

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

G-5

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

G-5

**Standing Committee on  
General Government**

Supporting People  
and Businesses Act, 2021

2<sup>nd</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament

Friday 26 November 2021

**Comité permanent des  
affaires gouvernementales**

Loi de 2021 visant  
à soutenir la population  
et les entreprises

2<sup>e</sup> session  
42<sup>e</sup> législature

Vendredi 26 novembre 2021

---

Chair: Logan Kanapathi  
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Président : Logan Kanapathi  
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

ISSN 1180-5218

## CONTENTS

Friday 26 November 2021

Supporting People and Businesses Act, 2021, Bill 13, Mrs. Tangri / Loi de 2021 visant  
à soutenir la population et les entreprises, projet de loi 13, Mme Tangri .....G-61



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES  
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES**

Friday 26 November 2021

Vendredi 26 novembre 2021

*The committee met at 0901 in committee room 2 and by video conference.*

SUPPORTING PEOPLE  
AND BUSINESSES ACT, 2021  
LOI DE 2021 VISANT  
À SOUTENIR LA POPULATION  
ET LES ENTREPRISES

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 13, An Act to amend various Acts / Projet de loi 13, Loi modifiant diverses lois.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):** Good morning, honourable members. In the absence of a Chair and Vice-Chair, it is my duty to call upon you to elect an Acting Chair. Are there any nominations? MPP Sabawy.

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** I nominate Natalia Kusendova to be the Chair.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):** Thank you. Are there any further nominations? There being no further nominations, I declare the nominations closed and MPP Kusendova elected Acting Chair of the committee.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Good morning, members. Happy Friday. Today we're here to consider Bill 13 for clause-by-clause consideration.

Before we begin, we will do our attendance check. First of all, we have in the room with us MPP Sheref Sabawy and MPP Marit Stiles.

Participating remotely, we have MPP Bob Bailey—if you could please state your name and that you are indeed in Ontario.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Yes, Chair. It's good to see you in the chair. I'm Bob Bailey, MPP for Sarnia–Lambton, and I'm in my home office in Petrolia.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Excellent.

We have MPP Daisy Wai.

**Mrs. Daisy Wai:** This is MPP Daisy Wai, and I am in Richmond Hill.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you.

We have MPP Guy Bourgoïn. Bonjour.

**M. Guy Bourgoïn:** Bon matin, Madame Chair. Guy Bourgoïn, ici à Kapuskasing.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

We also have MPP Mike Harris.

**Mr. Mike Harris:** It is indeed MPP Mike Harris. I'm here in Kitchener.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

We also have MPP Amarjot Sandhu.

**Mr. Amarjot Sandhu:** This is Amarjot Sandhu, and I am in Ontario.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

We also have MPP Chris Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** It's Chris Glover, and I am in Toronto.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you.

Last but not least, we have MPP Mike Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Good morning, Chair. Thank you for taking over the chairing duties today. I am indeed MPP Mike Schreiner, and I am in Ontario.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

We also have MPP Christine Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** For some reason, my camera is not working. I don't know what's going on, but I'm working on that. But I'm Christine Hogarth, and I am in Etobicoke.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

As you know, we are here today to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 13, An Act to amend various Acts. We have staff from Hansard, broadcast and recording, as well as legislative counsel joining us remotely today.

Please take a brief pause before beginning, and as always, please make your comments through the Chair. Are there any questions before we begin?

The Clerk has distributed the amendment packages to all members and staff electronically.

Bill 13 is comprised of three sections which enact 25 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest that we postpone these three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement for that? Thank you very much.

Welcome to the ministry staff who are joining us this morning. If I could kindly ask you to turn off your cameras, that would be much appreciated. Thank you very much.

Before we begin consideration of the schedules, I would like to ask members if anyone has any comments on the bill as a whole. This is your opportunity to speak to

the bill as a whole. Are there any members who would like to take the floor this morning? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I just want to clarify, in terms of procedure—at the end of the bill, when we’ve gone through the whole thing, we’ll get another chance to summarize our comments. Is that accurate?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Yes.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** Okay. I’ll save my comments for then.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Are there any other MPPs who would like to make comments on the bill as a whole? Seeing none, we can proceed to consider schedule 1.

Since we do not have any amendments to sections 1 and 2, I propose that we bundle them together. Do we have agreement to bundle sections 1 and 2 together? Thank you.

Is there any debate on schedule 1, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

I also didn’t mention at the beginning that if you’d like a recorded vote, the time to ask for that is when I ask “Are members ready to vote?” Any member can at that point ask to have a recorded vote. If you don’t ask at that point, I will not be able to have a recorded vote.

So we are considering schedule 1, sections 1 and 2. Are members ready to vote? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare sections 1 and 2 of schedule 1 carried.

Shall schedule 1, as a whole, carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 1 carried.

We will now move on to schedule 2, section 1. We don’t have any amendments. Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 2—sorry, MPP Glover; I didn’t see you. Go ahead.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I just want to clarify that this vote is on section 1 of schedule 2, and that we’ll have an opportunity to raise our amendment for section 1.1.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** That’s right. That’s coming next.

Just for your information, I have the amendment package, and I will call upon the appropriate party to move their motion. Okay?

0910

**Mr. Chris Glover:** Thank you.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** You’re welcome.

Shall schedule 2, section 1, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 2, section 1, carried.

We are now moving on to consider schedule 2, section 1.1. We have a motion by the NDP. MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I move that section 1.1 be added to schedule 2 to the bill:

“1.1 Section 4 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Resolution of council

“(9.1) In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the registrar shall consider a resolution of the council of the municipality, in which are located the premises for which

a person makes an application for a retail store authorization, as proof of the needs and wishes of the residents of the municipality for the purposes of paragraph 5 of subsection (6).

“Same

“(9.2) A resolution referred to in subsection (9.1) may apply with respect to a particular application for a retail store authorization, to one or more areas within the municipality or to the entire municipality.

“Same

“(9.3) A resolution referred to in subsection (9.1) may include guidance with respect to the concentration of cannabis retail stores.”

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order because it seeks to amend a section of the parent act that will—

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Point of order.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Go ahead.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I recognize that this opens up a new section of the bill. However, what I would like to do is seek unanimous consent of the committee members to allow debate and consideration of these motions. The point I want to make is that this bill, in and of itself, already amends sections of the act that don’t relate or interact in any way, and addressing cannabis retail locations here is therefore appropriate, timely and acceptable.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** MPP Stiles, I must finish my ruling first, and then you can raise your point of order.

Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order because it seeks to amend a section of the parent act that is not before the committee. As Bosc and Gagnon noted on page 771 of the third edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, “An amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill.”

I understand that MPP Stiles is seeking unanimous consent of the committee to consider her motion—MPP Harris, you have a point of order?

**Mr. Mike Harris:** Madam Chair, you’ll find the government members are amenable to giving unanimous consent to this.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** MPP Harris, you can also just say “nay” when I ask if there is unanimous consent—it’s sufficient to have one person say “nay”—and we can move on.

So I see there is not unanimous consent—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** In terms of orderliness, so that we are, according to the procedure—I first ruled this out of order, and MPP Stiles can now seek unanimous consent.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I’m seeking unanimous consent to allow debate and consideration, again, of these motions. As I mentioned previously, Bill 13 amends sections of the act that—

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** MPP Stiles, you don't need to give us a reason. You can just say you're seeking unanimous consent.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I'm seeking unanimous consent.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Do we have unanimous consent to consider the motion? We do? Okay.

Since we have unanimous consent, we will move on to consider the motion by the NDP. Is there any debate on the motion? MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I appreciate the opportunity for us to consider this motion.

This issue—and I know it's not just in my riding—is being raised in communities not just in Toronto, but across the province. The high concentration of cannabis retail locations has been a matter of concern for many communities. Of course, we all support legalization of cannabis and the industry itself. But what we are seeing is communities being transformed, particularly in this moment, when there are a lot of empty storefronts. We're seeing a really high concentration of cannabis retail locations.

The city of Toronto has passed a motion asking the provincial government to support the bill that I presented previously—Bill 29—in the Legislature. This would allow us to, essentially, do what the bill contemplates and allow for municipalities to have more consideration and say in the location, in particular, of cannabis retail. We've had really good response to this across the province.

I know that some of the Conservative members have presented similar kinds of petitions in the Legislature.

It's time, I think, that we consider how we can support and ensure that the cannabis retailers themselves have a fair footing and that communities have a little bit more say in cannabis retail locations. This is an opportunity to do that, right here in this piece of legislation.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I will be supporting this amendment.

I would recommend that all members of the House, especially members of the governing party, engage our communities, business associations, municipalities, cannabis retailers throughout the supply chain in a robust conversation about how we can stabilize the cannabis market and address issues around clustering, which we know is an increasing problem in many neighbourhoods and is having negative effects on other small businesses and the vibrancy and diversity of certain downtowns and retail sectors.

I'm not convinced that this amendment alone is going to solve that problem, but I think in the absence of direction from the province, this amendment is a step in the right direction in empowering municipalities to be able to have local decision-making authority to at least start to address this issue within their jurisdiction.

I do hope that we have a robust conversation and debate around how we avoid monopolization in the cannabis industry, how we avoid clustering, and how we make sure we have a robust market that, primarily, eliminates the

illicit underground market. That's something I would challenge all MPPs to think about as we move forward and deal with this issue.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any further debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I'm also very supportive of this amendment.

I'm very glad that MPP Stiles brought forward her Bill 29, which would give the municipalities the power to actually plan for the location of cannabis retailers, because we are seeing extreme clustering, particularly in the downtown core.

We had the chair of the Kensington BIA and our colleague Jessica Bell—MPP Jessica Bell has written to this committee, asking that this amendment be passed, that this power be given to the municipalities so they can plan for the locations of cannabis retail shops.

We even heard, during the committee hearings, from a cannabis retailer who said that he would be in support of giving the municipalities this power, because he sees clustering as a problem for the industry as well as for the local businesses and the local communities.

So I hope that the government will support this amendment and give the municipalities the power to actually plan for the locations of cannabis retailers.

Just as a side note: Currently, municipalities have the power to plan for the location of coffee shops. They should at least have the power to plan for the location of cannabis retailers.

So I hope everybody will support this amendment.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Further to MPP Schreiner's comments: I couldn't agree more. There needs to be more opportunity for a more fulsome conversation, certainly, between government, the cannabis industry and business associations, without question. I think this is, as MPP Schreiner mentioned, a real opportunity to do that.

#### 0920

Also, just because I forgot to do this earlier, I want to thank the business improvement areas in my riding for alerting me to this issue and for encouraging me to bring forward Bill 29—as well as many residents, and also BIAs outside of my community, like the Kensington Market BIA, which has been very active and is obviously a business improvement area that is cannabis-friendly, shall we say, but sees the issue that has emerged and really is asking government to take some action here. I appreciate it.

I really hope everybody will consider supporting this, and I would ask for a recorded vote.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any further debate? Are members ready to vote? We will have a recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

#### Nays

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare this motion lost.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Madam Chair?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Do you have a point of order?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I know it's outside of the usual scope of business, but I wondered if somebody from the government side would care to explain their opposition just so we can continue to move this issue forward.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I'm sorry, but that's not a valid point of order.

We will move on to consider schedule 2, section 2. Since we do not have any amendments to sections 2 through to 15, I propose we bundle them. Is there agreement to bundle? Thank you.

Is there any debate on schedule 2, sections 2 through to 15? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 2, sections 2 through to 15, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 2, sections 2 through to 15, carried.

We will now consider schedule 2 as a whole. Is there any debate on schedule 2 as a whole? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 2, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 2 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 3. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 4. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Thank you.

Is there any debate on schedule 3, sections 1 through 4? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 3, sections 1 through 4, carry? Those in favour, raise your hand. Those opposed, raise your hand. I declare schedule 3, sections 1 through 4, carried.

We will now consider schedule 3 as a whole. Is there any debate on schedule 3 as a whole? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 3 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 3 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 4. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 5. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 4, sections 1 through 5? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 4, sections 1 through 5, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 4, sections 1 through 5, carried.

Now we will consider schedule 4 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 4 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 4 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 5. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2, so I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 5, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 5, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 5, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 5 as a whole. Is there any debate on schedule 5? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 5 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 5 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 6. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 7. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 6, sections 1 through 7? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 6, sections 1 through 7, please raise your hand.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I'm so sorry, MPP Schreiner. Did you want to debate? Go ahead.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Actually, I want to make sure I have an opportunity to talk about schedule 6. But I'm assuming we'll do that at the very end.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Yes, MPP Schreiner. Right after we vote on sections 1 through 7, you can speak to the—

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** You'll do the whole schedule, right?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** The schedule as a whole. That's correct.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Perfect. Thank you.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** You're welcome.

Are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 6, sections 1 through 7, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 6, sections 1 through 7, carried.

We will now consider schedule 6 as a whole. Is there any debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I want to raise some concerns around schedule 6, and not because I'm in any way opposed to authorizing, defining or regulating personal-use harvesting rights within crown forests, but I have some concerns around the way this schedule is written.

At this particular moment, given the way that the schedule is written, it doesn't address key questions about the nature, the scope and, actually, the purpose of the schedule. There is very little information respecting the definition of what "personal use" is, the size and area that a personal harvester may harvest, the harvesting methods a personal-use harvester may use, what the environmental, social and other implications of the various exemptions granted to a personal-use harvester are, and how that will affect our crown forests and the sustainability of those forests.

In particular, I want to make sure that whatever personal-use authorization is granted, it's done in a way that is consistent with the overall purpose of the act and, in particular, maintaining the sustainability of crown forests and making sure that we manage our crown forests in a way that meets social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations. That's why I put forward a notice to vote against this schedule, because I think those types of issues need to be addressed. And assuming that the government will likely vote to keep this



schedule in the bill, I'd like it to be on the record that when regulations are considered under schedule 6, that the considerations I've raised are addressed in the regulations, because I think, given especially the stress on our forests due to increasing climate risk and the importance that forests play in helping us mitigate the worst effects of the climate crisis, we want to make sure that we maintain the integrity of the sustainability of our crown forests.

0930

Chair, I'd like to request a recorded vote on this schedule.

I appreciate the time.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any further debate? MPP Bourgouin.

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** So that I'm clear what we're voting on: We're not voting on a motion on schedule 6 that we had from the Green Party; we're voting on the full schedule, if I'm correct?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** We are voting on the schedule as a whole.

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** As a whole, not on a motion?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** That's right. There wasn't an actual motion; it was just a notice.

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** Thank you for that clarification.

Madame Chair, vous savez que pour nous dans le Nord, c'est important d'avoir accès à du « personal use » ou de l'utilisation personnelle. Comme vous le savez, dans nos régions éloignées du Nord ou même du Nord à la grandeur de la province, beaucoup de monde utilise le bois de chauffage. Très souvent, c'est très compliqué, comme c'est là, d'être capable de s'approvisionner de bois pour être capable de chauffer. C'est un processus qui est assez long, puis ça prend des permis.

Je pense qu'il y a du bon dans la motion. C'est certain que les réglementations que le gouvernement va amener, ça pose peut-être certains concerns—on a hâte de les voir—mais je pense que sur cette « schedule », je crois que c'est important de considérer l'usage personnel, puis de modifier pour essayer d'aider la situation des personnes qui veulent faire avec du bois de chauffage dans le Nord.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 6 carry?

### Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

### Nays

Schreiner.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 6 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 7. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 4. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Thank you.

Is there any debate on schedule 7, sections 1 through to 4? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall

schedule 7, sections 1 through to 4, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 7, sections 1 through to 4, carried.

We are now considering schedule 7 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 7 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 8. Since there are no amendments to sections 1 through 3, I propose we bundle them together. Is there agreement? Thank you.

Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 8, sections 1 through 3, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 8, sections 1 through 3, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 8, section 4. Is there any debate on schedule 8, section 4? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** We're recommending that people vote against this section of the bill. There are a number of things in this schedule that are concerning to a number of stakeholders, including myself. Some of it seems fairly benign, but other parts of it are a bit of a concern.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 8, section 4, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 8, section 4, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 8, section 5. Is there any debate? MPP Glover?

**Mr. Chris Glover:** The Ontario NDP is recommending voting against section 5 of schedule 8 of the bill. There are a number of concerns with section 5.

The first is that it makes a change to the way that appointments for supervisory officers—and we heard, from the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation and the Ontario Public School Boards' Association, deep concerns about some of the actions that are included in this schedule. I'll just read some of them.

One is around qualifications. Schedule 8 of Bill 13 introduces several amendments to the Education Act. Section 4 of the schedule would remove the requirement for school boards to seek confirmation from the Minister of Education that a person is eligible to be appointed as supervisory officer. The removal of this requirement is concerning since it opens the door to potential appointment of supervisory officers without the necessary qualifications and removes an important accountability safeguard that should remain in place.

Section 5 of the schedule would remove the requirement for a supervisory officer to seek approval of the Minister of Education to hold any additional office and have another appointment or profession during their tenure. The current requirements provide a mechanism to evaluate the impact of other activities on the role of supervisory officers. The removal of this safeguard is concerning, and it could lead to supervisory officers having competing priorities that would undermine their ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the roles. Basically, the concern here from the different organizations that I

have mentioned is that it opens the door to potential conflicts of interest among supervisory officers in the education system. That's why I hope all the members of the committee will vote against section 5 of this bill.

0940

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Go ahead, MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Can I ask for a recorded vote, please?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Yes, of course. We will have a recorded vote.

Shall schedule 8, section 5, carry?

#### Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

#### Nays

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 8, section 5, carried.

We will now move on to schedule 8, section 6. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 8, section 6, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 8, section 6, carried.

Now we will consider schedule 8 as a whole. Is there any debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I just want to give members an opportunity to vote to remove this schedule from the bill. I think it is irresponsible to remove ministerial oversight of the appointment of supervisory officers at school boards and to remove the requirement that ensures their only employer is the public school board. This raises serious questions around whether or not the supervisors have the appropriate qualifications to do the job. It opens the door to them being in competing roles, which could lead to a conflict of interest, and reduced accountability. I think this is a more significant change than the public may be aware of and, at the very least, we should be debating this in a stand-alone bill where we can have some rigorous debate about the effects this could have on the quality and direction of our school boards.

So I would recommend that members vote to remove schedule 8 from the bill.

Sorry; could I request a recorded vote, as well?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Yes, of course. Further debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** There are two sections of this bill—section 4 is of deep concern because it removes some of the oversights of the minister over the supervisory officers, and section 5 is of concern because it opens the door to potential conflicts of interest for supervisory officers. I don't think any supervisory officer wants that door opened, either. I think it does undermine the functioning of our school boards and it does open up a whole can of worms that doesn't need to be opened.

The other piece of this section is that it changes the makeup of the College of Teachers from 18 members to 12. The College of Teachers is the regulatory board for teachers, just like the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the College of Nurses. These are supposed to be democratically run by the membership in order to regulate the members of the profession.

In 2020, the government passed legislation that changed the College of Teachers from an elected board to an appointed board, so it's already not a democratically run organization. This further weakens the board by reducing the number of members from 18 to 12, and the membership itself—the teachers who actually pay for this college—will not have a majority of the seats on that board. It's of great concern to the teachers of this province that this power is being taken away in order to regulate themselves. There's no other college that I know of where the professionals are not regulating themselves through their own college.

I think this is a step in the wrong direction. I think it puts the power over the college in the government's hands rather than in the members' hands, who are paying for the college.

Again, I would recommend all members vote against this schedule or vote to have it removed from this bill.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? We will have a recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

#### Nays

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 8 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 9. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 13. Therefore, I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 9, sections 1 through to 13? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 9, sections 1 through to 13, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 9, sections 1 through to 13, carried.

We will now consider schedule 9 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 9, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 9 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 10. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. Therefore, I propose we bundle them together.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Do you have a point of order?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I'm not sure this is the right place to do this, but we did, I think, give notice of recommending a vote against schedule 10.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** You may raise that when we consider schedule 10 as a whole.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Okay.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you.

Is there any debate on sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 10 as a whole. Is there any debate? MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** Because we're recommending voting against the entire schedule 10 to the bill, I understand we have to give notice; we can't move a motion. So what we are doing now, as opposition NDP members, is recommending that all the committee members vote against this entire schedule.

While I will say that these changes aren't exactly expansive, what we see in this section is a continuation of the government's changes to environmental assessment and expanding the minister's and/or Lieutenant Governor in Council's powers to exempt types of projects from what is considered a full environmental assessment. This is building on changes that were made already by this government to the Environmental Assessment Act that were enacted with schedule 6 of Bill 197. We find these changes continue to be completely unsupportable.

I also want to note, Madam Chair, that in September 2021, a court found that the Ford government broke the law when it jammed through Bill 197's changes to the Planning Act without the public notice and consultation required under the Environmental Bill of Rights. While the legality of Bill 197's EA Act changes still remain before the courts, we are very deeply concerned with the further changes the government is proposing here. We know there is also a related constitutional challenge by nine First Nations; again, arguing that the EA Act changes were passed without fulfilling the constitutional duty to consult.

**0950**

At the end of the day, what this legislation does is, it actually weakens once again our environmental assessment laws, the protection of our environment, so this government can continue to bulldoze through projects over environmental concerns—and really important environmental concerns, especially at a time when we are seeing already the impact of climate change. Our dear friends in BC are experiencing a real climate change disaster, the kind of thing that we are going to see more of here in the province of Ontario.

So we are going to recommend to all committee members, please do not further weaken our environmental assessment laws.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I will be recommending voting against schedule 10 of this act. Bill 197 has already given the minister extraordinary, broad and really unprecedented powers to determine the classes and categories of environmental assessments. Its lack of public consultation is being challenged in the courts. The Auditor General, earlier this week, released a pretty scathing report about the government's lack of proper consultation and even just fulfilling and maintaining the environmental rights of the citizens of this province under the Environmental Bill of Rights.

I realize the minister has characterized this schedule as a minor change, but to further facilitate and empower the minister to even have more powers around the classes and categories of EAs is moving Ontario in the wrong direction.

As a matter of fact, I would strongly encourage government members to look at the written submissions by both Gravel Watch Ontario and the Canadian Environmental Law Association—especially CELA's submission—for a number of changes that would truly modernize the Environmental Assessment Act in a way that starts to enable the province to deal with the climate crisis that we're facing.

We only have to look at British Columbia, as the member from Davenport just mentioned, and also now, tragically, Atlantic Canada, and even many of the flood events we've experienced in Ontario over the last few years to recognize the importance of having a robust environmental assessment process that broadly consults with the people of Ontario.

I would conclude by saying that the fast-tracking of the environmental assessment process in previous legislation, which will be further enhanced with this change, has also raised significant concerns, not only about broad public consultation, but about the government fulfilling its constitutional obligation to consult with Indigenous nations. First Nations have raised the concern in the courts and publicly.

So I strongly recommend voting against this schedule, and I will request a recorded vote.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I want to echo the concerns raised by my colleagues. I just can't believe that the government at this time, when BC is a disaster zone because of climate change, when Atlantic Canada is now facing this, when just in northwest Ontario last year we had a record number of over 1,000 forest fires—we are in the midst of climate change right now and we are starting to feel the environmental impacts of that. And yet, this government has brought forward a schedule in this bill that would allow the minister to override the need for environmental assessments on some construction projects. It's wrong for the government to be doing that, because it's setting us up for future disasters.

We've seen that this government's track record on environmental protection is absolutely appalling. They've gutted the Endangered Species Act. They've already, with Bill 197, increased the minister's power to override environmental assessments. They have been found by the courts to be in breach of the Environmental Bill of Rights

of the people of Ontario. And the Indigenous communities are taking this government to court because they have overridden their environmental rights as well. So this is just wrong.

Future generations will look back on what this government is doing to our environment just as we are launching into horrific climate change and extreme weather events. This government keeps gutting the environmental protections that are in place. They call it cutting red tape, but what they're really doing is endangering future generations and endangering the people of this province by overriding these environmental protections and overriding the Environmental Bill of Rights.

I hope the government members will look at your constituents, look at your children and your grandchildren and think that you need to be making laws that will actually serve future generations. Further weakening the Environmental Assessment Act is not serving future generations.

I hope the government members and all members of this committee will vote against this schedule—and again, recorded vote.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Bourgouin.

**Mr. Guy Bourgouin:** I want to echo MPP Glover. In Ontario, when we look at the northern communities, every year—every year—Kashechewan is faced with having to evacuate because of the global climate, because the thaw is more and more evident. If we water down the environmental assessment even more, we will see other communities facing the same—and we're seeing other communities also facing that. We've seen the fires in Kiiwetinoong. We've seen, like I said, in Kashechewan, the evacuation that they see every year. It's irresponsible to continue in that vein.

C'est irresponsable de continuer dans cette veine-là quand on sait que donner du pouvoir suprême à un ministre, c'est inacceptable. On voit les effets que cela a dans notre province, puis on continue à donner plus de pouvoir puis essayer d'éroder les évaluations environnementales. Je pense qu'on a une responsabilité, puis je demande au comité de voter contre cette section-là, l'annexe 10.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** First of all, I just want to confirm that I think MPP Schreiner requested a recorded vote. So I want to make sure we are getting a recorded vote.

Secondly, listening to my colleagues speak, coming out of a couple of months when people have been very focused both on the challenge that world leaders were facing in Edinburgh—and that I think, generally, many would consider ultimately failed—and thinking about the recent Auditor General's report, which found this government to be completely ignoring the requirement for public transparency, undermining environmental assessments, I really want to plead with the government members to consider not supporting this schedule.

There aren't many opportunities that we get, I will say, as legislators, to do something truly historic. If we could

agree on how the weakening of the Environmental Bill of Rights and the environmental assessment process could potentially and will harm our environment and take us backward, I think we'd be sending a really important message, especially to our children, to the youth of this province, who feel so strongly and who are going to be the ones cleaning up this mess and suffering the consequences of it. And it's not happening 20 years from now or 30 years from now; it's happening now.

I also just want to say, because we often don't say it enough, that I'm very proud, as a New Democrat, of the Environmental Bill of Rights. It was brought in by an NDP government. I was working for that government at the time. It was an extraordinarily proud moment for me personally and a proud moment for many Ontarians. We've seen government after government attempt to weaken it over and over again.

**1000**

I know that the members here may not see this particular schedule and these changes as particularly significant. But with every tiny change you make, every time you weaken those laws, you send us backwards by decades, by generations, and we cannot afford it. If we're going to actually impact and take real, significant climate action in Canada, Ontario has to be at the table, and we are not there. We are stepping backwards, not forward.

So I would really encourage the government members to vote against this schedule. And if they can't vote against it, I would encourage them to speak to it, because I would really like to try to understand where they're coming from.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I just wanted to add a couple of more points and get them on the record.

I was at a Don't Mess with the Don—the Don Valley river cleanup—meeting on the weekend, and they're deeply concerned that Metrolinx is planning on building a workstation for railways for the new Ontario Line in the ravine of the Don Valley. My concern is that this schedule would allow the minister to either weaken or even eliminate the need for an environmental assessment for a construction project like that, that's on a ravine.

The reason that we have the ravines in Toronto is because of Hurricane Hazel. In 1954, Hurricane Hazel swept across the lake into southern Ontario. There were 82 people who were killed in the Humber River area of Etobicoke. The houses were literally floating down the river. This is why they've strengthened the ravines and we are not allowed to build on the ravines.

This government has already stripped conservation authorities of their power to protect flood plains like the Don Valley, like the Humber River, like all of the ravines that we have that keep us protected from flooding events.

We saw just, three years ago, floods along the Toronto waterfront—and not just along the Toronto waterfront, but across the Great Lakes, there were floods. In my riding of Spadina-Fort York, there are condos that are built close to the water's edge. The lake was so high that during a storm, the thing that protected the front lobbies of those condos was the six-inch curb of the road. The water was washing

up against the curb of the road. If it had gone over that curb, it would have been washing directly into the lobbies of some of those condos in Spadina–Fort York.

For this government to be taking a measure at this point that further weakens environmental protections and undermines the Environmental Bill of Rights of the people of Ontario is just wrong. So please, please, vote against this.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Stiles.

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I wasn't going to speak again, but I think the silence of the government members on this schedule is deafening and shocking, actually. We're making some pretty serious accusations here, and I'm really surprised that the government members don't want to at least respond.

I want to share one little thing that I picked up in the Provincial Auditor's report that I thought was really interesting and unfortunate and gives, I think, some other little test—and I appreciate MPP Glover's examples and MPP Bourgouin's examples that were shared, which also draw a picture of where we are going wrong and where we will go much deeper into degrading our environment. One of the Provincial Auditor's findings was that since 2009—and this is, of course, going deep into the previous Liberal government's time as well—the number of approvals that the province has given to projects that would harm endangered species has gone up by—hold onto your seats—6,262%. It's unimaginable. The permits that have been approved when concerns have been raised about protecting and recovering species have gone up 59% over the same time period—and the number of at-risk species has climbed by 22%. In fact, the environment ministry has never denied a permit to harm an at-risk species. The ministry also doesn't do any inspections to ensure companies abide by the conditions of their approvals, nor does it assess the cumulative effects of development. There's a ton of examples.

Once again, this change, this continued weakening of the Environmental Bill of Rights and the environmental assessment process, is absolutely unforgivable. I think what this government is doing is unforgivable.

I know that you like to talk about climate action; I hear you. I'm sure you don't want to be perceived in this way. Please at least explain to us—put it on the record—why you support this schedule and why you're ignoring the findings of those reports and why you're ignoring all those young people who are saying to you, to all of us, "Do better. Step forward."

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 10 carry?

#### Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

#### Nays

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 10 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 11. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 11, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 11, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 11, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 11 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 11 carry? Those in favour, raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 11 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 12. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 10. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 12, sections 1 through to 10? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 12, sections 1 through 10, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 12, sections 1 through to 10, carried.

We are now considering 12 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 12 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 12 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 13. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 13, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 13, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 13, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 13 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 13 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 13 carried.

#### 1010

We are now moving on to schedule 14. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 6. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 14, sections 1 through 6? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 14, sections 1 through 6, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 14, sections 1 through 6, carried.

We will now consider schedule 14 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 14 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 14 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 15. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 12. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 15, sections 1 through 12? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 15, sections 1 through 12, carry? Those in favour, raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 15, sections 1 through 12, carried.

We are now going to consider schedule 15 as a whole. Is there any debate on schedule 15? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 15 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 15 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 16. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 16, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 16, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 16, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 16 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 16 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 16 carried.

We will now move on to schedule 17. For sections 1 and 2, there are no amendments. Therefore, I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 17, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, sections 1 and 2, carried.

Committee members, I propose we take a short 10-minute recess. We will meet promptly at 10:25. Thank you.

*The committee recessed from 1015 to 1025.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** The Standing Committee on General Government will now come to order. We will resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 13, An Act to amend various Acts. We left off on schedule 17. We are now moving on to consider section 3 of schedule 17.

I believe we have a government motion. MPP Sabawy.

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** I move that section 3 of schedule 17 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 14(6) of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996, and substituting the following:

“Use of title

“(6) No person except a member of the college in good standing shall use the English title ‘Ontario Certified Teacher’ or the French title ‘Enseignant(e) agréé(e) de l’Ontario’ or an abbreviation of any of those titles to describe themselves or their profession.

“Good standing

“(6.1) For the purposes of subsection (6), a person’s membership in the college is in good standing if the member has paid their annual membership fee and holds a valid certificate of qualification and registration that is not revoked, suspended, or cancelled.

“Use of title, inactive/non-practising

“(6.2) No person except a member of the college whose certificate of qualification and registration has been suspended solely for the reason described in clause 24(1)(a) shall use the English title ‘Ontario Certified Teacher—Inactive/Non-Practising’ or the French title ‘Enseignant(e) agréé(e) de l’Ontario—Membre inactif’ or an abbreviation of any of those titles to describe themselves or their profession.”

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Is there any debate? MPP Stiles?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I think, by my count, this schedule is the third time that the government has tinkered with the Ontario College of Teachers since they were elected in 2018. I’ve been watching this carefully because, obviously, I’m the education critic for the opposition, but I find it very interesting that the government keeps coming back to it, further reducing the size etc. It’s really confounding. It’s not as if there isn’t some understanding out there, I think, among everyone, including members of the profession, that there are changes that are needed at the Ontario College of Teachers. But it is confounding that the government continues to make more and more changes, and it’s confusing why they didn’t get it right the first time.

What concerns me particularly about this part of the schedule is that, if you look at it on the surface, this looks like the government is trying to ensure that members of the profession—that their title is somehow protected, but what it is actually also doing is kind of policing members of the profession. What’s concerning to me is just simply that, having spoken to all of the teachers’ federations, this government didn’t consult in any way with the members of the profession themselves and their representatives before coming up with these changes.

We know all too well, given past actions, that this government doesn’t have a lot of respect for the profession. But to me, going in and tinkering with things like this and not understanding the full implications, because you haven’t taken the time and shown the respect to the profession to actually consult with their representatives, is appalling.

This is one of the many reasons why we will be voting against the entire schedule in this bill.

Again, it’s confounding that the government continues to make these little changes and yet, still, in all the years they’ve been elected now, haven’t taken the time to show the members of the profession the respect to ask their opinion about changes like this.

**1030**

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate?

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** For the respected member in the opposition: I think it’s not appropriate to assume that the government doesn’t have respect for the profession. I think this is not the right context for what we are trying to do here. I think this clause is already there in every profession—engineering or doctors or any other profession. I don’t see why we are trying to read between the lines versus looking into the exact wording of the bill.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** The other professions are self-regulating.

When the College of Teachers was established, the royal commission that recommended the establishment of the College of Teachers said that the College of Teachers “should be responsible for determining professional standards, certification, and accreditation of teacher education programs. Professional educators should form a majority of the membership of the college, with substantial representation of non-educators from the community at large.” The royal commission that recommended the establishment of the College of Teachers back in 1994 recommended that teachers have the majority of the seats, that it be a self-regulating profession, just like the engineers, like the doctors, like the nurses are.

The member from the governing party has said that we shouldn’t assume that the government doesn’t like or disrespects teachers, but I think that the government’s making changes to the College of Teachers without consulting with the profession is disrespectful—the process that you’ve come to do this, and that you are weakening the power. You’ve already passed another bill that makes the College of Teachers non-democratic; it’s not an elected body anymore. So you’ve taken away the democratic control of the college.

The other change that this is making—and it’s something that the commission was concerned about when they recommended the College of Teachers, was that they wanted this regulatory body to have distance from the provincial government. They didn’t want the provincial government to have direct control over the college. It should be operating at arm’s length from the provincial government. Yet the government now is going to be—the members of the college are going to be appointed.

Every legislative change that this government has made weakens the power of the teachers to regulate their own profession.

The government has shown incredible disrespect to the teachers of this province in moving this legislation and in making this legislation without at least consulting with the teachers so that you understand the implications of what you’re doing. And it is a differentiated response with the other professions in this province.

I would highly recommend that the government members and all members of this committee vote against schedule 17.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? We are voting now on government motion—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** MPP Glover, go ahead. I see you wanted to say something.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** Recorded vote, please.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** We will have a recorded vote.

We are now voting on government motion number 2. Shall government motion number 2 carry?

**Ayes**

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**Nays**

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare the motion carried.

We are now going to consider schedule 17, section 3, as amended. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, section 3, as amended, carry?

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Oh, sorry, MPP Glover. Go ahead.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** Recorded vote, please.

**Ayes**

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**Nays**

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 17, section 3, as amended, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 17, sections 4 and 5. There are no proposed amendments, so let’s bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Any debate on schedule 17, sections 4 and 5? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, sections 4 and 5, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, sections 4 and 5, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 17, section 6. We have a motion from the government. MPP Sabawy?

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** I move that section 6 of schedule 17 to the bill be amended by adding “(6.2)” after “subsection 16(6)” in section 49.1—

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Sorry, MPP Sabawy. Can you read that once again, starting with “after”?

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** —after “subsection 14(6)” in section 49.1 of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of motion number 3, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare the motion carried.

We are now considering schedule 17, section 6, as amended. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, section 6, as amended, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, section 6, as amended, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 17, section 6.1. We have a government motion. MPP Sabawy?

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** I move that schedule 17 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“6.1 Clauses 66(5)(a) and (b) of the act are amended by striking out ‘nine’ wherever it appears and substituting in each case ‘six’.”

1040

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order because it seeks to amend a section of the parent act that is not before the committee. As Bosc and Gagnon noted on page 771 of the third edition of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, “An amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill.”

MPP Sabawy?

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** I seek unanimous consent to consider the motion.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Do we have unanimous consent to consider this motion? Yes? We will therefore consider this motion.

Is there any debate on the motion? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of government motion number 4, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare the motion carried.

We will now consider schedule 17, section 6.1, as amended. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, section 6.1, as amended, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, section 6.1, as amended, carried.

We will now consider schedule 17, section 7. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, section 7, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, section 7, carried.

We are now going to consider schedule 17 as a whole, as amended. Is there any debate? MPP Stiles?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** You’ll notice that the opposition NDP have recommended voting against schedule 17 in this bill. I think we’ve already explained a little bit some of our concerns around the schedule, and MPP Glover made some really important comments with regard to how the profession of teaching is treated in comparison to other professions that are also self-regulating.

Once again, what we’ve seen are significant changes over the last three years to the Ontario College of Teachers without actual consultation with the federations that represent those teachers, without consultation with the teachers themselves—the members of the profession—and the weakening of the college with respect to the number of members of the profession who sit on the college. There are important conversations, of course, to always be having about how these bodies operate. But again, we’re continuing to see the government’s disrespectful approach to the teaching profession, and it’s reflected here in schedule 17.

We’ve heard, of course, in the course of these committee hearings, from members of the profession who had deep concerns about many of these changes.

So we’re hoping that the government members will vote with us in opposition to this schedule. Go back to the drawing board and talk to the teaching professionals about what they’d like to see go on here, and maybe it will be better legislation in the end.

It also speaks to the fact that we’re continuing to see these omnibus bills presented by this government—we saw it with the previous Liberal government—where you’re lumping together so many different issues that have absolutely nothing to do with one another. It really takes away from the opportunity that these committee hearings, for one, present, where you could actually have a more fulsome conversation about why these changes matter, and more careful consideration.

I’m a big supporter of the government listening to what people say in the committee and thinking about the legislation and making amendments. I’m glad they may have caught a few things that were incorrect or that they didn’t intend. But it speaks, as well, to the lack of actual thought and consideration given in this legislation that they have to keep coming back and tinkering with the College of Teachers again and again every year. We’re seeing once again that this government has refused to engage the members of the profession, who could actually give really important advice and perspective on how to make this regulatory body more effective and efficient.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Ontario Greens recommend voting against this schedule.

I think we need to make it clear to the public and have it on the record that this schedule, combined with legislation that was passed last year, significantly changes the Ontario teachers’ college and raises questions about whether it’s still a self-governing body, which then has implications for the profession of teaching.

I’m hoping it’s an unintended consequence of this schedule—to, at the end of the day, begin to undermine the quality of education in Ontario, when you start to question the very profession of the professionals who are delivering that education.

Changing the composition of the board, as many deputants said, raises concerns around the diversity of the board—not only gender and racial diversity, but geographical diversity, to ensure that broad sections of the province and various diverse voices are at the table regulating the profession. Previous changes have undermined the democracy and democratic selection of the college board members. And some of the changes outlined in this schedule around who can hold positions in the college in relation to participation in the federations raise some serious concerns around who would actually be even eligible to serve on the governing council.

In particular, we heard that members who may hold a provincial or even a higher local position within the federation—not only would those folks be excluded from



being on the governing council for a number of years, but people who are serving on federation committees just within their local school could be excluded from being eligible to serve on the governing council.

These are really significant changes that could affect the quality of education in this province, and they certainly will affect the way in which the profession is governed. I think they require a more robust debate, consultation, participation of voices at the table to make sure we get this right, because we know how critically important quality education is to the success of our province, to the quality of life in our province, to our economy. We certainly want to make sure that we maintain a world-class profession of teachers in this province. Anything that begins to undermine that is something I will oppose.

It's one of the reasons I will be voting against this schedule, and I recommend all members to vote against it.

And I would request a recorded vote on this schedule, Chair.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** This schedule is a small piece in a larger direction of the government that got me into the position where I am.

1050

In the early 2000s, my kids were in elementary school, and the Conservative government of the day was making such egregious cuts to my children's school that—I was the co-chair of the school council, and every month, we were dealing with another cut to my kids' school council. They were going to cancel the kindergarten gym class. They closed our art room. They were going to cancel the daytime custodian in an elementary school with 500 kids. It was absolute insanity what they were doing, and it led me to get involved in a parents' group. I eventually ran for trustee, and now I'm an MPP.

The thing is, I'm still fighting cuts to education. This government has made a number of cuts to education in its first three and a half years. We fought against some cuts, and we were able to prevent this government from making even more cuts.

What this particular schedule does is, it undermines the arm's-length relationship between the government and the College of Teachers, which is to be a self-regulating profession. Part of this is that if you are a member of a federation committee, you are ineligible to sit on the College of Teachers.

They've also reduced the number from 18 to 12. I heard my colleague from the Green Party talk about the diversity of this province. This province is enormous. There are a million square kilometres. You can fit the countries of France, Germany and the United Kingdom all in the map of Ontario. To have 12 members to represent that incredible geographical diversity is wrong. Also, we are the most diverse country and province in the world, and we need to have diversity representing the different cultural and racial groups, and make sure that we have gender parity on this board.

The makeup of the board is being weakened, the government is taking more control, and my fear is that—20 years ago, when I was fighting against the previous Conservative government's cuts to education and then, following that, the Liberal government's cuts to education, what I learned at the time was that this was part of a global movement to privatize public education. At the time, the Conservative government had underfunded—according to their own review, the Rozanski commission—our public and Catholic schools by \$1.2 billion, and it created a private school tax credit that would have cost \$700 million. So they're directly transferring public funds from the public and Catholic schools to the private schools. This was a privatization agenda, and weakening an independent body like the College of Teachers would also serve that privatization agenda, and that deeply concerns me. I hope that's not the goal of this government.

But the government is acting and undermining the independence from the government service of the College of Teachers, and they haven't given a rationale for doing it. They haven't consulted with the teaching profession, the teachers of this province, in making this amendment.

So I would strongly recommend that the government members vote against schedule 17.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, as amended, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 17, as amended, carried.

MPP Schreiner?

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I believe I requested a recorded vote, and that didn't appear to be a recorded vote.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** My apologies. We will redo that vote. Thank you for the reminder.

We will have a recorded vote on schedule 17, as amended.

### Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

### Nays

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare schedule 17, as amended, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 18. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 18, sections 1, 2 or 3? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 18, sections 1 through to 3, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 18, sections 1, 2 and 3, carried.

We will now consider schedule 18 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 18 carry? Those in favour, please raise your

hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 18 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 19. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 4. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 19, sections 1 to 4? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 19, sections 1 through 4, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 19, sections 1 through to 4, carried.

We will now consider schedule 19 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 19, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 19 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 20, section 1. We have an independent motion. MPP Schreiner?

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I move that section 1 of schedule 20 to the bill be amended by striking out the definition of “volunteer” in subsection 1(1) of the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015, and substituting the following:

“‘volunteer’ means an individual who,

“(a) performs services for,

“(i) a body corporate without share capital that is constituted and operated for the benefit of the public,

“(ii) the public service of Ontario within the meaning of the Public Service of Ontario Act, 2006,

“(iii) a broader public sector organization within the meaning of the Broader Public Sector Accountability Act, 2010,

“(iv) the crown in right of Canada, or

“(v) a band within the meaning of the Indian Act (Canada),

“(b) does not receive, in respect of those services,

“(i) compensation, other than reasonable reimbursement or allowance for expenses actually incurred, or

“(ii) money or any other thing of value in lieu of compensation in excess of \$500 per year,

“(c) is motivated to perform the services for civic, charitable or humanitarian reasons, and

“(d) is not receiving academic or training credit for performing the services or performing the services to fulfil a sentence requirement; (‘bénévole’)”

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Any debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I want to be clear with schedule 20, in the spirit of non-partisanship. I think schedule 20 is a step in the right direction, and I’ve proposed a couple of amendments, I believe, to improve the schedule. But I also want to be clear to folks that I think the spirit of schedule 20 is a positive one.

**1100**

The reason I’ve moved this amendment is, I felt that the Ontario Nonprofit Network and others, including the PIN network, came to committee with concerns around the definition of “volunteer” in the schedule. Both of those organizations made it very clear that they’re broadly supportive of the schedule, with a couple of changes that I’ve brought forward amendments to make.

One of the reasons I think it’s really important to get the definition of “volunteer” right in this schedule is that according to the ONN—and I tried to do my own research to verify this as well—it does not appear that “volunteer” is actually defined anywhere else in legislation. So this particular schedule could provide an important precedent for how a volunteer is defined. And that could have some potential unintended consequences, particularly around whether somebody “volunteering” for a for-profit, private corporation is misclassified or not. So to make sure that we have a robust definition of a volunteer, to make it clear that somebody is volunteering for a not-for-profit, a public institution, a civic organization etc., I thought that was important.

Two, the Ontario Nonprofit Network made a pretty compelling case that, especially when it comes to police record checks, having a standardized definition of a volunteer, as much as possible, across the country is important. Nova Scotia has defined what a volunteer is. This amendment is really modelled after what Nova Scotia has proposed. It’s also modelled after a BC Employment Standards Tribunal decision where legal scholars said it should be made very clear that the definition of a volunteer is not only that it’s unpaid work, but that the work is an act of altruism with the primary motivation supporting civic, charitable or humanitarian reasons, carried out [*inaudible*] activities for a non-profit organization. So that’s what this amendment seeks to do, which I think is completely in compliance with the spirit of what the government has proposed with the schedule.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote on independent motion 5?

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Can I request a recorded vote?

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** We will have a recorded vote.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** Thank you, Chair.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** You are most welcome.

**Ayes**

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**Nays**

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare the motion lost.

We will now consider schedule 20, section 1. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 20, section 1, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 20, section 1, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 20, section 2. We have an NDP motion, number 6. MPP Bourgouin?

**M. Guy Bourgouin:** Merci, Madame Chair. C’est Bourgouin, mais c’est correct. Ce n’est pas la première

fois. Ce n'est pas la première fois, puis souvent je fais les mêmes erreurs que vous, ce qui fait que ne vous sentez pas mal dans cette situation.

I move that section 2 of schedule 20 to the bill be amended by striking out “paragraph 1 or 2 of” in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 7(6) of the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015.

I would like to have a recorded vote on this, Madam Chair.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** We will have a recorded vote, but before we do that, is there any debate? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I'll let my colleague go first. He had his hand up when he introduced the motion.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Okay. MPP Bourgouin.

**M. Guy Bourgouin:** Vous savez comment c'est important, le volontaire. Cette motion, c'était demandé par les « non-profit networks. » This amendment will allow for vulnerable sector checks to be added to the list of the police record checks that will be covered free of charge.

Comme je le mentionnais, le volontaire est difficile à trouver. Le volontaire aujourd'hui n'est plus ce qu'il était. C'est important qu'on couvre les coûts pour être capable d'aller chercher—parce qu'il y a bien des organismes à but non lucratif qui n'ont pas les finances pour payer pour les volontaires. C'est pour ça que cette section est importante, qu'on fasse certain que leurs dépenses pour payer pour leurs volontaires, pour les « record checks », soient couvertes, car ces organismes-là en ont besoin. Puis quand ils trouvent les volontaires, ils veulent les garder. Je peux vous dire que dans les petites communautés—je pense à des petites communautés comme Opasatika, des petites communautés de populations de 1 000, 800 ou 700—ce n'est pas évident d'aller chercher des volontaires, puis quand on peut les aider de n'importe quelle façon, c'est important.

C'est pour ça que je demande au gouvernement de supporter cette motion, parce que les communautés ont besoin de leurs volontaires et on a besoin de les aider de toutes les manières qu'on peut. C'est une bonne manière de le faire. C'est pour ça que je demande au gouvernement de supporter cette motion.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Merci beaucoup. MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** I want to speak in favour of this amendment to the bill, because the Ontario Nonprofit Network came to us and asked for this change to be made. Currently, the bill would allow for schedule 1 and 2 volunteers to be exempt from paying fees in order to get their police record check, but not section 3. So this one removes the language around 1 and 2 and allows all volunteers to be allowed to get their police record check free of charge.

When the Police Record Checks Reform Act was introduced in 2015, I was on the Toronto District School Board, and I was the co-chair of a group called the communities and schools advisory committee. We had representation, volunteer organizations from across the

city that permitted space in the 600 public schools in the TDSB. They included volunteer symphony orchestras and sports organizations for kids. When they brought in this Police Record Checks Reform Act, it caused these agencies some problems, because it's not a set fee for getting a police record check done—it can vary between \$5 and \$60—and it can take anywhere up to three months.

There needs to be some standardization across the province around this so that getting the police record check is not a barrier to people volunteering. We're so fortunate in this province to have so many people volunteering to support and build our communities, and we need to support them by making this amendment so that all of the volunteers can get their police record check free of charge. So I'm asking all members to support the amendment that's on the table.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Schreiner.

1110

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I've put forward the exact same amendment, so I will speak to it through debate on this particular amendment.

I just want to begin by saying how much I deeply appreciate the role the non-profit sector plays in our communities, especially over the last 20 months, during the pandemic. It has been an incredibly challenging time for non-profits, as their number of volunteers has dropped by 61% because of people's obvious concerns around the spread of COVID-19. But the demand on many non-profits, particularly those non-profits that serve our most vulnerable, has gone up substantially. Non-profits have gone above and beyond the call of duty to really help meet the needs of people struggling in our communities.

Prior to the pandemic, there were 58,000 non-profits in Ontario that employed over 600,000 people and engaged 5.2 million Ontarians in volunteer activities, contributing \$50 billion to Ontario's GDP, and operating with about half of their income coming from non-government sources. It's a huge contribution to our province, which is one of the reasons I supported MPP Wai's bill to appreciate and acknowledge non-profits. I think we have an opportunity today, with this particular amendment, to really provide some critical support to non-profits.

The non-profit sector has been asking for a \$680-million stabilization fund to help get through the pandemic. In the absence of those funds being available, non-profits are struggling to do the best job they can.

I know non-profits absolutely appreciate the government making level 1 and 2 police record checks free of charge. Nobody is arguing that that's not a good thing. But the reality is that for non-profits across Ontario as a whole, that only covers about 20% of the police record checks. For the PIN network, who came to committee, it's even less; it's only about 10% of their police record checks. Expanding this to cover level 3 vulnerable sector checks would really cover off police record checks for all volunteers. While it wouldn't be the \$680-million stabilization fund—it wouldn't even come close to that—it would be of

significant benefit in cost savings for non-profits. It would help remove a barrier to people agreeing to volunteer.

I think this is a really important amendment to strengthen the volunteer sector that does so much for our communities, so I will be supporting this amendment.

I'd like to request a recorded vote on the amendment, and I encourage all my colleagues—I know that support for the volunteer sector crosses all party lines, and here's a really important moment for the Legislature to show our support and appreciation for non-profits.

I know when I asked the minister about this there were concerns about the costs and burden on police services. I thought the PIN network, in particular, gave really compelling testimony to committee about some ways in which the non-profit sector in Guelph and Wellington—my riding and region of the province—have worked with police services to clarify for the non-profit sector those volunteers who truly need a level 3 check and those who don't, to help minimize costs and pressure on police services. I think that's a model that we can apply across the province to make the whole volunteer sector check experience more efficient, and it would obviously lower the costs.

So let's support this amendment, and let's look at ways that we can take additional measures to make the process more efficient and effective.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? MPP Stiles?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** First of all, I will be supporting, of course, this motion by my colleague to make this really important amendment, and I'm glad to hear so much support from the opposition, and also the independent. Thank you very much.

I know all of us here—government members, opposition—truly appreciate the role of the non-profit sector. I think we can also all agree that, particularly over the last two years during this terrible pandemic, it is the non-profit sector that stepped up to such an extraordinary extent but has also taken an enormous hit in terms of their ability to fundraise, in terms of their ability to just continue the work they do. It has been an extremely great trial for many non-profits and the volunteer sector overall. I think this amendment to the legislation would remove very significant obstacles. We cannot underestimate the obstacle that this presents to, often, small non-profits. This amendment would reduce costs that are often significant for non-profits and would overall help strengthen our volunteer sector.

I would really encourage the government members to support this amendment; I know you want to. I know that you want to find ways to support the voluntary sector. So if you can't for some reason support this amendment, please explain a little bit about why so we can try to find solutions together to move forward. I think this is something that we should be looking at together as an improvement that we could all make and would all agree to. So if you can't, I'm really hoping the government members will go on record to explain why not.

I know that the MPP for Richmond Hill has legislation to appreciate the voluntary sector, the non-profit sector, and I think, again, we all support that legislation, and it's

wonderful to have a week of appreciation for the sector. In addition to that, we need to put our money where our mouth is, so to speak. We need to find ways that we can make little amendments, make changes, that will actually benefit the sector. This is one that I think we can all, again, agree on in principle.

If government members can't support this exact amendment—if they could explain why not, so that we can continue to work together to try to come up with some solutions, that would benefit everyone.

Again, I'm hoping that the members of the government will explain a little bit about or speak to this amendment at all. It would be really great. I'm also really encouraging everyone to vote in support.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? We will have a recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

### Nays

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare the motion lost.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Do you have a point of order, MPP Stiles?

**Ms. Marit Stiles:** I do. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm baffled why none of the government members would speak to that amendment. I really would appreciate, again, if the members from the government would just explain, for the record, to the non-profit sector and to all those volunteers why they wouldn't support this amendment.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I'm sorry, but that is not a valid point of order.

We will now be moving on to the independent motion for section 2 of schedule 20. MPP Schreiner, go ahead.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I move that section 2 of schedule 20 to the bill be amended by striking out "is of a type set out in paragraph 1 or 2 of subsection 8(1) and the check" in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 7(6) of the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015.

1120

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Is there any debate? MPP Schreiner.

**Mr. Mike Schreiner:** I don't want to re-litigate this particular motion, and typically I withdraw motions that have been already defeated, but since this one was short and I think supporting the non-profit volunteer sector is so, so important, and this just seems like such a small way to do it, I wanted to give all members an opportunity to speak on this amendment. I certainly don't want to guess how you are going to vote on the amendment or presume how

you're going to vote on the amendment—but to give everyone an opportunity to, once again, vote for it.

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

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** We will have a recorded vote.

Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

### Ayes

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

### Nays

Bailey, Harris, Hogarth, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare the motion lost.

We will now consider schedule 20, section 2. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 20, section 2, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 20, section 2, carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 20, sections 3 through 5. We do not have any amendments to sections 3 to 5, so I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate on schedule 20, sections 3, 4 or 5? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 20, sections 3 through 5, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 20, sections 3, 4 and 5, carried.

We will now consider schedule 20 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall section 20 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 20 carried.

I see we have MPP Bouma joining us this morning. Please state your name and that you are indeed in Ontario.

**Mr. Will Bouma:** I am indeed MPP Bouma, and I am in my home in St. George, Ontario.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Thank you very much.

We are now considering schedule 21, Professional Foresters Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 4, and I therefore propose we bundle them together. Agree? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 21, sections 1, 2, 3 or 4? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 21, sections 1 through 4, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 21, sections 1 through 4, carried.

We will now consider schedule 21 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 21 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 21 carried.

We are now moving on schedule 22, Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act. There are no amendments

to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 22, sections 1 and 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 22, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 22 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 22 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 22 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 23, Public Lands Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 17. I therefore propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 23, sections 1 through to 17? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 23, sections 1 through to 17, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 23, sections 1 through 17, carried.

We will now consider schedule 23 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 23 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 23 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 24, Toronto Atmospheric Fund Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them together. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate on schedule 24, sections 1 or 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 24, sections 1 and 2, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 24, sections 1 and 2, carried.

We will now consider schedule 24 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour of schedule 24, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 24 carried.

We are now moving on to schedule 25, Water Opportunities Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 3. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Is there any debate to schedule 25, sections 1, 2 or 3? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 25, sections 1, 2 and 3, carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 25, sections 1, 2 and 3, carried.

We will now consider schedule 25 as a whole. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare schedule 25 carried.

We will now go back to consider sections 1, 2 and 3 of the bill.

Is there any debate on section 1? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall section 1 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare section 1 carried.

### 1130

We are now considering section 2. Is there any debate on section 2? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall section 2 carry? Those in favour, please raise your

hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare section 2 carried.

We are now moving on to section 3. Is there any debate on section 3? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall section 3 carry? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare section 3 carried.

We will now consider the title of the bill. Is there any debate on the title of the bill? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare the title of the bill carried.

Is there any debate on the whole bill, Bill 13, as amended? MPP Glover.

**Mr. Chris Glover:** There are 25 schedules in this bill, and it's another omnibus bill from the government. Omnibus bills are very difficult. They present a challenge to our democratic system. You've got 25 very different pieces of legislation all bundled into one. When we were listening to the deputants last week, they were coming from completely different areas. Some were about education, and then the next deputant would be talking about the environment. It's hard for them to understand why they're in the same room at the same time.

There are a number of missed opportunities with this bill and a few things in this bill that are very troubling. One is schedule 2. We had the opportunity to accept the amendment brought forward by my colleague MPP Stiles that would have given municipalities the power to plan for the location of cannabis retailers by incorporating basically the gist of her Bill 29, which already has the support of city council. Unfortunately, the government side voted that down, and they didn't explain why they voted that down.

Schedule 8 of this bill creates potential conflicts of interest for supervisory officers of school boards. At the same time, later in the same bill, the government is prohibiting members of teacher federation committees from sitting on the College of Teachers. On the one hand, the government is saying that if you're a supervisory officer in a school board, you could have another job or profession, and potentially, that job could be selling educational products from the private sector to the school board, or you could have a job selling educational products to the public, in competition with the public or Catholic board, with our publicly funded schools. That is an issue. At the same time, they do not want the federations to have a say in the running of the college or for any teacher who sits on the committee of the federation to actually sit on the College of Teachers.

I'll go back to what I said earlier. My biggest concern, and one of my biggest fights over the last 20 years, is to make sure that our publicly funded schools remain public. There has been a movement, not just in Canada but in the

United States, in the UK and across the world, to privatize our education systems.

These two measures, taken jointly, look like they could open up our publicly funded schools to privatization. So I'm deeply, deeply concerned about those.

The other schedule in here around education undermines the College of Teachers' independence from the government, because instead of being democratically elected by the members of the college, it will be now that all of those members are appointed, and it reduces the number of that membership from 18 to 12. It's one more step in undermining the independence of the College of Teachers.

So from an education perspective, this bill has many, many troubling aspects.

The other aspect that's troubling in this bill is the environmental aspect, which gives the minister the power to override the need for environmental assessments on construction projects. We spoke about that in some detail during the debate on the bill. During this time, when climate change is becoming more and more real; when our headlines over the last 10 days have been about floods in British Columbia and about some flooding happening now in Atlantic Canada; when we have experienced first-hand during this term of this government tornadoes in Ottawa, floods along the Great Lakes and record forest fires two years out of the last four across this province—climate change is real, and yet this government is passing legislation that further undermines the environmental protections for future generations.

There are so many troubling aspects to this bill that we in the opposition will be voting against the bill. And I would ask for a recorded vote.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

#### Ayes

Bailey, Bouma, Harris, Sabawy, Sandhu, Wai.

#### Nays

Bourgouin, Glover, Schreiner, Stiles.

**The Acting Chair (Ms. Natalia Kusendova):** I declare Bill 13, as amended, carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Those in favour, please raise your hand. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I shall report the bill, as amended, to the House.

There being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned. Thank you to all members for your participation, and all of our staff as well. Have a wonderful weekend, everyone. Stay safe.

*The committee adjourned at 1136.*



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

**Chair / Président**

Mr. Logan Kanapathi (Markham–Thornhill 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. Will Bouma (Brantford–Brant PC)  
Mr. Guy Bourgoïn (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)  
Mr. Chris Glover (Spadina–Fort York ND)  
Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)  
Mr. Logan Kanapathi (Markham–Thornhill 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. Christine Hogarth (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)  
Ms. Natalia Kusendova (Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre PC)  
Ms. Marit Stiles (Davenport ND)

**Clerk / Greffier**

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

**Staff / Personnel**

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel