

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

PH-16

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

PH-16

**Standing Committee
on Procedure
and House Affairs**

**Comité permanent
de la procédure
et des affaires de la Chambre**

1st Session
43rd Parliament
Tuesday 30 May 2023

1^{re} session
43^e législature
Mardi 30 mai 2023

Chair: Jennifer K. French
Clerk: Christopher Tyrell

Présidente : Jennifer K. French
Greffier : Christopher Tyrell

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:

<https://www.ola.org/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

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 416-325-7400.

House Publications and Language Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service linguistique et des publications parlementaires
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

CONTENTS

Tuesday 30 May 2023

Superior Corporate Services Limited Act, 2023, Bill Pr25, Mr. Fraser	PH-83
Mr. John Fraser, MPP	
Ms. Nadia Campion	
Ms. Krista Maydew	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE
ON PROCEDURE
AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT
DE LA PROCÉDURE
ET DES AFFAIRES DE LA CHAMBRE**

Tuesday 30 May 2023

Mardi 30 mai 2023

The committee met at 0901 in committee room 1.

**SUPERIOR CORPORATE SERVICES
LIMITED ACT, 2023**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill Pr25, An Act to revive Superior Corporate Services Limited.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs will now come to order. First on the agenda today we have consideration of Bill Pr25, An Act to revive Superior Corporate Services Limited. First, I'm going to ask the MPP sponsor, Mr. Fraser, to introduce himself.

Mr. John Fraser: Yes. It's quite straightforward, just as you said, Chair. Thank you. I'm putting forward Bill Pr25, An Act to revive Superior Corporate Services. Nadia Campion, who is here on behalf of the applicant, will take it from here.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. MPP Fraser, do you have any additional comments?

Mr. John Fraser: No.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. In that case, I'll invite the applicant forward. If you'll introduce yourself for the record and if you have any comments?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Thank you, Ms. French. Good morning, honourable members of the committee. Some of you may remember me from last time. My name is Nadia Campion. I am the lawyer for Mary Young and the estate of Bruce Young, and I am here today on Ms. Young's behalf to have the corporation Superior Corporate Services revived.

Some of you may ask why it is that I am reattending today and what's different today as compared to last year, when I was before a different committee—but a committee nonetheless—to have the company revived. The difference is, in fact, twofold: (1) We have now included in the revival bill a full indemnity for the government, so that there is no risk on the litigation front to the government; and (2) we were in front of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, where we brought an application to preserve the royalty that is at issue in this case, and the Superior Court of Justice determined that Ms. Young does not have standing to bring her claim and to access justice in the absence of this corporation. And so those are two significant developments that, I would submit to this committee, should

be taken into consideration when thinking about our application.

We have also prepared for the committee a short documentary film. I believe some or all of you will have already received the link, and you may or may not have viewed it, but we would like to have you view the short documentary—it's about nine minutes long—so that you can acquire an appreciation for how this case started, what it's about and why, I submit to you, it's important that you take serious consideration in offering Ms. Young the opportunity to have her matter determined by the courts.

With that, we will share the screen.

Video presentation.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Ms. Campion, I'll return to you if you have any further comments beyond what the committee has just watched.

Ms. Nadia Campion: Well, I would like to thank the members of the committee for giving us their time today to watch this important video, and I would strongly encourage them to seriously consider this time voting in favour of the revival bill for the reasons described in the video and also in circumstances where there have been two significant changes that should hopefully assist any concerns that any of the members may have.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay, thank you. And there will be an opportunity for folks to engage and ask questions.

But next, then, we go to—if there are any interested parties in attendance. And if you will do the same and identify yourself for the committee.

Ms. Krista Maydew: Good morning, honourable members of the committee. My name is Krista Maydew. I'm the director of community relations for Iamgold, and I want to say thank you for the opportunity to present to you today.

Iamgold is a Canadian-based mining company. We're developing the Côté Gold project, which is a new open-pit gold mine located near Gogama, just west of Highway 144, between Timmins and Sudbury. We're located on Treaty 9 territory on the traditional lands of Mattagami First Nation, Flying Post First Nation and also on the traditional harvesting territory of the Métis Nation of Ontario, region 3.

Côté Gold a culmination of over 10 years of work and investment by Iamgold and its partners. Nearly \$3 billion to date has been spent in advancing the project. It's considered a model of industry and government working together to deliver benefits to northern Ontario, with both,

as you saw, Premier Ford and Prime Minister Trudeau attending the groundbreaking in 2020.

Construction of the mine is nearing completion. At the end of March, we announced that we're nearly 80% complete, and we plan to start full operations in early 2024.

So you might be asking, "Well, how does the revival of this corporation relate to a project that's supported by Indigenous communities, both levels of government and northern Ontario?" What looks like a routine private bill for the revival of a dissolved corporation is anything but routine. This private bill seeks to revive a company to permit the company to turn around and sue Iamgold and/or the Ontario government for a mining royalty that was bought from the government in 2021. The province took possession of this royalty as forfeited property in the 1990s, following Superior's dissolution due to unpaid taxes. In an effort to consolidate mining claims across its broader property, Iamgold purchased the royalty from the province in 2021. This was decades after the mining royalty was forfeited to the province. The purchase price of approximately \$6 million was an amount determined as fair market value by an independent valuation. Our purchase of the royalty from the province was a transaction that both parties entered into and carried out in good faith and intention, with Iamgold continuing to develop the project. We've created thousands of jobs and triggered economic development throughout northern Ontario.

The actions to revive Superior came as the mine came closer to operation, when the royalty became valuable. No action was taken over the three decades prior, including during the 20 years that the company could have been revived without the need for a private member's bill.

A little over a year ago, this same item came before the committee. We continue to believe that the negative policy implications of permitting the revival of Superior remain the same today, as do the applicant's motivations for pursuing revival. Allowing Superior to be revived would undermine the fairness, transparency and certainty that Ontario's legal framework for the management of forfeited corporate assets is meant to achieve. If Superior is revived, it would stand for the principle that individuals could choose not to pay their taxes, allow a corporation to be dissolved, but nonetheless preserve indefinitely the ability to recover the corporation's assets. Both the crown and a good-faith buyer of forfeited corporate assets must have certainty and finality in these types of transactions.

The members of the committee voted against the bill in 2022, and we kindly ask that the committee members do the same today and not allow the company to be revived.

0920

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Thank you, Ms. Maydew.

Are there any other interested parties in attendance? Okay.

In that case, are there any comments from the government? No.

In that case, we will have the opportunity for questions and comments from the committee members to the applicant, Ms. Champion, or Ms. Maydew—and as has been our custom, as folks would like to get on my speaking list.

Mr. Yakabuski.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Thank you very much for joining us today.

Ms. Champion, I was here when we dealt with this item before. I just want to say that the video is very, very compelling in many ways, but it's not uncommon. I can tell you that my mother-in-law will be 90 in a few days, as well. She was a war refugee out of Lithuania in the Second World War. She has a compelling story to tell, as well, and it does pull at your heartstrings.

I had never met Mary before or ever seen her, either virtually or in person. She seems very genuine. But I do have to wonder why it took 34 years to deal with this.

We've had countless circumstances over the years—I don't have them in front of me—of people who invented something and didn't realize just how great it was and sold it to one of these big companies that made billions on it over the years, over decades, and that person was left wondering, "What if?" Tim Horton's widow could be a good example, here in Canada. Her husband started an amazing story, and at the end of the day they realized very little out of it. The courts have ruled on those kinds of circumstances and said, "I'm sorry." It's kind of like if your grandpa sold the house, and decades later they found out that that dusty old painting that had all kinds of gunge over it—they cleaned it off, and it was a Rembrandt or something, and now they want to relitigate the sale of the house, or at least the contents that were left up in the attic.

We are opening, in my opinion, so many dangerous doors and precedents. That's why this decision was made by the committee the last time it came before us. There are huge ramifications here.

There is no question that Iamgold entered into their decision and their agreement with the Ontario government in good faith. They were not aware of the circumstances going back decades. They entered it in good faith, they dealt with it in good faith, and they have proceeded in good faith to begin a mining operation up in Gogama that will have tremendous benefits for the people of Ontario and Indigenous communities in that region, as well.

I'm not a lawyer, and I don't know exactly—because I wonder why, with these decisions that were made already by the courts, and now you've gone and indemnified the government. What that means, I'm not exactly sure of, but being unsure leaves me in a position to say that the safe position for us, as this committee and as members of the government who are responsible for also protecting the people of Ontario, is to leave it as it was. I don't know what could happen—I can't look through the window—but I do wonder why, if those decisions have been made by the courts, is there a reason why to bring back this corporation. If there are outstanding things, do they have to be in this corporation? I read about some of the things that she'd like to do. Could that not be done under the auspices of a new corporation being founded? I don't know. But to me, there are a lot of dangerous precedents that could be set here.

As I say, I'm not a lawyer, but we made this decision last year, a year and a few months ago. To be honest with

you, unless you're bringing something different than what I've seen today—and I understand the emotion, the purpose for us to maybe understand Mary a little better. But unless you're bringing something that radically would change what we saw a year and a couple of months ago, I honestly couldn't in good conscience want to support a different decision. If you can tell me something different, the committee is obviously open to hearing what you have to say. But that's my position. I have no specific questions for you because we've asked all those questions and we had the answers, and that's why the decision was made in March 2022.

Ms. Nadia Campion: If I may? Thank you. There have been two significant changes, one of which is a full indemnity for the government. That indemnity and the bill itself have been signed off on by all of the ministries, and so they have obviously accepted that, so that there is no risk to the government in this situation.

Why Mary brings this forward now, as opposed to decades ago, is because she was not aware of that. She wasn't aware of the company. She wasn't aware of the royalty. The first time she learned about it was when another gold company put her on notice.

I listened to my friend give her submissions on behalf of Iamgold. In doing so, she said that the transaction was carried out in good faith and with good intentions. But I would submit to this committee that that is not the case, because no notice went to the family. The suggestion that Iamgold did not know that this family had an ownership claim to the royalties is not accurate because, as Iamgold admitted in cross-examinations, they were aware and had in their possession a series of mining reports which indicated that the family had a claim to the royalty. Yet they went to the government, they pursued the transaction and they did not give any notice to Mary or to her family to let her know that this transaction was unfolding.

The only reason it came to the attention of anyone, frankly, is because ultimately it was registered on title. It was within a matter of a couple of months that Ms. Young had counsel retained, investigated the history and promptly brought forward the claim.

This revival bill here today doesn't determine the result. It doesn't determine the result. All it does is give the Young family an opportunity to have their case heard in the court—no risk to the government; there's a full indemnity.

So I would ask the members of the committee here today to decide who they're going to support. Are they going to support a corporation who acquired a royalty without giving any notice to the family and who has consistently refused to co-operate with the family in any way, or are you going to support the family, access to justice and an effort to have this woman have her day in court?

I would submit to you that that's a really important piece because it answers, sir, your question, which is, "What's the reason you're here again? Haven't the courts decided this?" The courts have decided this, and they've decided that the company is a requirement in order for her to have her day in court. That's a significant difference.

And it also differentiates this case from the case of Tim Hortons or the basement painting or any of the other examples, respectfully, that you gave. That is not this case. This case is different, and it's unique.

0930

I think that the members of this committee should seriously consider what are the principles of justice and fairness and good governance that should be applied here. I would submit that those principles certainly support allowing this company to be revived so that Ms. Young can have her matter determined in court, where it should be determined—not by this committee, but by the courts.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Thank you, Ms. Campion.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, I—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Mr. Yakabuski? I guess if you'd like to respond briefly, but I do have a speakers' list, as well. Did you want to answer her?

Mr. John Yakabuski: Do I just—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): You can, but just to let you know there are some colleagues who wanted to ask questions.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, I do want to—first of all, I'm not sure either one of us would know all the details of the Tim Hortons case, other than what's been out there publicly, because we weren't involved, and I don't think you were involved, either. But I would like to ask the lawyer for Iamgold to respond to some of the things. I mean, when you say the government is not at risk—Iamgold I suspect is at risk, and as for your assertion that they didn't enter this in good faith, I would like to at least hear from Iamgold's attorneys on that.

Ms. Krista Maydew: First off, I'm not an attorney. Like you, I'm not a lawyer, MPP Yakabuski.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Oh.

Ms. Krista Maydew: But just, I guess, from a non-legal perspective, based on my understanding: Regardless of the full indemnity that's promised to the government, effectively this is seeking to unwind a transaction in which Iamgold purchased a royalty that was held by the government as the owner of the royalty, given that it was forfeited property. From our perspective, unwinding that transaction is a potential embarrassment to the government under the principle that the royalty was incorrectly sold to us. That is our position.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. I have Mr. Harris next on the list.

Mr. Mike Harris: Ms. Campion, it's nice to see you again. We had a bit of a heated discussion, I believe, last time you were here and there were some rather unparliamentary words that were slung around after the committee meeting had adjourned. It's unfortunate that that had to happen.

But I did want to ask a couple of questions that, just looking back in Hansard here, were asked last time, around how your law firm and how Metalla, which is essentially a company that owns royalties, if I'm not mistaken—and you can invest in those royalties, which was mentioned in the video, as well. I was just curious as to—going back to,

I guess it would be, the early 2000s, when Ms. Young found out about this—how that all occurred, how Metalla is involved in that and if there's any payments that would be granted to them. Would they be getting a percentage? Would your company be receiving a percentage of any potential royalties? I'm just curious as to some of the background as to how this occurred.

Ms. Nadia Campion: Sure. Just to correct the timing of Ms. Young's knowledge about the royalty, it was not in the early 2000s. In fact, it was in 2021. What happened was that in—I guess it would have been in March or April 2021—actually, it was June 28, 2021—Iamgold registered a notice of this transaction on title to the mining claims, and that notice indicated that it had entered into an agreement of purchase and sale and a release—there's a release—with the Public Guardian and Trustee. That agreement is dated June 24, 2021, and it was pursuant to that agreement that Iamgold purported to acquire the royalty, and the royalty had forfeited to the crown because, of course, the corporation had been dissolved for tax arrears. Those tax arrears have all been paid, just if you're wondering.

Under the applicable legislation, where you have corporate property that has forfeited to the crown, the original owner of that property can apply to the government or the governing ministry and seek to have that forfeiture undone; in other words, they can try to take repossession. There's a whole statutory framework that exists for that purpose, which is where the notice becomes important that was registered on title.

As a result of the registration on title, Metalla, which—you are correct, Mr. Harris; it is a royalty corporation. The notice was brought to Metalla's attention, and the reason for that is because Metalla had also acquired another royalty—

Mr. Mike Harris: They have the Gosselin shares, I believe, as well?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Correct—in respect of this gold mine.

Before we were involved, Metalla reached out to the Young family, because as I say, it was known and understood in the community that they had had a claim to this royalty, and that is supported by a series of mining reports called the Trelawney reports. They contacted the Young family and asked the Young family what, if anything, they knew about it, and they said they didn't know anything about it, and that then resulted in a review of the history of the royalties and a series of agreements that had been entered into over time in respect of these royalties. So the notice that Iamgold registered on title referred to Superior Corporate Services, which is the company that we're dealing with here today, indicating that Superior had retained 1.5% of the royalty, and as a result of that, Metalla advised Ms. Young and the family that it would assist the family in recovering the royalty.

Mr. Mike Harris: Madam Chair, may I interject, just in the interests of time, so we can have some other questions from other colleagues, if that's all right with you?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Ms. Campion, I'll give you a moment to finish that thought, and then I do

have a series of other questions for you and the interested parties.

Ms. Nadia Campion: Metalla has been assisting the Young family in dealing with this issue of the royalty.

To answer your question directly, Mr. Harris—does our law firm have any kind of percentage interest or anything like that? Absolutely not. We are paid in the usual course, on an hourly basis—

0940

Mr. Mike Harris: Thank you, Ms. Campion. Metalla—what is their interest, then, in the ongoing royalties of this? And when you say assisting, what do they stand to benefit if this were to come to fruition?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Well, it depends on what the outcome is. Would there be a benefit to Metalla? The answer to that question is yes. Would that—

Mr. Mike Harris: To the tune of how much?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Well, that we don't—

Mr. Mike Harris: So if you were to be able to achieve the 1.5% royalty, how much would Metalla receive?

Ms. Nadia Campion: I don't know what the amount is, but what I can tell you is that there would be a significant amount paid to the family.

Mr. Mike Harris: And a significant amount paid to Metalla.

Ms. Nadia Campion: I don't know if it's significant or not, sir.

Mr. Mike Harris: As their lawyer, you're not aware of what that agreement would look like?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Well, no, that's not the issue. The issue is we don't know what the outcome is. It depends. Is it a recovery of the royalty? Is it a claim for damages against Iamgold, in which case those damages get paid to the Young family?

Mr. Mike Harris: But it wouldn't be out of the realm of possibility to say that it would be a fairly substantial sum?

Ms. Nadia Campion: Well, I guess it depends on what the production levels are in 2024. I don't know.

Mr. Mike Harris: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay, I have Mr. West, Ms. Hogarth, Mr. McGregor. Watching the clock, we still have to vote or decide as a committee to extend this, so I'll just put that to the members in terms of how this unfolds. Mr. West?

MPP Jamie West: Thank you to both of you for coming. I'll try to be as brief as I can. I read through Hansard; there are about 15 pages of notes from the two meetings that happened. I was here for the first one. The second meeting, I had COVID, so I wasn't there, but I followed through on the notes and just refreshed myself. I think I know a basic timeline. So, Mr. Young got sick and passed away and Mary was unaware of this happening, and then I think in 2021 is when she found out.

Interjection: Right.

MPP Jamie West: Okay. And so what we're looking at today—I know the video is very compelling and it has excellent music and Iamgold is concerned about royalties and stuff, but I think in terms of what we're doing as a committee—I sat on the previous version of this committee—is trying to figure out if they can revive a corporation.

All we did in this committee prior to when it was reformed was look at corporations that wanted to be revived, and they came down to two points: They had to be revived to pay a debt or they had to be revived because they thought they had a debt owing. So the business was around for 30 years and they made a deposit on their office space for \$50, 30 years ago, and they had to cash the \$50 cheque by the corporation, or they found that they owed some money and they had to pay it off.

So I'm wondering, from legal counsel—because I don't know what happens after this, and honestly, I don't think that's part of my purview or any of us on the committee. I think it's just, "What are we doing here today, and can it be revived?" So I'm looking to legislative counsel: Is there any reason that this corporation shouldn't be revived? Is there anything legally preventing them from being revived? Would it set precedent? Would it do damage? This just feels like the same thing, but instead of the down payment or—what's it called?—first and last on the rent, it's a lot bigger numbers. But is there anything—

Ms. Catherine Oh: I can't answer the question of what the consequences would be after its revival. What I can tell you is that this corporation has met the requirements for being revived. It needs to be approved by the Ministry of Finance and various other ministries. Although I should say it's not exactly an approval that they provide. They review the bill and review the history of the corporation to see if there are any specific reasons to object, and they have not proposed any objections. They've met all of the requirements under the standing orders to prepare the compendium, to do the public advertisement. Those are all sort of minimum requirements, but that does not mean that they're entitled to a revival. The role of this committee is to assess that and to decide.

Whenever a private bill comes before this committee, in a way, it's like the applicant is asking for a favour from the committee, from the Legislature: "Could you please give us this exception that we cannot get any other way?" And it is up to the committee to decide whether it's appropriate to grant that exemption. So they are not entitled to it as a right. You are not obliged to approve it just because they did meet the requirements.

As for the legal consequences to these two parties, I can't say.

MPP Jamie West: Okay. I know there's a lot of questions. I'm struggling with what to do with this, because I feel like we're getting in the weeds on, there's a lovely 90-year-old woman and there's a big company; there could be a court battle afterward, and what will happen after that? I think, in terms of the role of the committee, what I'm looking for is specifically—what they do afterward, I don't think I'm concerned with. It's what's happening right now. I don't see any reason why we wouldn't say, "Go have your day in court." I just don't.

I don't really have a question. I'm not sure what to do with the response. But I've heard a lot about what happens after this, and some people are going to profit or not profit or alternatively would have to pay out. But I don't see an argument about, today, what we're doing. That's all.

I cede the rest of my time.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Ms. Hogarth, I have you next.

Ms. Christine Hogarth: I think, Ms. Campion, you answered my question. I also went through the Hansard documents because I was not here. I guess my question, when we talk about, "Has anything changed?"—the company was dissolved as a result of failure to pay the necessary tax arrears; that's still true today. It was 1989 that it was dissolved.

Ms. Nadia Campion: Correct.

Ms. Christine Hogarth: That has not changed?

Ms. Nadia Campion: That has not changed.

Ms. Christine Hogarth: That's all I really had to ask. Thank you

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): MPP McGregor as well.

Mr. Graham McGregor: My question was answered, so I'm good.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Chair—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Ms. Bell is next. Mr. Yakabuski after.

Ms. Jessica Bell: My question is to legal counsel. In this new member's bill, there is an indemnity for the government. Can you explain that for me? How strong is it? Is the government fully protected from lawsuits? What does that look like?

Ms. Catherine Oh: I can't really give you an opinion on that. That's not my area of expertise. Like I said, it was distributed to the ministries, including the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Office of the Public Guardian and Trustee. They would be concerned with those matters. They have not chosen to object before the committee. That's all I can say about that.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I have Mr. Yakabuski. Is there anyone else to add to my list? Not yet? Go ahead.

Mr. John Yakabuski: I move that we vote on the matter.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Well, if there are no further—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): There's a motion on the table. I'm going to—

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, they can speak to the motion.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I will continue as I had asked, if there was anyone—Mr. Yakabuski is suggesting that we move to a vote, but did you have an additional question? I'm going to take yours first, and then we'll move along.

Ms. Jessica Bell: First, I would like to make sure that there are no other questions that people have. Then, second, I'd like to call for a five-minute recess so I can talk to my colleague to decide how we're going to vote.

Mr. John Yakabuski: I think I moved the vote—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Folks, we were in questions and comment period, much like debate. However, I don't see further questions. I will ask the committee if they would grant a five-minute recess, but the time for questions, seeing no more, will be finished. Then, beyond

that, we will move into the next portion so we can finish this.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, I'd like to be clear on something, Chair. We don't have an agenda that says "period for questions" or something. I put a motion on the table. I put a motion on the table. I had the floor. You gave me the floor. I put a motion on the table. I want it cleared from a protocol point of view. You can't just dance around and say, "Well, I'd really like this to happen first." So I put a motion on the table, yes? Is that a valid motion?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I will ask the Clerk to answer your question if you'd prefer the protocol.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Yes. Mr. Yakabuski, you did say that you wanted to move to the vote. The Chair quickly checked with the committee and no one else has any further questions. Ms. Bell has asked for a five-minute recess to consult—

Mr. John Yakabuski: Which came after my motion.
0950

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Yes. It's not a motion from her; it's asking if there's agreement from the committee. If there's not agreement from the committee, then we would be moving to the vote on the bill itself.

Mr. John Yakabuski: I understand that, but I was a little concerned about the Chair's reluctance to recognize the motion as opposed to continuing with what she seemed to want to do. We have rules here, too, and I should expect them to be respected.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I again will defer to the Clerk.

Clerk, if I made an error, I would be glad to rectify my error.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): In your motion, you said that you wanted to move to vote. It's akin to doing public hearings, followed by clause-by-clause. The questioning part is the public hearings part on the bill, and then the clause-by-clause part is—

Mr. John Yakabuski: They can speak to the motion. The motion is on the table. They can speak to the motion, correct?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): When a motion is properly moved, then yes, members can speak to—

Mr. John Yakabuski: I said I move to vote. That would have been the time—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. So did I improperly—

Mr. John Yakabuski: That would have been the time to say, "Well, Mr. Yakabuski, can you make the motion in a different way?" I moved, "Can we vote?" I would move now to vote. I don't have the verbiage exactly, but paraphrasing, I said, "I move that we vote."

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Vote on what?

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, there's only one thing here today.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I will admit that I am tangled, so I will look to the committee. Mr. Yakabuski has made it more formal and clear that he is moving to,

I'm going to say, advance in the process to vote on the various parts of the bill. Is that—

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, there is no timetable about voting. We had no idea how long this would take.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): So I'm seeking clarification—

Mr. John Yakabuski: That's right.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): —because moving through the normal flow of these bills we discuss, we will have the opportunity to vote on the different sections, if the committee is ready to do that. The committee could also take more time, if the committee felt that there was more time needed. Ms. Bell is looking for a recess to confer with her colleague, who is now sitting across the tables. I am going to hand this back to the committee.

Mr. Mike Harris: Madam Chair?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Yes, Mr. Harris? Although there's a motion on the floor.

Mr. Mike Harris: In the interest of Mr. Yakabuski's motion, while you guys sort out the proper procedure, perhaps MPPs West and Bell could just get together at the back of the room and have a quick conversation. I don't think we need to belabour it, but while you guys work out the proper way about moving Mr. Yakabuski's motion—

Mr. John Yakabuski: We'll keep our powder dry.

Mr. Mike Harris: I guess what I'm saying is that rather than recessing, the conversation could already have been had. If that's okay, while you guys work this out, perhaps the MPPs could go ahead and have a quick chat.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Don't vote without us.

Mr. Mike Harris: We won't.

I guess the question is, is Mr. Yakabuski's motion in order?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I will say that I recognized it as an interest in moving forward. I did not see it as a formal motion, though that has been clarified for me that you are hoping to make a formal motion. So I'm not entirely sure what to do with that at this stage.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Did you want it in writing?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): You could do that. I know that it is the flow of a private bill.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Pardon me?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): That is the flow of how this would unfold. So we would be looking to whether the members are ready to vote—

Mr. John Yakabuski: When was that going to go? At some point, would you say—

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Literally next.

Mr. John Yakabuski: No, but at one point would you have said, "We're now going to vote?"

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): I would have turned it to the committee, if there were no further questions, to ask if members were ready to vote.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Well, at that point, you had said there were no further questions, and then Ms. Bell then raised her hand while I was in the process, if you recall, because all she wanted was the recess. You had said there are no further questions and then she raised the recess, but it looks like we don't need the recess.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. I am going to stay the original course that I had charted, which was that, seeing as how we have no further questions and comments—Mr. Yakabuski, would you like to make a formal motion, or can I continue to ask the members if they are ready to vote?

Mr. John Yakabuski: I move that we vote on the matter before the committee today. If that's the formal—I don't have the wording that is necessary. I move that the committee vote on the business put before them today.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Thank you.

Mr. Yakabuski has moved that—but also, I would ask, are all members ready to vote?

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Okay. We're going to go section by section through the bill, Bill Pr25, An Act to revive Superior Corporate Services Limited.

Section 1 of the bill: Are there any questions or comments? Seeing none, shall section 1 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 1 is lost.

Moving on to section 2: Are there any questions or comments? Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour of section 2? All those opposed? Section 2 is lost.

Moving on to section 3 of the bill: Are there any questions or comments? Shall section 3 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 3 is lost.

Moving on to section 4: Are there any questions or comments? Shall section 4 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 4 is lost.

We'll go back to the preamble. Are there any questions or comments? Shall the preamble carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The preamble is lost.

Are there any questions or comments on the bill title? Shall the title carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The title is lost.

Regarding the bill as a whole, are there any questions or comments? Shall the bill carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The bill is lost.

Shall I report that the bill not be reported to the House?

MPP Jamie West: It's the opposite, right?

Mr. John Yakabuski: Can we maybe get counsel or the Clerk to explain this to them?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): Thank you, Mr. Yakabuski.

Clerk?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): Typically, if you vote in favour of the bill, you would ask that the Chair report the bill back to the House, as amended or in its original form.

When you vote down every section of the bill, it's more of a formality to say that you're reporting to the House that the bill not be reported. So you're getting it out of committee, but you're telling the House that you don't want the bill to proceed any further.

Mr. John Yakabuski: So we would not report?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Christopher Tyrell): The question was, "Shall I report that the bill not be reported?" Yes.

Mr. John Yakabuski: So that's what we're voting for, then.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): In that case, shall I report that the bill not be reported? All those in favour? All those opposed? That is carried. I shall report that the bill not be reported.

I thank everyone who came to make presentations today to the committee. I thank you for making the trip to Queen's Park.

I excuse the applicants and interested parties.

As far as the members of the committee—some house-keeping items, folks.

Members will recall that MPP Collard sent a letter to our committee pertaining to the Legislative Assembly's broadcast system. The committee directed me to forward her concerns to the director of broadcast and recording services, requesting an answer. A letter was received from the director and was shared with all members. You should have received that; let us know if you did not. I am seeking guidance now on how the committee would like to proceed with that matter. Was the committee satisfied with the response? Do you want to forward the response back to MPP Collard for her consideration? Would you like the director to appear? Or does the committee have another plan for that?

Mr. Harris?

Mr. Mike Harris: I would be interested to get Madame Collard's comments on it and then proceed from that point.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): In that case, would the committee want to share the letter that was received from the director with Ms. Collard and take it from there?

Mr. Mike Harris: I believe so.

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): There's nothing further? In that case, that is handled. Any further discussion to that point? Okay.

Second, as an update to the committee: You'll recall that this Thursday was originally going to be a—we had invited the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, for their representative to join us, and they were not able to, so an invitation letter was sent to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs looking to reschedule. I don't think we heard back—no. We had invited them for Tuesday of next week in the same time slot and as of yet are awaiting a response. So I don't know how best to tell you to schedule things—but recognizing that that is the invitation.

Ms. Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Help me out here. Does that mean we're not meeting on Thursday at 9 a.m.?

The Chair (Ms. Jennifer K. French): We were never going to be meeting on Thursday at 9 a.m. Our regular schedule is Tuesday at 9 a.m. and then Thursday from 1 until the committee ends, unless we make an exception. So that was originally going to be on Thursday afternoon. As it stands now, unless the committee has further business, that is not a scheduled time slot this week.

If there's no further business, this committee is adjourned until Tuesday, June 6. We will let the committee know if we hear from the ministry or not. Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 1002.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chair / Présidente

Ms. Jennifer K. French (Oshawa ND)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Matthew Rae (Perth–Wellington PC)

Ms. Jessica Bell (University–Rosedale ND)

Ms. Jennifer K. French (Oshawa ND)

M^{me} Dawn Gallagher Murphy (Newmarket–Aurora PC)

Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

Ms. Christine Hogarth (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)

Mr. Ted Hsu (Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles L)

Mr. Graham McGregor (Brampton North / Brampton-Nord PC)

Mr. Sam Oosterhoff (Niagara West / Niagara-Ouest PC)

Mr. Matthew Rae (Perth–Wellington PC)

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)

Mr. Stéphane Sarrazin (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell PC)

MPP Jamie West (Sudbury ND)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

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

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Christopher Tyrell

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel