



ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario
Second Session, 38th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario
Deuxième session, 38^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 29 November 2006

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Mercredi 29 novembre 2006

**Standing committee on
government agencies**

Agency Review:

Hydro One

Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Examen des organismes
gouvernementaux :

Hydro One

Société des loteries et des jeux
de l'Ontario

Chair: Julia Munro
Clerk: Tonia Grannum

Présidente : Julia Munro
Greffière : Tonia Grannum

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

Copies of Hansard can be purchased from Publications Ontario: 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. e-mail: webpubont@gov.on.ca

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

Des exemplaires du Journal sont en vente à Publications Ontario : 880, rue Bay Toronto (Ontario), M7A 1N8 courriel : webpubont@gov.on.ca

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



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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Wednesday 29 November 2006

Mercredi 29 novembre 2006

The committee met at 1005 in room 228.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair (Mrs. Julia Munro): I'd like to call the meeting this morning. If you have a look at the agenda, the first item is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated November 23. Mr. Parsons?

Mr. Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward–Hastings): I would move acceptance.

The Chair: Thank you. Any comments, questions? All in favour? Thank you very much.

AGENCY REVIEW

HYDRO ONE

The Chair: Let's move on, then, to the second item on our agenda, which is consideration of the draft reports, and we're beginning with Hydro One, draft number 2. As we have before, we'll just go through individual pages.

Just to draw your attention, we have the contents, and on page 2 we have the first comment on the material. You may wish to just simply take that as a drafting editorial note or you may wish to have it included. Comments? Leave it as it is?

Mr. John Milloy (Kitchener Centre): The question I had is, we had discussed at the first meeting the possibility of beefing this up with a bit more of positive comments. I'm just not sure where that went. There were some positive things. So I apologize. I just walked into the room but I just wanted to raise that right at the beginning.

The Chair: I think those are within the context of the report itself. However, I'll ask Ms. Hull to clarify, if she wishes to respond to your question.

Ms. Carrie Hull: If you recall, for the other two reports we put the introductory comments that the agency made at the very beginning of the discussion and recommendations section, which is on page 7. That provides a brief overview of Hydro One's comments, and I believe they include all of the positive comments that you mentioned from several weeks past.

Mr. Milloy: Okay.

Ms. Hull: There are also other, additional positive comments that I was able to glean from the post-committee material presented by Hydro One.

Mr. Milloy: Thank you.

The Chair: Any comments, then, looking at page 2? Moving on then to page 7, which I think deals with the opening remarks that Mr. Milloy just referred to, so if there are any comments there? All right. Further to the background opening remarks on pages 8, 9 and 10, and we're looking then at the recommendation on page 11.

I'll ask Ms. Hull to provide us with a few comments leading up to the recommendation on page 11.

Ms. Hull: Much of the material on pages 9 to 11 is just a reordering, but I have added extra material because the documentation provided by Hydro One following the committee hearings was quite lengthy, and I'm not certain that committee members had a chance to go through it.

1010

There are additional comments about how Hydro One calculates its safety statistics. There are a number of different sets of statistics that are used by Hydro One. Several weeks ago, we discussed the Canadian Electricity Association statistics. Hydro One also keeps its own material. I've noted that on page 10. The statistics are quite complicated. I tried to determine whether there were patterns that could be gathered from the material presented. Perhaps committee members would like to read this section because some significant material has been added.

Mr. John Yakabuski (Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke): We're talking—

Ms. Hull: Pages 9 and 10.

Mr. Yakabuski: Okay. I thought that was all new.

Ms. Hull: Some of it is just reordered from the previous session, but there is significant new material in there.

Mr. Yakabuski: So anything that's in red and underlined is new material?

Ms. Hull: Some of it has just been shifted. Unfortunately, that's the way the editing program works. It's in a new order just for ease of reading, but there is new material as well.

Mr. Yakabuski: Okay.

Mr. John Wilkinson (Perth–Middlesex): Is that where the material is, on page 9?

Ms. Hull: On page 9, the bulleted paragraphs. This is information the committee had several weeks ago. The Canadian Electricity Association gathers statistics on three fronts: lost-time injury frequency, and that's how many injuries occur where an employee actually loses

work time; lost-time injury severity—how many days lost, on average, did an injury cause? The third statistic is all-injury frequency, which covers all injuries, including deaths. Deaths are not covered by lost-time injury severity or frequency. Also, basically anything where a doctor was called for services beyond first aid.

In the material that Hydro One presented following the committee, they informed us that they are in the top quartile of the Canadian Electricity Association for the first two statistics. However, the third statistic does cover some fairly serious measures, including fatalities and also disabling injuries. So Hydro One is not in the top quartile of the CEA's statistics for the third measure.

The next paragraph, about Hydro One formally publishing information, is material that the committee previously had. The bottom paragraph with the new bullets on page 9: Hydro One did say, "Yes, we are trying to improve our safety record," and they gave me the bulleted information that takes us on to page 10. So they have tried to improve some measures to improve their safety record.

I don't know if the committee recalls, but immediately following the hearing—actually, more like a month following the hearings, we were given fairly complicated statistics from Hydro One covering 2004-05. They did not provide any analysis of the statistics. There are just about 10 or 15 safety measures in that material.

As I was saying at the beginning, it's very hard to distinguish any patterns in this material. There are definitely some measures that seem to show improvement. However, Hydro One did change its method of calculating these statistics in the past two years. I think it's fair to inform the committee that Hydro One did not tell me that they made that change. I had to find out myself. I had to ask Hydro One quite directly why the numbers differed quite drastically from 2004 to 2006. They made this change in line with changes approved by the Canadian Electricity Association in 2005.

Bearing this caveat in mind, there does seem to be improvement on some measures. However, in my opinion, other measures do not show any distinguishing patterns and some of those measures are for fairly serious matters, including high, maximum, reasonable potential-for-harm incidents. That doesn't mean that someone necessarily was severely hurt, but the incident could have led to a serious injury if something didn't happen.

I also contacted the Ministry of Labour and the WSIB. Both bodies informed me that they're very confident of their placement of Hydro One in the high-risk firms in the province. Hydro One claims that the dispute about the ranking depends on the calculation of days lost due to injuries. The WSIB and the Ministry of Labour have informed me that it's a measure of the total cost of claims that place Hydro One in the top 2% of firms in the province.

The Chair: That takes us to the recommendations. Are there any comments, then, on any of the materials presented by Ms. Hull or any comments on recommendations 1 and 2? The first one is clarifying the nature of the discrepancy, and—go ahead, Mr. Yakabuski.

Mr. Yakabuski: I just wanted to ask one question. According to what I'm reading here, if there was a fatality on the job prior to 2000-and-whatever, I saw, they would have to account for 6,000 days lost prior to 2005.

Ms. Hull: Yes.

Mr. Yakabuski: And since then, they only keep track of the actual days lost. They did not inform us of that change in the procedure.

Ms. Hull: No. In the statistics that I was given, I saw a discrepancy, and I had to ask for clarification about what happened.

Mr. Yakabuski: Well, that concerns me. That kind of major change, I think, is something that should be volunteered. I think anybody who is properly representing the facts should take it upon themselves to ensure that those kinds of serious changes in the way that you keep track of things are disclosed fully and completely.

The Chair: Looking at recommendation 2, obviously that's, I think—

Mr. Yakabuski: I am concerned that Ms. Hull had to seek that information because she saw what seemed to be significant changes in the data and wanted to know why, and it was only then that that information was volunteered to her. I don't think that's the way we should be getting information.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Yakabuski.

I ask you now to turn to page 12, where we're looking at the inclusion of further material there on page 12. Yes?

Mr. Wilkinson: Could I just ask Carrie about page 11—just a quick question. So you've made some changes to 1, to clarify, and also on 2, about publishing? This is information on this discrepancy about metrics, because obviously it needs to be consistent. We're recommending that they publish against their peer groups, right? That should be public. But at the bottom of 1, then you said, "and take steps to improve its safety performance." Why wouldn't that be a third bullet?

Ms. Hull: Why—

Mr. Wilkinson: Just logically, do you know what I mean?

Ms. Hull: That's entirely up to the committee. I think that's probably a sound recommendation.

Mr. Wilkinson: Sorry, I wasn't here. Did we ask you to add that into 1, or did you just add that into 1?

Ms. Hull: I added that in, but you're welcome to remove it or create a separate recommendation.

Mr. Wilkinson: Because I just think that, logically, it just seems to be added in there.

Ms. Hull: I know that last time the committee had some question about whether there had been any resolution to the deliberations between WSIB and the Ministry of Labour. I was able to ascertain that, as I said, the ministry and WSIB are very confident about their placement of Hydro One.

Mr. Wilkinson: I assume we all agree that obviously all of our employers, particularly Hydro One in this case, need to improve their safety record. We're all on the side of making sure the workplace is as safe as possible.

It just strikes me to be not logical to put it there. If that's what we want to say, we should actually make that a point and say that that's the recommendation.

Mr. Yakabuski: I agree with Mr. Wilkinson that that should be a separate recommendation.

The Chair: I appreciate that. Having it included, it looks as if it's a secondary issue to the issue of—

Mr. Wilkinson: —clarification.

The Chair: —clarifying. Clarification isn't the same thing as improving your safety record.

Mr. Wilkinson: In 1, talking about discrepancy—the discrepancy is not going to solve the problem, so I would assume that all of us, all parties, agree on the sub-point on number 1, but it should be a separate point if we're going to make that point.

The Chair: Certainly Mr. Yakabuski has indicated that. Any further comments on making that a separate recommendation?

Mr. Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie–Simcoe–Bradford): What specifically is he going to use?

Mr. Wilkinson: The language, right?

Mr. Tascona: What's the language you're going to use as another recommendation?

Mr. Wilkinson: Well, I might preface it with, "In our recommendation, we encourage Hydro One to take steps to improve its safety performance." That's motherhood and apple pie, but if we're going to state it, we should state it clearly.

1020

Mr. Tascona: At this stage of the proceedings, in terms of the committee having to report back, quite frankly I don't see the necessity to fine tune it any more; otherwise, it's just going to go back to the subcommittee. We're supposed to report back by next week. I think it might be prudent to minimize as many changes as we can if the impact of what we're trying to do here is done; otherwise, it's going to have to come back to the subcommittee—which I had to do yesterday, sign off on a report, because there were some minor, minor changes. Unless it's fundamental, I would just—

Mr. Wilkinson: It just struck me, like the Chair, that it seemed to be taking a very important point, the salient point, and making it as some kind of a passing reference in another recommendation.

Mr. Tascona: I don't think it's a passing reference. I think it's part of the full recommendation. But that's just my opinion.

Mr. Yakabuski: When are we supposed to be done this procedure? Were we supposed to finish this today?

The Chair: I'll defer to Ms. Grannum.

The Clerk of the Committee (Tonia Grannum): The committee wanted to have the report presented in the chamber before the House rises for the winter recess, but it's up to the committee. If we have to come back and do another draft, you may have to report back during the recess, which the House gives us authority to do.

Mr. Yakabuski: I guess the challenge—

Mr. Tascona: The subcommittee report was very clear: that we endeavour to have it completed today and report back to the House next week.

The Clerk of the Committee: It wouldn't be next week, because we still have to translate and print, and translation takes five days.

Mr. Yakabuski: My question would be: If we make any changes at all today, we would have to come back, correct?

Mr. Tascona: No.

Mr. Yakabuski: No?

The Chair: We can do as we did with the other report and simply—

Mr. Yakabuski: So we would not have to bring it back to the full committee?

The Chair: We would just be looking at any kind of minor changes, as we did last week. I think there were three or four minor changes, and we all agreed that—

Mr. Yakabuski: Okay, I understand; I just wanted to clarify that. So it does not have to come before the full committee if there are just some minor grammatical errors or changes.

The Chair: That's right. Essentially, what we're looking at is that any substantive issues would obviously have to come back to the committee. Ms. Hull?

Ms. Hull: I was just going to remind the committee, though, that this is only the second draft of the Hydro One report, and the other reports were on their third or fourth drafts.

Mr. Yakabuski: We got started late.

The Chair: All right. My question to the committee is: If you wish to put it as a second or stand-alone recommendation, would the suggestion of the wording not constitute a substantive change?

Mr. Wilkinson: That was taken out as the third point. It said that the committee recommends that "Hydro One take steps to improve its safety performance." It actually gives it the prominence that it should have. I think we all agree with that.

The Chair: Yes. All right, let's move on, then, to pages 12 and 13. On page 12, you have a couple of additional statements. Ms. Hull, would you care to give us an overview there, leading up to the recommendation on page 13.

Ms. Hull: Pages 12 and 13 address the issue of Hydro One working with colleges and universities to develop training programs to address the skilled labour shortage in the next few years. I was asked to merge former recommendations 3 and 4 into a single, longer recommendation. That's on page 13. Once again, though, in the background, the post-committee material, I was able to find a few other bits of information I thought might be of interest to the committee. Those are all on pages 12 and 13.

The Chair: Any comments on this particular section? We can look at "Labour Relations," then, starting at the bottom of page 13. Ms. Hull.

Ms. Hull: This issue, as we know, has been somewhat sensitive before the committee. I was asked to remove a

few sentences from the “Labour Relations” paragraph and add Hydro One’s comments that they had made in closing during the day of the committee hearings, and that material is presented on page 14. Hydro One basically says they have good bargaining relationships with their other unions. The society, for its part, says it has bargained successfully with all its employers as well. So the committee has to decide the contents of the recommendations on page 14.

The Chair: There are no changes to the recommendations on page 14. That would be those we have already seen. I take you, then, to page 15, where it’s merely a drafting change.

Interjection.

The Chair: I have been informed that we have not agreed on the two recommendations on page 14. Any comments on either of those?

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River): You’re talking about the recommendations that used to be numbered 45 and 56? Is that right?

The Chair: Recommendations 4 and 5 have become 5 and 6.

Mr. Hampton: All right.

Mr. Tascona: What are they?

The Chair: If we put in another one—

Interjection.

The Chair: Yes. Moving on to page 15—

Mr. Wilkinson: Just a question on page 14: So this committee can recommend that the government do something and not recommend what Hydro One should be doing? Do you want to clarify that for me?

The Clerk of the Committee: The committee couldn’t recommend that the government—maybe we could reword that.

Mr. Wilkinson: Pardon me, Tonia?

The Clerk of the Committee: We shouldn’t be recommending that the government—we don’t have that authority.

Mr. Wilkinson: So recommendation 45 seems to me to be out of order.

The Chair: If you wish to take it out or if you wish to find someone else to take on this responsibility—

Mr. Hampton: A point of clarification: You’re saying we don’t have the authority as a—

The Clerk of the Committee: We can recommend. We shouldn’t be saying that the government “appoint.” We could say that we recommend the government do something, but this is specifically saying that the government appoint. Make it more of a recommendation: “We recommend that the government do—”

Mr. Hampton: I’d like to speak to that for a minute. I think this is an important issue for a couple of reasons. We know there are continuing serious labour relations issues at Hydro One. This was what really struck me: We heard from both Hydro One management and the Hydro One board that they’re having trouble getting the engineering professionals and technically skilled people they need. We heard from the Society of Energy Professionals that they’re having trouble getting the engineering

capacity, the engineering skills, the technical skills they need, and yet we find out, as we delve deeper, that people who have these degrees are not being offered full-time positions.

If there’s a real competitive battle by other utilities and other energy companies out there to get these people, and other companies are offering full-time positions but Hydro One is only offering part-time, contract or temporary work, it says to me that there’s an even more serious problem about to happen. I wouldn’t feel comfortable, as a member of this committee, walking away without putting in a recommendation saying that there’s the potential for even more serious difficulties here. If the government chooses not to delve into it—governments can make that choice. But I couldn’t walk away from this committee and ignore what seems to be happening here.

1030

Mr. Wilkinson, you admitted they don’t have enough engineering folks to do some of the work that needs to be done to bring distributed generation online. They don’t have enough engineering professionals to deal with the off-grid issues and so on. They don’t have enough—I think I’m using Mr. Parkinson’s words here: They’re having trouble getting the kind of qualified engineering professionals they need for this organization to go forward. Yet when you delve deeper, the corporation itself is not hiring people on a full-time basis. It’s like saying you’re welcome, but you’re only welcome half-way. I think we would be doing a serious disservice to the people of Ontario if we ignored this issue.

The Clerk of the Committee: Because it says, “The committee therefore recommends” that the government appoint a committee, it’s fine. I totally missed “therefore recommends.” It’s still just a recommendation; it’s not ordering the government do anything.

Mr. Wilkinson: With all due respect to my friend Mr. Hampton, is it the recommendation of this committee that how we solve that problem is that the government of Ontario strike some other independent committee that does a review of the past management practices of Hydro One and monitors the current management practices of Hydro One? Listen, they’re either an arm’s-length agency or they’re not. We’ve done a review. They’re coming to us, and we’re hearing different things from different sides.

We had a discussion about how it’s not appropriate for us to get in the midst of taking sides. I hear your point, but somehow having a government committee—the idea that there is all-party agreement that that’s how you’re going to solve this problem. It strikes me that it’s important for all of us as legislators to understand that they’ve come here, that they’ve made that, but it just doesn’t seem to me that that is the cure. I don’t see how that is going to cure it. I take your point that it has been raised, but I don’t see that this is the cure.

With all due respect, I can’t remember which people around this table said, “Do you know what? That’s what we need to do. We really should get the government of Ontario to get some committee, figure out some struc-

ture, and we should do some investigation of past practices.”

How would that actually improve the situation over at Hydro One? Who recommended that? I don't remember anybody around this table saying that's what we should do. So if this is going to be in a report out of the blue, whose idea was that?

Mr. Hampton: In fact, I think that was a specific point made by the Society of Energy Professionals.

Mr. Wilkinson: One side—

Mr. Hampton: That's right.

Mr. Wilkinson:—and we had a discussion about how we were not going to be one-sided in this matter.

Mr. Hampton: I think this is far beyond taking sides. I think there's a recognition here that there's a very serious problem. In fact, when our research staff have tried to delve into the issues, what you find is an even more serious problem: The energy professionals who are available, the new graduates from universities who have the degrees and the professional capability, aren't being offered full-time work at Hydro One. It's almost as if Hydro One has put up the stop sign itself.

If you want to talk about how that could be worded differently—that the Ministry of Energy be encouraged, or that we recommend the Ministry of Energy look very seriously at the human resources practices or the human resources policies at Hydro One—I could entertain that. But to walk away from this issue, which may very well be the most serious issue not only for Hydro One but for what happens in terms of the delivery of hydroelectricity in the province—what's the headline today? You don't have the transmission capacity to hook up existing or soon-to-exist wind generation, never mind other wind generators who bid in and had their contracts accepted.

I think there's a serious problem here. So if you want to talk about recommending that the Ministry of Energy create a process to look seriously at the human resource issues at Hydro One, I think I could live with that. You don't want to talk about a committee.

Mr. Wilkinson: That's my point. If we're going to work together, what do we agree on? We've agreed on—

Mr. Hampton: Can I propose something?

Mr. Wilkinson: If you'd like to, sure.

Mr. Hampton: We recommend that the Minister of Energy establish a process to review the human resource issues at Hydro One on an urgent basis.

Mr. Wilkinson: Okay. So the question is, why is that not looked after by 5?

Mr. Hampton: I would be okay with what is 5 if we hadn't learned—you saw the detailed questions that we asked Hydro One about how they were managing their human resources. At no time, after hearing that they couldn't get engineering professionals and there weren't enough engineering professionals being educated out there and it was very competitive to hire those engineering professionals, did either the board or the management have the openness to say, “You know what? Even if they're available, we don't hire them on a full-time basis. We'll only hire them as temps or on a contract basis.” If

this were ministry staff, I think everybody around this table would have hit the roof.

I'd seriously be looking at a contempt motion. To come here and say, “Oh, there are these human resource issues. But by the way, even if these people are available, we don't hire them on a full-time basis”—that, to me, is verging on contempt.

The latter recommendation speaks to the board and management at Hydro One, who didn't have the openness to tell the committee here, when we were asking lots of questions, what the real issues were, which is why you need a recommendation going to the Minister of Energy: “You need to look seriously at this because we did not get open and transparent information from the management and board of Hydro One.”

Mr. Wilkinson: That's right; I hear you. The question is what we as a committee do about this and who we make the recommendation to.

Mr. Hampton: I think we make the recommendation to the minister. If the minister wants to appoint a task force, if the minister wants to hold a meeting with the board or if the minister says, “We'd better nip this in the bud,” that's the minister's discretion. That's where I think it should ride.

Mr. Wilkinson: And I think that in the recommendation, we shouldn't presume to tell the minister how to deal with it, but it's our job to bring it to the attention of the minister through this report.

Mr. Hampton: So we recommend that the minister establish a process to look at the human resource and human resource management issues at Hydro One; I would put “on an urgent basis.”

Mr. Wilkinson: Our job is to flag it for the minister, because we've had conflicting testimony. As we all agreed, in one sector it is not a good working relationship. I think it has to do, as we heard, with issues from a previous strike.

Mr. Hampton: I'd say that the behaviour around here is better than what I—

Mr. Wilkinson: If that's the standard we're setting—

Mr. Hampton: I don't want to set the bar too high.

The Chair: Could we come back to looking at the suggestion that is being offered here? We're suggesting that “the minister” or “the ministry”—

Mr. Hampton: Minister.

Interjections.

Mr. Hampton: The minister is the ministry. Let's be blunt.

The Chair: Yes. We're looking at appointing a committee, as it is written here, or just to undertake a review, and the way in which it's done, then, becomes an internal decision?

Mr. Wilkinson: I think we have agreement that this is an issue that needs to be flagged to the minister, that because of the nature of the testimony we received and the conflicts over there on this issue—I agree with my friend from Kenora–Rainy River that this is something that this committee has an obligation to flag for the min-

ister, though I can assure you, the minister is going to read the report anyway.

1040

We want to highlight this for him, but I don't think it's appropriate for this committee to start recommending that there be some committee without any—just kind of out there. So I disagree with how we're doing it in 4—not that we don't need it. I think we clearly recommend that the minister review that matter. The minister gets to decide how to respond to this. It's not for the committee to tell the minister how to do his or her job, but I think there's all-party agreement that this is a challenge that has been presented to us that needs to be addressed. It's the minister who has, on that part of it, the responsibility. It's not for us to presume how they deal with it.

Mr. Hampton: So what's your suggestion?

Mr. Wilkinson: First of all, I know that in the real world the minister has already read this. But you would like all parties to flag this, and I can see that.

The Chair: Can I suggest, then, that the minister consider undertaking a review?

Mr. Yakabuski: I think Mr. Hampton gave us the wording.

Mr. Hampton: Establish a process. He decides on what the process is. He might want to make a phone call, but—

Mr. Yakabuski: I think it's clear, from the back and forth between the government and the third party—and we all established at the hearings that there is a problem. Everybody recognizes it; all sides recognize it. I think it would be in everyone's best interests to ensure that the minister knows that from the point of view of this committee, we feel something has to be done to address that situation. I share Mr. Wilkinson's position that it's not up to us to tell the minister to appoint a committee, but it is our responsibility to advise the minister that this is something that requires his attention and requires it as soon as possible.

Mr. Hampton: How about this, John: "The committee therefore recommends that the Minister of Energy review the human resource and human resource management issues at Hydro One on an urgent basis" or "on a priority basis"?

Mr. Wilkinson: Yes, I guess—but we really focused in on a particular area that we're really concerned about. Hydro One is vast. If we want the minister to focus on something, let's just make sure that we're telling him where we think the problem is, as opposed to running off on all of this other stuff. The issue is that we think there's a shortage of full-time engineers, and one side is saying, "We need more full-time engineers," and the other side is saying, "We're hiring temps." We're saying, "That's an issue that obviously the two of them can't resolve," and there is an overall public interest in making sure that he's addressing that—

Mr. Yakabuski: So you want that to be more specific to the circumstances surrounding—

Mr. Wilkinson: Without us wading into the issues over there, because they're to run it.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, because there are thousands and thousands of employees. Yes, I think that's probably a reasonable clarification.

Mr. Wilkinson: But I don't know enough about the issue as to what area we need to direct him to. Really we want to flag what is already in the record—correct?—and the discussion in Hansard. If it were up to me, I would say to the minister—I'm sure he does this and he has people who do this for him: "You should review the testimony between this group and this group," because I think that's the nub of the problem that we've been discussing.

Mr. Yakabuski: I don't think we just want him to review the testimony; I think we do need some further action.

Mr. Wilkinson: If this committee says, "Of all the testimony, you'd better take a look at that," that's a pretty strong recommendation from this committee, that we say that that needs to be highlighted.

Mr. Yakabuski: Exactly. That's a good starting point, to make it very clear to anybody reading it that we have a problem.

Mr. Wilkinson: Our job is not to prejudge that, but the testimony is compelling enough, which is Mr. Hampton's point, that we shouldn't just gloss that over.

Mr. Yakabuski: Agreed.

The Chair: Mr. Parsons, you had—

Mr. Parsons: I'm going to hold back. We're wording it.

The Chair: All right. Back to Mr. Hampton.

Mr. Hampton: So how about this: "The committee therefore recommends that the minister review the human resource management issues at Hydro One on a priority basis" or "as a priority"?

Mr. Wilkinson: But the issue is around the engineering, though.

Mr. Hampton: We're highlighting that there's a problem. We're not trying to tie the minister's hand. He can narrow the focus; he can broaden the focus. There's a human resource management issue there, and we don't think, based on what we heard, that it's still being well handled, either by the—

Mr. Wilkinson: They're going to resolve it on their own.

Mr. Hampton: No, I don't think so.

Mr. Wilkinson: No, we can't prejudge that. We're just a committee that deals with the testimony that's presented.

Mr. Hampton: It's a fairly general recommendation, okay?

Mr. Wilkinson: I hear you, after we had the question about the subsequent answer on the helicopter use. I'm with you on that.

Mr. Yakabuski: We shouldn't stick forever on this. Regardless of what the recommendation is, the minister is going to determine how far he's going to go with it, so maybe we can get on with it.

The Chair: I would also remind you that if you look at the following recommendation, although it's directed

to Hydro One, it gives very specific areas. As we've already discussed, obviously the minister is going to read the report—

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, but Mr. Hampton clearly wanted this to go to the minister as well.

The Chair: I'm not suggesting otherwise; I'm just saying that in the context of the next one, you certainly get a sense of the direction that the committee wishes to go in.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes.

Mr. Wilkinson: So, for example, I would just say, "Hydro One be strongly encouraged and provided with the assistance...." So, who's providing the assistance? Are we saying that the government of Ontario should provide the assistance to Hydro One?

Mr. Hampton: No. You might want to bring in some outside—

Mr. Wilkinson: Right. To me, it should be "Hydro One be strongly encouraged to restore healthy labour relations," though it kind of prejudices the issue, that we don't have healthy relations. I can see that ending up in a subsequent labour-management discussion about how a committee of the government decided that the labour relations weren't healthy. It's not for us to judge that; it's up to us to say that we've had differing opinions.

But to me, we can solve the problem. Recommendation 56 I think carries it, but we just want to make sure that the minister sees that there's one particular area that we're particularly concerned about with Hydro One in regard to a potential or an actual shortage of engineers and that there is a management-labour problem there that has significance for the province of Ontario.

To me the logic of it is that overall, not all labour relations are good: "You need to focus on this and, specifically, we need you to focus on this area, or we would recommend that you focus on this area." To me, that's 56, as long as we get out of this question of who's providing it. I don't think we should go down there, right?

Mr. Hampton: So 45?

Mr. Wilkinson: I would say—I don't know whether we should go with "restore healthy labour." I don't know historically whether they ever had good labour relationships over there. It's just if we want to maintain it or encourage it as opposed to restore it. "Restore it" is prejudicial. It starts with the idea that it's accepted that at one time it was good.

Mr. Hampton: "Encourage to promote."

Mr. Wilkinson: Yes. "We strongly encourage to promote healthy labour relations and to improve employee morale at the organization so that management employees can focus to the business of planning and carrying out the safe and efficient delivery of electricity to the public," and as a separate recommendation subsequently, this whole issue of making sure that the minister sees the area of greatest concern.

Mr. Hampton: I would even propose a minor amendment to that: "The committee therefore recommends that the minister review the human resource management

issues at Hydro One." That's it. He can decide if it's a priority or not.

Mr. Wilkinson: But we shouldn't flag it down to where we think the problems are.

Mr. Hampton: No.

Mr. Wilkinson: That's not the testimony that we got.

Mr. Hampton: Let the minister decide that. I'm not here to tie the minister's hands. I'm just saying, "We're trying to save you a headache, Minister, in terms of what might happen to the transmission system."

Mr. Yakabuski: I think the testimony is clear in itself to direct him possibly to where the—

Mr. Wilkinson: Well, yes, to make his decision. Agreed. So I would say that we strike 45, that we amend 56 so that we're flagging this, and that we go with what you said as the next point, because logically it follows from that.

Mr. Hampton: So reverse the order.

Mr. Wilkinson: I've reversed the order. I don't think 45 is right. I think that 56 has to be stated first. I've suggested how we don't add prejudice with words like "restore," because it goes to the issue, or that they "return." We stay out of it.

1050

Mr. Hampton: So the new 45 would be the existing 56. "The committee therefore recommends that:

"Hydro One be strongly encouraged to promote healthy labour relations and to improve employee morale at the organization so that management and employees can focus on"—

Mr. Wilkinson: —"the business of planning"—

Mr. Hampton: —"and carrying out the safe and efficient delivery of electricity to the public."

The new 56 would be, "The committee therefore recommends that:

"The minister review human resource management issues at Hydro One."

Mr. Wilkinson: Period.

Mr. Hampton: Period.

Mr. Wilkinson: Agreed.

The Chair: Ready to move on. Thank you very much.

Let's look, then, at page 15. We're only looking at editing changes. "Helicopter use": The recommendation there I think reflects the very long discussion we had and the agreement we reached last time, which is maintaining a log listing the names of all individuals using Hydro One helicopters and the purpose of the trip.

All right, looking at the next section, "Service Delivery Issues": again, relatively minor additions there. Ms. Hull, is there any comment you wish to make on the delivery issues?

Ms. Hull: I will actually pass this over to Mr. Johnston now because he's responsible for the remaining sections.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Larry Johnston: The change in this section was as the committee had suggested: to remove a portion of the recommendation and put that at the end of the paragraph that begins, "The EDA spoke to the committee...."

The Chair: Any comments on page 16?

Mr. Hampton: So on recommendation 89 we agreed: “The committee therefore recommends that:

“Hydro One make significant capital investments to expand its system capabilities and that these not be deferred but be recognized and built into future plans.”

I guess there are some grammatical changes.

“The committee therefore recommends that:

“Hydro One make significant capital investments to expand its system capabilities and that these not be deferred but be recognized and built into future plans.”

That would be the recommendation—the results? No?

Mr. Johnston: No. I thought as it stood: “The committee recommends that:

“Hydro One’s need to make significant capital investments to expand its system capabilities not be deferred, but recognized and built into future plans.”

Mr. Hampton: Okay.

The Chair: Can I suggest that you might want to consider including the word “should” before “not be deferred” to clarify the meaning of the sentence?

Mr. Yakabuski: No, because “should” is not as direct as “not be deferred.”

The Chair: Okay. I just throw that out.

Mr. Yakabuski: “Should” gives far more options. “Should” is not “must.”

The Chair: Okay. We’ll leave it as it is.

Mr. Parsons: I don’t understand recommendation 9 on that page. “Hydro One outline to the committee”: To what committee?

The Chair: Reporting back to us, as I interpret it.

Mr. Parsons: Okay. Maybe I’m wrong. My understanding was that once we table this with the Legislature—

The Chair: No, we would ask them to report back to us.

Mr. Parsons: Okay.

Mr. Yakabuski: There are a number of recommendations that ask them to report back to us.

Mr. Parsons: Not to the Minister of Energy but back to us. Okay.

The Chair: It would also go to the Minister of Energy, but the report and the recommendations would go to Hydro One, and the expectation is that they will respond to us.

Mr. Parsons: When they respond to us, what do we then do with that information?

The Chair: It’s up to the committee. You can simply receive it as information. The committee has the power to ask them to come back again.

Mr. Parsons: But if we receive the information, are we then going to do another report?

The Chair: That would depend entirely on the wish of the committee.

Mr. Parsons: Okay.

The Chair: Any further comments? Can we look, then, at page 17? Here you will see that these reflect the text of the association’s suggestions. Maybe, Mr. Johnston, you’d like to just comment on that section.

Mr. Johnston: The committee expressed its wish that the two recommendations be moved into the body of the report because they were suggestions made by the association and that it simply reflect that and not be recommendations of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you. Any other comments? Then we could look at page 18. This section deals with the conservation initiatives.

Mr. Yakabuski: Were we satisfied with the bottom of page 17, the recommendation? I don’t think we—

The Chair: The reason I didn’t raise it was simply that the only change was the number.

Mr. Yakabuski: Okay, very good. Thank you.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Yakabuski is right. That recommendation has not actually been approved by the committee. The committee was told that there was further information in terms of a clarification issued by Hydro One on this issue. That clarification has not been received by the committee, and therefore the recommendation has been kept in its original form, but the committee itself has not given approval to it.

Mr. Wilkinson: Again, back to the point about the committee telling the ministry what to do with OEB while we’re writing a report on Hydro One, we’ve been very clear that we’re taking the information. If it’s a recommendation to Hydro One, we provide it to Hydro One. If there’s information that has come up that we’re concerned about, we make sure it’s in the report, so that it’s in the public document coming out of this all-party committee.

The Chair: Just to clarify—I shouldn’t use that word—it asks here, consistent with the text above, with regard to the fact that there seemed to be two avenues of directives. So what we’re asking in this recommendation is that the ministry clarify its directive. In other words, we’re not asking them to change anything or do anything but simply to provide information. Does that help to answer your question?

Mr. Wilkinson: It goes to the issue raised by Mr. Johnston, because the information I had is that this issue was moot because there had been clarity provided by the ministry or the OEB on this matter, and then you had asked me about that, if I remember correctly. This is the issue, then, Larry, the one that you said we need—

Mr. Johnston: This is the issue. My understanding was that you told the committee you would undertake to bring some documentation or clarification on this—

Mr. Wilkinson: And you still don’t have that?

Mr. Johnston: We still don’t have that.

Mr. Wilkinson: Oh, okay. That’s the issue, then, that you don’t have that information yet. I don’t know whether we can make the recommendation to the ministry on this as part of our recommendations to Hydro One. They’re going to say, “This is our report. What’s this about?” Okay, I will attempt to get some clarity for you. If we can revisit this issue—

Mr. Hampton: Look, if it bothers you, that recommendation can simply be reworded and not put in as a recommendation: that the EDA, or the LDCs—I’m not

sure which one it is—continues to ask that the Ministry of Energy clarify its directive.

Mr. Yakabuski: And we're not making a recommendation.

Mr. Hampton: And we're not making a recommendation. It's an outstanding issue. They're simply asking, "What's the directive, so we can know what's happening?"

Mr. Wilkinson: There seems to be, obviously, some question about whether or not that directive is getting communicated to all parties, including ours. So that's fine. It just doesn't strike me as where the recommendation—I have no problem with this if it's an outstanding issue.

Mr. Yakabuski: Based on this report, the minister is going to look at this report, and where he thinks there are weaknesses, he may, on his own—his or her own, depending on who is the minister at the time—decide to go to Hydro One and say, "Look, these things will have to be clarified," or to the OEB or wherever.

1100

Mr. Hampton: Or we may use the issue as a question in question period.

Mr. Wilkinson: That's right, you do ask questions.

Mr. Hampton: We do, yes. We hardly ever get answers.

Mr. Yakabuski: Well, I was going to say, "What clarification would that bring, asking it in question period?"

Mr. Wilkinson: But I just don't see it as a recommendation. I agree it's an outstanding issue.

Mr. Yakabuski: I agree, so maybe we could just do as Mr. Hampton said and build it into the text as part of the recommendation from the LDCs.

The Chair: Then would you agree that it would be identified as simply an outstanding issue?

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes.

Mr. Wilkinson: I think it is. If research says they don't have the answer yet, then it's—

The Chair: —it's an outstanding issue.

Are we ready to move on, then? Looking at page 18, this deals with the conservation initiatives. There is a rewording of the recommendation that is there. Yes, Mr. Milloy.

Mr. Milloy: Before the recommendation—I think this may have been raised. I apologize, I missed one of the meetings that looked at this. You have, "Hydro One has spent \$8 million in the first seven months of 2006, and will spend the remaining \$32 million...." and then it says, "An expenditure of \$8 million to save the electricity to run 700 homes is the equivalent of \$11,428.57 per home (compared to an average residential electricity cost of around \$500)." That final bullet makes absolutely no sense. I mean, that \$8 million is being invested for those 700 homes for 25 to 30 years. My understanding is that \$500 is what would be spent in one year. As I said, I think this may have been raised before, that whole bullet statistically doesn't make any sense. It's comparing apples and oranges.

Mr. Johnston: That may be so, but the bullet simply reflects what the committee was told. The quote is there in the preceding paragraph, where officials indicated that 8 million kilowatt hours has been saved, "about enough for 700 homes for one year, so we're off to a very good start." That's what the committee was told. Whether that makes sense is exactly what the bullet is asking, and that's why the recommendation continues by asking Hydro One to clarify its metrics and its evaluation techniques for its conservation programs. I agree that the statistics don't seem to make much sense, but that's what the committee was told.

The Chair: Mr. Milloy.

Mr. Milloy: Who said the average residential electricity costs around \$500?

Mr. Johnston: That figure is probably a calculation.

Mr. Milloy: Exactly. I just have trouble with the fact that we're sort of doing math on—

Mr. Johnston: I think that's probably the most reliable aspect of that bullet point.

Mr. Wilkinson: My business background shows that you have costs that end up being front-end loaded. So to allocate at the beginning of a process and extrapolate that math is crazy. That is, to me, invalid, unless you understood how that cost was going to be allocated over that period of time. You'll always have more—if you stop after doing one thing in a process and then extrapolate that cost over all houses, that would be invalid. Our question is: Can you actually get the result with the money that you said you have? I think the issue is: Can you end up with 100,000 homes for \$8 million? Well, you can't stop at the beginning of the process. If you take all of your front-end cost and throw it on the first house and then extrapolate that math, it's not going to work out. So it might be a question of clarity, but it seems to be specious mathematics. I wouldn't buy that around my board table.

Mr. Hampton: So you're objecting to the last bullet point?

Mr. Wilkinson: My point is that what we've heard is their testimony, and it raises questions about the transparency of the metrics so that a bunch of people like us, who are not experts on electricity, can understand it, because they've given us an answer which, on first blush, doesn't make sense to us. But rather than saying, "Let's have a long discussion about the symptom," our issue in this committee is the problem, in the sense that you're not able to come and give us metrics that we, as legislators, and obviously, the public can understand. That's what the body of the recommendation is all about, right, that we want to get to the metrics?

Mr. Yakabuski: That's why we're asking in our recommendation, John, for that information. Because nobody questioned Hydro One in committee at the time, and government members had the same options to question them, they accepted the information as was given. This is what it works out to be, so it does raise questions for all of us.

If you want to read between the lines, I think there are things in every body of the report that would leave someone to have to do some digging or some calculating on their own. I think we all accept that any kind of program is going to be front-end loaded and the payback—I mean, if you buy a new furnace for your house, you're not going to save money the first year if you paid for the furnace in the first year. We all accept that. That's why we're asking Hydro One to clarify with us the way that they do calculate the effectiveness of those programs.

Mr. Wilkinson: And the recommendation, as well, of the Environmental Commissioner, who also came in here, as you would see in the second last paragraph, and said, "I think they're off to a good start, but I'm a little short on mechanisms, a metric to measure success." If you want to set a goal and succeed, you have to be able to measure it. I think all around the table agree to that. So it just seems to me that in the three bullet points—"Considering these figures in more detail reveals that"—we, as a committee, are wading into our own analysis of that.

I don't think it should be there at all. I think we have clear testimony from Mr. Parkinson. He seems to think that it's working, and he gave us data, but the Environmental Commissioner says, "Well, I think they're off to a good start, but I can't measure this." So then we do recommendation 114. We need to see those. To me, that's the purview of this committee.

Mr. Yakabuski: So what are you asking for? The third bullet of the—

Mr. Wilkinson: No, I would just take all three out. I just don't think that we should be wading into, "Okay, we don't understand their math, so we'll come up with our own kind of crazy math." It just doesn't seem to make any sense to me. The issue is, Parkinson says one thing, Gord Miller says, "I think they're right, but I can't measure it," and we say, "You know what? You need to have metrics, because the stuff that has come in here we can't figure out either, so let's get some metrics."

Mr. Yakabuski: The bullets give us a justification for asking the question. We need some clarification, because on first blush, you say to yourself, "Boy, that doesn't sound right or doesn't sound very good, so give us the full information."

Mr. Wilkinson: If one doesn't understand that some costs reasonably could be front-end loaded—I don't think we should get into the mathematics games. I think, as a committee, we're realizing that there's no one who can answer that question, because there aren't agreed-upon metrics to measure success. That's what we should tell them. Professionally, putting my name on something where we say, "We didn't agree with their math, so here's our crazy math"—I could come up with 16 different ways to calculate that, and I don't think we should go there. Just go with the strength of the report. Because we're putting in the public record that that's how we think it's happening. I don't know that.

Mr. Yakabuski: So you're insisting that it be struck from the report?

Mr. Wilkinson: I don't agree to put something that I think is—

Mr. Yakabuski: Do you want to make a motion to that? Because we're going to sit here all day dealing with these points. If you want to make a motion to that, we'll entertain the motion.

The Chair: I think we do need to have a couple more comments. Mr. Hampton, I had recognized—

Mr. Wilkinson: If you want to explain to me how I'm wrong, I'm more than happy to entertain that.

Mr. Hampton: This is just a fairly simple calculation. Going back over 19 years, it's not the first time that Hydro One has been criticized for what amount to superficial energy conservation or energy efficiency schemes. Historically, they've often come forward and made grandiose statements and then, when you look at the numbers after the fact, you go, "Boy, there was a lot of money spent here and not much happened."

If you want to take out the last bullet point because it sounds like a conclusion, I'd have no problem with that, but I think there is a real issue. The first 20% of the conservation budget has resulted in less than 1% of the target being achieved: "\$8 million has saved enough electricity for 700 homes, leaving \$32 million to realize the remaining target of 99,300 homes." And then rather than have the third bullet point, just have another sentence that says, "This raises questions as to the effectiveness. This was echoed by the Ontario Environmental Commissioner, who observed that it seemed to consist of well-intentioned, positive plans, but a little short on mechanisms." So we're not drawing a hard and fast conclusion.

1110

If you've spent 20% of the budget and you've only achieved less than 1% of the target, and you now have \$32 million left and you have to achieve the target of 99,300 homes, at first blush, it looks like there's something wrong there. So I'd argue, leave the first two bullet points in, because they simply raise the question, and then move on to the Environmental Commissioner's comments and make our comment.

Mr. Wilkinson: And I'm okay, because it's the last point that I think is just way off.

Mr. Yakabuski: As I said, I'd be willing to take the third one out.

Mr. Wilkinson: Yes, take the third one out, and I wouldn't add in this other business. I would just let the record show—

Mr. Yakabuski: I can live with taking that out, as I recommended 10 minutes ago. If you want to remove the third bullet, I can live with that.

The Chair: All right, members, we've come to an agreement.

Mr. Wilkinson: Are we agreed then, Howard? We'll just take the third bullet out.

Mr. Hampton: Yes.

The Chair: We're taking the third one out, and we'll move on to comments on the recommendation itself: "Hydro One report back to the committee on its con-

ervation initiatives and on the evaluation and measurement techniques used to determine their cost effectiveness.”

Mr. Yakabuski: I think that’s good.

The Chair: Any comments? Okay.

Let’s look at the load-shifting section. Mr. Johnston.

Mr. Johnston: Again, at the committee’s request, what was recommendation 15 has been put into the body of the text to conclude that first paragraph.

The Chair: Any comments? At the bottom of page 19, then, there are just slight grammatical changes.

If we turn to page 20, looking at soft versus hard grids and the recommendation: “Report back on the potential to develop distributed energy options and on the costs associated with those activities.” Okay?

At the bottom of page 20, again, a minor wording change: “Hydro One work with the Ontario Energy Board to examine the feasibility and expense of recovering the cost of upgrades....”

Mr. Hampton: Can I ask a question?

The Chair: Certainly.

Mr. Hampton: Not being an accountant, what’s the difference between “cost” and “expense”?

Mr. Wilkinson: I’d leave that up to the accounting profession to answer that one.

Mr. Hampton: I just think it should be “the feasibility and cost”—sorry; I see. That’s fine: “The feasibility and expense of recovering the cost of upgrades....” I’ve got you. I understand why.

Mr. Wilkinson: They have an expense and we have a cost-recovery.

Mr. Hampton: Yes.

Mr. Yakabuski: It’s that red writing, Howard. It clashes with our inner selves.

Mr. Wilkinson: We’ll have to go with purple or something like that.

The Chair: Turning to page 21, again, the recommendation: “Hydro One consider ways of streamlining the processing of requests related to the standard offer program and examine the feasibility and cost of adding more resources for the processing of standard offer requests.” I think this is quite consistent with the text and with the direction of the committee.

At the bottom of page 21, the agricultural community: “Hydro One provide a 1-800 line for farmers and rural residents to connect with service representatives who are familiar with farm and rural electricity issues.” Again, I think that’s directly from the comments that—

Mr. Yakabuski: Can you still get a 1-800 number, or are they all different now?

The Chair: Fortunately, that’s outside the purview of the committee, Mr. Yakabuski.

Mr. Wilkinson: It’s a federal matter.

Mr. Yakabuski: Pick up the phone. I’m surprised you didn’t tell us: “Just pick up the phone.”

The Chair: Page 22, again, very minor changes there, and that takes us to the very end, which is the list of recommendations, which obviously have to be edited to

reflect those changes that we’ve made in our discussions today.

Now, I would like just to have a couple of comments made with regard to this report and its changes, whether you wish it to come before the full committee or whether you want a signoff by the subcommittee. Could I just ask for some brief comments on that?

Mr. Hampton: I thought there was fair unanimity now in terms of—

Mr. Wilkinson: In a sense, we have 45 minutes, and there are not a lot of changes that have to be made. I’d be more than happy to suggest a 30-minute break, and that we come back in 15 minutes and just make sure that what is reflected is exactly what we agreed to, so all three parties agree and we move forward, if you want to do it that way. The question is whether or not we end up, if we close right now—can we get them to come back? Is that what you’re saying? Do you guys want to see our discussions to make sure that it’s what we’ve agreed to?

The Chair: The issue is whether or not you want to leave it to your subcommittee to sign off on it or whether you want it brought back to the committee. That’s the question.

Mr. Wilkinson: I leave that to my subcommittee, Chair.

The Chair: I’m just looking for direction on that.

Mr. Yakabuski: Joe, you can deal with this at subcommittee? So all we’re doing is making the changes that we’ve made today, and there’ll be no further discussion, correct?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Yakabuski: We’ve clarified the changes made and accept that they reflect what the committee asked for, and we sign off on it, correct? That’s what we’re doing?

The Chair: Yes. All I’m asking is direction on whether you want it to go to your subcommittee or whether you want it brought back to the full committee.

Mr. Hampton: Just so I’m clear, all the members who are here today would get a copy of the changes, we could talk with our member on the subcommittee, and then subcommittee members would be able to say yea or nay.

The Chair: Exactly.

Mr. Hampton: I’d be fine with that.

The Chair: Okay? Thank you.

Mr. Yakabuski: If the subcommittee member came back and said, “You know what? This is not what”—

The Chair: If you don’t sign off on it, then it comes back here.

Mr. Yakabuski: Okay. That’s fine, then. I think that’s perfect.

The Chair: I would like to put the following questions to you: Shall the draft report on Hydro One, as amended, be adopted? And obviously the direction, then, on checking the final changes would come from the subcommittee. All those in favour? All those opposed? Thank you very much.

Shall the final report be translated and printed? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Upon receipt of the printed report, shall the Chair present the committee’s report on Hydro One to the

House and move the adoption of its recommendations? All in favour? Thank you very much.

That concludes this part of our meeting, the part on Hydro One.

1120

ONTARIO LOTTERY AND GAMING CORP.

The Chair: We'll move now to the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., if I could ask you to turn to draft 3. We're looking at the first page with the contents and the changes that reflect the direction of the committee. I'll ask Mr. Johnston to comment. We're looking at pages 2 to 5.

Mr. Johnston: If you'll note in the table of contents, there have been two structural changes to the report. There are now two appendices. Appendix A is "Other Issues" on which the committee did not make any recommendations. My sense was that the committee had agreed to put those as an appendix.

Appendix B is the original background information on the Lottery and Gaming Corp. You will see there is now a much shortened or abridged overview to begin the report, but in order not to lose the information that was in the original background, the text has been included as Appendix B.

The Chair: Ms. DiNovo.

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale-High Park): Just an overarching question, and I'm amazed this didn't come up before: Most of this report has dealt with the gaming part of the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., but the lottery part of the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. has of course come under serious review recently, in light of the allegations about vendors and vendor misconduct. I bow to your wisdom here, and this of course wouldn't have come out in the hearings this committee held, but I wonder if we should make some mention of being at least aware of that in this report. You could read this report and think everything's wonderful at the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., when in fact we know it's not and that there's a review ongoing. Again, I know this is late in the game, but I wonder if there's something we should be saying.

Ms. Monique M. Smith (Nipissing): My understanding is that these reviews are based on the time when we did the review, which was September. Our report is based on the testimony we heard in September, so it would be out of sync with what our report is based on to comment on stuff that's going on now.

Ms. DiNovo: So this is a snapshot.

Ms. Smith: Yes.

Ms. DiNovo: It just seems that in light of what has happened it's a rather dated snapshot already. Again, I'm not asking us to necessarily rewrite anything here, but maybe there could at least be some statement to the effect that we didn't deal with that because it wasn't presented before us, or even a statement to the effect that this is a snapshot based on the hearings and does not reflect later allegations or later reviews or developments.

Mr. Wilkinson: It's an interesting point that we had an agency review and not a single person came to this committee and flagged that there was a potential problem on vendors.

The Chair: Mr. Tascona.

Mr. Tascona: I think Ms. DiNovo's point is well taken. What is occurring right now is a matter of the public record. What we have here in the report at the moment is an introduction, apart from the fact that we did conduct some hearings with respect to this particular matter. I don't think she's asking for too much to properly reflect the public record in terms of the current status of the OLG, as opposed to what was part of the public hearings which, unfortunately, in terms of a snapshot in time, would have been a much different type of hearing had we chosen not to have it at that particular time.

Quite frankly, in terms of the very loose nature of the subcommittee minutes, I don't see why, if there was the will on this committee to bring back the OLG to go into this matter to make this a much more meaningful and relevant report—because for us to ignore the public record and say we were just doing this as a snapshot in time when there are some serious issues confronting the OLG in terms of public trust, in terms of the handling of these situations which are ongoing, not only dealing with the first part, which was dealing with an individual who felt that he was entitled to something and then became the target of litigation, as opposed to what we're dealing with now on issues of security in terms of what's happening in the particular stores—what Ms. DiNovo is asking is almost like a grain of rice in terms of what we really should be dealing with here, which is getting the whole bag back and reconducting the hearings. And I would be open to that.

If we're going to quibble over that, I'd even just bring a full motion in terms of bringing them back, and let's deal with this in a proper way so that this committee can actually do its job. We called this group, to be quite honest. It was brought by the opposition party that we wanted this group here. The timing of it was obviously subject to what it is. The fact of the matter is, we're about to close off on a report when we know there are other things that are going on that are much more serious than what we were dealing with at the time.

That's my view on this. If it needs a formal motion, I'd be requesting that they come back to deal with what is obviously a matter of public trust, which the minister who's responsible for this had to get involved in, and probably continues to be involved in in terms of dealing with this. What we're seeing on the public record is that the spokesperson seems to be refusing to even comment publicly to media inquiries on this particular issue.

I know the Liberals are going to shut this down today, based on that request. But quite frankly, I would move a motion that we ask these people to come back. I don't really care about the timing of this report. The fact is, the subcommittee minutes do not preclude this in any way, for us to do our job in an effective manner.

I would move a motion that they be brought back to deal with the issues that are out on the public record right now, which are not, you know, a huge impact on the public trust, but I think people want some answers. Heck, if we can't get answers as a standing committee of the Legislature, who do these people answer to? So that's what I would move, and that's on the floor.

The Chair: All right. Thank you. We have a motion on the floor. Ms. DiNovo.

Ms. DiNovo: Just further to the point I raised, of course we do know there is more than one individual. There are hundreds of cases that have come to the Ombudsman's attention. I hear my colleague Mr. Wilkinson. I wasn't present at the hearings, but understandably, it didn't arise there. A lot of this came as a result of investigative research. The CBC came post-hearing.

I'm concerned, as is my colleague, that we're going to sign off on a document that makes us look as if we're completely in the dark about the most recent developments with this particular corporation. Although I'm open to discussion around this motion in terms of whether I support it or not, certainly I wouldn't want to let this report go out like it is without some covering letter or something saying that since the development of this report, these new findings have come to light. There's clearly a huge issue here.

But absolutely, if it's feasible, maybe we should reopen it and have this be a forum. Because again, Madam Chair, I'm very aware that we're representing the electorate here. Are we really willing to go back to our own ridings and say we signed off on this report? Many in our own ridings may be the ones whose cases are now before the Ombudsman. They may be the ones who are concerned about the operation of Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. So I would want to answer my own electorate, and I'm sure other members here wouldn't want to go back to their own electorate either with full conscience and say, "You know, I signed off on this report and everything's fine," without some mitigating letter or something.

The Chair: Thank you. Ms. Smith.

1130

Ms. Smith: I find it interesting that Mr. Tascona is willing to come back and start the hearings all over again when on Hydro One he wasn't willing to give the time for another round on draft 3. It's an interesting interpretation of the subcommittee report and his adherence to the timing thereof.

We will not be agreeing to revisit this. As always, the standing committee does its hearings at a moment in time. Things change. If it would please Ms. DiNovo and her concerns, we could, in the appendices under "Other Issues," note that after the hearings had been completed, concerns were raised about the on-site ticket sales and that investigations have been undertaken by the Ombudsman, by an independent auditor and by the Chair and that those reports have not yet been tabled—something to that effect, to show that we recognize that those issues have been raised, that they are being investigated, so we're not, as you said, looking blind that things are

going on around us. So we would be willing to concede to that kind of amendment in the appendices under "Other Issues."

Mr. Parsons: I think, if I'm recalling right, we dealt with this principle at the meeting last week, with, do we modify the report after to reflect the unfortunate death of a board member? The three parties were in total agreement that this was a snapshot in time taken that day of that meeting. I think we need to stick to that principle. This is not a standing committee in the sense of reviewing that agency; we were empowered to review it. I say that knowing that this is not to overlook the issues that have come forth subsequently but, quite frankly, as has been mentioned, I have every faith in the Office of the Ombudsman. He's going to review it. This report must reflect the information we heard the day that we held the review.

Ms. DiNovo: In light of that—and I've been persuaded by Mr. Tascona as well—I don't want to see this just as an appendix item. The very least that I would be satisfied with would be some kind of letter that goes out or the covering or the first page that brings us right up front and centre, but I'm willing to support his amendment. Just to go on record with that because, again, I think it would be remiss to our electorate, it would be remiss to all of those people who have had some problems, to not note this and to not note this in Hansard and to not note the vote as well.

The Chair: All right. Any further comments? I think perhaps you mean the motion as opposed to the amendment.

Ms. DiNovo: Sorry. The motion, yes.

The Chair: Just as a point of clarification. All right, any further comments? I'll call for the—

Mr. Tascona: For the record, Madam Chair, just state what the motion is.

The Chair: Yes. Mr. Tascona has moved a motion that the committee ask the OLGC to come back and appear before the committee.

Mr. Tascona: To deal with the issues that have been reported in the media, in particular the CBC, involving matters of public trust in the OLG and its operations.

The Clerk of the Committee: Mr. Tascona moved that the committee ask the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. to come back and appear before the committee to deal with issues reported in the media and the CBC on matters of public trust in its operation.

The Chair: All right, that is the motion that we have on the floor. All those in favour?

Mr. Tascona: Recorded vote.

The Chair: Recorded vote? Yes.

Ayes

DiNovo, Scott, Tascona.

Nays

Gravelle, Milloy, Parsons, Smith, Wilkinson.

The Chair: I declare the motion lost.

Ms. DiNovo: Then might I propose another motion—the motion to have either a covering letter or first page that outlines our concerns, that states that this was a snapshot in history and that these allegations have come to light since we developed this report and since the hearings. Something to that effect would need to be drafted, but that a covering letter deal with these concerns, or a first page.

The Chair: I'll ask Mr. Johnston to speak to that.

Mr. Johnston: I just want to draw the committee members' attention to the introduction. The second paragraph of the introduction says, "In accordance with its terms of reference, the committee reviewed the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. on 6 September 2006." It could be stressed by adding an additional sentence to say that this report does not deal with any events that have transpired since that date.

Ms. DiNovo: I would want more specificity, in that I would want to talk about the allegations, talk about the review, talk about the Ombudsman's ongoing work. I'd want more than just a sentence, that's all, if that's okay with Mr. Johnston.

Mr. Johnston: It's not my decision.

Ms. DiNovo: But I would want something fairly substantial that draws the electorate's attention to the fact that we're doing our job here and we're not dropping the ball.

Mr. Wilkinson: We're also stating that, beyond this committee, there are a number of things that are going on, as elicited by my friend from North Bay. The Ombudsman is investigating, I think appropriately, and I agree with Mr. Parsons: I have every confidence that his office will do a fine job. My understanding is that there are two other reviews going on on what we all agree are very serious allegations. But, at the moment, they're allegations, and it's not for us as legislators to wade into issues of allegations.

I agree that in the covering letter it state specifically the time. I understand your kind of electoral concern as somehow—because I do note that this issue was not raised by anyone who came to this review, so all kudos to the media for ferreting this story out. But we have to let the chips fall where they may, not this committee. It has to be done, and there is work being done by the Ombudsman, who's an officer of this Legislature—there's a reason that he's arm's length—to look into this.

Ms. DiNovo: Again, though, it's an ethical concern, it's a moral concern and it's a concern of transparency and accountability. I think that we all around this table would want to be seen as being aware, not unaware, of what's happening, especially around and with a corporation that we've been called upon to review. So I would like to see that stated, that we are aware of what's going on, we're aware of allegations, and we're doing this on behalf of the consumers of this corporation, and that we're aware that the Ombudsman is conducting a review.

Again, asking for a paragraph, if not a letter, that deals with that and that deals with that right upfront, so that

people don't think—because, right now, "In accordance with its terms of reference, the committee reviewed the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. on 6 September 2006" doesn't say to me that this committee is aware of the allegations, that we take them seriously, that we're aware that there's a review going on. It doesn't say that, and also, it doesn't address directly the fact that this report is a snapshot from September 6 and therefore we didn't have a chance to look into those allegations. I'd want that on the record and want it in this report.

The Chair: I take from what you're suggesting that acting on your suggestion would mean that we would expand the second paragraph to indicate that the committee is aware of these ongoing issues but is not in a position to comment. Does that reflect—

Mr. Parsons: Was that a motion?

Ms. DiNovo: I did make a motion, actually, that there be a letter or a page, something substantial, that is included in this report to that effect. Mr. Johnston has suggested another paragraph. I'm uneasy with that. I'd like to stick with my original motion: that we have something substantial and something separate that describes the function of this committee and describes our concerns about that.

The Chair: We have a motion, then.

1140

Mr. Wilkinson: With all due respect to the member, I can understand your sensitivity, but let us not undermine the good work of the Ombudsman, who is an officer of this Legislature, who has decided independently, because he's an independent officer, to investigate this. I would not want to send out any message that we are presuming that he and his office will not do, as they always do, a very thorough job on this matter. That is the reflection of the role of the Legislature currently. We should not presume in any way—if you want to mention it, I'm okay with that as long as we're saying that an officer of this Legislature is doing an investigation which is appropriate.

Mr. Tascona: That's a bit rich in terms of the Liberal government's faith in the Ombudsman. I would say this: that Ms. DiNovo was not an elected member of this Legislature at the time we were dealing with this. To be fair to her and to put this in context in terms of her wishes is more fair.

We are the standing committee. Are we basically meaningless in terms of what our job is? It would appear that this committee, the majority at least, feels that we don't have a role to play. Certainly, the Ombudsman has a function to play in terms of dealing with complaints from the public. He's an officer of the Legislature, but so are we. We're creatures of the Legislature. We have a role to play. The mandate of this committee was to review, among other things, the operations of the OLG. The Liberal majority has already defeated a motion to bring them back so we can deal with these public issues, and they've refused that today.

Now, Ms. DiNovo, who was not a member of the Legislature, has raised some issues that she thinks are

important. I think it should be part of the public record if this committee is going to be relevant and also meaningful. So I don't share what the government is saying with respect to this issue, and I think we have to be as candid and transparent as we possibly can be with respect to this; if we're not, then maybe this report is not going to get unanimous approval, maybe there's going to be dissent, and strong dissent, on this particular matter. Government members should consider that seriously.

Ms. Smith: I think if we look back at the sub-committee report, the decision was made that we would review the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. on September 6. That's what this committee has done, that is what this report is reflecting and I think we should call the question on this motion.

The Chair: If there's no further discussion—yes, Ms. DiNovo?

Ms. DiNovo: Just for the record, the New Democratic Party, of course, has full faith in the Ombudsman. We're delighted with the Ombudsman's work so far. In fact, it's out of that faith in the Ombudsman that I would like that work recognized in this report. That's what I'm asking for in this letter or covering page: to highlight the fact that the Ombudsman is investigating this, that there have been concerns raised since the writing of this report, since the hearings happened, and that the Ombudsman is looking into that. That's all I'm asking for. I think it's a pretty small request. It highlights the fact that, again, this is a snapshot, as has been pointed out and I think rightly so, but also that there are ongoing issues and that we are aware of them, that we're doing our job, that we're representing the public here in dealing with this corporation that's supposedly acting on their behalf. So, again, I stand by the motion.

The Chair: Any further comments before I call for the motion?

Mr. Parsons: Call the vote.

The Chair: Yes. Will I have the motion read first?

The Clerk of the Committee: Ms. DiNovo moves that the report on the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. contain a covering letter at the outset or in the first paragraph in the introduction of the report dealing with the issues reported in the media relating to the matter of public trust with the operation of the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.

Ms. DiNovo: Could I have a recorded vote?

Ayes

DiNovo, Scott, Tascona.

Nays

Gravelle, Milloy, Parsons, Smith, Wilkinson.

The Chair: I declare the motion lost.

Further comment? Let us move on, then. We're looking at the first five pages, I believe. Mr. Johnston, we were just looking at those.

Mr. Johnston: On pages 2 through the middle of page 5, I have provided a three-and-a-half-page overview of the OLGC for the members to consider, as an abridgement of the original lengthy overview.

The Chair: Any comments? All right. Moving on, page 8 is the next change, and this is simply a rewording of the text, a textual change.

Ms. Smith: Chair, back on page 7, this is just a semantics thing, but at the top of the page, the first paragraph, "The corporation indicated it will expense between \$4 million and \$6 million on the rebranding...." To me, "expense" sounds like they're charging it to somebody else. I just wonder if there isn't a change of a word. Whatever they told us in their testimony, it was like they were absorbing the cost in their operating expenses of that year, something like that. I don't have the actual, and maybe that's what "expense" means, but to me, it sounds like they're charging it to somebody else, and I just wanted to be clear that it's part of their operating costs for the year.

The Chair: Any other comment?

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Victoria–Brock): I don't know if research can take a moment. Are you just clarifying what was—

Mr. Johnston: I'm trying to find the Hansard, because it's my suspicion that that's the wording they used.

Ms. Scott: If that's the wording they used, then that's okay? Yes, if we can just doublecheck that.

Ms. Smith: Back on page 8, I think it's just a typo, "currently standing referred to the standing committee." I think it's just "currently referred to the standing committee." I just don't think the word "standing" needs to be there unless that's specific lingo, Larry, that I don't understand.

The Chair: I think the terminology, if you were using it in the present tense, you would say "as currently standing" as in line in the committee.

Mr. Johnston: Stands referred to.

Ms. Smith: Okay, I'm fine, then. I don't have any other comments until we get to page 12.

The Chair: If we look on page 9, there is just a part that has been taken out, reflecting a conversation earlier. You will notice that the numbering has changed again for this draft, and that takes us through pages 10 to 14; again, a minor change on page 14 just to reflect more accurately the position we took, that it include "OLG officials, the CGA and some committee members" and the "Williams and Wood study and analysis."

Ms. Smith: If I could take the members back to page 12 for a second, just two things: In the committee, members asked Dr. Williams for evidence—you know, this is about the report that I have some issue with. The primary study he cited was a master's level thesis conducted by—was it not his student, a former gaming facility employee? I thought it was his student.

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Ms. Smith: Okay. Could we put in "by his student, a former gaming facility employee"?

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Ms. Smith: Then, if everybody is okay with that, my other point was just—you see at the bottom of the page where we've got recommendation 6 and then 7 and then that one bullet point, "Eliminate customer credit"? I was just wondering if we could move that up to just above "Committee members," because it's just out there and it looks like it could be part of a recommendation, but it's not. I just thought if we put it up above "Committee members asked Dr. Williams" with those other two bullet points, it gathers his recommendations together and then has ours separately. It's not crucial, just—

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Smith: Is everybody okay with that?

The Chair: Yes.

1150

Ms. Smith: Page 14. I just want to be clear: "Some committee members"—that would be me—"expressed skepticism about the results of the Williams and Wood study and" Dr. Williams's "analysis." We didn't have Dr. Wood here, and I don't want to question his analysis if he wasn't here to give us any—

The Chair: Okay. So that sentence then would be "OLGC officials, the CGA and some committee members expressed skepticism about the results of the Williams and Wood study and Dr. Williams's analysis." All right.

Moving on to page 18, I think the one change there reflects the discussion we had by omitting "with nothing to learn from the experience of any other jurisdiction"; very straightforward.

Then we have on page 19 the summary of recommendations as was recommended in the drafting. Obviously, with the change, recommendation 3 came out. That's why you have the changes in the numbering system.

Appendices A and B of course are materials that we have heretofore looked at. I would just draw your attention to one change that reflected the conversation on page 37, which was the question of the date and the snapshot issue. So that has then been altered to reflect, "At the time of review, the board had six members;"

Ms. Smith: Yes, that's fine.

The Chair: That takes us through draft 3.

Okay. We have relatively few numbers of changes to make here. I would ask if you wish this to come back to the committee as a whole or if you wish it to be signed off by the subcommittee members. That's the first decision we have to make. Do we have agreement on the subcommittee?

Mr. Tascona: Sure.

The Chair: All right. The first question is, then, shall the draft report on the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., as amended, be adopted? Obviously it will be a question of the subcommittee making that final decision. All those in favour?

Mr. Tascona: Hold on a second. I don't understand. The thing is, the changes have to be put through to the

subcommittee, so how can it be adopted by this committee?

The Chair: You're adopting the process by which the subcommittee—

Mr. Tascona: Okay. So we're talking about process. Sorry.

The Chair: All those in favour? Thank you. Carried.

Shall the final report be translated and printed? Agreed.

Upon receipt of the printed report, shall the Chair present the committee's report on the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp. to the House and move the adoption of its recommendations?

Mr. Tascona: In terms of that, if the report has a dissent in it, would they be bringing that back?

The Chair: That's my next question. If any dissenting opinions are to be appended to the report, they must be filed with the clerk by a specific day. We need to establish that, if there are to be dissenting opinions appended.

Mr. Tascona: That's fine.

The Clerk of the Committee: You would need to give me a date because they also need to go out to get translated, and they're included in the full, final report when it goes off to be printed. If we could make a decision right now, then we don't have to go to—today is November 29. Is Monday, December 4, okay or can you do it by Friday?

Mr. Tascona: When are you going to come back with the report for the subcommittee to look at?

The Clerk of the Committee: It depends on how quickly they can make the changes.

Mr. Tascona: I've got to deal with it in subcommittee based on if there's anything.

The Clerk of the Committee: Do you want to have a subcommittee meeting? Usually we just do a signoff sheet, but you can have a subcommittee—

Mr. Tascona: With respect, I recognize the procedure, but it does take—you are wanting to read it and make sure you've gone through it with your members and whatever. We may want to go through this at caucus, because our caucus meeting is on Tuesday. So I'm not going to limit it in terms of time frame, to be fair. The House isn't going to rise until December 14.

The Clerk of the Committee: Could you suggest a day?

Mr. Tascona: I would suggest—what is the 5th?

The Clerk of the Committee: It is a Tuesday.

Mr. Tascona: No, not Tuesday because we have caucus that day. So I would suggest the 6th.

The Clerk of the Committee: Which is the Wednesday. All right.

Mr. Parsons: We have a date we want to get it to the Legislature, is my understanding, before we rise this session.

The Chair: That's certainly the original intent of the committee.

Mr. Parsons: If we back up from that, I don't know what the time is that we require for translation.

The Clerk of the Committee: Five days.

Mr. Parsons: Okay. So we need to back up from that date.

The Clerk of the Committee: And a 24-hour turnaround for printing.

Mr. Parsons: If the subcommittee meets because it's a dissenting opinion—there's not going to be unanimous agreement on it and there doesn't need to be.

The Chair: No, there doesn't. The dissenting opinion, the issue that the subcommittee potentially could look at, is the date. That's it.

Mr. Parsons: Joe, you were suggesting the 6th or the 5th?

Mr. Tascona: The 6th is a Wednesday.

Mr. Parsons: Wednesday, okay. That will work then for translation purposes?

The Chair: That's right. Wednesday is the 6th.

Mr. Parsons: The day following your caucus will work?

Mr. Tascona: Yes.

The Clerk of the Committee: It would be due December 6.

The Chair: Ms. DiNovo, did you have a comment?

Ms. DiNovo: No, I'm in accord with that. That's fine. I was just wondering if maybe we could circumvent that by having the motions that were made, the vote and what was decided recorded and appended to this.

The Chair: That's entirely up to the authors of the dissenting report.

Ms. DiNovo: Okay.

Mr. Tascona: Let me ask you this: When would Hansard be ready on this committee?

The Chair: That's a good question. Several days.

The Clerk of the Committee: Yes. The House is sitting, so the draft Hansard may be ready in three or four days. Just because the House has been sitting late and they take priority and there are other committees sitting as well.

Mr. Tascona: So do we know? Are talking—

The Chair: This is Wednesday.

Mr. Tascona: We're talking about more than a week, so we're not going to even know if we've got no transcribed Hansard. We're supposed to meet Wednesday, if we meet next Wednesday. We're not scheduled to meet next Wednesday, are we?

The Clerk of the Committee: This committee? If we finalize the reports this week, we won't have a meeting next week.

Mr. Tascona: Okay. So is there no possibility of getting Hansard before the 6th?

The Chair: That's right. I forgot.

Mr. Tascona: No possibility of getting Hansard before the 6th?

The Clerk of the Committee: I can put in a request. I can't guarantee it.

Mr. Tascona: Okay. That's awful.

The Chair: Yes, it's a problem.

Mr. Tascona: Then it takes five days to transcribe, so are you talking business days or are you talking calendar days?

The Clerk of the Committee: Business days. Five business days.

Mr. Tascona: Okay. I'll go with your best efforts then. That's all I can say, unless you've got a different view, Cheri.

Ms. DiNovo: As I say, there are the motions and the vote appended to this. Let's put it forward like that and call it a day.

Mr. Tascona: Okay.

Ms. DiNovo: But if you'd like to take it to caucus, by all means, I defer.

The Chair: As it stands right now, then, it is December 6 on here. There being no further business, I declare the meeting adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1159.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 29 November 2006

Subcommittee report	A-405
Agency review	
Hydro One	A-405
Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp.....	A-416

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Présidente

Mrs. Julia Munro (York North / York-Nord PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park ND)

Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale–High Park ND)

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

Mr. John Milloy (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre L)

Mrs. Julia Munro (York North / York-Nord PC)

Mr. Ernie Parsons (Prince Edward–Hastings L)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Victoria–Brock PC)

Ms. Monique M. Smith (Nipissing L)

Mr. Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie–Simcoe–Bradford PC)

Mr. John Wilkinson (Perth–Middlesex L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Howard Hampton (Kenora–Rainy River ND)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

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

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Tonia Grannum

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Larry Johnston and Ms. Carrie Hull,
research officers, Research and Information Services