



ISSN 1710-9477

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 41st Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 41^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 2 May 2016

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 2 mai 2016

**Standing Committee on
Social Policy**

Waste-Free Ontario Act, 2016

**Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

Loi de 2016 favorisant
un Ontario sans déchets

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
SOCIAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DE
LA POLITIQUE SOCIALE**

Monday 2 May 2016

Lundi 2 mai 2016

The committee met at 1401 in committee room 1.

WASTE-FREE ONTARIO ACT, 2016

**LOI DE 2016 FAVORISANT
UN ONTARIO SANS DÉCHETS**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 151, An Act to enact the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016 and the Waste Diversion Transition Act, 2016 and to repeal the Waste Diversion Act, 2002 / Projet de loi 151, Loi édictant la Loi de 2016 sur la récupération des ressources et l'économie circulaire et la Loi transitoire de 2016 sur le réacheminement des déchets et abrogeant la Loi de 2002 sur le réacheminement des déchets.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Good afternoon, all. I'm calling the meeting to order for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 151. You'll note that in front of you is a package of all the amendments that are numbered.

Before we begin, there's an opportunity for any questions, if anyone has any. Yes?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Or comments?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, absolutely. Questions or general comments—absolutely, it's the appropriate time.

I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just for the record, I recognize a lot of stakeholders here, and thank you for your interest in this particular bill. We're very pleased to have the opportunity to review Bill 151. I think all parties around this table want to see greater environmental protection and waste diversion.

I'm also pleased to represent the Ontario PC caucus, along with my colleague Lorne Coe. Our party got this much-needed conversation started. We rolled out the PC waste diversion policy in 2012, which the government, we're pleased to see and say, has now begun to adopt in large part. Our plan was very clear. We would get government and Waste Diversion Ontario out of the business of setting prescriptive requirements and imposing eco taxes, and, instead, we'd let the private sector improve environmental outcomes. Under our plan, the government would set measurable and achievable waste diversion targets, establish environmental standards, monitor outcomes and enforce the rules, and that's it. Then, we'd

leave it to the ingenuity of the private sector to find the best way to achieve those outcomes.

We're glad to see that the government has moved towards this sound approach in many areas, but we are concerned with several sections in Bill 151, particularly on product design enforcement and eco taxes. We hope the government will address our most serious concern, and that is to set a clear, legislated timeline to eliminate eco taxes. If the government can work with us on this area while reducing red tape and improving the enforcement, I'm sure we can achieve a balanced solution that will be fair to consumers and taxpayers, while increasing economic growth and environmental protection. I think you will find, Chair, that all of our amendments we put forward will demonstrate our thoughtfulness around this.

I just want to close by saying that the PC Party of Ontario cares about the environment. We care about our stakeholders. This bill is the third kick at the proverbial can, and I just want to let it be known, on record, that I'm very disappointed in this government, in this ministry, in that they tried to spin it over the weekend that we're trying to hold it up. Shame on them. There's a rumour out there. We've been hit by stakeholders. We were talking with them since the rumour hit. Shame on them for using scare tactics to demean our honest and thoughtful approach to improving this bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Hatfield now.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Good afternoon. I am filling in for our environmental critic, Peter Tabuns, this afternoon, and I will be for the rest of the hearings. I didn't know I was to prepare a speech, an opening statement or to campaign for something down the road, so I'll leave it at that. I'm just pleased to be here.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Well, thank you very much, Mr. Hatfield. Anyone else with any comments? I recognize Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: It's simply to say that we'll take a look at each of these amendments based on their merits. We've looked at some of them and we'll see where we go from there. I'm looking forward to getting it done.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sounds good. Thank you very much, Mr. Fraser. Any further comments, questions or debate? Seeing none, we'll now move to consideration of the bill.

Just a bit of housekeeping: The bill consists of three sections enacting two schedules. In order to roll this out

in a way that makes sense, I would recommend that we deal with the three sections first—sorry, the exact opposite of what I was about to say. I'm so confused. We should postpone dealing with the three sections and deal with the two schedules first, and then come back to the sections because those sections are enacted by these schedules. Does that make sense?

Is everyone in agreement with that, dealing with the two schedules first? I see no dissent. Do I see any agreement? A little bit of agreement, a little bit of head-nodding in the affirmative—yes, I see some.

Mr. John Fraser: Yes, heads are shaking.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Heads are shaking; that is good enough for me. Okay, we are agreed.

We'll begin with the first motion. The first motion is a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: At this time, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to stand down this motion because it relates specifically to PC motion 27.10.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Right, I actually was supposed to make that comment as well, because it is linked. I think that just makes sense to stand it down.

Is everyone in agreement? This motion is linked to a motion that's further down in the package, and it makes sense to stand it down. Yes, everyone's in agreement? Okay.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Perfect. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We will now move to motion number 1, which is an NDP motion. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you, Chair, and I'm seeking your direction. Do you want me to read the entire motion?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, Mr. Hatfield, that's the way the amendment works. You'd have to read it.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following definitions:

“‘circular economy’ means an economy that is restorative and regenerative by design, and which aims to,

“(a) keep products, components and materials at their highest utility and value at all times while distinguishing between technical and biological cycles, and

“(b) rebuild capital, whether financial, manufactured, human, social or natural;

“‘recycling’ means any activity through which materials remaining after the use of a product or packaging are processed to make new products, packaging or other things, and includes the processing of materials for use as nutrients for improving the quality of soil, agriculture or landscaping;

“‘reduction,’ when used in relation to waste, means any activity that avoids or minimizes the use of materials, or that minimizes the amount of waste generated after the use of a product or packaging;

“‘resource recovery’ means the selective extraction of material from collected products and packaging or from other sources in order to obtain maximum benefits from sources and materials, to avoid or delay the consumption of resources, or to reduce the amount of waste generated, and includes reuse and recycling;

“‘reuse’ means any activity through which all or part of a material that has been used is used again for a purpose that is the same as or similar to its original purpose;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or comments with regard to that amendment?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I have none.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Any debate around this motion? Yes, I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion because a comparable government motion is introduced to define “circular economy,” “resource recovery” and “waste reduction,” in keeping with the scope and intent of the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further debate or questions? Seeing none, are we now in a position to vote on this amendment? Yes? All those in favour of the motion? Okay. All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion number 2. I recognize Ms. Mangat.

1410

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following definitions:

“‘circular economy’ means an economy in which participants strive,

“(a) to minimize the use of raw materials,

“(b) to maximize the useful life of materials and other resources through resource recovery, and

“(c) to minimize waste generated at the end of life of products and packaging; (‘économie circulaire’)

“‘resource recovery’ means the extraction of useful materials or other resources from things that might otherwise be waste, including through reuse, recycling, reintegration, regeneration or other activities; (‘récupération des ressources’)

“‘waste reduction’ means the minimization of waste generated at the end of life of products or packaging, including through activities related to design, manufacturing and material use; (‘réduction des déchets’)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I support this motion because the government has heard from stakeholders, while we were developing this legislation, that terms such as “circular economy,” “resource recovery” and “waste reduction” should be defined in the proposed Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act. The proposed motion responds to what we have heard from the stakeholders.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just for the record, we recognize that this omission in the original draft of Bill 151 is another sign of how this government is rushing legislation. We're glad to see that the government is taking time to fix the major problems of its bill with this particular type of amendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I will support the motion as a sign of co-operation and as a sign of good faith, and I hope in doing so we can see some more good faith and co-operation come over to this side of the table.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That sounds good.

Any additional comments or debate? Seeing none, are we now in a position to vote? All those in favour of this motion? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

We're moving now to motion 2.1. It's a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following definition:

“owner or operator of a waste management system’ has the same meaning as in part V of the Environmental Protection Act; (‘propriétaire ou exploitant d’un système de gestion des déchets’)”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: You'll find that throughout this bill, Bill 151, the government refers to owners or operators of waste management systems, as do several of our own amendments, so it just makes sense to include it in the definitions.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe?

Mr. Lorne Coe: I'd like a recorded vote on it, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure.

I should make mention: If at any time you'd like a recorded vote, just make sure that's indicated before the vote happens. That's absolutely appropriate.

Any other additional debate or discussion? I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion as the government sees it as unnecessary, as “owner” and “operator” are defined throughout the bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we now in a position to vote? This is a recorded vote.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is lost.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It's perfectly all right to abstain as well, in case anyone is wondering. That's also an appropriate decision to make at any time. The Chair does not judge anyone's vote.

The next motion is, coincidentally, an NDP motion. I'd ask Mr. Hatfield to move the motion.

Interjections.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I was delayed. There was a traffic pileup.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's absolutely acceptable.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Interpretation

“(2) A reference in this act to recycling, resource recovery or the use of material in the making of new things does not include reference to activities involving the generation of energy from the primary treatment of waste.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): An excellent motion.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I think so. I'll leave it at that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or debate on the motion? I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion because the government believes that energy from recycling is not a part of waste.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I would just like to say quickly that we need to be mindful always of keeping the door open to recovery.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, did I see a hand?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I wasn't going to speak to it, but I'll just say that we all know that global warming is a major issue. I know the Liberal government believes that to be the case. This motion was there to block waste incineration, which of course leads to global warming. I'm just surprised that the Liberals aren't supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we now in a position to vote on the motion? Yes? All those in favour of motion number 3? All those opposed? The motion fails.

Before we begin, is there any debate on schedule 1, as now amended? I recognize Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: Can we do that if we have an outstanding motion?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser, I think you've done very well in pointing that out. We are not able to do that at this point in time because we stood down a component of that, so we'll have to come back to that. We'll leave that as it is and move now to motion number 4. This is dealing with schedule 1, new section 1.1. It's an NDP motion. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section—before I continue, can we have a recorded vote?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: “Municipal advisory body

“1.1(1) A body is established, to be known as the municipal advisory body, which shall consist of one representative from each of,

“(a) the Association of Municipalities of Ontario;

“(b) the city of Toronto;

“(c) the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario; and

“(d) the Municipal Waste Association.

“Regulations

“(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations to facilitate the organization of the municipal advisory body.”

I think it’s pretty clear, so I don’t have to say anything else about it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure. I was going to ask you if you wanted to explain the motion, but thank you very much for that, Mr. Hatfield.

Any discussion or debate? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Thanks to the NDP for proposing the amendment. This responds to the request from municipalities. However, we will not support the motion because the Environmental Protection Act also already provides authority for the minister to establish any advisory committee.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate or discussion? This will be a recorded vote. Are we prepared to vote on the motion? It looks like it.

Ayes

Hatfield.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

The next motion is motion number 5.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I get nervous when I see good motions voted down by a majority of people. When we talk about other bills going to committee, I get a sense that if we’re talking election financing, this is how it would end up as well. But I’ll leave that aside for the moment—just for the moment.

I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clauses:

“(0.a) protect the natural environment and human health;

“(0.b) foster the continued growth and development of the circular economy;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: No, I’ll wait for them to say why they’re not supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat, I’ll recognize you.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I would like to take this opportunity to thank the NDP for bringing this motion forward. We will be very pleased to support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Let the record show Mr. Hatfield’s surprise at that comment, illustrated through gestures rather than words.

1420

I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: For the record, we’re choosing to support it as well.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I feel a sense of optimism at this committee.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on this motion?

Would you like a recorded vote? You mentioned it before.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Yes, Chair, we would like a recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure. Recorded vote requested.

Ayes

Anderson, Coe, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins, Thompson.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Next motion is motion 6, an NDP motion. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that clause 2(a) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(a) minimize greenhouse gas emissions resulting from,

“(i) materials management and the processing of products and packaging, at all stages, and

“(ii) resource recovery activities and waste reduction activities;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I’m not sure; are those really Roman numerals, or are those small i’s?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I think we understand, for the purpose of this.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Do you know what I mean?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We do, or I’m sure someone does.

I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The government cannot support an amendment that seeks to restrict the scope or application of the bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on the motion? Looks like so. A recorded vote?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: No, that's okay. In the interest of time on this one, I'll just try my coffee and—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion 7, a PC motion—6.1, sorry. My apologies. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that clauses (b) and (c) of section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We feel strongly that the government should not be meddling in the private sector in this particular case. It is not the role of government to tell a company how to design its product and packaging. The minister should not—I emphasize “should not”—set prescriptive requirements that tie the hands of entrepreneurs and innovators. Instead, we should have a government in place that is setting desired outcomes and let the ingenuity of the private sector take over and find the best way to achieve outcomes.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, the government doesn't support this motion because it would undermine the government policy, including reducing waste, advanced by the bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote? Yes. All those in favour of this motion—sorry, I should have asked: Do you want a recorded vote?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: No, it's okay.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

The next motion is motion 7, an NDP motion. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that clause 2(g) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(g) promote the highest and best use of materials in order to minimize the environmental impacts that result from resource recovery activities and waste reduction activities, including from waste disposal, and to maximize the value of such activities;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I just believe it would strengthen the environmental impact of the bill if this was added.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The government doesn't support the motion as it's very difficult to assess the application of promoting the highest and best use, because highest and best use is not definable.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none—

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Chair—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry. Yes, Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you. It may not be definable, but it's certainly well known, if you're going to make the highest and best use of something—like making the highest and best use of your time at committee. We all know what that means.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The provincial interest may lead to unintended consequences if we support that, so we are not supporting that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? I was enjoying the back and forth. Anything further? No? Are we in a position to vote on this motion? Yes. A recorded vote? No. All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is defeated. Please be careful of Mr. Hatfield's sensitive heart condition.

The next motion is motion 8. It's an NDP motion. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Let me try something else. I move that clause 2(g) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(g) encourage the highest and best use of recovered resources;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, any explanation or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: No, I just think it shortened it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The concept of minimizing the environmental impact resulting from resource recovery and waste reduction activities is a key part of the provincial interest. It should not be removed from the bill, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote? Is it a recorded vote requested? No? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is defeated.

The next motion is motion 8.1. It's a PC motion. Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Mr. Chair, through you, I'll move that the motion be withdrawn, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure; motion noted as withdrawn.

We move now to motion number 9, an NDP motion. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that clause 2(i) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(i) increase, through reuse and recycling, waste diversion levels across all sectors of the economy;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Just that it would drive up rates of waste reduction and diversion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The existing provincial interest already speaks to increasing reuse and recycling in all sectors of the economy. We will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Is there a recorded vote being requested? No? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? Thank you. The motion is defeated.

We move now to PC motion 9.1. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: On 9.1, Chair, through you, I'd like a recorded vote.

I move that clause 2(i) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(i) increase, through reuse and recycling, waste diversion levels across all sectors of the economy;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry, I don't want to interrupt you, Mr. Coe—

Mr. Lorne Coe: Oh, I'm reading the wrong one. Sorry.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause:

“promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry, Mr. Coe, just for formality and for clarity, you omitted reading the “m.1.” If you could just reread it?

Mr. Lorne Coe: All right, fine. I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause:

“(m.1) promote the reduction, reuse and recycling of waste;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you very much, Mr. Coe. Any discussion or debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We found it curious on our side in the opposition that the government didn't even include the core purpose of the Waste Diversion Act in Bill 151. Ontarians understand the purposes of and the importance of the three R's—reduce, reuse, recycle—and they work hard. We've seen evidence for years that everyone is working hard to reduce waste in their own homes, donate to Goodwill and constantly recycle what they can in the blue box. The three R's are the core purpose of the Waste Diversion Act, and they've served the province so well. I must say I find it stunning that this government has forgotten about the three R's in Bill 151. This omission appears to be just another proof point of how rushed this legislation really was.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I know that my niece and nephew will be really disappointed to not see the three Rs there.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

1430

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I'll be supporting this amendment because I believe we're on the same direction. It may be frightful to you, I know, to know that the New Democrats and the Conservatives are right on on this

one. I just can't see how anybody could possibly oppose this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, thank you for that. The Chair does not judge anyone's vote.

Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Minimizing the generation of waste including waste from products and packaging is a part of the legislation anyway, and the concepts of the three Rs—reduce, reuse, recycle—are also captured in the circular economy definition, so it's unnecessary. We have spoken about this in our government's earlier motion, so we will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion?

Mr. Lorne Coe: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Seeing none, I hear a recorded vote being called for. Are we ready to vote on this motion? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

We move now to PC motion 9.2. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that clause 2(n) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(n) foster fairness for consumers and taxpayers;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We just feel that it's very important that this government should foster fairness for property tax owners, in light of the fact that they pay 50% of the fees for the Blue Box Program.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I know there are members of the audience from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. This idea is generated by them, and it's trying to protect municipal taxpayers from getting stuck with industry's bill. The premise, of course, is that the people who produce waste should pay for the reuse and recycling of waste; it shouldn't come at the expense of municipal taxpayers.

In the city of Vancouver, when the municipal council there had tried to work with the industry to recover the full cost of the waste recycling program, they weren't able to do so, so they finally tossed in the towel and said to the industry, “We're not going to do it anymore. We're not going to subsidize picking up your waste.” There has been some talk in Ontario, at the municipal level, about Ontario municipalities doing the same thing. They're

doing it as a service to the people who produce the waste. The feeling is—and I'm speaking as a former city councillor of seven years in the city of Windsor—we shouldn't be subsidizing the industry for picking up their waste and allowing them to have it for recycling.

So it's a motion that I will be supporting. I thank AMO for making it one of their key asks, and I certainly hope the government would see their way fit to support this.

The Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The proposed legislation shifts the responsibility away from municipalities and places it onto the producer. This shift ensures fairness for the taxpayers by making producers, not municipal taxpayers, responsible for resource recovery and waste reduction. So we will not support this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Perhaps there's time for sober second thought here, because what I just heard was that municipal taxpayers shouldn't be paying for this, and in fact they are, be it 25%, 40%, whatever number you want to use, depending on the municipality. The municipal tax base is being taxed to pay the subsidy on the cost of the recycling, be it blue box, red box or whatever. It shouldn't fall on the municipal tax base to pay the full cost; it should be on the producer. The producer should accept responsibility and pay the full cost of recycling, and that isn't happening. It's no problem on the producer. All they have to do is change either their methods or their pricing to recover the cost of taking back what they put out into the economy, into the waste stream, if you will.

If we're going down this road, don't come crying to us when the municipalities say to you, "You've really messed it up. We're getting out of the Blue Box Program because you won't help us. You won't understand that it's costing municipal taxpayers a lot of money." You guys should be listening. You guys should be listening to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. You should be listening to your home municipalities when they say to you, "We need some help here. We're trying to save municipal tax dollars and you aren't helping." You are not helping with this motion by voting it down.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I would like to reiterate here that this proposed legislation—the shift ensures fairness for taxpayers by making producers, not municipal taxpayers, responsible for resource recovery and waste reduction. So we will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we ready to vote on this motion? It looks like so.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: It's a recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It's a recorded vote, yes; it's been noted before.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

We move now to NDP motion 10. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clauses:

"(n.1) promote fairness to taxpayers;

"(n.2) promote the goals of zero waste, zero greenhouse gas emissions and reintegration of recovered resources;

"(n.3) promote, in descending order of priority, waste reduction, reuse and recycling, with enforceable requirements to maximize use of recovered resources;

"(n.4) promote the highest possible resource recovery rates with a view to increasing those rates over time, without permitting reductions in related service standards;"

I would ask for a recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recoded vote noted. Any further discussion? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Similar to the last time, Chair, this is moved to protect the municipal taxpayers and to increase the overall effectiveness of the bill itself.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I have already spoken to this. The proposed legislation already shifts responsibility to manage end-of-life products and packaging away from municipalities and onto the producer. It will be done through our strategy, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: The PC Party of Ontario believes that we should be unleashing ingenuity and get out of the way of the innovation of the private sector as opposed to putting hurdles up.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: We are seeing an example, I guess, of recycled answers, the reuse of answers: That's two of the three Rs right there. I won't get to the recovery part, because there's no recovery from this kind of a voting down of these motions.

The fact of the matter is, they're not listening. They're not listening to the municipal tax base, they're not listening to the people who presented, and they're certainly not listening to the opposition members on the committee. I'm disappointed.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further discussion or debate? Seeing none—it's a recorded vote.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Ayes

Hatfield.

Nays

Anderson, Coe, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins, Thompson.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion 10.1. It's a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that clause 2(o) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Someone from the Conservative Party to explain? Yes, Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We have to reiterate our concern about this particular aspect of the bill, because it allows the government to "do any other related thing" to regulation. Given the current track record this government has, we just can't trust them to get anything right.

Really and truly, this bill has been in the works for quite some time. It was first introduced last fall, and they've only called it—we're here in committee now, this spring, in 2016. The government should have had the foresight to lay out the necessary provincial interests by now. Again, I don't think we can trust this minister to have an open-ended authority to set out provincial interests.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further discussion or debate? I recognize Ms. Mangat.

1440

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, this motion removes the ability of the government to develop additional policy statements in the future. That is available through the mechanism of consultation. We will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I agree.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We are now moving to a position—is there a recorded vote requested on this? No? Are we now in a position to vote on the motion? Yes? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is defeated.

We move now to NDP motion 11—I apologize. We have another step before we do that.

That completes all the amendments in schedule 1 of section 2, as amended. Before we continue schedule 1, section 2, as amended, is there any debate or any comments or questions with respect to that? Seeing none, shall schedule 1, section 2, as amended, carry?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Carried.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat, you did it right. There was no problem with that. Schedule 1, section 2, as amended, is carried.

We now move to schedule 1, section 3, NDP motion 11. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I did so want to vote against the last motion, Chair, but wasn't given the opportunity.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Oh, no, you could've—

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I couldn't have done anything until you asked what I wanted to do.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Oh, my goodness. When I say, "Shall it carry?", then you say, "No," and then I say, "All those in favour?"

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I'm sorry. It's obviously my fault. Let me apologize for that, but let me also apologize to any francophone members in the audience on this one in advance.

I move that subsection 3(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"Strategy

"(1) In order to support the provincial interest, the minister shall, no later than 90 days after the day this section comes into force,

"(a) develop a strategy entitled Strategy for a Waste-Free Ontario: Building the Circular Economy in English and Stratégie pour un Ontario sans déchets: Vers une économie circulaire in French; and

"(b) publish it on a website of the government of Ontario."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: In both official languages? No.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Either one. Whatever you can do.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I just think it ensures that the strategy is developed in a timely fashion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Yes, I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Building the Circular Economy to be developed and published within 90 days of proclamation is a great thing. We agree to it and we support it.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Merci beaucoup.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes and, certainly, just so we're on the record: We always support anything that improves accountability and transparency. Good job.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Look at that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Are we prepared to vote on the motion? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is carried.

The next motion is PC motion 11.1. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: And a recorded vote, please.

I move that section 3 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Assembly

"(1.1) The minister shall lay the strategy, and any amendment to the strategy, before the Legislative Assembly."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson for an explanation.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, in the spirit of accountability and transparency, we feel that this amendment would require the minister to provide strategy amendments directly to the House. It's very important to give the public and elected representatives time to review the strategy and any amendments before it gets implemented.

As I said before, this amendment strengthens the whole concept of accountability and transparency.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I believe all political parties in the Legislature say that they stand for transparency. This is a way of putting that transparency into legislation, so I'll certainly be supporting it. I can't understand anybody opposing it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The proposed act already provides that mechanism for extensive public consultation of the strategy, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: It's also published on the EBR, so it is transparent and it is accessible, contrary to my esteemed colleague's assertion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We'll just agree to disagree on that.

Can we have a recorded vote, please?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Duly noted. A recorded vote has been noted. Any additional debate or discussion? Not seeing any, are we now prepared to vote on the motion? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

The next motion is PC motion 11.2. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Thank you, Chair, and through you, I'd like a recorded vote again, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote noted.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 3 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Implementation

"(1.2) The minister shall not implement the strategy, or any amendment to the strategy, until at least 30 days have passed since it was laid before the Legislative Assembly."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I think it's very important that this amendment gets supported because the public and the elected representatives need time to review the strategy and amendments, as I've mentioned before, because there's a big issue here. We're seeing a trend in various committees where this government has rushed legislation and, therefore, it's correcting much of its work on the fly in committee.

I can't stress enough: We just can't trust this government to get anything right, and so we would really appreciate the opportunity—in the spirit of accountability and if they feel good about their work, they should be able to provide it for review by both the public and by elected officials before anything else gets implemented.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Just following up on what has just been stated: In the House in recent weeks we've heard a lot about the election financing crisis, if you will, and the fact that the Liberals want to take it to committee and back to the House because they say that this is the democratic way. We know, of course, that others have asked for either an inquiry or a non-partisan panel to hold those discussions, with the chief elections officer of Ontario chairing it.

The Premier or the finance minister will stand up in the House and say, "The committee is the best place to do it. It's the most democratic process. This is the democratic way we do it. We take it to committee; we bring it back in the House. That's the democratic way of doing it."

What has been put forward to us is an idea that this will increase the power of the Legislature and allow for public debate over what is going into this bill. For transparency, for democracy, this seems to me to be the way to go as opposed to having a majority on a committee make a decision and then that's it. I think the timing is there, the democracy is there, the transparency is there, and again, I can't see why anyone would not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The proposed legislation already provides that mechanism during the development and any amendments to the strategy, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Anyone else with discussion—

Mr. John Fraser: The last motion didn't pass, so we can't support this motion either; right? It wouldn't fit.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just support the original one.

Mr. John Fraser: I don't think so, no.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Are we prepared to vote on the motion?

Mr. Lorne Coe: A recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote is noted.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

PC motion 11.3: Mr. Coe.

1450

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “Within 10 years after the strategy is developed and at least every 10 years thereafter” at the beginning and substituting “Within five years after the strategy is developed and at least every five years thereafter”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Simply put, 10 years is way too long to review a strategy. The manner in which innovation is being adopted in this day and age—we feel that a five-year review is much more in line with how our private sector and our world is evolving, and we want to be responsive to that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I’ll support it for exactly those reasons, Chair. Five years is a better timeline. I believe it will make the plan more responsive to any change. It just makes more sense to me.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: While we were developing this legislation, we heard from the stakeholders very clearly that the 10-year review is broadly supported by the stakeholders. The minister already requires a progress report to be undertaken every five years, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Are we in a position to vote?

All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is defeated.

The next motion is PC motion 11.4. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 3 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Publication

“(4.1) The minister shall publish the results of any review described in subsection (4) on the registry under the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993 and lay them before the Legislative Assembly.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just moments ago, we heard the government member opposite reference the EBR as a place to go to. In that spirit, we feel that this amendment would require the minister to publish the results of a review on the EBR and provide them to the House. So there’s no reason why this government should be

opposing this particular amendment, I believe, based on the comments that we heard earlier.

Again, Chair, it’s just about transparency and accountability. We need to ensure as we move forward, given that it’s Ontario taxpayers and businesses and enterprises that are shouldering the burden, that the review and outcomes be public and available for review.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thanks to the New Democratic Party of Ontario back in 1993, when they brought in the Environmental Bill of Rights. I see this as a good improvement, that we could do this. It increases transparency. How often have we heard, in the House, the Premier and cabinet ministers say, “We are the most transparent government in the history of Ontario”? Of course they’d be more transparent if this was adopted. So I’m just waiting to see the reaction.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The minister is already required to consult on any proposed strategy or proposed amendment to the strategy through the Environmental Registry. So it is unnecessary, and we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: With regard to the minister consulting, I just have to let it be noted on record, on behalf of stakeholders and Ontarians, that this government’s concept of consultation leaves a lot to be desired and people just don’t trust it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: The motion is redundant.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or comments? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the motion?

All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is defeated.

Shall schedule 1, section 3, as amended, carry? Here, someone could say “no” if they wanted to and then I would say, “All opposed.”

Interjection: We all said “carried.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): You all said carried. I just feel a little bit sad about last time so I want to make sure there’s no problem.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: The last time I felt very strongly about certain clauses, but not so much this time.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Mr. Hatfield, I just want to make sure it’s fair.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Oh, it’s fair, all right. If you’ve got a majority, it’s fair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Schedule 1, section 3, as amended, is carried. Thank you very much, everybody.

Now we’re moving to schedule 1, section 4: We have PC motion 11.5. Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that paragraph 2 of section 4 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “to support the strategy’s goals” at the end and substituting “to support the strategy’s goals and to maintain private sector competition”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Over the last number of years, we've seen this particular government, more often than not, opt for command-and-control economics, which, essentially, is sidelining our private sector competition.

This government has adopted a very bad habit of picking winners and losers. Even as late as last week at the Economic Club there was clear evidence that this particular Minister of the Environment and Climate Change chooses, and is going down a path that will continue to pick winners and losers. Governments should not be creating prescriptive rules to direct the operations of companies. It should simply set outcomes and targets and let the private sector determine the best ways to achieve those outcomes.

We need to stop this government from meddling and let the private sector flourish and excel. So in every review of the strategy, the minister should have to present how the competition is being maintained.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion because the strategy already has outlined actions to support competition.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional—Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, I can't stress enough: We have seen the burden on Ontario taxpayers' shoulders grow and grow as this government chooses winners and losers on a regular basis. It's a travesty. In this particular instance, and around this motion, we feel that the government should be getting out of the way and letting the private sector move forward to achieve the outcomes and targets and, in that spirit, present how competition is being maintained.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize a couple of people, so I'll just go around in a circle. Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, that's why we are terminating industry funding organizations: to remove barriers for the competition. So we will not support this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: To the member opposite, I just want to say that this is about producer responsibility. It's a series of pressures and supports, which requires government and business to work together, and working together does not mean prescribing everything to those businesses. There are many successful models of government and business working together to ensure that things that are good for all of us get done.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Coe and then Ms. Thompson.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Through you, Chair, a recorded vote, please. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote, yes, noted. Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I'm just wondering: Did I hear the member opposite saying that government should

be out of the way of letting the private sector move forward to innovate?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: What I said was that it's a series of pressures and supports when you're trying to achieve something and that governments and businesses work together towards that goal. That's what I said.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I think it's kind of getting muddled here, but in this particular bill, it's not just about the government; it's not just about business; we also have to take into account the municipalities. I think we're forgetting about the municipalities in this trio. We're turning it into a duo, but it's a trio. We've got to consider the municipal role with government and business when we're doing this.

1500

Interjection.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Well, there could be more. All right, so we'll have a quartet. But whatever it is, I think, with all due respect, the wording in this amendment muddles the intent, so I will not be supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: The only pressure that's really going to result from this Liberal initiative is the pressure on Ontario taxpayers as this government continues to choose winners and losers.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we ready to vote?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote has been noted.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

We now move to motion 12. It's an NDP motion. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 4 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Performance measures, requirements

“(2) The performance measures referred to in paragraph 3 of subsection (1) shall include,

“(a) a performance measure for assessing waste reduction that is based on the total reduction of waste disposed of, and not just on the reduction of waste disposal in landfills; and

“(b) a performance measure for assessing the decrease of hazardous and toxic substances in products and packaging.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I think it gives us measures for accountability. It’s one thing to say, “We’re going to do this, and we’ve done that,” but when you have to account on a performance basis and you can actually measure what has been accomplished, then I think that gives us accountability. I would hope for unanimous support on it.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, we are having those performance measures in our strategy and then legislation, and that will allow us to improve those performance measures over time as needed. So we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote noted. Are we ready to vote on this motion? Yes, okay.

Ayes

Hatfield.

Nays

Anderson, Coe, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins, Thompson.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

Moving now to motion 12.1, a PC motion: I recognize—

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No? Guys, I’m getting ahead of myself here.

The question is, shall schedule 1, section 4 carry? I did not hear a no. Schedule 1, section 4 carries. Okay.

Now moving to schedule 1, section 5. PC motion 12.1: Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 5 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“3. A summary of economic activity related to the reduction, reuse, recycling and disposal of each class of designated waste under this act during the period covered by the report.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: A core objective, in our understanding of this bill, is to increase economic activity associated with the recycling sector. This amendment would require the minister to report on economic activity created by waste diversion activities in each progress report. It makes sense that we follow through and support this particular amendment. Of course, we would use

waste diversion to assess the progress of the programs under this bill.

Again, we won’t know the complete picture until we ascertain exactly how much economic activity has been attained.

Do you have anything to add?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe?

Mr. Lorne Coe: Yes. Thank you. At the end of the day, what we’re looking for here is a mechanism to strengthen the reporting requirements. We believe that the context of this amendment does that, Chair, and when you’re ready, I’d like a recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments, discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, the required progress report already includes the requirement for actions taken to support the strategy’s goals. These actions include environmental and economic activities related to resource recovery and waste reduction. So we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Yes. A recorded vote is noted.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you very much. The motion is—sorry?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: All those abstaining, or is abstention just—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It’s just not noted. Or it’s noted, but you don’t have to indicate it.

The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion 12.2. It’s also a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 5 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“4. A summary of the costs imposed on brand holders, as defined in section 59, during the period covered by the report as a result of the act and its regulations.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, to protect Ontario consumers, Chair, the minister should be reporting on the total costs being passed on to brand holders. Again, it’s all in the spirit of accountability and transparency. We believe the government must be fully transparent with its costs that it’s imposing on brand holders because at the end of the day, as I said, those costs will be passed along to consumers. Those pockets of the consumers are getting really tight.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It’s true. In life, this is true.

Any additional—Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I'll oppose the motion, Chair. I believe we're on a slippery slope here against producer responsibility if this passes. I believe producers should be responsible for their total costs. If we don't hold them to that, then we're down a slippery slope, so I'll be opposed to it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The cost and benefits to brand holders would be assessed in the new responsibility model, as my colleague said. That will be taken care of in the development of regulations. So we will not support that motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, just to sum up: This particular bill is asking brand holders to take on more responsibility of the end-of-life management of the waste. I would be surprised if we didn't all agree that this particular amendment is the right direction to be going.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I'm just a little surprised that after all this talk with regard to businesses supporting it, you would be interested in disclosing what might be somewhat proprietary information for businesses where it may affect their share value, exposure of their market share—a variety of things that are a central core to their business. I don't think businesses have been asking for this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this is just in the total spirit of accountability and transparency and taking a responsible position with regard to Ontario taxpayers.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the motion? Yes. All those in favour of motion 12.2? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Shall schedule 1, section 5 carry? Carried. Okay. All right; it sounds like it carried. Section 1, schedule 5 is carried.

We move now to schedule 1, section 6. The motion is 12.3, a PC motion.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 6 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Implementation

“(2) The minister shall not implement the strategy, or any amendment to the strategy, until at least 30 days have passed since notice of the strategy, or the amendment, was provided to the public in accordance with the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993.”

Chair, this amendment is really critically important because it will give the public and the elected representatives time to review the strategy and any amendments before it's implemented. That's critically important.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion is unnecessary as the Environmental Bill of Rights registry requirements

already apply and require a 30-day consultation period. So the government will not support this motion.

1510

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, in the spirit of making sure that both the public and elected representatives have an opportunity to review, and in the spirit of democracy that we heard the member of the third party speak of earlier, we feel it is reasonable to be asked that the strategy not be implemented until 30 days after it has been posted, simply.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: The motion is redundant. We won't be supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or questions? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on this? Was there a recorded vote mentioned on this one?

Mr. Lorne Coe: No.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Shall we vote on this motion? Yes. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Shall schedule 1, section 6 carry? Schedule 1, section 6 is carried.

There are no amendments that have been provided for schedule 1, section 7; however, is there any debate on that section? Seeing no debate on the section, we'll now move to the vote on the section. Shall schedule 1, section 7 carry? Carried.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Please note, for the record, Mrs. Martins' "hurrah."

We are now in a position to deal with schedule 1, section 8: government motion 13.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I move that section 8 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “an offence to which subsection 45(7) of the Competition Act (Canada) would provide a defence” and substituting “a contravention of the Competition Act (Canada)”.

Chair, we move this motion in response to the comments from the Competition Bureau of Canada, so I support this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: This motion appears to be an attempt to make an administrative fix to the bill, and I was wondering if the government could provide a clear explanation of your motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The intent of the broad reference is to limit or prevent regulated persons from successfully claiming that the bill authorizes them to engage in any competitive behaviour. This is the clarity I would like to provide to the member from the opposition.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote requested. Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, a recorded vote is noted.

Ayes

Anderson, Coe, Fraser, Mangat, Martins, Thompson.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Opposed? The motion is carried.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I don't think you do.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Good to know.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): You're going to be recorded as abstained, I'm pretty sure.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I could have been out of the room.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, just to clarify, your name won't show up in the record.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Okay, I won't argue.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: You can. I don't mind.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I don't want to argue. If I was out of the room, my name wouldn't be on the record. I'm in the room; I abstained. I don't want to argue, though.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Let me just confer with the Clerk.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I can provide more clarity if you like, Mr. Hatfield, but it's just not recorded.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: My interest is completely gone, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure.

The motion, as we indicated, carries.

We'll continue to PC motion 13.1. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 8 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Guidelines

"(2) The minister shall establish guidelines consistent with the Competition Act (Canada) that promote and foster a competitive marketplace among brand holders, as defined in section 59, and owners and operators of waste management systems."

A couple of facts that we'd like to bring forward in this particular amendment are that we want to ensure that everyone understands that competition be an organizing principle within the recycling sector going forward, and that we believe that government should lay out clear guidelines that promote and foster private sector competition. My colleague to my left spoke about the context and importance of that.

Going forward, it's an expectation that we have as a caucus, and I hope that my other colleagues around the table agree with that particular approach.

We'd like a recorded vote on this, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote noted. Any additional debate or discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The current proposed bill supports and fosters an open and competitive marketplace for businesses, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: It's not appropriate to be making guidelines in the area of federal jurisdiction, so I won't be supporting the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just want it to be noted that the command-and-control structure of the Liberals' recycling cartels have created a system that was more focused on planning economic activity and imposing eco taxes than on creating jobs or protecting our environment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The provincial interest would include an aim to promote competition and also allow the minister to issue a policy statement to provide for the direction. It is already allowing competition for the businesses, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well, to that end, we're happy to see that the government has conceded a key PC demand to create a competitive marketplace within the recycling sector, but we worry about the command-and-control structure.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I would repeat what I had said earlier.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Anyone else? Seeing none, this is a recorded vote. Are we prepared to vote on this motion? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

Shall schedule 1, section 8, as amended, carry? Carried.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry, what was that, Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Schedule 1, section 8.1?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's a new section.

Now we're going to NDP motion 14. It is creating a new section: schedule 1, section 8.1. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Administration not to be delegated

“8.1 The administration of the provisions of this act or of the regulations shall not be delegated to a delegated administrative authority under the Delegated Administrative Authorities Act, 2012.”

The purpose of the motion is to ensure that the authority is not a full-fledged designated authority.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): There is some concern around this being outside the scope. I will entertain this motion. I’ll provide you an opportunity to explain it.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I believe that I just did, Chair. It’s just to make sure that the authority is not a full-fledged designated authority.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Any discussion or debate? Yes, Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, the current proposed legislation sets clear roles and responsibilities for the government and the authority, so this motion is unnecessary. We will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion or debate?

Despite the fact that this may be somewhat out of the scope, I’ll allow for a vote on this motion. Are we in a position to vote on it? Okay. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

The next motion is NDP motion 15.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

“8.2 The authority is deemed to be an institution under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and its chair is deemed to be its head.”

1520

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Would you like to provide an explanation?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Very simply, it’s just to provide for the transparency of the authority itself.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion on this motion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act only applies to information in the custody and control of government actors—that is, crown agencies and ministers—and not for the non-crown agencies.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Not for the—

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Non-crown agencies. The authority is a non-crown agency, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion?

On this motion, although I understand the intent of it, Mr. Hatfield, and I think it’s an important issue, it does fall outside the scope of the sections that are being opened up by this bill, so I have to deem this motion out of order. It’s beyond the scope of the bill, but thank you for the motion.

Moving on to the next motion: motion 16, an NDP motion.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993

“8.3(1) A proposal under consideration with respect to this act is deemed to meet the criteria for public notice under subsection 15(1) of the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993, subject to subsection 15(2) of that act.

“Same

“(2) A proposal under consideration with respect to a regulation made or to be made under this act is deemed to meet the criteria for public notice under subsection 16(1) of the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993, subject to subsection 16(2) of that act.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Very briefly, Chair: That’s just to ensure that it applies to the Environmental Bill of Rights.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: As the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change is a prescribed ministry under the Environmental Bill of Rights, any proposal for any environmentally significant act or policy is automatically subject to the consultation provisions under section 15 of the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993. So this motion is redundant and we will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or discussion? Are we in a position to vote on the bill? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Moving to motion 17, an NDP motion: I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Ombudsman Act

“8.4 The authority is deemed to be a governmental organization for the purposes of the Ombudsman Act.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation on this, Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Basically, Chair, it gives citizens the Ombudsman’s protection under this legislation. The Ombudsman would come into play should there be reasons for concern that we need somebody to delve into and perhaps be a mediator in a dispute.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The government doesn’t support this motion. The Ombudsman Act only applies to government organizations such as ministries, commissions, boards and agencies, and authorities in non-government organizations. So we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion or debate?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: A recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I wanted to allow as much leeway as possible. Based on what’s

opened up by the act, this doesn't—before I make a ruling, let me just double-check.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's fine. I'll allow this. Although there's some concern around it being out of order, I will allow this to continue.

You wanted a recorded vote as well?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I do, Chair, but if I may say, just before the vote, perhaps if the table wants to rule a future motion out of order, you could say so at the beginning rather than me taking the time to read it. Maybe give me a brief moment to express my moral outrage at such a ruling, but otherwise I wouldn't have to read the whole thing.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): All right.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The issue is, if I rule before, then you can't read it or talk about it. You're not allowed to discuss it. So it's leeway to allow the issue to be raised.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I withdraw what I just said.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No problem. But on this one, we'll go ahead.

A recorded vote has been indicated. We'll move now to the vote.

Interjection: Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I think the motion is out of order, so I won't be supporting it. I just want to get that on the record.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's fair. Thank you for that, Mr. Fraser.

Any other debate, discussion? No?

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

There are no amendments to schedule 1, section 9. Any debate on schedule 1, section 9? Seeing no debate, are we in a position to vote on schedule 1, section 9? Yes? Shall schedule 1, section 9, carry? Carried.

Moving now to schedule 1, section 10, the first motion is government motion 18. I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I move that subsection 10(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "A person or entity exercising" wherever it appears in paragraphs 1 and 2 and substituting in each case "A person or entity when exercising".

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you—

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry. Thank you very much, Ms. Mangat. Please, if you'd like to explain, yes.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Thank you, Chair. I support this motion because the overarching provincial interest in resource recovery and waste reduction would apply to key decision-makers, including the province, municipalities, producers, waste management services providers and those responsible for waste management systems. So I support this clause.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments? Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Chair, certainly I'm supportive of any steps on the part of the government to clean up the legislation, and this is largely a technical change.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: In the interest of full co-operation and extending the hand of friendship in the hope of eliciting support for future NDP motions, I too will be supporting this government amendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further discussion or debate? Shall we now move to the vote? Excellent. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Okay. This motion carries.

We'll move now to PC motion 18.1. Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Thank you, Chair. I—

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: No, no.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Go ahead.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Actually, if I may, Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson, yes. Sorry, I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We're going to ask for unanimous consent to stand down this motion as it relates to sections 67 to 70. So in that spirit of co-operation that we just had, we ask for unanimous to stand down.

1530

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Certainly. I think in cases where it doesn't flow, that's a very reasonable request, to address the other sections before dealing with this one. Is everyone in agreement with that? No issues? Okay, that's fine. This will be stood down.

Now we move to schedule 1, section 11, motion 19, NDP motion. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that subsection 11(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "may issue" and substituting "shall issue".

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or discussion on that?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Very briefly, Chair: It just ensures that the policies will be issued—shall be issued.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any debate or discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion because the minister should have flexibility to determine, in consultation with the stakeholders, when government direction to the policy statements should be issued. So we will not be supporting that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any addition? Mr. Coe?

Mr. Lorne Coe: As I read and understand this amendment, it would compel the minister to issue policy statements. We've seen the practice and efficiency of that, rather than keeping it optional. As a caucus, we oppose policy statements, so I'll be opposing this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I know in legal terminology there's a big difference between "may issue" and "shall issue." In a former life as a journalist at the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., I was privileged to be on the bargaining committee several times—the national bargaining committee and the national grievance committee. We had glorious fights over the words "may" and "shall." The management may do something, as opposed to the management shall do something—big difference. And it goes both ways: The employee may be responsible or the employee shall be responsible. Whatever it is, "may" and "shall" mean totally different things, actually.

If we're talking about reporting—"shall issue" something, as opposed to "may issue"—in the interest of transparency and in the interest of accountability, it just makes sense to me that you would go with the stronger word to ensure the transparency, to ensure the accountability. That's why the motion, in good faith, was put forward.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: There is a wide range of stakeholders who would be involved when there will be policy statements and all that, so there needs to be an extensive consultation, so it's very important that ministers should have the flexibility to determine. So we will not support this motion.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote noted.

Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, we're in a position to vote.

Ayes

Hatfield.

Nays

Anderson, Coe, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins, Thompson.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

Moving now to motion 19.1, a PC motion: Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 11(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "may issue resource recovery and waste reduction policy statements" at the end and substituting "may issue policy statements that are limited to setting out waste diversion targets for classes of materials designated under subsection 60(1)."

To speak to it, as I said earlier to the amendment we just discussed as a committee, we believe that policy

statements are an unnecessary addition to this bill. They simply create regulatory overlap, duplication and conflict. For that reason, we feel this change is necessary.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I wonder if I can propose a friendly amendment? Instead of "may issue policy statements," it is changed to "shall issue policy statements."

Interjection.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I'm just trying to strengthen your motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, if you would like to do that, you're absolutely entitled to bring a motion. It has to be in writing, and we can absolutely recess and do that—

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I could ask for a 20-minute recess, Chair, but I will not, in the interest of—I get the sense from my opposition colleagues that they are not interested in a friendly amendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's good. Thank you for—

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you very much, Mr. Hatfield. If I understand you correctly, you don't want to proceed with the amendment to the motion?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Or the 20-minute recess.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Excellent. Moving along, back to Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just to come back to the motion at hand, we know this government likes to handcuff people through the use of policy statements. Given that, and that we recognize it, we're just trying to make the best out of a tough situation here. With that, we believe the use of policy statements should be limited with regard to setting waste diversion targets. That way, we avoid the minister attempting to control the design of products and packaging.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional—Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion as it limits the application of policy statements when it comes to setting of targets. We are not supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Chair, I "shall" oppose this motion as well.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you for that clarity, Mr. Hatfield. I appreciate it. Any additional debate or discussion? Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, we—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Please don't use the words "may" or "shall."

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I "shall" not use—yes.

In all seriousness, we feel strongly that we can't be handcuffing through policy statements. Again, as I mentioned earlier, given the propensity of this government to tie people's hands through policy statements, we just thought this was an effort in the spirit of enabling dexterity in the marketplace, to allow a little bit of oppor-

tunity, to let the marketplace determine how to move forward in addressing targets.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Fraser and then Ms. Mangat.

Mr. John Fraser: This motion waters down the legislation and I won't be supporting it.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Policy statements go beyond the producer responsibility model. They are intended to provide criteria, guidelines and principles, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote requested. Are we in a position to vote on this motion? Okay.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Just because of the confusion, let's take that vote again.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated. The reason for that clarity was that otherwise a member's use of the word "shall" would have been called into question. We needed to make sure that was clear.

Moving now to motion 19.2. It is a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that subsection 11(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "may issue resource recovery and waste reduction policy statements" at the end and substituting "may issue policy statements that are limited to setting out waste diversion targets for classes of materials designated under subsection 60(1) and setting out activities that would support achieving those targets."

Mr. Lorne Coe: What this motion is intended to do—and I think it's clear to the committee members. It would keep policy statements limited—and I underscore limited—to setting targets and activities that support achieving those targets.

1540

When you read through the legislation, this speaks to the spirit of the legislation. By no means is it intended to undermine it. What it's saying, again, is, setting targets and activities that support achieving those targets. I think that's an objective that's worthwhile working towards.

It's what we heard from the delegations over the course of two days.

I would ask the committee members—and I know that it has been a couple of hours already and we have several hundred more to go through. This is one motion that I think really speaks to the spirit and direction of the legislation.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: As I said earlier, policy statements go beyond the producer responsibility. Policy statements are intended to provide criteria, principles and guidelines on implementing the provincial interest as it relates to resource recovery and waste reduction. So the government will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I'd be remiss if I didn't mention that we all know how well the provincial policy statement has worked across the province. We're very worried that additional policy statements are going to yank people down the same path. We feel that the amendment that we put forward would keep a focus and reduce regulatory overlap and keep the sights limited to setting targets and activities supporting the overall goal of this bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional debate or discussion?

Mr. Lorne Coe: Recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote, noted. Thank you, sir. Shall we move to the vote? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is lost.

Moving now to motion 19.3: Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 11(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "resource recovery and waste reduction policy statements" at the end and substituting "resource recovery policy statements."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, referencing the deputations that we heard last week and being respectful of the concerns shared with us by stakeholders, we believe that policy statements are absolutely unnecessary in terms of adding them to Bill 151. This particular amendment would prevent the minister from overreaching and attempting to control the design of products and packaging through said policy statements.

This particular amendment would see the minister focus on resource recovery as opposed to dabbling and tying hands with regard to product design and packaging.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Minimum requirements or standards related to producer obligation would be set out in regulation to ensure they are enforceable. So we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: This motion weakens and undermines the legislation. I won't be supporting it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Actually, again, we agree to disagree. This is something we clearly heard during deputations from our stakeholders. We feel that this is an important step forward to have the minister focusing on resource recovery as opposed to tying hands. This is what the industry is looking for.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, let us move to the vote.

Mr. Lorne Coe: A recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote requested. Yes; absolutely.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is lost.

We move now to motion 20, an NDP motion. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: It's a very important motion.

I move that clause 11(2)(a) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(a) representatives of municipalities;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Explanation, if you'd like?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: We've heard earlier: When I was making reference to the cross-table fight between the government and the official opposition about business and government, I referred to them as a “duo” as opposed to a “trio” of municipalities.

Municipalities have a major role to play in the collection of the blue box, red box and green box and in the reuse, recycle and reduce collection of producer waste. Municipalities are subsidizing the cost of this. Municipalities carry out the function. Municipal tax dollars are used for this when they shouldn't be; it should be full producer responsibility.

The bottom line is that you need the voice of the municipalities at the table. You need to understand what your partners in this are saying and what their representa-

tives are telling them at the local level. This is a local function carried out municipality by municipality across the province. Every municipality is different and the concerns are different, but there will be a coordinated municipal voice that has to be heard. The intent of this motion is just to add that the representatives of municipalities will be heard.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: My colleague is going to be very happy. I fully agree with him. Municipalities have the ability to participate and they should have the ability to participate in the development of the policy. We fully agree with you, and we support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you very much, Ms. Mangat, for the great news.

Any additional comments or debate on this motion? Seeing none, shall we move to the vote? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed to the motion? The motion is carried.

Because this Bill 151 committee is not time-allocated, there are no scheduled breaks. The Chair, perhaps, would need to take a brief break if it's okay with the members of the committee. Could I indulge you all for a 15-minute break so we can return at 4 o'clock? Am I reading that right?

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Something like that—4:03, 4:04.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That strategically? I did not know that at all. There you go; you can use it for that purpose as well, if you like. Is that okay with everybody? Everyone is okay with that? Great. We're on recess until 4:04.

The committee recessed from 1548 to 1608.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The committee is now resumed. Thank you so much for that break. It was tremendous for me; I hope it was tremendous for you.

We will recommence with Conservative motion 20.1. I recognize—

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Oh, we did that one already.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We did it already? Are you sure? No, 20.1, according to us, has not been done yet.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Okay.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that clause 11(2)(b) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(b) representatives of brand holders, as defined in section 59;

“(b.1) owners or operators of waste management systems;”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Excellent. Any discussion or debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Sure. This motion specifically states that the government must consult with brand

holders and service providers rather than persons engaging in resource recovery.

We all agreed that brand holders should be responsible for the end-of-life management of designated waste and it is service providers who will work with brand holders to meet this responsibility. We feel strongly that it must be clearly laid out in this proposed act that each group should be consulted on the development of policy statements.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Anyone—Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion limits the scope of consultation. As we know, there will be relevant stakeholders during the development of any policy statements, so we are not going to support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote is noted. Any other discussion or debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is defeated.

We'll move to—

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Pardon me?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Did I hear my name called? I was opposed. I didn't hear my name called.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, he voted opposed. Okay. Let's make sure that happens again.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you for your diligence, Mr. Hatfield. The motion is defeated.

Moving to motion 21, an NDP motion, I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that subsection 11(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause:

“(b.1) the municipal advisory body established under subsection 1.1;”

Of course, that didn't happen. I guess I should have withdrawn that. I wasn't paying attention. I was so caught up in seeing Prince Harry in the hallway—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, yes. That's it. Because it's connected to the previous motion,

it's now no longer in order and it's deemed out of order. Thank you for that, Mr. Hatfield. I should have caught it as well.

Moving now to motion 21.1, I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 11(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following clauses:

“(b.1) representatives of brand holders, as defined in section 59;

“(b.2) owners or operators of waste management systems;”

I'd like a recorded vote, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): A recorded vote is noted. Any additional discussion? Yes, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: To the motion, it's service providers who work with producers to meet this responsibility I just spoke of. We all agree, hopefully—and we'll find out in a moment—that producers should be responsible for the end-of-life management of designated waste.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The consultation list already includes brand holders, owners and operators of waste management systems and representatives of persons engaging in resource recovery and waste reduction activities, so this motion is redundant. We will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I always try to keep an open mind, but I think I'm coming across a trend here to contain producer and private sector responsibility. I'll be opposed to this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We just feel very strongly that it must be clearly laid out in this proposed act that each group should be considered and consulted on the development of policy statements. We feel very strongly about that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It's a recorded vote. Are we in a position now to vote on the motion? Yes.

Ayes

Coe, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Hatfield, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is lost.

We move now to motion 21.2, a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that clause 11(2)(c) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

This particular subsection is largely designed, committee members, to ensure that the government consults with the companies, municipalities and individuals who will be most affected by a policy statement. Really

important here: Paragraph (c) creates a legal requirement for the minister to consult—consult—with a particular type of special interest group.

Those are my comments on the motion. I'm sure my colleague to my left will have additional comments that she'd like to add as well.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: This is nothing but a straightforward attack on the environmental sector. You can call them "special interest groups," but everybody deserves to have a say in this matter, and the people who are out working to protect the environment have a voice, and a voice that should be heard loud and clear. I think the intent of this amendment, with all due respect, is to silence that voice. I'll be opposed to it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I fully agree with my colleague Percy Hatfield. Everyone should have a right to voice their opinion. Environmental groups play a very important role in resource recovery and waste reduction activities, and they should be consulted during the development of any policy statement. I will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well, we feel it's important to see this particular motion passed because, again, the concept of consulting in this government leaves a lot to be desired.

Reflecting on what our honourable member from the third party just said, that everyone deserves to have a say, especially those who care most about the environment, why, then, did the government not include agricultural groups? They are the best stewards of the land. I represent a large section where—Huron—Bruce could be considered one of the bread baskets of Ontario. The fact that they're not listed here gets me riled up. This is very short-sighted. I just don't want to stop with agricultural groups, though. Taxpayer groups, consumer protection groups, aboriginal groups, urban planning groups: Why shouldn't they be consulted as well?

We're not in favour, at all, of picking winners and losers. Here we have, yet again, a government demonstrating that they just don't care about certain sectors, and they're choosing one over another. It's not right. We are not in any way in favour of giving special treatment to unaffected groups that don't really get impacted by what's happening in this particular bill. Instead, we're in favour of making sure that those affected by the provisions in this particular bill are consulted.

The fact that parties in this room may not understand the complete sincerity and fairness that is coming through in this particular motion is going to be shameful. I have to be straight up about that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I'm moved—I'm moved—by what I've just heard, and I would support a PC sub-amendment to add farmers' groups to the bill. If the member feels strongly that farmers' groups is a category

that should be added, I'd gladly support that, and some of the other groups as well. But I don't want to eliminate environmental voices just for the sake of eliminating other voices. If you want to add voices, I'll gladly listen to the reasoning for that, and probably support most of them.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I disagree with my friend Lisa when she's saying, "Why not consult with agricultural groups?" The Ontario Federation of Agriculture represents 36,000 family farm businesses. I was reading their letter, and they are saying that they are very supportive of Bill 151.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, we can't get lost in the weeds here. This is just the plain, simple initiative of picking winners and losers again. We could debate what type of group until Harry leaves this building later today, but the fact of the matter is that this is another attempt of the government to choose winners and losers. We just are not in favour of giving special treatment to anyone, especially unaffected groups, with regard to this particular bill.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Was there a recorded vote requested?

Mr. Lorne Coe: No.

1620

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Are we in a position to vote? Yes. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion number 22. I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Timing requirement

"(2.1) The minister shall begin developing a policy statement and consulting on it in accordance with subsection (2) no later than the first anniversary of the day this section comes into force."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or discussion?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I think it's important to drive the policy statement delivery, the timing of it, to make sure that there is a timeline to be followed. The bill, I believe, would be enhanced by such a declaration.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Moving to Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We agree with that recommendation and we support that. I fully agree that the minister should begin the development and consultation on the first policy statement within a year of the section coming into effect. Thank you very much for bringing that forward, and we support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion or debate? Seeing none, are we in a position

to vote on this motion? It looks like it. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost—or, no; it is carried. I'm so used to motions being lost.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): My apologies. The motion carries. Congratulations to all. You're paying attention. That's great. Thank you, Ms. Thompson, for noting that test. It was just a test, not because I in any way made a mistake. Excellent. So that motion is completed.

Moving onto PC motion 22.1: recognizing Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Assembly

“(3.1) The minister shall lay every policy statement, and every amendment to a policy statement, before the Legislative Assembly.”

Chair, the basis for the amendment is, as we've talked about earlier today, the transparency and accountability of government information. We believe that every policy statement as well as every amendment to a policy statement should be provided to the House. That's the underpinning of this particular amendment.

I'd like a recorded vote, please, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Recorded vote noted.

Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The proposed legislation has required the minister to publish each new or amended policy statement on a government website, EBR and in the Ontario Gazette, and to provide further notice to the members of the Legislative Assembly. So we will not be supporting this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I think it's a great motion. I think it supports transparency and the power of the Legislature. I just can't understand how anybody could possibly vote against it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Yes, Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this is just about fulfilling and walking the talk when we embrace the concept of democracy. To echo the comments from the esteemed member from the third party, I don't know how anyone could vote against it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Very passionate pleas for democracy from both Mr. Hatfield and Ms. Thompson. Acknowledged.

Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I think this government is walking the talk. Whatever transparency and accountability has happened, it has happened under the watch of this government.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or questions? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes. Ontarians elect us to represent them at Queen's Park and, because of that, they

expect to see and hear credible debate in the House. By not supporting this particular motion, this government is purposely taking that away from the voters of Ontario.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional? Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: Nobody is taking any chance for debate away. It's being published on a government website, the EBR, the Ontario Gazette—there are lots of opportunities for people to have access to this, both members and non-members, and lots of opportunity in debate and in question period. I really refute my colleague's remarks. I think they're off base.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, clearly this is an area where we are going to agree to disagree, because when I hear the EBR come up, I have to share and put it on record that stakeholder after stakeholder contacts me with concerns about the EBR and the fact that when information should be public on the EBR, it absolutely isn't. We can't trust that the EBR will facilitate the type of democracy that we stand for in the PC Party of Ontario.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments or debate? It has been a lively one. No? Okay. Are we in a position to vote?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Recorded vote.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It's a recorded vote, yes. It has been noted. Let's move to the vote.

Ayes

Coe, Hatfield, Thompson.

Nays

Anderson, Dhillon, Fraser, Mangat, Martins.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The motion is lost.

Moving now to motion 22.2, a PC motion: Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Implementation

“(3.2) The minister shall not implement a policy statement, or an amendment to a policy statement, until at least 30 days have passed since it was laid before the Legislative Assembly.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation?

Mr. Lorne Coe: Yes, please. Again, the basis for this particular amendment, committee members, is that it would give the public and elected representatives time to review the policy statements and any amendments to them before they're implemented. It's to the premise—as we've talked about previously, and I know I'm being repetitive—of strengthening accountability and improved transparency.

I know that my colleague opposite has pointed out the extent of consultation and dialogue in the Legislature, but what's important in this process is that there's ongoing dialogue and scrutiny and opportunity to engage all levels of stakeholders, including elected representatives. At the end of the day, we're accountable to the people who elected us. The more we're involved in that process, I think it strengthens the process. That's my commentary on this particular amendment.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion is related to a series of motions aimed at restricting the implementation of the bill, so we will not support this motion. My colleagues have spoken about transparency and accountability. I think our government has shown leadership when it comes to transparency and accountability to strengthen democracy. We will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: Is this motion out of order or not possible, given the fact that we've voted down those—I think it's out of order now because we've defeated the motions that had that requirement.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I understand, Mr. Fraser, where you're coming from. The motion can be read on a stand-alone basis and would still work on a stand-alone basis, though I see where you're saying that there have been related motions that have been struck down. Because this motion could stand on its own without those, it's still in order.

Now we can move to further discussion. Yes, Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I thought for a minute there we were getting time allocation, but we're not. There are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight—with yourself, nine members on the committee. What the bill amendment proposes is to bring it to the House and leave it there for 30 days for further time for discussion. There are 107 voices in the House at the moment and nine voices here. By putting it there for at least 30 days, it would inform all members of the House as to exactly what is on the table. I think that is in the interests of democracy. I think that is in the interests of transparency.

I agree with Ms. Mangat that the government has demonstrated, from time to time, transparency and accountability. But it's not always what has happened in the past; it is what is happening at the present and in the future. If you want to continue to be known as a government that believes in transparency and accountability, I believe you should look at well-intentioned motions such as this and say, "I've got some speaking notes here, but the people that wrote them aren't here to hear what has just been said, so perhaps it's time to change what was written in advance and look at transparency and accountability on a go-forward basis and come to realize that this isn't such a bad suggestion. This is something we could all live with."

1630

I'll just leave it at that. In the interest of transparency, accountability and democracy, it makes sense to support this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you very much. I respect the member's passion, but there is a road that's paved with good intentions.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: We just voted on that a couple of years ago, and look what happened.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Are we ready to vote on this motion? Yes? Excellent. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Motion 22.3; it's a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 11(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "Within 10 years after a policy statement is issued" at the beginning and substituting "Within five years after a policy statement is issued".

I'll defer to my colleague.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We spoke to this earlier. The reality is that 10 years is just way too long. In terms of fairness, astute review and responsibility, and given the pace at which innovation and the marketplace move and evolve, 10 years is just out of date and out of touch. Unless they want to keep "10 years" in to reflect how out of touch this government is, we feel that every five years is sufficient for the review and that 10 years is just way too long.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you, Chair. Let alone 10 years, 10 weeks ago the Legislature wasn't seized with a reform of the election finances; 10 weeks ago we were dealing with other matters. So five weeks ago our priority shifted to what we now deem important issues.

When you have a 10-year life cycle, you can quickly become—in this day and age, with the technology that we have—rapidly out of date. Even five years is a long time. Some people might suggest that three years would be more appropriate. I'll support five years because I do believe that in five years our system may be facing different circumstances. By then, we will certainly have had sufficient time to regulate, digest and evaluate the changes that have been made. You know, a five-year time period is only one more year than a normal election cycle, which gives the voters in Ontario time to reassess, evaluate and determine whether that was the direction they wanted to go four years previous.

I think a five-year time frame is appropriate. I think a five-year time frame is something that, upon reflection, perhaps the government might say, "Maybe that does give the industry enough time to see if indeed changes should be made on their behalf, let alone the municipal voices and so on." Five years from now, a lot of those things that have been put into place might not be the same as they are today.

I'll be supporting the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The 10-year review period very much aligns with the existing timelines and requirements for provincial plans and strategies under other related provincial legislation, such as the Planning Act. So we will not be supporting this recommendation.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

NDP motion 23: I recognize Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you, Chair. I recognize you as well.

Laughter.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): You're becoming all too familiar today.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Consultation re amendments

"(4.1) The consultation requirements of subsection (2) apply with necessary modifications to the amendment of a policy statement."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you, sir. Would you like to provide any discussion or explanation to that?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Very briefly, sir, it just ensures that the consultation actually happens. I hope we would agree that it's good to be consulted.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We feel that amendment number 24 better reflects the intention for the minister to consult not only during the development but also during the amendment of policy statements. We will not favour this statement.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Yes? All those in favour of this motion? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We move now to motion 24, also an NDP motion. Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: It's awfully lonely down in this corner.

I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Consultation

"(4.1) In considering whether to amend a policy statement, the minister shall consult, in the manner the minister considers appropriate, with the persons listed in subsection (2)."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: No, I'll just leave it at that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: While the intention is similar to amendment 23, we feel that this wording better reflects the intention for the minister to consult not only during the development but also during the amendment of policy statements.

Thank you for putting forward this amendment. We will support this.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Oh, thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We like the idea of requiring consultation before a policy statement because, again, it's making the best of a poor situation. There were many times before—and I'm sure the third party can echo this. We talk to stakeholders, and they say, "We've never been consulted."

We embrace the notion behind this NDP motion and we'll be supporting it as well.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional discussion or debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Looks like it. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): There's a bit of a wave going on. It's in solitude with our baseball team—or in solidarity, not solitude. That's the wrong word there, guys.

Mr. John Fraser: It will be solitude if they keep playing that way.

The Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Right; that's what some people are saying. Thank you for that.

Now we are moving on to motion 24.1. It's a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We withdraw this. We withdraw 24.1.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It's noted as withdrawn. Thank you.

Now moving on to motion 24.2: Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Implementation

"(7.1) The minister shall not implement a policy statement, or any amendment to a policy statement, until at least 30 days have passed since notice of the policy statement, or the amendment, was provided to the public in accordance with the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, in the spirit of accountability and transparency, we feel this particular motion is very important because it gives the public and elected representatives an opportunity to review the policy statements. We stand firm on this, and that's why some people might say, "Oh, here they go with the same old talking points." But time and again, we'll always stand firm on saying that the public, as well as elected representatives, deserve and should have the right to review policy statements.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I understand that this motion is important, but the public consultation requirements

outlined in the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993, apply. So we will not support that motion.

1640

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: We only need to look as far as some of the existing policy statements that the government has put in place for some of the challenges that exist within those policy statements, where an opportunity for greater transparency and accountability was present but wasn't taken up. We actually have another opportunity here before us to allow elected representatives to review the policy statements and any amendments that they feel would strengthen it, but again, there doesn't seem to be a willingness to land on the space of greater accountability and transparency.

It's becoming a bit of a circular discussion at this point, isn't it? Yet the proof is in the pudding of what has transpired with existing policy statements and some of the downside that has occurred. We don't need to look very far.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: My comment actually reflects on what I'm hearing from stakeholders and constituents with regard to the EBR. I respectfully agree to disagree when I hear the EBR referenced as a "mode of consultation" because we just have to look to the Green Energy Act and the manner in which concerns, complaints and absolutely valid concepts and ideas were totally ignored when they were entered into the EBR.

We feel that relying upon the EBR has not worked in the past under this government. Therefore, we cannot trust that it will work going forward. That's why this particular amendment was important.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional—Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I would like to reiterate that this motion is unnecessary. Public consultation requirements are already outlined in the Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993. That applies to this one, too.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I concur with my colleague. I disagree that the Environmental Bill of Rights is ineffective or hasn't been used properly. It provides for what is in this motion, so this motion is unnecessary and I won't be voting for it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I would just like to let it be known that if anybody's interested in receiving copies of the information that's been submitted to the EBR and not responded to, I would be very glad to share it with all the members of government sitting opposite to demonstrate how many concerns and efforts to consult are being ignored.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Can you share that with me, too?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Absolutely, Mr. Hatfield.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments, questions, concerns? Are we ready to vote on this motion? Yes? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We have now completed all the amendments for schedule 1, section 11. Now, any debate on schedule 1, section 11 in total?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Say it again, Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sorry, is there any debate or questions around schedule 1, section 11, as amended? Yes?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Actually, I feel that on behalf of the PC Party of Ontario, we need to make sure that we have on record and completely clear that we believe policy statements are unnecessary and do not need to be added to this bill. They will simply create overlap, regulatory burden and duplication, which will lead to conflict at the end of the day.

We stand for reducing red tape and avoiding confusion. We just feel that thorough impact assessments and proper consultation are going to be out of sync with the manner in which this government is going to move forward with their policy statements. We think the new rules should be laid out in regulation.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Fair enough. Thank you very much, Ms. Thompson. Any other debate on this section in its entirety? Okay. We are now in a position to vote on schedule 1, section 11, as amended. Shall schedule 1, section 11, as amended, carry? No? All those in favour? All those opposed? The section carries.

Now we are moving to section 24.3. This is in schedule 1, section 12. It's a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: This motion actually relates to PC motion 25.2, and therefore we would seek unanimous consent to stand down this motion until 25.2 has been voted on.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay, there has been a request to stand down this motion to deal with another motion that's connected to it. Is everyone in agreement? Yes, I see nods of the heads. Okay, excellent, sure. We'll stand it down.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Thank you. I appreciate that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Moving to PC motion 24.4. Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: This particular motion relates to PC motion 25.1, so again we seek unanimous consent to stand it down until 25.1 has been voted on.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure. The request is to stand down this motion as well because it's connected to another motion. Is everyone in agreement? That's okay? Just give me a little bit of a—everyone's okay? Yes, sounds good. That's stood down.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Thank you. I appreciate it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No problem. PC motion 24.5: also standing down? No? We're good to go? Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that paragraph 2 of subsection 12(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

I defer to my colleague.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Okay, so we've been told by the government that policy statements are intended to be a soft regulatory tool that's limited in scope. However, this paragraph will require actions that take place under 16 different laws to follow the rules of policy statements. This part of the bill, the way we see it, is basically elevating policy statements above other laws and will create confusion amongst companies, stakeholders, organizations and anyone affected by this particular act.

We believe that any policy that will affect such a large amount of laws should be dealt with in regulations so it undergoes proper consultation and review.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate or discussion? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The government will not support this motion as it limits the application of policy statements.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just find it curious that for this particular section or area of the bill, we didn't hear any differing views that this paragraph will require actions that take place under 16 different laws. I'm concerned that the government is willingly following through on policy that will affect such a large amount of laws. That really should be dealt with in regulations.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No additional comments or debate? Okay, are we ready to vote on this motion? Yes. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All right. All those opposed? The motion is lost.

Moving now to PC motion 24.6: I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, I ask for the committee's indulgence and we ask for unanimous consent to stand down as this particular motion relates to our amendments on 67 to 70.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The request is to stand down the motion. Is everyone in agreement? I'm seeing some nodding of the head. No one's opposed to it. Okay, this will be stood down. Thank you very much.

Next motion is government motion 25. I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I move that subsection 12(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(1) Subject to section 13, the following persons and entities shall, when doing the following things, ensure the things are done in a manner that is consistent with all applicable policy statements:

"1. A person or entity when exercising a power or performing a duty under this part or part III, IV or V.

"2. A person or entity when exercising a power or performing a duty under an act mentioned in subsection (2) or a provision mentioned in subsection (3), if the exercise of the power or the performance of the duty relates to resource recovery or waste reduction.

"3. A person or entity retained to provide services in relation to another person's responsibilities under section 67, 68, 69 or 70 when performing those services.

"4. An owner or operator of a waste management system when engaging in waste management activities.
1650

"5. A prescribed person or entity when carrying out prescribed activities related to resource recovery or waste reduction."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Would you like to provide an explanation?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The production of waste is one of the key outcomes of the proposed legislation that requires co-operation by all key actors, including service providers, so I will vote in favour of this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: What appears to be happening here is that the government is softening the language. If you look at subsection 12(1) and the inclusion of words like "doing the following things" instead of "exercising powers" and "performing duties" and "carrying out activities," it's a legal cleanup of that particular part, and it is something that we'll support.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Chair, I can sum up my input in four words: I support the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I appreciate your input, always. Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I would like to clarify that, for consistency, this amendment clarifies that policy statements apply to persons and entities only when they are exercising a power or performing a duty.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments or debate? Are we ready to vote on this motion? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion carries.

PC motion 25.1: I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 12(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation or discussion? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this part of the bill is basically elevating policy statements over 16 different laws. We feel that this action will create confusion among all stakeholders who are going to be impacted by this act. We feel very strongly that policy statements should not rise above 16 different laws that are already on the books.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: It limits the application of policy statements, so the government doesn't support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate or discussion? Seeing none, shall we move to the vote? I'm seeing agreement. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Moving to motion 25.2: I recognize Mr. Coe.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Is it 25.1?

Mr. John Fraser: Chair, we set aside two motions that were directly related to 25.1, or at least one—

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, I have 25.1.

Mr. John Fraser: Motion 24.4—was that not dependent on motion 25.1?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: No, it relates to it.

Mr. John Fraser: So we put it aside. I have motion 24.4. Two of the motions that we put aside—24.3 related to 25.2, and 24.4 related to 25.1. Or do I have that written down wrong?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just to go back and revisit: Motion 24.4 relates to motion 25.1, so we asked for unanimous consent to stand down until 25.1 has been voted on.

Mr. John Fraser: We just voted on it.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: So then we go with 25.1, not 25.2. You had mentioned 25.2.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We just dealt with 25.1—

Mr. John Fraser: We voted on the motion that this depends on. We had unanimous consent to put this aside until 25.1. We've done that vote. What are we doing with this? What are you doing with 24.4?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I'll jump in and clarify. There is 25.1, which we just voted on; it was defeated. So 25.1 is related to 24.4, and now we stood that down because they are connected. Now that 25.1 has been lost, we're in a position to deal with 24.4.

We can go ahead and deal with it now. Because they're connected, I have a feeling—

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, we're going to withdraw it.

Mr. John Fraser: That's what I thought you were going to do.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I thought that he had said 25.2 originally; that's why.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No. Okay, perfect. That's withdrawn. Thank you for that.

Now we are going to move to 25.2. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 12(3) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate? Mr. Coe or Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Sure. With regard to this, again, we feel very strongly that we have proper consultation and review. We're very concerned that the manner in which this particular bill has been written would require actions that take place under 16 different laws and follow the rules of a policy statement.

This particular bill is basically elevating policy statements over existing laws. We have a tremendous issue with that and we're just demonstrating that through our motions.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Could I pose a question to the legislative counsel?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Other than in baseball, where we know what "struck out" is, is "out" redundant if we say "struck" as opposed to "struck out"?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Counsel?

Ms. Pauline Rosenbaum: Mr. Hatfield, I believe it's just the practice that has developed over decades in Ontario for how to draft motions in this way.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: So "struck out" is legitimate and not redundant?

Ms. Pauline Rosenbaum: Not according to the practice of the committees over the years.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): No problem. Thank you, Mr. Hatfield. Thank you, counsel.

Back to motion 25.2: Any other debate or discussion around it? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion removes prescribed provisions under several municipal acts that are required to be consistent with the policy statements, because municipalities play an important role in resource recovery and waste reduction. This limits the application of the policy statements. We will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other discussion or debate? Seeing no further discussion, we're ready to vote on this motion. Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Just a moment's indulgence.

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay, excellent. Now that 25.2 has been dealt with, we can move back to 24.3. We go back to Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Because 25.2 was defeated, we'll withdraw motion 24.3.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay, thank you very much.

Now we're moving to motion 25.3. It's a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

1700

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Because 2.1 has not passed, we're going to withdraw this motion as well.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. The motion is withdrawn.

That completes all of the motions for schedule 1, section 12.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): There's one motion left that we stood down, which is 24.6. That is going to be stood down for a while longer. So we are not going to be able to deal with that—

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Because that's going to be down the road.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Sixty-seven to 70.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Right. So we'll just hold onto that and move on to the next motion, motion 25.4, which deals with schedule 1, section 13. It's a PC motion. I recognize Ms. Thompson or Mr. Coe—whichever.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Go ahead.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 13(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any discussion or debate? Ms. Mangat.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson. The convention is, if it's your motion, I think it makes sense to explain it.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

The fact of the matter is, this is just legal cleanup. That's our position on this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, it's very important that we take into account geographic differences and local circumstances across the province. So, keeping that in mind, we will not support.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate or discussion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Yes. Shall motion 25.4 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We now move to a vote on schedule 1, section 13. Before we go to this vote, is there any debate on schedule 1, section 13, in its totality? Yes, Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, we do not support the PCs' voting recommendation. The government votes to carry this section.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Any further debate regarding schedule 1, section 13? No, I do not see any further debate. We're now in a position to vote on schedule 1, section 13. Shall schedule 1, section 13, carry?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Do I hear a no? I do not hear a no. So schedule 1, section 13, carries.

Now we are moving on to schedule 1, section 14. The first motion is PC motion 25.5. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Official plans

“(1) A council of a municipality or a municipal planning authority shall have regard for the resource recovery and waste reduction policy statements that apply to the municipality or the authority when making or amending its official plan.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson for further explanation.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: After years and years of good work protecting our environment, municipalities don't need the province dictating yet again how to write

their bylaws and policy statements. It's such a nanny state that you're creating in this regard.

Local governments are already leading in environmental protection and waste management. I could go on and on about the amazing efforts that our lower tiers are doing within the riding of Huron–Bruce alone. And I'm sure my colleagues here on the opposition side of the committee table would echo the opportunity and appreciate talking about the good work their respective local governments are doing.

We can't stress enough that municipalities already have enough burden dealing with the provincial policy statement and the Planning Act. Requiring every municipality to amend its official plan every time the province develops a new policy statement is ludicrous, plain and simple.

This government should not be tying the hands of our local politicians. We feel that because of this, if we're standing up for our local governments and encouraging a good rapport with our local municipalities, everyone in this room should be voting in support of this particular motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Anyone else? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Municipal official plans are important instruments to support the implementation of the applicable policy statements, and it is important to ensure their consistency with these policy statements, so we will not be voting in favour of that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe?

Mr. Lorne Coe: I know that my colleague from the third party has served on a council before coming to Queen's Park, as I did for 13 years. I chaired the planning and development committee of the town of Whitby.

Requiring each municipality to amend its official plan every time the province develops a policy statement under this proposed act just adds more red tape. It just adds a burden on municipal officials that just isn't warranted. It just isn't warranted.

I know my colleague from the third party will speak to this as well because of his vast experience. But I can tell you, from my involvement as the chair of the planning and development department of the town of Whitby for the period I was—for 13 years—this would be a significant burden on municipalities' staff in the planning and development departments, and on the planning and development committees within councils across municipalities.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Moving to Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I wasn't planning on speaking to this, but I will. I wouldn't say I have vast municipal experience; I was only there for seven years, but I did sit on the planning advisory committee for those seven years. I sat on the city/county municipal waste committee, as well as the conservation authority and—I won't go into all the committees I sat on.

But what I learned on the planning committee was that it's important to always update your official plan,

because if you don't, decisions are made and then a developer or somebody comes in and says, "Well, you know, you're in contravention of the official policy statement on that." That leads to litigation. That leads to this, and that leads to that.

I don't see it as over-burdensome to keep up on the provincial policy statements. I believe that municipalities should be doing that to make sure that any municipal bylaws that are adopted are in full and complete compliance with provincial policy statements.

Having said that, that brings me to the Ontario Municipal Board, which overrules provincial policy statements, municipal plans and official plans and does whatever it wants to do. But I'm going down a different line on that one; I'll just leave it at that. It's always important to update your official plan and keep it in compliance with provincial policy statements, despite what the OMB may do to them.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat, then Mr. Fraser.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, what I understand is that this motion weakens the application of policy statements, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: It's clear that the member opposite does not support policy statements. Effectively, this motion is to weaken the effect of policy statements by describing them as "having regard to," so I can't support it. I can understand that it's consistent with the motions that they've put forward, but I can't support the motion because it does weaken the legislation, as Mr. Hatfield has said as well.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just feel it's important to recognize that through consulting with a number of our stakeholders, concerns were raised about policy statements. We heard it time and again through our deputations as well.

For goodness' sake, we do not need more red tape and bureaucracy in this province. The pressures and the burden on the shoulders of stakeholders, as well as municipalities, have gone through the roof over the last decade, and we should be moving towards helping municipalities stickhandle through their responsibilities as opposed to making it tougher.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional debate or discussion? Seeing none—

Mr. John Fraser: I'm not sure that it makes it tougher. I just think it makes things very clear as to who's doing—Mr. Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes.

Mr. John Fraser: I just want to respond. I'm not sure that it makes things tougher. I just believe that it makes things very clear as to what the expectations are for all the parties.

1710

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Chair, I feel very strongly that it is an extra burden if the municipality has to amend its official plan every time the province, the government of Ontario, develops a new policy statement. They really need to be thinking through what they're asking our lower tiers to be doing.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): We'll go to Mr. Hatfield and then come back to—

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Thank you. Just to pick up on something that was just said—"Every time the province adopts a new policy statement"—it's not like it happens every week. For the sake of argument, I would argue that they're few and far between in the greater scheme of things. I'll just leave it at that. It's not like it's something that is routinely imposed on a municipal council.

Mr. John Fraser: I agree with Mr. Hatfield.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The motion changes the requirement on policy statements to municipalities from ensuring consistency to "have regard to" when developing or amending official plans.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional—Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I'm sure my colleague will have a comment to wrap up, but the government is looking to use policy statements as a vehicle to impose their will on our lower-tier governments. Again, we will never stand in support of additional bureaucracy and/or additional red tape. From our stakeholders, we understand that there is concern that there could be multiple policy statements that come out of this particular initiative and it's enough to cause worry. Over to my colleague.

Mr. Lorne Coe: My colleague from the third party will know the Planning Act—that municipalities are required to update their official plans on a five-year cycle. That's what they're intended to do on a five-year cycle.

What this does, in effect, is add another layer of bureaucracy and red tape and expectations on municipalities that are not there at the present time. That lies where the issue is. It's just requiring more work on the part of the staff in municipalities, the 444 municipalities overall. We already have a prescribed time limit for when you update your official plans in municipalities. This is another layer, again, of red tape. We want to put in place conditions for municipalities to succeed. Not everyone here wants to do that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe, thank you for your passion. Any additional comments or questions?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: It's not about adding another layer of bureaucracy or red tape. It is about the seamless and efficient transitioning of the existing programs to a producer responsibility model.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Well, we'll agree to disagree. I can go through the layers that exist, whether it's the provincial policy planning statement, whether it's the other aspects of the Long-Term Affordable Housing

Strategy—I could go on and on about the layers within municipalities that they have to deal with right now. This is just another layer on top of that, believe me. Talk to AMO. They're right there in the audience.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Yes. Shall motion 25.5 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Motion 25.6: I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that subsection 14(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any comments or concerns?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, just straightforward: Municipalities already have enough red tape to deal with from this particular government. Local governments already are leading with regard to environmental protection and management. In recognition of their good work, we are just trying to reduce their regulatory burden.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: We will not support this motion as it removes requirements for municipalities. Official plans, we think, are very important implementation tools. They need to be amended in order to be consistent with the policy statements. We will not support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: I would just like to remind Ms. Thompson of the \$3 billion we uploaded from the download from her previous government.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well, let's not even start talking about the decrease in OMPF funding that we hear concern about day in and day out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): The zings are flying back and forth. Any further comments? Mr. Hatfield, do you want to weigh in?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: No, Chair. I would enjoy it but I see no benefit to it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I'm probably not doing the right thing by egging this on.

Are we in a position to vote on this motion 25.6? Yes? Shall the motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We now move to PC motion 25.7. Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(3) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I always had the expectation, when I was a regional councillor, that the province should be working with local decision-makers. Reasonable expectation, isn't it? Hasn't happened here; hasn't happened at all. Rather than dictating, engage. The best outcomes that we have here in the Legislature are when we engage in a robust way and we speak specifically to local decision-makers on the front line and ask municipalities. They make our province work. That's one of the bases for the

amendment here, and I'm sure my colleague will augment that.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Certainly. Again, just to revisit—and for those of you who are tuning in on the TV or reading this in Hansard, it's important to realize that subsection 14(3) requires municipalities to update their zoning bylaws every time the province amends one of its policy statements. This is a huge concern for us. We should be freeing up folks who come forward at lower tiers within our local municipalities to do the job that they wanted to do, as opposed to tying their hands with additional red tape.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Thank you, Chair. This motion is related a series of motions aimed at restricting the implementation of the bill, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: Chair, if you could just move your mike a little bit closer? I'm having difficulty hearing you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Sure. Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Interjection.

Mr. Lorne Coe: That's okay. I just couldn't hear you very well. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's okay; that's fine. Thank you for that, Mr. Coe. We think it's important to make sure everyone can hear what's going on, so that's fair.

Any other comments or concerns to raise? Okay, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Shall motion 25.7 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We now have PC motion 25.8. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Bylaw under listed acts

“(4) If a bylaw that is in effect under an act mentioned in subsection 12(2) or a provision of an act prescribed under paragraph 6 of subsection 12(3) relates to resource recovery or waste reduction, the person or entity that made the bylaw shall have regard for the policy statements that apply to the person or entity.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any comments or—Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, we stand on our previous comments with regard to a rationale as to why we brought forward this motion. We want to do everything we can to support our municipalities, as opposed to continuing the buildup of burden that this government seems intent on doing.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mrs. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion weakens the application of policy statements with regard to bylaws, so we will not favour this recommendation.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments or questions? Mr. Coe.

1720

Mr. Lorne Coe: Well, what's clear in the discussion of this particular amendment is that municipalities in this province have really strong records of protecting our environment. Municipalities don't need the province dictating how to write their bylaws; within the context of policy statements, they surely don't. We heard that during delegations. I've heard it, and I'm sure there are other members of provincial Parliament who have heard it overall.

Those are my comments on this right now.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, yes, we have all heard, but it's very important to understand that bylaws are important instruments to support the implementation of the applicable policy statements. It's very important to ensure that consistency with these policy statements. That's what I have heard.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional debate, questions or comments? Seeing none, shall we move to the vote on this motion? Seeing no disagreement, shall motion 25.8 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We now move to motion 25.9. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We're withdrawing this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Motion marked withdrawn.

Moving now to motion 25.10.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: We're withdrawing this particular motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Also withdrawn at the request of the official opposition.

Moving now to 25.11: Mr. Coe?

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further discussion or debate? Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well, the fact of the matter is that this motion simply strikes out subsection 14(4), which is the requirement to ensure bylaws are consistent with policy statements. Again, it's just creating more red tape. That's our concern.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: As I have said earlier, and I'm going to reiterate: It weakens the application of policy statements with regard to bylaws, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Only in the sense that when you're running a municipality and you're doing planning and you have developers come in, you want for them to understand what's going on in your official plan and you want the municipality to know exactly what's being proposed. But if you have contradictions in the official plan and the provincial policy statement, you're going to run into confusion, you're going to run into a possibly

protracted legal debate—which costs the taxpayers money—to defend your official plan or to be proven that it's out of context with the provincial policy statement.

I think you have to do whatever you can as legislators or as municipal planners and as municipal councils to integrate provincial policy statements with official plans. You can't have them being in contradiction and you can't have them up for debate, up for question, because it's just going to end up costing the taxpayer more money. Believe it or not, there is only one taxpayer. We have to do what we can to coordinate any action through legislation and through the Planning Act so that we're all on the same page. I think the purpose of this motion is to weaken the system that is there and what has been proposed.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or questions? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote? Yes. Shall motion 25.11 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We now move to PC motion 25.12. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(5) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Prescribed instruments

“(5) If an instrument prescribed in the regulations, other than an instrument mentioned in subsection (1), (3) or (4), relates to resource recovery or waste reduction, the person or entity that made the prescribed instrument shall have regard for the policy statements that apply to the person or entity.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any explanation?

Mr. Lorne Coe: To my colleague.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, it's all about reducing red tape. It's in the spirit of letting municipalities be dextrous and do what they do best. They're already leading by example in many different ways in terms of their environmental initiatives, and we feel government should stay out of their way.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion is related to a number of PC motions that restrict the implementation of the provincial interest and policy statements, so the government doesn't support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments, debate or questions? No. Shall we move to the vote? Yes. Shall motion 25.12 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Moving to PC motion 25.13, I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 14(6) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: This is again recognizing the excessive regulatory burden associated with what's coming through in this bill with regard to tying municipalities' hands. We believe that the province should be

working with our local government decision-makers, not setting deadlines or dictating what they should do at the stroke of a pen. Again, this is all in the spirit of reducing red tape.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, this motion removes timing requirements to amend prescribed instruments to be consistent with policy statements, so we will not be supporting this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote? Yes. Shall motion 25.13 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

The last motion for this section is PC motion 25.14. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: On the motion, Chair, I move that subsection 14(7) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further debate? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Sure. Essentially, the manner in which subsection 14(7) is written would allow the minister to compel municipalities to update their bylaws or official plans to bring them in line with policy statements.

It's interesting; we hear time and again how, throughout this province, municipalities have stood tall absolutely in their defiance of losing their autonomy with regard to the Green Energy Act. We feel strongly that we don't need to be giving the minister veto powers over local decision-making in this regard. We should be putting more faith in the hands of our local decision-makers, but again, here we have a government—they stripped autonomy away from municipalities with regard to the Green Energy Act, and now this particular bill will give the minister veto.

We just feel that we should be having more faith and allowing our local decision-makers an opportunity to do the job they thought they were elected to do in terms of representing their local boards and their municipalities.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, it's very important that ministers should have the tools to support the implementation of policy statements, so the government doesn't support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I agree with what the member from Huron–Bruce just said about the Green Energy Act. I would like to think it's an aberration of the overriding of municipal jurisdiction by the provincial government as opposed to something that happens on a regular basis.

I don't see what is proposed here as comparable to the Green Energy Act legislation. I think what we have here is, again, a coordination between official plans and policy statements.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Actually, at this stage of the game, late in the afternoon, I'm going to have to respectfully ask the member from the third party to agree

to disagree on this particular issue. We do not believe that people—in my riding of Huron–Bruce and across the greater province of Ontario, I hear time and again that people are tired of folks in Toronto dictating what happens in rural Ontario. I'm not trying to perpetuate the rural-urban issue, but we should be working with our municipalities and letting our local decision-makers do what they've been elected to do because they know best, as opposed to being imposed with a cookie-cutter approach that could potentially tie their hands.

1730

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Yes. Shall motion 25.14 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We are now in a position to deal with schedule 1, section 14. Before we deal with the vote, are there any comments with respect to schedule 1, section 14? Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, you've heard us loud and clear. We do not feel that the government should be tying the hands of municipal officials with policy statements. We heard through deputations, and we heard through meetings with our stakeholders, that they have concerns about these policy statements, and our motions reflect how we've been trying to stand up for the stakeholders that we listened to.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate on section 14, schedule 1? We're now in a position to vote on schedule 1, section 14. Shall schedule 1, section 14, carry?

Interjection.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I don't hear any—no? Yes? There being a no, shall schedule 1, section 14, carry? All those in favour of it carrying? All those opposed? The section carries.

We are now moving to schedule 1, section 15, and PC motion 25.15. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that paragraph 1 of subsection 15(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“1. The policy statement or provision that respects local decision-making and provides the greatest protection to the natural environment and human health governs, to the extent of the conflict.”

The context of this motion would require the provincial government to consider respect for local decision-making when resolving a conflict between a policy statement and any other provision of the law.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: The current conflict provisions provide the greatest protection to the natural environment and human health, so we will not be supporting this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on this motion? Yes. Shall motion 25.15 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

We're now moving to motion 25.16. I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that paragraph 2 of subsection 15(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “provide equal protection to the natural environment and human health” and substituting “provide equal respect for local decision-making and equal protection to the natural environment and human health”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this is just a motion that supports local decision-making, which we feel the provincial government should have respect for. Local decision-making should be a factor in determining what policy governs, and we shouldn't be ignoring our local municipal tiers.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, as I said earlier, the current conflict provisions provide the greatest protection to the natural environment and human health, so we will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional debate or comments? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on motion 25.16? Okay. Shall motion 25.16 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost.

Motion 25.17 is a PC motion. Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I move that paragraph 2 of subsection 15(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “the policy that best promotes the provincial interest described in section 2 governs” and substituting “the policy that best protects local decision-making governs”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Well, again, this motion essentially would require that all policy conflicts be resolved by ensuring that we best protect the local decision-makers. We just ask for the government to respect that.

Interjection.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I didn't mean to choke you up on that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Apologies.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I'll just close off by saying that local decision-making should be deciding factor in determining what policy governs.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Please don't take that as a reflection on you. I just swallowed the wrong way.

Any additional comments or questions? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I don't agree with my colleague, because local circumstances have been considered in other parts of the proposed legislation, including considering a geographic-based approach for policy statement development and regulation-making. We will not be supporting this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional comments or debate? Are we ready to vote on this

motion? Okay. Shall motion 25.17 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost.

Moving now to government motion 26: I recognize Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: I move that the French version of paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection 15(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “I emporte” wherever it appears and substituting “I emporte, dans la mesure de l'incompatibilité” in each case.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat, would you like to provide an explanation?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Yes. The provision is for consistency between the English and French version of the legislation. This motion is very important, so I support the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Just for clarification, I'm not sure that it's “I” as opposed to “1” for “1”.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Yes, “I emporte”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): That's fair. That's noted.

Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, we support any motion that fixes or corrects the legislation as it stands.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any further debate? Are we in a position to vote on this motion? Shall government motion 26 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion awkwardly carries.

The next motion is PC motion 26.1. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 15(3) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding “while ensuring that any guidelines respect local decision-making” at the end.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional comments or debate? Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: The amendment would require the minister to ensure that any guidelines that flow out of what we're discussing here today respect the local decision-making process that's well ingrained and that members know works so well. Under subsection 15(3), the minister can establish guidelines to clarify the relationship between policy statements and policy plans.

So here's an opportunity, isn't there? Here's an opportunity. Hands up.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Baby, hands up.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you, Mr. Coe, and a special thanks to Ms. Thompson for the song rendition.

Laughter.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, local circumstances have been considered in other parts of the proposed legislation, including considering a geographic-based approach for policy statement development and regulation-making. I think it's unnecessary. We will not support this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Additional debate or comments? Seeing no additional hands being raised—Ms. Thompson.

1740

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just want to echo and reflect upon the fact that my colleague from Whitby–Oshawa lived, ate and breathed this, and my colleague in the third party did as well. I grew up with a municipal office in my home till I was a teenager. I know how much effort goes into local decision-making.

People who are elected to represent our local municipalities probably have the toughest job out of all three levels of government. I think there's probably agreement with that. They're closest to their constituents. I think we should be able to support them, as opposed to burdening them, and we should, at the provincial level, have respect for local decision-making. We should be doing that, as opposed to just adding to red tape.

I really appreciate the perspectives that both the member from Whitby–Oshawa and the member from Windsor—

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Tecumseh.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: —Tecumseh have brought to the table in that regard. We may not always agree, and we end up agreeing to disagree, but at the end of the day this is about respecting the people who throw their hat into the local municipal ring and not only sit at their local municipal level but, as was drawn to our attention earlier, on conservation authorities and source water protection organizations—the list goes on and on. We should be supporting our local level as opposed to burdening them.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I agree that municipal politicians are, in my opinion, the hardest-working of the three orders of government. They are closest to the ground with the people who elect them; they run into them every day as opposed to those of us who travel to Toronto or Ottawa and spend three or four days a week—or five or six days a week, sometimes—out of town.

Having said that, and having great respect for our municipal politicians, I do not believe that what is proposed in any way detracts from their ability to make their own decisions. I think they make decisions based on what's best for their municipalities, based on the rules and regulations they have before them that they have to comply with. What's proposed in this amendment I don't believe impacts them in a negative way. I will not be supporting the motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Chair, I would like to add that I also do have a great respect for our municipal partners. Those provisions are already there in the current proposed legislation, so I will not support this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any additional debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? Seeing yes, shall motion 26.1 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Now we're in a position to deal with schedule 1, section 15, as amended. Before we get to the vote, is there any debate on schedule 1, section 15? Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this is an opportunity for us representing the PC Party of Ontario and the loyal opposition to stand up on behalf of our constituents and let people know that we need to be reducing red tape and bureaucracy. We believe strongly—and I can't stress it enough—that new rules should be laid out in regulation. Then everybody can undergo and trust the thorough impact assessments that regulations would have, the proper consultation that follows with regulation.

We, again, would like to respectfully remind everybody with regard to what we heard during deputations and what you possibly heard—I know we heard it—through our stakeholder consultations: that policy statements are essentially an unnecessary addition that will cause burden. That's why we're doing the job that we're doing today.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Yes, I'm not a member of the official loyal opposition, but I am a member of the progressive opposition. Being a progressive-minded kind of guy, I don't see anything in this section that restricts the ability of municipalities to make their own decisions based on what's in front of them. Because of that, I will be voting opposed—I will be supporting the—

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I liked your first one.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I will be supporting the motion to support this section, as opposed to the motion to reject the section.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat? No comments?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: No comments.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Now we've heard debate on this section. We're now in a position to vote on it. Shall schedule 1, section 15, as amended, carry? I heard a no. All those in favour? All those opposed? The section carries.

We are now in a position to deal with schedule 1, section 16. Our first motion is a PC motion, 26.2. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 16(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “as the minister considers necessary for the purposes of section 17” at the end and substituting “who specialize in regulatory compliance for the waste management sector”.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): An explanation or comments? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Believe it or not, once upon a time I was an Ontario civil servant. I know first-hand—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Really? Oh.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, I was. I worked for the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs in the GTA. My first office was in Brampton—or in Peel region, I would be more correct in saying.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I just want to share with you that Ontario has very good civil servants who can manage compliance very well. They have enforcement officers already in place with regard to compliance, and we know that civil servants are very adept. Again, they're

close to their constituents and they have their feet on the street, so to speak.

Given that past behaviour is somewhat indicative of future behaviour, we're somewhat concerned, on this side of the House, that we can't rely on the minister to select the right people to do the job. We want a balance to it.

This particular amendment would ensure that only civil servants who specialize in waste management—in waste management compliance, to be exact—would be able to serve as a director.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I am so pleased to hear the official opposition speak highly of the Ontario civil service.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: I said that there are good people there.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I just wish we had heard those comments before Mr. Hudak made his comments in the last election about eliminating so many of them. I do agree that they are hard-working and they are dedicated. I'm pleased that you were once a member of them. I hope you'll always stand up and support them as we go forward.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat?

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Why the minister would be appointing a director: because they will be knowledgeable, they will have skills and they will have training related to the task. This motion creates unnecessary duplication, so we will not be supporting this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Just to clarify as well: We support good ideas, and civil servants stand by good ideas. They're not about red tape.

I just want to give a shout-out, because it is part of this conversation. There have been amazing programs facilitated by civil servants—the environmental farm plan, and nutrient management plans—and it all pertains to where we're going in terms of protecting our environment. But unfortunately, that type of facilitation and that type of programming, traditionally facilitated by the field staff of the civil service, has gone by the wayside. So the manner in which I knew the traditional form of extension has completely changed. I just want people to know that.

The true definition of "extension" was shared with me by an agricultural representative. His name was Carm Hamilton, from Lindsay, Ontario. He said that you know you've done your job as an extension worker, as an agent of change, when the people you work with no longer need you because you've empowered them to go forward.

That's the manner in which I embraced my opportunity to be a civil servant, and it's in that spirit that we need to be mindful of not burdening folks in 2016 with additional red tape.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I'll recognize Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: If there are any civil servants in the room, I suggest you run out and get a copy of instant Hansard and share it with your colleagues.

1750

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes. I was a proud extension worker.

Mr. John Fraser: I agree. But I don't think that's germane to what we're discussing here. I won't be able to support this motion, but I really do appreciate your respect and admiration for public servants.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Mr. Hatfield, and then back to Ms. Thompson.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Last weekend, I took part in the 25th anniversary of the Little River Enhancement Group, which is a group that was formed 25 years ago to clean up the Little River in my riding. They've planted thousands and thousands of trees ever since, as well as cleaned up the environment.

One of the founding members is a former employee of the Ministry of the Environment. He was telling me—believe it or not—how grateful he was when he was laid off by Mike Harris, when Mike Harris was the Premier of Ontario and laid off a lot—I won't get into the numbers—a lot of civil servants who had specialties and expertise in the environment and other areas. Those people aren't there anymore. The inspectors and the regulators were laid off under a previous administration. So when I hear Ms. Thompson from Huron–Bruce talk about the importance of having specialized persons in these fields, I hearken back to previous decisions made by former leaders of her party and I say that what goes around comes around, I guess, in many ways, but I'm glad we all three parties recognize the importance and the abilities of Ontario's civil servants.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): I recognize Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, and I'm going to date myself. Anybody who is quick in math, I'm outing my age a little bit, but I do recall Rae Days as well. Every government has had an opportunity to dabble with the manner in which extension—my traditional definition of extension was affected. I would like to share with you as well, in that same light, that the OMAFRA offices that used to be very well used are nothing but shelves now under this particular government.

It's important to recognize that traditional extension work has been whittled away. That's a fact that we're facing in the riding of Huron–Bruce at this time. Bruce county doesn't even have an OMAFRA office. They have a ServiceOntario office in Bruce county, but the traditional OMAFRA office in Clinton has many people concerned.

We can't let the fun that we've had in this discussion take away from the motion at hand, and that is making sure that our constituents are well represented and that we do right by this bill and not burden people with red tape.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Anything further? Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: I think that we have to get on with this, but I would like to say that I'm really happy that

there are 100,000 of them that are still around that we can respect here in Ontario.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Oh, okay. We could go on forever here. I'm going to let that one go. For the record, I'm letting that one go. Nurses?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Thank you very much for that, Ms. Thompson. Anyone else want to take any shots?

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Sounds good. Let's get to the vote on this one and then we'll wrap it up because we only have a couple of minutes left. So, 26.2: Shall this motion carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Now we can deal with this last section perhaps before we wrap up for today. We're in a position to deal with schedule 1, section 16. Before we do that, any comments or debate with respect to schedule 1, section 16? Ms. Thompson?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes. We stand with regard to the rationale we've presented earlier. We're going to have to move against this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate or discussion? Okay, we're now in a position to vote. Shall schedule 1, section 16 carry? All those in favour of schedule 1, section 16? All those opposed? This section carries.

We have five minutes. Do you guys want to go five more minutes?

Interjections.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I wanted to say, "The Liberals don't want to work."

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): All right, we're on 26.3. We're dealing with schedule 1, section 17. This is a PC motion. I recognize Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that subsection 17(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "all applicable policy statements" at the end and substituting "this act and regulations."

Again, the premise here is that, if the government wants to set the rules, which obviously they do, they should do so in regulation—is our view. That way, they'll undergo consultation and review. On one hand, you talk about all the consultation that's taking place; you have the opportunity again for that consultation—and review. You know that the consultation and review, in terms of other directions you've taken, have improved the process. You have another opportunity to strengthen the process and engage those who are your constituents.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Just to show that I was listening, Chair, what is written is "this act and the regulations," and what was said was "this act and regulations." I don't know if it makes a difference to the legislative counsel or the Clerk. I'll just point that out as a point of information.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Mr. Hatfield, would you like to direct the question to counsel, and then counsel can provide an answer?

Mr. Percy Hatfield: Does that make a difference?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Counsel?

Ms. Pauline Rosenbaum: It's fine. It's fine in this motion. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Counsel's answer: It's fine on this motion.

Any other debate? Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: This motion is related to a series of motions aiming at restricting the implementation of policy statements under the current proposed legislation, so we will not be supporting this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any addition? Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Earlier, just moments ago, we had one of our motions pertaining to making sure that directors came with experience of waste management compliance. That got voted down. We don't need directors who may not necessarily have the expertise in waste management compliance policing brand holders and telling them—not only brand holders, but service providers and municipalities—what they should and should not be doing. That's our rationale behind this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate with respect to this motion? Seeing none, are we in a position to vote on it? It looks like we are. Shall motion 26.3 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is defeated.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Two more minutes, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Yes. Let's keep on going. Let's do it.

Okay, 26.4, I understand, might need to be stood down.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, absolutely. I'd ask for unanimous consent to stand down motion 26.4, as it relates to sections 61 and 62.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Okay. Is everyone in agreement with that? Yes. All right; sounds good.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Let's keep on going: 26.5. Do you want to just read that in?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes. Actually, I ask for unanimous consent to stand down this particular motion as it relates to 67 to 70.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Another stand-down.

Interjection.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Sections 67 to 70.

Interjection: That's 67 to 70, inclusive, am I right?

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Yes, "to." Yes, sorry.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Is everyone okay with that? It looks like everyone is. Okay—stood down.

Next one: 26.6. Mr. Coe.

Mr. Lorne Coe: I move that section 17 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"Appeal

"(5.1) A person or entity may appeal a decision by the director under subsection (5) to the minister in accord-

ance with the regulations, who may overturn the decision.”

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Thompson, for an explanation.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: Again, this is just straight up. Brand holders, service providers and municipalities should be able to appeal a director’s decisions to the minister. Again, we reserve concern over the fact that our previous motion was defeated, where we wanted to see the director to have specific waste management compliance experience, so we feel that brand holders, service providers and municipalities should be able to appeal a director’s decision to the minister.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Any other debate? Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Percy Hatfield: I have a concern that this could unnecessarily politicize decision-making, so I don’t think that I can support it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Ms. Mangat.

Mrs. Amrit Mangat: Thank you, Chair. It’s already addressed through a previous government motion, which provides an opportunity for persons to be heard before the director, so we will not be supporting this motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): Are we in a position to vote on this? Yes. We can make this the last one of the day. All those in favour of motion 26.6? All those opposed? The motion is defeated, and so is our time here today.

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson: One more.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): You guys want to do one more?

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Jagmeet Singh): It’s 6 on the dot, everybody. I would love to continue working, but we are bound by certain rules.

I adjourn the committee until 4 p.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, in the same room. See you all there.

The committee adjourned at 1800.

CONTENTS

Monday 2 May 2016

Waste-Free Ontario Act, 2016, Bill 151, Mr. Murray / Loi de 2016 favorisant un
Ontario sans déchets, projet de loi 151, M. Murray SP-951

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Bramalea–Gore–Malton ND)

Mr. Granville Anderson (Durham L)
Mr. Lorne Coe (Whitby–Oshawa PC)
Mr. Vic Dhillon (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest L)
Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)
Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Ottawa–Orléans L)
Mrs. Gila Martow (Thornhill PC)
Mrs. Kathryn McGarry (Cambridge L)
Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Bramalea–Gore–Malton ND)
Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Percy Hatfield (Windsor–Tecumseh ND)
Mrs. Amrit Mangat (Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud L)
Mrs. Cristina Martins (Davenport L)
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson (Huron–Bruce PC)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Katch Koch

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Pauline Rosenbaum, legislative counsel