

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

G-55

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

G-55

**Standing Committee on
General Government**

Supporting Recovery
and Competitiveness Act, 2021

1st Session
42nd Parliament
Friday 28 May 2021

**Comité permanent des
affaires gouvernementales**

Loi de 2021
sur le soutien à la relance
et à la compétitivité

1^{re} session
42^e législature
Vendredi 28 mai 2021

Chair: Goldie Ghamari
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Présidente : Goldie Ghamari
Greffier : Isaiah Thorning

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:

<https://www.ola.org/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

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 416-325-7400.

House Publications and Language 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 linguistique et des publications parlementaires
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

CONTENTS

Friday 28 May 2021

Supporting Recovery and Competitiveness Act, 2021, Bill 276, Mr. Sarkaria / Loi de
2021 sur le soutien à la relance et à la compétitivité, projet de loi 276, M. Sarkaria.....G-1391

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENTCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES

Friday 28 May 2021

Vendredi 28 mai 2021

The committee met at 0904 in room 151 and by video conference.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): Good morning, everyone.

Honourable members, in the absence of a Chair and Vice-Chair, it is my duty to call upon you to elect an Acting Chair. Currently, we have MPP Sabawy in the room. Are there any nominations?

Ms. Donna Skelly: I would like to nominate MPP Sabawy.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): Thank you. Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, I declare the nominations closed and MPP Sabawy elected Acting Chair of the Committee.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Good morning, everyone. I will start with the attendance check and will ask the attendance again at the end of our pre-meeting, in case anyone else has joined.

MPP Bob Bailey, can you please identify your name and where are you located?

Mr. Robert Bailey: Yes, it's Bob Bailey, MPP for Sarnia-Lambton. I'm in my riding today, Chair. Thank you.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Stephen Crawford?

Mr. Stephen Crawford: Yes, good morning, Chair. I'm MPP Stephen Crawford, in Oakville.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Goldie Ghamari? Not here. MPP Chris Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: Hi, it's Chris Glover, and I'm in Toronto.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Mike Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Good morning, Chair. Thank you. I am MPP Schreiner, and I'm in my constituency office in Guelph.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Daisy Wai?

Mrs. Daisy Wai: Good morning, Chair. This is MPP Daisy Wai from Richmond Hill, and I am in Toronto. Thank you.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): MPP David Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: Morning, Chair. I am in my constituency office in Port Hope, Ontario.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Donna Skelly?

Ms. Donna Skelly: Good morning, Chair. It is MPP Donna Skelly, and I am in my hometown of Hamilton.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): MPP Peter Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Morning, Chair. Peter Tabuns, here in Toronto.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you. MPP Monteith-Farrell?

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: Good morning, Chair and everyone. I'm MPP Judith Monteith-Farrell, and I am here in Thunder Bay, Ontario.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): Thank you.

SUPPORTING RECOVERY
AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT, 2021LOI DE 2021
SUR LE SOUTIEN À LA RELANCE
ET À LA COMPÉTITIVITÉ

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 276, An Act to enact and amend various Acts /
Projet de loi 276, Loi édictant et modifiant diverses lois.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Sheref Sabawy): We are here today to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 276, An Act to enact and amend various Acts. Staff from Hansard, broadcast and recording, and legislative counsel join us remotely today.

Please take a brief pause before beginning, and as always, all comments should go through the Chair. Are there any questions before we begin? The Clerk has distributed the amendment packages to all members and staff electronically.

Bill 276 is comprised of three sections, which enact 28 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest we postpone the three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there an agreement on that? Thank you. We'll begin.

0910

Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill, and if so, which section? Seeing none, we will move to schedule 1. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Do we have an agreement to bundle sections 1 and 2, as there are no amendments? Okay. Schedule 1, sections 1 and 2: any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 1, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour,

please raise hands. All opposed, please raise hands. I declare sections 1 and 2 carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 1? Are members ready to vote on schedule 1? Shall schedule 1 carry? Those in favour, please raise hands. Those opposed, please raise hands. I declare schedule 1 carried.

We are moving now to schedule 2. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them. Do members agree? Any debate on schedule 2, sections 1 to 3? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on schedule 2, sections 1 to 3? Shall schedule 2, sections 1 to 3, carry? Those in favour, please raise hands. Those opposed, raise hands. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 2 carried.

Are we ready to vote on schedule 2? Any debate on schedule 2? Seeing none, shall schedule 2 carry? Those in favour, please raise hands. Those opposed, please raise hands. I declare schedule 2 carried.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Good morning, everyone. My apologies. I was feeling the side effects of the COVID vaccine, but I'm all better now. I hope you're all doing well and staying safe.

We're now turning to schedule 3. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 5. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Yes? Is there any further debate on schedule 3, sections 1 through 5? No? Shall schedule 3, sections 1 through 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 3, sections 1 through 5, carried.

Shall schedule 3 carry? Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 3 carried.

There are no amendments to schedule 4, sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 4, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 4, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 4, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Shall schedule 4 carry? Is there any further debate? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 4 carried.

Turning now to schedule 5: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 4. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? MPP Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Sorry, Chair; we've moved to schedule 5, or did I mishear you? Are we still wrapping up schedule 4?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We just finished schedule 4, so we're now on schedule 5.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to speak to schedule 5. And just as an advance notice, I'd like a recorded vote.

Colleagues, I think this is a mistake on the part of the government, and it's a mistake on two levels. I think others may well want to speak to this. The first, obviously, is my concern that the government continues to roll back action

on climate change. I think that the consequences for Ontario of unchecked climate change are extraordinarily dangerous. The discomfort and problems we've faced with COVID pale in comparison to the destruction we face if we don't actually bring the climate crisis under control. Putting renewable energy aside and making it a non-priority accelerates climate change. That is a huge problem.

Frankly, in terms of the government's own credibility, it brought forward a climate plan in 2018. The Auditor General has made it very clear that the government's other departments, aside from the Ministry of the Environment, are frustrating the agenda put forward by its own Minister of the Environment and, frankly, by its own Premier. Adopting this schedule undermines the government's own actions on climate change, undermines Ontario's actions on climate change and sets us up for a much hotter world.

I think the other thing to say, and others have said this and may say it again this morning, is that the lowest-cost sources of new energy services are renewable, and not making them a priority means that there's a very good chance we will be investing in very high-cost electricity options instead of the lowest-cost electricity options. For all those reasons, I would urge people to vote against this schedule and related schedules further on in the bill.

Again, Chair, when we go to vote on this schedule, I would like a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested by MPP Tabuns. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner and then MPP Glover.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair, and I hope you're feeling better.

I too am going to strongly suggest to my colleagues that this schedule be removed from the bill. I'm going to give you three reasons why we should remove this schedule, which not only removes priority access for renewable energies but even removes the need to provide information about how to accommodate access to the grid for renewable energies.

0920

The first reason I would suggest voting against this is that it basically sends the message that Ontario isn't serious about addressing the climate crisis and reducing climate pollution. If you look at Ontario's energy plans right now, the plan is to ramp up gas-generated electricity. We saw the problems the last government ran into when it came to gas plants, and in this case, it's going to ramp up climate pollution by 300% in the next decade and 500% in the next two decades, essentially undermining about half of the reductions we saw in climate pollution from the coal phase-out and making it virtually impossible for Ontario to meet our climate obligations any time in the near future, certainly by 2030.

Secondly, this sends a horrible message when it comes to economic recovery and job creation. It's basically telling the world that Ontario is closed for business when it comes to renewable energy. If you look globally over the last five years, investments in renewable energy have been double those in fossil fuels, and that's largely driven by the fact that the cost of wind energy has dropped by

71% in the last decade and the cost of solar has dropped by 90% in the last decade. So the government's policy seems to be driven by conditions in 2010, not 2021.

The cancellation of 758 renewable energy contracts early in the government's mandate cost, according to the FAO, over \$200 million, and additional studies suggested that it cost Ontario 6,000 jobs and \$500 million in direct investment—this at a time when Bloomberg estimates that 77% of the global investment in energy generation in the next decade will be in wind, solar and storage. Essentially we're saying that that \$8 trillion in investment, we don't want it in Ontario.

I say we want it in Ontario. I say we want those jobs. Currently, 11 million people worldwide work in renewable energy. According to Simon Fraser University, we could attract and generate over 560,000 jobs in this country if we take advantage of the opportunities in renewables. And this government is saying no to that investment, no to those jobs and no to that economic prosperity.

Finally, I would say that it undermines the government's stated goal to lower costs in the electricity system. If you look at the current contracts for commercial-grade solar being signed around the world, it's between 3.8 and 5.5 cents a kilowatt hour. For onshore wind, it's between 3.4 and seven cents a kilowatt hour, and for offshore wind, 11.2 cents a kilowatt hour. Meanwhile, the government is ramping up gas plants, where the average contract cost is 11.8 cents a kilowatt hour. The government is touting SMRs—the estimated cost: 16.3 cents a kilowatt hour.

I don't understand why we would have a schedule in a bill that's going to increase climate pollution, hurt our ability to create jobs and advance economic recovery and prosperity, and hurt the ability to lower costs in our electricity system. For all those reasons, colleagues, I strongly urge you to remove schedule 5 from this bill. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Before we continue, I just want to confirm MPP Gravelle. Can you please confirm that you are present and that you are in Ontario? You're muted.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Do you have headphones on? We can't hear you through your microphone. No, we cannot hear you, unfortunately. We'll have to figure that out, to see. I will ask you to call in. The Clerk will work with you through the Zoom chat.

We'll now turn to MPP Glover. MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to echo my colleagues' comments about this schedule. It's a schedule that makes it more difficult for renewable energy companies to operate in Ontario, and I don't know why we would be doing that.

I would also make my arguments on three points: First of all, it's about electricity costs. The privatization of Ontario Hydro, which started with the former Conservative government and was completed by the last Liberal government, has jacked up our electricity rates so that in Ontario, our electricity rates are now a huge competitive disadvantage and we are wasting \$5 billion a

year in tax subsidies for electricity costs. So the privatization has already created a competitive disadvantage.

What we are proposing here is that now, when renewables are the cheapest form of electricity that is available, this government is now passing a piece of legislation that will make it more difficult for renewables companies to operate and to get their electricity onto our grid. It makes no sense from an economic perspective, particularly when you consider the numbers. I heard my colleague from Guelph mention the numbers: Solar is 3.8 to 5.5 cents a kilowatt hour and onshore wind is 3.4 to seven cents a kilowatt hour, whereas the gas plants that this government is planning on opening are 13.5 cents a kilowatt hour. So why would we be investing in or supporting the most expensive alternatives, which not only will impact residents and their electricity costs, it will also impact every business that operates in this province, because it will create a competitive disadvantage when they have to pay their hydro bills?

When they're looking at where to locate, this government keeps talking about being open for business, but it's not going to be open for renewable energy businesses. And by not being open for renewable energy businesses, it's also going to be disincentivizing many other businesses that are heavily dependent upon electricity to operate, so I would strongly recommend that this government not pass this schedule today.

The other argument, obviously, is climate change. This government is investing in gas plants again, and it's taking us in reverse. We shut down the Nanticoke coal plant. That was our major single source of air pollution and our carbon footprint in Ontario. That was a good move to shut that down. Now this government is actually going in the opposite direction with fossil fuels, and could erase all of the climate change gains that were made by shutting down Nanticoke.

This makes no sense whatsoever to have this schedule in here. It's bad for business, it's bad for our electricity rates and it's bad for the environment, so I hope that the government members will vote against this schedule today so that we can remove it from this bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I would strongly urge that this schedule be removed from this bill, for all the reasons that my colleagues have stated. But also, there's a fundamental principle of transparency, and I think it's incumbent on us also to be listening to the voices of our young people. That is the single topic that comes up most with our youth when they're talking to us: the need to address climate change. Why would we have something that would make it more difficult? Why are we trying to discourage the use of renewable energy sources? But the fundamental reason is around transparency: Why are we trying to hide the ability for renewable energy sources to use our grids? This schedule makes no sense and should be removed.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there further debate? Seeing none, MPP Tabuns has requested a recorded vote. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 4. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Are members now prepared to vote? Shall schedule 5, sections 1 through 4, carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 5, sections 1 through 4, carried.

0930

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Shall schedule 5 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 5 carried.

Turning now to schedule 6, section 1: Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 6, section 1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 6, section 2: Is there any further debate? MPP Tabuns.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: This is a very odd section. This actually is something that allows an employer to make deposits in an institution that could be extremely inconvenient for employees. We see no reason to change the act in this fashion. It disadvantages employees. I don't know exactly what is driving the minister on this change, but I'm going to ask that people vote against this and protect working people across Ontario, who deserve to be able to very conveniently get their pay, pay their bills and get on with their lives.

I would like a recorded vote on this subsection, please, Chair, just to be certain that it happens.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. MPP Tabuns has requested a recorded vote for schedule 6, section 2. I'd just like to make a note of that.

Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I'd also like to raise some concerns around this section. Employees should have the right to determine where their cheques are deposited, and for that to be taken away and possibly being forced to be deposited into a bank that charges higher fees that would be tough financially on a working person—or, in some cases, as I did further research into this, that could even be deposited somewhere where there isn't a branch and an ATM. I think this could be detrimental to an employee, both from a convenience standpoint but also by subjecting them to being forced to a banking institution that may charge higher fees.

I don't understand why the government wants to make this change, but I would recommend voting against this section.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'd like to hear the rationale from the government for this section. It makes no sense to any of us why an employee would not be able to determine which bank his pay is deposited in. As we've heard from my colleagues, it could lead to additional expenses, both in terms of financial costs at the bank or at the institution and also in terms of inconvenience. Is there somebody from the government side who would explain the rationale for this section?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? MPP Tabuns has requested a recorded vote.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 6, section 2, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 3 through 5 of schedule 6. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? There is agreement. Is there any further debate on schedule 6, sections 3 through 5? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, sections 3 through 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 6, sections 3 through 5, carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 6 carried.

Turning now to schedule 7: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 6. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? MPP Skelly?

Ms. Donna Skelly: Sorry, Madam Chair. Could we go back to the full screen, if that's possible, and remove the "Ontario NDP recommends" off the screen, please?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. We're now turning to schedule 7. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 6. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Shall schedule 7, sections 1 through 6, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 7, sections 1 through 6, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 7? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 7 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 7 carried.

Turning now to schedule 8: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 8, sections 1 and 2? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 8, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 8, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Shall schedule 8 carry? Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 8 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 8 carried.

Turning now to schedule 9: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate to schedule 9, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 9, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 9, sections 1 and 2, carried.

0940

Shall schedule 9 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 9 carried.

Turning now to schedule 10: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 10, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 10? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 10 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 10 carried.

MPP Gravelle, we'll try again now and see if your audio is working and we can hear you. No, we are unable to hear you, MPP Gravelle. There might be an audio setting on your end, on your computer. Perhaps you need to change the microphone setting or something. If that's not able to work then perhaps you could also dial in so that we can hear you over the phone, as well, while you're on the screen. Just a possibility.

All right, we'll now continue. Turning now to schedule 11: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Any further debate to schedule 11, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 11, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Shall schedule 11 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 11 carried.

Turning now to schedule 12: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 12, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members

prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 12, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Shall schedule 12 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 12 carried.

Okay, we'll try MPP Gravelle again, one more time.

Mr. Michael Gravelle: Michael Gravelle, MPP for Thunder Bay—Superior North, here in Thunder Bay, Ontario.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you very much, MPP Gravelle. You have now been confirmed and accounted for. Welcome.

Turning now to schedule 13: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 10. I propose that we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 13, sections 1 through 10? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 13, sections 1 through 10, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 13, sections 1 through 10, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 13? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 13 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 13 carried.

Turning now to schedule 14: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 17. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 14, sections 1 through 17? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Thank you. Shall schedule 14, sections 1 through 17, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 14, sections 1 through 17, carried.

Shall schedule 14 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 14 carried.

Turning now to schedule 15: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 7. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Shall schedule 15, sections 1 through 7, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 15, sections 1 through 7, carried.

Shall schedule 15 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. Thank you. I declare schedule 15 carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 1: Is there any further debate? MPP Gravelle.

Mr. Michael Gravelle: I appreciate the opportunity to take part in the general government committee this morning, although I'm not a voting member. I did want to speak to schedule 16 particularly as it related to the Northern Ontario School of Medicine.

I think it's important for people to understand the perspective of my constituents here in Thunder Bay—Superior North and, indeed, all of us in northwestern Ontario when we say that when the announcement was made of the independent university being set up for NOSM and the severing of their relationship with Lakehead and

Laurentian Universities, it was met with much dismay and great outrage.

For over 15 or 16 years, Lakehead and Laurentian had been valuable partners with the Northern Ontario School of Medicine, and it continues to educate over 600 people and bring them into the profession all across the northwest. Certainly one of the real shocks of the announcement was that no consultation whatsoever took place: no consultation with the NOSM board, with the chair or the vice-chair; no consultation with northwestern Ontario municipalities or Indigenous leadership and communities. This was really something.

I know you've had experts who have told you of the risks of moving the school into an independent state and severing that relationship with Lakehead University. We believe very strongly, and Lakehead does very strongly, that that partnership should continue. There are significant costs involved in changing that, let alone the fact that this would be the only medical school with no accreditation to another university.

We are very concerned about this, and I've received—and it's no exaggeration to say—thousands of emails, hundreds of phone calls from people all across the province but particularly here in the northwest who are keen to see this process not go forward. Indeed, I would like to ask the committee to consider withdrawing schedule 16 from Bill 276 until that consultation takes place. There needs to at least be that kind of a discussion for the fairness of all those involved and particularly Lakehead University.

There are some considerable ramifications for Lakehead, and I know that they are very, very keen to continue that partnership. They believe it's in the best interests of the medical school and, of course, of the province that that take place.

I wanted to have that opportunity to make that pitch on behalf of Lakehead, on behalf of Thunder Bay and on behalf of northwestern Ontario. We recognize that the government has their challenges related to the financial issues at Laurentian University, but from our perspective, that made no reason why Lakehead should be severed from their relationship with NOSM. We are hopeful that saner heads will prevail and that, indeed, the consultation process can take place where we can have a full and complete discussion about the best steps forward in terms of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine.

0950

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I have to echo the comments of my colleague on the other side of the city and the other side of northwestern Ontario, that this has been the most controversial kind of event that has happened and is really disrespectful to the people of northwestern Ontario, when local leaders and the heads of all the organizations that are involved are opposed to this and yet it is continuing forward. We need to remove this schedule from this bill, because there has been no thoughtful process involved with this at all. When I asked even the head of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine if she had asked

for this: No, she didn't ask for this; she asked for an expansion of students, because we sorely need more doctors in northwestern Ontario.

Any process that is going to threaten our medical school and our post-secondary institutions—you've already made a mess of Laurentian, and you're going after Lakehead—is unacceptable. This is a dangerous move, and like we saw in schedule 15, we don't want to be going down the road of later on having to retract something because you're rushing something through. When we create a university, there should be a stand-alone piece of legislation, like there was for Algoma. It's not something that you throw in an omnibus bill as a second thought; it's something that needs to be thought out. It needs to be consulted about. If we want to improve the Northern Ontario School of Medicine and expand it, then let's do that. It doesn't mean severing it from other organizations that have supported it, where there is a symbiosis.

The other thing is that financially it doesn't make any sense. It's not something that is without cost. We're going to take money away from actually educating medical students and medical professionals for northern Ontario, and put it in administrative costs and disrupt what is working well—because NOSM is a gem, but that gem was created with that partnership, and the people in northwestern Ontario and northeastern Ontario feel very strongly about this. It's unacceptable. It needs to be removed from this bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I want to echo the comments from my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan. It is really incredible that this government would do this. In fact, as she said, it's incredibly disrespectful to the north. We heard from a number of deputants in the committee hearings about the importance of keeping NOSM as part of Lakehead University.

The other thing we heard about was that it was a 25-year struggle for the northern Ontario communities to get a medical school, to finally get it. They advocated for 25 years, and now, the government from the south is determining the future of that medical school that the northern communities fought for, so no wonder my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan is saying that this schedule is incredibly disrespectful to the people of northern Ontario.

And I want to just state some of the names we heard from. We heard from Moira McPherson at Lakehead University. We heard from Wendy Landry, Ontario's first First Nations woman to be elected as a mayor in Ontario. She gave a number of reasons about why this should not go through. She talked about how the senate and board of governors would be determined by regulation, which means that the minister would be determining who runs the university, and this is contrary to every other public university in Ontario. Every other public university has some degree of independence from the government, and so this government is actually going to be stepping in and con-

trolling this university directly through ministerial regulation. It's wrong, and we heard from a number of faculty members that it will impede academic freedom in the institution. That's a real concern as well.

There was the lack of consultation that this decision is being made with. Those who are being impacted, the communities that are being impacted, were not consulted about this and why it's being done.

I was the critic for colleges and universities before my current portfolio. I toured the northern universities, and I can see the importance of Lakehead, of Laurentian, of Algoma, of Nipissing, of all those universities to their communities. They have a disproportionately positive impact on the economies of those communities, those northern communities, compared to the universities in the south, where there are many more universities, just because they are the sole universities in those areas.

For the government to actually come in and sever NOSM from Lakehead is an act of arrogance, and it just should not be done. And then to give the minister the power to determine the board of governors and the senate through regulation—that also should not be done.

The other thing that we heard about: Farhan Yousaf, who is the president of the Lakehead student union, came and spoke about how this will impact the ability of Lakehead University to attract international students. He, himself, is an international student, and he was saying part of the reason why he went to Lakehead and why thousands of other students go to Lakehead who are international students is because it has a medical school. That raises the stature of the university. So it's going to have a negative impact not only on the Thunder Bay community and economy, but it's going to have a negative impact on Lakehead University.

I don't know why the government would do something that's actually going to undermine this northern institution. Anyway, I'm hoping that the government members will reconsider and at least remove this schedule from the bill at this time so that some consultation can be done.

I'd also, Madam Chair, like to ask for a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Yes. Thank you very much, Chair. Certainly a lot to unpack there. I appreciate the comments from all of my colleagues here, a number of which—Chris, I know we worked closely on some issues as critic, so I appreciate your comments there.

There are a number of government amendments for this schedule, including the board of governors and senate composition, so I encourage everyone to keep a close eye on those government amendments that have been put forward. Hopefully, we'll have your support on that.

With respect to how we look at our institutions in the north, I've had the opportunity to see a number of strong partnerships among independently governed institutions in the north, working closely. I think to recent partnerships between Lakehead and Confederation, among many, to support a seamless approach for Indigenous learners. I

think to nursing partnerships, again from independently governed bodies in the north.

I'm very proud that under this government, we've seen now two francophone universities. This legislation would propose Université de Hearst. I ironically note that one of the opposition amendments, which I'll comment on later, doesn't necessarily acknowledge the importance of the core francophone element just even in nomenclature, in their name, to that university—in doing my homework, just reviewing the opposition amendments, as well.

I wanted to put on record just the importance of NOSM's independent accreditation. I think anyone who has spent any time going through CACMS, LCME or ACCME accreditation knows the importance of that in legislation and that independent accreditation piece.

Going forward, I think we heard at length from NOSM's deposition here on the fact that they're a separate legal entity, the fact that 90% of operating funds flow through directly to that institution. This is sort of a natural evolution, and it's going to continue to expand partnerships. So I think rather than suggesting that we're going to sever relationships and ascribing that on these institutions, I think we can look at the strong partnerships that exist with those independently governed institutions, leading to better learning outcomes for learners in the north, and build on it and expand on those opportunities for learners in the north. I'm excited to see what NOSM will continue to offer graduates in the north. I remain hopeful. Certainly from NOSM's standpoint, they've signalled a willingness to maintain that strong partnership with Lakehead and with other universities and colleges in the north, and I fully expect to see that going forward.

1000

So there are a number of amendments coming forward, and I'm looking forward to, hopefully, having the support of colleagues on this.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I just want to explain why I filed a notice to vote against schedule 16. The first reason, as we've heard, particularly from our colleagues representing both sides of Thunder Bay and region, is the lack of consultation and due process around severing NOSM's ties to Lakehead and Laurentian, and the outcry we've heard from academics, both faculty and staff, including presidents and former presidents of universities in the north and the south, from various student associations, from Indigenous and municipal leaders. I've also had business leaders reach out and express deep concern about the lack of consultation and due process in this schedule.

We've heard over and over again from a number of academic experts that it is highly irregular to have a school of medicine that is separate from university degree-granting institutions. We heard about how having that partnership and having that formal partnership benefits the quality of education for everyone and how important that collaboration between a university and a school of medicine is and how important it is in attracting students. We certainly

heard from the student association around that—the importance of not only attracting students from the north and Indigenous students, but also international students and students from across Ontario. We heard about the importance of the ability to attract and retain faculty, how important that partnership is, and how that could be threatened by severing the relationship.

We heard from a number of individuals, including the doctor who played the key role in establishing NOSM, about the accreditation risk associated with this particular schedule, and the quality assurance risks. I realize that that may or may not come to pass, but I think we've had a number of credible voices come and raise serious concerns about that.

Then, finally, we've heard a lot about the financial risks associated with this particular move, and about the loss of efficiencies and the possibility of increased administrative costs if this severing takes place. That money should go into quality education. It should go into supporting students. It should go into ensuring that we continue to graduate high-quality students both at the university and at the medical school.

So the relationship with NOSM and Lakehead has been a very valuable one. Almost everybody I've consulted with and essentially everyone who came to committee talked about what a success NOSM has been and how schedule 16 of this bill threatens that success.

I want to directly address a point my colleague MPP Piccini raised: that the government has—and we'll get to them shortly—brought forward some amendments that did address some of the concerns around the fact that the board of governors and senate composition should be in legislation and not in regulations. But that only addresses some of the concerns that were brought forward to this committee. These other concerns which I've outlined in my arguments really form the basis of why I filed a notice to vote against this schedule. Those amendments don't address those concerns, and so I would strongly encourage the government to pull this schedule, take the time to do the proper consultations and get this right. NOSM is too important to the north. It's too important to all of Ontario, all of Canada, to not get this right. Let's take the time to do that.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: There's a couple of more comments that I would just like to add to the record here.

First of all, the number of international students that Farhan Yousaf was talking about: In 2011, Lakehead University attracted 150 international students. They now attract 1,800 international students a year. It's a major component of their student body, and it's also a major component of the reason that the university is viable and why it's such a rich place to learn in northern Ontario. It's absolutely essential that it maintain its current status and its ability to attract those international students.

The other thing: The government is talking about developing partnerships between NOSM and Lakehead and NOSM and Laurentian. One of the deputants was the

person who actually helped to create NOSM in the late 1990s, Arnie Aberman. He said it's like the government is saying, "We should get divorced to get married again," and part of the problem with getting divorced and getting married again is that the severance is going to cost—the estimated cost from one of the deputants was \$8 million. There's going to be \$8 million paid out in this severance, plus a lot of efficiencies that will be lost between the institutions, so additional costs to students and also additional impacts on students who won't be able to utilize all of the services between the two institutions. It makes no sense to do it, and as my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan said, it's disrespectful to the north.

The final point I want to make on this is that it also gives the government the power to regulate contracts. We heard from a number of deputants that this is a breach of the charter right of freedom of association. The former Liberal government tried to regulate contracts with teachers in Ontario. It went all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court decision was that no, the government does not have the right to regulate contracts; that people have the right to bargain, to belong to unions and to bargain for their contracts; and the government cannot impede on that process. The cost at that time was \$100 million. That was the cost of the lesson that the last Liberal government made when they tried to interfere with contracts and the right of people to free negotiations of those contracts.

I don't know why the government is wading back into those waters with this: a schedule of the bill that seems to be in violation of the charter rights of the people of Ontario and of the faculty of the university. I really strongly recommend that the government withdraw this schedule and take it out for consultation so that they can figure out a way forward for Laurentian, for Lakehead and for NOSM and have a process that is respectful to the communities that will be impacted by this bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I really appreciate the comments that were made with regard to all the aspects of why we should remove this schedule from this bill. I think it's really important to reflect that this is far too important to rush through in a tiny clause, even with the amendments. The amendments have flaws in them as well, one that my colleague MPP Glover spoke to with regard to the total lack of reference to any kind of collective agreements or ensuring that the staff of NOSM would actually be protected and the non-teaching staff as well. There's lack of clarity, and that comes because we drafted legislation in haste. Then you heard from the opposition and now you're trying to put in a bit more of the extensive detail that we need in this kind of bill if you're going to be creating this kind of organization.

1010

It's important that we take the time, listen to the community leaders, listen to the people who have been involved with NOSM, who have been involved with Lakehead and Laurentian and have all that information in

place before we go ahead with any kind of radical approach of having—first of all, it was just a tiny schedule in an omnibus bill. This is far too important for the people of northern Ontario to have it handled this way, so I would appreciate my colleagues on this committee voting down this schedule and removing it from this bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: I just want to ask for a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested.

Further debate? MPP Gravelle?

Mr. Michael Gravelle: I just want to thank my colleagues, those who have been speaking very eloquently about the reasons why this schedule should be removed from Bill 276 and brought forward for full consultation. I think strong cases have been made as to the reasons why this will have an extraordinarily negative impact on Lakehead University, Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario and the efforts that have been made by Lakehead to co-operate with the government, to make things work so that NOSM can remain a partner with Lakehead.

This is a huge issue up here in Thunder Bay. I share MPP Monteith-Farrell's point that this has been a disrespectful process and one that needs to be changed. There's no question in my mind that this is going to have a real impact on how people feel about the government of the day. It's very important from my perspective that my colleagues who have spoken well are listened to by the government and that this schedule 16 should be removed from the legislation and put forward for further consultation.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell?

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I think I'd like to get on the record that even the nominated Conservative candidate for Thunder Bay—Atikokan withdrew her candidacy because she felt so strongly that the government was not listening; she felt so strongly about this.

It speaks something to the members of the committee on the government side that you had a candidate willing to run for your party, who was nominated and elected as your candidate, and she withdrew her candidacy because she felt so strongly about this. I'm sure that was something she did not do lightly, as someone who has run before, who definitely wants to beat me. You have to think about it, that that is how strongly people feel about this in our region. For all the reasons that we spoke to, she felt that this was the wrong move by this government. I encourage you to think about that aspect.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Okay.

We have independent motion number 1. Who would like to move that motion? No? All right. Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 1? Are members prepared to vote? A recorded vote has been requested for schedule 16, section 1.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 16, section 1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 2: Who would like to move independent motion number 2? Okay.

Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 2? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 2, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 3: We have independent motion number 3. Would someone like to move that motion? No? Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 3? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 3, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 4: Who would like to move independent motion number 4? No? Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 4? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 4, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 5: Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 5? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 16, section 5, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 6, we have government motion number 5R. MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 6 of schedule 16 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Board of governors

“6(1) There shall be a board of governors of the university, composed of not less than 15 and not more than 30 members, as follows:

“1. The president of the university, who shall be a member by virtue of office.

“2. The chancellor of the university, if one is appointed, who shall be a member by virtue of office.

“3. Five persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council who shall not be students, members of the teaching staff or non-teaching employees of the university.

“4. One person elected by the teaching staff from among themselves.

“5. One person elected by the students of the university from among themselves.

“6. One person elected by the non-teaching employees of the university from among themselves.

“7. Such other persons as may be set out in the bylaws of the board who shall be appointed by the board, and who shall not be students, members of the teaching staff or non-teaching employees of the university.

“Composition and procedures

“(2) The board shall comply with any further requirements prescribed by regulation with respect to its composition and procedures.

“Powers and duties

“(3) The board is responsible for governing and managing the affairs of the university and has the powers and duties prescribed by regulation.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: The most important people at the university are obviously the students, and this proposal gives the students one seat on the board of governors.

When I started university at U of T, Innis College, I was part of the Innis College council. It was a parity council. Half the members were students and half the members were faculty and the president of the college. It worked extremely well. It was an incredibly democratic college. There were other institutions, I believe, at that time—Queen’s and some of the other universities also had parity councils for their entire universities.

This step of diminishing students to one seat on the board of governors is not nearly democratic, considering the students are by far the largest group on the university campus and the one that is most impacted by the decisions that are made by the board of governors. I think there should be an increase in the number of students on the board of governors, and I would strongly recommend a parity council or a parity board of governors. It not only creates a more democratic institution; it creates an incredible learning opportunity for the students who get to take part in that board of governors and the students who are supporting those members, because they get to see at a very young age how a board of governors and an institution are actually run and take part in the decisions that will affect their education.

1020

So I will be voting against this schedule, and I wish the government would withdraw it and actually consider, through consultation, a parity board of governors for the new institution.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? I see MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I’d like to point out the flaws in this schedule, in that it doesn’t have clear language about the powers of the board and what is actually included in most public universities’ acts. It’s the detail. It speaks to the rushed nature of this. It goes a step in the right direction but does not give the full detail that is normal in most public universities’ acts that are created. I would encourage that we withdraw this, and also withdraw the schedule, so that we can in fact move forward and in a more positive way.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none, MPP Piccini has moved motion number 5R. All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare motion 5R carried.

Turning now to government motion number 5: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I withdraw that, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. Okay.

Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 6, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 16, section 6, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 6, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 7: We have motion number 6R. MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Colleagues, I move that section 7 of schedule 16 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Senate

“7.(1) There shall be a senate of the university, composed of the following members:

“1. The following persons who are members by virtue of their office:

“i. The president and dean of the university.

“ii. The chancellor of the university, if one is appointed.

“iii. The vice-president and provost of the university, if one is appointed.

“iv. The registrar of the university.

“v. The associate dean of each academic portfolio.

“vi. The senior associate dean.

“vii. The head of each academic division of the university, or the person designated by the head from within the teaching staff of each division.

“viii. The assistant dean of admissions.

“ix. The assistant dean of graduate studies.

“x. The assistant dean of research.

“xi. The director of research and health sciences library.

“xii. The chair of each standing committee of the senate, or the person designated by the chair from within each standing committee.

“2. Such number of persons, not exceeding eight, elected by the students of the university from among themselves, as set out in senate bylaws.

“3. Such number of persons elected by the teaching staff from among themselves, as set out in senate bylaws, which number shall be at least twice the total number of all members of the senate.

“4. Two persons appointed by the senate who,

“i. are members of the teaching staff of a university in Ontario, but not members of the teaching staff of the university, and

“ii. are not engaged in the teaching of medicine or health sciences.

“5. Such other persons as may be determined by senate bylaw.

“Composition and procedures

“(2) The senate shall comply with any further requirements prescribed by regulation with respect to its composition and procedures.

“Powers and duties

“(3) The senate is responsible for determining and regulating the educational policy of the university and has the powers and duties prescribed by regulation.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Piccini has moved motion 6R. Is there any further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: There are a couple of problems in this section as well. What is not determined in this section is a clear indication that the senate has the power to create its own bylaws. It is not stated clearly, as it is in other pieces of legislation when creating universities. It's left ambiguous, and so that's problematic.

The other thing which is unusual is the creation of allowing members of a teaching staff of another university to sit on the senate of a stand-alone university. That's unprecedented and maybe was put in there to try to address some of the hard feelings about Lakehead and Laurentian, but there is no saying that that would be—and they say there, “but not members of the teaching staff of the university.” It's a very unusual addition, and I don't even know why it would be there, because we didn't get a chance to debate this anywhere, other than here, and I only received these amendments last night. It is something that is problematic, and I think it should be removed.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Before we continue, MPP Piccini, can you please reread paragraph 3 for clarification?

Mr. David Piccini: Just to clarify, it's “Composition and procedures” you're looking for me to reread?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Paragraph 3, which begins with “Such number of persons,” on page 2.

Mr. David Piccini: “Such number of persons, not exceeding eight”—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No, sorry—paragraph 3. Number 3.

Mr. David Piccini: Okay. Sorry.

“3. Such number of persons elected by the teaching staff from among themselves, as set out in senate bylaws, which number shall be at least twice the total number of all other members of the senate.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you very much. Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion 6R carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion carried.

We now have government motion number 6. Who would like to move that? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move to withdraw that motion.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 7, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 7, as amended, carried.

There are no amendments to schedule 16, sections 8 through 13. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 16, sections 8 through 13? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 16, sections 8 through 13, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, sections 8 through 13, carried.

1030

Turning now to schedule 16, section 14, we have independent motion number 7. Who would like to move that motion? Okay.

Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 14? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 16, section 14, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 14, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 15, we have motion number 8. Who would like to move this motion? Okay.

Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 16, section 15, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 15, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 16: Is there any further debate? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: May I move a motion, Chair?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): That would be for section 16.1. We're not there yet. This is currently—

Mr. David Piccini: Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 16? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16 carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 16.1, we have government motion number 9R. MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that schedule 16 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Transition, board”—sorry, Chair you're just on—just for the benefit of colleagues, I'm going to reread the motion. If you could go to the correct one, that would be great. There. Perfect. Thank you.

I move that schedule 16 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Transition, board

“16.1(1) Despite anything in this act, but subject to subsection (2), the persons who were members of the board of directors or members of the academic council of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine on the day immediately before the day section 2 of this act came into force shall, on and after that day, constitute the board and the senate, respectively, of the university.

“Same

“(2) The board and senate constituted under subsection (1) shall not include any person who was a member of the board of directors or a member of the academic council of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine by virtue of an office that the person held at Laurentian University of Sudbury or Lakehead University.

“Same

“(3) The board and the senate of the university shall, no later 12 months after the day section 2 of this act comes into force, appoint or elect such new members of the board and senate as are necessary in order to ensure that the board and senate are constituted in accordance with the requirements of this act.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on motion 9R? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion 9R carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare motion 9R carried.

We now have government motion number 9. Would anyone like to move that? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that that be withdrawn, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdraw? Okay.

Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 16.1? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 16.1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 17: Is there any further debate? We have motion number 10. Who would like to move that motion? Okay. Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 17? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 17, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 17.1, we have independent motion number 11. Who would like to move that motion? Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 17.1? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 17.1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 18, we have independent motion number 12. Who would like to move that motion? No? Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 18? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 18 of schedule 16 carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 19, we have independent motion number 13. Who would like to move this motion? Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall section 19 of schedule 16 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 19, carried.

Turning now to schedule 16, section 20, we have independent motion number 14. Who would like to move this motion? Okay. Is there any further debate on schedule 16, section 20? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 16, section 20, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 16, as amended? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Many of you know I grew up on a farm, and we have a saying that you can put lipstick on a pig but it doesn't work. I feel like the government brought forward some motions here that address some of the most egregious concerns that people brought forward about the independence of the governing board and senate, but these amendments in no way address the concerns that have been brought forward about the lack of consultation and due process, the risk of accreditation and quality assurance

risks, the financial risk, the risk associated with attracting and retaining students and faculty, and the concerns that have been brought up about undermining and violating the collective bargaining process.

Even with these amendments that were passed, I strongly recommend to my colleagues to vote against this schedule. Chair, I would like a recorded vote on the vote on this schedule. To me, we're doing a disservice to the north, we're doing a disservice to NOSM, we're doing a disservice to Lakehead. The government is on the verge of creating an independent school of medicine not directly affiliated with the university, which is not how things are done in Canada or North America and, quite frankly, most places around the world, with rare exceptions. There's a reason for that, and that's because there are multiple benefits that many witnesses have brought forward to this committee about the importance of having a formal relationship with NOSM and Lakehead in particular. Colleagues, even as amended, I strongly urge you to vote against this schedule.

1040

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'd like my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan, MPP Monteith-Farrell, to go first.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Next I have MPP Gravelle.

Mr. Michael Gravelle: Thank you to all the members who spoke so strongly against schedule 16. I want to make a final plea, as well, to make the case that this is by no means in the best interests of those of us here in northwestern Ontario, in Thunder Bay or at Lakehead University. There are some significant risks involved in moving forward with this regardless of the amendments that have been put forward by the government. I think we will rue the day when this legislation goes through without the proper consultation taking place. There is no question that this is a huge issue up here in northwestern Ontario, and there is an overwhelming desire for the government to remove schedule 16 from this legislation. It shouldn't even be in this particular omnibus bill, but there's no doubt in my mind that unless the government changes their mind on this—and it has an opportunity to do so, when you vote on the final parts of schedule 16—you will regret this.

MPP Monteith-Farrell referenced a political candidate who withdrew her candidacy, the Conservative candidate, as a result of the government's decision on this, and I think there may be significant members of the party who feel the same way. That's evidenced by the kinds of emails and phone calls and discussions that certainly I've had with many, many, many people. So I would make the final plea to have the government members recognize that this is something that needs further consultation and should not be part of this, and to vote against schedule 16.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I want to encourage the government members of this committee to vote against this schedule when it comes for a vote. Our Northern School of Medicine is far too important to the communities across

northern Ontario. It is a gem the way it is, and what it really needs is a cash injection and an expansion in collaboration and going forward so that we can have more graduates of the Northern School of Medicine. We don't need to recreate something that is working but could work so much better if it was allowed to expand.

The collaboration with the universities is so important not only for recruitment of students, but it also makes a medical school actually something that children in northern Ontario don't have to go away for. They can continue their education. It makes it affordable, and that's one of the cornerstones of why it was created. People could go to school in their hometown, and then they could continue that education and become doctors, and we see them practising now here in our communities. We have a critical shortage of physicians across northern Ontario, and that is the vision that created NOSM. That vision was supported by Laurentian and Lakehead Universities. It is not something that should be done lightly; it should be something that's done in a thoughtful way. The amendments that were passed are just a tiny—"lipstick on a pig" is one of my favourite sayings, too, as my colleague has stated. I would encourage you to step back from this arrogant and wrong-thinking decision and take the thoughtful approach, because there is too much at stake for the people of northern Ontario, too much at stake for—we provide doctors for southern Ontario too. It is something that has made medical education and the research that is going on at Northern Ontario School of Medicine—it is such an exciting place, but it was done with the collaboration of universities, and creating an unprecedented kind of structure is not something that is required. What is required is an investment in our universities in northern Ontario, and a significant investment—something that this government needs to step up to.

I am also very concerned that you are putting that in jeopardy, and I am talking about many people in our community that feel the same way. I would encourage you to take this schedule out and take a thoughtful approach, and if you want to continue down this road of creating a separate school of medicine and a separate university, then you need to look at that very carefully. I strongly encourage you to vote against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We have MPP Glover next.

Mr. Chris Glover: I just want to echo my colleague MPP Monteith-Farrell. When I visited Lakehead University a couple of years ago—she and I went. She's very well connected with the administration, with the staff, with the faculty and with the students there and she knows the university and she knows its importance to the community. That this government is making this decision without consulting with any of those people, including the MPP from Thunder Bay—Atikokan, who knows the institution so well—it's understandable why the government has made such a wrong-headed decision.

The other part about this is, this is schedule 16 of a 28-schedule omnibus bill, so obviously it's not getting the attention that it deserves. This is a major gaffe that this

government is making. I guess if you make so many gaffes, if you combine them all at once, then it's more difficult for the media and for the public to grasp all of the mistakes that are being made, but this is a huge mistake and it should not be being done. It's disrespectful to the northern communities. It's harmful to Lakehead University and to Laurentian University. These institutions need public support. They don't need the government just strong-arming them and creating this divorce of these institutions. I really do hope that the government members will reconsider and vote against this.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I would also like to request a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay, a recorded vote has been requested.

Further debate? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Just in closing, I wanted to just reiterate some important feedback with respect to boards and governance, as reflected in these amendments here. I would encourage the members opposite, while I take their point, that if they want to take issue with expanding and allowing NOSM to be fully independent—if we look back at other examples, opposition members supported, for example, Huron in doing that and Algoma's evolution to become independent and expand its offerings in the north.

But I would encourage them to reflect upon their language and some of the harm being done by some of that rhetoric; and just reflect back a little, as I am reflecting, on the comments that they're making today; and consider hearing, direct from the leadership at NOSM, which is not leaving Thunder Bay, which is not leaving Sudbury. In fact, they've signalled that they want to enhance the relationships with the two universities, as well as forge new ones with other universities and colleges across Ontario. They've reiterated their deep commitment to those sorts of partnerships, and the same partnerships we see across the north from separate, fully independent institutions.

So while we can certainly disagree on that path to full independence, I do think it's really important to reflect on the importance of the words we use to reflect on at the end of the day, speaking positively about the partnerships that will be forged and reflecting on some of the terminology that's being used, because at the end of the day here, expanding opportunities for learners in the north—when this government reflects back on our track record, it was this government that expanded nursing seats after previous governments utterly neglected it. After previous governments cut residency positions, it's this government that gave planning grants in the last budget to expand medical schools. It's this government that's expanded this opportunity here for learners in the north. It's this government that's expanded the important work our Indigenous institutes do.

1050

I think it's just really important, for me, given the hard work that civil servants are doing within our ministry, the

important consultations we've had over the past week with COU and other partners, that I mention that.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Are members prepared to vote?

Before we vote, though, I just wanted to clarify one thing: There is no section 17.1 to schedule 16. I just wanted to clarify. MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: [*Inaudible*] on this schedule. I respect the comments from MPP Piccini, but I strongly disagree.

The harm that's being done is not by the words that are being said to point out the flaws in this legislation. The harm that's being done is by this schedule and this bill. For the government to step in and sever NOSM from Lakehead and from Laurentian Universities without consulting with the Indigenous communities or the northern communities that are going to be impacted by the decision—that's the harm that's being done and that's the harm that could be undone if the government would just withdraw this schedule and actually engage in some consultation.

There's nothing about expanding opportunities for people in the north through this. It's possible to expand the Northern Ontario School of Medicine as part of Lakehead University or as part of Laurentian University. It's possible to expand those opportunities. I think the northern communities would welcome the expansion of those opportunities. Instead, this is going to cost—well, the estimate we heard was \$8 million to create this divorce. And then we've been told that, well, there will be this divorce between these institutions, but then there's going to be all this developing of partnerships. That makes no sense, to get divorced in order to get remarried again. It's not a wise decision or anything that should be done to any institution.

We've heard from a number of deputants about the negative impacts that this will have on the institutions and on the northern communities, on Indigenous communities. I have yet to hear any real benefits from it that come anywhere close to mollifying the drawbacks of this legislation. When you do the cost-benefit analysis, this is a bad piece of legislation, this is a bad schedule, and it is disrespectful to the north.

I wish the government would withdraw it and I hope members—all the members in this committee—will vote against it. I hope all members of the Legislature will vote against it when this bill comes to the Legislature. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 16, as amended, carry? A recorded vote has been requested.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 16, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 17: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 10. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Is there any further debate on schedule 17, sections 1 through 10? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 17 [*inaudible*] carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 17? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 17 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 17 carried.

Turning now to schedule 18: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 18, sections 1 through 3? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I have some concerns about this particular schedule. It was first brought to my attention when Ontario For All came to committee. Subsequently, I've looked at some of the other written submissions from disability rights groups, such as Defend Disability and others, who have raised, I think, valid concerns around the importance of having the pharmacy council and the Citizens' Council under the Ontario Drug Benefit Act to provide medical professionals with an opportunity and people with lived experience with an opportunity to have a say in the policies relating to Ontario drug benefits.

I have yet to hear a compelling reason why these councils would be removed. I oftentimes have people, especially constituents, reaching out to my office with concerns around Ontario drug benefits, and so I think it's important to have both professional and expert input and the input of people with lived experience when it comes to the Ontario drug benefits. I would recommend voting against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on schedule 18, sections 1 through 3? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Can we have a recorded vote, please?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested. Do you want a recorded vote on schedules 1 through 3, or do you want a recorded vote on schedule—

Mr. Mike Schreiner: We'll just do it on the whole schedule. That's fine. Sorry, Chair. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. Is there any further debate? All right. Shall schedule 18, sections 1 through 3, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 18, sections 1 through 3, carried.

Shall schedule 18 carry? A recorded vote has been requested.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 18 carried.

Turning now to schedule 19: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? MPP Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes, I'm agreeing to the bundling. I just want to note that I want to speak to the schedule as a whole, and I want a recorded vote on each element.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. So we've agreed to bundle sections 1 through 3. Is there any further debate? MPP Tabuns, you would like to speak to the section?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes, thank you very much, Chair. As I had argued earlier, I think that this is a retrograde schedule. It undermines Ontario's ability to take on the climate crisis. It sets the stage for higher hydro prices. It undermines, frankly, the government's credibility on this whole issue. I think it's in the government's self-interest to vote against it. I certainly hope all the members here will. I think it's in the interest of Ontario that it be defeated.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I would recommend voting against this schedule for the same reasons I suggested voting against schedule 5.

There's one point I wanted to make—I decided to save it for this schedule. There's another schedule in this bill that talks about changes to the Mining Act. I know the government has a Critical Minerals Strategy that they're looking at around how Ontario could be providing minerals that would go into batteries for electric vehicles. But I would suggest to the members that battery storage for renewable energy is a huge economic opportunity, not only to better utilize renewables here in Ontario but to export those batteries around the world. And while there are many forms of storage for renewables, and batteries aren't even necessarily my favourite one—I think we should be using water power and some natural sources to enhance other forms of renewables, as well as part of our storage—there is no doubt that battery storage will be an important part of the trillions of dollars that are going to be invested into renewable energy over the next decade.

The government's actions to aggressively attack renewable energy, to say to the world that our province is closed to renewable energy development, I also think undermines the work they're trying to do around a Critical Minerals Strategy for Ontario.

1100

I think when we think about economic recovery in this province, having policies that undermine the province's

positions in renewable energy is bad for climate action, obviously, it's bad for job creation and the economy, and it will undermine our efforts to control the increases in electricity prices. So I would recommend voting against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote on schedule 19, sections 1 through 3? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 19, sections 1 through 3, carried.

Turning now to schedule 19 in its entirety, MPP Tabuns has requested a recorded vote.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 19 carried.

Turning now to schedule 20, there are no amendments to sections 1 through 7. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 20, sections 1 through 7? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 20, sections 1 through 7, carried.

Shall schedule 20 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 20 carried.

Turning now to schedule 21, section 1: Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 21, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, section 1, carried.

Turning now to section 21, section 2, we have independent motion number 15. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 2 of schedule 21 to the bill be amended by adding "and to support their well-being" at the end of section 4 of the Ontario Works Act, 1997.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 15. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I have significant concerns about this entire schedule, to be quite frank, and would be fine if the government wanted to just remove it from the bill. But in the efforts to try to at least improve it, assuming the government won't remove the schedule from the bill, I think it is important to clearly outline that our social assistance programs need to support the well-being of people, and that oftentimes is forgotten. I've said over and over again over the years, and I've said it in relation to this bill, that we oftentimes talk about reducing red tape, and

oftentimes it's about reducing red tape on business. But I would argue the people in our society who face the most red tape are people on social assistance. The amount of forms people have to fill out to access benefits, the undignified way in which the case management system oftentimes works to the detriment of people on social assistance suggests to me that we should be looking at ways of reducing red tape on the most vulnerable in our society and providing them with the supports they need to live dignified and stabilized lives.

Acknowledging and focusing policy on well-being I think is an important step in that direction, and I would recommend voting in favour of this amendment and would request a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has requested a recorded vote. MPP Glover?

Mr. Chris Glover: The decision for us as the NDP was whether to support this amendment or not, but again, the entire schedule should be eliminated. This schedule is about privatizing Ontario Works and ODSP, which are incredibly inadequate. If the government is going to do anything with Ontario Works and ODSP, they should be increasing the rates. The rate for a single person on Ontario Works is \$733 per month.

Anybody who is in the Legislature today, you pass tent encampments on the way to the Legislature. The reason we have a homelessness crisis, or a big factor in that homelessness crisis, is because you cannot rent a place to live on \$733 a month, let alone meet any of your other needs for food or clothing or transportation. It's absolutely disgusting that we have such low Ontario Works rates. And the ODSP rate is \$1,050 a month.

The government, instead of fixing the system with this schedule, is actually going to be privatizing it. I'll speak more after this amendment, but we in the NDP are strongly opposed to this entire schedule and the direction that the government is taking with this.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? MPP Schreiner requested a recorded vote on motion number 15.

Ayes

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

Nays

Bailey, Crawford, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare motion number 15 lost.

We now have independent motion number 16. Who would like to move this motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 2 of schedule 21 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 4 of the Ontario Works Act, 1997:

“Same

“(2) Any prescribed assistance to help a person to become and stay employed must reflect principles of personal

autonomy, self-determination and culturally appropriate service delivery.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 16. Is there further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Again, I'd like to reiterate my opposition to the entire schedule of the bill, but I'm trying to make some efforts to improve what I feel are the most troubling parts of this bill. The current language in the draft legislation is very vague, and so I've put forward this amendment to try to create some parameters to ensure that life stabilization is not being used in a coercive way; that it respects people's personal autonomy, their self-determination; and, especially in our diverse province, that service delivery is done in a culturally appropriate way.

I've had a number of stakeholders come forward to me with some serious concerns about how the vague nature of the language in this bill could have significant negative consequences for people on social assistance. This amendment is an attempt to try to mitigate the concerns around how vague language can be used in a coercive way.

And I would request a recorded vote on this amendment as well, Chair. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has requested a recorded vote. Further debate? MPP Monteith-Farrell.

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell: I appreciate trying to put some parameters around vague language, because I believe that this schedule should be removed from the bill.

Ontario Works is a program that is inadequate for people to live on, and we're not addressing it. It's a very important piece of how we operate as a society, when people are in their most vulnerable state. If we want to create legislation that's going to assist people to get out of that, we need to look at the full package around their housing, about their health care access. They can't even access their identification in some cases.

1110

This use of vague language is dangerous in the sense that we have seen models that put people on the street. Creating this in an afterthought schedule in an omnibus bill, rather than giving it the thought and the consultation—actually engaging with people with real-life experience would be so important. So I would really like to see that we have a thoughtful approach about this that gives people some dignity.

The system now creates a system where people are unable to sustain themselves and they're hopeless. We see that, and this schedule doesn't address that. It's sort of like, perhaps, a feel-good for the government. Perhaps it's the road to privatization. But this is such an important piece and affects so many people's lives that we really need to remove this schedule and do a thoughtful approach towards this very important subject.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? MPP Schreiner has requested a recorded vote—no? He has not requested a recorded vote? Yes, MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Excuse me, Chair. Thank you. I believe I did request a recorded vote, but if I did not, I will request one now.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): All right. Shall motion number 16 carry?

Ayes

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

Nays

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Skelly, Sabawy, Wai.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare the motion lost.

Any further debate on schedule 21, section 2? Shall schedule 21, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, section 2, carried.

Turning now to schedule 21, section 3: We have independent motion number 17. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 3 of schedule 21 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 7(4)(a) of the Ontario Works Act, 1997, and substituting the following:

“(a) participate in employment and life stabilization activities in accordance with a service plan developed with the input of and approved by the recipient or dependant, as the case may be; and”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. Again, I have moved this motion as an effort to try to figure out some ways to at least improve a bad system and to at least give people who are social assistance recipients some agency and some ability to participate in the development of their service plan, and to have it be done with their approval as just a way to help mitigate and minimize coercion. If we really, truly want to support people who are on social assistance, providing them with some agency in their life is a way to provide some dignity in their life, and that’s what this amendment proposes to do.

I would request a recorded vote, Chair. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has requested a recorded vote. Is there any further debate on motion number 17? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion number 17 carry?

Ayes

Glover, Schreiner, Tabuns.

Nays

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare motion number 17 lost.

Turning now to motion 18: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 3 of schedule 21 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 7 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Exception

“(5) Despite subsection (4), a recipient and any prescribed dependants may not be required as a condition of eligibility for basic financial assistance to participate in any employment and life stabilization assistance activities related to medical, therapeutic or drug rehabilitation treatment.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’ve met with a number of anti-poverty organizations. In particular, I’ll give a shout-out to the Maytree Foundation, who came and delegated to committee. There are serious concerns that this schedule, as written, may create additional barriers to people receiving assistance. In particular, people could potentially be denied the meagre financial assistance people receive on Ontario Works—and I’m going to talk about a bit more of that when we debate the entire schedule—for things like a medical or therapeutic condition or around how they’re accessing drug rehabilitation treatment. There’s serious concern among a number of people on social assistance right now that their benefits could be denied for those reasons. We’re talking about people, in many cases, who are living on \$733 a month. You can’t even rent a couch for that. To create additional barriers for those folks even being able to access their meagre social assistance funds I think moves us in the wrong direction in many ways. This amendment seeks to provide some assurances and clarity around making sure that additional barriers are not put in place to people receiving their social assistance benefits.

I would ask for a recorded vote and I would ask members to support this amendment.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I thank MPP Schreiner for bringing these amendments forward.

The frustration that I have with this government is that I’ve been sitting on this committee for three years, and I have yet to see the government actually accept an amendment brought in by any of the opposition members. I can’t think of one that’s been done. It’s just incredibly frustrating that the government doesn’t work with the opposition members. It’s not the way that Parliament is supposed to work. The member has brought this amendment in good faith and it would improve a horrific schedule of this bill, but I know the government is going to be voting against it. I know they’ve already got their—and it’s just awful, because these decisions that we are making in this committee today and that will be part of this legislation are going to have negative impacts on the most vulnerable people in our province and it’s going to worsen their lives and worsen the meagre supports that are given to them that keep them living in destitution.

I'll speak more about the entire schedule, but it's incredibly frustrating that the government almost never—never that I can remember in three years—has accepted an amendment from an opposition member. That's incredibly frustrating and it undermines the committee process. But I thank MPP Schreiner for bringing this forward.

1120

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion number 18 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands for a recorded vote.

Ayes

Glover, Schreiner, Tabuns.

Nays

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to schedule 21, section 3, is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote?

Shall schedule 21, section 3, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, section 3, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 through 17. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 21, sections 4 through 17? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, sections 4 through 17, carried.

Turning now to schedule 21, section 18: We have independent motion number 19.

MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 18 of schedule 21 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(5.1) Section 74 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2.1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall ensure that the amount of assistance to be provided, determined under the regulations made under subsection (1), are, at a minimum, equal to the most recent Market Basket Measure threshold published by Statistics Canada.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. On independent motion number 19: Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order. As Bosc and Gagnon noted on page 772 of the third edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, a motion is out of order if it infringes upon the financial initiative of the crown by imposing a charge on the public treasury.

MPP Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Chair, I'd like to ask unanimous consent to allow this motion to go forward.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Do we have unanimous consent from the committee?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Nope, we do not. All right. We'll move on.

Is there any further debate on schedule 21, section 18? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, section 18, carried.

There are now amendments to sections 19 through 26. I propose we bundle them. Do we have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on sections 19 through 26 of schedule 21? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 21, sections 19 through 26, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 21? MPP Tabuns and then MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Brief debate but a request for a recorded vote on the passage of the schedule as a whole.

I think my colleagues have made quite a strong argument that this is actually going to make life much more difficult for people who are receiving social assistance in Ontario. It's unfortunate the amendments that were brought forward weren't adopted, but even if they had been, I have grave concerns about the heart of this schedule, which seems to be driving us towards the privatization of social welfare systems and will make life harder for a large group of people in Ontario who don't deserve to have their lives made harder; in fact, they need help. They need support, they need assistance and they need an opportunity to live a life of dignity.

With that said, Chair, I'd like the recorded vote on this schedule as a whole.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. A recorded vote has been requested.

We now have MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. I'm disappointed the amendments didn't pass because I thought they were an opportunity for the government to at least make some changes to signify that they do want to reduce red tape on people on social assistance and not create more coercive structures.

I want to thank MPP Tabuns for requesting unanimous consent to move forward with debate on amendment 19 because I think that amendment gets at the heart of what's wrong with our social assistance system. We've come to normalize the just crushing poverty that the low rates of assistance impose on people. Right now on Ontario Works, a person receives 40% below the basic market-basket measure, which is the measure of the least amount you need to survive. Right now, social assistance rates are 40% below that.

It just seems problematic to me that the government would talk about things like life stabilization—and yes, I think we should be thinking about ways to provide supports to stabilize the lives of people who are on social assistance. But the bottom line is, if you don't provide them with enough money to survive on, to pay the rent, to buy food, to buy clothes, just the basic necessities of life,

then there is no way you're going to stabilize people's lives. We're seeing the results of that in our communities.

I would argue that even from a, let's say, pro-business perspective, I can't tell you how many people in downtown Guelph complain to me about the number of homeless people on the streets interfering with the small businesses trying to conduct business downtown. My response to them is: What are people supposed to do when they don't have enough to survive on? People who are in serious need—many of these folks have significant mental health challenges that are not being addressed by our mental health and addictions system, because that's under-resourced. So what are they supposed to do?

I guess the measure of any society is how we collectively care for the most vulnerable in our society. I think at the bare minimum, if we're going to talk about stabilizing people's lives, we need to make sure that they have enough income to survive month to month. I don't think anyone is talking about anybody living an extravagant lifestyle. We're talking about basic necessities here.

As an example, I was looking, and I think the average rent for a bachelor apartment in Ontario—and I'm sure MPP Glover is going to tell us how much more expensive it is in Toronto—is \$1,100. As a matter of fact, the exact total is \$1,142. People on Ontario Works receive \$733 a month. So our social assistance system needs significant reform and a significant overhaul, and doing it and doing it right will not only benefit the current and future recipients of social assistance, but it will benefit our entire society.

I'm disappointed in this schedule, but I'm especially disappointed that some of the amendments that were brought forward to just try to make life a little bit better and easier for people who deal with stigma and an undignified system each and every day didn't pass. So I would recommend that members vote against this schedule, and I too would like to request a recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay, a recorded vote has been requested. MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I also want to add my voice to the opposition to this schedule. It seems like the goal of this schedule is to privatize Ontario Works and ODSP and to reduce the number of people who are on assistance. A number of advocates have specifically warned about a contract the government signed with Fedcap, which is a multinational social service provider with a global track record of cost-cutting and punitive service. They received a contract for the new employment service delivery area in Brant, Hamilton and Niagara regions back in February 2020. The concern is that this is actually a way to privatize the delivery of Ontario Works and ODSP in order for people to make profit off of the misery of others.

1130

This is what we've seen over the last year with long-term care, or what has been exposed over the last year. The crisis in long-term care started more than 25 years ago, when the Conservative government of that day started to privatize the delivery of long-term-care homes and then

used tax—just a whole range of things. They used taxpayer dollars to build for-profit long-term-care homes. Now what we're seeing is—we saw people die of thirst because of a lack of care during the pandemic. We've got decades of reports on horrific conditions that people live in in long-term-care homes that are operated by private, for-profit companies, including by the former Premier of this province.

This is just another really egregious step and inhumane step towards privatizing and profiting and allowing somebody to profit off of the suffering of others. It's absolutely—I've got to use the word despicable, that the government would actually do this. I would strongly recommend to the government members who are here, look at your conscience. Look at the people that you walk by every day when you're going into the Legislature who are sleeping on the streets. This is a schedule in this bill that is going to increase the number of people who are going to be sleeping on our streets and the suffering of others who are on Ontario Works and ODSP. So please, please vote against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I'd just like to remind all members to please make their comments through the Chair.

Is there any further debate on schedule 21? A recorded vote has been requested. Shall schedule 21 carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 21 carried.

Turning now to schedule 22, there are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 22, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Shall schedule 22 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 22 carried.

Turning now to schedule 23: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 23, sections 1 through 3? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 23, sections 1 through 3, carried.

Shall schedule 23 carry? Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 23 carried.

Turning now to schedule 24, section 1: Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to

vote? Shall schedule 24, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, section 1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 24, section 2: We have government motion number 20. Who would like to move this motion, government motion number 20? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 2(3) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by striking out “the land was previously owned” at the beginning of clause 50(3)(a.1) of the Planning Act and substituting “the land is the whole of a parcel of land that was previously owned”.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion number 20 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare motion number 20 carried.

Turning now to government motion number 21: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 2(4) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by,

(a) adding “or” at the end of subclause 50(3)(b)(ii) of the Planning Act,

(b) striking out “or” at the end of subclause 56(3)(b)(iii) of that act; and

(c) striking out subclause 50(3)(b)(iv) of that act.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on motion 21? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare motion 21 carried.

Turning now to government motion number 22: Who would like to move this motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 2(7) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by,

(a) adding “or” at the end of subclause 50(5)(a)(ii) of the Planning Act;

(b) striking out “or” at the end of subclause 50(5)(a)(iii) of that act; and

(c) striking out subclause 50(5)(a)(iv) of that act.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall motion number 22 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare motion number 22 carried.

Turning now to motion number 23: Who would like to move this motion, government motion number 23? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 2(8) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by striking out “the land was previously owned” at the beginning of clause 50(5)(a.2) of the Planning Act and substituting “the land is the whole of a parcel of land that was previously owned”.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 23 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare government motion number 23 carried.

Shall schedule 24, section 2, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, section 2, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 24, section 3: Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, section 3, carried.

1140

Turning now to schedule 24, section 4, we have government motion number 24. MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 4(11) of schedule 24 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(11) Subsection 53(41) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

““Conditions not fulfilled

“(41) If conditions have been imposed and the applicant has not, within a period of two years after notice was given under subsections (17) or (24), whichever is later, fulfilled the conditions, the application for consent shall be deemed to be refused but, if there is an appeal under subsections (14), (19) or (27), the application for consent shall not be deemed to be refused for failure to fulfill the conditions until the expiry of two years from the date of the order of the tribunal issued in respect of the appeal or from the date of a notice issued by tribunal under subsection (29) or (33).

““Transition

“(41.1) For greater certainty, subsection (41), as it reads on and after the day subsection 4(11) of schedule 24 to the Supporting Recovery and Competitiveness Act, 2021 comes into force, does not apply with respect to an application that was, before that day, deemed to have been refused under subsection (41), as it read immediately before that day.””

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on government motion number 24? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare government motion number 24 carried.

We now have government motion number 25. Who would like to move that? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 4(12) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by striking out “shall give a certificate to the applicant” in subsection 53(42.1) of the Planning Act in the portion before clause (a) and substituting “shall give the same form of certificate described in subsection (42) to the applicant”.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Piccini has moved government motion number 25. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 25 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion carried.

Turning now to government motion number 26: Who would like to move that motion? Government motion number 26: MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Colleagues, I move that subsection 4(13) of schedule 24 to the bill be amended by striking out “may apply for the issuance of” in subsection 53(45) of the Planning Act and substituting “may apply to the council or the minister, whichever is authorized to give a consent in respect of the land at the time of the application, for the issuance of”.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Piccini has moved government motion number 26. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 26 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare government motion number 26 carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 24, section 4, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 24, section 4, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, section 4, as amended, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 5 through 9 of schedule 24. I propose we bundle them. Do we have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 24, sections 5 through 9? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 24, sections 5 through 9, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, sections 5 through 9, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 24, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 24, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 24, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 25, there are no amendments to sections 1 through 32. I propose we bundle them. Do we have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 25, sections 1 through 32? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 25, sections 1 through 32, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 25, sections 1 through 32, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 25? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 25 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 25 carried.

Turning now to schedule 26, there are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them. Do we have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 26, sections 1 through 3? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 26, sections 1 to 3, carried.

Shall schedule 26 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 26 carried.

Turning now to schedule 27, there are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. MPP Tabuns, your hand is raised?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Thanks very much, Chair. I just want to give advance notice that I would like a recorded vote on schedule 27. I think there are substantial problems with this schedule throughout.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Sorry, to clarify, that’s a recorded vote on the schedule in its entirety, correct?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Correct, and I will also speak to section 3. Bundling 1 and 2 I’m fine with.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay, thank you. Turning back now to schedule 27, sections 1 and 2, I propose we bundle them. Do we have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on Schedule 27, sections 1 and 2? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 27, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 27, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Turning now to schedule 27, section 3, MPP Tabuns wished to speak to this section.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that. As you’re aware, this section prohibits unauthorized recordings of tribunal proceedings and it prohibits publication of unauthorized recordings. The fine is \$25,000, which is pretty hefty. It’s an attention-catching fine. I tried to get that kind of fine for destruction of government documents when the Liberals were shredding and deleting everywhere, but they just went out of their minds at the thought; \$25,000 is very substantial.

Chair, I have to say, this is an attack on tenants. It’s an attack on tenant advocates. Those recordings have been used to point out injustice, problems in the tribunal system. Frankly, it’s also a violation of the open courts principle.

We’ve had a long history in British parliamentary tradition of trying to keep our courts open. People, I’m sure, remember their grade 6 or 7 history: Court of Star Chamber in the UK and the fact that people were excluded from knowing what was going on in the courts. That infamy lasted through centuries and is something that is still in mind when we ask, how do we know that justice is served and seen to be served?

1150

This section is going to undermine both the serving of justice and the appearance of justice being served. It discredits courts and, frankly, it undermines the rights of tenants in this province.

I strongly urge the government to withdraw this. They have said in the past their concerns around protection of privacy. Well, if that, in fact, is the case, then withdraw and come back with a bill that actually—having consulted with tenants and those who support them, having consulted with landlords and those who support them, come back with a method of preserving and protecting privacy. But don’t do this. This will be a stain that will be on the government for a very long time and a stain on the people of Ontario for a very long time.

With that, I’d like a recorded vote when we vote on section 3 and for the schedule as a whole, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay, so section 3 and the schedule as a whole?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Yes, please. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. Is there any further debate on schedule 27, section 3? Are members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 27, section 3, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 through 6. I propose we bundle them. Do I have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 27, sections 4 through 6? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 27, sections 4 through 6, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 27, sections 4 through 6, carried.

Is there any further debate on schedule 27? MPP Schreiner and then MPP Glover.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I put a notice to vote against this schedule for some of the reasons MPP Tabuns just articulated. My recommendation to the government would be to put your energy and resources into fixing the Landlord and Tenant Board instead of attacking folks who are simply seeking justice and publicly making available just how dysfunctional the LTB is right now. I think it's in the interest of both tenants and landlords to fix the LTB to make the investments in making sure that while we're having to deal with it online, the technology be fixed and the digital divide that exists for the most vulnerable and even accessing online hearings be addressed; and then when we go back to in-person, making sure we actually have enough adjudicators to properly make the system work and that legal aid has enough funding to be able to properly represent the most vulnerable in our society.

I guess my parting message would be: Let's remove this schedule from the bill and let's actually come back with a bill that fixes the Landlord and Tenant Board and addresses a number of the systemic inequities that the most vulnerable tenants face.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: We heard from a couple of deputies about this, like Douglas Kwan from the Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario. The way the Landlord and Tenant Board has been functioning—we've heard this from many, many critics over the pandemic—is not fair. Moving to an online platform makes it very difficult for many of the tenants who have trouble with the technology or don't have access to the technology. There are tenants who have been phoning in on pay phones and then getting

cut off, so they're not able to fully participate in the decisions about their evictions. We've heard about members of the tribunal who do not have adequate training, who are not following due process, and there's been a lot of criticism about it. A lot of that criticism has been exposed, about this lack of process in the Landlord and Tenant Board, by the recording and publication of some of the hearings. That's how the public has found out about what is actually happening with this eviction blitz.

A fair process at the Landlord and Tenant Board is good for both the landlord and the tenants, but the current process is not fair because it puts people who have language barriers, who have technical barriers, who are low income at a disadvantage. That's really not fair. Instead of creating a Landlord and Tenant Board that is operating in a fair manner, with due process, what this is doing is silencing the critics. That's exactly what Douglas Kwan from the Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario said. The fine, the \$25,000 fine, seems more like a way to keep critics silent than to protect privacy.

We've got a homelessness crisis in this province right now, and not having due process at the Landlord and Tenant Board and an eviction blitz where people are evicted in hearings that sometimes take just a minute or two is absolutely appalling. It's fuelling that crisis. I wish the government, instead of trying to silence the critics, would actually pass the legislation to make the Landlord and Tenant Board operate fairly for everyone. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate on schedule 27? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? A recorded vote has been requested, I believe.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 27 carried.

At this point, it's almost close to noon. We have one more schedule left, and there are a lot of motions and notices being brought, so I suggest at this point that the committee recess and that we return at 1 o'clock. We can begin schedule 28 at 1 o'clock.

Thank you, everyone, for your co-operation. The committee is now recessed until 1 o'clock.

The committee recessed from 1158 to 1300.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on General Government will now come to order. We are currently doing clause-by-clause on Bill 276, An Act to enact and amend various Acts.

At this point, we are now resuming clause-by-clause and starting with schedule 28. We are now turning to schedule 28, section 1. We have independent motion number

27. Who would like to move independent motion number 27? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 1 of schedule 28 to the bill be amended by adding the following definition to section 1 of the Université de Hearst Act, 2021:

“teaching staff” means professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, associates, instructors, tutors and all others employed to do the work of teaching or giving instruction and includes persons employed to do research at the university;”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 27. Do we have any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. I’m going to be moving a series of amendments with the objective of trying to provide within this schedule the same provisions that were provided when Algoma became a university. We heard from the faculty association from the Université de Hearst. We’ve heard from the Ontario colleges and universities and others just how important it is to have a stand-alone act to proclaim a university, and that would be my preferred way of approaching this.

But we also heard from a number of members of the Université de Hearst community of how long they’ve been fighting for and seeking university status. And so, I think that at the very least, it’s important that if the government’s going to provide that university status, that it be done in a way that addresses the concerns people brought forward about making sure that the governance structure, particularly the board of governors and the senate, is outlined in legislation and that collective bargaining agreements are respected. So this amendment is the first amendment to set up other amendments to achieve those objectives.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall motion number 27 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to independent motion number 28: Who would like to move this motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’ll withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Yes.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 1? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 28, section 1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 2: We have independent motion number 29. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 2? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 2 carry? All those in favour please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 28, section 2, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 3: We have independent motion number 30. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 3 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Objects

“3. The objects of the university are the pursuit of learning through scholarship, teaching and research within a spirit of free enquiry and expression.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 30. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I just want to take a moment to acknowledge and thank the Council of Ontario Universities, who assisted me in putting forward a number of these amendments, including this one, really designed to protect the independence and freedom of academic expression, the independence of the university, which are important principles. This and other amendments are designed to honour that and, again, are based on the legislation that made Algoma a university.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 30 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 3? Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 3, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 3.1, we have independent motion number 31. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’ll withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. Turning now to schedule 28, section 4, we have independent motion number 32. Who would like to move this motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 4 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Powers

“4. The university has all the powers necessary and incidental to its objects.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 32. Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to—sorry, MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I wanted to mention to my colleague MPP Schreiner, thank you very much for the work you’ve done on this. I just wanted to allude to—I appreciate the intent, and I think a lot of this will be reflected in regs, but a number of the aforementioned motions that you put forward, just in terms of the linguistics of even the nomenclature for how you’ve put it forward, with “University of Hearst,” we feel very strongly to be similar with the Université de l’Ontario français that it’s only in French and that we’re not even putting a bilingual name forward. I wanted to explain that, MPP Schreiner, because I appreciate the intent there and that you have worked with the COU.

I think the structure is in place with motions you’re going to see the government move here that are akin to

what you have done. It was just that nuanced piece on nomenclature that was not acceptable for Hearst and is not in spirit with the “governed by and for francophones” and the nomenclature with the Université de l’Ontario français. So I just wanted to mention that. Thank you very much for the opportunity, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you. I appreciate those comments. Those motions were not actually moved, and for a reason, and that’s why. Just to put it on the record, sometimes when the opposition pushes the government to provide sufficient time to prepare amendments and to do proper consultation, it is in order for MPPs, especially opposition MPPs, to do their job. That is why some of us in the opposition push for having adequate time to review bills, because it is very challenging to get everything exactly how I want it and how I would intend it to be in very compressed time schedules. There was a reason I did not move those motions.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 32 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 4? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 4, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 4, carried.

1310

Turning now to schedule 28, section 4.1, we have independent motion number 33. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 4.1 be added to schedule 28 to the bill:

“Degrees, etc.

“4.1(1) Subject to subsection (2), the university may confer degrees, including honorary degrees, and award certificates and diplomas in any and all branches of learning.

“(2) The authority of the university to confer credentials under subsection (1) shall be exercised in a manner consistent with the objects of the university.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 33. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Is there any further debate? Actually, no, we’ll move on now. Turning now to schedule 28, section 5: Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 5, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 6, we have independent motion number 34. Who would like to move independent motion number 34? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’m going to withdraw, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn.

We now have government motion number 35R. Who would like to move government motion number 35R? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 6 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Board of governors composition

“6(1) There shall be a board of governors of the university, composed of the following members:

“1. The president of the university, who shall be a member by virtue of office.

“2. The chancellor of the university, if one is appointed, who shall be a member by virtue of office.

“3. One person appointed by the president of the university from among the vice-presidents or other senior officers of the university.

“4. Three persons elected by the teaching staff of the university from among themselves.

“5. Two persons elected by the students of the university from among themselves.

“6. Two persons elected by the non-teaching employees of the university from among themselves.”

VN: “Five persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who shall not be students, members of the teaching staff or non-teaching employees of the university.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. MPP Piccini has moved motion number 25—oh, that’s not the entirety of the motion.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Sorry, MPP Piccini, we can’t hear you.

Mr. David Piccini: Sorry, I have a bit more; I was just muted.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Oh, okay.

Mr. David Piccini: VM: “Nine other persons who shall be appointed by the board, who shall not be students, members of the teaching staff or non-teaching employees of the university.

“Composition and procedures

“(2) The board shall comply with any further requirements prescribed by regulation with respect to its composition and procedures.

“Powers and duties

“(3) The board is responsible for governing and managing the affairs of the university and has the powers and duties prescribed by regulation.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Could you just confirm that you meant paragraphs “vii” and “viii”?

Mr. David Piccini: Yes, “vii” and “viii”; that’s correct.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay, thank you.

Mr. David Piccini: Sorry, Chair; my eyes. My apologies.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No, that’s okay. It’s also the lag sometimes with the technology here. I just want to make sure.

Is there any further debate on government motion number 35R? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 35R carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare government motion number 35R carried.

Turning now to government motion number 35: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Withdrawn, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 6, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 6, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 6, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 6.1, we have independent motion number 36. Who would like to move this motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 6.1 be added to schedule 28 to the bill:

“Term of office

“6.1(1) Subject to subsection (2), the term of office for an elected or appointed member of the board shall not be more than three years, as determined by the bylaws of the board.

“Same, student

“(2) The term of office for a member of the board who is a student shall be one year.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 36. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Again, I’ll be moving a series of amendments that address concerns brought forward by Ontario colleges and universities and I think are important components of modelling the Université de Hearst after the creation of Algoma University.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 36 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to independent motion number 37: MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 6.2 be added to schedule 28 to the bill:

“Loss of eligibility

“6.2(1) If, during their term of office, a member of the board elected or appointed under paragraph 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7 of subsection 6(1) ceases to be eligible for election or appointment to the board under the same paragraph, they cease to be a member of the board.

“Exception, student graduation

“(2) Despite subsection (1), if a student member of the board graduates during their term of office, they may continue to sit as a member of the board for the remainder of the one-year term.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): On independent motion number 37, committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order. As Bosc and Gagnon note on page 771 of the third edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, a motion is out of order if it is dependent on an amendment which has already been negated.

Turning now to independent motion number 38: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’ll withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. And independent motion number 39: MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I’ll withdraw again, because it will be ruled out of order.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 6.5, we have independent motion number 40. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. And independent motion number 41?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 42?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I withdraw as well.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 43?

1320

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I withdraw. They will all be dependent on the other motion.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 44?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I withdraw.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We’re now turning to schedule 28, section 7. We have independent motion number 45. MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 7 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Senate composition

“7(1) There shall be a senate of the university, consisting of not more than 31 members, including the following members:

“1. The following persons who are member by virtue of their office:

“i. The president of the university.

“ii. The dean of each faculty or, if a division or department is not part of a faculty, the chair of the division or department.

“iii. The university registrar.

“iv. The university library director or chief librarian.

“2. Four students elected by the students of the university from among themselves.

“3. Such number of persons who are on the teaching staff, elected by the teaching staff from among themselves, as set out in the senate bylaws, which number shall be at least twice the total number of all other members of the senate.

“4. One person, other than the president of the university, appointed by the board from among the board members.

“5. Such other persons as may be determined by senate bylaw.

“Bylaws respecting elections

“(2) The senate shall by bylaw determine,

“(a) the procedures to be followed in the election of members of the senate;

“(b) the eligibility requirements for the election or appointment, as the case may be, to the senate of members described in paragraphs 2 to 5 of subsection (1);

“(c) the number of persons to be elected or appointed, as the case may be, to the senate under paragraphs 3 and 5 of subsection (1); and

“(d) the constituencies for each groups referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of subsection (1).”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 45. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: A number of delegates came to committee, highlighting how important it is for the independence of the university to have a senate that is outlined in statute rather than in regulation. Again, this is modelled after legislation that made Algoma a university, and I think it’s important, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 45 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands? I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to government motion number 46R: Who would like to move that motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Colleagues, I move that section 7 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Senate

“7(1) There shall be a senate of the university composed of not more than 40 members, including the following members:

“1. The following persons who are members by virtue of their office:

“i. The president of the university.

“ii. The vice-president of the university.

“iii. The registrar of the university.

“2. Not less than two persons and not more than the number of persons that is one-fifth the total size of the senate, elected by the students of the university from among themselves, as set out in senate bylaws.

“3. One person elected by the teaching staff of each teaching unit from among themselves.

“4. One person elected by the teaching staff of the university from among themselves.

“5. One person, other than the president or chancellor of the university, appointed by the board from among the board members.

“6. Such other persons, other than the chancellor of the university, as may be determined by senate bylaw.

“Composition and procedures

“(2) The senate shall comply with any further requirements prescribed by regulation with respect to its composition and procedures.

“Powers and duties

“(3) The senate is responsible for determining and regulating the educational policy of the university and has the powers and duties prescribed by regulation.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Piccini has moved government motion number 46R. Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 46R carry? All those in favour,

please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion carried.

Turning now to government motion number 46: MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 7, as amended? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 7, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 28, section 7, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 7.1, we have independent motion number 47. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I will be withdrawing a number of amendments because they will be ruled out of order.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. Independent motion number 48?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 49?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 50?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 51?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 52?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 53?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Independent motion number 54?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. I’m going to move this one. I move that section 8.1 be—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Sorry, MPP Schreiner. My apologies. One moment.

Mr. David Piccini: Chair, I believe we need schedule 28, section 7, to be voted on.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. My apologies. Before we continue: MPP Schreiner withdrew motion number 53; however, that still leaves us with having to vote on schedule 28, section 8. Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 8? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Apologies, Chair. Can I just receive clarification that schedule 28, section 7, has been carried?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, it has, as amended.

Mr. David Piccini: There was no—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): You moved some amendments.

Mr. David Piccini: Oh, yes, sorry. So it has gone through with amendments and a vote and carried?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes.

Mr. David Piccini: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We're now currently on section 28, section 8. Are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 28, section 8, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 8.1, independent motion number 54: MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 8.1 be added to schedule 28 to the bill:

“Bylaws available to public

“8.1(1) The bylaws of the board and of the senate shall be open to examination by members of the public during normal business hours.

“Publication

“(2) The board and the senate shall publish their bylaws from time to time in such manner as they consider proper.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved independent motion number 54. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to independent motion number 55: MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 9 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Chancellor

“9.(1) The board may, in its discretion, decide to appoint a chancellor of the university.

“Appointment committee

“(2) If the board decides to appoint a chancellor, it shall establish an appointment committee to make recommendations as to the person to be appointed chancellor.

“Same

1330

“(3) The appointment committee shall be composed of such members of the board and senate as may be determined by the bylaws of the board.

“Appointment

“(4) The board shall take into consideration the recommendation of the appointment committee when appointing a chancellor.

“Term of office

“(5) If appointed, the chancellor shall hold office for four years.

“Reappointment

“(6) The chancellor may be reappointed for a further term but shall not be reappointed for more than two consecutive terms.

“Vice-chancellor

“(7) If a chancellor is appointed under subsection (1), the president shall be the vice-chancellor of the university.

“Duties

“(8) The chancellor is the titular head of the university and, when authorized by the senate to do so, shall confer all degrees, honorary degrees, certificates and diplomas on behalf of the university.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 55. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I just want to say again, this is outlined by the Council of Ontario Universities and using Algoma as a model.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 55 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 9? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 9, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 10, we have independent motion number 56. MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 10 of schedule 28 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“President

“10(1) There shall be a president of the university appointed by the board in such manner and for such term as the board shall determine.

“Powers and duties

“(2) The president is the chief executive officer of the university and has supervision over and direction of the academic and general administration of the university, its students, managers, teaching staff and non-teaching employees and such other powers and duties as may be conferred upon or assigned to the president by the board.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 56. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare independent motion number 56 carried.

Shall schedule 28, section 10, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 10, as amended, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 11, we have independent motion number 57. MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 11 of schedule 28 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 11 of the Université de Hearst Act, 2021:

“Exemption from taxation

“(1.1) Land vested in the university and land and premises leased to and occupied by the university are exempt from provincial and municipal taxes and development charges, so long as the vested land or leased land and premises are actually used and occupied for the objects of the university.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved motion number 57. Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion 57 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Turning now to independent motion number 58: Who would like to move this motion? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I move that section 11 of schedule 28 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 11 of the *Université de Hearst Act*, 2021:

“Deemed vesting in crown

“(2.1) All property vested in the university shall be deemed to be vested in the crown for the public uses of Ontario for the purposes of the *Real Property Limitations Act*.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has moved independent motion number 58. Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall independent motion number 58 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion lost.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 11? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 11, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 11, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 12 and 13. I propose we bundle them. Do I have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate on schedule 28, sections 12 and 13? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, sections 12 and 13, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 28, sections 12 and 13, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 14: Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you to my colleagues for at least considering some of my motions reflecting what the Council of Ontario Universities has presented. Sections 14, 15 and 16 are problematic sections of this bill, because they provide the government with the power to intervene in the contracts and collective agreements of what would be an autonomous institution. I’ve heard from a number of faculty associations, I’ve heard from the Council of Ontario Universities, I met with faculty associates from the University of Hearst—all raising concerns about the government having this power, because, really, the power to negotiate contracts and collective agreements should be in the hands of the institution, the board of governors and the employees of the university to negotiate fair and reasonable contracts.

I’m worried that violation of collective bargaining rights may subject the government and/or the institution to a constitutional challenge. Therefore, I would like a recorded vote on sections 14, 15 and 16, Chair; I’ll give you notice on that. To save everyone time, I’ll just say the same argument applies to each one of those sections of schedule 28.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner has requested recorded votes for sections 14, 15 and 16. Is there any further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I just want to echo the comments of MPP Schreiner but also the comments of a number of deputants who came to the Legislature to depute to this committee—or deputed by Zoom, anyway. A number of them talked about this government’s overreach with this

schedule to change contracts by regulation. It seems to be a breach of their charter rights. We were told that it was a breach of their charter rights to free bargaining, to the essence of belonging to a union in Canada.

I mentioned earlier today that we’ve already gone through this. When the Liberal government passed legislation to override the contracts of teachers in this province, it ended up going all the way to the Supreme Court. They passed their legislation in 2011. By 2017, the Supreme Court had ruled that it was a violation of the charter right to association, and then the government ended up paying out \$100 million, but they also in the meantime incurred a lot of legal fees at the taxpayers’ expense. This is something that’s probably going to happen again, because people want to make sure that the right to bargaining, our freedom of association, is protected. So putting this schedule in just means that a lot of our taxpayer dollars are going to be going into a fruitless and unnecessary legal battle over this schedule. I don’t know why the government would want to be entering into this and wasting our money on a bunch of lawyers to fight for something that the Supreme Court just ruled on.

1340

I’m hoping that the government will vote down this schedule and just eliminate this schedule from this bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Further debate? Are members prepared to vote? A recorded vote has been requested.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 28, section 14, carried.

A recorded vote has been requested for schedule 28, section 15.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 28, section 15, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 16: Again, a recorded vote has been requested. All those in favour of carrying schedule 28, section 16, please raise their hands.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Sorry; my apologies. MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: My apologies. Do we not move a motion on schedule 16 before we vote on it in totality?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): There is no—we're on schedule 28, section 16.

Mr. David Piccini: Correct.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): There's no motion here. We've already—

Mr. David Piccini: Okay, apologies. Well—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I see there is an amendment for 16.1, but that would be after this section.

Mr. David Piccini: But wouldn't we vote for section 16 to carry after—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No.

Mr. David Piccini: —the 16.1 amendment?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No.

Mr. David Piccini: Okay.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 28, section 16, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 16.1, we have government motion number 59R. MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that schedule 28 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Transition, board

“16.1(1) Despite anything in this act, but subject to subsection (2), the persons who were members of the board of governors or members of the senate of Collège de Hearst on the day immediately before the day section 2 of this act came into force shall, on and after that date, constitute the board and senate, respectively, of the university.

“Same

“(2) The board and the senate of the university shall, no later” than “12 months after the day section 2 of this act comes into force, appoint or elect such new members of the board and senate as are necessary in order to ensure that the board and senate are constituted in accordance with the requirements of this act.”

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. MPP Piccini has moved government motion number 59R. Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall government motion number 59R carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raised your hands. I declare government motion number 59R carried.

Turning now to government motion number 59: MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: Withdrawn, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn. Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 16.1? Shall schedule 28, section 16.1, carry? All those in favour,

please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 16.1, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 17: Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this section. This section outlines a number of regulations that provide regulatory power for the Lieutenant Governor in Council that seem to be, or at least most of these seem to be, much more appropriate that they are matters the governing board should have responsibility for, especially as we think of maintaining the academic independence of universities. We certainly don't want to see anything that could potentially compromise academic free expression, academic independence etc.

I think it makes sense to remove this schedule, and, like most universities, that the board of governors would create rules and regulations around the governing of the university that would address most of what is contained here. Being invested in the power of cabinet through the regulatory process, to me, doesn't make sense and could compromise academic freedom and independence. I recommend voting against this section.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is there any further debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 17—MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Sorry, Chair. I meant to say recorded vote on this one.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested. Shall schedule 28, section 17, carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare schedule 28, section 17, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 18 and 19. I propose we bundle them. Do I have agreement from the committee? Thank you. Is there any further debate to schedule 28, sections 18 and 19? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, sections 18 and 19, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, sections 18 and 19, carried.

Turning now to schedule 28, section 20, we have independent motion number 60. MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Withdrawn. That one shouldn't have been submitted.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Withdrawn.

Is there any further debate on schedule 28, section 20? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 28, section 20, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, section 20, carried.

Shall schedule 28, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 28, as amended, carried.

Turning now to section 1 of the bill: Shall section 1 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 1 carried.

Turning now to section 2: Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 2 carried.

Turning now to section 3, the short title: Shall section 3 carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare section 3 carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion carried.

Shall Bill 276, as amended, carry? All those in—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, MPP Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Recorded vote on the bill, please.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested.

Ayes

Bailey, Crawford, Piccini, Sabawy, Skelly, Wai.

Nays

Glover, Monteith-Farrell, Schreiner, Tabuns.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare Bill 276, as amended, carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare the motion carried.

There being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, MPP Tabuns?

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Chair, I just wanted to thank you for your businesslike way of handling things today. It was very nice to see—an appreciated, well-done effort.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. I wanted to—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Yes, I wanted to ditto what MPP Tabuns just said, and also just to acknowledge: Thank you for getting a vaccine, and thank you for working hard today as you work through the after-effects of the vaccine. Having gotten a vaccine myself, I know that can be challenging shortly thereafter, so thank you for your good work.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you very much, MPP Schreiner.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, MPP Wai?

Mrs. Daisy Wai: Thank you, Chair. I echo everything the colleagues are saying, definitely. From the government side, of course, we thank you for all the great effort you have put in, especially when you're not feeling well today. Thank you so much.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you very much. I'd like to thank all committee members, as well, for their cooperation today. You're making me a little bit emotional, which shouldn't happen; the Chair is supposed to be neutral here. But I just wanted to thank everyone for everything, for their cooperation and for participating. It's been a pleasure to work with all of you this session, and I hope you all do well and stay safe and have a great summer. Hopefully we can resume in person in September.

With that, there being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned. Thank you, everyone, and take care.

The committee adjourned at 1353.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Présidente

Ms. Goldie Ghamari (Carleton PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Mike Schreiner (Guelph G)

Ms. Jill Andrew (Toronto–St. Paul’s ND)
Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)
Mr. Guy Bourgouin (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)
Mr. Stephen Crawford (Oakville PC)
Ms. Goldie Ghamari (Carleton PC)
Mr. Chris Glover (Spadina–Fort York ND)
Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)
Mr. Sheref Sabawy (Mississauga–Erin Mills PC)
Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)
Mr. Mike Schreiner (Guelph G)
Mrs. Daisy Wai (Richmond Hill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Judith Monteith-Farrell (Thunder Bay–Atikokan ND)
Mr. David Piccini (Northumberland–Peterborough South / Northumberland–Peterborough-Sud PC)
Ms. Donna Skelly (Flamborough–Glanbrook PC)
Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

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

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Bradley Warden, legislative counsel