



ISSN 1180-4335

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**
Second Session, 37th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**
Deuxième session, 37^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 7 November 2001

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 7 novembre 2001

**Standing committee on
government agencies**

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Subcommittee reports

Rapports du sous-comité

Intended appointments

Nominations prévues

Chair: James J. Bradley
Clerk: Donna Bryce

Président : James J. Bradley
Greffière : Donna Bryce

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.

Copies of Hansard

Information regarding purchase of copies of Hansard may be obtained from Publications Ontario, Management Board Secretariat, 50 Grosvenor Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone 416-326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

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.

Exemplaires du Journal

Pour des exemplaires, veuillez prendre contact avec Publications Ontario, Secrétariat du Conseil de gestion, 50 rue Grosvenor, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : 416-326-5310, 326-5311, ou sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
3330 Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W
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
3330 Édifice Whitney ; 99, rue Wellesley ouest
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400 ; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Wednesday 7 November 2001

Mercredi 7 novembre 2001

The committee met at 1004 in room 151.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

The Chair (Mr James J. Bradley): We'll call the meeting to order. The first item of business is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Thursday, October 25, 2001.

Mr Bob Wood (London West): I move its adoption.

The Chair: Mr Wood has moved its adoption. Any discussion? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The second is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Thursday, November 1, 2001.

Mr Wood: I move its adoption.

The Chair: Its adoption has been moved by Mr Wood. Any discussion? All in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

GLEN CAMELFORD

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Glen Camelford, intended appointee as member, Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario, complaints committee and discipline committee.

The Chair: Our first appointment to be reviewed today is Mr Glen R. Camelford, intended appointee as member, Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario, complaints committee and discipline committee.

You may come forward, Mr Camelford. I presume you have been briefed to know that if you choose to do so—it's entirely up to you—you may make an initial statement to the committee and then representatives of each of the three parties represented on the committee will have an opportunity to address questions to you. Welcome to the committee, sir.

Mr Glen Camelford: Thank you for inviting me to attend this examination to consider my appointment as a lay member to the Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario.

My opening statement: I believe that the combination of my professional experience plus my formal training and education makes me a credible candidate for the appointment as a lay member of the Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario.

During my career as a financial professional, I have held a number of progressively responsible positions in industry, moving through from controller to director of finance and secretary-treasurer in industries of equipment fabrication and paper conversion. My responsibilities as a financial manager have included, but are not limited to, the management of issues such as project management, systems implementations, change management and business systems needs evaluations, in addition to all of the normal financial and fiduciary responsibilities that go with that type of position.

My professional status is that of a certified management accountant, and through the years I have maintained a practice of continuous learning. In addition to the numerous courses that I have taken, ranging anywhere from team building, process evaluation, project management and on and on, I have recently gone on with my formal training and have earned a master's of business administration through Athabasca University and graduated in the spring of the year 2000, probably giving new meaning to the word "mature" student.

Since then I have started my own business as a management consultant with a focus on process evaluation and improvement and business performance measurement within private sector manufacturing and distribution operations.

I am married with three grown children, all of whom have moved out and are established by themselves, and I am presently living temporarily in Bowmanville, Ontario.

My community focus has included being one of the founding directors of Whitby Housing, a non-profit organization dedicated to providing suitable accommodation to the socially disadvantaged.

I would describe myself, in addition to my professional experience, as being hard-working, analytical, a team player and, above all, having good, sound ethical values.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that my broad business experience, my current technical training and professional standards make me a suitable candidate for the appointment in question.

I am confident that with an appropriate amount of training by the Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario, I would be a strong contributor to the necessary evaluations that would be brought before the tribunal.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you. I welcome any questions you may have.

The Chair: We're going to continue the rotation from last day. I'll commence with the third party in this case, if the third party wishes to be commenced with, and that will be Mr Martin.

Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie): Thanks for being here.

The Chair: Sorry to surprise you, Mr Martin.

Mr Martin: That's OK. We'll do our best here to ask some good questions and find out if we think that you're worthy of our support in terms of this important appointment.

We take our role here quite seriously in vetting and making sure that the government is appointing people who understand the challenge in front of them and bring to the job a broad understanding of what needs to be done; and also to get some sense of why it is you would want a position such as this given the array of public service one can do in this day in one's community. So the first question is, why this position and not others, given that you have a very impressive background?

1010

Mr Camelford: The reason I have considered this position and would look to have this position is really threefold. One is an opportunity to continually hone my skills in process evaluation and root cause analysis. That's my personal professional development perspective. I'm also looking forward to periodically working with a group of like-minded professionals. Third, but certainly not least, I want to be able to provide some measure, in a way, to serve my community in a larger perspective.

Mr Martin: This appointment will require you to understand, on one hand, the business that insurance represents. It's quite significant in today's world, because we all seem to want and need insurance for everything. It will also require you to understand the very real human circumstance and difficulty that people get themselves into, and the balance between challenging the insurance company to live up to its commitment to provide that service and support it's been paid to provide and, on the other hand, making sure that brokers and others are acting ethically.

In the material that was provided for us it was indicated that there were a significant number of brokers challenged every year in the industry and found to be short. Do you have any idea what kind of issues this represents? What is your experience and knowledge of that part of this job?

Mr Camelford: I gather from that there were probably several questions that you've posed to me.

Mr Martin: Yes.

Mr Camelford: Let me go back to expand on my understanding of the insurance industry. I have not made it a primary study in my education to understand the industry per se at this point. However, I certainly have the ability to do research and to learn about the unique particulars of a particular industry.

As a user of insurance services throughout a good number of years as a professional, I have been aware, from a consumer perspective, of what the insurance industry means and its impact on an organization by way of a financial professional discharging their responsibilities to ensure their corporation is held safe. So I have a very high regard for the complexities and the impact that this industry can have on individuals and corporations.

In terms of dealing with the business issues, the issues themselves, I understand that each and every issue needs to be reviewed on its own merits and needs to be thoroughly researched and understood before any type of conclusions could be drawn or any type of recommendations could be made.

From what I've read to date, by way of the public information available from the Internet on RIBO, I've only been able to see the one- or two-line synopsis of individual cases that have been identified and presented. I certainly do not pretend to have any deep insight as to the root cause and effect. That's only illustrated by one or two lines of statement within this presentation on their Web site. But I can assure you that as a financial director, and having had substantial staff and dealing with many other stakeholders within a corporation, I have had practical experience in dealing with individuals and even with departments that have not moved or behaved in concert with the standards and practices of the organization. In other words, I've also had to deal with disciplinary measures as a senior financial person and have brought to that type of analysis all of the skill sets by way of doing a full process evaluation, of understanding the root causes and hopefully understanding some of the motivation that may have caused an individual to behave in a particular manner.

Mr Martin: It is certainly an issue today, more so than I've seen in a while, and I've been in this job for over 11 years now. We get people coming in who feel aggrieved by decisions of insurance companies not living up to commitments that were made. Our fear is that we will make appointments to these boards that will be supportive of what you often hear from the government in this day, that we just have to get out of the way of business and let them do their business, let them make money, let them be successful and let them generate profit. Anything that gets in the way is now called red tape. That has taken on a very negative connotation.

There used to be a time that we considered red tape to be regulation to protect people. That had arisen out of circumstances where people weren't protected and got hurt, so we put in place regulatory regimes to make sure that doesn't happen again. We see more and more an elimination of those regulations and setting the table for a free-for-all, like the Wild West. "Business, come on in. You can operate here in a fashion that you can't in other jurisdictions," because we've done away with all of the challenges that are out there.

For example, in my office, one of the issues that continually comes at us now is the issue of people, on the

first application, being automatically turned down. The sense is that if you turn people down, I suppose from a business perspective, the frivolous ones go away. But you also, in my view, in the experience from my office, recognize that there are a whole lot of very legitimate applications put in that also get turned down, and people simply don't apply again because they're intimidated or frustrated or think, "I guess I didn't qualify," and then walk away from that. It seems to me that's driven by the head office attitude.

Having said that, it's also an attitude that seems to be creeping into some of the insurance vehicles that government has at its disposal to help and support people in time of difficulty. They seem to be taking on that same view. What's your view on this issue of "First time around, we deny"? Would that be something you think this board you're being appointed to might want to be sensitive to or take up in some serious and significant way?

Mr Camelford: I don't think I'm at liberty to talk in terms of the overall strategy or business practices of the insurance industry per se. I think if somebody were impacted, by way of a complaint brought forward, I would probably envisage that would be within the jurisdiction of the council that I'm applying to become a part of.

I think to answer that, each complaint would have to be weighed on its own merits, whether a person has been unduly denied access to insurance. Maybe if there is a departure from a standard, a departure from a policy, it would then probably come within the jurisdiction of the council.

1020

Mr Martin: What would your personal view be of this approach to doing business, which basically says that the first time around most people are possibly trying to take advantage of the system and so we'll automatically deny them to see if they're really serious and will do the work to come back the second time? Is that an approach you would support?

Mr Camelford: I would have difficulty answering whether that's an approach I would support. It would depend obviously on the criteria on which the application is being made. If it's an arbitrary dismissal, then I would have difficulty with it. If it were a dismissal by way of standards and/or criteria, then it would probably be agreeable.

Mr Martin: You see, my—

The Chair: Mr Martin, I hate to tell you that just when you're having a good time, the time ends. Your time has concluded, and we move to the government.

Mr Wood: We will waive our time.

The Chair: Mr Wood has waived the government time, so we come to the official opposition. Mrs Dombrowsky.

Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Good morning, Mr Camelford. Thank you for taking the time to be with us this morning. We certainly appreciate the background you have provided to us.

From time to time we do have intended appointees who provide some information about some political interests they may have or political experience they may have in their background. Would you have any? Would you be a member of a political party? Would you be involved with a political party at the present time?

Mr Camelford: The answer to both those questions is no. I am not a member of a political party, and I'm not active in one.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Thank you very much. You indicated in your comments to Mr Martin why you looked to have this position, so perhaps you could tell us this morning about how it is that you've come to be an intended appointee for this council.

Mr Camelford: Certainly. The minister's office contacted me and advised me of that opportunity.

Mrs Dombrowsky: The minister's office contacted you. How would they have received your name? Have you indicated in the past that you might be inclined to consider such a role? Have you spoken with members of the government?

Mr Camelford: It would be known that I have gone into private practice, and obviously the minister's office would have seen that I would have the skills and background to make a credible candidate.

Mrs Dombrowsky: I believe that perhaps you do have those skills. But I would suggest, with respect, that certainly there are many people who would possess similar or the same skills. I'm just curious how it is that individuals are identified within communities for such a call, and would then come as appointees, particularly when you suggest to me that you have not had any political involvement of any sort. I am just curious about how that would have happened.

Mr Camelford: It's possible that the minister knows of me from our church affiliations and also possibly from my work on other boards within the community.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Can you identify the minister, please, the office that contacted you?

Mr Camelford: It was the Minister of Finance's office that contacted me.

Mrs Dombrowsky: I see. Thank you very much.

With regard to the background you provided to us, it indicates that you had a role with Paxar Canada until the year 2000.

Mr Camelford: That's correct.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Are you employed at the present time?

Mr Camelford: I am self-employed as a management consultant.

Mrs Dombrowsky: OK. Also in the background that we have provided, you are aware that an appointment to this council is a quasi-judicial role, so you are required to make recommendations that will affect the lives of individuals involved. I would suggest that really is a role that carries with it a great deal of responsibility. Have you had any previous experience with a quasi-judicial body where the decisions you made as an individual

would profoundly impact the lives of an individual, their family or a group of individuals?

Mr Camelford: To answer that, I would refer to my work in a corporate setting and as a senior financial executive, inasmuch again of having to exercise a review of performance of an individual and/or review a new fraction of the corporate policies and procedures. By doing so, I would say I have acted very much in a quasi-judicial setting, because obviously the decisions I've had to make on occasion have certainly impacted an individual's livelihood.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Thank you very much.

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North): Good morning, Mr Camelford. Welcome. Obviously part of the discipline committee is to make sure business is being conducted in an appropriate fashion so consumers are protected. That's one of the important roles. Are you familiar with that role? Have you got any awareness yourself of certain examples of situations where there has been misconduct, or have you done any research even in terms of the particular role you're hoping to take on?

Mr Camelford: Yes—probably to both of those. The research I've done, as I mentioned earlier, has been limited to a review of the documentation, which is in the public domain, issued by RIBO. I can read through it, and I have enough business experience to somewhat understand, within the one or two sentences that have been presented on each and every case, and have some idea as to what may have been the issue at hand.

Mr Gravelle: Fair enough. I'd like to hear your thoughts on insurance rates in general. You've made reference obviously to being a consumer yourself, as most of us are. I think Mr Martin alluded to it as well, certainly in terms of getting people contacting us in our constituency offices, if not down here, related to the fact that they feel unfair rates are being charged. I've certainly got some examples in my own part of the province, which is northwestern Ontario, in terms of extraordinarily high rates that are being charged to logging truck operators, independent owner-operators, essentially on the basis that they could qualify to some degree as a high risk, but they're also being classed in a general sense—I think they're all being treated as if they're poor drivers, and they shouldn't be.

What are your thoughts in terms of how the insurance industry works in that sense? Do you think it's appropriate to simply classify groups of experienced drivers with good driving records as being high-risk because they drive a certain vehicle, and therefore their insurance rates should be extraordinarily high, or do you think there should be more fairness in the system? It seems to be very difficult to get to the insurance companies. I must admit I've written my share of letters and tried to get ministers involved in this particular issue. I'd love to engage in a conversation about that.

Mr Camelford: Thank you for your thoughts on insurance pricing. I quite candidly have not done a full business research, and I'm not qualified to comment on

the pricing practices and policies or cost structures of the insurance industry per se. I'm not sure whether issues of that type would come forward to the council I'm looking to serve on. I'm not so sure I would see that as an issue I would have to—

Mr Gravelle: No, it probably wouldn't. You're right. I'm not so sure it should, but I was just curious about your personal thoughts on it.

As a lay member of the group, do you think the makeup of the board is appropriate, in terms of the way it's set up?

Mr Camelford: Yes, I do. I believe the council would have appointed individuals who have high integrity, and I think there's an equitable makeup between members from the Registered Insurance Brokers Association and lay members.

1030

Mr Gravelle: You got called by the minister's office. Were there other agencies, boards or commissions you were interested in, or were you called specifically about this appointment?

Mr Camelford: I was advised of this particular appointment.

Mr Gravelle: Thank you, Mr Camelford.

The Chair: That's convenient, because your time has expired.

Mr Gravelle: I sensed that.

The Chair: You sensed that, did you? You actually had about 15 seconds to go.

That completes the questioning. Thank you very much, sir, for being with us. You may step down, and we'll move to our next appointment.

Mr Camelford: Thank you very much, indeed.

GEOFFREY GROSSMITH

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Geoffrey Grossmith, intended appointee as member, Ontario Film Review Board.

The Chair: Our next intended appointee is Geoffrey Grossmith, intended appointee as member, Ontario Film Review Board. You may come forward, sir. As you know, you are entitled to make an initial statement if you see fit, and then questions will come from the three political parties who choose to ask. Welcome, sir.

Mr Geoffrey Grossmith: Good morning, Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.

It is with great pleasure and some trepidation that I present myself to you this morning for your consideration for the Ontario Film Review Board.

I'd like to fill in some blanks on my background, if that's OK. I'm a veteran, having served overseas with the RCAF as aircrew. On discharge I attended the University of Alberta, Calgary branch, and I graduated in aeronautical engineering. I joined A.V. Roe at Malton and held a position as senior flight test engineer for a number of years.

In 1956, I was appointed to the Etobicoke planning board and over a period of 25 years served as a member,

vice-chairman and chairman. I also served as a member of the Metro planning board.

I've owned and operated an advertising agency for five shopping centres in Metro. I've also owned and operated a two-branch travel agency. Presently, and for the past 15 years, I am engaged as a real estate agent.

I've lived in Toronto all my life, except for a couple of trips with the service.

More personally, I'm the father of five children, aged 51 to 12, and I recently became a great-grandfather.

Having survived my first three children during the 1950s, I'm happy and proud to say they are respected and professional citizens. My oldest son once told me that the best thing I ever taught him was responsibility. I've tried to live up to that wonderful endorsement as a parent and am now faced with raising two children, aged 12 and 13, in a totally different environment than the previous children.

The multifaceted media of today presents a much more intensive and, in some cases, alarming picture of life to everyone. I feel foremost my family responsibility and a commitment to the public of standards of acceptance. If we are to continue to live and grow, then these standards must prevail.

I look forward to the opportunity to serve on the Ontario Film Review Board and to contribute a positive effort based on my varied experience. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We commence the questions with the governing party. Mrs Marland.

Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South): Good morning, Mr Grossmith, and welcome to the committee.

I'm intrigued with your background, only because I'm just a little private pilot with a float endorsement and I'm fascinated that you were in the bomber command in 1945. Knowing that you were a flight test pilot with A.V. Roe, I guess you must have known Jan Zurakowski at that time.

Mr Grossmith: I flew with him many a time.

Mrs Marland: You flew with him?

Mr Grossmith: And he never scared me once.

Mrs Marland: Well, he scared me once, I can tell you.

The fact that that's your background probably makes me wonder why the film board would interest you. Certainly you'd have the courage to sit through some of the garbage that this film review board has to review, both violence and terrifying stuff, plus really objectionable, distasteful material. I once saw the outtakes film they produced, an hour of all the stuff they'd cut out in the last six months. What you're offering to do in the service of the public is quite amazing, and I commend you for being willing to do. Frankly, I couldn't do it.

You mentioned, in talking about your family, about standards to bring children up in to become responsible adults. But I'm still intrigued about why you would accept this particular nomination to the film review board when it will not be an easy challenge for you at all. It's

very commendable, as I say, that you're willing to do that on behalf of our Ontario citizens.

Mr Grossmith: I don't know if it has any bearing, but my background—when I say my background, my grandfather and father were in the thespian field. It never bit me as such, but I've always had an interest in the acting profession. That's number one—I guess the fire within is still there.

But I think basically that if I hadn't had a second family—and I hesitate to say this—I perhaps would not have had as much involvement and interest in the products that are produced today. But having two small children, I'm in the fortunate position of looking at both sides here. It's incredible today what these children are exposed to, and I felt that although I was a member of ratepayer organizations and political organizations, my contribution to being a father was to make sure these children are exposed to the best they can possibly get, and today is not the best.

Mrs Marland: That's very commendable, and I certainly thank you on behalf of my constituents. I think it's marvellous that you're willing to serve—again. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Marland.

Mr Wood: We'll waive the balance of our time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Wood. Our first questioner for the official opposition will be Mr Gravelle.

Mr Gravelle: Good morning, Mr Grossmith. I want to follow up on some of the questions from Mrs Marland. But first of all, how did you manage to get this appointment? Did you seek it out, or were you called about it?

Mr Grossmith: No, I looked for it. I have some friends left over from 1963, when I ran for the government, and I still have some friends in Parliament and the Legislature, and when speaking to them I guess I expressed my concern on a number of things. They're familiar with my concerns in the planning end of it—proper distribution of homes and factories and what-ever—but personally, the family is what concerned me. In speaking with one of them in particular, I guess the subject came up and it was suggested that the film review board could serve as a table for me to sit at and do some work with.

Mr Gravelle: Who did you get the call from, then?

Mr Grossmith: He didn't call me; I know him. Morley Kells.

Mr Gravelle: OK. Are you a supporter of Mr Kells? You're a friend of Mr Kells, obviously.

Mr Grossmith: I met him through my sojourn on the Etobicoke planning board—he was a member of council—as well as Chris Stockwell's father, and I know Chris too. That's the thing that started me thinking about doing something about today's entertainment industry.

Mr Gravelle: As Mrs Marland said, it's a very interesting position to be taking on, and it's not an easy one in terms of what you're viewing, there's no question, in terms of some of the things. Having said that, I believe there are some wonderful films out there as well that often don't get the audience they deserve.

Community standards really end up being a very interesting point to define. How does one define community standards? You're obviously in an interesting position in terms of your family. With children, one 51 and younger children, you've perhaps seen all aspects of it. But are you a filmgoer yourself? Are you someone who has a strong sense about what defines a quality film?

Mr Grossmith: I guess, going back to, say, my thespian background, if I had the money and the time, I would be in a show every day. I just love movies. I can remember Ben-Hur, and I'm talking about the first one, the silent movie.

Mr Gravelle: I remember the second one. I got the 1957 one.

Mr Grossmith: That's how far back I go.

1040

Mr Gravelle: That's a long way back.

Mr Grossmith: I thought the guy who was adrift on the island was a terrific film, well acted and things like that, and a good lesson for children to have a look at as self-reliant and what have you. I don't frequent the movies that much because they're a lot of money, but I do see some on television and I'm selective in that respect. You can't be selective when you go to the show. You pick your show and you go to it, but with television I am selective in what I watch and I hope what I try to instill in my children to watch.

Mr Gravelle: But would you agree that community standards are a shifting reality, that they have changed in the last—I think they change all the time, but certainly we live in a society now where community standards would be differently defined than they were 20 or 30 years ago.

Mr Grossmith: Like night and day.

Mr Gravelle: Do you have a strong sense about the kinds of films or the kinds of scenes—one of the things that is often commented on is that sexual content would certainly get a restricted rating but many violent films will be deemed OK for young people to see. Is that something you've given some thought to as well? A lot of people think that often the violence is something we should be watching out for more carefully.

Mr Grossmith: Not to not answer it, but I think the onus lies with the parents to begin with. But failing that, yes, there have to be some restrictions or permission granted to the public to view these. I don't have my feet stuck in the sand as far as anything like that goes. I'm prepared to look at it and I'm prepared to judge it, again based on the fact that I am now exposed to modern-day kids. It's a big decision to have to make, but I'm not buried in sand in my decisions. I can be flexible.

Mr Gravelle: Are your younger children on the Internet? Do they use the Internet a great deal, or at least use computers a great deal?

Mr Grossmith: I don't have a headache from my halo fitting so tight, but I said to them—they were talking about the Internet and a friend of one of them said that their mother puts a lock on the Internet. I said, "I'm not putting a lock on the Internet. I want you to realize what

you're looking at and what is good and not good. If you don't know, ask me." So in answer, I hope, to your question, yes, they view the Internet. They don't go to raunchy movies. They do see some on TV, and I've got an eye on them and I kind of try to explain to them. I don't try to forbid; I try to explain to them what the problem is, if they're going to watch this and form an opinion.

Mr Gravelle: There's an issue related to video games. With that, I'm going to pass it on to my colleague Mrs Dombrowsky.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Good morning, Mr Grossmith. As children's critic for our party, I think the role of the review board is very important, particularly as it relates to reviewing material that would include abject violence. I believe that as a society we need to do all we can to limit the presentation of that sort of violence, because it leaves impressions with children that I think sometimes result in subsequent behaviour, and it's behaviour that they view without any tempering.

Another form of access to this kind of material is through video games, not through film. Video games have become increasingly more violent. As a mother, that's something I am very concerned about. While there is not legislation in Ontario at the present time that would include video games under your responsibility, do you have an opinion as a parent? I think you and I have children of the same age. I would expect that you probably have the same concern that video games might be rented in your home that would be very violent in nature. Would you have an opinion about whether the government of Ontario would have a role to introduce legislation that would include video games as a responsibility for the film review board in terms of determining the violent exposure to children? Do you think that would be reasonable? In British Columbia this is something that the government there did consider. The status of that legislation is somewhat in question now, but I would be interested to know what your position is on video games, if you have one, and whether or not they should be considered by the film review board.

Mr Grossmith: In answer to your question, I do think the government has a role, and might I just add also on the Internet, which is literally uncontrollable. You do have some control; the store owner is responsible and things like that. I don't want to legislate ourselves out of our pants, but I do think the government should have some control over what, and identify these particular vehicles that are being rented. I think legislation to instill that is necessary.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Is that a position you would be prepared to press with your friends in the government, for example, that for the protection of our children there should be consideration given to legislation that would include the viewing of video games by the review board?

Mr Grossmith: Yes.

Mrs Dombrowsky: Very good. That would conclude my questions.

The Chair: Any other questions? You have about one minute left. None? Then we move to the third party.

Mr Martin: Good morning. I certainly heard and understand your concern for children from the perspective of a parent. You know that there's a constant debate in Ontario. On one hand, you have people who think that the review board is too lenient, too liberal, accepts a definition of community standard that's too broad, and on the other hand you've got a group out there who are very concerned about freedom of expression, artistic licence, all that kind of thing. There's a constant balance that one has to arrive at, it seems to me. Have you any thoughts for us today that would indicate to us that you understand the other side of that equation, which is the folks out there who feel they need to be allowed both to express themselves in the way they do through their art form and also those who want to see this kind of stuff?

Mr Grossmith: Yes, I think so. I think everyone has a vested interest in it, whether it's from an artistic or a financial standpoint. They're interested in producing something and having it shown to make money. That's the bottom line. I thought my position would be to kind of take an overall view of it all.

May I digress for a moment? We had the same thing when I was on the planning board. We would have a developer who thought he had the best building in the world, but it didn't always please everybody and you had to listen to the other people who were going to be affected or involved with it. I would take the same approach with this particular problem, having regard to the vested interest of some people, whether good or bad, in my view, and keep them in consideration when I'm making the decision which way to go.

Mr Martin: What about your view on artistic impression and people who claim that what they're doing is simply expressing an artistic impression? I think you understand.

Mr Grossmith: Well, everyone's entitled to it. I just hope that it doesn't become too artistic to influence other people. If they want to express themselves, fine, but when it becomes a point of their artistic views influencing other people, then I think we have a role to play in that.

Mr Martin: What about the issue of people out there who don't want other people imposing their moral or ethical standard on what they as adults should have access to or be able to take into their own home and watch, for example, or perhaps go to a movie theatre and see?

Mr Grossmith: That's a tough one. I think that's parental guidance, and individual guidance if it's not the parents. That's a tough one to answer, I think. In their own homes, that's different. If they're not influencing anyone else other than themselves, then I have to be a little bit more liberal in my thinking on that. Did I answer your question?

Mr Martin: Sort of. Yes, you did.

There was an issue not that long ago that still may be brewing out there; I'm not quite sure. There were materials coming across the border into Canada that were

seen as acceptable by the gay and homosexual community but were being blocked by others who didn't see it as appropriate. Did you pay attention to that at all? Could you share with me what you thought the issues were and where perhaps you would have come down on that?

1050

Mr Grossmith: No, truthfully, I can't be specific about it but I am aware of the movement of the gay community to become more acceptable. I'm aware of that. I have my reservations but I also have my feelings on what should be permitted. I'm aware of it but I've not made a big issue out of it myself.

Mr Martin: Just to get a little more personal for a minute, I'm a father of four children, the youngest being 11, the oldest being 17. When we sit down sometimes as a family on a Friday or Saturday night to have a movie with popcorn and the trimmings, our concern is that so many of the movies nowadays that present as acceptable have within them a little piece that just blows you away. You're sitting there watching something with your kids and it's a really nice story, but there seems to be this wont now to stick something in there that's explicit or of a violent-language nature or something. You just want to fast-forward it but you don't know where it is to be prepared for it. Any thoughts about how we might manage that? I know there's a new system in place now. Where it used to be AA and R, it's now 14A and 18A in terms of going to the movies, which I think is good.

Mr Grossmith: You're saying that should apply to the—

Mr Martin: Yes. What about videos when you're bringing them home and trying to get a handle on that?

Mr Grossmith: From a personal experience, the last two videos they rented, I was quite surprised. The boy picked Joan of Arc, which I thought was really artistic. He had a lot of questions as a result of that. The girl—she likes to laugh—picked *Animals*. So I didn't have that problem at home. But how to deal with it is a problem and how they inject these saleable innuendoes or language or whatever you want to call it into video is a problem. As I said before, I think we should have a better look at it and be able to control it.

Mr Martin: Just one other question I'm sure the Chair will have some interest in, and it's around the issue of the WWF. It's a thing that I just have a hard time with. I don't allow my kids to watch that and I fight with them all the time. It's a huge battle every time. I have one kid particularly who loves to watch this, but it's so violent and it's so sexually explicit. There are so many things in it that are so offensive.

Mr Grossmith: Can I ask you a question? What do they like about it?

Mr Martin: It's the action and the pyrotechnics.

Mr Grossmith: So if that were the only problem, it wouldn't be a problem, would it?

Mr Martin: No, but it's everything else that goes with it and the fact that when my son watches any amount of it, we can't calm him down. He's on the roof. He's run-

ning around the house and he's challenging his mother and all kinds of things. But what concerns me, though, is that we have leaders in our communities—the Premier and the mayor of this community—out there promoting this stuff.

Mr Grossmith: And Tie Domi.

Mr Martin: And Tie Domi. We can understand Tie promoting it, I guess, perhaps, but the Premier and the mayor of Toronto? My son now wants to come down. He says, "What's the problem, Dad? Mike Harris and Mel Lastman think it's good stuff. Why shouldn't I be able to go?" I have a hard time explaining to him why it is that we think, as his mother and father, that when he's older and he's living on his own and he makes his own decisions, he can do whatever he wants. Anyway, any thoughts about that kind of stuff? Should we be regulating or censoring?

Mr Grossmith: Not to interpret their reasons, but I think probably they are in favour of it because it sells. Now, what it sells is what concerns you. It sells something that's violent, it sells something that's sexy, as you say, and a little explicit.

Mr Martin: It's diminishing of women, too.

Mr Grossmith: I personally think the whole thing's dumb, but that's my opinion. But, no, I don't know how you would restrict that. It's very popular. The only way I restrict it is I laugh at it and so do my kids. But that's my particular problem; I don't know how to solve it.

Mr Martin: Do you have a message here that I would join you in this morning to the Premier, for example, that maybe he shouldn't be out there promoting this kind of stuff?

Mr Grossmith: Again, I say I think he was promoting it because of the method that's used to promote it. I can apply that method to that glass of water if I want to make a big enough deal of it, but I don't think it's right, no.

The Chair: Have we concluded our questions now?

Mr Wood: We've waived our time.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I appreciate all of the input from members of the committee. Sir, you may step down at this time.

Mr Grossmith: Thank you very much. I've enjoyed this.

The Chair: Some people do and some people don't, so it's nice to hear that somebody enjoyed this experience.

Mr Grossmith: That's life. Thank you again.

The Chair: We come now to the part of the agenda where we deal with the appointments themselves, so we have motions that we entertain. First, we'll deal with the intended appointee as member of the Council of the Registered Insurance Brokers of Ontario, complaints committee and discipline committee, Glen R. Camelford.

Mr Wood: I move concurrence. I might say, we have a couple of young people here from London today as part of our Take Our Kids to Work Day. I'm going to ask for a recorded vote on this so they can see a recorded vote.

The Chair: Would you want to name the people? Are you able to name the people?

Mr Wood: I'm going to do that in the Legislature. I don't want to announce this prematurely. There will be an introduction in the Legislature which I know all members will enjoy.

Mrs Marland: You should probably do it here so you know you're safe, so you've got it on the record somewhere, because you never know what the Speaker's going to do.

Mr Wood: Maybe I better. I think Mrs Marland is right.

The Chair: I should say to the students who are here that, for the purpose of Hansard, so your name is spelled correctly, Mr Wood will read it into the record.

Mr Wood: We have Mira Pavan and Virginia Kane, who go to London South Secondary School in the great riding of London West.

The Chair: We welcome them to the committee today.

Mr Wood: I might say Anita Pavan, one of the parents, is also here.

The Chair: Very good. Welcome to the committee, all of you. You get a good opportunity today to see a committee in action and also the Legislature in action. We hope when you go back, you'll be interested in coming back here again, either as a spectator or as a participant. So we'll go back to the business.

Mr Wood: I've moved concurrence re Mr Camelford and indicated I want a recorded vote.

The Chair: Any discussion? Then we will have the vote.

Ayes

Arnott, Dombrowsky, Gravelle, Marland, Martin, Mazzilli, Wood.

The Chair: The motion is carried.

The second intended appointee is Geoffrey J. Grossmith, intended appointee as member, Ontario Film Review Board.

Mr Wood: I move concurrence re Mr Grossmith.

The Chair: Concurrence has been moved by Mr Wood. Any discussion? All in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

That concludes our dealing with official business. I'm going to ask members of the committee, after we have completed our business, to deal with another matter where I may get your advice, but that will be subsequent to the meeting, if I can. It will take about two minutes maximum.

Mr Wood: I move adjournment of the committee meeting.

The Chair: Mr Wood has moved adjournment. All in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

The committee adjourned at 1059.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 7 November 2001

Subcommittee reports	A-225
Intended appointments	A-225
Mr Glen Camelford.....	A-225
Mr Geoffrey Grossmith.....	A-228

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Président

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord L)

Mr James J. Bradley (St Catharines L)
Mrs Leona Dombrowsky (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington L)
Mr Michael Gravelle (Thunder Bay-Superior North / -Nord L)
Mr Bert Johnson (Perth-Middlesex PC)
Mr Tony Martin (Sault Ste Marie ND)
Mr Frank Mazzilli (London-Fanshawe PC)
Mr Jerry J. Ouellette (Oshawa PC)
Mr Bob Wood (London West / -Ouest PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr Ted Arnott (Waterloo-Wellington PC)
Mrs Margaret Marland (Mississauga South / -Sud PC)

Clerk pro tem / Greffier par intérim

Mr Douglas Arnott

Staff / Personnel

Mr David Pond, research officer,
Research and Information Services