it down. It’s very nice for this collegiality to happen so late in the session, so I appreciate it.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Hoggarth.

Ms. Ann Hoggarth: Could we bundle sections 4 and 5?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Is it the wish of the committee to bundle sections 4 and 5? We are capable and able, with the consent of the committee, to bundle sections 4 and 5. For clarification purposes, there is a new section being proposed under 5.1, so that is not going to be included in this. Is it the consensus of the committee that we bundle 4 and 5?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I hear a no. We shall move to section 4. There are no amendments. Is there any discussion on section 4? There being none, shall section 4 carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 4 is carried.

We shall move to section 5. Any further discussion on section 5? There being none, shall section 5 carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 5 is carried.

We shall move to new section 5.1, which is government motion number 8. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Infrastructure Asset Management Plans

“Infrastructure asset management plans

“5.1(1) Every broader public sector entity prescribed for the purposes of this section shall prepare the infrastructure asset management plans that are required by the regulations and that satisfy the prescribed requirements.

“Infrastructure asset management planning information

“(2) Every broader public sector entity prescribed for the purposes of this section shall prepare such additional infrastructure asset management planning information as may be prescribed by the regulations and that satisfies any prescribed requirements.

“Submission of plans, information to minister

“(3) If required by the minister, a broader public sector entity shall, in accordance with any requirements the minister may specify, provide to the minister or to any other minister of the crown the minister may specify, a copy of an infrastructure asset management plan it has prepared under subsection (1), or of information it has prepared under subsection (2).

1440

“Same, other minister

“(4) If required by a prescribed minister of the crown, a broader public sector entity shall, in accordance with any requirements that minister may specify, provide to that minister a copy of an infrastructure asset management plan it has prepared under subsection (1), or of information it has prepared under subsection (2).

“Public availability of plans, information

“(5) If required by the regulations, a broader public sector entity shall make an infrastructure asset management plan it has prepared under subsection (1), or information it has prepared under subsection (2), available to the public in the prescribed form or manner.

“Supplemental information to minister

“(6) If required by the minister, a broader public sector entity shall, in accordance with any requirements the minister may specify, provide to the minister or to any other minister of the crown the minister may specify, any supplemental information respecting an infrastructure asset management plan or information it has provided under subsection (3) that the minister specifies.

“Same, other minister

“(7) If a broader public sector entity provides information to a prescribed minister of the crown under subsection (4), the broader public sector entity shall, if required by that minister and in accordance with any requirements the minister may specify, provide to that minister any supplemental information respecting an infrastructure asset management plan or information it has provided under that subsection that the minister specifies.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Well done. Mr. Milczyn: further discussion?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Chair, this is enabling authority to the minister to bring forward regulations that would require standardized asset management plans to be brought forward throughout the broader public sector. The government—the minister—has heard from stakeholders, through a variety of consultations, the importance of this for long-term infrastructure planning.

We’ve also heard, through conversations with AMO and ROMA/OGRA, about not coming forward with definitions or requirements within the legislation, but continuing that dialogue in consultation so that regulations could be brought forward that may address different sizes of municipalities or different types of organizations but, nonetheless, achieve the purpose of having standardized reporting for asset management plans.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you, Mr. Milczyn.

Further discussion? Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: A question to the members of the government: Subsection 5.1(5) says that infrastructure asset management plans may be made public but only if required by regulation, and will only be delivered in “the prescribed form or manner.”

Why is public disclosure not mandatory? Also, why is the language regarding the delivery of this information—when it is permitted by regulation—ambiguous? Our contention is that public accountability and transparency measures should be strengthened here.

Thirdly, will supplemental information be made available to the public to view? There are currently no absolute or conditional provisions requiring this.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: The regulations haven’t been drafted yet. There will be extensive further consultation with stakeholders, around the drafting of those regulations, as to the form and nature of asset management plans.

Certainly, I assume that municipalities—all their information will be readily public and accessible. There may be other types of broader public sector organizations that are under other legislation.

I think the intent is that the regulations would ensure that there would be transparency and accountability, but those regulations haven’t been drafted yet.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on new section 5.1, government motion 8.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Government motion number 8, adding new section 5.1, is carried.

We shall move to section 6, which is government motion number 9, which is adding new subsection 6(4.1). Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that section 6 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Legislation Act, 2006 (Part III)

“(4.1) Part III (Regulations) of the Legislation Act, 2006 does not apply to criteria issued under this section.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion on government motion number 9? There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

Nays

Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Government motion number 9, adding new subsection 6(4.1), is carried.

We shall move to section 6, as amended. Is there any further discussion on section 6, as amended, before I call for the vote?

There being none, shall section 6, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 6, as amended, carried.

We shall move to section 7: PC motion number 10, an amendment to subsection 7(1), paragraph 2. Mr. Yurek?

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that paragraph 2 of subsection 7(1) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“2. A professional engineer as defined in section 1 of the Professional Engineers Act.

“3. A person, other than an architect or a professional engineer, with demonstrable expertise in and experience with design in relation to infrastructure assets.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: This basically brings light to the oversight the government had in drafting this bill, which included engineers. This rightfully puts engineers into the bill, where they belong.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: We won't be supporting this amendment. We have brought forward a different motion that addresses the concerns we've heard from the engineering community. The wording of this particular amendment may have unforeseen consequences, as there are already several other pieces of legislation that govern both professional engineers and architects—their own respective acts, as well as the Building Code Act—so our view is that our amendment will be a cleaner amendment that will achieve a similar result.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call the vote on PC motion number 10, which is an amendment to paragraph 2 of subsection 7(1).

Ayes

Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

Nays

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare PC motion number 10 defeated.

We shall move to government motion number 11, which is an amendment to subsections 7(1), (2) and (3). Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that subsections 7(1), (2) and (3) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Requirements respecting certain professionals

“7.(1) The government shall require that the following persons be involved in the preparation of the design for the construction of every infrastructure asset described in subsection (2), unless it is not practicable in the circumstances:

1450

“1. If the government reasonably expects costs for the construction of the infrastructure asset to meet or exceed the amount prescribed for the purposes of this paragraph for the infrastructure asset,

“i. an architect as defined in the Architects Act, and

“ii. a person, other than an architect, with demonstrable expertise in and experience with design in relation to infrastructure assets.

“2. If the government reasonably expects costs for the construction of the infrastructure asset to meet or exceed the amount prescribed for the purposes of this paragraph for the infrastructure asset, a professional engineer as defined in the Professional Engineers Act.

“Applicable infrastructure assets

“(2) Subsection (1) applies to the following infrastructure assets:

“1. The following infrastructure assets, if they are wholly owned by the government:

“i. Infrastructure assets relating to transportation, including highways, bridges and transit stations.

“ii. Infrastructure assets intended primarily for the study and enjoyment of works in the arts or for the production of works in the arts.

“iii. Museums, as defined in regulation 877 of the Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990 (Grants for Museums) made under the Ontario Heritage Act.

“iv. Infrastructure assets that have been identified as having cultural heritage value or interest under part III.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that are located on a property that has been designated under part IV of the act or in an area designated as a heritage conservation district under part V of that act.

“2. Any other infrastructure assets wholly owned by the government that may be prescribed.

“3. Any infrastructure assets partly owned by the government, or for which the government provides any funding, that may be prescribed.

“Minister’s discretion

“(3) The minister may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, require that one or more persons referred to in subsection (1) be involved in the preparation of the design for the construction of any infrastructure asset that is wholly or partly owned by the government, or for which the government provides any funding, in a case where no such person or persons would be required under that subsection or otherwise to be involved.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Before we get going, under 1 iv, Mr. Milczyn, following “Ontario Heritage Act,” you read “or the are located” and “of the act.” According to what I have here, it’s “that.” Would you like to stay with “the” or correct it to “that”?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I’d like to correct my record to stay with what was submitted in writing.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): “That” in the place of “the”?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): That would be great. Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I believe this will address the concern that was raised by the professional engineering community when the bill was originally introduced, making explicit reference to architects only. It was never the intention to leave the impression that the engineering community would be in any way removed from the preparation of plans or required documentation for any type of infrastructure that they are by law required to do, or that makes sense under the circumstances.

This strives to address the issue. Architects are involved when they are required to be, engineers are involved when they are required to be, but the government may at times involve architects or other design professionals in projects as they see fit, where there may be added value gained from additional design expertise being applied to the design or planning of that particular asset.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Natyshak?

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I have a couple of questions—at least one glaring question on this. The amendment

reads that if a project is expected to meet or exceed costs, architects, engineers and others with expertise are not required to partake in the project. When we had the original debate of the bill, second reading in the House, there was a lot of fanfare around the fact that this was going to be incorporated within the procurement policy and within Bill 6. It was quite widely celebrated by the architectural community in Ontario as recognizing the value that they bring in design and quality as well as longevity and performance of our various assets and infrastructure projects.

I’m wondering if the government actually recognizes what the language says here—because we would need some clarification on the intent specifically of subsection 7(1). The section is saying, “If the government reasonably expects costs for the construction of the infrastructure asset to meet or exceed” previously estimated amounts, then architects, engineers and other experts will not be involved in the construction design.

Is the government saying that they will only be involved if the costs fall below the forecast threshold? I think that falls well below what was explained and, I guess, offered to the professional architects in the province of Ontario. I’d love some clarification on that.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I take the member’s comment, and I understand what he means. The regulations have not yet been drafted, but the intent is that where you have projects of a certain financial value—which I assume would be relatively small—where perhaps no design professional is required at all, notwithstanding this act, it wouldn’t impose that requirement and those additional costs.

It could be the installation of a road sign. It could be any number of things that are part of an infrastructure project that are of so little inherent value that ascribing the need for design professionals that wouldn’t otherwise be required could add costs and complexity.

The intent of this bill was to ensure that when more significant infrastructure assets are being built, they’re built to the highest design possible, that value is being added through the design for the resiliency of that asset, its longevity, innovation in the use of materials or design elements and its ability to add to the landscape or to the urban streetscape. That does not mean that you would involve an architect or an engineer in every single project, even if it’s extremely minor. I don’t think anybody wants to add unnecessary costs or unnecessary burdens on infrastructure projects.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Natyshak.

Mr. Taras Natyshak: I appreciate Mr. Milczyn’s clarifications on that. However, the section says, “If the government reasonably expects costs for the construction of the infrastructure asset to meet or exceed” previously estimated amounts. To me, that doesn’t indicate or set a threshold in terms of the size of the infrastructure project nor the nature. It simply says the value. So if it comes in

at estimated costs or above, then the language within this amendment specifically precludes the government from involving architects or engineers within the design elements of it. That is a little bit ambiguous.

Although we fully support the inclusion of our professional architects and engineers within the design phases and as a matter of procurement, because it is ambiguous and allows way too much of an open door for the government to eliminate or exclude those professionals, we're going to have to vote against this amendment, Chair.

1500

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on government motion number 11, which is an amendment to subsections 7(1), (2) and (3).

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

Nays

Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare government motion 11 carried.

We shall move to the section, as amended. Is there further discussion on section 7, as amended? There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 7, as amended, carried.

We shall move to section 8. We have PC motion number 12, which is an amendment to subsection 8(2). Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that subsection 8(2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Apprentices

“(2) The government shall not impose any requirements respecting the numbers of apprentices that must be engaged or employed in the construction or maintenance of infrastructure assets.”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We will not be supporting this amendment. It creates a conflict with the apprentice-to-journeyman ratio under the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act. The ratios are there to ensure that there's a sufficient balance between journeymen and apprentices, for safety and a variety of other reasons, and it ensures the quality of on-the-job training for apprentices, as well. We

have submitted another amendment that I believe will address this issue in a different way.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair, I think if the government took another look at this motion—it has nothing to do with apprentice ratios at all, but where, in fact, the government is prescribing quotas for the number of apprentices. I'm sure the government side was here during testimony, deputations, preparing for clause-by-clause, where many businesses were saying it's quite impractical to state how many apprentices must be in a job, only to multiply that by the number of journeymen that must be in attendance due to the ratios. So we're basically just saying, don't tie the hands of private business in this province by ensuring that a set amount of apprentices must be onsite.

We do support the training of apprentices, as a party. However, we do respect the fact of the costs and the ability to actually carry out these infrastructure projects when you set the prescribed amount of apprentices on a site, as opposed to letting the businesses craft their journeymen—therefore bringing out their apprenticeships to ensure that we are able to complete these jobs on task and on budget and ensure that training can be continued on for our apprentices.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Further discussion? There being none, I shall call the vote on PC amendment number 12.

Ayes

Thompson, Yurek.

Nays

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The PC motion, which is an amendment to subsection 8(2), is defeated.

We shall move to government motion number 13, which is section 8. Mr. Milczyn, enjoy your read.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move that section 8 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Requirements re apprentices

“Definitions

“8.(1) In this section,

“‘apprentice’ means an individual who, under the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009, has entered into a registered training agreement under which the individual is to receive training in a trade required as part of an apprenticeship program established by the Ontario College of Trades; (‘apprenti’)

“‘registered training agreement’ means an agreement registered under section 65 of the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009 under which an individual is to receive training in a trade required as part of an apprenticeship program established by the Ontario College of Trades; (‘contrat d’apprentissage enregistré’)

“trade” means a trade prescribed under subsection 74(3) of the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009 as a trade for the purposes of that Act. (“métier”)

“Commitment re intended use of apprentices

“(2) A bidder that enters into a procurement process for the construction or maintenance by the government of an infrastructure asset shall, in the prescribed circumstances, provide to the government as part of the procurement process a commitment respecting the intended use of apprentices in the construction or maintenance in the event of a successful bid.

“Prescribed requirements

“(3) A commitment provided under subsection (2) shall meet the prescribed requirements.

“Apprenticeship plan

“(4) Every bidder referred to in subsection (5) that enters into a procurement process for the construction or maintenance by the government of an infrastructure asset shall provide to the government a plan for the intended use of apprentices in the construction or maintenance, in the event of a successful bid, that,

“(a) includes the following information:

“(i) the number of apprentices whom the bidder intends to employ for the construction or maintenance in each trade,

“(ii) the methods by which the bidder intends to support the completion by those apprentices of their training under the registered training agreements into which they have entered,

“(iii) the methods by which the bidder intends to create employment opportunities arising from the construction or maintenance for apprentices who are women, aboriginal persons, newcomers to Ontario, at-risk youth, veterans, residents of the community in which the infrastructure asset is located or any other persons specified by the regulations; and

“(b) meets any other requirements that may be prescribed.

“Same, application

“(5) Subsection (4) applies to,

“(a) a successful bidder that was required to provide a commitment to the government under subsection (2) and, in the prescribed circumstances, any other successful bidder; and

“(b) any other bidder, in the prescribed circumstances, as part of the procurement process.

“Non-compliance during procurement process

“(6) The government shall not consider the bid of a bidder that is required to provide, as part of the procurement process, a commitment under subsection (2) or a plan under subsection (4) in accordance with the prescribed requirements, and fails to do so.

“Obligations regarding ratios

“(7) For greater certainty, information included in a commitment or plan provided for the purposes of this section must conform to any applicable requirements respecting journey-person-to-apprentice ratios that are

established for the purposes of section 60 of the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act, 2009.

“Public availability

“(8) A bidder shall, in the prescribed circumstances, make a commitment or plan it has provided for the purposes of this section available to the public in the prescribed form or manner.”

1510

If I have strayed from the written submission that was made, in any way, the written submission should be the official version.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I think you did marvellously. Congratulations.

Any further discussion on that short motion? Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: Chair, I’m quite concerned that they turned down our motion, previously, and put forward a motion on red tape. I think we should be building more competitiveness in our business climate. However, all this does is add more red tape. All we seem to hear about from businesses throughout this province—other than hydro prices and a lack of proper transportation modes—is the massive, massive red tape throughout the industry. I’m quite shocked that this government has just thrown in a whole pile of red tape into this bill when unfortunately we shouldn’t have to be doing so.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Well, in fact, this amendment proposes to ensure that bidders on projects will submit, as part of their bid through the procurement process, a plan on how they propose to address the issue of apprentices to journeypersons on a specific project. This will vary by type of infrastructure, by type of trades that are involved. This, in fact, will ensure that the goals of ensuring that there are substantial apprenticeship opportunities throughout the province are addressed, that the training is of a high quality and that the workplaces are safe. It is not our government’s intention to undermine the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act. We actually want to see it working in practice, not through red tape but actually through pouring concrete and directing steel and the other construction that will be done throughout the province.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you, Mr. Milczyn.

Further discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just need to concur with my colleague from Elgin–Middlesex–London. I have to tell you that I can’t believe how much this government continues to choose to bury small business under red tape. It shows that there is an absolute disconnect between small business in Ontario and where this government is heading.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on section 8 of the bill, which is government motion number 13.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): A little bit of order would be appropriate. I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

Nays

Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare government motion number 13 carried.

Section 8 is amended. I shall ask, is there any further discussion on section 8, as amended? There being none, I shall call for the vote.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 8, as amended, carried.

We shall move to section 9. There are no amendments. Is there any further discussion on section 9? There being none, I shall call for the vote on section 9.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Section 9 is carried.

Section 10: There are no amendments. Is there any further discussion on section 10? There being none, I shall call for the vote on section 10.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 10 carried.

We shall move to section 11, which is PC motion number 14 in your package, an amendment to subsection 11(1). Mr. Yurek.

Mr. Jeff Yurek: I move that subsection 11(1) of the bill be amended by adding the following clause:

“(0.a) specifying what constitutes acceptable recycled aggregates;”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Chair, we won't be supporting this amendment. It duplicates what is already in this bill. There is existing language under section 11(1)(f) that gives the government the ability to make

regulations specifying anything that is not defined in the bill.

As I said earlier, the Ministry of Natural Resources is continuing to assess what should constitute acceptable recycled aggregates.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on PC amendment number 14.

Ayes

Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

Nays

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare PC motion number 14 defeated.

We shall move to government motion number 15, which is an amendment to subsection 11(1), with a new clause.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that subsection 11(1) of the bill be amended by adding the following clause:

“(c.1) for the purposes of section 5.1,

“(i) prescribing broader public sector bodies,

“(ii) setting out the infrastructure asset management plans that must be prepared under subsection 5.1(1) and governing their preparation, including governing their form, content and timing,

“(iii) setting out any additional infrastructure asset management planning information that must be prepared under subsection 5.1(2) and governing its preparation, including governing its form, content and timing,

“(iv) prescribing ministers of the crown for the purposes of subsection 5.1(4), and

“(v) governing the circumstances in which a plan prepared under subsection 5.1(1) or information prepared under subsection 5.1(2) must be made available to the public and governing the form or manner of that availability;”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Chair, during consultations and from witnesses, we heard about this concept. It's important that all broader public sector bodies—the provincial government as well as municipalities and others—have data at their fingertips in order to make smart decisions about prioritizing infrastructure planning.

This will set out the requirement that there will be infrastructure management plans that will be in somewhat of a standardized form, that they will be accountable and transparent, and that that will be utilized by all in terms of assessing which infrastructure projects should proceed first.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on government motion number 15.

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson, Yurek.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There being none opposed, I declare government motion 15 carried.

We shall move to government motion number 16, which is an amendment to clause 11(1)(d). Mr. Milczyn.

1520

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that clause 11(1)(d) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(d) for the purposes of section 7,

“(i) prescribing amounts for the purposes of paragraph 1 or 2 of subsection 7(1),

“(ii) prescribing infrastructure assets for the purposes of paragraph 2 of subsection 7(2), and

“(iii) prescribing infrastructure assets, including any asset referred to in subparagraphs 1 i, ii, iii or iv of subsection 7(2), for the purposes of paragraph 3 of that subsection;”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: This refers to the previous amendment that supports the inclusion of engineers and architects on design teams, as they’re required for their design expertise. It fulfills our commitment that we made to engineers to ensure that their role will be honoured in this legislation. It also clarifies the respective roles of architects and engineers.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? There being none, I shall call the question.

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn.

Nays

Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare government motion 16 carried.

We shall move to government motion number 17. Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I move that clause 11(1)(e) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(e) for the purposes of section 8,

“(i) governing the circumstances in which a commitment must be provided under subsection 8(2), and governing the preparation and provision of commitments, including governing their form, content and timing,

“(ii) governing the circumstances in which a plan must be provided under subsection 8(4), and governing the preparation and provision of plans, including governing their form, content and timing, and

“(iii) governing the circumstances in which a commitment or plan provided for the purposes of the section

must be made available to the public and governing the form or manner of that availability;”

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion on government motion number 17? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We just need to reiterate where we stand on this. This is not a proper way to support apprenticeship training in Ontario. Thanks.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Milczyn?

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: I appreciate Ms. Thompson’s views on apprenticeship training. This particular amendment, however, is about putting in place the authority for the government to implement apprenticeship training. It has been well received by a variety of stakeholders. We believe this is the way that we’re going to ensure that young people and others across this province have good opportunities to learn trades and participate in the benefits from the infrastructure construction.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on government motion 17.

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

Nays

Thompson.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare government motion 17, which is an amendment to clause 11(1)(e), carried.

We shall move to PC motion number 18, which is an amendment to clause 11(1)(e). Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that clause 11(1)(e) of the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, we do not see the value for money, and we question the return on investment by forcing companies to commit to unrealistic apprenticeship numbers. It’s a burden of more bureaucratic red tape that we’re seeing from this Liberal government. We’re hearing from our stakeholders that it’s absolutely not necessary.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Well, we fundamentally disagree with the opposition. It’s important, as we build \$130 billion worth of infrastructure across this province over the next 10 years, that young people and others throughout the province have the opportunity for good apprenticeship training in safe circumstances, that the trades and skills that are required are taught, and that this is done in a way that’s consistent with the Ontario College of Trades and Apprenticeship Act. That will actually create the greatest value for the residents of Ontario.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just want to make sure everyone understands that the PC Party of Ontario supports proper training and that we encourage growth in skilled trades, absolutely. However, this section of the bill does not achieve those goals.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Further discussion? There being none, I shall call for the vote on PC motion 18.

Ayes

Thompson.

Nays

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare PC motion number 18 defeated.

We shall move to section 11. There were three amendments, so section 11 is amended. Are there any comments prior to me calling the vote? There are none. Shall 11, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 11, as amended, carried.

We shall move to section 12; there are no amendments. Any discussion on section 12? There being none, I shall call the vote. Shall section 12 carry?

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 12 carried.

We're dealing with section 13. Is there further discussion on section 13? There being none, I shall call the question. Shall section 13 carry?

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare section 13—those opposed? I declare section 13 carried.

I got to the fourth-last one before I made an error, so I apologize. Could I have unanimous consent that I could redo that one?

Laughter.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): We shall move to the title of the bill. There are no amendments. Any discussion on the title? There being none, shall the title of the bill carry?

Ayes

Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare the title of the bill carried.

Bill 6 is amended. Any further discussion on the amended bill? I shall call the question. Shall Bill 6, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I declare Bill 6, as amended, carried.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Point of order: Mr. Milczyn.

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn: Mr. Natyshak early in the proceedings made a comment. I just wanted to clarify that indeed, our government has applied to the federal Building Canada Fund for a number of projects. I believe Mr. Natyshak said that we hadn't applied. We submitted 108 projects to the federal government. The Ottawa River Action Plan so far—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much, Mr. Milczyn. That is not a point of order; that's a point of debate. I appreciate that. I would like to continue my work with regard to reporting the bill to the House. I appreciate your point of order. Good try.

So the bill is amended. Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House on your behalf? Further discussion? There being none, I shall call the question.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House?

Ayes

Dickson, Dong, Hoggarth, Kiwala, Milczyn, Natyshak, Thompson.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I shall report the bill, as amended, to the House. Carried.

I thank you all very much for your excellent work.

Mr. Joe Dickson: Chair, congratulations on chairing a great meeting.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Sorry?

Mr. Joe Dickson: Great job. Thank you, sir.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I really appreciate the support that you give me, and that all of you give me.

Just a reminder that on June 3 at 4 p.m., we will be meeting to discuss Bill 30. We have four presenters coming before us during the public hearings, but there is room for eight. If there are more that come forward, would the committee consider allowing more to come forward to fill up the extra four time slots? I'm just asking.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I hear a yes. Do I hear anyone opposed? Is it the consensus of the committee, if there are more presenters wishing to come forward during the public hearing process, that the Clerk be authorized to put them on the schedule on a first-come, first-served basis? Is there anyone opposed? Further discussion? There being none, I will assume that

the committee is in agreement that if there are up to four more who wish to come before the committee, it will be allowed on June 3.

I'd like to thank everyone very much. An hour and a half—great work.

Adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1532.

CONTENTS

Monday 1 June 2015

Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act, 2015, Bill 6, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2015 sur
l'infrastructure au service de l'emploi et de la prospérité, projet de loi 6, M. DuguidG-585

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Président

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Joe Dickson (Ajax–Pickering L)

Mr. Mike Colle (Eglinton–Lawrence L)

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

Mr. Joe Dickson (Ajax–Pickering L)

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky (Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest ND)

Ms. Ann Hogarth (Barrie L)

Ms. Sophie Kiwala (Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles L)

Ms. Eleanor McMahon (Burlington L)

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson (Huron–Bruce PC)

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

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Han Dong (Trinity–Spadina L)

Mr. Peter Z. Milczyn (Etobicoke–Lakeshore L)

Mr. Taras Natyshak (Essex ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk, legislative counsel