



ISSN 1180-4386

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 38th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 38^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 19 May 2005

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Jeudi 19 mai 2005

**Standing committee on
finance and economic affairs**

Regional Municipality
of Peel Act, 2005

**Comité permanent des finances
et des affaires économiques**

Loi de 2005 sur la
municipalité régionale de Peel

Chair: Pat Hoy
Clerk: Trevor Day

Président : Pat Hoy
Greffier : Trevor Day

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
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
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES**

Thursday 19 May 2005

Jeudi 19 mai 2005

The committee met at 1002 in room 151.

**REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF PEEL ACT, 2005**

**LOI DE 2005 SUR LA MUNICIPALITÉ
RÉGIONALE DE PEEL**

Consideration of Bill 186, An Act respecting the composition of the council of The Regional Municipality of Peel / Projet de loi 186, Loi traitant de la composition du conseil de la municipalité régionale de Peel.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Phil McNeely): The standing committee on finance and economic affairs will now come to order for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 186, An Act respecting the composition of the council of The Regional Municipality of Peel.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments, and, if so, to which sections? All amendments have been filed with the clerk.

The first proposed amendment, number 1, is to be moved by Mr. Hudak.

Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie–Lincoln): Thank you very much, Chair, and a good morning to my colleagues at the committee and those who are visiting from the constituent municipalities and from the ministry. Can you give me a sec, Chair? I was having a preliminary conversation with one of my colleagues, so I need to flip through my binder.

While I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues opposite—all of them very talented individuals—I do want to note with regret that there are no members from Brampton sitting here at the table today. We had brought this up at the hearings in Peel and—

Interjection.

Mr. Hudak: With respect, Mr. Chair, I'm just going to finish my opening comments.

When we were in Peel for the hearings, we were told that those hearings weren't as important and that that was just listening. The actual votes would take place at clause-by-clause on Thursday, May 19. I guess that's where the rubber hits the road. I know Ms. Jeffrey is here in the audience listening. It's good to see you're here at committee. I do regret the evidence that the whip must be holding back the Brampton members from being here to vote and to defend their community against this legislation.

So, Chair, we'll move on with the amendment package, which I know is before me somewhere in my binder. The very first amendment is a good one and one that I'm pleased to move.

I move that subsection 1(1) of the bill be amended by striking out "25" in the portion before paragraph 1 and substituting "26."

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Hudak: Yes, Chair. In fact, I expect Mr. Prue has the same way of trying to work closely with the communities impacted by this bill. This one comes from the city of Brampton. I congratulate Mayor Fennell and her council for the very strong stance against the undemocratic changes to the construction of Peel region if Bill 186 passes. Not only did they make a very strong and convincing argument at committee, but they were good enough to pass on a number of proposed amendments. This would be one that the city of Brampton supports, and therefore I'm pleased to move it and look forward to debate and hopefully its passage to improve the bill.

Mr. Brad Duguid (Scarborough Centre): I appreciate the motion in front of us. I'm assuming that this motion was moved in order to accommodate a subsequent motion to add an additional representative for Brampton. I assume that's where this motion fits in.

I guess to respond first off to the suggestion or the comments about the makeup of our committee today and who happens to be sitting on it, I have some disappointment myself as well on the makeup of the other side, both today but in particular during the hearings where the Leader of the Opposition appeared at one hearing in Brampton to hear one side of the story but never had the courage to appear at the hearing in Mississauga. Frankly, had he appeared in Mississauga, it's quite likely that this approach to increase the representation of one side that diminishes the representation by population of the Mississauga side may not have taken place.

I suggest that what we're trying to achieve with this legislation is balance. We're increasing the level of representation by population, improving the ratio of representation by population, with the additional seat for Brampton and the two additional seats for Mississauga. What this does is go in the opposite direction, taken with a subsequent motion, to add an additional councillor to

Brampton without adding any more to Mississauga. It creates a situation where Mississauga, which is already hard done by in terms of representation by population on any of the models—it makes it even worse. I would suggest that this is a motion that I would probably characterize as anti-representation by population and, given the situation that Mississauga's in now, anti-Mississauga. Certainly I'm surprised to see it here before us today, but it's here and I would recommend that my colleagues vote in opposition to this motion.

Mr. Hudak: Obviously I need to respond to Mr. Duguid's statements. He did this at the committee hearing in Mississauga and Brampton too. He likes to throw a few partisan shots at my leader so in due course I'll respond.

He should know, as I said at the beginning, that this was an amendment recommended by the city of Brampton which I'm pleased to introduce on their behalf. There was a great deal of concern we heard at the hearings about a potential paralysis of the region because there would be an even number of councillors on Peel regional council if this bill were to pass in its present form. That could be a recipe for a paralyzed region and give the chair probably an unenviable position of having to break a lot of ties if people vote along municipal lines. Brampton's amendment, they would probably argue—and they did, at the committee, quite well—would recognize Brampton's potential growth, as well as ensure that that paralysis would not take place.

I was proud that our leader, John Tory, was there for the hearings. It was pretty rare that we ever saw Dalton McGuinty, as official opposition leader, actually get involved with the committee process. Certainly he didn't take the time to appear at committee. I suspect that he won't go anywhere near Brampton or Caledon for a long, long time. When he goes down the 410, I bet he's going to close the windows, lock the doors and duck down in the back seat of his limousine to avoid the controversy he's created in at least that section of Peel.

1010

I don't want to get too political; I just felt like I had to respond in kind to Mr. Duguid's cards. I do think it's an important amendment to bring forward for debate on behalf of the city of Brampton. They've done a lot of work on this. As I've said, as the official opposition critic for this, we have a great deal of concern about the government unilaterally imposing its solution on Peel region. This structure has not even had a minute of debate at Peel regional council. We thought that everything should be done to try to develop a consensus on the structure of Peel council, and we have a great fear that Peel region, which has always been an upper-tier model of governance for regions and even counties across the province of Ontario, now, through Bill 186, faces the grim spectre of being turned into a model of Dalton McGuinty himself: deadlocked, dithering and unable to make a difficult decision.

Therefore, I think it's important to make sure that we have an odd number of councillors on that committee so

we won't have split votes and paralyze the region. While Mr. Duguid made his arguments, I am going to appeal to the sensibilities of my colleagues across and to my left to support this motion.

Mr. Mike Colle (Eglinton–Lawrence): I just have to put on the record something about unilateral imposition. I remember a bill which imposed a form of government on the people of Toronto called the megacity act, which was opposed by 76% of the people of Toronto. They had no say whatsoever. In fact, the people of Toronto, in a referendum, almost unilaterally rejected it. This government proceeded to impose it, against the will of the people. Even beyond that, I remember there was a dictum by the then municipal affairs minister, Mr. Clement, who said that by noon the next day, the city of Toronto would have to reduce its council by half or else.

The member opposite was part of a government that dictated and imposed government solution after government solution on cities all across this province, without any semblance of public hearings or debate, and he has the gall to talk about unilateral decisions? They are the architects of a government that was totally arbitrary, bordering on totalitarian, in the way they dealt with the city of Toronto and its people, who begged for relief from that horrific piece of legislation that imposed a governance upon the people of Toronto that they did not want.

I just wanted to put that on the record, because the member opposite forgets that he voted with that government on every committee and every bill that was proposed that dictated Mr. Harris's will on the people of Toronto and other municipalities, who had no say whatsoever in the kind of local government they wanted. For him to sit there and talk about our government imposing unilateral decisions, after this has gone through a committee process, is a bit of a stretch. That has to be put on the record.

Mr. Hudak: If my colleagues opposite want to engage in that kind of partisan debate, I'm certainly willing to do so. I suspect that's not why people are here from Peel today, but if Mr. Colle wants to make those remarks, I think I should have an opportunity to respond. I do think it's interesting that Mr. Colle, who objected to the City of Toronto Act, now sits quietly and rather meekly in the Dalton McGuinty government, doing nothing to change that. I know there are cabinet appointments coming up, and Mr. Colle is an ambitious and talented individual. Maybe biting his tongue to get into cabinet might be one of the goals here. But I do find it ironic, if he was such a vociferous opponent of the City of Toronto Act, that he's been so quiet on it since he's had the reins of power and an opportunity to do something.

I think the member should have done a bit more of his homework before he came to the committee today, as Mayor McCallion likes to say. He said that there were committee hearings for this bill. I'll remind him that the advertisements for this committee consisted merely of putting up an ad on the legislative Web site and perhaps

the legislative channel, which is hardly a recipe for good and widespread public hearings. I think the mayors of the constituent municipalities had a matter of hours of notice. There's no doubt the government wants to ram this bill through, because Dalton McGuinty knows he's been caught making a number of contradictory statements—in fact, broken promises—when it comes to Peel restructuring.

I'll remind the member, too, that the City of Toronto Act had, if memory serves, about 15 days of public hearings, far more than this government bothered to do for the region of Peel, which I think unfortunately shows a disregard for what the people of the community of Peel had to say with respect to legislation. So the member should be careful in terms of the criticism that he brings forward to committee.

Nonetheless, Chair, if the member does want to stand out and stand up for local democracy, then I think he will support a number of the Conservative Party amendments that reflect what we did here at the hearings, limited as they may be.

The Vice-Chair: I'd just like to tell members that we'd like to focus more on the amendments so that we can get through this today. Is there further debate?

Mr. Colle: I just have to put on the record that we see the headlines today in the paper, which again proves that the member opposite only tells half the story, that our government's prepared to revisit the so-called City of Toronto Act, the megacity act.

The Vice-Chair: I'm sorry, but this is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Colle: Well, I just want to correct the record. We can't have one side putting half-truths on the record, saying that the members of Toronto are not—

The Vice-Chair: I think that's sufficient.

Mr. Hudak: I want to know if the language is in order, Chair.

Mr. Colle: There we go, trying to shut down debate again.

The Vice-Chair: We have to get on with this. Any further debate on the amendment?

Mr. Hudak: I'd like a recorded vote, Chair, to see how Mr. Colle stands on the issue.

The Chair: All in favour of the amendment, raise your hands.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The amendment fails.

We go to amendment 2, and it will be Mr. Hudak.

Mr. Hudak: While, as Mr. Duguid correctly indicated, we did have companion motions to move today, this second motion reflects Brampton's position with respect to the number of seats on Peel council.

I move that paragraph 1 of subsection 1(1) of the bill be amended by striking out "who is appointed" and substituting "who is elected."

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Hudak: I did hear widespread support for this. I don't think I heard—and I'm sure my colleagues will correct me if I'm wrong—a dissenting suggestion that this part of the bill should be amended. The history of Peel region, like I think all regions across the province, has had election of the chair either by members of council or a direct election. The people who spoke to us at committee, particularly from Brampton and Caledon but I also think there was support from the Mississauga hearings, said that we should clearly have in legislation that the regional chair is elected by members of council rather than appointed. The case was made that if it's an appointment, it begs the question of whether that chair could be removed if he or she loses favour with members of council. They wanted it clear as well, as we'll get to later on, that it's for the entire term of council. So I think this clarification will ensure that the regional chair of Peel will continue to be elected by members of regional council.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate?

Mr. Michael Prue (Beaches–East York): I'm not sure it's debate; I just have a question of the mover. The other regional municipalities, most of them, in Ontario have appointed chairs, and I'm wondering why you think that Peel should be different. I am also a little worried about this in terms of the charged atmosphere between and amongst the municipalities of Peel. At this point, an elected chair, with the anointment of a certain mayor, would likely further exacerbate the problems, at least in the short term. I just wondered if you could comment, because I need to know where you're coming from with this.

1020

Mr. Hudak: We heard quite clearly at committee that people from Peel region were concerned about the chair being appointed. Particularly, they worried, if there was a deadlock, that the chair would potentially be appointed by Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Secondly, they wanted clarity in the legislation, to use the term "elected," and by that they meant "elected by members of regional council." They were afraid that the term "appointed" would leave open that the chair would serve only at the behest of the regional council members as opposed to be being elected for the entire term of council. Again I would say that this motion came forward from the city of Brampton, and I believe is also supported by the town of Caledon.

Mr. Prue: So it is your intention that "elected" means by the members of council, not by the general public.

Mr. Hudak: Exactly.

Mr. Prue: OK. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Duguid: I appreciate the motion the member has brought forward. I can assure him that we have actually looked at this issue ourselves. This was brought forward

capably by Mr. Connor, the solicitor for the city of Brampton. It looked rather innocuous when it was brought forward. It's really a case of wording, "appointed" or "elected." At least that's what it appeared on a cursory look.

We have run this by our legal people in the ministry and they've expressed some concerns as to the use of the word "elected" in the context that's it's not in keeping with the terminology used in the Municipal Act. They were concerned about the consistency. They were concerned that it may result in some confusion regarding the method of selection. It may result in unnecessary court challenges.

So while we would have liked to have adopted, in the interest of collegiality, a motion that, at first, we thought was innocuous, we've been advised by our legal staff that in fact there are some legal concerns that have been expressed with it. Notwithstanding the issues as raised ably by Mr. Connor, we understand the concerns that were raised but our solicitors have disagreed with their conclusions. So in order to ensure that there's no confusion, in order to ensure that it's consistent with the language used in the Municipal Act, and to protect ourselves and the municipalities involved from unnecessary court actions, my recommendation would be to stay with the wording the way it is and not support the amendment.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the parliamentary assistant's point of view. I don't know if folks are here from the ministry who can offer more weight to that. It sounds like it's a matter of what the word means in legislation. What members of the government, particularly parliamentary assistants to the ministers, say will tend to hold weight, whether it's at committee or in debate in the Legislature.

Could we just make it clear, for the sake of Clay and others who have presented on this, that the government's intention is still that the regional chair would be determined by an election held among the regional councillors of Peel, and that there is no intention to appoint a regional chair?

Mr. Duguid: I want to be careful about the wording here to suggest anything otherwise. Our intention with this legislation is that the regional chair would be appointed, selected, elected by the regional council. I don't think we can be any clearer than that—the way it has probably been done in the past and the way we expect it to be done in the future.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the reassurances of the parliamentary assistant, who was good enough to come and talk to me before the committee hearings. So I appreciate his thoughts and his description of the government's concerns with this.

Nonetheless, I still plan on supporting it just for clarity, and I believe the city of Brampton did some work on this as well. But it is good to hear that it sounds like there's no intention of the government to appoint the regional chair. I do hope that it's left in the hands of the regional councillors to determine the chair by a direct election by the regional councillors themselves.

Mr. Duguid: I can certainly clarify that that's the case.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The motion is lost.

The third amendment is tied to amendment 1, and I'll ask for clarification from legal.

Ms. Laura Hopkins: Motion number 1 dealt with the number of councillors, and the decision was made by the committee to leave the number of councillors the same. Because that principle was decided by the first motion, the third motion is no longer appropriate.

Mr. Hudak: It's out of order?

Ms. Hopkins: Yes.

The Vice-Chair: It's out of order.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate legal counsel's advice on that. Of course, if it's out of order, we will not be making any debate over it. I just wanted to indicate that that was another amendment that had come forward by the good work of the city of Brampton. That was a companion motion to the first which changed the structure of regional council to being, I think, eight persons from Brampton as opposed to seven, and that would have included the mayor. But I do appreciate that, because the first motion was defeated, it's no longer in order.

The Vice-Chair: The fourth motion is an NDP motion.

Mr. Prue: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections after subsection 1(1):

"Annual review, population increases in Brampton

"(1.1) Each year until the results of the first Canadian census after January 1, 2005 are made public, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall consider whether an increase in the population of the city of Brampton warrants increasing the number of representatives of the city on the council of the regional municipality and, if the increase is warranted, shall take such steps as may be required to change the composition of the council accordingly.

"Full review

"(1.2) When the results of the first Canadian census after January 1, 2005 are made public, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall consider whether changes in the respective populations of the city of Brampton, the town of Caledon and the city of Mississauga warrant changing the number of their respective representatives on the council and, if the changes are warranted, shall take such steps as may be required to change the composition of council accordingly."

To speak to that, we heard much debate about the growing size of both Mississauga and Brampton, but particularly of Brampton. The census, of course, takes place only every 10 years and there is a sub-census every five, which in the case of these two rapidly growing communities—particularly in the case of Brampton—will not adequately reflect the number of people who are coming to that municipality each and every year.

I had an opportunity last night to appear on a television show with the chair of the Peel United Way and she had some really strong statistics that backed up what we heard. The regional municipality of Peel attracts some 30,000 people a year—that's the equivalent of the town of Stratford being added to Peel every year—and the bulk of those, the majority of those, are going to Brampton. We know that it is a very fast-growing city. If we are to wait for the full decennial census before we make any changes, then I think we're going to be doing a disservice to the deliberations here today.

I'm asking the minister, if for some unknown reason he saw fit to review this at this time and create turmoil in that region, then he should be willing to stick his neck out a little bit further and closely and carefully monitor the growth as it occurs. It seems to me to be very patently unfair to wait until after the next census, and then a government may or may not choose to do anything at that point. It's taken 20 years to get us to this stage here today, since the last Peel act was looked at, and I'm afraid if we wait 20 more years and if we don't look at it year by year, the turmoil and the bitterness are going to continue. This is just a safeguard against that. If the government is intent on proceeding—and I have my very mixed doubts about whether this is a good thing to do—then I would at least ask that you have the courage to review your decision on a yearly basis to make sure that what you're doing here today isn't wrong.

Mr. Duguid: I appreciate the motion put forward by Mr. Prue. I will not be supporting it and I will be recommending to my colleagues not to support it as well, for the following reasons.

First, regional councils already have the authority to initiate actions to alter their representation. We fully expect that, going forward, Peel regional council will in fact be able to work together to ensure that when population does shift—and there is shifting; we agree with that—they will have the ability to change their representation accordingly.

Annual reviews, I believe, would be intrusive and destabilizing. If every single year you're going to see potential shifts in representation, that would be very difficult for municipalities to have to continually adjust to.

1030

The power to change wards and boundaries and the number of councillors is found within the Municipal Act, so the power is already there for the region to do that. Of course, it would take a triple majority: a majority of the regional members of council, a majority of the local caucuses in each city, and a majority of regional coun-

cillors making up a majority of the population of the region.

My other concern is how you define steps that would need to be taken. It says here, "shall take such steps as may be required to change the composition of council accordingly." That's what the minister is being asked to do after the census reports. I question how much that may tie the minister's hands and the government's hands in terms of making recommendations, because if taken literally, if there's a census and it tells us that the population has changed and we have to move and reflect the representation based on that population change, Caledon can probably kiss three or four of its current five seats goodbye. They'll probably end up with just one seat, maybe two, if you really looked at it straight out through population. So I'm a little bit concerned about either what kind of pressure—or whether this, in fact, could force the minister to have to adjust those balances in a way that would be very destabilizing for some of those local communities. I'd recommend that we not support this particular amendment.

Mr. Hudak: I am going to speak in favour of Mr. Prue's motion, but I want to set aside my comments to allow Mr. Prue to respond, if he so chooses.

Mr. Duguid: You'd better be careful of the Caledon—

Mr. Prue: It's a little rich. Here the minister is intruding without asking the region of Peel to look at it. They never even had an opportunity to look at it. They were given a *fait accompli*. The mayors were called in to a meeting and the proposal was put down in front of them. That is what's causing a lot of the bitterness.

I do have to tell you that I find it kind of bizarre that the parliamentary assistant will not allow looking at the changing populations. It was very clear to me, and it should be clear to all of you who were in the Mississauga portion, that every single speaker, including the mayor, supports your recommendation as the precursor to secession from Peel. Every single person who spoke said that they like your recommendation because it will allow them to break up the regional municipality of Peel. And that is what you are doing: You are feeding that secessionist movement. I'm not sure that that is in the best interests of the people of Peel.

What I'm trying to do here is assist you in rescuing a very bad bill by making sure that doesn't happen. This will allow additional representation in the non-secessionist areas of Caledon and Brampton as they grow—and they're growing very fast—to make sure that that regional municipality, which has won many and copious awards and been recognized across the country as being probably the best regional municipality there is, does not face further secessionist pressures.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate Mr. Prue's points, and as I said, on behalf of the official opposition, I'll be supporting the motion before us to have a review of the act on populations. Mr. Prue's proposal is more aggressive than the one the official opposition has brought forward, but nonetheless, the principle is the same. I'll remind my

colleagues opposite that, while the parliamentary assistant defends this by saying that there is the opportunity under the Municipal Act for regional councillors to review the set-up of regional council, it is a triple majority, which is a significant barrier to overcome.

Secondly, that principle had existed and exists today for the region of Peel, but the government has ignored that, and has, in fact, abrogated that right of council to bring that up and impose their own solution—again, for the record, a solution that was not brought forward by any of the constituent municipalities and that didn't even have one minute of debate at Peel regional council. I think the minister made up this solution on the fly, in an effort to try to get away from a runaway issue caused by Dalton McGuinty's broken promises not to get involved in Peel governance issues.

Nonetheless, I think because the minister has made an unwise decision to potentially paralyze Peel regional council and turn what Mr. Prue has rightly described as a model municipality into one that I think is in danger of becoming indecisive and frozen, it makes a lot of sense that this should be reviewed. The government may be right: Maybe things will continue to advance and Peel will still be a model region and we'll continue to have growth and prosperity in Peel; I hope that's the case. But the opposition has its doubts, and I think those who came to the hearing had their doubts, about whether this new governance structure proposed by Bill 186 will be successful. I will appeal to the government members to bring forward, if you don't like Mr. Prue's amendment, some motion to have that bill reviewed at some time in the near future to make sure that the new composition of Peel council, first of all, is functioning adequately on behalf of taxpayers, and second, will reflect what we see as significant growth for the Brampton part of the region. Even in your colleague the Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal's growth plan, he makes decisions based on future growth in the Brampton area, which we all know to be rapid.

The last point I'll make—I think there's actually a consensus among the mayors on this principle; maybe not on the amendment, but on the principle. Mayor McCallion did speak that she was very frustrated that, after over 30 years in office, Mississauga did not get more seats on Peel. That was her case, and the government has moved to address that case. But at the same time, she also said that she didn't want to see Brampton caught in that same box, that if Brampton similarly grew relative to the other municipalities in Peel, they would have some way of addressing their seats upward. So I think even Mayor McCallion would like to see some sort of review mechanism, for fairness's sake.

I do appreciate the concerns about Caledon. I think the official opposition has been clear that we don't think that rep by pop is the only principle that upper-tier municipalities should be designed upon. They also need a balance between the smaller municipalities and the larger ones so that the governance structure will look out for the

region as a whole rather than vote strictly on rep by pop. So we do want to make sure that Caledon maintains a strong position on council.

Nonetheless, this amendment, if passed, or a subsequent amendment brought forward by the official opposition, will ensure that at least a review takes place and that we'll have the opportunity to correct what I fear will be a wrong move by the government that could paralyze Peel council.

Mr. Duguid: First off, to correct the suggestion that somehow or another the government took it upon itself to look at Peel and say, "We have to go in there and restructure": Number one, we're not restructuring anything. This is a minor reallocation of seats, of representation—very, very minor. So there's no restructuring going on here at all. Number two, the government was brought into this issue by the very mayors—all three of the mayors had expressed concern about the way Peel had been operating. Peel has operated over the years; it has won awards; it has operated very, very well. But the opposition speak as though the status quo is OK, that there are no problems with the status quo and that everything is fine and rosy on Peel council. That was not the case. There were parties that were boycotting the meetings; they were having trouble getting the work of Peel done. That's why the government was approached to try to do something to get things back working again in Peel.

What we've brought forward is a bill that's balanced, that provides balanced representation to ensure that one particular community cannot rule over the other. It will ensure that there's incentive to bring about consensus. That's why we've moved forward with that.

With regard to the secession of Mississauga, let's be absolutely clear, because the Premier's been clear on this, as has the minister: We are not and have no intention of considering the secession of Mississauga. We have no intention of getting into any kind of major restructuring. The Premier made that clear at the beginning, and we're standing by that now. That's not on; it's not something that we're considering right now. This is a minor tinkering to take into consideration some of the legitimate concerns that have been raised about the representation by population ratios that have been expressed.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the parliamentary assistant's point of view. I do want to take issue with a couple of points for the sake of the record, and maybe we could convince the members of the government to take a contrary point to the parliamentary assistant's.

1040

I don't recall anybody who came before our committee or who expressed concern about Bill 186—even those who spoke in favour of Bill 186—describing it as minor or as minor tinkering. In fact, because the seats are changing, I think the reaction we've seen from the municipalities is that this is a significant change. Even those who support it, while they wanted Mississauga to be outside of Peel and to be a single-tier municipality, did view this as change, and hardly a minor

change. If Mayor Fennell and Mayor Morrison were reviewing these comments or watching here today, you'd probably have to pull them down off the ceiling after hearing the government describe this as a minor change. It hardly reflects the reaction that we've seen from Brampton and Caledon.

I don't mean to belabour that point, but I think it's important to reinforce that in Peel, those who are involved in the governance debate see this as a significant change, and a significant number believe it is a change for the worse. What we witnessed in the Legislature, with Mayor McCallion on one side of the Legislature and Mayor Fennell and Mayor Morrison on the other, may be a harbinger of things to come, in terms of a divided council that will harm Peel's reputation as a model region.

The government, by their intervention and the broken promises of the Premier and the minister, have caused a significant fissure in Peel region. By splitting the votes down the middle 50-50, with Mississauga on one side and Caledon and Brampton combined on the other, we have a very legitimate fear that that division we witnessed in the House will manifest itself at Peel council and harm services like better roads, better police or better public health.

I hope that some members of the committee will support Mr. Prue's motion, because I believe that the principle of reviewing this to make sure that the government has it right is an important principle and should be incorporated in Bill 186.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment—

Mr. Prue: Recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The amendment fails.

The next motion is an official opposition motion.

Mr. Hudak: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections after subsection 1(1):

“Change in composition following census

“(1.1) If, after a census, the combined populations of the city of Brampton and the town of Caledon exceed the population of the city of Mississauga, the heads of council for those municipalities shall endeavour to reach a unanimous decision about whether a change in the composition of the council of the regional municipality is warranted and, if a change is warranted, about the change to be made.

“Same

“(1.2) If the heads of council do not reach the required unanimous decisions within a prescribed period after the results of the census are made public, the composition of the council is changed so that it has the same com-

position as was in effect immediately before this act received royal assent.

“Same

“(1.3) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing a period for the purposes of subsection (1.2).”

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to your amendment?

Mr. Hudak: I would. Following on the principle that was embodied in the motion that was just before us—unfortunately defeated by the government—from Mr. Prue, we are looking for some sort of review mechanism.

My arguments are the same that I made in the previous motion: We are concerned that the new construction of Peel council, if Bill 186 passes unamended, will cause a paralysis in the region. We also want to take the government up on the argument that they have made on growth issues and population: If Brampton grows significantly, reflecting support from all three of the municipalities, the act should be revisited. We propose that it be opened up for review. We used the census as a basis. I'm willing to amend my motion if there's a better measure of population than the census, but I do want to maintain that principle of a review mechanism based on population.

Secondly, I think a goal should be for the three heads of the local councils to develop a consensus position. That should always be the first and foremost point of entry into this debate. I do hope consensus could be reached; if it could not be reached, we would go back to the composition of Peel council as it is today. That would act as an incentive, I believe, for the three heads of council to come to a consensus for Peel seats. That would enable the province to have a local solution as opposed to having the minister's intervention.

Mr. Duguid: Right now, Mississauga has approximately 61% of Peel's population and only has 45% of the councillors on Peel council. The legislation we're proposing gives them 48% of the councillors on Peel regional council. That's an improvement, but hardly excessive. Meanwhile, Brampton and Caledon make up close to 40% of Peel's population and, between them, have about 48% of the seats.

I'm not sure why the opposition are so concerned about a potential shift that may take place down the road, why we should be so conscious of it then when they seem to be opposed to us trying to correct what is an obvious inequity in representation by population now.

We're trying to do this in a balanced way to ensure that no one party on that council can dominate, and what we're proposing will ensure that that happens. It will drive all three municipalities to have to work through a consensual type of approach.

In all practicality, if the population of Brampton and Caledon is going to equal Mississauga's, that won't be for a very long time. There'll be plenty of time for Peel regional council to take whatever appropriate actions they wish to take to make the needed adjustments. If it does reach a stage where they feel that they cannot reach

a consensus and move forward when those population issues come about, I'm sure the government can take another look at it then. But we're talking about a pretty long time from now, so I think this motion is not necessary. In fact, again, I think it strikes at potentially impacting the balance that we've tried to achieve through our legislation.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the parliamentary assistant's comments. I think it's a different viewpoint than the official opposition and the third party and others who came before the committee would take. What you call "balance" we call "potential paralysis." By having an even number of councillors there, divided clearly along municipal lines, there's a great fear that there'll be an ongoing paralysis, evidenced by the debate in the Legislature, manifesting itself on Peel regional council and harming services for taxpayers.

If the government believes that they need to act today based on representation by population, then surely the government would still believe in that principle down the road, and there should be a review mechanism.

I appreciate my colleague's remarks that the census may be too far. We're trying to find some measure of population that people would agree to. If there's a better way, if you can improve this potential amendment to the bill, I'm willing to hear that. It's the principle that's most important to the official opposition. If the government does believe in the rep by pop principle, then surely there must be a review mechanism if that ratio changes.

We all know that it isn't easy to get bills through the House. They do take time. While we regret that this bill has been pushed through without greater consultations with municipalities, we do fear that it may not get on the calendar.

Second, I think that we do, for the record, need to reflect on the ugly bumps this went through initially. The Premier said he would not get involved in the Peel restructuring issue. The minister said they wanted a consensus-based approach. Assurances were made to my colleague from Brampton Centre that things would not be done unless there was a consensus. Then, all of a sudden, Dalton McGuinty and the minister, John Gerretsen, broke their promises and brought this forward. Surely we don't want to repeat that kind of ugly process in the future, no matter who the leader or the minister may be.

Therefore, we should have enshrined in legislation some mechanism to review the seats on Peel council, since the province entered into this debate, in the first place, through Bill 186.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, does the amendment carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The motion is lost.

Amendment 6 is withdrawn.

We go to amendment 7. It's a government motion.

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

"Appointment of chair

"(2) The chair is to be appointed by the members of the regional council who are described in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of subsection (1) and, despite section 458 of the Municipal Act, 2001, subsection 6(3) of the Regional Municipalities Act, as it read immediately before its repeal, does not apply to the appointment of the chair.

"Term of office, etc., of chair

"(2.1) The chair is the head of council and holds office for the term of the council of the regional municipality and until his or her successor is appointed."

1050

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to your amendment?

Mr. Duguid: I'll speak as briefly as I can. This change will clarify that the current chair cannot vote during council actions to appoint the successor chair and that cabinet does not have any authority to appoint a chair in the event of a deadlock at regional council. The authority to appoint the chair of Peel region would rest solely with the locally elected members of regional council, as it should be. This change should clarify that the chair of regional council is the head of council, with the same responsibilities as all heads of council established in the Municipal Act, 2001. The change would clarify that for the council organized following the 2006 election, the term of the head of council is three years, the same as council, and continues until a successor is appointed.

This is a response to some of the concerns that were raised, which were clarifying motions more than anything else.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate that the parliamentary assistant has ascribed this as being to bring clarity to the election of chair and the chair's responsibilities and tenure. My earlier motion was my preferred motion; I had hoped that would go through to clarify that the chair is to be elected by members of Peel regional council rather than appointed. Nonetheless, this is an improvement over the bill as it stands, and I'll be supporting it on behalf of the official opposition.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? Carried.

Amendment 8, Mr. Hudak.

Mr. Hudak: I have had a conversation with the parliamentary assistant as to a potential amendment to the motion, but I'll read the motion as a whole to begin with.

I move that subsection 1(2) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Election of chair

"(2) At the first meeting of the council of the regional municipality at which quorum is present after a regular election, the council shall elect a person as its chair to hold office for the term of the council and until his or her

successor is elected; in case of a tie vote for the candidates, the chair shall be chosen as follows:

“1. The names of the candidates shall be written on equal sized pieces of paper and the papers shall be placed in a box.

“2. The clerk of the regional municipality shall choose a person who, in turn, shall choose one of the pieces of paper from the box.

“3. The candidate whose name is on the piece of paper is the chair of the council.

“Same

“(2.1) A member of the council of the regional municipality or any other person is eligible to be nominated as chair.

“Same

“(2.2) The clerk of the regional municipality shall preside at the first meeting until the chair is chosen.”

This is an amendment that has been kindly recommended by the city of Brampton, again to bring clarity to the election of the chair's position, particularly in case of deadlock. We heard quite often at the hearings a fear that regional council could become deadlocked, where they're split along municipal lines as to who the regional chair should be, and the fear then that that would produce a decision by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to appoint a chair. This is a mechanism that the city of Brampton has brought forward to help break that deadlock, if it were to occur, to make sure there's clarity in the legislation on how to break a tie for the election of regional chair.

Mr. Duguid: With an amendment that I believe Mr. Hudak is going to bring forward to subsection (2.2), we could probably support that subsection. We would be asking for a split vote on each section, because I would recommend that my colleagues vote against subsections (2) and (2.1). With an amendment that was just recommended by legal, we can likely support (2.2). I'll speak to the reason why we can't support the suggestion on how to break a tie vote.

First and foremost, the objective, as I've said in the past, is to try to bring a consensual approach to decision-making among the lower-tier municipalities in Peel on Peel regional council. We feel that, if you provide a way out, as in choosing a name from a hat if they can't reach a consensus, you may end up with a chair that a good proportion, maybe even the majority of council, is not supportive of. To me, that's a way of ensuring, or potentially ensuring, a dysfunctional term of council if a good majority of the council did not in some way, shape or form consent to the selection of a chair.

What we're proposing is—and we're quite confident that Peel regional council will be able to find a consensus—a chair that is probably a little more neutral, that doesn't have the interests of just Mississauga or just Brampton or just Caledon in mind, but instead thinks of the region of Peel as a whole. We're absolutely confident that all parties will be able to come to an agreement on the appropriate selection of a chair, and we would want to leave it to them to do that, because we feel any other

method is going to create the potential, as I said, for a dysfunctional council.

The reason we can support (2.2) with the amendment—I've got to make sure that Mr. Hudak moves that amendment before we can—is that the way it's written now, there'd be an option for the previous chair to preside over a consideration of the election of chair. While I don't think that would be the end of the world, I think it makes a little more sense to have the clerk preside over such a proceeding in case the previous chair is standing again for reselection or re-election as chair. So that's an amendment that we believe is something that would improve the legislation and improve the process. With a slight amendment made to (2.2)—if we can split this into three separate votes—we'd be willing to support that.

Mr. Prue: I really don't see the reluctance in this. The present Municipal Act sets out an identical procedure that is proposed here in the event of a vacancy in a council where there's an appointment being made. Where the council is tied at the end, then the name is drawn from a hat. That's what every municipality in the province does at this point. I don't know whether those of you who were municipal councillors before ever went through such a system, but I certainly did. That's the way the law is, even unto this very day. I don't understand why it would not apply to the regional municipality of Peel in the event of a tie.

I also do not understand the argument that a sizable majority of the council does not support that's been put forward by the parliamentary assistant. This is where the council is tied. It means that there is a sizable portion in favour. It just does not exceed that 50% ratio. It seems that this is a far better scenario than the one that was originally in the bill—having the Lieutenant Governor in Council appoint someone. It certainly allows for the process to be quick and efficient, rather than send the council of the municipality of Peel back to, I guess, vote after vote after vote, which is the other possibility if you do not allow for the process that you have deemed acceptable in 450 other municipalities.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate my colleagues' comments and particularly Mr. Prue's comments. I do think there is a legitimate and broad-based concern that the regional chair's election could be split, could be deadlocked, and therefore the region would become paralyzed. We certainly have seen in the debate today that the municipalities have taken very strong sides on different parts of the bill. As I'd like to illustrate, it came home to roost in the Legislature, with Mayor McCallion on one side of the House and Mayors Fennell and Morrison on the other. I think the councillors are of a similar viewpoint—at least those we heard from.

1100

I really do have a concern that if this bill passes in its current form, there could be a deadlocked vote for regional chair of Peel. The votes are based on municipal boundaries. If Mississauga votes on one side of an issue and Brampton and Caledon on the other, the regional

chair is going to play a very important role in splitting tied votes. In fact, we heard argument at committee that the regional chair of Peel could become one of the most powerful of municipal politicians, or of politicians in general, across the province of Ontario.

I do agree with my colleague. As you can see in the motion we brought forward on behalf of Brampton today, there should be a mechanism to break a tie. Whether you like this one or if there's a better one, there should be some mechanism, just in case, to break a tie. I remind members of the committee that not only the lawyer on behalf of the city of Brampton but the mayor herself brought forward the notion that, under section 6 of the Regional Municipalities Act, there is concern if the Lieutenant Governor in Council were to appoint a chair in the event of a tie. I don't think anybody really wants to see cabinet making that decision; they want to see it determined locally. I do hope that we'll have support for some tie-breaking mechanism—if not this one, which Mr. Prue spoke to very eloquently, then some other.

From a procedural point of view, I appreciate my colleague's suggestion of a friendly amendment to (2.2), and that his advice to the government members is not to support (2) or (2.1). What I would like to do, Chair, if it's OK with you, is still move my motion as a whole. If it passes, then I'm happy. If it doesn't pass, then I will bring forward (2.2), as suggested to be amended by the parliamentary assistant, for a separate vote.

Mr. Duguid: First and foremost, I understand that what Mr. Prue had indicated about the Municipal Act and about the method for resolving a tie vote in the selection of the head of council may have been true at one time, but I believe, in the last go-round of the Municipal Act—my information is that has changed. So in essence, if we were—

Interjection.

Mr. Duguid: It's a small thing. It rarely happens, but my information is that that's no longer the case, which would then mean, in fact, that we would be treating Peel differently if we were to prescribe to them how they were to select the chair.

As I said before, it is extremely important, in this particular dynamic, to make sure that the parties consent on who is chair. Let's speak in very plain language here. If two people are applying for chair and you were to pick a name out of a hat—you might have two candidates. You may have a pro-Mississauga person and a pro-Caledon and Brampton person. There's a 50-50 chance that whoever gets selected would be one way or another way, and then you're looking at the potential for shifting the balance of power.

What we're suggesting is that the sides have to come together and choose somebody who, in theory—I believe it's quite possible to find somebody who is relatively neutral. So I think that's the key there.

Thirdly, the deadlocked vote issue is a red herring. Every council making any decision on appointing anybody has the potential for a deadlock. The key is to put it to those particular representatives to ensure that

they make their decisions in the best interests of the region, which means finding somebody whom they can all live with. That will ensure that there's a functional council going into the future, and that's what we plan to stick with here.

Mr. Hudak: I don't want to belabour the point, but I do need to take issue with the description of this issue as a red herring. I do believe we heard very strong and consistent concerns during the public hearings about the spectre of a tie for the regional chair vote. I would remind the parliamentary assistant that it's the Dalton McGuinty government that has chosen to intervene in this process and has now structured council with an even number of councillors clearly split on municipal lines. This prolonged debate and the broken promises by the Premier have caused a lot of controversy locally, which I think will reinforce the danger of having a split along municipal lines, an even number of councillors, for a 50-50 vote. So I think from the official opposition's point of view, and obviously from Mr. Prue's point of view, we do have that concern.

I don't know if the parliamentary assistant can answer this, or somebody from municipal affairs: How, if the Municipal Act has been updated, is a tie vote for regional chair or warden of a county solved today? Do they just keep voting until it's solved? What's the current mechanism that would take place if the amendment fails?

Mr. Duguid: I can try to respond to that, but I'd be happy to allow legal staff to verify. My understanding is that it's left up to the regional council to determine that.

They are nodding their head that it is up to the regional council to determine how they deal with that. They could, in essence, decide to draw names out of a hat if they chose to, but it's their choice. Maybe we can get a clarification.

Mr. Hudak: Chair, legal counsel here have been watching us, paying rapt attention to the debate. Maybe we could clarify, for the sake of the record, while we're discussing this motion.

The Vice-Chair: Does the committee agree to hear from legal counsel? OK.

Mr. Scott Gray: My name is Scott Gray. I'm a lawyer with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

When we passed the new Municipal Act, effective January 1, 2003, the old provision that provided, in the event of a tie in an appointment, that you draw names out of a hat was removed. The rationale was simply that if councils have to fill the vacancy, they'll find a way of filling the vacancy. They'll make whatever judgments and compromises and find a candidate who can acquire that support. That was the rationale. Councils can have ties, and they have to find a way of breaking them. It's as simple as that.

I think it was a reaction to concerns from municipalities: "We don't need to be micromanaged. We have the ability to make decisions." So we looked through the act and removed as many prescriptive things telling municipalities how to behave as we could, and that was one of them.

Mr. Prue: I have heard of people, even up until recently, being chosen by names out of a hat. I just want to know: The municipalities continue to use the old way if they wish?

Mr. Gray: It's quite common for municipalities to pick a name they want to appoint—they have some kind of debate; names are put forward. If there is a tie, they draw the name out of a hat, and then the name that has been drawn out of the hat is put to council to appoint. It isn't the actual appointment mechanism; it's the method of selecting the name they are going to appoint.

Mr. Prue: So in fact, even though it is no longer in the act, it is still predominantly the way things are done in the event of a tie.

Mr. Gray: Oh, sure. If that's how councils want to continue to operate, they can.

Mr. Prue: Thank you.

Mr. Hudak: Thank you very much for clarifying for us. We appreciate your answer to Mr. Prue.

The other quick question I had for you: Under the Municipal Act as it stands today, does the Lieutenant Governor in Council retain any authority whatsoever for resolving a deadlocked council? Can the minister or cabinet make a decision as to who the regional chair would be, potentially?

Mr. Gray: Our view was that they didn't, but we heard the concerns raised by Brampton that our transition provision—in the new Municipal Act, we say that the composition of all the councils continues. The concern we heard from Brampton was that that includes the method by which people are selected, so that includes that they are appointed by the regional council, and if after a week they can't fill the position, cabinet is the default. I was told, "We don't want that to be a possibility." That's why one of the motions that we produced clarifies that that's not the case, cannot be the case.

Mr. Hudak: That was the motion that we voted on?

Mr. Gray: Motion number 7, yes.

Mr. Hudak: Motion 7 has passed; therefore, to be clear, the Lieutenant Governor will have no authority whatsoever to appoint the chair of Peel region?

Mr. Gray: That's right, yes.

The Vice-Chair: We will now vote on the amendment as originally proposed.

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair: A recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The full amendment fails.

Mr. Hudak, the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Hudak: A new motion, now that motion number 8 has been voted down. I do appreciate the helpful comments of the parliamentary assistant.

I move that subsection 1(2.2) of the bill be amended—sorry; let me be clear for the sake of the record.

I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"First meeting

"(2.2) The clerk of the regional municipality shall preside at the first meeting under subsections 233(1) or (2) of the Municipal Act, 2001, until the chair is chosen."

The Vice-Chair: Do you wish to speak to your amendment?

Mr. Hudak: It's not the so-called whole enchilada. I do appreciate the parliamentary assistant trying to find a friendly amendment to my motion. I think that will bring some clarity for transition provisions, if I follow, on the selection of the chair for the region of Peel.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Hudak: A recorded vote, for the sake of posterity.

Mr. Duguid: That doesn't happen too often.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Duguid, Hudak, Mitchell, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: The amendment carries.

We move to number 9. This is a Conservative motion.

1110

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the support of four members of the government on that last one. Mr. Colle is obviously exercising his right to stand up against the Dalton McGuinty government and fight for something he strongly believes in.

I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection after subsection 1(2):

"Same

"(2.1) If the members are unable to elect a chair after three tie votes, the chair shall be appointed by a majority vote of the heads of council for the city of Brampton, the town of Caledon and the city of Mississauga."

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to that amendment?

Mr. Hudak: Similar arguments, and I'm not going to repeat them, but we are seeking a tie-breaking mechanism of some kind. We thought that if after three tie votes no resolution occurred for the chair, we would then put it in the hands of the heads of council by majority vote to find a candidate who is agreeable for the chair's position. It's just a way, I think, of sensibly resolving a deadlock vote for chair in that eventuality.

Mr. Duguid: We've really been through this already. We're not going to impose an arbitrary method of resolving tie votes on the matter of selecting the chair. We feel that would defeat the objective of encouraging the municipalities to reach a consensus and select a neutral chair.

Mr. Prue: I can't support this. I've been supporting most of the official opposition motions but I cannot support this one. There are 25 members of council, each

one of whom has equal rights. I cannot give three members of that council more rights than others to choose who is there. I think we have to acknowledge in a democracy that every vote counts, and I cannot leave it up to people who exercise a different office, that of mayor in their respective municipalities. They are there acting as regional spokespeople, regional electors, and I cannot support this motion.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate my colleagues' comments. We were trying to find some mechanism to break a tie in case that occurred. The expectation here would be that, with the mayors making a decision after three tie votes, councillors would come to some resolution. I appreciate the concerns. Without meaning any disrespect to all members of council, we were trying to find some basis to resolve a split, if that occurred, and we did have the fear at the time—I appreciate legal counsel's updating us that we may have the Lieutenant Governor in Council make that decision. That was the principle that this motion was based upon.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? In favour? Against? The motion fails.

Number 10 is also from the official opposition.

Mr. Hudak: I move that subsection 1(3) of the bill be amended,

(a) by striking out “before his or her appointment” and substituting “before his or her election as chair”; and

(b) by striking out “upon being appointed as chair” and substituting “upon being elected as chair.”

The Vice-Chair: This is contingent on the second amendment, which lost, so it's out of order.

Mr. Hudak: Yes.

The Vice-Chair: Number 11 is also a PC motion.

Mr. Hudak: I move that subsection 1(4) of the bill be amended,

(a) by striking out “six persons” in the portion before paragraph 1 and substituting “seven persons”; and

(b) by striking out “one person” in subparagraph 2ii and substituting “two persons.”

The Vice-Chair: This amendment depended on amendment number 1, which failed, so it's out of order.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate your ruling. I do want to note for the record that these were companion motions to other motions that were defeated earlier on; I still wanted to bring them forward. I do appreciate the city of Brampton's assistance in crafting these motions as a package.

The Vice-Chair: We will now be voting on section 1, as amended.

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: Carried, as amended.

We're into section 2 of the bill. It's a PC motion, number 12 in our package. Mr. Hudak?

Mr. Hudak: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections:

“School board elections

“(2) Despite subsection (1), if a ward boundary is changed in connection with the implementation of section 1 and a school board is affected by the change, the deadlines under the Education Act and the Municipal Elections Act for the 2006 general election relating to nominations for school board trustees of the affected school board are postponed until the school board has completed any preparations that the school board considers necessary in the circumstances.”

This reflects the presentation at the Brampton hearings, I believe, brought forward by one of the school boards in Peel that expressed concern—I think it was inadvertent—that the potential school board elections would be impacted by Bill 186. I believe this reflects the concerns the school board brought forward. The act, if amended, would allow these school boards enough time to set their own boundaries for trustees.

Mr. Duguid: We recognize that this is one of the issues that was raised at the hearings, and we've taken a very good look at it. That's why we have a motion that's in front of you, motion number 17, that will provide the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing with the authority to ensure that all elections can be properly conducted. We think the government motion would provide the flexibility needed to ensure that the time would be there for them do the coordination of both school board and municipal preparations for the election. In fact, in consultation with them, we feel that while the concerns expressed reflect some of what was said at the hearings, there will be certainly enough time, if this legislation is passed in an appropriate amount of time, to be able to adjust next year. I believe the concerns that they've raised have been accommodated and will be accommodated under the minister's motion.

The message I would give is that I appreciate the concern, but we feel there's more than adequate time.

This is one of the reasons why it has been important that we move this process onward on a pretty timely basis. I know there were some who expressed concern about the speed with which we're moving forward. This is one of the reasons why we do wish to move forward at a reasonable pace on this: to ensure that there is plenty of time for the school boards, the local municipalities and the regional municipality to adjust.

Mr. Hudak: I do appreciate that the parliamentary assistant has obviously listened closely to the school board and is aware of their concerns. That's good to hear.

While the parliamentary assistant does talk about section 4 of the act and giving the minister the authority to get involved in these situations directly, the official opposition does have a great deal of concern about the scope of section 4, which gives the minister a wide jurisdiction into the municipal elections or school board elections. We think that is too great a power, particularly

considering the way this bill was born. Therefore, I will be planning to vote against section 4. I hope that this motion will pass, to ensure that the school board is treated appropriately if section 4 of the bill fails.

1120

Mr. Prue: I'm glad to see government motion 17, because I do have a little bit of a problem with the wording, not with what is trying to be done with PC motion 12. It says "postponed until the school board has completed any preparations that the school board considers necessary in the circumstances." This is kind of open-ended. This doesn't say "at the next full meeting of the school board"; it doesn't say "within a month." It's crafted in such a way that the school board could turn around and say, "We aren't prepared," right up until election day. I agree with you—I want to give them the time—but the way it's worded, unless it were somehow amended, I don't think I could support it. I think the government motion is also weak but I don't think it has the same pitfall.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate my colleague's comments, and I appreciate the support we had from legislative counsel, who worked very hard to help get these amendments forward. I think he knows that in opposition, your resources are somewhat limited; you don't always craft amendments perfectly.

Mr. Prue: Of course.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate your support for the principle. If the government has any friendly amendments so that the principle is enacted, obviously the opposition is open to them. We think it important for the school board to have ample opportunity to prepare for any changes in boundaries for the 2006 election of school board trustees.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? The amendment fails.

That's the end of section 2. Shall section 2 carry? I'll take a vote.

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: Carried.

On section 3 of the bill: government motion 13 in our package.

Mr. Duguid: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by inserting "or the term of office of its head of council" after "the composition of its council."

If I may speak to it, what this change will provide is that, following the 2006 regular election, regional council would have the authority to change the term of office for its head of council to either a one-year or a three-year term in accordance with what's allowed by all other municipalities across the province under the Municipal Act. This would provide Peel regional council with the same flexibility that other upper-tier councils have.

Mr. Hudak: I appreciate the parliamentary assistant's explanation in trying to read through the acts simultaneously. I want to note, though, that the opposition has an ongoing concern that the mechanism for any future changes to Peel council is based upon the standard Municipal Act approach and the triple majority.

While we support that notion in a general sense, these are exceptional circumstances that have been created by the government's intervention and imposition of a number of seats at regional council. Therefore, we feel strongly that, given the dynamic growth in the region, there should be some kind of review mechanism outside of the standard approach since the government has entered into that debate through Bill 186. We want to make sure that those reservations are on the record.

Mr. Duguid: I stand to be corrected, but there was a general perception out there on this in the past that there is a triple majority required to replace the chair. But it's my understanding that that doesn't exist. Legal staff could probably clarify that for us if we require it. We just want to make sure that with this motion, Peel is treated the same way other municipalities are under the Municipal Act.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? All in favour? Opposed? The amendment carries.

Number 14 is a PC motion.

Mr. Hudak: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Power re ward boundaries

"(2) Only a lower-tier municipality may determine the boundaries of a ward in the municipality."

We did hear concern, I believe, from Mr. Connor on behalf of the city of Brampton, among others, about a current lack of clarity under statutes affecting municipalities that may leave open—that in Peel, under Bill 186, the upper tier could set ward boundaries for the lower tier. That would be a significant change from the status quo.

We want to make sure, for clarity in legislation, that Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon would continue to set their own ward boundaries. We believe that this is a power that should be at the local level in a two-tier government.

We hope that for clarity's sake this amendment will pass. I don't think we heard any dissenting opinions on this. It wasn't one of the most prominent issues of debate. Nonetheless, we think it is important and should be reflected in the act.

Mr. Duguid: I'll be recommending to my colleagues to vote in opposition to this particular motion.

Each local municipality continues to have authority to establish their wards under the current arrangement. We don't intend to limit the opportunity for the region of Peel or any other region to perhaps decide one day to go to directly elected regional councillors. If they were to do that, obviously the regional council would have to have the ability to set wards.

I believe that this is the same provision that's available to all regional municipalities across the province under the Municipal Act. I don't think we would want to see Peel treated any differently from its sister regions.

Mr. Hudak: With all due respect to the parliamentary assistant's arguments, we think that Peel region has already been treated differently by Bill 186 and the government.

There's an ongoing concern that I think will abide about a potentially fractured council. Mississauga was very clear that their goal is to become a single-tier municipality outside, obviously, of Peel region. I do respect the fact that Mayor McCallion, her councillors and those who made their presentation have been very consistent in that regard. Nonetheless, I think that reinforces the concern about a divided regional council determining ward boundaries. I believe, particularly under the circumstances that we find ourselves in today with Bill 186, it should clearly remain the prerogative of Caledon, Brampton and Mississauga councils to set their own ward boundaries, not the region of Peel.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The motion is lost.

Number 15 is a Conservative motion.

Mr. Hudak: I'll take a deep breath for this one. This is a long one.

I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections:

"Mandatory increases

"(2) For any regular election after 2006, the following rules apply if the average number of persons per Brampton regional councillor (excluding the mayor) exceeds the average number of persons per Mississauga and Brampton regional councillor (excluding the mayors):

"1. If the product of the difference between the average number of persons per Brampton regional councillor and the average number of persons per Mississauga and Brampton regional councillors multiplied by the number of Brampton regional councillors exceeds the average number of persons per Mississauga and Brampton regional councillor but does not exceed twice this number, the number of Brampton regional councillors is automatically increased by one.

"2. If the product exceeds twice the average number of persons per Mississauga and Brampton regional councillor, the number of Brampton regional councillors is automatically increased by two.

"Same

"(3) The commissioner of planning for the regional municipality shall make the determinations required by subsection (2) and the commissioner's decisions are final and shall not be questioned by any court.

"Same

"(4) The determinations required by subsection (2) must be made 24 months before the regular election and must be calculated as of the projected date of the election."

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to your amendment?

1130

Mr. Hudak: Certainly. I want to say thank you to the city of Brampton, who had suggested this amendment. Obviously, they're much cleverer than I am. I don't think I could have crafted this particular motion.

The principles have been debated before without much success in terms of passing motions, but this gets at the ongoing concern that if council is constructed, more so, based on rep by pop, that will shift, and probably shift relatively soon, because of Brampton's growing population. This would have a mechanism in place, if passed, to ensure that Brampton's seats would increase requisite with their increase in population by the ratio outlined in the motion. Caledon's seats would not be impacted by this motion, if passed.

Mr. Duguid: I must have read this motion about 20 times last night, trying to figure out how this would actually work, and I still haven't been able to figure it out. It looks pretty complicated and difficult to follow.

We feel that the regional council has the ability to respond in a responsible manner to future population shifts. As the population shifts, there can be adjustments made in the future. I don't think we need a complex formula front-end-loaded to bring about those changes. We feel that automatic recalculation of representation would potentially be a source of constant instability in the region, so I would recommend to my colleagues not to support it.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? All in favour of the amendment? All opposed? The motion fails.

Shall section 3, as amended, carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: The section, as amended, carries.

We're now at number 16. It's a Conservative motion.

Mr. Hudak: I move that section 4 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Mandatory postponement

"4. If any municipal council, school board or other body in the regional municipality is unable to complete its preparations for the implementation of this act by De-

ember 31, 2005, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall, by regulation, specify that section 1 applies with respect to the regular election in 2009 instead of the regular election in 2006.”

This is a bit of a hammer of an amendment, but I think we’re responding in kind to the government’s approach to the Peel restructuring issue by imposing their own minister-made or cabinet-made solution on Peel, devoid of any consensus and devoid of any actual debate at Peel regional council.

We do hold out the opportunity, if the government does back off a little bit, that the mayors and the councillors at the region of Peel could resolve this issue on their own, without the Gerretsen bill being brought forward arbitrarily. This would give the municipalities time to complete the election on their own, and, if not ready for 2006, would take place for the 2009 election.

Mr. Duguid: I’ll be recommending to my colleagues that we vote in opposition to this. We expect municipalities to move toward their decisions following the passage of this bill, if it is passed in the Legislature, very quickly and in a timely manner. There’s no rational reason to suggest that there’s not enough time for them to move forward and implement the changes that they may need to implement. In the case of Brampton, they can choose their representative in any way they see fit. They don’t even have to change their boundaries if they choose not to. So we don’t see any rational reason to have to postpone the election or anything like that.

This bill is intended to provide a fair and balanced representation based on recent populations. To delay the implementation of this bill, we believe, is to delay fairness and balance. As they say, fairness deliberately delayed is fairness denied, and we don’t want to do that. We think the best way to ensure that this can be implemented on a timely basis is to have the co-operation of the opposition parties to move this ahead on a timely basis through the Legislature and get on with it.

Mr. Hudak: Again, to the parliamentary assistant’s description of fairness and fairness denied, while I will grant that the majority of the speakers in Mississauga spoke in favour of this bill toward their goal of seceding from the region of Peel, we also heard very strong presentations at the morning hearings opposed to this bill. We think it’s important to look at the region as a whole in making the right decision, and fairness as a principle should be applied to the region as a whole. I don’t believe this bill would be described as fair by a large number of the presenters or residents of Peel.

Secondly, for the sake of the record, we do have to recognize that there were guarantees and reassurances by the Premier himself and by the minister himself that they would not be getting involved in the restructuring decision. Suddenly, a cabinet or ministerial decision was made to restructure Peel regional council, without a single hour of debate at Peel regional council. The hearings were among the shortest hearings, with the poorest notice, that I’ve seen in this sitting of this particular assembly, so I don’t think there has been adequate debate

or exploration of the issues from those who are concerned in Peel. Therefore, I believe there should be a mandatory postponement provision as part of this legislation.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none—

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The motion fails.

Number 17, a government motion.

Mr. Duguid: I move that clause 4(1)(a) of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(a) providing for those matters which, in the minister’s opinion, are necessary or expedient to conduct the regular election in 2006 for,

“(i) a municipal council, school board or other body in the regional municipality, and

“(ii) a school board whose area of jurisdiction includes the regional municipality and an area outside the regional municipality.”

The Vice-Chair: Would you like to speak to your amendment?

Mr. Duguid: Just briefly. This motion will clarify the authority of the minister to make regulations affecting the conduct of the regular election in 2006. It includes elections to a municipal council, school board and other bodies within Peel, as well as elections to a school board that extends to an area outside of Peel; for example, the Dufferin-Peel separate school board or the French-language public and separate school boards.

Mr. Hudak: This obviously does give considerable power to the minister himself or herself to help conduct these elections. I think we as a committee have to decide and debate in the House whether this power is warranted under the act, but secondly, consider the minister and the government that seeks to wield this power. Under some circumstances, may this be appropriate? That’s a potential there, and I look forward to the debate on that. I would argue, in these circumstances, with a government that’s already broken some 47 promises and a Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing who sits in that office today who himself has broken, I think, three or four major campaign promises—we could look at, for example, the Oak Ridges moraine, the Kawartha Lakes referendum, and a promise not to cut municipal funding when he has obviously done so. It offends the principle that the minister could be trusted to wield this power appropriately, or a subsequent minister under the Dalton McGuinty government, considering their record of broken promises.

The third point I would make on this has to do with the shifts in position that the Premier himself has taken on this issue. I think Nadia Comaneci would be envious

of the political gymnastics that Premier McGuinty has performed in taking about five or six different positions on Peel restructuring.

Therefore, I would strongly recommend voting against this amendment and section 4 as a whole, simply based on the principle that the minister or the government could not be trusted to wield this wisely.

Mr. Duguid: I take issue with some of the comments made by my colleague. That's probably not surprising, because from time to time we do take issue with comments made by each other. But to suggest that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has been anything but impressive in his performance and in his work, in terms of treating municipalities well, is absolutely inaccurate. Think of the funding to municipalities through the years; the uploading of public health this previous budget; the gas tax, which is providing unprecedented amounts of money to public transit for municipalities; the Municipal Act changes that we're looking at. Instead of treating municipalities like creatures of the province and downloading on them arbitrarily, like the previous government did—

The Vice-Chair: I'd just like to say that we've been sticking to the subject of the amendments up till now and doing pretty well. If we could continue to do so, Mr. Duguid.

1140

Mr. Duguid: I'll try to do so, but I just want to point out that municipalities have been treated by this government in a much better manner than the previous government treated them. I think it's important to recognize that as we move forward with this legislation as well.

Mr. Prue: I'm going to vote for this motion, but not because I'm particularly enamoured of it. There is a certain amount of mistrust from members of the opposition because of what has gone on here. However, I am also mindful of the very strong representation that was made at the hearings in terms of the school boards and the necessity of having some kind of mechanism to allow the elections to take place in an expeditious manner. I'm not convinced that this is the best way, but at this point, this appears to be the only way we can do that. Therefore, in order that the elections take place and democracy prevail, I will reluctantly vote for this motion.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being none, shall the amendment carry? All in favour of the amendment? All opposed? Carried.

Shall section 4, as amended, carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak.

The Vice-Chair: Carried, as amended.

We now move on to 18. That's a Conservative motion.

Mr. Hudak: I move that section 5 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Commencement

“5. This section comes into force on the day, if any, on which a bylaw endorsing it is passed by the council of the regional municipality.”

Before I get to the amendment, I want to thank legislative counsel for their assistance, as well as Brampton and Caledon. I appreciate Mississauga's presentations as well. I think Mississauga was clearly in support of the bill; some speakers said, without amendment. But I do appreciate the amendments brought forward as suggestions from the municipalities, which we have brought forward. Some were our own ideas. There were certain principles brought forward in debate and discussion at the committee hearings. Without the help of legislative counsel, it would have been very difficult to craft appropriate amendments. So we do appreciate all of the work under some difficult time constraints.

This is our final amendment. While I did get the one friendly, I am holding out hope that this last amendment may win some support among my colleagues opposite. It basically ensures that the final say on Bill 186 and the construction of Peel council is determined at the regional municipality of Peel itself.

The opposition has expressed over and over again concerns that the government did not make adequate attempts to have a consensus of the three heads of the local councils, or even to allow debate at Peel regional council to take place on their own restructuring. This bill, if it is passed through third reading in the House as amended, with this motion before the floor, would at least allow Peel regional council to vote on whether they wanted to accept this new fate determined by Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government or their own fate. I hope it will pass.

Mr. Prue: I'm going to support this motion, because I don't think the people of Peel have been adequately heard. Notwithstanding the fact that we had one full day of representations that we heard in Mississauga and Brampton, the regional municipality of Peel has never had an opportunity to debate this bill. They've never had an opportunity to put forward their own ideas. Maybe they'll like this. If the government passes it and they like it, then I think they should have it, but I am reluctant to impose something upon that regional municipality which they themselves do not accept.

I heard Emil Kolb, who spoke quite brilliantly about the regional municipality and the need to forge some kind of consensus. He felt that the regional municipal members could have and should have been given that opportunity. This would in fact give him and his colleagues that opportunity. I know that he has provided good and sage leadership in the past, and would probably do so as well with the contents of this bill. If they determine, in their wisdom, that it is the way to go, then I would radically change my mind on what is happening here and wish them Godspeed.

Mr. Hudak: I don't mean to interrupt the parliamentary assistant, but I think my colleague Mr. Prue put it quite well on behalf of the official opposition. If this were put to a vote at Peel regional council to implement or not, the official opposition would of course respect the decision of Peel regional council as constituted today.

Mr. Duguid: As we come down to the final amendment here, I want to thank all members of the committee on all sides for their input; the deputants, who have provided us with some excellent deputations during our hearings; and our staff, who have worked diligently to put together this bill and ensure that the motions were crafted in a way that was effective.

All that being said, it's very important we move forward with this initiative to ensure that there is balance on Peel regional council. That's something that this bill recognizes, that there's balance. It also ensures that we move a little bit more in the direction of fairer equity, in terms of representation on the council. With Mississauga having 61% of Peel's population and only 45% of the councillors, it's pretty obvious why they had problems with the status quo. It's obvious to me that it's OK, in terms of the opposition, to just live with the status quo, that the status quo is OK. The motion in front of us today would simply have the effect of delaying taking any action even further, which would make the proportion in terms of representation even worse than it is right now. I think that would be dissing the people of Mississauga. They're not second-class citizens; they deserve to have consideration for their concerns, as residents throughout Peel do.

What this legislation does is provide a balanced approach that ensures that no local municipality, no caucus from Caledon, Brampton or Mississauga, will be able to control the council in and of themselves. It forces them into a dynamic that they will have to work together in selecting a neutral chair and getting on with the very important business that the people of Peel expect of their representatives, to continue to manage a regional municipality that has been managed very well in previous years.

Mr. Hudak: To the parliamentary assistant: I think we need to remind those watching and for the record that the defender of the status quo, up until about February, was Dalton McGuinty, the Premier himself, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, when they reassured the people of Peel and the municipal leaders of Peel—

Mr. Prue: And the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Hudak: I think they hoodwinked the Minister of Finance, which ain't easy; he's a smart fellow. The Minister of Finance actually went on record saying that they wouldn't restructure, and their own members from Brampton, who have spoken in the House about their opposition to this bill—the member from Brampton Centre herself had reassured the public that nothing would be imposed. So we can't forget that for about a

year of this debate, Premier McGuinty was on the record as not getting involved in decisions. Then something in February happened, and they changed their minds and have imposed a solution. We believe that the three mayors, all very strong women, strong mayors, could have come forward with their own plans and worked with regional council to continue to improve the work of the region of Peel.

We regret the way this bill has been brought about, and while I did have one amendment pass, I regret that others did not pass which would have at least allowed the bill to be reopened and have a more democratic selection of the chair, I say to the Chair of the standing committee. Again, I do hold out hope that the ultimate decision-makers on Peel restructuring would be the directly elected members of Peel regional council themselves, if the motion on section 5 that I have before the committee today were to pass.

The Vice-Chair: Further debate? There being no further debate, shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Hudak, Prue.

Nays

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

The Vice-Chair: The motion fails.
Shall section 5 carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: Section 5 is carried.

Shall section 6 carry? All in favour? All opposed?
Carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? All in favour? All opposed?
Carried.

Shall the bill, as amended, carry?

Mr. Hudak: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Berardinetti, Cansfield, Colle, Duguid, Mitchell.

Nays

Hudak, Prue.

The Vice-Chair: Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? All in favour? All opposed?
Carried.

The meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1150.

CONTENTS

Thursday 19 May 2005

**Regional Municipality of Peel Act, 2005, Bill 186, *Mr. Gerretsen / Loi de 2005 sur la
municipalité régionale de Peel, projet de loi 186, M. Gerretsen*..... F-1787**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr Phil McNeely (Ottawa-Orléans L)

Mr Toby Barrett (Haldimand-Norfolk-Brant PC)

Mr Mike Colle (Eglinton-Lawrence L)

Mr Pat Hoy (Chatham-Kent Essex L)

Ms Judy Marsales (Hamilton West / Hamilton-Ouest L)

Mr Phil McNeely (Ottawa-Orléans L)

Mrs Carol Mitchell (Huron-Bruce L)

Mr John O'Toole (Durham PC)

Mr Michael Prue (Beaches-East York / Beaches-York-Est ND)

Mr John Wilkinson (Perth-Middlesex L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

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

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Mr. Brad Duguid (Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre L)

Mr. Tim Hudak (Erie-Lincoln PC)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Mr. Scott Gray, legal counsel, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Trevor Day

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Laura Hopkins, legislative counsel