



---

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario  
Second Session, 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario  
Deuxième session, 38<sup>e</sup> législature

## **Official Report of Debates (Hansard)**

Wednesday 4 April 2007

## **Journal des débats (Hansard)**

Mercredi 4 avril 2007

**Standing committee on  
government agencies**

Intended appointments

**Comité permanent des  
organismes gouvernementaux**

Nominations prévues

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](mailto: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](mailto: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 AGENCIESCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES  
ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Wednesday 4 April 2007

Mercredi 4 avril 2007

*The committee met at 1001 in room 151.*

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

**The Chair (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the standing committee on government agencies. I'd like to begin with our first order of business, which is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Thursday, March 1, 2007. Can we have somebody to move its adoption?

**Ms. Monique M. Smith (Nipissing):** I move acceptance of the subcommittee report dated Thursday, March 1, 2007.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion? If not, all in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The next order of business is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Thursday, March 15, 2007.

**Ms. Smith:** I move acceptance of the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated March 15, 2007.

**The Chair:** Any discussion? If not, all in favour? The motion is carried.

The next order of business is the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated Thursday, March 29, 2007.

**Ms. Smith:** I move acceptance of the report of the subcommittee on committee business dated March 29, 2007.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favour? The motion is carried.

## INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

## KEN JEPSON

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Ken Jepson, intended appointee as member, Landlord and Tenant Board.

**The Chair:** We will now move to the appointments review. Our first interview is with Ken Jepson, intended appointee as member of the Landlord and Tenant Board. Mr. Jepson, please come forward. Good morning, and welcome to the committee. As you may be aware, you have an opportunity, should you choose to do so, to make an initial statement. Subsequent to that, there are questions from members of the committee, and today we will be commencing with the official opposition. Each party

will have 10 minutes allocated for questions, and we will go in rotation. As is also the practice of this committee, any time you take in your statement will be deducted from the time allotted to the government party. Please begin.

**Mr. Ken Jepson:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to meet with members of the committee to review my qualifications and to answer your questions. I have a brief statement, as is, I gather, customary, and I propose to take a few minutes to outline some of my qualifications.

The work of the Landlord and Tenant Board is very important. It affects an element of people's lives that is very central to them. For tenants, it's about their home. For landlords, these decisions can affect their livelihood, and in some cases their own personal living situations as well.

I consider it a privilege to be proposed for appointment to the Landlord and Tenant Board. At the same time, I am confident that I have the right set of skills and experience to fulfill the duties of adjudicating for the board, and I'm hopeful that after having met with me today, the members of the committee will share that confidence.

I understand you all have a copy of my resumé, and if anyone does not, I have extra copies if anyone requests one. As I said, I just propose to use this time to review and highlight a few elements of my background that are relevant to this role.

I was born and raised in Ancaster, Ontario, and I have since lived in London and also in Burlington, and since 1992, I have been a resident of Toronto.

My academic training is in the arts and philosophy, education and the law. I obtained an honours BA with a specialization in philosophy from the University of Western Ontario, graduating in their scholar's electives program. I later received a bachelor of education from Western, following which I taught at both the elementary and secondary school levels.

I received my law degree from the University of Toronto in 1995 and was called to the Ontario bar in 1997. During my time at law school, I volunteered with the school's legal clinic where I advised on residential landlord and tenant matters, among other matters. Since my call to the bar, I have gained diverse experience in both private practice and in the public sector. I have practised in several downtown Toronto law firms, and I

have experience in a number of different areas of the law, quite a broad range of areas, including, but not limited to, insurance law, commercial litigation, employment and labour law, construction law, and commercial landlord and tenant matters.

In recent years, my legal career has evolved such that I have come to focus on administrative law, and I have developed some specialized expertise in administrative justice. This began when I became counsel to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Appeals Tribunal, or WSIAT, as it's often referred to. As you likely know, that tribunal hears the final appeals from decisions of the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board on workers' compensation matters and related insurance matters. It is one of the busiest of Ontario's adjudicative tribunals.

As associate counsel to the chair, my role at WSIAT was to work very closely with the adjudicators to assist them in their decision-making and their decision-writing functions. I did this in a number of ways. I assisted with questions about interpretation of legislative provisions, providing necessary research concerning the tribunal's case law, which is actually fairly extensive. I also reviewed draft reasons and gave feedback on really two key aspects of those reasons: legal issues themselves contained within the reasons, and persuasiveness.

Because a large part of my work involved critiquing written reasons, I developed through that work a very strong expertise in judging the persuasiveness of administrative decisions. I learned a lot about what constitutes a sound, fair adjudicative decision, both in terms of the reasoning itself and the way in which that reasoning is conveyed. Being a close adviser to adjudicators also allowed me to really learn how natural justice principles play out and are applied in practice.

In addition to the advisory and research aspects of my work at WSIAT, I was also involved in planning and delivering training for the WSIAT adjudicators, and obviously my teaching experience helped me greatly in that regard.

I found that the work at WSIAT was very rewarding, and when I asked myself why that was so, I realized that I have tended to gravitate towards and have a greater interest in those areas of the law that typically affect "everyday people" in a very direct way. For me at least, there is a contrast between, for example, an area like employment law and workers' compensation law, where you are dealing with a very direct impact on individuals and often small to medium-sized businesses, and something like a large corporate transaction or a large piece of complex commercial litigation, where the impact on individuals is much more indirect. I believe this contrast is one of the main reasons that I felt such a good fit working in an administrative tribunal, obviously being more in the former category. Like workers' compensation or employment law, the balancing of residential landlord and tenant interests is also an area of law that has a direct and potentially very significant impact on the lives of ordinary people.

I should mention that during the time I was at WSIAT, I completed the week-long adjudicator training program

that's offered by SOAR. Many of you may be familiar with SOAR, the Society of Ontario Adjudicators and Regulators. I have also completed the dispute resolution training provided by the Ministry of the Attorney General's dispute resolution office.

#### 1010

I worked at WSIAT on a series of contracts for over four and a half years. Shortly after the last of those contracts expired, I was fortunate enough to receive a part-time appointment to the Licence Appeal Tribunal as a part-time vice-chair. You probably all have familiarity with the work of that tribunal. As an adjudicator at LAT, as I shall refer to it, I was able to use all the knowledge and experience I gained at WSIAT about administrative justice, decision-making and decision-writing in a very direct way. I found it a smooth and very natural transition.

From my work for LAT, I have direct experience, then, adjudicating, including running complex hearings with multiple parties, making evidentiary rulings, dealing with both represented and unrepresented parties, and generally controlling the hearing process. Of course, my knowledge of decision-writing also was applied at LAT.

When I took on the part-time appointment at LAT, my plan was to supplement that adjudication with some part-time workers' compensation private practice and research work. As events played out, private practice workers' compensation did not prove to be feasible in the way I'd hoped, and I was left with just doing the part-time Licence Appeal Tribunal adjudication. Since it was only part-time and paid a fairly small per diem, I was forced to look for other income to make ends meet. I became aware of an opportunity with Osgoode Hall Law School that would allow me to combine my education and teacher training with my legal skills.

In March 2005, I accepted my current position as a program lawyer with Osgoode Hall Law School's professional development program. What I do for Osgoode is research, plan and oversee the execution of continuing legal education programs for lawyers and occasionally some non-lawyers who are interested in legal education programs. Although the areas in which I do programming for Osgoode can run the full gamut, I have tended to focus to some extent on programs within the areas of civil litigation, public law and administrative law.

I believe a good adjudicator must possess a specialized tool kit of skills, abilities and knowledge. I hope I have highlighted how my education and work experience, particularly the work at WSIAT and LAT, have provided me the opportunity to acquire this knowledge and to develop these skills.

As I've also noted, I do feel that the work of the Landlord and Tenant Board—the balancing of the respective interests—is something that makes a significant difference in many people's lives in Ontario. This is both the reason that the work, in my view, is so important and also the reason that I'm attracted to making a contribution in this area.

I thank you for the opportunity to take these few minutes to review some of my qualifications and I look forward to any questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. We'll go first to Mr. Tascona.

**Mr. Joseph N. Tascona (Barrie–Simcoe–Bradford):** Thank you, Mr. Jepson. I appreciate your coming here today. Just to start off, do you have any political affiliation at all?

**Mr. Jepson:** I took out a membership in the federal Liberal Party last summer, around July, I believe. Other than that, I've never been particularly politically active and have not participated in any riding associations or anything of that sort.

**Mr. Tascona:** Any political contributions?

**Mr. Jepson:** Other than the cost of that membership, no.

**Mr. Tascona:** Where do you reside?

**Mr. Jepson:** In downtown Toronto.

**Mr. Tascona:** You've got an extensive resumé and experience. I'd like to know how you found out about this appointment and who you dealt with to come forward.

**Mr. Jepson:** I found out about the potential need for adjudicators because I was organizing an administrative law continuing legal education program as part of my current job last October. The organization for that would actually be taking place much in advance, so the initial contacts were probably back in May 2006, almost a year ago.

One of the people who I engaged as a speaker for that program—I engage a number of volunteer speakers, in this case, from administrative justice, the community of administrative lawyers—was Dr. Lilian Ma, who was the chair of what was then the Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal. I ended up chatting with her quite a bit at the time that I engaged her as a speaker in the summer, and she then came to speak in October as part of a panel and we ended up talking a little bit in a break in the program. In one of those conversations—I think it was the latter conversation—I learned that the tribunal had a push to acquire quite a few more adjudicators for what was then going to become the Landlord and Tenant Board.

**Mr. Tascona:** So you applied—it looks here like it was received November 9, 2006.

**Mr. Jepson:** That conference was on October 4-5 or 5-6, I believe, 2006. Within about a week or two of that, I sent my resumé to the Public Appointments Secretariat and to the tribunal.

**Mr. Tascona:** Whom did you deal with from there?

**Mr. Jepson:** From the Public Appointments Secretariat?

**Mr. Tascona:** Yes.

**Mr. Jepson:** I don't recall who actually responded to the resumé. I received probably a standard acknowledgement letter saying that it would be considered. I believe I actually did it electronically through the online Public Appointments Secretariat.

**Mr. Tascona:** Did you deal with anyone from ministry staff directly?

**Mr. Jepson:** No. I didn't actually meet with anybody at the Public Appointments Secretariat.

**Mr. Tascona:** Did you communicate with anybody from the secretariat verbally?

**Mr. Jepson:** No.

**Mr. Tascona:** How did you find out that you were being appointed?

**Mr. Jepson:** I guess at a certain point, after the process of interview and all the substantive process that went on at the Rental Housing Tribunal, I received notification at some juncture. I can't honestly remember if I received it first by contact through the board or from the Public Appointments Secretariat, but at some point I received notification that I had been recommended.

**Mr. Tascona:** Who interviewed you?

**Mr. Jepson:** I interviewed with Dr. Lilian Ma, the chair of the tribunal, and two vice-chairs, Murray Graham and Guy Savoie, I think.

**Mr. Tascona:** This is a full-time position, I understand. Are you aware of what the compensation is for this position?

**Mr. Jepson:** I think it's in the neighbourhood of \$83,100—something like that.

**Mr. Tascona:** And for what term, did they tell you?

**Mr. Jepson:** It's a two-year term, I believe.

**Mr. Tascona:** If you get this appointment, will you be continuing in any of your current professional activities?

**Mr. Jepson:** Do you mean with Osgoode? No. That wouldn't be possible. My work with Osgoode is actually full-time and then some, so the two could not be combined in any way.

**Mr. Tascona:** So you won't be working with a law firm or anyone else?

**Mr. Jepson:** No.

**Mr. Tascona:** Have you ever been a landlord or a tenant?

**Mr. Jepson:** I have never been a landlord. Like many people, I have been a tenant at one time.

**Mr. Tascona:** I think you indicated that when you went to law school you were working with a clinic in terms of landlord and tenant matters.

**Mr. Jepson:** Yes. At that time, of course, it would have been a different legislative regime. I believe that was in the days of the Landlord and Tenant Act. Residential tenancies were contained in what was then part IV of the Landlord and Tenant Act.

**Mr. Tascona:** Recently in the Legislature, we debated a resolution that called for landlord licensing. Are you familiar with that?

**Mr. Jepson:** No, I haven't heard about that proposal.

**Mr. Tascona:** What do you think about that idea?

**Mr. Jepson:** Obviously, since I haven't heard the proposal, I don't have any information about it. I would have to have a lot more information in order to form a useful opinion, I think. Maybe you could expand on it a little bit and give me some information about what the proposal is.

**Mr. Tascona:** Well, it's basically to deal with bad landlords and developing a list in terms of work orders and things like that, so that people have knowledge of what they're getting into and so the tribunal can also sift them out.

**Mr. Jepson:** I don't have any initial opinion on that, because I think there are a lot of parameters one would have to consider. Obviously, the impetus is perhaps salutary to trying to form some sort of register, but I think there are a lot of parameters that would have to be considered. It's probably more a matter for policy-makers and legislators than for—obviously it wouldn't be something I'd be considering in this role as an adjudicator.

**Mr. Tascona:** Yes. Given the issues that are currently creating much attention at a government agency, the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corp., do you feel it's important that the Landlord and Tenant Board provide to the public the statistics, summaries and other materials related to the decisions that are made?

**Mr. Jepson:** I think there are actually two different things there. You mentioned statistics and decisions—the full text of decisions. My understanding is that at present they do not offer full-text decisions. They still offer summaries that are contained in the annual report. All considerations aside—and there are a number of parameters that have to be considered—as a baseline proposition, I think it's a good thing for full-text decisions to be widely available. It has a number of positive effects. From the point of view of sound adjudication, it's nice if parties can access those decisions and, therefore, in appropriate cases, cite them to you. It helps them perhaps to analyze their own cases.

1020

**Mr. Tascona:** What about statistics, though, to give people a reason, where the tribunal's going?

**Mr. Jepson:** Statistics? The reason I said—sorry. Go ahead.

**Mr. Tascona:** Statistics in terms of getting a feel for how they decide things and what they've been deciding.

**Mr. Jepson:** Statistics, I feel, are perhaps not as useful. I believe that WSIAT, where I worked, did publish some statistics, and because I worked inside that tribunal and then saw the statistics, I had a chance to see that it's easy for them to be misinterpreted unless you know all of the details, nuances and background.

I don't think it's necessarily a terrible idea, but I think there are some drawbacks, potentially, that have to be looked at very closely, how much information is being given with the statistics and so on.

**Mr. Tascona:** Do you want to give me an example of a drawback?

**Mr. Jepson:** As I just mentioned, for instance, if you have statistics about outcomes, just bare outcomes that are not linked to the type of application or the subtype of application, then the information can potentially be misleading.

**Mr. Tascona:** Okay. What effect do you feel rent controls have on affordable housing?

**Mr. Jepson:** I don't feel I actually have the requisite information to give a really informed opinion about that. The policy-makers and legislators have had to look at that repeatedly over the years. I think that relationship is a complex one. I feel they're in a better position than I am to make that judgment.

I would just point out that I remain acutely aware that this is a position where I would be an adjudicator. In my own view, it's very important that myself and anyone adjudicating really keep clear about how that function is a delegated function and you are only a creature of statute, so your role is to apply the statute that exists.

**Mr. Tascona:** Do you have any knowledge of the current statute? Because they did make changes.

**Mr. Jepson:** Yes. Obviously, if I receive the appointment, I will be receiving extensive training and I will be learning a lot more, but I have some initial knowledge. I am certainly aware that the RTA brings in certain changes relative to the former Tenant Protection Act.

**Mr. Tascona:** Do you have any familiarity of how they—procedurally, have you ever represented anyone in front of the tribunal?

**Mr. Jepson:** Not this tribunal. As I said, when I was doing landlord-tenant work back in the clinic, it wasn't this set-up.

**Mr. Tascona:** So you have no real opinion in terms of what may be improved or what could be done in terms of procedure or how they operate in a hearing?

**Mr. Jepson:** No. I know it's clear that some of the changes brought in with the RTA that I've looked at are meant to address, among other things, what must have been perceived as procedural issues, and whether they successfully do so, I would suspect, obviously remains to be seen, because that's a very new legislation coming before us—only at the end of January. It will take some time to see whether those changes actually have the positive effects that presumably, let's hope, they would have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. We've run out of time. Ms. DiNovo.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo (Parkdale-High Park):** Thank you, Mr. Jepson, for appearing before us. We know you are a member of the Liberal Party but we hope that, in the delegation of your duties and the duties themselves, you would be non-partisan. You certainly have the Ombudsman as a wonderful example of someone who fulfills his task extremely well.

I'd like to start off with asking you what you feel about the Residential Tenancies Act. What do you think about it?

**Mr. Jepson:** Can you be more specific? I mean, it's a broad act. It takes a fresh look at this regime and, as I understand it, brings in quite a number of different changes and adjustments. Is there anything specific that you're referring to?

**Ms. DiNovo:** What jumps out at you? What would you see as some of the benefits and what perhaps would you see as some of the negatives of this move?

**Mr. Jepson:** I would add, I guess, the initial caveat that I'm not sure I'm well placed to say what will be a benefit and what will be a negative, and I'm not sure anyone will be until it's been in place for a while. But you ask what jumps out at me. I think the thing that to me is one of the most significant changes is the fact that default eviction orders are eliminated in all cases. Whether or not the tenant has filed a reply, there is going to be a hearing. Procedurally, I know from speaking with people at tribunal that that obviously is going to make a big difference in the scheduling, in the number of hearings, and for all the parties involved. It's going to change things a lot. It remains to be seen how that will work out. But that's certainly a significant change, and it's a change substantively because it means that a number of applications that previously would not have been heard on their merits will now be heard on their merits in some form.

**Ms. DiNovo:** It sounds like you are favourably disposed to the Residential Tenancies Act. Am I correct in that?

**Mr. Jepson:** As I said, I really wouldn't be able to say that because, first of all, I don't feel I have the requisite intimate familiarity with that act, which I will, if I'm appointed, shortly be acquiring. Being a lawyer, I'm always very cautious about the holes in my knowledge. I only have an overview of the act, the parts that I've attempted to look at. So I don't have a strong view as to whether it will be successful. What I can say, as an overview in my observations, is that it's not a wholesale change in the entire regime. It looks as if there's been an attempt to make a number of surgical changes to address issues that have been identified, and whether those are successful in helping to create the right balance between landlord and tenant interests, I think we'll have to wait and see.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Certainly in my riding of Parkdale-High Park, there are a great number of tenants and a great number of tenant issues, and some very deep concerns and some vociferous opposition to this act. One of the concerns—I'll just go through them and I would love to have you comment upon them—is that we're looking at evictions now, really, at record highs in the city, and that seems to be a change. So I was wondering if you would comment about the increase in evictions.

**Mr. Jepson:** I actually don't have any real opinion on that because I don't have the information and the statistics. I would also add that I would be very cautious in giving an opinion on something like that because my role, again, if I'm appointed to this board, requires that I adjudicate, and I'm very careful to adjudicate only on the facts of the case before me. Broad, general statistics like that—I suppose one might imagine the very unusual case where they're actually led as evidence, but otherwise, they would be irrelevant considerations; one has to focus on the individual facts. So I'd be very cautious about looking at those generalized statistics.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Well, certainly they're out there for public knowledge: an 8.7% increase between 2004 and

2005, 10.7% in Toronto alone; and again in 2006, another increase on top of that. So I'm just wondering, on behalf of tenants out there—I'm a landlord and I have been a tenant, so I think that I can speak somewhat impartially on this.

The other concern, of course, is the rental deposit change. Now when a tenant gives first and last month's rent—which is common—when they take over a unit, they're not getting as much back on their money at the end. Again, I wondered what you thought about that, the fact that tenants are being penalized on the interest on their deposit.

**Mr. Jepson:** My understanding is that with that change, now the interest will be based on the annual rent increase, which itself is going to be the CPI. That's my understanding. I don't have any strong opinion one way or the other as to whether that's a good idea because I don't know the policy reasons behind the change from the prior regime and what were exactly identified as the problems. Again, that's a matter for policy-makers and legislators to look at. It's not that it's unimportant, but I don't think that it's appropriate for me to comment on it as an adjudicator.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Obviously, we in the New Democratic Party are in favour of real rent control, which is unit rent control, and not based on the person who's doing the renting so that there's inducement for the landlord to move them out to get higher rent with the next tenant.

But to move on from that, the process of the hearing itself: Landlords, particularly large landlords, tend to have larger purses than the average tenant, so they tend to have, for example—many of the large ones—lawyers on hire, whereas a tenant does not. The process itself of appeal, I'm wondering if you could comment upon that, particularly in light of, for example, my own riding where many of the tenants are recent immigrants and can't speak English very well.

**Mr. Jepson:** If I understand your question correctly, I wouldn't be able to comment specifically on the process as it has been at the tribunal because, as I indicated to Mr. Tascona, I have not appeared there, so I don't want to suggest that I'm speaking from experience in hearings.

**1030**

I guess what I would say, from the point of view of what I believe is important for adjudicators, in my experience as an adjudicator and as an adviser to adjudicators, is that one of the qualities adjudicators should have is the ability to communicate well with a variety of parties of a wide variety of sophistication. Part of implementing the principles of natural justice in a hearing, if the adjudicator is doing the job well, is to ensure that regardless of how the person is represented or if they're represented at all, they have an opportunity to receive notice of what the issues are, of course, to be heard and to have an opportunity to test the evidence of the other side. I do think it's possible to do that in almost any hearing set-up, provided that one is careful to apply those principles.

**Ms. DiNovo:** I'm reassured to hear that because, again, many tenants go before these tribunals not know-

ing what the rules are, what their rights are, and up against some pretty sophisticated legal expertise on the other side, so it's not really a fair game. My hope would be that you would be a little partial on the tenants' side in that situation.

I'm also concerned too—and I know you haven't been involved in this yet, but again, carrying forward into your duties—about the lack of transparency. Mr. Tascona touched on this, the fact that we can't get our hands on statistics, summaries of decisions. In the interest of transparency and accountability of the board, we would very much like to be able to see summaries of decisions, the reasons for decisions and statistics coming out of that. How do you feel going into this about the transparency of the process? I know you haven't been there, but just in general with your legal background.

**Mr. Jepson:** Are you asking about decisions and statistics?

**Ms. DiNovo:** Absolutely, yes, and the ability of the public to be able to see statistics on decisions and summaries of the basis of those decisions.

**Mr. Jepson:** I think I would just reiterate what I said to Mr. Tascona, which is that, in principle, it's usually a good thing at the starting point for decisions to be available. I didn't get into this in my answer to Mr. Tascona, but there are, however, other considerations when one looks at that, including costs and administrative problems. In fact, I actually understand that there's been an effort to make Landlord and Tenant Board decisions available through Quicklaw, and there is some sort of technical problem with that which I can't comment on. As a starting point, I think it's a good thing, but there are issues. It's not necessarily a simple thing to just go ahead and do that. There are costs, there's administration and so on. So those are issues, I think, for the chair to weigh and consider when deciding whether to make those changes.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. That concludes the time allocated. You may step down.

**Ms. Smith:** Did he use all his time?

**The Chair:** About 30 seconds—

**Ms. Smith:** Okay, that's fine. I was just wondering. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

#### GARY CARR

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Gary Carr, intended appointee as member, Greater Toronto Transportation Authority board of directors.

**The Chair:** Our second interview is with Gary Carr, intended appointee as member, Greater Toronto Transportation Authority board of directors. Good morning, and welcome to the committee. As I'm sure you're aware, you have an opportunity, should you wish to do so, to make an initial statement, and subsequent to that there are questions from members of the committee. Each party will have 10 minutes allocated for questions and we'll go in rotation. As is also the practice of the com-

mittee, any time you take in your statement will be deducted from the time allotted to the government party. Please begin when you're ready.

**Mr. Gary Carr:** Thank you very much. It is great to be back and seeing my old friends—as many of you know, I spent a number of years here—not only friends around the table but those who are working in the back, as well as our fine clerk and you as well, Madam Chair.

I won't take a great deal of time. As some of you do know, I was an MPP at Queen's Park for 13 years. I was elected in 1990, re-elected in 1995 and then re-elected in 1999, so I spent about 13 years here. I was also Speaker for four years, the last four years prior to the election. I spent a little bit of time as an MP up in Ottawa, and in November of last year, I was elected regional chair in Halton. For those of you who don't know, in Halton we do elect the regional chair. The fine region of Halton is made up of Halton Hills, Milton, Oakville and Burlington.

One of the reasons I was appointed to this is that council endorsed a unanimous resolution to send me as chair to the GTTA. We have had a history of doing that. My predecessor as regional chair, who is now an MPP here, Joyce Savoline—for those of you who don't know—was on the GO board. So it's our hope and intention that as part of the region we can participate. In fact, some of the other members include my good friend Bill Fisch, the chair from York, and Roger Anderson from Durham, who has become a good friend. The reason my name was put forward was twofold: (1) that I was elected by the good people of Halton; and (2) the council endorsed me with a unanimous resolution.

With my background of spending about 15 years now—17 if you include back to 1990—in political life, I believe I can contribute to this particular committee, and it would be my hope that people around the table would endorse the recommendation of the council to put me on that board.

With that, I'll open it to questions. Again, it's great to be back and to see everyone. I say this in all sincerity: I really did enjoy my time here and I really do miss you. The good news is that at the region we still have a lot of interaction with the province, including a lot of the social programs, so I do get a chance to see a lot of the folks around the table whom I knew previously, even those that weren't elected. Thank you for having me here today.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. We'll begin with Ms. DiNovo.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Thank you, Mr. Carr, for coming and sitting before us. You know what the process is like; you've been on this side.

Just to begin with, about the transparency of public consultation, if you could say a few words about what the public's role should be in developing a transit strategy and how that should be carried out.

**Mr. Carr:** That's a very good question. I went to the first meeting of the GTTA because they are open. The press and everybody was there. One of the things that all

of them stressed, and I think it was Roger Anderson in particular, was that all the meetings of the GTTA should be open unless you're dealing, like you do on council, with some type of personnel matters or property. And while I couldn't vote because I hadn't been endorsed by this committee, I did go and participate. I must say—and I'm not just saying this—we do have a really good board. The two chairs and the mayor were there, and the chair of the TTC. One of the things that they did stress is that we are going to have an open process.

And one of the things I did like too—and again I will say this; it's no secret—was that people like Hazel McCallion, Mayor Miller, the two chairs, are very, very outspoken, they don't pull any punches. That's what I admire about them. I said that to all of them. We sometimes will disagree on things, but you always know where you stand with them. I must admit I was very impressed. I didn't know Adam from the TTC, but having listened to him at the meeting, I was very impressed with the people around there, as well as Paul Bedford, who was a planner with the city of Toronto. So it's my hope that we will get the public involved in the process.

One of the things that came out as a result of that meeting—again, it was open to the press and everybody—is that they really are not going to try and reinvent the wheel. They're going to take a lot of the work that has been done in the GTSB, which really looked at it.

The other thing I will say is that that my hope was—I was here during the 1990s, when it was a very, very difficult period of time financially. We had huge deficits here and at the federal government. The good news is that we're out of that now and we're hopeful—and I'm not telling tales out of school, but what came at the first meeting is that this board is hopeful of having a plan in place in about a year, and lay it out to the provincial government and to everybody and say, "This is what we need to do, here's how we need to fund it."

I was very pleased to hear from the chair, who also happens to be a former mayor of Burlington whom we know very well, Rob MacIsaac, that we are going to move fairly quickly. It's our hope, based on that first meeting, to have something back to the province for some of the funding—and probably the federal government as well. What we want to do is piggyback on the great work that's been done. All the meetings will be open and we would hope that all the folks around the table, certainly the MPPs as well as the people who come out, will participate and give us their feedback.

**1040**

Let me just say this finally: We have a real once-in-a-lifetime opportunity here. I was really pleased that they were looking at planning out for 50 and 100 years. This isn't a short-term gap. Our economic prosperity really depends on having a great transit system, so we would like to participate and be a part of that.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Thank you. Certainly, the New Democratic Party has a bill before the federal government about a national transit strategy. Just to dream a little bit, if there were a national transit strategy—first of all, do

you think there should be? And then, what might it look like?

**Mr. Carr:** Yes, I'm hopeful because, having spent time in the federal government, the federal government does have now a big surplus, even with all of the spending—about \$10 billion. My good friend the mayor of Mississauga, Hazel McCallion, I think summed it up in a speech she made recently. She said that the federal government has the money, the provincial government has the authority and the municipal governments have all of the problems. In a nutshell, that really does sum it up. The good news is that the federal government does have money.

I'm of the opinion, and there are two trains of thought—it might be a bit of a long answer. When I was there—as you know, I was with the Progressive-Conservatives provincially, federally with the Liberals—the Liberal government wanted to tie a lot of their funding to specific programs. It was earmarked for child care, it was earmarked for Kyoto and it was earmarked for health care under the accord. I wasn't too concerned with how the money was earmarked, whether it comes in as transit. I was a big, big believer, though, in dealing with the fiscal imbalance, and in fact was one who argued that there was one. Some of the people up there didn't.

What I have argued and pushed forward to our greater Toronto area mayors and chairs is for the federal government to give some of that money back to the provincial government. I must say, I think they did a pretty good job—it wasn't entirely what the province wanted—on the last go-round, helping out a little bit with that. What I've said to people is that if the money comes to the province, then we can go to the province and argue for transit money versus health care and versus education. I'm not as hung up on whether it's tied to a specific program such as a federal transit program, because I believe the people around this table are elected and if you get the money, you can decide that in Ontario you'd like to spend a lot on transit. In Saskatchewan, for example, you might not, because that might not be their priority.

To be fair, I want the federal government to give its rightful share to Ontario and then, because the MPPs are elected, I think you will make the right decision about what you want to do, whether it's to put it into housing or child care. I'm not really hung up on if the federal government puts together a national transit strategy. In fact, I think the Prime Minister came to the FCM and said, "I'm not going to give money to the municipalities, but I'm going to give it to the province." Recently, though, they did change that and gave money for the York subway.

I'm not as concerned about whether it's tied to that or whether it's given sort of carte blanche, as long as they give the money to—I'm not just saying this, because I've been at both levels. If you give the money to the provincial government, I am quite confident that in election campaigns they'll be out there and say, "We should spend this and this party should spend that." And at the end of the day, they're a duly elected government.

But the bottom line is that the federal government does have the money now. If I could sum it up, the fed-

eral government, from my recollection having been there, has more revenue than it needs for the services they provide. The provincial government is starting to get right, but in my opinion it has less money than it needs to provide for health care and education.

**Ms. DiNovo:** The city, from Mayor Miller's point of view—of course, he's been shortchanged hugely, at least \$71 million worth in this budget, and is calling for an uploading of the downloads. So have we, for quite a while now.

If you're going to get transit happening, and particularly this wonderful dream of light rapid transit, you're going to need money to do it. Isn't this the province's responsibility also?

**Mr. Carr:** Yes, definitely so, and at the first meeting—as I mentioned, I went, even though I wasn't fully endorsed to the GTTA—I did say that to Mayor Miller. I did endorse his program for getting more money, because I believe the city of Toronto does need some money. We were very helpful. We were pleased that the provincial government in the last budget gave some pooling money. When I was a provincial member, I actually voted against my own government on the downloading and the pooling. So I was pleased that the provincial government is starting to do that, and my feeling is that if the federal government gets some money, they will be able to give it.

Over lunch at the GTTA meeting, I did say to Mayor Miller, "I support you in that." I fully believe that the city of Toronto does require some money. I've said this and I'll say it publicly: Everybody tries to be more efficient. We'll always continue to do that at the federal, municipal, provincial levels. We'll always be trying to do that. But the city of Toronto really does have a financial situation, and I don't care who the mayor is, it's going to be very difficult unless they get the money.

I hope they will come forward with that one cent. In fact, I tried to get a resolution that the GTA mayors and chairs call on the federal government to give us some of that money, but the other members didn't do it.

**Ms. DiNovo:** Just one last question—I'm very reassured by that, by the way. Thank you. But also, we saw a huge amount of money going into the subway up to York, and then the dream of light rapid transit that some would argue is the way to go rather than extensive subway construction. Where would you fall on that spectrum?

**Mr. Carr:** What I've said when I've come forward is that I don't come in with any preconceived ideas. We're going to look at everything; I think everything should be on the table. It did come up at that meeting. Again, I'm not telling tales out of school, because it was public. People like Roger Anderson were very strong in pushing for light rapid transit. A lot of the people around there have excellent experience and have been around a lot of years. What they seem to be saying is, "Let's move on with it."

The good news is that regardless of what happens—as all of you know, there's an election coming up in the

fall—regardless of who's in there, I really believe there will be some money put towards it. What we want to do is have a good plan in place. Where I'm particularly pleased is that in Halton—as part of Places to Grow, we're looking at Durable Halton—we are now picking the spots where we're going to put new growth. Where other communities didn't have a chance to do that—for example, Toronto grew and didn't have the money for a lot of the transit—we will have a tremendous opportunity, because we can decide to put our growth in this area or this area and match up transit with what we're doing under Places to Grow. That's one of the reasons I would like to be on there, because we'll be one of the regions that can learn from some of the things that have happened in other regions and say, "We're going to put our growth in this area because it's intensive and we can have a goal." I think that will be something really exciting if we match it up. After the first meeting, I went back to our regional staff and said, "I'd like to have some people from our staff come down and understand what they're doing at the GTTA, because I really believe that we can benefit by matching up our growth to where the transit is going to be over the next few years."

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. It's time to move on. Ms. Smith?

**Ms. Smith:** I want to thank you, Mr. Carr, for being here today. I think that you bring to the GTTA an extensive amount of experience, and a varied experience, at all three levels of government which I think will be a real value-add to the authority. I want to thank you for being here and for putting your name forward. We appreciate it.

**Mr. Carr:** Thank you very much. I appreciate that. That's very kind.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Any other comments here? Seeing none, Mr. Tascona?

**Mr. Tascona:** It's good to see you. We saw each other in the Speaker's office, Gary. It's good to see you again.

I know you served with us and the Conservative Party until 2003, then you were elected in Halton as a Liberal member for two years. I've got to ask you this question: Are you carrying a card for either party these days?

**Mr. Carr:** No, neither federally or provincially. I did of course carry one and I endorsed in 1990, 1995 and 1999 for the Progressive Conservatives because I liked the candidate I was supporting—me. Then federally, I obviously bought a membership in 2004 and supported the 2004 candidate in the last election.

**Mr. Tascona:** So you haven't bought a card and joined Mr. Turner's—

**Mr. Carr:** No.

**Mr. Tascona:** In this particular situation, you've been appointed. This is an area that covers Durham up to York, and it excludes Simcoe county—as you know, I represent that area—which I find puzzling in terms of what they're trying to do, which is to develop an integrated, multi-modal model with respect to public transit, GO Transit and highway. As you may know, they're targeting bringing GO Transit back to the city of

Barrie in the fall of 2007. It certainly is a growth area because the current government left Simcoe county out of the greenbelt and also out of this particular operation.

I think one reason why I did call you—because I know you've got experience in this area and I'm very familiar with you—is that that's something I think is a mistake in terms of having a seamless model. If you're going to have it all the way up from Durham, it should have gone up to Simcoe county. I would give you that thought to maybe explore with the board of directors in terms of thinking about Simcoe county, even though that's not your mandate in terms of the gridlock that is being created, just as you pass Newmarket going up into our area. Certainly the GO Transit system will be a part of that. I know the HOV lanes that they're talking about are only going to go up to Major Mackenzie on Highway 400, but I really think, if you're going to be doing something, you've got to think of the entire area.

**1050**

You talk about Places to Grow. Barrie is targeted as probably the fastest-growing community in the country, and yet it's not in there. I find that puzzling and I think, as the member, we don't have representation on that municipally. I need to bring that to your attention, that it's got to be something if you're going to think about how we move the traffic. You've got to move the traffic. As you know, people go up north every weekend. I think you're talking in the millions of vehicles a year, and that's not even thought of in terms of how they're going to deal with that.

As you know, when we were in government we had plans for the Highway 400 expansion, which never occurred under this government, and also the 427 being extended, which has gone off the board also in terms of planning.

You've got that experience in terms of the knowledge of where that was going. I just bring that to you because I think it's important for that to be considered.

From what I understand about Halton region, it's not responsible for its own transit; it's the area municipalities that are responsible? Okay. How is that going to be dealt with? There's a possibility, from what I understand, of reducing the number of transit operating authorities in the GTA, moving toward a Halton regional transit system similar to York, Durham, Toronto and Hamilton. What are your thoughts about that? It's obviously going to be complicated.

**Mr. Carr:** Yes. I'll speak to your first point, and it's a good point. I think we do need to look—I know Barrie is growing. I must say, the people on there at the first meeting—I've been very pleased. Hazel McCallion isn't looking at it just from Mississauga's standpoint—and the regional chair's. From the discussions we had at the first meeting, they are looking at a real system. I say this in all honesty: There are some real straight shooters on there. I know they're going to be looking at it.

Obviously in an area like Barrie, transportation has to be a big issue. If we're going to get people around, and under Places to Grow, if Barrie is going to be a place that

is going to have tremendous growth, we need to ensure that we look at everything there. Obviously, I would do that, look at it. But it isn't just me. I think the other folks on there really aren't looking at it from their own parochial interests. They will look at it from all of the greater Toronto area. So we obviously will be keeping that in mind.

To the second point, one of the reasons we did it and had the regional chair on there is because of the GO situation. We have GO service in Oakville and Burlington. We're working to make sure that we get, for example, more parking for the GO. I came in this morning on the GO. But out in my region, I have to go to Appleby—

**Mr. Tascona:** You're lucky. I haven't had that opportunity in 12 years.

**Mr. Carr:** Yes, and do you know what? I must admit it was great. We're doing the Durable Halton. This is my Durable Halton file; I sat and read it. I got a lot of work done. We came in, met some folks. It really is good. One of the problems, though, is that we need something very simple: parking at Oakville and Burlington. If you don't get there very early in the morning, you can't come in. I had to go to Appleby. For those who are watching, you still can get parking at Appleby. So there are some challenges in the areas we have. The reason we've had the chair on there has been because she has been on the GO board, in the case of Joyce Savoline, in the past.

The reason I particularly want to be in there from a Halton standpoint is because of what I mentioned. As part of Places to Grow, as we look at where to grow, we will look at where we need to have service. As you may know, Milton is the fastest-growing in all of Canada, with 71%. We will be extending GO service out there as that population continues to grow. So we want to make sure that we have our voice heard in Halton.

The good news is that I honestly believe this group is going to be able to look at it in the context of putting together a really good plan that they can take back to whoever the minister is a year from now and say, "This is what we'd like to do." I'm hoping that will incorporate not only my region but Durham. As you know, it will be a combination of roads, transit, light rapid, the GO service, everything that we need to make sure that transportation in the greater Toronto area becomes—

**Mr. Tascona:** Is there any possibility that in that deliberation to develop a plan you'd be considering Simcoe county as part of looking at this? Traffic doesn't stop when you go past Newmarket; it picks up both ways. It's going to be sort of a very myopic type of approach to dealing with transportation issues.

**Mr. Carr:** And we'd like to look at that. Also, the Hamilton mayor sits, so it goes all the way around the Golden Horseshoe and all the way up. It is going to be all-encompassing, and I assure you that we will bring that about Simcoe, and the concerns of Barrie to the table as well.

**Mr. Tascona:** Okay. I know you were a chairperson when you were in the federal government. Did you deal,

within your committee or in your time there, in any transportation issues?

**Mr. Carr:** No. I wasn't a chair of a committee. I was on public accounts.

**Mr. Tascona:** I guess as chair of Halton, you're familiar with Halton region's Connections report.

**Mr. Carr:** The transit report?

**Mr. Tascona:** Yes.

**Mr. Carr:** Yes.

**Mr. Tascona:** You're familiar with that. You know what it means and what it represents.

**Mr. Carr:** It's in my file here for the Durable Halton plan.

**Mr. Tascona:** Do you agree with what that stands for?

**Mr. Carr:** What we're doing now as part of the Places to Grow and Durable Halton is reviewing it. Just to give you some idea of what's happening now, under Places to Grow, we've put together about 20 technical papers, we have an interministerial committee, and probably by June of this year we'll be going out to the public and saying, "Here is where we have to grow," and putting together, "Here is how we're going to do our transit."

As part of our technical papers, we are looking at the whole issue of transit. We are reviewing our master plan for transit, as well as national heritage, as part of where to grow our green space and all the things that will be encompassed under Places to Grow. As part of our process, we are reviewing what we are going to be doing in transportation. Again, the bottom line is that what we want to do is match up transportation to the growth, because we're supposed to go from about 390,000—we're probably closer to 400,000—to probably about 800,000 over the next little while. In order to do that, we want to make sure that we have the transit in place, and also, as you know, we have been going after the federal and provincial governments to ensure that the financing is there for the requirements.

**Mr. Tascona:** Now, the Premier has appointed people; he hasn't really set out how he is going to do this. As chair of Halton, what do you feel is needed, and what type of funding will you be proposing as a member of the board? Because we're talking big money here.

**Mr. Carr:** Yes, and in speaking with Rob MacIsaac, we are looking at everything. He has said that publicly. We are looking at everything that we do. As a part of it, we're looking at how we're going to fund it over the next little while. For example, we do have responsibilities for roads. We've been very clear in saying that we wanted some of the GTA pooling money, which we got back. We also want the government of the day, whether it's this government or any other—particularly as a run-up to the election campaign—to take a look at development charges again and see what we will be doing. Particularly, what we want to have them look at is—as you know, they look at past years' averages. Our friends in Durham, for example, have taken over transit. Roger Anderson—again, I'm not telling tales out of school—has said that when we look at that, we can't look at the

past, because they didn't have very much in terms of transit in the past. We need to look to the future. How are we going to fund this? Quite frankly, I think that will be the biggest challenge for this board. I think we can put a good plan together, work with people, work with the public, and come together with a real plan about what you should do.

Where the pavement will hit the road will be how it will be funded, how that will be done. That will be a responsibility that will fall back on your shoulders as provincial members and also, I believe, the federal government, because the amount that your talking about, I don't the provincial government alone—whether it's getting money through the fiscal imbalance or whether they've put a national transit strategy together, I don't think you can do it alone based on the financial situation of the province. It will need help from the federal government. That's why I'm saying—where I am pleased—that the federal government is now out of a deficit position. I believe they can give you some money. I think you had an all-party resolution asking for money from the federal government in a non-partisan way. That was good. You all got some of the fiscal imbalance money back. That will be our challenge, and your challenge I believe will be that it will still need to go to education, it will still need to go to health care, it will need to go to the environment.

But what I've said is that if we put a good plan together, I'm quite prepared to line up with the health care people, the environment people and the education people and say, "Here's where we think you should spend X amount of money," because I really believe—I firmly believe this—that what we're doing with transportation is a real economic driver. If we do not get transit solved, and goods and people can't move around, our great prosperity—and we've been very blessed in this region, going all the way out even to Gerry's area around Hamilton. It's one of the best economies, with one of the highest standards of living in the world. One of the reasons is because we've had a great transportation system. We can't lose this opportunity now to build for the future.

Again, I have been to the one meeting. I think we've got some great people around the table to make those decisions. Then I think we'll be coming back to you and saying, "Here's our plan to finance it." The folks around this table, if you're all here then, which I'm sure you all will be, will have some really tough decisions to make on how to fund it.

**The Chair:** This concludes the time that's been allocated. Thank you very much for coming. It's good to see you.

I now ask members of the committee to deal with concurrences. We will now consider the intended appointment of Ken Jepson, intended appointee as member, Landlord and Tenant Board.

**Ms. Smith:** I move concurrence of the appointment of Ken Jepson as a member of the Landlord and Tenant Board.

**The Chair:** Concurrence in the appointment has been moved by Ms. Smith. Any discussion? If not, all in favour? No one opposed. The motion is carried.

We will now consider the intended appointment of Gary Carr, intended appointee as member, Greater Toronto Transportation Authority board of directors.

**Ms. Smith:** I move the appointment of Gary Carr as a member of the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Concurrence in the appointment has been moved by Ms. Smith. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favour? The motion is carried.

That concludes our business on intended appointments. Congratulations to both intended appointees. Thank you very much.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

**The Chair:** We will now revert to agenda item number 5. As you will note from your agenda, this is the report of the subcommittee on report writing.

**Ms. Smith:** I move acceptance of the following report of the subcommittee:

Your subcommittee on committee business met on Tuesday, March 20, and Tuesday, March 27, 2007, to consider the method of proceeding on report writing and agreed to the following:

(1) That report writing on the three agencies be conducted in the following order:

- (i) Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (WSIB);
- (ii) Health Professions Appeal and Review Board (HPARB); and
- (iii) Ontario Power Generation (OPG).

(2) That the research officers prepare a draft report on the WSIB and that the draft report contain a condensed version of the WSIB background material, a summary of the agency presentation, followed by a summary of stakeholder presentations, followed by the list of stakeholder recommendations appended to the end of the draft report.

(3) That the committee commence report writing on the WSIB following the intended appointments on April 4, 2007.

(4) That the research officers prepare a glossary explanation of WSIB terminology mentioned in the recommendations listed in the summary of public hearings.

**The Chair:** Any further comments? I'd ask that the subcommittee report be adopted. All those in favour? Thank you.

We will now move into closed session in order to begin our deliberations on report writing.

*The committee continued in closed session at 1104.*





## CONTENTS

Wednesday 4 April 2007

<b>Subcommittee reports</b> .....	A-569, A-579
<b>Intended appointments</b>	
Mr. Ken Jepson .....	A-569
Mr. Gary Carr .....	A-574

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

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

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

Mrs. Carol Mitchell (Huron–Bruce L)

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

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

Ms. Monique M. Smith (Nipissing L)

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

#### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mrs. Liz Sandals (Guelph–Wellington L)

Mr. Jim Brownell (Stormont–Dundas–Charlottenburgh L)

#### **Clerk / Greffière**

Ms. Tonia Grannum

#### **Staff / Personnel**

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