

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

HE-12

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

HE-12

**Standing Committee
on Heritage, Infrastructure
and Cultural Policy**

More Homes Built Faster
Act, 2022

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Monday 21 November 2022

**Comité permanent du
patrimoine, de l'infrastructure
et de la culture**

Loi de 2022 visant à accélérer
la construction de plus
de logements

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Lundi 21 novembre 2022

Chair: Laurie Scott
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Présidente : Laurie Scott
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 2816-7252

CONTENTS

Monday 21 November 2022

More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, Bill 23, Mr. Clark / Loi de 2022 visant à accélérer
la construction de plus de logements, projet de loi 23, M. Clark..... HE-249

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE,
INFRASTRUCTURE
AND CULTURAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DU PATRIMOINE,
DE L'INFRASTRUCTURE
ET DE LA CULTURE**

Monday 21 November 2022

Lundi 21 novembre 2022

The committee met at 0901 in committee room 1.

**MORE HOMES BUILT FASTER ACT, 2022
LOI DE 2022 VISANT
À ACCÉLÉRER LA CONSTRUCTION
DE PLUS DE LOGEMENTS**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 23, An Act to amend various statutes, to revoke various regulations and to enact the Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 / Projet de loi 23, Loi modifiant diverses lois, abrogeant divers règlements et édictant la Loi de 2022 visant à soutenir la croissance et la construction de logements dans les régions de York et de Durham.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We are here to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 23, An Act to amend various statutes, to revoke various regulations and to enact the Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022.

We are joined by staff from legislative counsel, Hansard, and broadcast and recording.

Please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak, and as always, all comments should go through the Chair. Are there any questions before we begin? Thank you.

The Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all members and staff electronically. Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill? And, if so, to which section? No? Okay. Thank you. We will now begin clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Bill 23 is comprised of three sections which enact 10 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest we postpone these three sections, in order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement on this? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Can you please explain what that means in practical terms?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): We'll try to get it as succinct as possible. Give us one sec.

In the first part of the bill—do you see that? So there's the three:

- “1. Contents of this act
- “2. Commencement

“3. Short title,” and then it's followed by the 10 schedules.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): What happens is we'll stand down sections 1 to 3, if we're all in agreement—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Oh, yes, sure.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):—and then we deal with the schedules, and then we go back. It's just the order. It makes it flow and it makes sense. All right? Thank you so much.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Crystal clear now. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): It's all technical. Don't worry. There's good guidance here in the Clerks.

Okay. We'll start the flow—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Good morning, everyone.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Morning.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you for your patience here.

Schedule 1, City of Toronto Act, 2006: In schedule 1, section 1, there's amendment 1, NDP motion number 1. MPP Bell, please go ahead.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Good morning, everybody. The first thing I'm going to do is read out the motion, right?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Subsection 111(1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 is repealed and the following substituted:

“Demolition, conversion and repairs and renovation of residential rental properties

“(1) The city may prohibit and regulate,

“(a) the demolition of residential rental properties;

“(b) the conversion of residential rental properties to a purpose other than the purpose of a residential rental property; and

“(c) the repair or renovation of residential rental properties for which the landlord has or will give notice under section 50 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why we are introducing this amendment is because we're very concerned about the impact of schedule 1 on affordable-housing private market rentals in the city of Toronto. These are rentals that are rented

for \$1,000, sometimes \$1,200 a month or less. They are overwhelmingly lived in by people who are on fixed income, on minimum wage, seniors, newcomers—people who are really struggling to live in one of the most expensive cities in North America. It is absolutely critical that the city is given all the powers that it needs to preserve this affordable private market rental stock.

What we are seeing even today is a big transfer of, or a reduction in, affordable private market rentals of \$1,000 or less, and a big increase in luxury rentals that are advertising for \$3,000 or more. I'll give you some specific statistics. Luxury rentals in the last five years in the city of Toronto have gone up 86%, and the number of cheap, affordable private market rentals, \$1,000 or less, have gone down 36%. We are losing our affordable private market rental stock.

We have added an additional amendment here to include properties that are being renovated. The reason is that there has been a sharp rise in illegal renovictions taking place not just in Toronto, but across Ontario, where a landlord will come in and say, "I need to renovate the property, and I'm going to evict you in order to do that." What the renter finds when they walk by the property a year or so later is that the property wasn't renovated at all—or, even if it was, it was a very superficial renovation—and that tenant has lost their rent-controlled apartment for good. They're now living in a more expensive apartment, because that's what happens when you have to move. In some cases—in most cases—the rent for the apartment that has been superficially renovated retails for sometimes double the amount that it used to. That is a shame. If we want our city to remain affordable for people who work in our city, we need to maintain our affordable private market rental stock.

This has precedence. New Westminster, BC, began to regulate renovations and not just demolitions, and the number of illegal evictions that took place in that city plummeted to zero. That's what we want to see. We want to see an end to illegal evictions and illegal renovictions. That is why I'm proposing this amendment here, and I urge you to support it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everybody. I just wanted to add, for the record, the perspective from Ottawa, because we've admired this aspect of Toronto's rental replacement bylaw from our standpoint.

I think members heard loud and clear from some experts who deposed to this committee—Carolyn Whitzman, a housing expert who actually lives in Ottawa Centre; Leilani Farha, who is the UN special rapporteur on housing, who spoke to us and is now working for a group called the Shift—that we have a significant problem where a third of existing rental housing stock is owned by large real estate investment trusts or largely absentee corporate landowners who are letting buildings fall apart infrastructurally and, casually or more forcefully, pushing low-income tenants out of their homes. Without these sorts of rental replacement bylaws, that essentially allows that process to continue.

I'm just reminding my friends in government this morning that we heard this advice at committee. If we vote against an amendment like this, the message we're sending to low-income tenants is that there is absolutely no protection for them when Blackstone or Smart Living, or any of these organizations—Hazelview—that allow buildings to fall apart, put tenants in a precarious position for renovation or a demoviction. I can't remember; one of my colleagues can perhaps remind me of the organization's name. Mr. Irwin, who spoke to us from the perspective of building owners—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Tony Irwin.

0910

Mr. Joel Harden: Mr. Tony Irwin also acknowledged that this is a problem. There is a question over how we would define "renoviction" or "demoviction," but he acknowledged that this was a stain on the industry insofar as we allow building owners, within the laws that we have, to see buildings fall apart, to see tenants pushed out into the context MPP Bell is talking about where rent can double or triple.

So I just want to say loud and clear, from an Ottawa perspective, that I have heard this from tenants. We've had the experience of the Heron Gate eviction, which I talked about at this committee in dialogue with experts, where 400 evictions were issued. We talked about the Manor Village eviction that's currently before us in a community in Barrhaven. I read out the story from Alison Trowbridge, the mom of the seven-year-old who does not want to lose her home, but Smart Living wants to demovict that community, wants to flatten that community. They will not meet with the tenants collectively; they will only meet with people one-on-one.

Not only do we need to protect what the city of Toronto has done, Chair; what we need to do is make sure that low-income tenants have rights that matter. I understand building owners need a margin to continue the viability of their businesses. I understand that. But there's a difference between that and super-margining profits at the expense of low-income people, particularly in an inflation-oriented environment where the cost of living is so high right now. Rent is, of course, for renters, the biggest part of the costs they bear for themselves and their families.

Again, I think this is a non-partisan initiative that MPP Bell has put forward here. We can all agree that the rights of tenants, low-income tenants, should matter; that the city of Toronto has innovated. I believe the chief planner was telling us, MPP Bell, that 5,000 units of housing had been saved since this rental replacement bylaw was brought into place in 2009. That's clearly a good thing.

So what I'm telling my friends in government this morning is that voting against this amendment is voting against that progressive history of saving 5,000 units of affordable housing and voting for Blackstone, voting for Smart Living, voting for these organizations that are acting in a predatory environment against people who do not have lawyers and consultants to defend themselves. I hope this is an amendment we all can agree on today. It would be a great way to begin debate on this bill, to vote in favour of

the rights of low-income tenants and the progressive history of the city of Toronto.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm fully supportive of MPP Bell's amendment on this. It's the right thing to do. It's the smart thing. It's the compassionate thing to do.

Over half of Torontonians are renters. All of us here, I am sure, have been renters at one point in our lives, or maybe still rent. I'm hearing from a lot of Gen Zs that they are looking for affordable rentals—they're not looking for the single-family detached home with the white picket fence—and they want them in an urban setting. I'm just wondering why we would purposely disadvantage a chunk of our residents by not protecting them. We continually support homeowners while we neglect renters, and that's got to change.

Again, I'm supportive, and I hope all of us are.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Holland.

Mr. Kevin Holland: I think we've been pretty clear from the outset of the introduction of this bill: The intention is not to eliminate the municipal bylaws with regard to tenant protections, and the proposal would not remove these protections for tenants. In fact, we've increased the protections in the Residential Tenancies Act in the last little while to provide better protection to renters and to avoid the renovations that are taking place that our members opposite are speaking to.

I don't believe that this motion is going to accomplish the intended position that the opposition is suggesting. It's pretty clear in here that this is not the intent of the bill and that we have provided the protections for the tenants under the RTA. So I won't be supporting this amendment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, MPP Holland. The Ontario government has made a small increase to the amount of money that a tenant can receive if they are evicted in some situations. They included that in a bill that also made it far easier for tenants to be evicted overall.

Another reason why we see to protecting the city of Toronto's rental replacement bylaw is because we do not want to declare open season on renters living in purpose-built rentals. Developers will look at these big purpose-built rentals—I have many of them in my riding: Prince Arthur, St. George, Spadina, Walmer. It's very expensive to rent in my riding, and developers have long eyed purpose-built rentals in my riding with an eye on demolishing them and replacing them with luxury condos.

I have an example in my riding at 145 St. George, where the building is majority seniors, many of them women, who are very concerned about a developer's application to demolish their building and replace it with a luxury condo. Right now, the city has been negotiating with the developer to ensure they keep their right to return to that building once construction is complete and receive some compensation during the time that construction occurs so that they can continue to live in the neighbourhood that they call

home and love. If this bill goes ahead with this schedule, it means these tenants will have no real right to return. They will be forced onto the private market. They will be required to pay upwards of \$2,000 to \$3,000 a month for a one-bedroom apartment. That's what it costs in my riding to rent. They are on a fixed income. They will not be able to afford it. That is extremely concerning.

We also hear this argument that this is necessary in order to maintain and improve the quality of purpose-built rentals to upgrade the housing stock, but that's already required under the Residential Tenancies Act. A landlord is required to maintain their building to a reasonable standard of living. That's already required. So to say that we need to eviscerate tenant protections in order to ensure that a landlord does their job, even though they're already required to do it, doesn't make sense.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I wouldn't want to take away the time from Mr. Harden, but I'm sure we'll hear from him after. Maybe they can point out to us where in the bill we're touching the Residential Tenancies Act. That's not part of this bill that we're putting forward. We have been clear from the outset we're not eliminating bylaws; we actually made changes that better protect tenants in the past, deter renovations and avoid unnecessary evictions. I see this is news to my colleagues on the other side.

When we took action to better protect tenants, let's be clear about who voted for and against that. The PC government was the government that has consistently stood up for tenants' rights, consistently raised fees on bad developers, bad landlords. We're the ones who have the backs of renters.

Frankly, if I may say on behalf of my generation, we worry about open season on the housing market. I'm worried about open season for NIMBY city councillors. We have an important bill here to take on a generational challenge for young families, for new Canadians and for seniors. This bill is going to increase housing supply. This bill is going to increase the fines on bad builders who try to play footsie with people who are buying their pre-construction units. This bill is going to maintain tenant protections.

We've heard it from the testimony. This is a key part of our plan to tackle the housing supply crisis. Is this a silver bullet? Absolutely not. Will we be back here in the spring or the fall next year with additions to this plan, with a new housing supply action plan, the way that we've committed to do every single year for four years? Absolutely.

But I would urge all colleagues—this isn't partisan. The housing supply crisis affects people in University–Rosedale, it affects people in Niagara Centre, it affects people in Ottawa Centre, it affects people in Beaches–East York, but it's really been affecting, as well, people in Brampton North. In my city, in Brampton, we just saw the average housing price go north of \$1 million. We have to take decisive action. That includes action to streamline construction and revitalization of our aging rental stock—again, aging rental stock that in some cases is decades old and very energy-inefficient, which is bad for the climate,

which is bad for the pocketbooks of our renters. We need to take decisive action. We have an opportunity to do that. I certainly urge my colleagues on all sides to take that opportunity and take that decisive action.

0920

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I listened intently to what my friend just said, Chair. What I'll inform the committee of, through you, is that this government just rejected the official plan that the city of Ottawa had proposed. Part of that official plan was modelled on what the city of Toronto is doing with this particular amendment MPP Bell is proposing: a rental replacement bylaw that would actually protect tenants in a case of a renovation or a demoviction where they're being pushed out onto the streets by wealthy multi-property owners, largely absentee landlords.

Again, recalling the testimony of the former UN special rapporteur on housing, Leilani Farha, 30% of the rental housing market that we have in all of our communities is owned by these absentee large-property landlords who are letting housing stock fall into disrepair.

When MPP McGregor says that it's not sustainable on an ecological side to see these buildings fall apart, I would agree that it's not sustainable. But do you know what else is not sustainable, Chair? Watching these large, absentee, multi-property landlords see these housing stocks fall apart and, as was confirmed with deputants here, not abiding by their responsibility to maintain the integrity of these buildings. Where has the action been from this government and previous governments to make sure that organizations like Hazelview, formerly Timbercreek, which owns properties in Heron Gate, were required to maintain those? Where was the government? Absolutely absent—absolutely, patently absent.

The buildings are inefficient because governments have allowed them to become inefficient. I have walked in these units, Chair. I have seen the residents improvising faucet fixtures—key infrastructure in these units—with duct tape, because rich, million-dollar-profit-holding absentee landlords are letting the units fall apart.

The city of Toronto, in 2009, innovated with a rental replacement bylaw to protect tenants and, as I said earlier, saved 5,000 units of housing. What my colleague is saying this morning is that we should just trust amendments to the Residential Tenancies Act to accomplish—somehow, magically—what the city of Toronto has accomplished through precisely this measure. I think people have every reason to be skeptical about what the government may or may not do with the Residential Tenancies Act, but here right in front of us is evidence of a plan that works.

This government, Chair, has not allowed the city of Ottawa to follow this particular policy solution. They have forbidden it in the plan that we submitted to the city, which was changed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and this morning it would appear that they're going to vote against an amendment to maintain this precedent that the city of Toronto has. For what? Certainly not to build affordable homes for residents. Maybe it's to build more

luxury and vacation homes for the owners of Blackstone and Smart Living and Hazelview. I bet you there will be a lot of fancy vacation properties built with the profits generated from organizations tacitly supported by this government.

They have a choice. You're on camera. The people of Ontario will be able to see: Are you actually going to support the rental replacement bylaw that the city of Toronto has used to defend affordable housing, or are you just going to put blind faith in the market and the Residential Tenancies Act to accomplish that?

Chair, through you: It strains credulity for government members this morning to sit here and tell us, against the evidence we heard here at committee, that we can protect affordable housing stock. In fact, what I just heard was that it's actually better to just sacrifice that stock for the planet. I can tell you, Chair, as a lifelong environmentalist, that is not an environmental argument.

We need to make sure that the property owners are required to do what most of the large building owners I know in Ottawa do: They maintain the integrity of their buildings. They want them to be efficient because it saves them money. It means that they're good places to live, it means that there's less turnover in their buildings, and families grow up and build lasting bonds because they love where they live.

Instead, what I'm seeing over here is that there's a likelihood—and folks will be able to see it live on-camera. The members can speak to the camera all they want with the platitudes they want to offer us this morning, but they will be voting against an amendment that has protected 5,000 units of affordable housing—

Interjections.

Mr. Joel Harden: They're upset, Chair, and I would be upset too. If I was sitting over there and I was throwing people out on the street, I would be upset too. It would be tough for me to bring that home, to know that I was tacitly encouraging the Hazelviews, the Smart Livings, the Blackstones of the world.

But do you know what? The people on this side of the committee room don't wake up in the morning and say, "How can I make Mario Cortellucci happy?" That's not what we say when we wake up in the morning. We don't say, "How can we make Smart Living happy? How can we make Blackstone happy? How can I pass a law to lead people astray and think that they're going to be protected when there actually are"—

Interjections.

Mr. Joel Harden: Does someone over there need a hug, Chair?

The fact of the matter is that you're going to be on record, on camera, voting for or against an amendment, proposed by my colleague, which has saved 5,000 units of affordable housing in this great city.

The city of Ottawa, as I'm trying to explain here very clearly for the record, Chair, has asked to follow this precedent. This government denied it. This government said, "No, you cannot have rental replacement bylaws in the city of Ottawa. You can't protect the people of Manor Village. You can't protect the people of Heron Gate. You

can't protect the people who are going to be struggling against these folks who are damaging the livelihoods of low-income people."

They have a choice. A majority government is a powerful thing. You can decide what you want to do with that influence. Are you going to stand up for Alison Trowbridge and her seven-year-old son, who are going to be thrown out on the street, or are you going to stand up for Mario Cortellucci, Blackstone, Smart Living, donors to the PC Party? Who do you work for? On this side of the House, on this side of the committee room, Chair, I'm very clear about who I work for, and in a moment we're going to see who the government works for.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Well, as MPP Holland says, this government is very supportive of tenants, and they've increased protections in the tenancies act, so that's great. In that case, I would ask why you wouldn't support MPP Bell's motion. Why not add another layer of protection? If you're pro-tenants and pro-support in keeping their rights and adding more rights, why wouldn't you? What possible excuse would you possibly have to not support this, if that is your claim?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote. Shall amendment number 1 carry?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment number 1 is lost.

We're now down to amendment number 2. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'll read it into the record first.

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

"(0.2.) Subsection 111(2) of the act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (b) and by striking out clause (c) and substituting the following:

"(c) to prohibit the repair or renovation of residential rental properties without a permit; and

"(d) to impose conditions as a requirement of obtaining a permit, including requiring compensation to tenants for moving costs and rental costs above what the tenant had been paying prior to the displacement."

0930

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why we're introducing this amendment is because we need to protect the 50% of people in the city of Toronto who rent. To ensure people can afford to live in this city, we need to protect renters

when they are faced with a renovation or a renoviction of some kind, ensure that they can move back in and help them during the period of time that renovation is taking place.

The city does not have the ability right now to regulate renovations as effectively as they should. That is a Residential Tenancies Act matter. The purpose of this motion is to empower municipalities and give them the authority to do exactly that.

This has precedent. New Westminster, BC, introduced this bylaw and implemented it. It's been extremely effective. It was appealed to the Supreme Court and it was upheld. Municipalities are allowed to have this right.

The power of it is that, if we're looking at moving forward with missing middle zoning reform, which I do support, it does mean that renters living in single-family homes or living in a home where there are multiple units will be more vulnerable to being evicted because this will encourage the construction of homes in existing neighbourhoods. In order for us to meet supply and encourage more missing middle housing, we also have a responsibility to protect renters who will be impacted by these renovations. So, we can build more supply and make sure that people who work in our city can continue to live in the city and can continue to afford to live in the city. That's the purpose of this motion.

The second piece, I've already alluded to, which is to ensure that municipalities have the authority to provide additional compensation to renters while they're out during renovation. This compensation is usually negotiated between the city and the developer. It's the developer's responsibility to pay it. In some cases, the city does negotiate with the developer to ensure that that compensation is provided, and in some cases the tenant gets nothing. The city is concerned about their authority to do exactly that, which is why I'm putting that in this motion, so that the city knows for sure that they can negotiate with the developers to ensure those tenants get that compensation. That's the purpose of this motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm absolutely happy to support MPP Bell's amendment here as we continue to protect tenants and, actually, not only say we protect tenants but walk the talk. I'm hopeful that everyone here will do the same.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Pang.

Mr. Billy Pang: Under the Municipal Act and the City of Toronto Act, municipalities enact bylaws to prohibit and regulate the demolition or conversion of multi-unit residential rental properties of six units or more. These bylaws may vary among municipalities, and through consultation, will determine whether they include requirements that limit access to housing or pose as barriers to creating housing supply. So I'm not going to support this amendment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you very much for the debate.

MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you for raising that, MPP Pang. I noticed when you were communicating that you talked about how the Residential Tenancies Act only applies to buildings that are six units or more. That's exactly why we need this motion, because if we are moving forward with missing middle zoning reform, which I very much support, it's going to primarily support people who live in homes that are three units or less. Therefore, the Residential Tenancies Act doesn't protect these people if they are facing a renovation or a renoviction of some kind.

This would allow the city to provide protections for people who are experiencing a renoviction or a renovation, to ensure they have the protections they need to return to their unit at approximately the same rent so that they can continue to afford to live in our city and work in our city.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: Hearing what I just heard from MPP Pang, I'm wondering if the government can help me explain the rationale of voting against this amendment to Melissa Nigi, who is a constituent back in Ottawa Centre. She lives in a five-unit home that would not be covered by the Residential Tenancies Act, as MPP Bell has said, and has now faced, as I'm understanding it from her text over the weekend, the second N12 form she's encountered in the last year from a lawyer specializing in orchestrating renovictions in the city of Ottawa—quite a lovely livelihood—specializing in making sure people are cleared out under the auspices that family members of the landlord in question move in, who never ultimately move in. This is a documented case in this particular situation.

Melissa and ourselves—through our office, we worked with her, a low-income tenant. We supported her work to appeal and challenge the decision. At one point, her belongings, Chair—this is a true story—that were in the storage unit in the basement of this home were moved without her consent to a location she didn't know about. That happened in the course of the last round of contesting the renoviction. But Melissa is strong, stood steadfast in that process, and we were able to convince that particular landlord that it was not fair, that Melissa had rights as a tenant in the province of Ontario, that renters do matter.

But I think MPP Bell is making a very clear point: How do we actually protect tenants like Melissa? The question I would have, through you, to MPP Pang is—if you're relying upon the Residential Tenancies Act to be able to help people like Melissa, there is a disconnect between rhetoric and reality, because that particular piece of legislation will not help residents like Melissa. So my question, through you, to the government, is: What is your plan to help tenants like Melissa who are right now fighting an N12 order of eviction? We're trying to help her. Again, what are you going to do for them? It would seem that this amendment is a great way you can send a clear message to Melissa and all the tenants living in units that would not be covered by the Residential Tenancies Act that the government actually has their back. My question, through you, to the government members: Will you support this amendment and support Melissa today? A clear question: yes or no?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Smith.

Ms. Laura Smith: I would just add that, to evict a tenant so that major repairs or renovations can be done to the rental unit, the landlord must offer them an acceptable place to live or offer the tenant the first right of refusal. There are major implications. There's up to a \$50,000 fine for an individual and a \$250,000 fine on a corporation. These are not small amounts of money. We're trying to tighten things up so that we're benefiting the lives of the tenants so that they can have more surety in where they're going to live or where they're going live in the future.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, MPP Smith. For all practical purposes, the right of return that's enshrined in the Residential Tenancies Act is not functioning. We have many tenants in our riding who have been evicted and who are patiently waiting for their right to return. There is no enforcement mechanism to require a landlord to return a tenant. It's on the onus of the tenant to go all "private eye" and gather the information necessary to take it to the Landlord and Tenant Board. The tenant actually stands to gain very little if they move a tenant in, because the landlord doesn't have the power to evict a new tenant. So the tenant basically never gets their apartment back, and the tenant is not eligible for any of that compensation that is written in the Residential Tenancies Act. The tenant basically has to be a good Samaritan, because they're not going to get anything out of it. They're not going to get their apartment back, and they're not going to get those fines; that mainly goes to the Landlord and Tenant Board or it goes to the government, so it doesn't happen.

We have people in our riding right now who are trying to get back into a purpose-built rental on Walmer. They were evicted a few years ago. They signed a document saying, "We want to exercise our right to return." We've been working with the purpose-built provider, the property manager and the landlord to get them to exercise their rights to get them back in. The property manager doesn't even return our phone calls, even though they have a massive sign on the lawn saying these apartments are now available to rent. It's literally not enforceable. We've called the police. We've called the rental housing enforcement unit. They can't even file a claim to the Landlord and Tenant Board until we can prove that the company has broken the law, which means they actually have to move a tenant into that person's apartment. And once you move a tenant into that person's apartment, they can never get back in.

0940

So to all intents and purposes, the Residential Tenancies Act is not enforcing the right of return, which is why we need to add additional protections. If this government is interested in strengthening the Residential Tenancies Act and tenants' right to return, then we'll support it. That would be fantastic, but I'm not seeing it from this government right now.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I would say, I think we're hearing a lot of political rhetoric from the other side on this issue. To be abundantly clear, for Melissa's issue with her N12 form, right now this amendment would do nothing to help Melissa with her current situation, and I think Mr. Harden is aware of that. Frankly this is another case of the NDP playing politics. I think they're using emotion-driven political rhetoric to avoid talking about the real issue.

What will help people across Ontario is if we get building. We have seen the prevalence of NIMBYism across Ontario for way too long. This is the same party that, when we strengthened the Residential Tenancies Act to deter renovations and stand up for tenants—this is the party that voted against it.

So when we hear that they're going to be supporting good policy, supporting good motions that will actually help people—I mean, here's your opportunity to do that. We know this bill is going to rapidly expand housing supply across the province. We know that this bill will be increasing fines for bad developers, bad builders. We know that this policy will be taking a stance against NIMBYism.

What I would say to folks at home: What we're trying to do with this bill is we're trying to expand housing supply; we're trying to get you some new neighbours. And what we're hearing from the NDP, the New Democratic Party—maybe call them the NIMBY democratic party—is that they don't want any new neighbours. They don't want any new builds going up in existing neighbourhoods. They want to keep the exact same buildings the exact same way that they've always been.

Frankly, I got into politics because I think that we need to approach this problem differently. We're seeing the same old, same old political tricks, and who's really being left behind are the people of Ontario.

I'll talk about some of the families that are in my riding in Brampton North. We have families right now in Snelgrove where you've got two or three kids—I say kids; 22, 24, 26—working great jobs that are living in their parent's basement because they can't afford a home. You can't have a good job, make a middle-class living and afford a home in today's economy. And why that is is because of a fundamental misbalance between the demand of housing and the supply of housing.

Who is getting left behind here are millennial Canadians, new families that want to expand. We're leaving behind seniors that are looking for the right type of housing as they downsize and as they try to age gracefully at home. We're letting down new Canadians. We have 500,000 new Canadians coming to our country in 2025; the lion's share of them are going to come and move to Ontario. They're going to move to Ottawa Centre. They're going to move to University–Rosedale. They're going to move to Brampton North.

I really think there's an opportunity here for New Democrats to welcome our new neighbours, to stand up for a market that's fair, a market that's responsive to the needs of potential first-time homebuyers. I think they have a real

opportunity here. I'd say we have some heavy hitters from the NDP caucus on this committee. Your party will listen to you. We have good ideas here. There are good ideas being put forward. This is a great bill on housing that will stand up, as I said, for millennials, for seniors, for new Canadians—people who have been priced out of the market up until this point. This is a good bill. If you go speak to your leader's office right now, they'll listen to you. We have heavy hitters on this committee. We encourage you to use your voice for good, for the good of the province. We hope that they'll consider supporting the bill.

I think this amendment that's put forward has some very poor, unintended consequences that will result in a much more unfair rental market. We're looking for good ideas on how to further continue to strengthen tenant protections, as we have always done, as they have always voted against. We need New Democrats to stand up for people that want to enter the market, people that want to enter the rental market. We certainly hope they'll support our bill; they have the opportunity to do that here today.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: What I just heard over there was the notion that we needed to support this bill in order to help residents, and what I'm just inviting us to consider, Chair, is that the amendment we're debating is a piece of legislation that would manifestly help Melissa Nigi. It would help Melissa because the Residential Tenancies Act will not. Let's live in the ecosystem of laws that we have in front of us and the amendment that's on the table. This amendment would help ensure Melissa can get back into her home and would compensate her. The bill the member is proposing would not.

That's why committees study bills after listening to expert testimony and put forward amendments. I've had one amendment taken in four years with the previous version of this government and the current government. That's the level of receptivity of collegiality in this place, in my experience. I really hope they don't vote down this amendment, Chair, but I fear they might. And one has to ask the question: Why would they, given what I've just heard, given that it's all about helping first-time homebuyers and helping people get out of their parents' basements and all that sort of stuff?

Melissa Nigi is facing her second N12. Who stood up for Melissa Nigi? Not this government. The office of the MPP in Ottawa Centre has. Not me; the great people back home, constituency assistants with whom I am blessed to work, have answered Melissa's call and helped, and are helping right now.

If the members opposite vote against this amendment, they aren't just voting against words on a piece of paper, they're voting against Melissa. They're telling Melissa she doesn't have a right to stay in her home, that the person who has a track record of evicting people, in this property and others, despite the consequences that MPP Smith articulated very well—that property owner is willing to risk those consequences, because this is the way the law actually works in Canada. Those who have the ability to wait out

the clock win the game. That's how the law actually works, unless we have rules by which people can seek quick remedy in the moment of need. Otherwise, you pay a lawyer, you pay a consultant to burn out the clock on the person who has less money than you. That's how the law actually works.

I want to talk about another case, on Elgin Street: a couple that had lived in a unit of affordable market housing for 42 years—42 years. There was a fire last summer in this particular unit. I know this couple because the church they worship at is a church I have been to several times for the great work it does in the community, and after service I was met by this couple, who have asked me not to talk about their names, but I'm happy to talk about their story, and they've given me consent to do that. They said, "Joel, there was a fire in the building in the summer. Our unit was not damaged, but the landlord asked everybody in our building to clear out while repairs were done."

But here's the problem: Their unit was not damaged. They were in temporary hotel housing based upon their insurance policy, but that policy was running out at the end of October. So after service, they asked me, "Joel, what are we going to do? The neighbours to the left, the neighbours to the right, the neighbours upstairs, the neighbours downstairs, they're all moved back in, but we're being told we can't move back in. That doesn't smell right for us, Joel, because all of those folks who live around us are people who have recently moved into the building. They're paying rent which is twice what we pay. But all of a sudden, we're being told that our unit is so beyond repair that we need to stay out." A week before they spoke to me at their church, wouldn't you know it, the landlord offered them a cash settlement to agree to move out. That's the way some bad actors are gaming this moment.

So what did that couple do? They contacted ACORN Ottawa. They contacted me. We held a rally outside. Well, first I tried to call the property owner and have some kind of a dialogue about what could be done. They wouldn't return any of my calls; no surprise there. But we had a rally outside their building.

0950

They had asked to go into their unit to get some of their possessions. The landlord had said no. They went in anyway, and I was a witness, because they have a right to access their property under the rules of this province. They went into their unit. I looked at the unit myself. There was nothing falling apart. There was no real and present danger. It was a building that needed refurbishment, for sure; there was no real and present danger. But we were in that unit. We looked it over, and we told the landlord very clearly that people would come back to that unit to support those neighbours until some remedy was made.

And guess what? A week later, the landlord announced that this couple could move back in, and they are in that unit today. They're not in that unit today because of the government stripping away amendments or voting against amendments like those my colleague is proposing that would actually help people in these sorts of situations. They're in that unit because the community stood up and stood beside them and said, "We will support you."

I'm just going to tell the government clearly: They may think this is theatrics; it is not. If you vote down suggested amendments like this and you don't put in the protections that people need, this is what you are effectively asking tenants to do. You're asking tenants to engage—

Mr. Graham McGregor: Why would we think it's theatrics?

Mr. Joel Harden: There might be a pest problem on aisle 5 there, Chair—sorry.

The question I'm asking the government is—the government is putting tenants in a situation where they literally have to openly defy what bad-apple landlords are doing in order to seek remedy. They have to invite their neighbours to their doorstep to rally and get in the news to get remedy, when the government could just pass an amendment like this today and send some guarantees to people that they actually have the backs of the folks who want to maintain the affordable rental housing stock we have.

They have stood by for four, five years and watched the price of housing double in the ownership market, double under the tenure of this government, and now they're telling us a story about how they want to make homes affordable? Give me a break. If you believe what you're saying this morning, please vote for this amendment that will make sure that people like Melissa and the couple I'm talking about—and there will be dozens and dozens more, potentially hundreds more—will actually be able to stay in their units of housing. That's really the question for this government today.

And then, on the ownership side, there's a lot we could talk about, about how you work collaboratively with cities and developers in cities that are progressive—and there are many—who actually want to build affordable housing.

But look, this is about the rental market, which has not gotten enough consideration at this committee. Who has got the back of renters, particularly low-income, long-tenure renters? How people vote on this amendment will tell us very clearly the answer to that. Are you going to support people who need immediate remedy when they're at risk of being thrown out on the street and losing their home, or are you going to support their landlord that watches people suffer, watches buildings fall apart? Are you going to support the bad-actor landlord, or are you going to support the tenants? We're going to find out in a moment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Burch.

Mr. Jeff Burch: I'll be brief, because my colleagues have done such a good job speaking to this specific amendment. We heard some general comments from the other side regarding the bill. I just want to point out that this isn't a case of the government consulting properly and then putting this bill forward and that the NDP is the only one in opposition to it. We're actually carrying the voices of so many stakeholders that we've heard from in the last couple weeks to this committee hearing. My colleague has done a lot of work and our party has done a lot of work putting together amendments that—we didn't just come up with these ourselves—are based on listening to folks.

One of the folks we've listened to is AMO. AMO was very clear in saying that the more radical elements of the bill—that's their wording—do not create affordable housing, but they cater to the private development industry, at the expense of taxpayers and at the expense of the natural environment. That's AMO that said that, and they represent hundreds of municipalities.

We've heard from individual municipalities like St. Catharines, in my neck of the woods, who say that this bill is a disaster—their words. These amendments are put forward to make the bill better because it was a poorly thought-out, poorly conceived, badly researched bill. The government is going to put their own amendments forward because there are so many things that even they have to fix in the bill. What we're doing here is trying to make the bill better. We're trying to salvage it and speak on behalf of all of the people who have come to our committee and given us their thoughts.

So that's where we're coming from. It's not a situation where the government put forward this well-researched bill that's fair to everyone. It actually isn't going to lead to more housing. Very few people believe that line from the government. Like AMO says, it's going to cater to the private development industry at the expense of taxpayers and at the expense of the natural environment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Is there someone who would like to put up their hand for further debate? Okay. Are we ready to vote, members? Shall amendment number 2—

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Okay. Recorded vote on amendment number 2.

Aye

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nay

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): The amendment is lost. We're going to go to amendment number 3. MPP Bell, please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, Chair. I'll read it into the Hansard.

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

“(0.3) Subsection 111(3) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition or conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion or repair and renovation’.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you very much. Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'll be brief. This is very similar to the other motions that I've introduced. The purpose of this motion is to protect renters in cases of demolition, conversion or renovation so that they can keep their home and continue to afford to live in the city. The purpose of this

motion is to also ensure that we preserve affordable rental stock so our city is affordable for people who are low-income, moderate-income and middle-income.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Of course, because I believe in supporting renters, I am supporting MPP Bell's amendment. I will just read to you some factoids. In the city of Toronto there are 70,866 apartment buildings built before 1960, representing 26% of Toronto's private rental market apartments. These are the apartments most at risk of demolition or conversion—not insignificant. That's Toronto-specific, but this spans across Ontario. So it's the right thing to do at the right time: protecting renters.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Aye

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nay

Grewal, Holland, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare the amendment lost.

Moving to amendment number 4. MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Once again, this is similar.

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

“(0.4) Subsection 111(4) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition or conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion or repair and renovation’.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Just to be clear about what this motion means, the purpose of this motion is to protect tenants who live in private-market affordable rentals and to protect tenants who are facing demolition, conversion, repair and renovation, so really to expand the protections that renters have and to expand the jurisdiction the city of Toronto has to protect them. If we want our city to remain affordable for low-income, moderate-income and middle-income people, we need to protect our affordable housing stock.

1000

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare the amendment lost.

Now to amendment 5: MPP Bell, please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: It's a similar thing. I'll read it in.

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

“(0.5) Subsection 111(6) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition and conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion and repair and renovation’.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Seeing no debate, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote is called. Shall amendment number 5 carry?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare the amendment lost.

Moving on to amendment number 6: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 111(7) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting the following:

“Regulations

“(7) The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing may make regulations prescribing minimum standards on the powers of the city under this section with respect to,

“(a) the protection and compensation of tenants; and

“(b) the preservation of the stock of available residential units.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why we're introducing this motion is it is very important that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing work with the city of Toronto to identify regulations, laws, bylaws to protect tenants—the 50% of our city that rents—and to ensure that we protect the affordable housing units that we have. It doesn't just involve compensating tenants or ensuring that they guarantee their right of return; there are a lot of innovative measures that the city of Montreal developed, as well as other cities, to really make sure our city is affordable.

If you look at Professor Hulchanski's work—he's a professor at the University of Toronto—he documents the decline in the number of middle-income households in the city of Toronto, the sharp rise in upper-middle-class and wealthy neighbourhoods and the increase in the number of neighbourhoods that are low-income and moderate-income. We are losing our middle class in the city of Toronto. People cannot afford to save up to buy a home because their rent is too expensive, and we need to protect them. This motion would allow the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

to work with the city to come up with regulations to enable that to happen.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Obviously, I'm very supportive of this motion. Thanks to MPP Bell for moving it and continuing to protect renters.

This government has mentioned time and time again that it is supportive of addressing the missing middle and actually implementing measures to that accord. So why wouldn't you support this amendment? Because that takes it a step further for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to work with the city of Toronto.

The city of Toronto, as you know—you heard from the chief planner the other day and 10 high-level city staff on the call at committee. You saw the talent, the expertise and the experience with them for building a great city. We have more cranes on the ground than four of the top US cities, and we manage it well. We're trying to do the right thing with addressing the housing crisis. So why wouldn't we want the ministry to work with the city of Toronto? Why wouldn't you support this amendment?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further discussion? MPP Sabawy.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: If I may ask some clarification about this motion: Is the member putting the motion trying to add more involvement from the ministry or from the city? Can I understand the purpose of that motion? Do you feel that the municipality does not have enough power or the ministry does not have enough power? What's the purpose of that motion?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, shall—are we ready?

Interjection: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): For a recorded vote. All those in favour of amendment number 6—

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: The Chair already said it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): It was called.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 6 lost.

Shall schedule 1 of section 1 carry? Any debate? Yes, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: We're talking about the entirety of schedule 1?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes. Well, it's section 1 of schedule 1.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Oh.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Sorry, yes, just the amendments that were—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Could we do a recorded vote on that piece?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes. Are members ready to vote?

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 1 of section 1 carried.

We're now moving on to schedule 1, section 2, amendment number 7. MPP McMahon, I believe that is—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Oh, I'm sorry. MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Just clarify for me the process here: So we've done schedule 1, section 1. What about schedule 1, section 2, because—

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): That's what we've just called. So sorry.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Okay, because this is 2(2). Have we done 2(1) yet?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): There was no amendment—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Are we going to do the amendments first and then go back and vote on everything? Is that the plan?

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): So section 2 is now what we're doing, and so back to the beginning, maybe, of the bill, which I just don't have handy, but yes.

Okay. MPP McMahon, I believe it's amendment 7.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subparagraph 2 iv of subsection 114(5) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“iv. matters relating to sustainable design, health, safety, accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands, if an official plan and a by-law passed under subsection (2) that both contain provisions relating to such matters are in effect in the city,”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Yes, I'll just explain that. This is pertaining to the Toronto Green Standard. I did speak to Minister Clark the other week, and I feel that this was a possible oversight in the zeal to move this bill. We heard from Toronto Atmospheric Fund at committee last week that the former mayor of Toronto, Rob Ford, and our current Premier did support Toronto green standards

when they were at the city, that they are the model—I would argue one of the best models—for North America and other municipalities across Ontario, maybe your own. I think we heard Brampton, for sure, has a green standard, and they were modelled after the Toronto Green Standard. Wouldn't it be a beautiful world to live in if every municipality in Ontario, in Canada, had a green standard, since we are currently in a climate emergency, if people weren't aware by now?

Not only that, but we claim Ontario is open for business. Clean tech, green industry, green economy, green jobs: That is an exponentially growing business. We're going to have these companies look at Ontario: “Oh, what? There are no regulations. How can we ensure that our innovation actually gets implemented and encouraged? Oh, no, there are no regulations, so why don't we go off to British Columbia or overseas, or wherever?” It's on so many levels that the Toronto Green Standard is important. Also, for a level of comfort, sustainability and economic win, because you're living in a more energy-efficient home—and developers are asking for that. We heard at committee that industry is looking for that. Everyone is asking, so let's put it back in and keep it, where it should have been all along.

1010

I would love your support on this, and I know that you care about being open for business and preserving the green standard.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I will be supporting MPP McMahon's motion. It makes a lot of sense. The city of Toronto's green building standards allow the city to move forward with greening its building stock to respond to climate change and build well-made and energy-efficient homes.

I looked at the green building standard before I came here and I was struck by how innovative and important it is. The green building standard protects birds and species by allowing bird-friendly design. It reduces waste. Green building standards reduce stormwater runoff. They reduce the heat island effect, which is becoming a huge issue in urban centres because of the climate crisis. The green building standards reduce energy use and they can improve air quality. They also save consumers money because they reduce energy costs, and they ensure that a renter, home-buyer or a business is moving into a building that is well made.

I support it. Green building standards are our future. Thank you for bringing this motion forward, MPP McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP Pang.

Mr. Billy Pang: Our government intends to amend the building code to allow municipalities to require certain green standards through bylaws, so we don't need this amendment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: MPP Pang—

Mr. Graham McGregor: I'll go.

Ms. Jessica Bell: It goes back and forth, buddy.

MPP Pang, thank you for raising that issue. I have read the government's amendments to the green building standard. It is true the government has rolled back on its very drastic severance of the green building standards; however, our initial read is that the green building standard motions that you are proposing will only allow for green roofs and bird-friendly design. There are a lot of elements of the green building standard which could still be exempt and they would not be allowed to be implemented by municipalities, including the city of Toronto, as the government's motions are written.

We are very concerned about that piece and we are hopeful that this government moves forward with improving the provincial building code so true green building standards can be implemented across the province, because that is actually necessary for your motions to protect the green building standards that we have.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: For the record, I just wanted to mention that there are a number of advocates back home who are very happy that Toronto has a standard, Chair. They very much want, as MPP McMahon has articulated quite well and MPP Bell, this maintained. They want to build upon it. In fact, they've had some progress back home in Ottawa.

One of the things that we were quite impressed to see is the way in which Toronto's downtown has utilized Lake Ontario as a means to regulate temperature in a lot of its buildings. What an innovative idea.

I remember the late Jack Layton, a long-time councillor for the city and a former leader of our party federally—

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP Harden, I'm afraid I'm going to have to interrupt you because the bells are ringing. We will take this up after.

The committee will now recess until 1 p.m.

The committee recessed from 1014 to 1302.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We're here to resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 23, An Act to amend various statutes, to revoke various regulations and to enact the Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022.

We will now resume consideration of independent motion 7. I believe MPP Harden had the floor, so I will turn over to MPP Harden, if you are ready to continue.

Mr. Joel Harden: Aren't you kind, Chair? Thank you for remembering it was me.

I just wanted to again point out for the record that folks back home, who care deeply about sustainable architecture and sustainable buildings, were following the Toronto standard with great interest, had adopted elements of it and were quite disappointed that this isn't something that's being championed with this particular bill. My colleague, I think, is making a fantastic amendment in wanting to encourage that back in. That's going to help municipalities everywhere.

Sustainable architecture is not a partisan issue. We should be able to make the case for this from a financial

perspective, from an ecological perspective, from an accessibility perspective for persons with disabilities. I just would encourage us all to support MPP McMahon's motion. Thank you for moving it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Sure. Something has come to my attention. I believe it was mentioned this morning, maybe by MPP McGregor, about the government moving some amendments for the Toronto Green Standard. It has come to my attention that 7.1 and 7.2 are not going to do anything for the Toronto Green Standard. That's to do with green roofs, which is part of the Toronto act.

My motion here, my amendment, preserves the Toronto Green Standard in its entirety. It's clean and surgical. So the amendment that I'm assuming my colleagues are going to move, from the other side, would also only apply to the city of Toronto, so all these other green standards—and that's specifically green roofs, not green standards. It's totally different. Think of all these other municipalities, great municipalities in Ontario, that have green standards: Brampton; Vaughan; Markham; Richmond Hill; Mississauga just got a grant to pursue green standards; Ajax; Pickering; Whitby; Ottawa and more—I'm sure I'm missing some. That will kill their green standards. Some people think, "Oh, it's all about Toronto," but it's not just all about Toronto. It's about the other great municipalities across Ontario who are doing phenomenal work on this front, and I wouldn't want them to be robbed of that opportunity.

So I think it might be just a little glitch or an oversight about the green roofs, and if you could just support my motion which preserves the Toronto Green Standard in its entirety, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Okay. MPP McMahon?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded? Okay. Thank you. Recorded for sure. Shall amendment number 7 carry?

Ayes

Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I rule the amendment is lost. Amendment number 7, to be precise, is lost.

We'll now move to amendment 7.1 and, I believe, MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subparagraph 2 iv of subsection 114(5) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“iv. matters relating to building construction required under a by-law referred to in section 108 or 108.1,”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Further debate? Any comments on amendment 7.1? Okay. Are the members—MPP McGregor?

Mr. Graham McGregor: I think the amendment is fairly self-explanatory. It certainly is a change requested by some of the stakeholders we all heard from in the committee. I hope the members support it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you very much. MPP McMahon, and then I'll go to the other side.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: If you're referring to some of the stakeholders such as the Toronto Atmospheric Fund, this is not what they suggested. This is a mix-up. The Toronto Green Standard incorporates so much: energy efficiency, bird-friendly windows—all kinds of elements to it. The green roofs is something separate. Yours is green roofs, so we're talking apples and oranges here. I think there's some confusion, and I'm just trying to explain to you the confusion, hoping you can move something to preserve the green standard, which actually matters in your riding of Brampton. You'll have a lot of explaining to do to your groups as to why they can't be energy efficient anymore and why you won't have innovative companies investing in Brampton to build greener buildings.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Grewal.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal: I just wanted to quickly mention, Chair, that I hope the members opposite support this and support giving the city of Toronto the authority to apply the green development standards through site plan control. We're expanding those ideas, and we're bringing in those amendments to help facilitate that. So I hope they join us in supporting the green development standards.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Okay. All those in favour of amendment—

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

1310

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Laura Smith, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you. I declare amendment 7.1 carried.

We'll now move on to—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: It doesn't do what you think it does.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you. We've got a lot of amendments to go through here. Let's move on to amendment 7.2. I look to MPP McGregor, please.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Thank you, Chair.

I move that subsection 2(3) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding “or is a matter referred to in subparagraph 2 iv of subsection (5)” at the end of paragraph 1.1 of subsection 114(6) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Discussion? Debate? MPP McMahon?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Again, with all due respect to my colleagues across the floor of this room, I'm not sure that you're aware or you've done your homework on this. This does not address the Toronto Green Standard.

I'm from Toronto—well, I'm from Collingwood actually, but I live in Toronto—and I was there at city council when we amended the Toronto Green Standard. I know well of it. I was chair of parks and environment for the city of Toronto for a few years. I know damn well about the Toronto Green Standard. This is green roofs.

This does not address the issue. You guys are mistaken. If you could rethink your amendment to include mine, that will help your municipalities as well, because you're going to have a lot of accounting to do to your residents when they find out that their green standards are null and void, and also the motions you're moving only apply to Toronto—only to Toronto. It's the City of Toronto Act you're addressing. I'm not sure you're aware of that.

I don't know if there's someone you can talk to in the meantime, but I would.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Grewal.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal: Just quickly, Chair, I wanted to say that I hope the members opposite join us in providing a consistent provincial approach when it comes to green development standards across the province.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? Debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote on amendment 7.2? Okay.

All those in favour of amendment 7.2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare the amendment carried.

Moving to amendment number 8, I will go to MPP Burch to read it into the record, please.

Mr. Jeff Burch: Thank you, Chair.

I move that subsection 2(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 114(6.1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting the following:

“Same

“(6.1) The appearance of the elements, facilities and works on the land or any adjoining highway under the city's jurisdiction is not subject to site plan control, except to the extent that the appearance,

“(a) impacts matters of health, safety, accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands; or

“(b) relates to sustainable design, but only if an official plan and a by-law passed under subsection (2) that both contain provisions relating to sustainable design are in effect in the city.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion or debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Mr. Jeff Burch: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote—
Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Apparently your hand was up for debate, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'd encourage everyone to support my colleague's motion. It's the right thing to do. We want innovation. We want investment. We're open for business; "Ontario: We're open for business." That includes green buildings, green economy, and it is not addressed by your previous amendments.

Honestly, talk to someone and figure it out. Thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Laura Smith, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 8 lost.

We're now moving on to amendment 8.1. If I can call on MPP McGregor. Please go ahead.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 2(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands" at the end of subsection 114(6.1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting "accessibility, sustainable design or the protection of adjoining lands".

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Holland, Grewal, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Burch, Harden.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 8.1 carried.

Now moving to amendment number 9, I turn to MPP Burch.

Mr. Jeff Burch: I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(5) Section 114 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"Penalty

"(21) Subject to and in accordance with the regulations, the city may, by by-law, impose penalties on the owner of the land for failure to substantially commence development within a timely manner after the plans and drawings have been approved under this section."

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Burch.

Mr. Jeff Burch: I can speak to this. I've raised this many, many times in the House throughout the course of many housing bills: that the government has been fond of blaming municipalities for every delay and process issue when it comes to acting on approvals, but they continually fail in their bills to include a sunset clause for developers. The big-city mayors said very clearly that, I think it was, 250,000 units of housing had been approved, but developers were sitting on the approvals. When a developer goes through the process in a municipality and they take up staff time and resources and time within the process, they should have a sunset clause on when they are going to act on the approvals, rather than be allowed to sit on the land and bank it.

Blaming municipalities for all the problems is not working. Quite frankly, I think AMO is tired of it. The big-city mayors are tired of it. We're hearing a common theme from our municipal partners that they're sick and tired of being blamed for every delay when we all know that developers are playing this game, and we need to act on that as well.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I would just add to what MPP Burch has said. I think we really missed an opportunity to hear from AMO in our deputations, and I'm wondering if any of the members of the government can explain to this committee—through you, Chair—why we weren't allowed to be beneficiaries of AMO's opinion, on particularly this matter that MPP Burch is raising right now or any other related matter. If there's any insight for the record they can provide, that would be very helpful.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Mr. Jeff Burch: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote? Thank you. A recorded vote on amendment number 9.

Ayes

Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 9 lost.

Shall schedule 1, section 2, as amended, carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour?

Mr. Jeff Burch: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 1, section 2, as amended, carried.

I believe now we are going to interrupt the proceedings. I move to MPP Thanigasalam.

Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam: I move that if the committee is required to recess today, pursuant to standing order 74(b), it stands recessed until five minutes following the conclusion of conflicting business in the House or any vote related to that business.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP Thanigasalam has moved a motion, and I—

Mr. Graham McGregor: Chair, point of order.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Do you need—

Mr. Graham McGregor: The New Democrats filed this opposition day knowing the business of the committee at stake. Unlike when the government had a similar conflict—we moved a unanimous motion to continue the business of committee. New Democrats denied the unanimous motion and are rejecting the important work that this committee has to do today.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): The opposition day motion has started, so there will be no further debate. We're just going to put the question as brought by MPP Thanigasalam to the floor. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. MPP Thanigasalam's motion is carried.

We are now recessed until five minutes after the opposition day motion.

The committee recessed from 1322 to 1419.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Good afternoon, everyone. We're resuming again. We're going to continue with schedule 1, section 3, and it's going to be amendment number 10. I'll ask MPP Bell if she would read in amendment 10.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Commencement

“3. This schedule comes into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Is there any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why we're introducing this motion is because the significance of schedule 1 on housing affordability is huge. Our request is that we just pause and give us time to really assess the impact of this schedule before enacting it into law, which is why we're calling for delay of the implementation of schedule 1 until it's proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor. That's the purpose of this motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members ready for the vote? All those in favour of amendment number 10, please raise your hands.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, we'll take it, MPP Pang.

Mr. Graham McGregor: He's just scratching his head.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Sorry, guys. Put your hands back up again, please. Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare the amendment lost.

Shall schedule 1, section 3, carry? Any debate?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Recorded vote. This is on schedule 1, section 3.

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Schedule 1, section 3, is carried.

Now we'll consider schedule 1, as amended, as a whole. Any debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Does this come into play, or is that next?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): If you want to debate that notice for schedule 1 as a whole, you can.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I do.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Okay, then. You're up, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I just want to conclude: Schedule 1 is a bad, bad schedule. It's going to affect housing affordability. It's going to affect many people who live in private-market, purpose-built rentals. This will make it easier for them to be evicted. It will mean they pay higher rent. It means they'll have a harder time paying bills and paying rent. Honestly, I urge you to vote against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 1, as amended, carry?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 1, as amended, carried.

We're now moving onto schedule 2, Conservation Authorities Act. There are no amendments for sections 1 and section 2. Because there are no amendments, I propose we bundle them. Is it agreed that we bundle them?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Does that affect mine for schedule 2?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): No, just sections 1 and 2 of schedule 2, to which there are no amendments.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, okay. I'll support that, then.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Agreed? Okay. Shall sections 1 and 2 carry? Any debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: For everything in schedule 2, I'd like to have a recorded vote, if that's possible.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I think so. Is that correct? Yes.

Again, to the question: Shall sections 1 and 2 carry?

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes, and there's a requested recorded vote.

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 1 and 2 of schedule 2 carried.

We will now move to schedule 2, section 3. I believe there's a notice on section 3 of schedule 2. Any debate? MPP Bell, please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm very concerned about, overall, the impact of schedule 2 on our natural environment and on our ability to protect ourselves from extreme weather events, including flooding. There are many issues with schedule 2. The big ones are that it restricts conservation authorities' ability to work with municipalities to protect our natural environment, to ensure we protect flood plains, to ensure we're not building homes on flood plains. It's extremely concerning.

The reason conservation authorities were developed in the first place is because we had Hurricane Hazel. It led to 83 people dying because of that extreme weather event. Conservation authorities have done a very good job at

protecting us and protecting our flood plains and our natural environment. We heard from people in committee—Conservation Ontario, the TRCA, the conservation authority of the Niagara region—and they sounded the alarm loud and clear that the consequences of removing their authority and their ability to ensure we plan well will have significant consequences on our natural environment and our ability to protect ourselves from extreme weather events. And that is why we're doing a recorded vote on these measures and why we're asking you to take out schedule 2.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I have a similar motion. I'm not sure if it will—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I think we're just debating the NDP [*inaudible*] section 3 of schedule 2.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, okay. I'm very supportive of my colleague MPP Bell's motion—or amendment; sorry, it's my old city hall habit. Again, why wouldn't we want the expertise of knowledgeable, trained staff? You heard from committee members of all the skill sets that make up the conservation authorities. We don't have that skill set at the 444 municipalities, who will be swamped by trying to have oversight over these lands. There's a reason why we haven't had the flooding in Ontario, and it's thanks to the conservation authorities. If you want things to speed up, that's fine. Then sit down with them and give them deadlines—you know, "Report back within a certain period of time"—and they would gladly work with you and come to some common ground. But don't just take a sledgehammer to the people who have protected Ontarians for years and Ontario lands. So I'm voting in support.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Smith.

Ms. Laura Smith: Through you, Madam Chair: We understand how valuable the conservation authorities are and the role that they play in our communities. Their core mandate is to best protect people and property from the impacts of natural hazards, which is precisely what my friend from the other side was talking about. We think that it's important that that mandate remain within the core values of keeping the citizens safe and healthy.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Burch.

Mr. Jeff Burch: Because it was just mentioned, I thought I would remind committee members that during our Brampton committee hearings, we heard from the Toronto conservation authority and they raised a very compelling case about how this government's actions are actually going to make things more difficult for business and more difficult for developers, who are working on other developments and need to work with conservation authorities and need their expertise. It creates uncertainty and will create delays for business. The conservation authority clearly outlined how that's the case, and it's unfortunate that government has not listened to them.

1430

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 2, section 3, carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 3, carried.

We'll now move to schedule 2, section 4. NDP notice, section 4 of schedule 2: Any debate? It's a notice.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This one?

Interjections.

Ms. Jessica Bell: My apologies. Yes, I do want a reason for notice rather than a motion. The reason is because section 4 of schedule 2 gets to the core functions of what a conservation authority can do. This prohibits conservation authorities from reviewing or commenting on matters that they currently can, related to protecting the natural environment, flood plain issues and more. It's extremely concerning, and it will really gut their ability to protect us.

I honestly don't know why you would want to restrict conservation authorities' ability to do their job. There was nothing in the Housing Affordability Task Force, nothing at all, that recommended changing the structure of conservation authorities. To say that this is being done in order to meet our housing supply shortage is false.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 4, carried.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Chair, could I ask a question of clarification?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP McMahon, yes.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I guess it's a notice rather than a motion. Does it come in at the end before we vote on schedule 2 as a whole? I thought it might come in at the beginning before we go through this line by line.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): At the end.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Okay, thank you.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Again, in schedule 2, the Conservation Authorities Act, sections 5 and 6, there are no amendments. I propose we bundle them. All in agreement? Agreed.

For sections 5 and 6, is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 2, sections 5 and 6, carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, sections 5 and 6, carried.

Moving to schedule 2, section 7: I believe we have amendment 11. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 7(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why I'm introducing this motion is that conservation authorities were very clear with us that this section is a direct attack on the core functions of conservation authorities, which is why I'm asking for it to be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I support MPP Bell's amendment. We've heard from a couple of conservation authorities here, Niagara and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. We've also had an endless amount of submissions to this accord, in this vein of the importance of the conservation authorities. Yes, we want them to consider their mandate, but they're not able to do that if we remove this oversight.

I'm not sure; it just seems like there's such a big disconnect with a lot of this stuff, the Toronto Green Standard and the green roofs. Now my colleague across is saying that they still have the right to their core mandate, but they don't when we remove this. I'm just wondering about the disconnect there and hoping you will support MPP Bell's amendment, which is doing the right thing.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? Are the members ready to vote? Shall section 7 of schedule 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands—sorry, wait a minute. Amendment number 11: All those in favour of amendment 11, please raise your hands. I apologize.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 11 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 7, carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 7, carried.

We'll now move to schedule 2, section 8, amendment number 12. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I believe there was a notice to vote against section 7 of schedule 2 of the bill. I don't know if we addressed that.

Interjection.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes, all right. That's reasonable. I'm going to read out the motion.

I move that subsection 8(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock" at the end of clause 28.0.1(6)(a) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting "the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land".

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The government has made a decision to pull out two of the five measures that conservation authorities use when they are making sure that we're protecting our natural environment. This motion aims to put back two of the critical ones, which are pollution and conservation of land. When we put those two measures back, it means that conservation authorities can do their job to protect our natural environment, which means that they can protect us from extreme weather events. That is the economically sound thing to do—extreme weather events cost us money—and it's also the environmentally responsible thing to do.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm not sure if anyone here saw the letter from the deputy city manager of Toronto to city council, citing the 10 million concerns they have with this bill. One of them is that "the proposed bill would severely weaken the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority's ... regulatory authority and land use planning decisions by eliminating their ability to review, comment on, and impose conditions on the conservation of land within their jurisdiction. The proposed bill would also limit the type of municipal programs or services the TRCA can provide.

"The potential impact would be a downloading of some TRCA responsibilities to the city to cover the land conservation services. Currently, the TRCA provides review and comment on natural heritage impact studies to the city through an MOU."

1440

Again, we don't want our cities or municipalities across—you're going to be accountable to your municipalities that

are going to be inundated, all 444, with this new workload on them without the expertise or the knowledge. Honestly, do we have flooding in the world right now? Do we have flooding in Ontario? No, thanks to the conservation authorities. We don't have it as much, but do we have flooding elsewhere? Yes.

Thank you to the conservation authorities for keeping us safe over these years. I would like you to continue to do so.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? Shall amendment number 12 carry?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 12 lost.

Moving to amendment 13. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 8(6) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock" at the end of clause 28.0.1(17)(a) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting "the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land".

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is very similar to our motion 12, the previous one. Essentially what it does is it requires the minister to consider pollution and the conservation of land when reviewing conservation authority conditions on a permit.

There is serious value in having a comprehensive approach when we're deciding whether to develop on a piece of property or not, and having these five measures available for conservation authorities or the minister to consider will ensure we do not have extreme weather events that cost us billions of dollars in losses and expenses because we didn't plan well and use our natural environment to help protect us.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I think we are throwing the baby out with the bathwater with this. We are just not taking the time to think it through. We want to speed up the building of homes in Ontario. We all want that, so let's just slow it down and do it right and not inadvertently kill a bunch of things that matter and that we will end up paying for hugely economically, emotionally, sustainably in all aspects in the future.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment 13?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 13 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 8, carry? Any debate?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 8 carried.

Now moving on to schedule 2, section 9. We'll look at amendment number 14. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 9(1) of schedule 2 to the bill—is that right?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): It's schedule 2, subsection 9(1), yes.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes, sorry—be amended by striking out “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock” at the end of clause 28.1(1)(a) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate or discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Once again, I'm introducing this motion because there are a whole series of amendments that would need to be made to the conservation act to ensure that the conservation authorities can do their job. This is another example of that, where we need to make sure conservation authorities can also consider pollution and conservation of land when they're deciding and commenting on whether a development should proceed and how.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: You know, I feel like a broken record over here. I don't think people understand the ramifications of what's going on here. You're going to learn when your residents have basement floods that cost them \$40,000 or \$50,000 and you could have prevented that.

Honestly, let's rethink this. Slow it down and consider some of our amendments. We're here to build more homes in Ontario with you, so let's do that together properly.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 14 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 9, carry? Any debate?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 9, carried.

Moving to schedule 2 of section 10—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Oh, did I do that wrong again? Schedule 2, section 10—sorry. Amendment number 15: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 10(4) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock” at the end of clause 28.1.2(6)(a) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Discussion? Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Same thing: This is all about protecting residents, protecting cities from natural hazards and flooding, and ensuring that we're protecting our natural environment, our greenbelt, our forests, our fields, our farmland. That's what this is all about.

Conservation authorities have done a very good job at protecting us, and we need to give them the authority they need to keep doing it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion or debate? Are the members ready to vote on amendment 15?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 15 lost.

Amendment 16: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 10(7) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock” at the end of clause 28.1.2(12)(a) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: It’s very similar. It’s about giving conservation authorities the jurisdiction, the power they need to do their job. This specifically is related to what the minister can do in a review of their conditions, but it’s the same thing; it just ensures that conservation authorities can do their job.

1450

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 16 lost.

Shall section 10 of schedule 2 carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare section 10 of schedule 2 carried.

Moving to schedule 2, section 11, amendment 17: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 11(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock” at the end of subclause 30.2(1.1)(b)(i) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes. This would allow conservation officers to continue to enforce the rules, not just related to flooding, erosion and dynamic beaches, but also pollution and the conservation of land. That’s the whole purpose of this motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Discussion? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: As we heard the other day and as we know, conservation authorities have been around for 70 years, more than any of us here. They know their business. They know how to protect Ontarians and protect Ontario lands, so it would be completely ridiculous for us to remove that authority. I ask why we are doing that. Why not support MPP Bell’s amendment?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Discussion? Are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 17 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 11, carry? Any debate? Discussion? Are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 11, carried.

Now moving to schedule 2, section 12, amendment 18: MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 12(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or unstable soil or bedrock” at the end of subclause 30.4(1)(b)(i) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or unstable soil or bedrock or the conservation of land”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Once again, this allows conservation officers to continue enforcing the rules related to all five of the measures that conservation authorities look into. I hope that you can remember in committee the urgency and the concern that witnesses from TRCA and Conservation Ontario had when they spoke about the impact of these changes to schedule 2 on our natural environment. I really hope that you can remember that, because when I was listening to them, I was really struck at the job that these organizations do and their concern that we’re gutting it.

This is all part of us trying to reinstate some of their powers, some of their authority to stop this extremely bad

schedule from being—you know, going from very bad to less bad. All this is to improve it just a little bit.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion or debate? Yes, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: To my colleagues, let's just let the conservation authorities do their jobs. They are the experts; we are not. I know we think we're the sharpest knives in the drawer many a time, but we're not. There are some people who have different skill sets and expertise than we do, and that would be the conservation authorities, who have been keeping Ontario safe for 70 years—until now.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate or discussion on amendment 18? Are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 18 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 12, carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, section 12, carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 13 to 17. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

On sections 13 to 17, any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 13 to 17 carry?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2, sections 13 to 17, carried.

Shall schedule 2 carry as a whole? Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Schedule 2 of Bill 23 is a horrible, horrible, horrible schedule. I'm going to quote from the

Friends of the Golden Horseshoe: David Crombie, Lynn Morrow, Susan Swail, Kevin Eby, Ken Greenberg, David Israelson and Victor Doyle. This is their summary: "These changes to conservation authorities are unfathomable in this era of climate change"—unfathomable.

What schedule 2 does is that it makes it much easier for developers to build sprawl and much harder for municipalities and conservation authorities to do their job and protect us and build right. It's very concerning and I urge you to vote against schedule 2.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I think this is a similar motion to mine. Great minds think alike, I guess.

We've heard from many people—the conservation authorities themselves and Conservation Ontario. We know we've lived in a safer Ontario for the last 70 years because of the conservation authorities. We haven't had the flooding that exists in other provinces because of the conservation authorities. They have an endless amount of advice and expertise in their talented staff.

The 444 municipalities across Ontario have talent as well. They don't have the expertise; they will tell you that straight up. They don't have the expertise, they don't have the capacity, to handle this workload that will be coming down on them—unfairly and unwarranted.

Again, we're throwing the baby out with the bathwater. I'm going to give my colleagues across the table the benefit of the doubt. I just don't think that it has been thought through, and the ramifications are huge. We will all pay the price for that, all across our ridings, and it doesn't have to be that way. We can do the right thing, vote against schedule 2 and retain the conservation authorities' expertise and oversight that they have so wonderfully and dutifully implemented in the last 70 years—70 years, people. It's a heck of a lot of experience and knowledge and history in keeping Ontario safe.

1500

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 2 carried.

Moving to schedule 3, section 1, Development Charges Act, 1997: Shall schedule 3, section 1, carry? Any debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Just one second.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Sure. Okay? Are the members ready to vote, then? Shall schedule 3, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those

opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 3, section 1, carried.

Moving to schedule 3, section 2: We have amendment number 19. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: What does this mean? This is a very important motion because it will allow municipalities to keep using development charges to fund housing services. In the city of Toronto, development fees—about \$1,000 a unit—go to helping us address our homelessness crisis.

In the city of Toronto, we have encampments returning; our shelters are full. We have over 10,000 people who have nowhere to go. They've got no homes. They're sleeping on couches; they're sleeping in parks; they're sleeping in ravines. They've got nowhere to go. The city of Toronto has some programs to help people. They've got a shelter system. They have an Open Door program, which provides discounts to developers that are building deeply affordable homes. They have the Housing Now program, which is building non-market housing, among other things, on public land. These are initiatives that tackle the short-term and the long-term issues that we're facing with our homelessness crisis. That's what the city does.

If this government is truly interested in addressing homelessness and addressing housing affordability, then this government would allow development fees to go towards helping people find a home. That's exactly what removing this motion will allow us to do. It's what is currently on the books right now. I urge you to vote for motion 19.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate, discussion on amendment 19? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I particularly came for this part of the debate this afternoon because the city of Waterloo is experiencing its first tent city ever, and they have actually asked the government to stop moving forward with this legislation so quickly, because they want the government to fully understand the financial impact of this legislation.

If you don't strike out this particular part of the legislation, then you're actually removing one of the only tools they have—around the \$1,000—to actually invest in some community housing options. By not supporting this you're actively, intentionally saying to municipalities, "We're going to remove this tool so that you don't actually have any recourse around creative housing options," as my colleague has outlined. This is felt more in areas like Brampton where the growth is so profound.

You need creative options. Municipalities need creative options. By not striking this part of the legislation out, you're saying, "Okay, well, you're still on your own as a municipality." It's disrespectful. Also, it's counter to what you say are your goals as a government in building more housing.

I would urge the government to strike this part of the legislation down.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 19, please raise your hands.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Okay. Recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 19 lost.

We're going to amendment 20. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm withdrawing this motion. It was dependent on the previous motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you.

Moving on now to schedule 3, section 2. Shall it carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour of—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Chair?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Oh, I'm sorry. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Because we have to bounce back and forth and I'm really desperately trying to follow, just give me one second.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): That's okay. So it's just at schedule 3, section 2. We'll just hold on for one sec. You're good? Okay.

Shall schedule 3, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 3, section 2, carried.

Moving to amendment number 21, which is to schedule 3, section 3.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 4.1(2) of the Development Charges Act, 1997 and substituting the following:

"Affordable residential unit, rented

"(2) A residential unit intended for use as a rented residential premises shall be considered to be an affordable residential unit if it is the less expensive of,

"(a) a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or

"(b) a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.

"Interpretation

"(2.1) In subsection (2), 'low and moderate income households' and 'regional market area' have the same meaning as in the provincial policy statement, 2020 issued under section 3 of the Planning Act and approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council by order in council No. 229/2020."

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate or discussion, please? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why we're introducing this motion is because in Bill 23, this government wants to bring in development fee exemptions for so-called affordable rental units, and affordable rental units for rent and sale, that are not affordable. They're just not affordable.

We are proposing an affordable housing definition that comes from the provincial government's own provincial policy statement. This is basically the definition of "affordable" that the provincial government already uses. We are listening to housing experts who are telling us loud and clear that a definition of affordability needs to be tied to how much the occupant earns. It has to be tied to income. It cannot be tied exclusively to market rent or market conditions because then we're in a situation like we're in today, where housing affordability—rent and purchase price—is so far above what a low- or moderate- or middle-income person can earn. And because that's so far above what they can earn, this government is introducing definitions of affordability that just really aren't affordable, so you're going to give these developers a massive exemption in development fees to build unaffordable units.

1510

I'm putting forward a motion here that says, "Look. If we're going to give discounts to developers on fees, which the city already does, then at least make the definition affordable." That's what this motion is about.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I will definitely be supporting this phenomenal amendment to this—I won't even put an adjective—bill. It's the right thing to do. We heard it time and time again from people who won the lottery and were able to present here—the few people that could. We heard it from them. They're experts in their field; again, we are not the experts. We think we know everything sometimes, but we don't. Also, we've seen it in the endless amount of written submissions that have come in. People have taken the time to write to us and share their areas of expertise, their passion, their knowledge, their thoughts, and we should respect that and be open and consider this.

So I would wholeheartedly ask you for your support for this amendment.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate or discussion? MPP Fife, yes.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Since 2016, the tenant advocacy group has reported on the shocking drop in affordable private market rentals. From 2016 to 2021—so this is your responsibility—the number of rentals costing \$1,000 a month or less dropped by 36%. So 36% of the people could not afford housing. The number of luxury rentals costing \$3,000 a month or more increased by 87%. That's the new housing that this government has overseen.

We're trying to help you here with a definition of affordability which may provide housing for people in Ontario. I thought that was the goal. I thought that was your stated goal. If not, then you should just rename this bill "more unaffordable housing for Ontarians." At least be honest about it.

This motion should be supportable. It's good that your undivided attention is on housing. But I do think, Madam Chair, that there's value in being open to changing legislation.

If you've got it wrong, which you do, then at least make an effort to make it right.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? Okay. Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 21 lost.

Moving to amendment 22: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 4.1(3) of the Development Charges Act, 1997 and substituting the following:

"Affordable residential unit, ownership

"(3) A residential unit not intended for use as a rented residential premises shall be considered to be an affordable residential unit if it is the less expensive of,

"(a) a unit for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or

"(b) a unit for which the purchase price is at least 10 per cent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area.

"Interpretation

"(3.1) In subsection (3), 'low and moderate income households' and 'regional market area' have the same meaning as in the provincial policy statement, 2020 issued under section 3 of the Planning Act and approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council by order in council No. 229/2020."

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is very similar to motion 21. In this case, we're talking about units that are built with the goal of helping people move in and own it.

I am a big fan of rent-to-own measures and measures which allow people to own the home they live in. It's a very good thing. We're very much supportive of it. I'm very excited to see the rent-to-own measures that this government is looking at introducing.

But here's the challenge that I have: Bill 23, as it's written, means that developers who build affordable residential units for ownership can get a development fee

exemption if the unit is at 80% of the average sale price in that area.

The city of Toronto worked that out for our area. That means a one-bedroom condo costs \$440,000, which means that a household needs to be earning about \$130,000 a year in order to afford it. That is not a low-income, moderate-income or even middle-income family at \$130,000 in household income in a year. We're talking upper-middle when we're getting to \$130,000. Those people need homes too, no question, but should we be giving developers a fee exemption for building one-bedroom condos that cost \$440,000 to buy? No, we shouldn't.

This definition creates affordable housing for people to own that is, once again, tied to their income. So they move into a home, they get to own it, they get to have that security, and it's based on it costing no more than 30% of their gross annual household income, so they can afford it.

In our riding—I like to think of Yorkville. People think of Yorkville as being a very wealthy area. There are actually a lot of lower-income and middle-income people in Yorkville as well. There are people who have been living there for 20 or 30 years. A lot of them are health care workers; a lot of them are front-line workers. A lot of them aren't earning a lot of money. Some of them are seniors. These are the kinds of people I think of when I think about people who should be able to afford a home, and they can't afford this home. They don't have \$130,000 in household income.

We are proposing a definition of "affordable" that's based on the provincial government's own definition. It makes a lot of sense. It would be great if you could support it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: Well, I want to thank my colleague for moving this forward and, just for the committee's benefit, name a couple of the deputations we have that align with what MPP Bell is expressing. Carolyn Whitzman, a proud resident of Ottawa Centre and one of Canada's housing experts, talked about this, that if we move away from the notion that housing that is truly affordable is separated from income and we associate it the cost for the housing market, which has just absolutely grown exponentially in the last decade, we're really not landing in a spot of something being affordable.

MPP Bell can maybe jog my memory—or if you're busy, don't worry about it; perhaps someone else can. We had a developer appear before this committee, a progressive developer, making the case against the notion of what the government has proposed, 80% of market rent, and actually saying it was—I'm forgetting the gentleman's name.

Ms. Jessica Bell: It was the Rose foundation.

Mr. Joel Harden: That's correct: the Rose foundation. Thank you—for the record. He was saying that we needed to make sure that if we were actually going to build affordable housing, it can't be linked to what prevailing market prices are and an 80% average of it. We need to actually make sure that it's linked to people's incomes.

Certainly one can make a case, as our friends from Reena made—very persuasively, I thought, from a disability rights perspective—that to build supportive housing, there should be some benefit. The government can go out of its way to make sure there's some benefit and some help in reducing costs.

But across the board, doing that for people who can't afford a \$440,000 purchase price for a condo—I guess I'm just asking: Does math matter? Because if math mattered, we wouldn't be saying something is affordable if it costs \$440,000 for people on a guaranteed income supplement, who are seniors; for people on the Ontario Disability Support Program; for people stitching together a couple of minimum-wage jobs, trying to raise kids. We want those folks to have homes as much as people around this table, who work hard for this province and earn much better livings.

So I want to wholeheartedly support what my colleague is doing—sticking with the expert advice we received from two different experts, if not more—and suggest that if we pass this, it would be a good message. We would be saying to the development community, "We want to support you—if you're building affordable housing that's truly linked to people's income."

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment number 22? All those in favour of amendment 22, please raise your hands.

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 22 lost.

Moving to amendment 23: MPP Bell.

1520

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out "intended to be an affordable residential unit for a period of 25 years or more from the time that the unit is first rented or sold" in subsection 4.1(8) of the Development Charges Act, 1997 and substituting "intended to permanently be an affordable residential unit".

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: If we pass Bill 23 as it's currently written, we're just kicking the can, we're kicking the housing affordability crisis down the road. That's what we're doing to the next generation. It is essential that we have permanently affordable homes. If we are going to give big development-fee exemptions, then these homes need to be permanently affordable.

I sometimes see the argument that that's not going to work, that it's too financially difficult for developers to do

that, and when I hear that, I think about the city of Toronto's inclusionary zoning law. They spent years studying it. They had developers look at it, they had experts look at it, to come up with affordable housing targets that allowed developers to develop and also allowed them to contribute their fair share to the community, to our city, by contributing to services and building affordable housing units. Study after study after study showed that it could be done.

The city of Toronto used a definition of affordable housing that was essentially permanent: It was 99 years. It has been studied, and we know that it can work. We should be including that here in this bill as well, in Bill 23, which is why I've introduced this motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Again, I'm happy to support MPP Bell's amendment. It's the right thing to do. I was at the city when we were debating inclusionary zoning, and I would argue that the percentage needs to be much higher. I think there was talk about increasing it. Germany—honestly, I think it's an over 50% rate of inclusionary zoning.

So we don't want to mess with a good thing, and we just seem to be continuing to do that with this bill. Again, I think there's a little bit of confusion about the fine details and how we're throwing the baby out with the bathwater. We could just slow it down and think things through a little bit more methodically and do the right thing. So I'm happy to support this, and I hope you can too.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Thanks to MPP Bell for this amendment. It leaves more questions, really, that the government isn't going to support this—because where did you even come up with the 25 years? I mean, what an arbitrary number.

We do know from several conservative economists that stability in the housing market actually lends itself to stability in the economy. The rent-to-own option, for instance, actually has people building up equity. You're not supportive of that, even though the research and the documentation is very clear that this actually improves economic outcomes, and equity as a sideline, I guess.

Minister Clark has said that he wants to make sure that all options are on the table, that every tool in the tool box is used. Well, making sure that the housing actually stays affordable and inclusionary for a period of time past 25 years seems like easy, low-hanging fruit for the minister.

Once again, though, if you're not committed to making housing affordable for a period of time past 25 years, even though we have great issues with your affordability ceiling, then, really, the question is why? Why would the government not want to be permanently investing in housing options that are affordable in the long term?

This should be a very easy motion for the government to support, because it makes common sense, even conservative common sense.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment 23? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 23, please raise

your hands. All those opposed to amendment 23, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 23 lost.

Shall schedule 3, section 3, carry? Debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 3 of section 3 carried.

Shall schedule 3, section 4, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 3, section 4, carried.

Moving to schedule 3, section 5, amendment number 24: MPP Bell, when you're ready.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 5(1) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'll read out what this motion actually means and then I'll explain its intent. Essentially, this allows municipalities to continue basing development charges on the service standards that existed 10 years ago, instead of extending this retrospective outlook to 15 years. The essence of that is it means that development charges are less than what they should be. That's a problem. Development fees are used to partially pay—it's just partial—the cost of providing infrastructure to new residents, TTC, schools, parks and sewage. It doesn't make sense to make it harder for municipalities to generate their revenue in order to provide for the services we need to make a municipality great.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment number 24? All those in favour of amendment—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 24 lost.

Going to amendment 25: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 5(3) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm just going to explain what this motion means. This motion would take away the ability of municipalities to levy development charges to recover land acquisition costs for services. What that essentially means is, the province can say, "You're required to build this new road because of this new development." If the municipality turns around and says, "We have to buy all this land in order to provide this service," the province is telling them, "You can't actually turn around and use development fees to cover that cost."

The essence of it is that developers and the provincial government have got the credit card—they're the child, and it is the parent, the municipality that has to pay the bill. That's what this means.

Our proposal to strike this out is to just add certainty to development fees and give municipalities the power they need and not have a situation where they're forced to pay for things that they didn't plan for or ask for.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Just to quote a few mayors, the mayor of Markham, Mayor Frank Scarpitti, says, "We've already exempted subsidized housing units from development charges and park levies and a number of other things... So that's nothing new and I don't think we need to be taught how."

"At the same time, Bill 23 reduces development charges that municipalities rely on to build infrastructure for future growth—an estimated loss of about 10% in charges collected," said the CAO.

"This could cost the region billions of dollars over the next 30 years ... 'eliminating the opportunity to build soccer fields, baseball diamonds, cricket pitches and splash pads, amenities that people expect to be in a community.'"

He "called on the province to follow through on its promise, made shortly after the provincial election, to work with a special task force including municipal leaders. 1530

"The fact that the very task force they set out to work with hasn't even been appointed and never met begs the question, where did this policy get developed?"

I think that's at the heart of the motion that MPP Bell has brought forward. I mean, who is driving these changes?

Municipalities have become very dependent on the revenue through development charges to strengthen their communities, and the fact is that you have mayors and regional leaders from across the province telling you that they need this revenue. You're intentionally, through this legislation, removing that leverage.

I think the question of why the service standards that existed 15 years ago are a better baseline than the standard that existed 10 years ago—it certainly doesn't make a lot of sense, because a lot of knowledge about planning inclusive and whole communities was learned through that process. All we can do is try to point out the inconsistencies in the arguments that you've made for this legislation, strengthen the community voices who are in charge of housing at the municipal level and support those points of view.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Member—

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): McMahan.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): McMahan.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahan: Remember me?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I remember you.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahan: Remember me from my standing ovation this morning? Thank you very much.

This is another great amendment by MPP Bell. We heard loudly and clearly from mayors across Ontario, the big-city mayors—Guelph Mayor Cam Guthrie was representing them last week, I guess it was, at committee—but also all kinds of other mayors.

We heard from the city of Toronto that there will be a \$230-million hole in their annual budget. This is the city of Toronto, the economic engine of Ontario, saying they're going to have a \$230-million hole in their budget with this removal of the DCs.

We are sharing this narrative, some of us, that these municipalities are sitting on a treasure chest of unspent DCs when we found out from the horse's mouth directly that those funds were already allocated, some of them to provincial projects including the Ontario Line. How does that make sense? We're taking away the money for them to deliver the Ontario Line, and that's our project—again, a disconnect. That's the theme of today.

So where is this money going to come from? Is it going to be slapped on the backs of taxpayers? If so, they won't have the money, because they're too busy spending it on their basements that are flooding now because the conservation authorities are gone. So let's think this through and do the right thing: Support MPP Bell's amendment.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much, MPP McMahan. Any further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? All those in favour—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahan: Recorded, please.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): A recorded vote has been called for.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahan.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We'll now proceed with amendment 26. MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 5(6) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding "and in respect of which Ontario has established a compensation program to reimburse municipalities for loss of revenues from reduced development charges" before "the rules must provide" in the portion before subparagraph 4 i of subsection 5(6) of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any debate on the motion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm going to read AMO's submission. This relates to development charges. The whole purpose of development charges is "to help municipalities pay for a portion of the capital infrastructure required to support new growth." Just pay a portion of the capital. They don't pay operating; it's just a portion of the capital.

The challenge is that with the radical and drastic cuts to development fees, we are seeing a situation where municipalities are going to be facing a very difficult predicament where they're going to have to dramatically raise taxes or significantly cut services and capital projects in order to break even.

Just to give you some understanding of the financial cost of this, the city of Toronto expects to lose \$230 million, and Ottawa, \$30 million. AMO estimates that it will lead to an overall reduction of \$5.1 billion over the next nine years.

What that means is that, next time you're driving down a road and there's a pothole that hasn't been fixed, you should blame a Conservative. If the TTC is late because service standards have been cut, you should blame a Conservative. If you go to a school and you find that, because of all the development in the area, your child cannot go to the local school because it's overcrowded—which is happening in my area, at Whitney—blame a Conservative. If there is no nearby park for you to attend, blame a Conservative, because this also cuts funding to parks as well. If you've got an issue, if your municipality has issues with stormwater runoff because the sewage system and the water system can't handle the increase in the number of people in your area, once again, blame a Conservative.

We have introduced this motion asking the Ontario government to come up with a compensation program to help municipalities fund the necessary infrastructure if they want to move forward with these development fee cuts. It's pretty simple.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, are members—

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): A recorded vote has been called for.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We'll proceed now with amendment 27. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 5(7) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding “in respect of which Ontario has established a compensation program to reimburse municipalities for loss of revenues from reduced development charges” before “shall be reduced” in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 5(8) of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Same thing: If you're going to cut development fees, come up with a program to help municipalities provide for the services that we need to make our cities great. From the TTC to schools to sewage, it's all necessary. That's the purpose of this motion.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm happy to support this. I think we all should, because our municipalities are going to be asking us, “Where's the money coming from?” We're in an affordability crisis, we're in a housing crisis, we're in a climate emergency, we're in a million terrible situations, and then we're robbing municipalities of some funding. Again, have we thought this through? Where's the money going to come from? Where do we think that's coming from? I'm just asking. I'm just feeling like I'm screaming into the wind over here. But anyway, I'm hoping you can support the amendment.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): A recorded vote has been called for.

Ayes

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We'll now proceed with amendment number 27.1: MPP McGregor.

1540

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(7) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out “June 1, 2022” in subsection 5(7) of the Development Charges Act, 1997 and substituting “January 1, 2022”.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: MPP McGregor, could you please explain what this motion means and why you're introducing it?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Mr. Graham McGregor: I think the amendment's fairly self-explanatory.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Well, I would encourage you to share. You must be proud of it. We have spoken about our amendments at length, and it would be great to hear from you.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Bell

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm very concerned about this motion, and I'll tell you why. This motion says that the development charge reductions apply to January 1, 2022, instead of June 1, 2022, which essentially means that once the government introduced this bill, a whole lot of developers that had already got their building permits in said, "Whoa, whoa, whoa. What about us? We're not going to get that reduction as well?" They probably called you guys up and said, "Oh, no, we want this to be retroactive so that we can get the development fee reduction as well."

What's so interesting about that is that they were already scheduled to build these new homes. So when this government talks about how this is going to help build new homes, these homes were already in the pipeline. We're already planning on building these homes. So why should these developers get the fee reduction, especially when we know that the definition isn't affordable and that the development fee reductions also apply to purpose-built rentals that are exempt from rent control?

If you go to a new purpose-built rental in my riding and you look at what it costs to rent a two-bedroom home or a three-bedroom home, you're looking at upwards of \$3,500 for a three-bedroom home. The floor layout—they do it really well where they can get down to an 1,100-square-foot unit or less and they can still squeeze in three bedrooms. Why should a developer who is building a luxury purpose-built rental that retails for \$3,000 a month or more get a development fee exemption, and why would we support it being retroactive to January 1? The impact of that is that it will further disrupt the infrastructure plans and the financial plans of municipalities—not a good idea.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise their hands. All those opposed? I declare the motion carried. For the record, that's amendment 27.1 carried.

Shall schedule 3, section 5, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried. I declare schedule 3, section 5, as amended, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 6 or 7. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Shall schedule 3, sections 6 and 7 carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour? All those opposed? I declare schedule 3, section 6 and section 7, carried.

We're now on schedule 3, section 8, and we'll proceed with amendment 28. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 8(2) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding "in respect of which Ontario has established a compensation program to reimburse municipalities for loss of revenues from reduced development charges" before "shall be reduced" in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 26.1(1.1) of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you, MPP Bell. If I could ask you to reread after "subsection 26.2"—or before that?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): After.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Do you want me to read the whole thing again?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): After "subsection."

Ms. Jessica Bell: Sure. My apologies—subsection 26.2(1.1) of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Same thing: This government is looking at providing reductions in development charges for residential units that are two bedrooms in size or three or more bedrooms in size. If this is going to be proceeding, then our request is that Ontario come up with a compensation plan to reimburse municipalities for the loss of revenues.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise their hands. All those opposed? I declare the motion lost.

Amendment 28.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 8(2) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(2) Section 26.2 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

""Discount, rental housing development

""(1.1) In the case of rental housing development, the amount determined under subsection (1) shall be reduced in accordance with the following rules:

""1. A development charge for a residential unit intended for use as a rented residential premises with three or more bedrooms shall be reduced by 25 per cent.

""2. A development charge for a residential unit intended for use as a rented residential premises with two bedrooms shall be reduced by 20 per cent.

""3. A development charge for a residential unit intended for use as a rented residential premises not referred to in paragraph 1 or 2 shall be reduced by 15 per cent.

""Same, transition

""(1.2) Subject to subsection (1.3), subsection (1.1) does not apply in respect of a development charge for a development in respect of which a building permit was issued before the day subsection 8(2) of schedule 3 to the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 came into force.

""Same, exception

""(1.3) Despite subsection (7), paragraphs 1 to 3 of subsection (1.1) apply to any part of a development charge payable under an agreement under section 27 that is in respect of a prescribed development and that was entered into before the day that subsection 8(2) of schedule 3 to the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 came into force, other than a part of the development charge that is payable under the agreement before the day the development was prescribed for the purposes of this subsection."

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Could MPP McGregor please explain what this motion means and why you're introducing it?

Mr. Graham McGregor: I appreciate the ask for clarification. I was going to add that basically this gives the

government the ability to extend the proposed development charges discount for rental housing to rental housing developments that are subject to an existing agreement with the municipality. It would reduce development charge costs for rental housing development, incent the development of this type of housing and encourage the development of family-sized units. So it's consistent with our approach of reducing the costs for renters through reducing development charges. This extends that definition.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Harden.

1550

Mr. Joel Harden: Thanks for that explanation. I guess what I've yet to truly understand here is that it would seem, from what my colleague said, the cuts in development charges would apply to non-affordable rental housing. I remember the member mentioned family units, but I didn't hear the adjective "affordable" in there, Chair.

I'm just wondering if the member could clarify for the committee what specific developments the government wants to retroactively give discounts to, and how this will spur additional housing, since the provision applies to developments already under way that, on the surface, at least, you would think don't require additional incentives. How is this anything other than a taxpayer-funded gift to developers for building non-affordable housing?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Excellent question, MPP Harden. It does not make sense to allow this development fee discount to be retroactive. It means that developers that had already gotten their building permits, or were already proceeding with the development of this purpose-built rental building, will receive the development fee discount. That means it's not going to have any impact on incentivizing new housing supply.

All it's going to do is mean that the municipalities are going to have to pay more to pay for the infrastructure and the services that will now be needed for the new residents who are moving in. It will create more financial instability for municipalities and will impact their infrastructure plans. I don't get it. The only people who are going to be benefiting from this are developers. That's it.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: Again, Chair, I'm just begging for an answer to the question. From the government's standpoint, what's the rationale for doing this? I can understand, given the deputations we received here, the rationale for incentivizing housing for people with disabilities, as the Reena group mentioned. I can understand the rationale for wanting to develop deeply affordable homes for low-income people—everybody needs housing, for certain. But for people who can afford significant housing on the existing ownership or rental market—why are we opening up subsidies for them? What's the Conservative case for that?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none—MPP Harden, you want to debate more?

Mr. Joel Harden: Just because I'm trying to get an answer, Chair. It would seem, given that there's no reply to the question that I'm posing—the people of Ontario put the work to this committee to scrutinize this piece of legislation. All the people of Ontario know at this point, Chair, after hearing from expert advice, is that we have a housing affordability crisis—that adjective, "affordability," is really important—and we really need to target the province's money, given to us by hard-working people around the province, to best use. So how is it good use to target subsidies to properties that are not affordable? For the third time, is there an answer to this question?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? There being none, are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): A recorded vote has been called for.

Ayes

Bresee, Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith.

Nays

Bell, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion carried.

We're going to take a 10-minute break at this point, and we'll be back here at approximately 4:05.

The committee recessed from 1555 to 1606.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order.

When we left off, we had finished the amendments on schedule 3, section 8. So shall schedule 3, section 8, as amended, carry? Any debate? No debate. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Sorry. A point of clarification or a point of order: I just want to make sure 28.1 carried and is part of the new—okay, perfect. Thanks.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Yes. We didn't actually define it when it was carried. I didn't say "28.1." Should I have said—

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I did? Okay. Sorry. So, yes, it has been—a clarification for MPP McGregor.

One more time: Shall schedule 3, section 8, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it carried.

There are no amendments to sections 9 or 10. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 3, sections 9 and 10, carry? I declare sections 9 and 10 carried.

Schedule 3, section 11, amendment 29: Any debate?

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Pardon me. Can we just—give us a second here.

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Shall schedule 3, section 11, carry? Carried.

Schedule 3, section 11.1, amendment 29: MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that section 11.1 be added to schedule 3 to the bill:

“11.1 The act is amended by adding the following section:

“Compensation for municipalities

“59.2(1) The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall implement a program to compensate municipalities for the amount they would have been able to charge under this act is the amendments made by schedule 3 of the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 had not come into force.

“Appropriation required

“(2) The minister may only make a payment under subsection 1 if money has been appropriated for that purpose by the Legislature.”

MPP Bell and I have spoken about this similar topic earlier today, and I know you’ve been listening captively. It’s a big deal for the municipalities, how they’re going to fund their infrastructure and how they’re going to fund, as we heard from the city of Toronto, some of our provincial projects. We’re taking this away, but we haven’t heard where any assistance would come from. Maybe you know, but we don’t know.

We’re happy to work together on building more homes, but we need to do it the right way—in the right place, I would argue. So this is why I’m moving this: because I’m fighting for municipalities, especially yours and mine. We need to compensate them fairly, so our residents can have the infrastructure that’s needed. Thank you for your support.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise their hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 29 lost.

Okay. We’re now on schedule 3, section 12, amendment 30. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 12(3) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, Chair. I’d like this subsection to be struck out, because it removes the power the provincial government is giving itself to force municipalities to acquire land to provide services yet ban them from raising development charges to cover it. Once again, this is like someone having a credit card and then someone else paying the bill. It’s concerning. Municipalities should have authority over development fees and how they’re providing services—more authority than this gives them.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote? All those in favour of amendment 30, please raise their hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 30 lost.

Amendment 30.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that section 12 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4.1) Subsection 60(1) of the act is amended by adding the following clause:

“(s.2.1) prescribing developments for the purposes of subsection 26.2”.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP McGregor, could you reread the clause at the end in its entirety? The last line.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Oh—“of subsection 26.2(1.3);”

Sorry about that, Chair.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much.

Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I’m wondering if MPP McGregor or someone from the government side can explain the rationale for the amendment?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I think the amendment is fairly self-explanatory, and I urge all members to vote in favour.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: It’s not self-explanatory to me. In fact, as I understand it, this amendment is related to 28.1, whereupon I asked three times, in that debate, what is the case for a subsidy for non-affordable housing? So it’s another opportunity for someone to clarify: Why are we subsidizing non-affordable housing in a housing affordability crisis?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I’m surprised MPP McGregor didn’t raise his hand to speak, because it was a direct question from MPP Harden. I’m very concerned about this government’s measure. Essentially it brings in a retroactive tax break. Developers that were already planning on building are now eligible for a development fee discount that is supposed to incentivize them to build. That doesn’t make sense to me, especially when it is the municipalities, and you or I, that now have to pay for the services that will need to be delivered to Ontarians that move into this development because we’re reducing the amount of development fee a developer pays.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: We hear this kind of rhetoric from the opposition regularly, where we know their favour for increased fees and stalling development.

We know that we need to make housing affordable across the board. This is an initiative designed to incent, certainly, family-sized rental. We need to see more of that. We haven’t seen enough purpose-built rentals. We had a record year in 2021, including rental starts, but we need to

do more. We certainly hope that the opposition will support us on it. I don't have the highest hopes of that, but I think we all have a duty. We all promised in the last election to build 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years. Our party did it; your party did it as well. The work that we're doing to lower the costs for the eventual tenants and homeowners, for some of these units—we all have a duty to incent the construction of housing that people need. We certainly hope that the opposition will vote in favour.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: Thank you, Chair. Through you, that was further along the road to an answer, and that's good. But can I just drill down, through you, Chair, to my friends in government? Is the case being made this afternoon that, towards the prime objective of resolving the housing affordability crisis, if I'm to quote what I just heard, we need to make all forms of housing more affordable? So is the allegation that I'm hearing, then, as MPP Bell had said in earlier debate, that a one-bedroom condo for \$440,000—would MPP McGregor consider that affordable? Because that would qualify for a subsidy under this amendment.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I didn't hear an answer to that, so I'll ask the question a different way: Would a two-bedroom condo costing \$720,000 be affordable for MPP McGregor? Because it would apply under this amendment.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I'll just say, I think it's fun to see political games from the opposition, but to be clear about this, we are fundamentally misaligned with our housing market. I think the NDP acknowledged this with their words and their platform, but we haven't really seen them put it forward in action.

We live in a G7 country. Of any G7 country, we have the lowest amount of housing units per person. In Ontario, we have the lowest amount of housing units per person of any province in Canada. So we need get building.

We know the NDP, the New Democratic Party—maybe we should call them the needlessly-delaying-projects party of Ontario. We know they're in this favour of increased fees and increased delays that eventually work their way to the tenant and the homeowner.

We need to incent construction of 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years. We have strong levels of immigration, which we need. We have a labour shortage of almost 400,000 people that need to fill some of the jobs in Ontario. To put that in perspective, I've only been elected, myself, since June, but I was initially nominated as a candidate about October last year. When I was nominated, that number about the labour shortage was actually under 300,000, so we know there's a problem that's getting more extenuated, not less extenuated.

1620

We need everyone to come to the table. This is not a partisan issue, right? The federal government has increased the immigration targets for the country, because we know

that Ontario doesn't exist in a bubble. We know the labour shortage affects all Canadians. It affects all the provinces in Canada and they've increased—we see immigration levels rising up to half a million people in 2025. We know that the lion's share of those people are going to come to Ontario. I say this to the opposition through the Chair: Who would we be if we invited the lion's share of half a million people into Ontario and we didn't build homes for them to live in; we didn't build hospitals for them to go to when they get sick—which the NDP voted against; we didn't build transit for them to get around—which the NDP voted against, which, by the way, the province has been funding in partnership with the federal government to assist a lot of these municipalities. So for a lot of the infrastructure wants and needs that we're hearing about, Ontario has skin in the game anyway.

I'd reiterate it's not a partisan issue. We have a Progressive Conservative government here in Ontario. We have a federal Liberal government over in Ottawa. I hope members aren't suggesting that we stop building. Not only is it NIMBY, "not in my backyard," not only is it BANANA, "build absolutely nothing anywhere near anyone"; it's getting to the point where you feel that the members from the opposition don't only want construction to be delayed in their own backyard, they don't want anyone to build in anybody else's backyard either.

We know that many new Canadians coming deserve a chance at a home that they want and deserve. We know that millennials have been priced out of the market for way too long. You look at a neighbourhood like Snelgrove in my riding where you have empty nesters who have kids in their twenties earning good paycheques that are still living at home, still living in the basement.

You look at a neighbourhood like M section in Brampton North where you have seniors that want to downsize, but they're not able to find the right type of housing where they want to live. You see new Canadians coming in continuously, trying to make their home and have a good life for them and their family here in Brampton, but the right type of housing doesn't exist for them.

You see international students—a lot them moving in around Sheridan College, a lot of them moving across the city of Brampton—who are living in illegal basement apartments. When the type of housing they need is not available, it's hard to blame the student, right? I mean politicians have really let down a lot of these people. You see it through this constant delay tactic. You see it when they want to say no for the sake of saying no.

We know that we need to incent construction. That's certainly part of what this bill is doing, but I would also say, Chair, that I'd be remiss if I didn't add that there's no silver bullet to the housing crisis. We know, and I think my colleagues across the committee room know as well, that we need continuous action on this front. We need a housing supply action plan every year over the next four years to continue the good work that was started at the start of this government, but we need to continue it because we know that we need to fundamentally align the market. That supply has not kept up with the demand. The demand is

only going to increase. I think as lawmakers, as legislators, we all need to take that responsibility seriously.

I would also say to the members opposite, we need to move beyond this kind of “not in my backyard” mentality to a “yes in my backyard” mentality. Sometimes we’ll hear from other folks that the NDP are categorized as the NIMBY democratic party; I don’t think that’s true. I think the members across have good intentions, but we constantly hear from them the need to delay, to increase the costs on projects, to really penalize people that want to get into a new home or get into a new rental unit.

We’re going to continue to take action to incent more rental construction. I think that’s needed across Ontario. It’s certainly needed in Ottawa. I’d say it’s probably needed in Niagara Centre. I think it’s probably needed in University–Rosedale. Dare I say, it’s needed in Beaches–East York. It’s certainly needed in Brampton. We are seeing the population increase. Depending on the number that you look at, it’s near to 700,000 people living in Brampton. Twenty years ago that number was closer to 300,000.

It’s funny when you say to people in Brampton that we need to build more homes. We feel like we built a lot of homes, but we’re still nowhere up to meeting the demand. That’s going to take some courage. That’s going to take some resolve. Certainly, on this side of the committee, we have the resolve to see that through. That speaks to the heart of what we are trying to do regarding rental. We want to make it more affordable to build rental of all types, because when you incent the development of rental you start to align the market to the direction that we want it to go.

But I’ll also say the members raise a very good point around affordability. They say you need to do more on affordable—I would point to the other parts of the bill where we lower the development charges on affordable housing as well.

This amendment is about rental specifically. We also have parts of the bill around affordable that, if I’m not mistaken, the members filed notice to vote against. They want to vote against amendments that we have that will lower the cost of building affordable housing in Ontario. They want to vote against decreasing the cost of building purpose-built rental in Ontario.

We heard from experts. We heard from the Federation of Rental-housing Providers of Ontario how this will help incent the construction of more rental. When we have a market that is more aligned between supply and demand, I think that results in a better, more fair market, which hopefully levels the playing field for members of my generation, young Canadians, but also for new Canadians and for seniors.

I guess I’ll leave my comments there, but I’m happy to expand on those thoughts if the members opposite require.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: We got a little further towards an answer there, Chair. That’s not bad. That was a good amount of extemporaneous venting.

But look, the question was, how will this subsidy of non-affordable housing help the affordability crisis? I heard in the last round of comments that there was an allegation that we are opposed to development. One of the deputations that left the biggest impression on me was from Mr. Phil Pothén, from Environmental Defence. He said very clearly that those of us who represent urban centres, and that’s pretty much everybody on this side of the table here, know very well that, of course—members have a point—there will be some people that aren’t liking any kind of development anywhere. But if you actually rigorously poll and consult neighbourhoods in urban centres in Ontario, we want intensification in the downtown. It just has to be consultative.

What isn’t going to go over terribly well and what we just had in Ottawa, in the Lansdowne area, if you’re familiar with where the Redblacks play—because a lot of your constituents ride down the highway to come see those games. The fact of the matter is, in that community, we had at the eleventh hour, in the dying weeks of the last municipal government in Ottawa, two huge towers of highly expensive housing get proposed as a means to deal with our housing supply crisis in the downtown. And residents rightfully said, “Well, wait a second. How is that going to help families who need affordable housing?” How is that going to help the newcomers the member talks about live in our great city of Ottawa? Frankly, it won’t. But, as is often the case, this was dropped upon Capital Ward, a community in Ottawa Centre, at the last moment—two huge towers, zero consultation—railroaded through our planning committee, railroaded through the whole process.

So you can understand how we look at amendments like this with a great deal of suspicion. Is this going to be encouraging more expensive rental housing? Is that what the member is actually alluding to? I don’t get it. I honestly don’t get it. If we’re in a housing affordability crisis and we need more affordable housing, how is providing gifts to developers to build more luxury homes going to help us? In fact, what it might do—and Toronto members here can give me some of the figures on this; I don’t have them at the tips of my fingers—is create a glut of unutilized expensive housing, because I understand that has happened in this city, where we actually have very beautiful units with glass panes that you can see from the outside as you drive along the Gardiner sitting empty. We’ve had no serious debate at this committee about what the government of Ontario plans to do. Other jurisdictions in New York assess a levy on that, and they use the resources from that levy to build housing.

1630

Now, to the NDP’s record: Let’s talk about that, because one of the constituents I’m proud to work with is Evelyn Gigantes. That name will ring a bell for you, Chair, I’m sure. She served in this House as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing under the Rae government, and guess what happened under Evelyn’s leadership here? Non-market housing increased in Ontario by 62%. That’s social housing, that’s co-operative housing, where they—in the case of a co-op, the residents; in the case of community

housing building, the province—can fix the price. That really did help people and low-income folks get access to a home they could afford. But that housing stock, as we've already said in debate, is falling apart.

So if we want to talk about the NDP record on creating affordable homes, I think the record is clear. I don't think any government since can claim that kind of increase in non-market housing that directly helped low-income people, be it in a co-op or a community-housing environment. Of course, we've got lots more work to do.

So, again, I'm going to throw it out to the member, to anybody on that side of the House, to explain to this committee and to the people of Ontario: How does subsidizing not-affordable housing deal with the affordability crisis? How does that happen, in the rental or ownership market?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none—oh, pardon me. Get that hand up a little higher there. MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Sorry about that, Chair. I'm still new around here.

Again, I would just implore the member to consider that incenting the building of more purpose-built rental in Ontario and lowering the cost of building such rental is going to create more rental housing opportunities across Ontario and help the entire market. I appreciate if the member won't be voting for the amendment, but I think it's a good one and I hope he reconsiders.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 30.1 carried.

Shall schedule 3, section 12, as amended, carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare schedule 3, section 12, as amended, carried.

I now have amendment 31: section 12.1 of schedule 3. MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that section 12.1 be added to schedule 3 to the bill:

"12.1 Part IV of the act is amended by adding the following section:

"Report on impact of More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022

"60.2(1) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall prepare a report detailing the impact of the amendments to this act made by the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, including in particular,

"(a) the ministry's efforts to ensure that development charge and fee savings are passed on to consumers;

"(b) the impact of the amendments on housing prices in Ontario; and

"(c) the impact of the amendments on the number of first-time home buyers in Ontario.

"Publication and tabling

"(2) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall make the report described in subsection (1) available to the public and table it in the assembly."

That which is measured gets done. If we want to move this bill, let's measure it to see how successful it is and report back and be transparent about that. Also, we want to make sure that if we're robbing municipalities of these development charges so they can't put in the infrastructure, then we want to pass that savings along to consumers and ensure it's done.

That's, in essence, my amendment. Thank you in advance for your support.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I support MPP McMahon's amendment. Experts are clear on this: There is no indication that Bill 23 is going to lower home prices; there is no indication that Bill 23 is going to lower rent prices. It is a wise idea for the impact of Bill 23 to at least be measured so we can document the impacts of this bill.

I'm reminded of the federal government's National Housing Strategy and a recent Auditor General report that indicated that the billions of dollars that the federal government's National Housing Strategy has invested in affordable housing have had no impact on addressing homelessness, because the federal government did not bother to track it. The Canadian Auditor General just concluded that. I wouldn't want the same allegations to be made about Bill 23, where there are all these bold, bold promises that increasing supply will make housing more affordable, when there's nothing in this bill that indicates that you're going to track it.

It's an excellent amendment. I will be supporting it. Let's track it.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the amendment? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 31 lost.

Amendment 32, to section 12.2 of schedule 3: MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that section 12.2 be added to schedule 3 to the bill:

"12.2 Part IV of the act is amended by adding the following section:

"Report on consumer reductions and costs

"60.3(1) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing shall prepare a report describing,

"(a) whether the reduction in development charges caused by the amendments to this act made by the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 has resulted in a proportionate reduction in the cost of housing; and

"(b) what additional costs, in the form of property tax increases or other financial burdens, were placed on consumers as a result of the amendments made to this act by the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022.

"Publication and tabling

"(2) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall make the report described in subsection (1) available to the public and table it in the assembly."

It's the same kind of thing: Just measure it, track it, brag about it if it's successful, showcase it publicly, bring it back to the assembly, and let us know. It's really drastic, what's happening with the development charges, and so we want to know the effects that that is going to have all around. Thank you again, in advance, for your consideration and possible support.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Just to clarify—and I apologize to the member—once you move your amendment, we'll then call for further debate. It's fine for this one, but in the future we'll just move the amendment, then we'll call for further debate. You went directly into debate.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, okay.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you, MPP McMahon. So, now: Any further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you. I support this amendment that was introduced by MPP McMahon. It makes a lot of sense. With this testimony and the written submissions that we received, many experts, including municipal experts and housing experts, questioned the theory that if we reduce development fees it will lead to a corresponding reduction in housing prices. Housing prices are set by the market. It makes sense to introduce this motion to really look at the impact of cutting development charges on housing prices, because a lot of people are telling us that there is no real direct link.

1640

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded, please.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare amendment 32 lost.

There are no amendments to sections 13 and 14. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 3, sections 13 and 14, carry? Any debate? Shall schedule 3, sections 13 and 14, carry? Carried—oh, sorry, we do have debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I want to debate about schedule 3 overall. I just don't want to miss that bit.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We're not there yet.

So sections 13 and 14 of schedule 3 have carried.

Does schedule 3, as amended, carry? Any further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate it.

Overall, schedule 3 has some very concerning elements to it: It significantly reduces development charges for luxury purpose-built rentals as well as homes that are not

affordable for low-income, middle-income, moderate-income people—it's very concerning; nor has this government been interested in accepting some of the amendments that we proposed, which is to have the provincial government provide additional support to municipalities so we can have the services that we need as we grow.

There are some measures in schedule 3 which we support. The missing middle provisions to allow three homes as of right on a residential lot makes a lot of sense. Changing development fees to encourage that makes a lot of sense. Reducing and exempting development fees for non-market homes, co-op homes and non-profit homes makes a lot of sense. But there are so many other measures within schedule 3 that are concerning that we will be voting against this schedule.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Are we prepared to vote? Shall schedule 3, as amended, carry?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded, please.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 3, as amended, carried.

We'll now move on to schedule 4. We're making great progress here. We're moving on to schedule 4, the Municipal Act, 2001. Schedule 4, section 1, NDP amendment 33: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Subsection 99.1(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 is repealed and the following substituted:

“Demolition, conversion and repairs and renovation of residential rental properties

“(1) The city may prohibit and regulate”—can I just say “the municipality”? Is that okay?

Interjections.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Bear with us.

I move to withdraw section 33, because I have another one with it.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Amendment 33?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Correct. I would like to withdraw amendment 33.

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The member has another motion. Please proceed.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you. I appreciate it.

I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 99.1(7) of the Municipal Act, 2001 and substituting the following:

“Regulations

“(7) The minister may make regulations prescribing minimum standards on the powers of a local municipality under this section with respect to,

“(a) the protection and compensation of tenants; and

“(b) the preservation of the stock of available residential units.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The Clerk will circulate the motion so all members have an opportunity to peruse it, and then we will offer an opportunity for further debate.

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Very well. Thank you, MPP Bell. Please proceed.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you. I appreciate it.

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

“(0.1) Subsection 99.1(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 is repealed and the following substituted:

“Demolition, conversion and repairs and renovation of residential rental properties

“(1) A local municipality may prohibit and regulate,

“(a) the demolition of residential rental properties;

“(b) the conversion of residential rental properties to a purpose other than the purpose of a residential rental property; and

“(c) the repair or renovation of residential rental properties for which the landlord has or will give notice under section 50 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The amendment is now being distributed to the members of the committee, and then we will open it up to further debate, should they choose to participate.

Have all the members received the copy of the amendment? Are they ready to proceed on further debate? They have had a chance to look at it, so we'll call for further debate. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why I'm introducing this motion is because it's not just Toronto that has a rental replacement bylaw that is under threat; it's the right of municipalities across Ontario to have their own rental replacement bylaw to protect tenants who live in purpose-built rentals if a developer chooses to turn that purpose-built rental into a luxury condo.

1650

Currently, in the city of Toronto and also in Mississauga, if a renter has to move out because of conversion, then they have the right to return at about the same rent that they are currently paying. It ensures that we keep our affordable housing stock, and it also ensures that people who call a neighbourhood home get to stay in that neighbourhood and contribute to their community. It's very important.

We are wanting to extend the provisions that municipalities can use to include renovation so we can really clamp down on the sharp rise in illegal renovations that are happening in municipalities across Ontario. We think that is very important.

We also want to respect the municipalities that are looking at bringing in this rental replacement bylaw. Hamilton and Ottawa are moving forward with bringing in this regulation, because they also understand the value in keeping private market affordable homes in the municipality and protecting renters who can't afford a big rent increase. That's why I'm introducing this motion.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I want to thank MPP Bell for putting this forward.

Members of this committee will know that I have spoken at length about Manor Village, and the fact that Manor Village was a community in Barrhaven, south of the where I serve, in the downtown, that was saved from demoviction when the third stage of the LRT was going to take down the community. It's 118 affordable market housing homes. The community advocated to make sure that the LRT path was changed so we could keep that stock. Right now, Smart Living, the owner, is planning to follow through with demovicting these folks. At the moment, we do not have the benefit of what MPP Bell was talking about for Toronto. These people are going to be thrown into the full-on rental market.

For Alison Trowbridge and her seven-year-old boy, whom I've met—a lovely kid with a mental health disability—she figures this is going to be a moment for them to be going into the family shelter. She can't afford, on an ODSP income, to lose the housing that she currently has and the community that has been taking care of her son with her.

So I would invite the members to vote for this, because these tenants matter to me. Even though they don't live in Ottawa Centre, they matter to me, as do the folks in Heron Gate, in MPP Fraser's riding, where 400 evictions happened under Timbercreek, now Hazelview, precisely along this design. The communities advocated to make sure that some of those tenants can come back to some of the homes. But MPP Fraser had to spend a lot of time shuffling people around, well beyond Heron Gate, so they were separated from their faith communities, from their grocery stores, from the child care centres and schools they had built relationships with.

This is the kind of thing that we can all agree—this is important. Let Ottawa build the skills, build the repertoire, build the policy measures that they have in Toronto. Let Hamilton do it too, and then we'll actually help some of these communities, who deserve to have some stability in a housing affordability crisis.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? We'll now ask: Are members prepared to vote?

Mr. Joel Harden: Recorded vote.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): A recorded vote has been called for. For the sake of the committee, we'll call this amendment 33.1.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment 34, NDP amendment, section 1 of schedule 4: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.2) Subsection 99.1(2) of the act is amended by striking out ‘and’ at the end of clause (b) and by striking out clause (c) and substituting the following:

“(c) to prohibit the repair or renovation of residential rental properties without a permit; and

“(d) to impose conditions as a requirement of obtaining a permit, including requiring compensation to tenants for moving costs and rental costs above what the tenant had been paying prior to the displacement.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The idea for this motion came from ACORN and the good work that they’ve been doing in New Westminster, BC.

New Westminster, BC, has implemented a program that has effectively ended renovictions and illegal evictions. Tenants, if they have to move because of a renovation, are able to move in—guaranteed right of return—once the renovation is complete, and the municipality can require the landlord or the developer to pay compensation costs to the tenant while they’re living outside the home.

The reason why this is so important is because if this government is moving forward with missing middle zoning reform, which I very much support, we need to make sure that there are renter protections in place to ensure that communities aren’t gentrified and tenants aren’t subject to mass eviction. Renters are not second-class citizens. They deserve to live in safe and affordable homes. Measures like this will ensure they have the protections they need from eviction and from big rent hikes and from illegal renovations and renovictions.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We’ll now proceed with an NDP amendment to section 1 of schedule 4, amendment number 35. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.3) Subsection 99.1(3) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition or conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion or repair and renovation’.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I think the motion speaks for itself. The whole purpose of this is to protect renters facing renovations, conversions or demolitions so they can afford to live in our municipalities and our cities. If you’re voting against this motion, it means that you are voting against renters and housing affordability.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We’ll proceed with an NDP amendment to section 1 of schedule 4, amendment 36. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.4) Subsection 99.1(4) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition or conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion or repair and renovation’.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much, MPP Bell. Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This motion achieves the same purpose as 35. The whole goal of it is to protect renters in Ontario. It doesn’t matter what municipality they live in; it’s to protect them, make sure they have safe and affordable homes.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We’ll now proceed with NDP amendment 37 to the bill. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.5) Subsection 99.1(6) of the act is amended by striking out ‘demolition and conversion’ and substituting ‘demolition, conversion and repair and renovation’.”

1700

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This motion achieves the same goal as 36 and 35. It’s to ensure that municipalities have the power to protect renters in their municipalities, so they can have safe and affordable homes as well.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

We’ll now proceed with NDP amendment number 38 to the bill. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 99.1(7) of the Municipal Act, 2001 and substituting the following:

“Regulations

“(7) The minister may make regulations prescribing minimum standards on the powers of a local municipality under this section with respect to,

“(a) the protection and compensation of tenants; and

“(b) the preservation of the stock of available residential units.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion—

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Excuse me. Pardon me. I’m sorry.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is the right one, right?

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I think we have, perhaps, a clarification from MPP Bell on amendment 38.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I’d like to withdraw motion 38.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): NDP amendment 38 has been withdrawn.

I’ll turn the floor back to MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Motion 38.1: I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 99.1(7) of the Municipal Act, 2001 and substituting the following:

“Regulations

“(7) The minister may make regulations prescribing minimum standards on the powers of a local municipality under this section with respect to,

“(a) the protection and compensation of tenants; and

“(b) the preservation of the stock of available residential units.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is similar to the motion that I introduced with schedule 1. It gives the minister the authority to be visionary, bold and caring and provide regulations to ensure that we protect tenants that are facing eviction or renovation, and that we do everything we can to preserve the stock of available residential units. Montreal has done some really interesting work on this that we can replicate. This gives your government the power to show that same kind of innovation and care.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much, MPP Bell. I’m going to give the members on the government side a moment to peruse the amendment, and then call for further debate.

In the meantime: MPP McMahon?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Do you mind if I ask a question of clarification? Did we miss one of my amendments, to section 1 of schedule 4, subsection 99.1(1), or is it redundant to MPP Bell’s?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The table is looking to clarify that.

Members of the committee, we’re still on amendment 38.1 and the government side has had time to look at the amendment. I’m calling for further debate at this time. Seeing none, are we ready to vote?

1710

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the amendment lost.

Shall schedule 4, section 1, carry?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 4, section 1, carried.

We'll move on to schedule 4, section 2, NDP amendment—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Chair?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I'm sorry. MPP Bell?

Ms. Jessica Bell: I have an amendment, amendment 39, to delay the implementation of schedule 2 until the proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.

It's 39; that comes next, right?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Bell, please proceed with the motion.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you.

I move that section 2 of schedule 4 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Commencement

“2. This schedule comes into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why I am asking that this schedule be delayed is because this has such significant ramifications on thousands and thousands and thousands of lower-income, moderate-income and middle-income people in Toronto who rent. I am asking for this schedule to come into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, so it doesn't come into force when this bill goes through the House, so that we can just pause, talk to municipalities, talk to housing stakeholders, talk to renters, and just really consider the consequences of this very bad schedule.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare the motion lost.

Shall schedule 4, section 2, carry? Any debate?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 4, section 2, carried.

Shall schedule 4 carry? Any debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 4 carried.

We'll now move on to schedule 5, the New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017. Shall schedule 5, section 1, carry? Any debate?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I have a request for debate, so excuse me.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you. The New Home Construction Licensing Act amendments are measures that I support. I will be supporting these amendments. It makes a lot of sense to have a Home Construction Regulatory Authority with additional powers that it needs to hold shoddy builders to account so first-time homebuyers and homebuyers can get recourse if they move into a home that's got defects and mould. I'm going to be introducing some improvements, but this schedule, as it stands, is an improvement on what we've currently got.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): There are no amendments proposed for schedule 5, section 1. Shall schedule 5, section 1—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Mr. Joel Harden: I just want, on the record, to thank Dr. Karen Somerville for appearing before this committee from Canadians for Properly Built Homes, that I'm sure the government's met with, as well, to help us do right by homebuyers.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? No further debate? Seeing none, we will—I believe a recorded vote was already requested.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5, section—

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5, section 1, carried.

Please don't interrupt the Chair when they're speaking. Thank you.

We'll move on to schedule 5, section 2, NDP amendment number 40. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 2 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Composition of the board”—

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Excuse me, MPP Bell; I apologize. In the second line of your motion, could you read everything after “(0.1),” please? Reread that.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes, sure: “Section 11 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Composition of the board

“(0.1) At least two members of the board must be representatives of consumer groups.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Thank you to Karen Somerville from Canadians for Properly Built Homes for the advocacy she has done over the last decade or more to ensure that our regulatory authorities in Ontario do their job and hold shoddy builders to account when they take advantage of first-time homebuyers, homebuyers and fail to deliver a properly built home.

Many of these amendments that I'll be introducing to the New Home Construction Licensing Act come from her organization's recommendations. This one is pretty simple: It's to ensure there's accountability at the board level by having consumer groups sit on the board and oversee the work of the Home Construction Regulatory Authority, the HCRA. And the reason for this is because we want to make sure the HCRA is accountable to Ontarians and not accountable to builders who are building shoddy homes. In order for that to happen, we need to make sure that there are independent citizens on the board who can make sure this regulatory authority does its job and is held to account. It's all about transparency. It makes a lot of sense.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the amendment?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahan.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare amendment 40 lost.

Moving on with amendment 41, an NDP motion: MPP Bell.

1720

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 2 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 11 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Limitation re: conflict of interest

“(3) A person is not eligible to be appointed as a member of the board if, at the time of the purported appointment, the person has a real or apparent conflict of interest within the meaning set out in the regulations.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes. Once again, this is about ensuring that the HCRA is a transparent and accountable regulatory agency that protects consumers. So it's first-time homebuyers, those buyers who are going out and buying a pre-construction home or a new home or a new condo, and it's the biggest purchase of their lives. It's a huge risk. It's a huge stress. We want to make sure that they build a home that is properly built, and if it is not properly built, they need to have recourse. They need to be able to go to the HCRA and have recourse so that they can get the home that they expected to have.

Ensuring that the HCRA is accountable and transparent and that there are no board members that have an apparent or real conflict of interest—that's the goal—is the purpose of this motion. It makes so much sense. We know your constituents are getting calls about this as well. You've seen it in the media: developers delaying contracts, increasing the amount of down payment that someone has to pay, increasing the amount of the value of a home or the amount that a first-time homebuyer or homebuyer has to pay. It's a concern. So strengthening this regulatory authority makes a lot of sense.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared—I'm sorry. MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I appreciate the member's amendments. We certainly share the goal of holding bad builders accountable for their actions. That's why we're putting increased fines in the bill.

I would say, on this particular proposed amendment, the New Home Construction Licensing Act currently already provides the minister with the regulatory authority to make changes to the composition of the board. I feel this amendment, particularly, would be difficult to enforce and wouldn't actually address conflicts of interest that arise after a board member is appointed. An unintended consequence certainly could be that consumers or homeowners may be prohibited from serving on the board of the regulatory authority.

For that reason, I'll be voting against. I appreciate where the member is coming from, but I'll be voting against it. I encourage members of the committee to do the same.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour of the amendment, please—

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Please ask for those a little more quickly, please.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare amendment 41 lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 2, carry? Any debate?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5, section 2, carried.

Moving on to schedule 5, section 3, NDP amendment 42: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3.1 be added to schedule 5 to the bill:

“3.1”—

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Excuse me, MPP Bell.

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I’m sorry. We have to change the order a bit there, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Yes, that’s fine.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): My apologies.

Shall schedule 5, section 3, carry?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): All those opposed?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Are you opposed?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Are you—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I’m voting in favour of MPP Bell.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): This is a vote on a section at this point.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Oh, yes.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much, MPP McMahon. I declare schedule 5, section 3 carried.

We’ll now move on with amendment 42, NDP amendment. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 3.1 be added to schedule 5 of the bill:

“3.1 The act is amended by adding the following section:

“Application of Ombudsman Act

“22.1 The regulatory authority is deemed to be a governmental organization for the purposes of the Ombudsman Act and the chair of the board of directors is deemed to be its head.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The amendment is beyond the scope of the bill—just to clarify for MPP Bell. If passed, the amendment would vicariously amend the Ombudsman Act, 1990, which is an act that is not opened by Bill 23. It is not possible to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. I therefore rule the amendment out of order.

We will now move on to schedule 5, section 4. There are no amendments to section 5, section 4. We’re now on schedule 5, section 4, New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017. Any debate? No debate? Shall schedule 5, section 4, carry?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5, section 4, carried.

Moving to schedule 5, section 5, and amendment 43, NDP amendment: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 5 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Subsection 71(5) of the act is amended by adding ‘unless the court hearing the proceeding believes it is fair and reasonable for the proceeding to have been commenced later’ at the end.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I just want to tell you what this motion means. It means that, after a two-year period, if a first-time homebuyer or a buyer still wants to go to court, they will be able to have a judge consider it. The reason why this is important is that sometimes it takes more than two years for something to get to the point where it needs to be taken to court, if a home is not properly built and the developer has not expressed enough interest in rectifying it.

This is a request that came from Canadians for Properly Built Homes. They have Ontarians that they’re working with who are facing this issue where they need more than two years in order to go to court to get redress. It would still be up for a judge to decide if it could proceed.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the amendment? All those in favour of the amendment, please raise your hands.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare amendment 43 lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 5, carry? Any debate? No debate? Ready to vote?

1730

Mr. Graham McGregor: Can we bundle them?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We will—not this one. We're still on section 5, schedule 5, so we need to vote on that. All those in favour?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahan, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5, section 5, carried.

We have no amendments to sections 6, 7 and 8. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 5, sections 6, 7 and 8, carry? Any debate? No debate. All those in favour, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 5, sections 6, 7 and 8, carried.

We'll now move on to schedule 5, the New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017. We're on schedule 5, section 9, amendment 44, NDP amendment: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 9 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Subsection 84(1) of the act is amended by adding the following clause:

“(b.1) requiring the regulatory authority to publish, on its website, specified information from the minutes of its board meetings;”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This, again, came from Canadians for Properly Built Homes. It is an important requirement related to accountability and transparency.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour of amendment 44, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 44 lost.

Moving on with amendment 45: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 9 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.2) Subsection 84(1) of the act is amended by adding the following clause:

“(e.1) requiring the regulatory authority to publish specific information about the past performance and conduct of licensees on an online directory on its website and setting standards respecting the timeliness, completeness and accuracy of the published information;”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The whole purpose of having an on-line builder directory that is timely, complete and accurate is to ensure that if a consumer is looking at buying a home, they can go to this website and look at the track record of the builder or the developer to see if they're a builder that builds well-maintained homes or if they're a builder that has a whole litany of complaints against them, and where they're building homes, where they might be cutting corners or building shoddily built homes. It's about consumer protection.

I urge to you vote for this motion. I'm getting the impression that this government is not so interested in strengthening protections for consumers. My hope is that you will look at these motions, reconsider them and put them into a future government bill if you're not looking at supporting them today.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour of the motion, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 45 lost.

Amendment 46: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 9 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.1) Subsection 84(1) of the act is amended by adding the following clause:

“(f.1) requiring the regulatory authority to ensure that builders do not use, and do not allow to be used, the affixed heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment in a new home during the construction of the home, except as permitted in the regulations;”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much. Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: This again came from Canadians for Properly Built Homes. The reason why they are concerned about it is that the furnace is a critical part of a home, especially in a country like ours, Canada, and Tarion's warranties on furnaces are only for two years. If you're in a situation where a furnace is being used during the period of construction, maybe for 18 months, maybe even for two years, then your warranty could be over by the time you move in. This is a motion that was developed in response to consumer complaints. It is very practical, doesn't cost the government any money; it just ensures that when a homebuyer moves into their home, everything's working and their warranty is what they expect it to be.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much. Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote on the motion?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahan.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare amendment 46 lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 9, carry? Any debate? All those in favour? I declare schedule 5, section 9, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 10 and 11. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 5, section 10 and section 11, carry? Any debate? All those in favour? I declare schedule 5, section 10 and section 11, carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? Any debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 5 carried.

Moving on to schedule 6, Ontario Heritage Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 6, section 1 and section 2, carry? Any debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare schedule 6, section 1 and section 2, carried.

Moving on to schedule 6, section 3, amendment 47. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I think it's the independent.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Yes, it's me.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Oh, sorry, you are correct. What we'll do is amend the papers. How's that? So is it an independent amendment?

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): An independent amendment: MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I like the sounds of that rhyme. All right. So I have actually three amendments coming under heritage, so I'll speak to you about those.

I move that subsection 3(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection—I think this is right, yes?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Excuse me, MPP McMahon. On the end of the first line, can I ask you to reread everything after “striking out”—everything beyond that?

1740

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Okay: “Subject to subsection (18)” at the beginning of the portion before clause (a) of subsection 27(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much. Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: First of all, we heard from people about heritage and how important it is, and we definitely know that some people view it as something that blocks development. I think we appreciate Canada's, Toronto's, Ontario's heritage, and we don't want to just destroy the Ontario Heritage Act or any heritage properties, but I think there's a way to work together with heritage folks

and find some happy medium. This would allow municipalities the opportunity to flag potential heritage properties, because with the new legislation, listed properties must meet the criteria for designated properties, so there's little to no difference between the two.

Flagging properties for municipalities is a valuable resource, and they use it collaboratively with property owners, actually, because many owners wish their properties to be listed as heritage. Happy to have your support on this motion.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour of amendment 47, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 47 lost.

Also an independent motion, amendment 48: MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Round 2: Trying again, picking myself up, dusting myself off. I'm going to read after “striking out,” right? Subsections 27(14), (15)—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. John Yakabuski): Excuse me, MPP McMahon. Read it from the start, please.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I was just thinking of the last one.

I move that subsection 3(4) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out subsections 27(14), (15), (16), (17) and (18) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you. Further debate?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: It's another heritage one, obviously. Bill 23 proposes a number of changes to the Ontario Heritage Act that threaten the city's ability to identify and protect cultural heritage resources. The limitations proposed for the heritage register would require all existing and newly listed properties to be designated within two years or removed from the registry for five years, and would leave thousands of heritage properties vulnerable to demolition, so this is removing the proposed timelines.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour of amendment 48, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare the amendment 48 lost.

Amendment 49: Back to the independent member, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Third time's the charm.

I move that subsection 3(4) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “second anniversary” wherever it appears in subsections 27(15) and (16) of the Ontario Heritage Act and substituting in each case “fifth anniversary”.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP McMahon, further debate?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Yes. Sorry. The city of Toronto—you may not be aware—has 11,000 properties on the heritage register, and 4,000 of them are listed heritage properties. The city has limited capacity to process designations, and it would be impossible to do 4,000 properties in two years. There needs to be a transition period, so I'm proposing five years. Let's be reasonable and rational

and let the people do their proper job and give them the time to do so. I appreciate your support.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none—oh, I'm sorry. MPP McGregor?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Just to get it on the record, I think the intention with these changes—certainly, on this side, we respect the heritage of Ontario; I expect all members do. We just want to set some consistency and transparency around how we designate heritage. The idea is around making it more transparent and easily accessible for the public to understand.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Harden.

Mr. Joel Harden: I'm wondering if MPP McGregor—Chair, through you—could finish that thought. What does that look like? What does that transparency and clarity look like? Because the architects I've met with at home, and who are part of the architects' association of Ontario, have been very clear with me that what we have is utilized often to protect key things. I'm thinking—you know Ottawa, Chair—things like Somerset House or Barrymore's hall. These are decrepit buildings that need protection. They're important. So how do we maintain them and build housing with them? Can the member just clarify what he means by transparency and clarity?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I'd just say, by applying a standard for heritage, what these heritage properties are—that's the goal of the bill. I think that's been well documented. That's the intention from the government.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none—oh, I'm sorry. MPP McMahon?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I appreciate that from my colleague across the floor. So if we want to be transparent and we want to do this right, why not allow the staff time to do so? Like, 4,000 properties in two years—I'm not sure how any of us could do that, so why not allow them a bit more time?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? There being none, are we prepared to vote? Shall amendment 49 carry? All those in favour of amendment 49, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare amendment 49 lost.

Shall schedule 6, section 3, carry? Any debate? No debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare schedule 6, section 3, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 to 10, inclusive. I propose we bundle them. Agreed?

Shall schedule 6, sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, carry? Any debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare schedule 6, sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Any debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: We say we care about heritage, but do we really? Because the proof is in the pudding, and we need to walk the talk when we say that. We have a great history in Ontario. In all your municipalities you have heritage buildings, so why not continue to protect them, to find them, to list them, to designate

them, to stop them from being demolished, to add value to your communities and our rich Ontario history? Why not? That's the theme of the day: Why not support this? Why not support heritage? It's very disappointing.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Shall schedule 6 carry?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 6 carried.

1750

We now move on to schedule 7, the Ontario Land Tribunal Act, 2021. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 7, sections 1 and 2, carry? Any debate? No debate? All those in favour of the motion? All those opposed? I declare sections 1 and 2 carried.

Schedule 7, section 3: Is there any debate? Shall schedule 3, section 3, carry?

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Oh, pardon me, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I apologize. I do have a few comments I would like to make to section 3 of schedule 7. Section 3 of schedule 7 allows an adjudicator to make an unsuccessful party pay a successful party's costs. I have a lot of concerns with that. Stakeholders raised a lot of concerns with that. This means if a dump site is going up in your neighbourhood and you've got concerns about how it's going to affect the local water quality, and you make an appeal to the land tribunal to say, "Hold on. This is something that is going to be harming me," you will take a sober second thought at that, because you might be fearful of having to pay costs, even though you're taking steps to protect your community from water pollution and air pollution.

We had a situation in the city of Toronto where the city of Toronto moved forward on a short-term rental regulation in order to limit short-term rentals to an individual's primary residence and to ban short-term rentals from investment properties, in order to increase the amount of long-term rental stock that's available for people to move into, to address housing affordability. That bylaw was appealed to the land tribunal. There were many stakeholders that got involved. I wouldn't want them to have to pay costs because they wanted to increase the amount of long-term rental housing supply that existed in the city of Toronto. They were doing the right thing. They were standing up for renters in the city of Toronto, and now they might

not, because they might have to pay costs. That's why we have a lot of concerns about this measure.

I understand sometimes people use the land tribunal to stop affordable housing. I've got a lot of concerns with that. We have a situation with 59 modular homes that should be going up in the MPP for Willowdale's area, but they're not. I have a lot of concerns with that. The land tribunal does have the power to dismiss frivolous appeals that have no chance of succeeding, and the Ontario government has the authority to move forward and allow some of these affordable housing projects to proceed. With this section, I think this will do us a disservice.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 7, section 3, carry?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I declare schedule 7, section 3, carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 and 5. I propose we bundle them. Agreed.

Shall schedule 7, sections 4 and 5, carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? I declare schedule 7, section 4 and section 5, carried.

Shall schedule 7 carry? Any debate? No debate—oh, I'm sorry, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: It is important that we have land tribunal reform so the land tribunal operates in the public interest and is a place of last resort as opposed to a place that people go to override municipal decisions whenever they want. But we do have some concerns with the amendments that this government is proposing, especially the decision to make an unsuccessful party pay costs.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 7 carry? All those in favour? Opposed? I declare schedule 7 carried.

Seeing as we have finished that schedule, we are going to now recess until 6:30 of the clock. We will reconvene at that time.

The committee recessed from 1756 to 1832.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Good evening, everybody. We're now resuming clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 23. This is the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy. We'll now resume our evening sitting.

I believe we left off at schedule 8, Ontario Underground Infrastructure Notification System Act, 2012. Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 1 to 4, so I propose we bundle them. Do I have the committee in agreement to bundle? Okay.

Shall sections 1 to 4 carry? Debate? Seeing no debate, are members ready to vote? All those in favour of sections 1 to 4 of schedule 8, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 8, sections 1 to 4, is carried.

We'll now deal with schedule 8 as a whole. Will schedule 8 carry? Any debate? No, okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 8 carried.

Now moving on to schedule 9, Planning Act. I believe amendment 50 is up. If MPP Bell could please start.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Essentially, this section stops the government from doing something which is extremely concerning, which is to eliminate the right of upper-tier municipalities to plan in a regional fashion. It downloads the responsibilities onto municipalities, but a lot of the costs of the infrastructure will stay with the upper-tier municipality, which is very concerning. In short, eliminating the ability for upper-tier municipalities to plan is a recipe for expensive, poorly planned and environmentally destructive sprawl.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 50, please raise your hands. And all those opposed to amendment 50, please raise your hands. I deem amendment 50 lost.

We'll now move on to amendment number 51. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 1(4) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'd like to explain the motion. This motion restores the ability of conservation authorities to participate in planning appeals. It would allow conservation authorities to do their job effectively to protect our natural environment, ensure we plan well and we use our natural environment to protect ourselves from future inevitable extreme weather events such as flooding.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 51, please raise your hands. All those opposed to amendment 51, please raise your hands. I deem the amendment lost.

Moving on to amendment 52: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I withdraw amendment 52.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment 52 is withdrawn.

I move to go to amendment 52.1. MPP McGregor, please.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 1(5) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by striking out “subsection 17(24.0.2) or (36.0.2), 34(19.0.0.2), 45(12.2)” in subsection 1(4.4) of the Planning Act and substituting “subsection 45(12.2)”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'd like to hear MPP McGregor explain what this motion means.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate, anyone? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: As with prior ones, I think the amendment is pretty self-explanatory, and I hope that all members of the committee will vote in favour.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I would just like to hear your passion behind moving the amendments and your story behind moving them.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of 52.1, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Amendment 52.1 is now carried.

Moving to amendment number 53, I look to MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 1(6) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Discussion? Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is to restore the planning responsibilities of upper-tier municipalities. It takes away the minister's right to strip them of their power, essentially. The benefit of having an upper-tier municipality engage in planning is that it ensures that an entire region is planned in a coordinated fashion that saves lower- and upper-tier municipalities money, and it ensures that we are building the kind of development that we need: that is well made, that uses infrastructure wisely and that also protects our precious green spaces, including our greenbelt. That's the purpose of amendment 53.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'd be very supportive of MPP Bell's amendment. You heard the great reasons why. We're all about protecting our areas, and it's the right thing to do.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 53, please raise your hands. All those opposed to amendment 53, please raise your hands. Thank you. I deem amendment 53 lost.

1840

Shall schedule 9, section 1, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 1, carried, as amended.

Now moving to schedule 9, section 2. Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I have overall comments about section 2. In short, this section ends the planning responsibilities of specific upper-tier municipalities. This proposal was

made without consulting with the public, without consulting with municipalities, without consulting with AMO, and many of them have expressed deep concerns about the impact of these schedules, particularly section 2, on their ability to plan and plan well and plan in a way that is environmentally responsible and economically responsible.

There are a lot of concerns and unintended consequences with moving the planning responsibilities away from seven upper-tier municipalities to 59 lower-tier municipalities. That does not signal efficiency or streamlining. It signals chaos, and it signals more unplanned suburban sprawl, which will cost all of us.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thanks. I agree, and I don't think it's fair for those municipalities. It's essentially saying they don't know what they're doing, that they don't have the knowledge of their own communities. I mean, any of us would take umbrage with that if someone came into our riding and was alleging we didn't have the knowledge or capability to do our jobs, and I'm sure the planners there are very insulted that we would remove that function from them. I don't think it's fair to our neighbouring communities.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Thank you. All those in favour of schedule 9, section 2, please raise your hands. All those opposed to schedule 9, section 2, please raise your hands. Schedule 9, section 2, is carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 3: I believe we have a notice.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I would like a recorded vote on this.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Sure. Any discussion? Any debate on schedule 9, section 3? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, Pang, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 9, section 3, carried.

Going to schedule 9 of the Planning Act, section 4, I believe we have amendment number 54. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 4 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Section 16 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Interpretation

“(0.1) In this section,

““affordable” means,

“in the case of ownership of housing units, the least expensive of,

“(i) housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs”—

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I'm sorry. I just have to interrupt. Just a technicality. If you could reread everything after "'affordable' means"?

Ms. Jessica Bell: —"'affordable' means,

“(a) in the case of ownership of housing units, the least expensive of,

“(i) housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households, and

“(ii) housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 per cent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area, and

“(b) in the case of rental of housing units, the least expensive of,

“(i) a rental unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households, and

“(ii) a rental unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate or discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I introduced this amendment to redefine affordable housing, because it is what the provincial government currently uses. It ensures that rent and ownership price is tied to what the individual, the occupant, can afford, tied to income, as opposed to the market rate, which could be completely unaffordable for the occupant. This just grounds it in what the provincial government already uses in their provincial policy statement.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote. Shall amendment 54 carry?

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment 54 is lost. Moving on to amendment 55, please: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 4 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.2) Clause 16(1)(a.1) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(a.1) such policies and measures as are practicable to ensure the adequate provision of affordable housing and such policies and measures shall include targets for housing that,

“(i) is affordable to very low, low and median income households, and

“(ii) meets minimum floor space requirements for different household sizes;”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment 55? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is to redefine the housing targets that the provincial government has assigned for municipalities, based less on number—that's important—but also based on whether it's going to meet people who are most disadvantaged by the housing market right now, low-income people, moderate income people; and also meet the square-footage needs of current Ontarians and future Ontarians.

Our housing market is building 3,000-square-foot McMansions and 600-square-foot condos. One is too small; the other is too expensive, and it means that seniors, students and starting families are entering the housing market and they're not finding housing that works for them, either because it doesn't work for them for size or it doesn't work for them for affordability.

Putting sub-targets and targets into these housing targets would mean that we would actually create a housing market that meets the need, as opposed to just the number. It makes a lot of sense.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 55, please raise their hands. All those opposed to amendment 55, please raise their hands. I declare amendment 55 lost.

Now moving down to amendment 56: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 4 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.2) Subsection 16(5) of the act is amended by striking out 'or' at the end of clause (a), by adding 'or' at the end of clause (b) and by adding the following clause:

“(c) any other area.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This sounds like a bunch of gobble-dygook, but in fact, this is one of the most important amendments that we are proposing. This amendment is calling for the provincial government, the Ontario government, to allow inclusionary zoning anywhere in a municipality if a municipality wants to move forward on it. That is what the city of Toronto agreed to when they went through a multi-year process to require developers to build a percentage of affordable housing units in any new development of 100 units or more, and then the provincial government came down and said, “No, no, no. We're going to restrict it just to certain areas of the city, and everywhere else, they don't have to build affordable at all.”

The studies have been done. Developers can make their profit. It's still worthwhile for them, and we can also build affordable housing units. So we are asking for an amendment so that the city of Toronto and other municipalities can have more control over their inclusionary zoning laws to ensure that more affordable housing units are built.

1850

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 56?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment 56 is lost. Moving to amendment 57: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 4(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is to restore planning responsibilities to upper-tier municipalities, because that's the way that we can build right.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 57 lost.

Shall schedule 9, section 4, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I deem schedule 9, section 4, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 5, amendment 57.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(1) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“5(1) Subsection 17(2) of the act is amended by striking out ‘An upper-tier municipality’ at the beginning and substituting ‘An upper-tier municipality with planning responsibilities’.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Discussion? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Just to provide context, this is fixing a technical error and making the bill consistent with other provincial direction.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall amendment 57.1 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 57.1 carried.

Going to amendment number 58: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 5(4) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is to restore planning to upper-tier municipalities so we can plan right.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall amendment 58 pass? Please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 58 lost.

Moving to amendment 58.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(6) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: For context, this is in response to some of the feedback we've heard, kind of moderating the approach.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 58.1, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem amendment 58.1 carried.

Going to amendment 58.2: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(7) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Sabawy, any debate?

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: No.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): No? Sorry. All right.

Are members ready for the question? All those in favour of amendment 58.2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Thank you. I deem amendment 58.2 carried.

Amendment 58.3: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(9) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? All those in favour of amendment 58.3, please raise your hands. And all those opposed to amendment 58.3, please raise your hands. Seeing none, I deem amendment 58.3 carried.

Moving to amendment 58.4: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 5(10) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 58.4, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem amendment 58.4 carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 5, as amended, carry? Any debate, first of all? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 5 carried as amended.

Moving to schedule 9, section 6, amendment 58.5: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 6(1) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“6(1) Subsections 22(2.1) to (2.1.2) of the act are repealed.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Can MPP McGregor please explain what this motion means?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? No? No hands?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Sorry.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes, I thought you had your hand up, and then it was down. MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Yes, just to be responsive to stakeholder concerns, we're amending the bill that was originally put forward.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm just wondering if you can elaborate on that in a more fulsome answer. Thanks.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: How we read this amendment is that it scraps the two-year timeout, so anyone can request an amendment to an official plan or a secondary plan or a zoning bylaw amendment immediately after a municipality passes it. This is a problem, because once an amendment or a bylaw or an official plan is done, planners and the city need time to roll out the changes, enact them, bring them into force, understand them and see if they work.

Giving developers, applicants and third parties permission to immediately start appealing these changes will do the very thing that this government says doesn't make any sense: It will give extra work to planners, it will tie up appeals processes and it will slow everything down. I'm actually very surprised that this government is bringing this change forward, because having the two-year timeout period is really what municipalities want in order to stop unnecessary appeals until we really understand how they work.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 58.5, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem amendment 58.5 carried.

Moving to amendment number 58.6, please: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that section 6 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.1) Subsection 22(2.2) of the act is amended by striking out ‘subsection (2.1), (2.1.1) or (2.1.3)’ and substituting ‘subsection (2.1.3)’.”

1900

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall amendment 58.6 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 58.6 carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 6, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 6, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 7, is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 9, section 7, carrying, raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 9, section 7, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 8, amendment 58.7: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 8(1) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“8(1) subsections 34(10.0.0.1) and (10.0.0.2) of the act are repealed.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Discussion? Seeing none, shall amendment 58.7 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 58.7 carried.

Moving to amendment 58.8: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 8(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall amendment 58.8 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 58.8 carried.

Moving to amendment 58.9: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 8(3) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 58.9, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Seeing none, amendment 58.9 is carried.

Moving to amendment 59: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 8(6) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is all about allowing upper-tier municipalities to participate in planning again so we can plan right.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Discussion? Are the members ready for votes? All those in favour of amendment 59, please raise your hands. All those opposed to amendment 59, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 59 lost.

Shall schedule 9, section 8, as amended, carry? Any discussion? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 8, as amended, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 9: Shall it carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 9, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 10, amendment 59.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that section 10 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Section 37 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Agreement re facilities, services or matters

“(7.1) If the municipality intends to allow an owner of land to provide facilities, services or matters in accordance with subsection (6), the municipality may require the owner to enter into an agreement with the municipality that addresses the provision of the facilities, services or matters.

“Registration of agreement

“(7.2) An agreement entered into under subsection (7.1) may be registered against the land to which it applies and the municipality is entitled to enforce the agreement against the owner and, subject to the Registry Act and the Land Titles Act, against any and all subsequent owners of the land.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate or discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: So what this means is you can assign section 37 agreements to be registered on a property's title? We have no problem with that.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion or debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 59.1? All those opposed? I deem amendment 59.1 carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 10, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 10, as amended, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 11, amendment 60: MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that subsection 11(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subparagraph 2(d) of subsection 41(4) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(d) matters relating to sustainable design, health, safety, accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands, if an official plan and a bylaw passed under subsection (2) that both contain provisions relating to such matters are in effect in the municipality;”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: So one final kick at the can for the Toronto Green Standard—let's go—because we care about energy efficiency, we care about sustainable buildings, we care about keeping our residents in a nice level of comfort while reducing their energy bills and we care about attracting business to Ontario in the form of the green economy and green jobs. Here's a chance to do it.

There was an amendment moved this morning by my colleague across the way, and that only dealt with one thing, the green roofs. It did not deal with the energy efficiency, the bird-friendly windows and all the other great stuff in the Toronto Green Standard, and it did not allow for green standards across Ontario.

I do not want to rob municipalities across Ontario, which I know are doing great work on the green front—lots of municipalities have declared a climate emergency; they have environmental squads and groups in their communities doing great work, and they want to do better.

They want to continue their great work. And some municipalities want to start green standards. We heard that Mississauga has a grant to work on green standards. I think there are quite a few MPPs in the government from Mississauga who might be interested in that. So I'd love your support—one final kick at the can. Why not?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a very good motion. We have had the Atmospheric Fund look at the government's green building standards. They are weak, and they only allow bird-friendly design and green roofs to be regulated by the city. They do not strengthen green building standards or expand it or allow municipalities to move forward on it. It's very concerning. I support MPP McMahon's motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate or discussion? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I think one of the things that we've heard, certainly from the government, but you hear it from the witnesses as well—and dare I say, I think the opposition parties agree with the premise—is that we have a housing crisis in Ontario, drawn by a fundamental misalignment of supply and demand. Of any G7 country, Canada has the lowest amount of housing units per person, and of any province in Canada, we have the lowest amount of housing units per person. So I think what we've put forward to increase housing supply is something that all members should agree to.

1910

I'll note that, in the last election, the NDP also put forward a plan for 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years. We certainly agree on the goal; I think we disagree on how to get there. But we've seen, through expert testimony from the industry, that the changes that we're putting forward are actually going to help. They're very good measures. This is a good bill. It's a bill that the NDP and the Liberal Party should support as well.

We have been responsive. We have moved amendments to this bill earlier in clause-by-clause to certainly allow for some of these green standards to continue and move forward in a consistent fashion province-wide.

With all that being said, we'll be voting against this amendment, but we do hope that all members vote for the bill.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Sure. I would love to support this bill, had you supported some amendments and cleaned up some messes.

I would say that the housing crisis that you're talking about has nothing to do with my amendment, in the sense that my amendment will not slow down the shovels in the ground at all. In fact, it encourages more builders, especially green builders, to build homes, and build sustainable homes, which is an economic win for the developer and the homeowner. By us not doing this, we are essentially not open for business. We are closing the door on the green economy and on green jobs, and we are robbing people of good, green jobs.

I know the government likes to say that they're ramping up the trades and skills, and a lot of that is jobs that are just being newly created as well: heat pump installers, things like that. Why wouldn't want to be open for business? Why wouldn't we want to be leading on the sustainability front, as other areas around the world are—unless we just want to lag behind and deny Ontarians this opportunity. It just makes no sense from an economic point of view, from an environmental point of view, from a logistics point of view, a logical point of view. It just makes no sense not to support this. It does not slow down building homes in Ontario.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I'm glad my colleague brought up jobs, and actually, Mississauga—I'll get to Mississauga in a minute.

Speaking of jobs, we have almost 400,000 unfilled jobs across Ontario, and we need people to move here to fill those jobs, which is part of what we're tackling with the bill today. And actually, reading the room—I think you've heard this from me before, but I'll just say that this is a good bill, and we hope members support it. I will not be supporting the amendment from the member.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? Debate? Seeing none—oh, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I forgot one little bit. Sorry to belabour this, because I feel like MPP McGregor and I could go all night arguing. What MPP McGregor moved was just pertaining to green roofs, so let's just have that on the record. It's not the Toronto Green Standard. It's not what we expected from this government, because I thought they understood the opportunity for workers in Ontario, for homeowners in Ontario, for new homeowners in Ontario and for the green economy. But I guess not. I guess we're not open for business.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further discussion? Debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All right. All those in favour of amendment—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 60 lost.

Moving on to amendment number 60.1: MPP McGregor, would you like to do amendment 60.1?

Mr. Graham McGregor: Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Chair.

I move that subsection 11(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subparagraph 2(d) of subsection 41(4) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(d) matters relating to building construction required under a by-law referred to in section 97.1 of the Municipal Act, 2001.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? Discussion? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I really hope this government listens to stakeholders and the green building industry because they are contacting us and telling us loud and clear that the government's amendments are too weak to ensure that municipalities can maintain their green building standards. That's what we're hearing loud and clear.

I'm going to support this motion because it's better than what Bill 23 was before. But I really hope that there are some amendments that are introduced in future bills very quickly to strengthen green building standards to what they could currently be watered down at. From what we are hearing, this will only apply to green roofs and bird-friendly design, and all the energy efficiency measures, the green building standards—there's a whole component to it. A lot of that could be permanently left out, so I've got some concerns.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I would encourage everyone across the room to take a look at the Toronto Green Standard in full detail and your own communities that have green standards and get to know them better so that you, hopefully, can move something at a later point in time, since you didn't support my amendment, twice. This is better than nothing, but it's not doing what you think it's doing; it's only green roofs.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate, discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 60.1 carried.

Moving to amendment 60.2: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 11(3) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding “or is a matter referred to in subparagraph 2(d) of subsection (4)” at the end of paragraph 1.1 of subsection 41(4.1) of the Planning Act.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to move to the vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Grewal, Harden, Holland, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 60.2 carried.

Moving to amendment 61: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 11(4) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 41(4.1.1) of the Planning Act and substituting the following:

“Same

“(6.1) The appearance of the elements, facilities and works on the land or any adjoining highway under a municipality’s jurisdiction is not subject to site plan control, except to the extent that the appearance,

“(a) impacts matters of health, safety, accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands; or

“(b) relates to sustainable design, but only if an official plan and a by-law passed under subsection (2) that both contain provisions relating to sustainable design are in effect in a municipality.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

1920

Ms. Jessica Bell: The purpose of this motion is to ensure that green building standards in Toronto and other municipalities can continue to function. Green building standards are our future. It’s where our building stock should go. It’s how we build sustainable cities, and it’s how we prepare ourselves for climate change—what’s here and what’s to come.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 61, please raise your hands. All those opposed to amendment 61, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 61 lost.

Moving to amendment 61.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 11(4) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by striking out “accessibility or the protection of adjoining lands” at the end of subsection 41(4.1.1) of the Planning Act and substituting “accessibility, sustainable design or the protection of adjoining lands”.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Just that this proposed motion, along with some of the other motions that we put in as part of the bill, ensures that municipalities may continue to require sustainable landscape design.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 61.1? All those opposed? Amendment 61.1 is carried.

Moving to amendment 62: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that section 11 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(8) Section 41 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Penalty

“(15.4) Subject to and in accordance with the regulations, a municipality may, by bylaw, impose penalties on the owner of the land for failure to substantially commence

development within a timely manner after the plans and drawings have been approved under this section.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is a use-it-or-lose-it policy. Many municipalities, including the city of Toronto, have pointed out that there are many building permits that have been approved that the owner of the property just sits on. In the case of the city of Toronto, they have approved about 30,000 permits a year, and about 15,000 of them each year are built.

Our proposal here is that we just bring in a use-it-or-lose-it policy. If there’s no good reason why an owner is not moving forward with a development to address our housing supply shortage, then they should use it or lose it. It’s a very effective way to make sure that we’re building the kind of homes we need.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 62, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem amendment 62 lost.

Shall schedule 9, section 11, as amended, carry? Any debate? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Seeing none, schedule 9, section 11 is carried as amended.

Schedule 9, section 12—schedule 9, the Planning Act. Again, we have amendment 63. MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 12(7) of schedule 9 be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: The reason why I am moving for amendment 63 is because it removes the clause in Bill 23 that cuts the required parkland dedication in half. What that means is that there’ll be less parkland available for people who live in apartments. That’s a concern. If we’re building new homes, we need to make sure people have a park or green space nearby so they can have access to the kind of green space that people who have a backyard have. It’s very simple; it’s very sensible. That’s what this amendment does. I urge you to support it. It’s about liveability.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahan.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment 63 is lost. Moving to amendment 64, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I’m withdrawing 64.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Withdrawn? Amendment 64 is withdrawn.

Moving to amendment 65: MPP McMahan, I believe that is you.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahan: Yes, thank you.

I move that subsection 12(15) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Yes, go ahead, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm just too keen on my amendments; what can I say? This—because I will reveal what my amendments are about—is about parkland levies. We heard from the chief planner for the city of Toronto the other day about the devastation this would cause to the city of Toronto in that it's a \$30-million hole in the parks budget in a city where we need as much green space as we can possibly have.

We all know, in this pandemic, how valuable green space was—for everyone, for all of our residents, for ourselves—to keep us healthy and happy, physically, mentally and spiritually, and so we need to continue. We're attracting a lot more residents to Canada, to Ontario, every year, and we want them to have the green space that everyone has, and we want to expand that.

The city of Toronto—I think I was talking to you earlier. One of the deputy managers filed a report to council. In it, she explains the impacts that a decreased parkland levy would have:

“—less parkland per development (over 33% less parkland on large sites greater than one hectare);

“—poorer quality parkland (100% parkland dedication credit for encumbered parkland and privately-owned publicly-accessible spaces and an applicant's ability to identify park parcels);

“—less revenue for parks and recreational facilities (estimated minimum 15% reduction in revenue);

“—less council and public discretion regarding the provision of suitable parkland (developers/applicants now have appeal right if council refuses proposed parkland dedication).

“Operationally, the proposed site-based caps would result in an inequitable distribution of parks in a high-density context. For example, a five-storey development and a 50-storey development would typically provide the same amount of new parkland.”

How is that acceptable? Five storeys and 50 storeys with the same amount of parkland? It doesn't make sense.

“Taken as a whole, the changes would potentially accelerate the decline in parkland provision and compromise the city's ability to provide sufficient and high-quality parkland and recreation projects that would serve both growing and equity-deserving communities where gaps exist.”

I don't think we want to deny anyone our green sanctuaries. Many of you live in more rural environments where you have access to forests and more nature than we have in the city, so I would urge you to support this. Thunder Bay has an endless amount of green space; we don't, in the city, so we need every patch we can get. I know you don't want to rob Torontonians of green space.

1930

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 65 lost.

Amendment 66: I will go to MPP Bell, please.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 12(16) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This is very similar to MPP McMahon's excellent motion to allow municipalities to have greater say over how much parkland is needed. I very much support it. As one of many people who went through the pandemic with small children in an apartment, I can assure you that parkland is absolutely critical to sanity and for just living a good life in a big city like Toronto.

In my riding, just like Toronto Centre, Spadina–Fort York and many big, highly developed ridings, 80% of people live in buildings. I happen to live in a building. It is like a lifeline to have a park. To cut park space and funding dedicated to park space makes cities a little bit more mean, a little bit more miserable, just less livable. It's not what we want. It makes a lot of sense to have parks along with apartments, and Bill 23 eviscerates it. It really cuts it down.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 66 lost.

Moving on to amendment 66.1: MPP McGregor, please.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Thank you, Chair. I move—*Interjections.*

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Wait, what happened? We're a little out of order here. Hold on one sec. Thanks very much. Good pickup, MPPs Holland and Sabawy.

Shall schedule 9 of section 12 carry, as amended?

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Just a second. Amended? He says amended. Just one moment, please.

Okay. We'll take it again from the top.

Shall schedule 9, section 12, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 9, section 12, carries.

Now moving to section 13 of schedule 9: Amendment 66.1 goes there. MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that section 13 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Subsections 45(1.2) to (1.4) of the act are repealed.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for a vote?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I deem amendment 66.1 carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 13, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 13, as amended, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 14: Shall schedule 9, section 14, carry. Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 9, section 14, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 14, carried.

Now we're going to schedule 9, section 15, amendment 67.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I'm withdrawing 67.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Okay. Amendment 67 is withdrawn.

Moving to amendment 67.1: MPP McGregor.

Mr. Graham McGregor: I move that subsection 15(1) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“15(1) Sub-subparagraph 1 ii D of subsection 47(4.4) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“D. matters relating to building construction required under a by-law referred to in section 97.1 of the Municipal Act, 2001 or section 108 or 108.1 of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 as the case may be.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment 67.1? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 67.1 carried.

Moving to amendment 67.2—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I can make that happen. Let's move to amendment 67.2.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment 67.2 once again.

Mr. Graham McGregor: Sorry, Chair. Thank you, Chair, for the time, and I apologize to my colleagues.

I move that subsection 15(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding “or is a matter referred to in sub-subparagraph 1 ii D of subsection (4.4)” at the end of paragraph 1.1 of subsection 47(4.11) of the Planning Act.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 67.2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Seeing none, I deem amendment 67.2 carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 15, as amended, carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, section 15, as amended, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 16, shall that carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Seeing none, schedule 9, section 16, is carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 17, amendment number 68: MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: I move that subsection 17(2) of schedule 9 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: This removes the clause that limits the ability of upper-tier municipalities to plan well.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McGregor.

1940

Mr. Graham McGregor: I'm just wondering if our colleague could show some cases where an upper tier does a better job than a lower tier. If there are some success examples outside of—obviously, appreciating that Toronto and Ottawa are single-tier municipalities. But if there are, any success stories the member would share with us?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: AMO has been very clear that having upper-tier municipalities plan for the entire region instead of downloading it so that all the little municipalities do their own little planning is a better way to plan. It means we build infrastructure right and in the right places. It means we can really control suburban sprawl, which is incredibly expensive to municipalities. This is something that stakeholders have asked us to implement, and I support it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 68, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I deem amendment 68 lost.

Shall schedule 9, section 17, carry? Any debate? All of those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I deem schedule 9, section 17, carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 18 to 19. I propose we bundle them. All in agreement? Okay. Thank you.

Further debate on schedule 9, section 18 or 19? Are the members ready to vote? All of those in favour, please raise

your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I deem schedule 9, sections 18 to 19, carried.

Moving to schedule 9, section 20: There's an independent motion, amendment number 69. Go ahead, please, MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I move that section 20.1 be added to schedule 9 to the bill:

“20.1 The act is—

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Sorry. Hold on. I'm sorry to interrupt.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I'm so sorry. I have to go back on a technical thing of what I said.

Schedule 9, section 20: Any debate? Shall it carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. That's section 20 of schedule 9. Carried.

Now, we'll move on to amendment number 69. I'm sorry, MPP McMahon. If you would start again to read it into the record the amendment.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Sure. Thank you.

I move that section 20.1 be added to schedule 9 to the bill:

“20.1 The act is amended by adding the following section:

““Vacant homes report

“69.3(1) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall prepare a report identifying the number of vacant homes in Ontario.

““Publication and tabling

“(2) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall make the report described in subsection (1) available to the public and table it in the assembly.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Any debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Sure. Thank you. I'm always happy to explain in full detail my amendments. This one is—we don't want to leave any stone unturned. We are all horrified at the housing crisis, and we want to do everything we can so we can build homes, for sure. We can renovate homes; we can add additions, laneway suites, secondary units etc.; and we can also look at existing homes that have been left vacant for years and years and years for no apparent reason. We shouldn't have homes sitting empty in a housing crisis. Occupy them. Rent them out. There are lots of things to be done. So let's look at this, and let's report back on it. It would be a missed opportunity if we did not.

Thank you for your full, enthusiastic support.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Municipalities, Ontario—not even Canada has a full understanding of how many vacant homes we have in existence in Canada today. We don't know if they're just cottages. We don't know how long they're vacant for. We literally don't have the number. This is a very sensible way for us to identify how many vacant homes there are, and then we can identify measures to ensure that people who are leaving their vacant homes empty can either sell them, put a long-term renter in or pay

some kind of vacant home tax so that we can raise money for affordable housing. But the first thing we need to do is work out how many we've got. It's a big issue.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, shall the members be ready for a vote on amendment number 69?

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 69 lost.

Moving to amendment 70: MPP McMahon, if you're ready, please.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Sure thing; I'm super eager.

Mr. Kevin Holland: Oh, here we go.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Are you guys ready over there?

Mr. Kevin Holland: We're ready—bated breath.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: All right, pop your popcorn.

I move that section 20.2 be added to schedule 9 to the bill:

“20.2 The act is amended by adding the following section:

““Opportunities for housing report

“69.4(1) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall prepare a report describing,

“(a) the number of publicly owned properties in Ontario, whether vacant or occupied, that might be effectively converted into housing; and

“(b) the ministry's efforts in converting the properties identified under clause (b) into housing.

““Publication and tabling

“(2) Before the end of each year beginning in 2023, the minister shall make the report described in subsection (1) available to the public and table it in the assembly.”

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Of course. I'm always happy to explain my amendments in full detail.

We heard from the big-city mayors' representative, the mayor of Guelph, Cam Guthrie, that the Premier asked all the mayors to look in their own backyards for housing opportunities, which is absolutely fair. We should all be doing that. So we should also look in the mirror, walk the talk, and look in your own backyards. There are plenty of provincial properties that we can reassess.

We heard from one of the presenters, LCBO—someone get a list of all the LCBOs in Ontario. I mean, who wouldn't want to live on top of an LCBO, actually? Right? I'm sure many of you here would sign up right away for an apartment on top of an LCBO.

But looking in our own backyard at sites—we're missing an opportunity if we don't do that. We need to walk the talk. We can't expect others to do everything for the housing crisis and us to sit on properties that have potential.

Interjections.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Thank you, peanut gallery, for listening to me over there. An advance thank you from the bottom of my heart for your continued support, as you have done all day today.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing no further debate, are the members ready for the vote? All those in favour of amendment number 70, please raise your hands—

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: Recorded, recorded, recorded.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): —and it's recorded.

Ayes

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

Nays

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 70 lost.

1950

Now we're moving on to schedule 9, section 21. There are no amendments to sections 21 to 22. I propose we bundle them. Is the committee in agreement? Thank you.

Shall schedule 9, sections 21 to 22, carry? Any debate? No debate. All those in favour, please raise your hands. And all those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 9, sections 21 to 22, carried.

Moving on to schedule 9, section 23: Any debate? Shall schedule 9, section 23, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 9, section 23, carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 24 to 25. I propose we bundle them. All in agreement? Agreed.

Shall schedule 9, sections 24 to 25, carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Sections 24 to 25 are carried.

Shall schedule 9, as a whole, as amended, carry? Further debate?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): And a recorded vote is asked for.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 9, as amended, carried.

Schedule 10, Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022: Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 1 to 13. I would propose we bundle them. All in agreement? Thank you. Just a second.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I did say that, but we're just double-checking. It is 1 to 12. So back to schedule 10, sections 1 to 12: I propose we bundle them. Okay.

Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 10, sections 1 to 12, carried.

Schedule 10, section 13: Any debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: Overall, section 13 of schedule 10 exempts the York region new sewage waste proposal from an environmental assessment. That's concerning. An environmental assessment is important for us to determine the impact of this pretty significant sewage works project. We're also concerned that it would enable more sprawl-oriented development, so that also needs to be assessed. An environmental assessment should be done for the York region sewage works project, and this section would exempt it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote. Shall schedule 10, section 13, carry? All those in favour, please raise their—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): What was that?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote? Okay.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Schedule 10, section 13, is carried.

Moving to schedule 10, section 14: Shall that carry? Debate? MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: We have some concerns here because it exempts the Lake Simcoe phosphorus project from the Environmental Assessment Act. It is crucial that we make sure that we do an environmental assessment before we move forward on this project.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 10, section 14, carry?

Ms. Jessica Bell: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 10, section 14, carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 15 to 88. I propose we bundle them. Everybody agreed?

Any debate? Seeing no debate, I'll ask for the vote, then, if you're ready. On schedule 10, sections 15 to 88: Shall that carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 10, sections 15 to 88, are carried.

We will now do schedule 10 as a whole. Any debate? No? Okay. Shall schedule 10, as a whole, pass? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 10, as a whole, is carried.

Return to—I'm just catching up on papers—the first page to vote on sections—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): So return to section 1. Shall section 1, as amended, carry? No debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Section 1, as a whole, is carried.

Moving to section 2: Any debate? All those in favour of section 2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Section 2, as a whole, is carried.

Moving to section 3 as a whole: Any debate? All those in favour of section 3, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 3 carried.

We shall now vote on the title of the bill. Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. The title of the bill is carried.

Shall Bill 23, as amended, carry? Any debate? Yes, MPP Bell.

Ms. Jessica Bell: There is no evidence that Bill 23 is going to lower housing prices. There is no evidence that Bill 23 is going to lower rent prices. What we do know is that Bill 23 will harm democracy, it will pave over farmland, it will cut public services, and it will make life worse for renters. That's what we know Bill 23 does, so we have a lot of concerns about it.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Okay, who wants go first? MPP McMahon.

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon: I'm very disappointed that none of our amendments on this side of the room passed today. I'm not sure how this is collaborative or collegial, working together, and how we're going to continue in the next four years, because we're here to help. We have residents who support us. We represent communities, and we want to absolutely address the housing crisis.

So today, we killed the Toronto Green Standard, which essentially kills all green standards across Ontario, in a climate emergency, when every other area of the world is actually accelerating their net-zero goals. We are looking like dinosaurs.

We killed the conservation authorities, so better get those sump pumps in the basements because we're going to start flooding. That's the Insurance Bureau of Canada telling you that, and the Intact Centre on Climate Adaption is telling you that. I'm not the expert in that, but I respect people who have studied disasters and emergency preparedness.

And we have killed heritage and denied tenants' rights. Gosh, the list goes on and on and on.

Parkland dedication: We're denying Torontonians access to vital green space.

Municipalities: We've robbed them of their bank accounts for development charges. How is the infrastructure being built? I don't know. I don't know how people are going to sleep at night tonight. It's very disappointing.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Sabawy.

Mr. Sheref Sabawy: Just to address the colleague in opposition: In your final testimony, you are saying that there is no guarantee that the rent will go down. There is no guarantee that the housing crisis will improve. There's no guarantee that the prices will go down. There is no guarantee that the renters will get better chances. There is no guarantee about anything.

For 13 years, there was no guarantee of anything, and now we are in a crisis. We have no houses for rent or to buy, or even to build. To build, it will take 11 years. To buy, you have to have lots of money. To rent, there is no space. I don't know how we can go further in the same direction.

Even if you are saying there are no guarantees, I think this is changing the narrative a little bit, allowing more capacity, more houses to be built, encouraging more companies to get into the rental space and make more rental units available. People who are renting now, if they can buy a house, they will move on and there will be availability in the rent space for the newcomers. I think we are trying to move the whole cycle of housing, and I think this bill, even if there are no guarantees, is done with good intentions. We are trying to change the narrative here. We are in a crisis and we have to think out of the box.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): MPP McGregor? I'm so sorry—

Mr. Graham McGregor: Nope.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Oh, okay. All right then. Are the members ready to vote? Shall Bill 23, as amended, carry?

Mr. Jeff Burch: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Grewal, Holland, McGregor, Pang, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Bell, Burch, Harden, McMahon.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I declare Bill 23, as amended, carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Any debate? All those in favour of reporting the bill, as

amended, to the House, please raise your hands. All those opposed to Bill 23 being reported back to the House, please raise your hands. I deem that the bill can be reported, as amended, back to the House. Thank you.

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

The committee adjourned at 2004.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY

Chair / Présidente

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

MPP Laura Mae Lindo (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre ND)

MPP Jill Andrew (Toronto–St. Paul’s ND)

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal (Brampton East / Brampton-Est PC)

Mr. Joel Harden (Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre ND)

Mr. Kevin Holland (Thunder Bay–Atikokan PC)

MPP Laura Mae Lindo (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre ND)

Mr. Graham McGregor (Brampton North / Brampton-Nord PC)

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon (Beaches–East York L)

Mr. Billy Pang (Markham–Unionville PC)

Mr. Sheref Sabawy (Mississauga–Erin Mills PC)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Ms. Laura Smith (Thornhill PC)

Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam (Scarborough–Rouge Park PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Jessica Bell (University–Rosedale ND)

Mr. Ric Bresee (Hastings–Lennox and Addington PC)

Mr. Jeff Burch (Niagara Centre / Niagara-Centre ND)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk, legislative counsel

Mr. Mark Spakowski, chief legislative counsel