



ISSN 1180-436X

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 41st Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Wednesday 20 April 2016

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Mercredi 20 avril 2016

**Standing Committee on
the Legislative Assembly**

Organization

**Comité permanent de
l'Assemblée législative**

Organisation

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 416-325-3708.

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 416-325-3708.

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
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLYCOMITÉ PERMANENT DE
L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

Wednesday 20 April 2016

Mercredi 20 avril 2016

The committee met at 1301 in committee room 1.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Welcome, everyone, to the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly. Everyone has their agenda in front of them.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): We're going to deal with the election of the Vice-Chair. It's my duty to entertain a motion for Vice-Chair. Are there any motions? Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Robert Bailey: Mr. Chair, I'd like to nominate Mr. Steve Clark as Vice-Chair of the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): A motion has been moved by Mr. Bailey. Is there any debate? Shall the motion carry? Carried.

Welcome, Mr. Clark. Congratulations on being Vice-Chair.

Mr. Steve Clark: Thank you, Chair. It's a great honour. Thank you, sir.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): I'd now like to move to the second item on the agenda, and it's organization and discussion on Bill 100 and what the committee's views are on how we should deal with that.

I'll move first to Ms. Wong.

Ms. Soo Wong: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I move:

(1) That the committee meet during its regularly scheduled times on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, and Wednesday, May 11, 2016, for the purpose of public hearings.

(2) That the Clerk of the Committee post information regarding public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly website, and on Canada NewsWire.

(3) That the deadline for requests to appear be 4 p.m. on Wednesday, April 27, 2016.

(4) That the Clerk of the Committee provide a list of all interested persons to the subcommittee following the deadline for requests.

(5) That each subcommittee member or delegate provide their selections of witnesses based on the list of interested persons received from the Clerk of the Committee by 12 noon on Friday, April 29, 2016.

(6) That all witnesses be offered 10 minutes for presentation, and three minutes for questioning by committee

members on a rotation by caucus for a total of nine minutes.

(7) That the deadline for written submissions be 6 p.m. on Wednesday, May 11, 2016.

(8) That amendments to Bill 100 be filed with the Clerk of the Committee by 12 noon on Friday, May 13, 2016.

(9) That the committee meet for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 100 on Wednesday, May 18, 2016, and Wednesday, June 1, 2016.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): We have a motion by Ms. Wong. Any debate on that motion? Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes. In your submission, I don't see any travel. I don't see any northern communities that are going to be visited by the committee. What's the status on that?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): I'm sorry, Mr. Miller. Could you repeat that?

Mr. Paul Miller: I'll repeat it. I don't see on this submission anything about any travel or any northern communities that are going to be visited, like Sudbury, Thunder Bay or Timmins. This looks like it's all local.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Ms. Wong.

Ms. Soo Wong: Mr. Chair, through you to the member, I believe that there's going to be a discussion by your House leader on this whole issue of travelling.

Don't look at me funny.

With regard to the discussion, you know the House leaders decide, in terms of—don't look at me funny.

Mr. Paul Miller: What do you mean, look at you funny?

Ms. Soo Wong: It's true. Yes, you do.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Hold on, hold on.

Ms. Soo Wong: Stop looking at me funny.

Mr. Paul Miller: I'm squinting.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): All right. We're going to move to Mr. Clark.

Mr. Paul Miller: I can't even do body expression now.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Order.

Mr. Clark.

Mr. Steve Clark: I just want to express, like my colleague, the same disappointment with the government for having invoked closure on this bill in the House, yet it appears again that this government hasn't done their due diligence prior to a motion being tabled by this com-

mittee. It seems to be the pattern of this government, when it comes to the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, that they're flying by the seat of their pants.

This is a bill that has caused frustration and confusion throughout the province of Ontario, in all corners. Trails in my riding and in many other ridings have been closed because of this government's reluctance to actually speak directly in the communities that are affected by this bill.

To offer up a motion that only has two days of hearings in Toronto, to me, is unacceptable and an insult to anyone who has put their name on the record regarding wanting to be heard on Bill 100.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thanks, Mr. Clark. Mr. Miller?

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes. I was a little confused by the presentation by MPP Wong when she said that the House leaders—the House leaders don't decide. The committee decides what the agenda is. We can't put this through and then wait, maybe, for a House leaders' decision down the road that may not agree with what we've suggested here. The decision is made here on how it's handled with the public, not by the House leaders. That's number one.

Number two, we were under the assumption that there would be some travel involved and you would be hitting the northern communities. I can speak for my own community. We have the Bruce Trail and we have the waterfront trail in Hamilton, and that's about it. But if you go up north, they've got hundreds of trails, thousands of trails. They feel that they're playing an integral part of this decision, and they don't feel represented and they don't feel like they've had their say.

We would expect that this committee would go to at least two locations in the north, to allow people to come in to that centre to voice their opinions on a very important bill which involves tourism, economic development committees in their areas, private landowners and snowmobile clubs. It involves all of these types of people that use this all year round, not just in the wintertime. They use it for fishing; they use it for off-road vehicles. They use it for all kinds of different things, even during the summer. It's an all-year-round usage of these trails, which require different aspects to be dealt with by the individuals who have these clubs, or by the municipality or the landowner.

Just to have a two-day hearing in Toronto is a bit of a joke, to be honest with you. They, frankly, don't want people in downtown Toronto making decisions for them about what happens in North Bay or Sudbury because they can't even get a handle on it, because they may not have even been there. They may not have traveled that far north.

This is unacceptable in its present form. What we would like to see, from our party, is at least two visits to the north, to Thunder Bay, maybe Sudbury, Timmins—one of those—to at least allow the areas to get involved.

Now, if you're talking Orillia, Barrie, those types of things, yes, they can come to Toronto. It's reasonable to expect them to come to Toronto to make submissions.

But a lot of these people up there won't be able to come to Toronto to make submissions on those two days. They're preparing for their season. They're working. They're preparing their trails. They're preparing for what they have to do.

So I cannot vote for this motion in its present form unless you do some housekeeping and change it—bottom line.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Ms. Kiwala.

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This bill has been debated and has been discussed, and we've been meeting with stakeholders and having consultations since 2005. There have been numerous meetings. There have been numerous stakeholders, including the Bruce Trail, Ontario Trails and snowmobiler associations, who have come in to Queen's Park and have been present for the debate in the House.

The feedback that I've received has been very supportive from these stakeholders. My understanding as well is that travelling the bill is not something that is decided here, but it is something that is decided—and perhaps this could be clarified—by House leaders. Is it possible we could get that clarified?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): The committee is in charge of its own agenda. However, in order for this committee to meet outside of the two hours on Wednesday, it will require authority from the House. In order for this committee to meet outside of regular meeting days—in, say, a constit week—it will require the authority of the House.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): We move to Ms. Wong.

Ms. Soo Wong: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm just going to remind everybody that we all sit on a lot of committees. Individuals across Ontario have a right to teleconference into the committee when we have public hearings. We've seen it done before in other committees.

1310

I listened very attentively when there was debate on Bill 100. The critic for the official opposition, Mr. Hillier, supported it. Mr. Hillier actually supported the bill. There was also some tweaking that he didn't mention about the landowners and what have you. He did mention some piece about them here.

We also heard, Mr. Miller, that you also supported the bill, and I know you said it, because we recognize the fact that this is a year-round industry. We totally agree with you. We also recognize that this is tourism and economic development, and there's a piece about landowners, as well. Having said that, we have reached out, and you heard, from my colleague the member for Kingston and the Islands, the fact that the ministry has consulted.

With regard to the two visits outside the House, it is always the House leaders making that decision, and we need the House's permission before we can step out, as the Clerk has indicated. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Ms. McMahon.

Ms. Eleanor McMahon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As my colleagues opposites will know, I spent about seven years of my life leading a province-wide cycling organization, navigating the province and talking about trails and working with significant organizations, like the Ontario Trails Council, the Waterfront Regeneration Trust and the leading cycling tourism organizations in Ontario, to design, build, construct, sign and develop trails across this province.

I perhaps have the privilege of knowing a little bit more about this subject than the members opposite, so I'm very glad that we're having this conversation, Mr. Chair. I'm glad to see the support for trails from the members opposite, but I would like to just remind all members in this context about a few things.

The organizations that I'm still in touch with and I still navigate—in fact, we were at the Ontario Bike Summit this morning—want us to move on this legislation quickly. The stakeholders have had their say, and they are anxious for our government to continue this work because, as everyone knows, undertaking infrastructure projects and, especially, trail work is often a complex process. They want to get going, okay?

I am not hearing from any of the colleagues who I talk to on this file on a regular basis—and believe me, I do—that they are clamouring for us to then go out and take more time. They know that this consultation has been under way for many years; they want to see us proceed with this legislation; they are pleased, actually, with the pace and rate of progress. I would like us to do the responsible thing and get on with what we were put here to do, which is enact this important piece of legislation that has had almost 10 years of consultation.

Mr. Chair, that is my window on this. I hope that that is helpful. Again, I'm someone who is pleased to see the interest and concern on the trails issue. I know the member opposite, Mr. Clark, for example, is a vibrant supporter of cycling in his own community, as is Mr. Bailey. He was one before I got elected. Mr. Miller is new to me. Certainly, Mr. Mantha is the co-chair of the All-Party Cycling Caucus with me.

So again, let's get moving, let's get on with it and let's implement what we were sent here to do. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thanks, Ms. McMahon.

Mr. Mantha.

Mr. Michael Mantha: On that note, I have the utmost respect for my friend across the way, Ms. McMahon—

Ms. Eleanor McMahon: I know. We might disagree, but that's okay.

Mr. Michael Mantha: No, it's not a matter of disagreeing; it's a matter of the process of how we're going to be going with this. I truly appreciate the fact that you have been extensively engaged in this process for a very long time.

The concern that I'm hearing from constituents in my particular area, and even across northern Ontario, is the economic impact that this potentially might have on

those communities. However much time it takes us to go through the process of actually getting delegations, they're coming in in order to clarify a lot of the uncertainties in the definitions of what's in this act. That's going to be really key to making sure that those trails remain open and that landowners are going to be satisfied with the proposed legislation that is being put in place.

If we don't take our time in doing that, the potential for this piece of legislation is that it will devastate tourism and economic development in many, many communities across my riding. I've had the barriers and the flags that have been set up, and individuals want to have their say.

Now, I was frustrated—and I have to share this with the Chair—because I wasn't provided with the opportunity to speak about this on behalf of my constituents in the House, because the debate was closed. There was closure that was put; it was rushed through the House. Yes, there was a lot of consultation that was done, but that consultation was done with individuals that are within that circle. Let's not kid ourselves: We're within a bubble when we're over here at Queen's Park. The individuals and the people that we deal with, which are our stakeholders who are close to this—yes, we have been consulting with those individuals, but once the legislation came out, individual landowners were actually told that this is how this could be interpreted or this is how this potentially could affect you.

They only became aware of this just recently, and when I say “recently,” within the last year. So they've been preparing themselves with their legal counsel and getting their views—the history that has been made on this. Whether they're wrong or right in the situation, I believe that's our role and that's our job, when we can go out and actually consult with these communities and these groups so that we can explain to them, “This is what we're trying to do. This is what we're trying to say.”

In this particular piece of legislation, the act basically says that the minister will be able to designate a trail at his discretion. Well, I think I have a definition of what that means; you might have a definition of what that means, but others as well. We need to respect what that means. Is it going to hinder them? Is it going to take away my right as a landowner? What does a volunteer agreement for a trail to cross your land mean?

We need to make sure that this is done right—and I need to stress this—so that there is no negative impact on the good relations that are there between the various trail users—with the Ski-Doo operators, with the ATV operators, with the bike operators. We need to make sure that we're doing this right, so that the interpretation and how this is going to affect those individuals is done right and that we are actually doing it as was always the practice: An individual who has land—the land will be accessible, which will always be and which always has been, in writing, through a volunteer process, and that nothing will be imposed on them.

That's the point that we really need to stress and why we need to go out and engage with others, not with the

stakeholders that we've had within this bubble within the last five or 10 years. It's the others, who have only become part of this process because they perceive that there is going to be a threat on their club, on their land, on their leisure activities and on their opportunities for tourism or economic development.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thanks, Mr. Mantha. Mr. Miller?

Mr. Paul Miller: In reference to the comment that an individual voted for it, I most certainly did. I know that we need to make changes. I know we have to solidify the trails system in Ontario and make every user and owner comfortable with what's going on and get rid of the red tape. I'm well aware of that.

But with all due respect, that's what you do at committee. You don't rush it through because one group thinks that they've talked to their circle and that's okay and we'll move ahead with it. When you do have a committee, the committee does make recommendations to the House. Yes, the House leaders will have to make the final decision as to whether there's travel or not; I didn't say that. But they don't make the recommendations to the House leaders; we do, as a committee. The whole purpose of a committee is to make everyone feel part of the process, and the whole purpose of having people come down here and make presentations is that they're comfortable with the legislation that's going forward.

If you cut out certain areas of Ontario, especially the ones that use it the most, and they feel they don't have their say—in reference to the member from Burlington, yes, maybe it has been going on for 10 years, but if you're going to do it, do it right the first time. I do remember a lot of bills coming back to the House from Liberals for new amendments in the last couple of years to fix things they missed, didn't do it right. We want to do it right, so we're saying, if it takes another month or two to get it right—10 years means nothing to me, if you're going to get it right in that couple of months, in comparison.

So I would suggest that time-allocating these types of things is not a good thing, and to rush it through committee is not a good thing, and I think you're doing a disservice to the people of Ontario with what you're doing.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Mr. Miller, thank you. Mr. Bailey?

Mr. Robert Bailey: Chair, I'd just like it on the record that I too voted against Bill 100. I didn't know at the time that voting for or against it was going to—well, first of all, I didn't know I was going to be on this committee at the time. But I didn't know that voting for or against it was then going to be thrown up at committee: "Oh, better get on board, guys, because you voted for it in the House." I didn't understand that was a prerequisite then to come down.

I support what Mr. Clark, Mr. Mantha and Mr. Miller said. Let's take time to take the—I have some trails in my community. They're already established. They're

public trails, so they're not affected, like on private property.

1320

I think that we should go to the north, go to the east, go wherever these trails are that are going to be affected, especially in these snowmobile areas where these private landowners support these, and make sure that it's done right. There has been a lot of debate about it, and people aren't sure, so I think we need to give them that certainty.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Mr. Clark?

Mr. Steve Clark: Yes, just one final thing: Obviously, we're going to vote against this. As someone who is a former House leader—this government could have handled this a lot differently. They say one thing in the House—the minister has said to me, in quiet conversations in the House, that he's looking at amendments and he's looking to deal with this co-operatively. The government could have very easily brought in a proposed motion that they're going to table at House leaders, to get our feeling on what we felt.

Again, regardless of when the consultations took place—and I want to stress this—not one property owner was part of that consultation. Just to go to a number of stakeholders and draft a bill, without seeing the cause and effect of that bill, is not the way to govern.

I again want to put my final comments on the record that governing by teleconference is not the way that these committees should operate. We should have the opportunity to travel in affected areas.

I still have trails in my riding that are partially closed. I have property owners who are very concerned about the speed with which this bill is being passed, without property owner comment. I'm concerned that other trails will be closed in this province if this government doesn't take a different approach. One of the different approaches that they could take is further consultation.

I'm going to vote against this motion as well.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thanks, Mr. Clark. Ms. Kiwala?

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: Considering that we have had engaged conversations since 2005—and some of the organizations and stakeholders that we've been talking to, previous to that, said that it went on since 2003—and I understand the concerns from the opposite side—I don't think it would be out of line to put this forward to the House leaders to make a decision on it and discuss it. I think that sounds like a reasonable approach at this point. I think that I would feel comfortable doing that and offering that. I'm just going to put that forward.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Okay. Any further comments? Are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Steve Clark: Recorded vote.

Mr. Paul Miller: I think you have an amendment.

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: Just one last thing: I do think that some of the concerns that have been brought forward could be discussed at that time and within some of the amendments or regulations. But I do think that going to the House leaders would be the best option at this point.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Are you suggesting an amendment to the motion?

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: No, sorry. I'm just suggesting that we discuss this with the House leaders and have them have a conversation about if it will travel or not.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Further debate? Mr. Miller.

Mr. Paul Miller: I have two things. First of all, I would like to move that the committee travel during constit week of May 22. I'd like to move that.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): So we have an amendment?

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Just one second.

Ms. Soo Wong: How many days?

Mr. Paul Miller: One day in each community, maybe, wherever it is—whatever it takes to get to Timmins or Sudbury or Thunder Bay. Whatever it takes—two or three days—I can't really put a day thing on it. I don't know—

Ms. Soo Wong: How many days do you want to travel?

Mr. Paul Miller: One day there and one day back, and two days for committee. I don't know. Three days?

Ms. Soo Wong: I don't know—

Ms. Sophie Kiwala: Well, we should let the House leaders work that out, should we not?

Mr. Paul Miller: The final travel plans aren't a concern here. What I—

Interjection.

Mr. Paul Miller: I think I've got the floor here. I do have the floor.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Mr. Miller, would you repeat your motion?

Mr. Paul Miller: Yes.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thanks.

Mr. Paul Miller: I move that the committee travel during constit week of May 22 to address these issues.

I also have another amendment. I think the member from Kingston and the Islands made a good suggestion, but I think that if you don't put it down on paper, it's not going to go anywhere, because they won't even deal with it at House leaders. So I'd just like to see an amendment that states that the House leaders will make the appropriate and final decision on whether the travel will take place or not.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): The House leaders will make that decision anyway, so we won't have to put that as part of the motion—

Mr. Paul Miller: They'll make the decision, but you've got to put it down to recommend it to them or they won't deal with it.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Mr. Day.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): In reference to your motion, there are a couple of things that we've got to work out based on this. One is that to travel during a constit week, the committee will have to

recommend it to the House leaders. So the Chair would write to the House leaders, saying, "We'd like to travel this week." That part is fine, and we can deal with that.

Some of these other dates within the motion are going to have to be pushed back, if the committee is still doing public hearings at that time. Let me just check here—the request-to-appear deadline is the 29th; that should be fine. The deadline for written submissions is May 11—if we're still travelling, that will have to be pushed back, so that will need to be changed. Amendments by May 13: That will have to be changed, and clause-by-clause consideration dates will have to be changed as well.

Mr. Paul Miller: That's fine.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): I'm just looking for direction as to what dates you would like for these.

Mr. Paul Miller: Well, I just got this paper put in front of me. Can I have a five-minute recess, and I'll get you the dates?

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Sure.

The committee recessed from 1326 to 1334.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Okay, we'll call the meeting back to order and we'll turn it over to the Clerk to read the motion.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): Mr. Miller, Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, has moved that the motion be amended to read as follows:

(1) That the committee meet during its regularly scheduled times on Wednesday, May 4, 2016, and Wednesday, May 11, 2016, for the purpose of public hearings.

That the committee request authorization to meet during the week of May 23, 2016.

(2) That the Clerk of the Committee post information regarding public hearings on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly website and on Canada NewsWire.

(3) That the deadline for requests to appear be 12 noon on Monday, May 2, 2016.

(4) That the Clerk of the Committee provide a list of all interested persons to the subcommittee following the deadline for requests.

(5) That each subcommittee member or delegate provide their selections of witnesses based on the list of interested persons received from the Clerk of the Committee by 5 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2016.

(6) That all witnesses be offered 10 minutes for presentation and three minutes for questioning by committee members on a rotation by caucus, for a total of nine minutes.

(7) That the deadline for written submissions be 6 p.m. on Friday, May 27, 2016.

(8) That amendments to Bill 100 be filed with the Clerk of the Committee by 12 noon on Monday, May 30, 2016.

(9) That the committee meet for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 100 on Wednesday, June 1, 2016, and Wednesday, June 8, 2016.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Any debate first? Are the members ready—

Mr. Paul Miller: I didn't catch any of the travel in there. Where was the travel part of it?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Trevor Day): The Chair will request authorization from the House to meet during that week.

Mr. Paul Miller: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Are the members ready to vote? We're voting on Mr. Miller's amendment first.

Mr. Steve Clark: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Bailey, Clark, P. Miller.

Nays

Anderson, Kiwala, McMahan, Wong.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): The amendment is lost.

Are the members ready to vote on the main motion?

Mr. Steve Clark: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anderson, Kiwala, McMahan, Wong.

Nays

Bailey, Clark, P. Miller.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): The motion is carried. We have no further—

Mr. Steve Clark: Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Sorry, Mr. Clark.

Mr. Steve Clark: Regardless of the vote, I would ask—because the parliamentary assistant is here, I hope that she'll talk to her House leader and ask if it's at all possible for us to travel this bill outside of Toronto.

Ms. Soo Wong: Can I make a comment?

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): No, sorry. Mr. Mantha first.

Mr. Michael Mantha: You know, it's regrettable that we're not going to take the time to do this right. There's a lot of misinformation that is out there. I'm going to hate

coming back to this committee once this legislation goes through—because by the looks of it, it will go through, and it's going to be our job to try to do our best to explain this to constituents back home: landowners, Ski-Doo clubs and so on.

I will do my very best in doing that, but I hope that I don't have to come back to this committee and tell you of the negative impacts that you have actually created within the communities that I'm here representing on behalf of Algoma-Manitoulin. I would hate to come back to this committee and indicate to you that the Ski-Doo trails are shut down, economic development has crashed and there's a negative impact on tourism that is happening throughout northern Ontario. I would hate to have to come back to this.

For the days that we do have, we need to roll up our sleeves and really get to work with regard to the messaging and how we're going to be proposing this to individuals, because there's a lot of poor information that is out there and it's a big concern to me. I will hate to come back to this committee and tell you "I told you so" when we didn't take the time to go out and actually communicate with constituents across this province.

Mr. Paul Miller: I even came—

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Sorry. Ms. Wong, you have the floor.

Ms. Soo Wong: I, too, want to echo what Mr. Clark just asked our members to do. I would say that all of the caucuses here need to speak to their House leaders—because I hear the concerns of my colleagues opposite. I am an urban member. I do have trails in downtown Toronto. If there is a desire to travel, I'm not saying no travelling. The decision of whether we travel outside committee time—the House leader has to agree. The House has to agree. So that's the first piece.

The second piece here is that I do respect that Mr. Clark asked our members to speak to our House leader. I would say all three House leaders need to talk, because they are meeting tomorrow.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Mr. Clark.

Mr. Steve Clark: I just want to put on record that I have a wonderful House leader—his name is Jim Wilson—and I know that he'll support me.

The Chair (Mr. Monte McNaughton): Thank you. We'll now meet on May 4.

The committee adjourned at 1340.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 20 April 2016

Election of Vice-Chair.....	M-259
Committee business.....	M-259

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Chair / Président

Mr. Monte McNaughton (Lambton–Kent–Middlesex PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Steve Clark (Leeds–Grenville PC)

Mr. Granville Anderson (Durham L)
Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)
Mr. Steve Clark (Leeds–Grenville PC)
Mr. Vic Dhillon (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest L)
Ms. Sophie Kiwala (Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles L)
Mr. Michael Mantha (Algoma–Manitoulin ND)
Ms. Eleanor McMahon (Burlington L)
Mr. Monte McNaughton (Lambton–Kent–Middlesex PC)
Ms. Soo Wong (Scarborough–Agincourt L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)
Mr. Paul Miller (Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek ND)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Trevor Day

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Jeff Parker, research officer,
Research Services