Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

G-21

Standing Committee on General Government

Better for People, Smarter for Business Act, 2019

1st Session
42nd Parliament

Tuesday 3 December 2019

Chair: Goldie Ghamari
Clerk: Jocelyn McCauley

Journal des débats (Hansard)

G-21

Comité permanent des affaires gouvernementales

Loi de 2019 pour mieux servir la population et faciliter les affaires

1re session
42e législature

Mardi 3 décembre 2019

Présidente : Goldie Ghamari
Greffière : Jocelyn McCauley

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:

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 :

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.

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.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Service du Journal des débats et de l'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

ISSN 1180-5218

CONTENTS

Tuesday 3 December 2019

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES

Tuesday 3 December 2019

Mardi 3 décembre 2019

The committee met at 0900 in committee room 1.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): Good morning, honourable members. In the absence of a Chair and Vice-Chair, it is my duty to call upon you to elect an Acting Chair. Are there any nominations? Ms. Khanjin.

Ms. Andrea Khanjin: I would like to nominate Bob Bailey to be Chair.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): Mr. Bailey, do you accept the nomination?

Mr. Robert Bailey: I will accept that with pleasure.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations, I declare the nominations closed. Mr. Bailey, assume the role of Acting Chair.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Robert Bailey): Thank you, Madam Clerk. The Standing Committee on General Government will now come to order.

BETTER FOR PEOPLE, SMARTER FOR BUSINESS ACT, 2019

LOI DE 2019 POUR MIEUX SERVIR LA POPULATION ET FACILITER LES AFFAIRES

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 132, An Act to reduce burdens on people and businesses by enacting, amending and repealing various Acts and revoking various Regulations / Projet de loi 132, Loi visant à alléger le fardeau administratif qui pèse sur la population et les entreprises en édictant, modifiant ou abrogeant diverses lois et en abrogeant divers règlements.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Robert Bailey): Pursuant to the order of the House dated November 7, 2019, we will now begin the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 132, An Act to reduce burdens on people and businesses by enacting, amending and repealing various Acts and revoking various Regulations.

Catherine Oh from legislative counsel is here today to assist us with our work. Copies of the numbered amendments received on Monday, December 2, 2019, are on your desks. The amendments have been numbered in the order in which they appear in the bill. We will now begin with section 1 of the bill.

Bill 132 is comprised of three sections which enact 17 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? Agreed.

Schedule 1 of the bill, the Foreign Cultural Objects Immunity from Seizure Act, 2019: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 7 of schedule 1 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 7 of schedule 1, inclusive, carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 7 of schedule 2 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

The Green Party of Ontario recommends voting against schedule 2 to the bill. Green Party, would you like to say a few words?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I'll just say that we had a number of witnesses, including the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, speak out against schedule 2, and I thought they presented compelling arguments of why schedule 2 should be removed from the act.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: We concur on this item. An example of why this bill is so flawed is that not enough due diligence was done in the early consultation process, and so we heard that there were going to be problems with the implementation of this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): The official opposition and the government also recommend voting against schedule 2 to the bill. Any further debate?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: A recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): All right. We're now going to vote on the schedule as a whole.

Nays

Bailey, Fife, Glover, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Schreiner, Skelly, Dave Smith, Stevens.

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

We'll turn now to schedule 3. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 5 of schedule 3 of the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections.

Mr. Dave Smith: Chair?

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

Mr. Dave Smith: We voted to oppose each of the individual sections, but we did not vote on whether schedule 2 should carry.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We just did.

Mr. Dave Smith: We voted on each individual schedule—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No, I just said, "Shall schedule 2 carry?" It was voted against.

Mr. Dave Smith: Thank you.

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): If you'd like, I'll restate the initial statement. This is with respect to schedule 2. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 7 of schedule 2 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 7 of schedule 2, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Now, shall schedule 2 carry? All those in favour—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): We already did that.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): —which we already did. Thank you.

Turning now to schedule 3, there are no amendments to sections 1 through 5 of schedule 3 of the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Shall sections 1 through 5 of schedule 3, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): There's a notice that the Green Party of Ontario recommends voting against schedule 3 to the bill. There's also a notice that the Ontario NDP recommends voting against schedule 3 to the bill.

Is there any debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I'm recommending voting against this. I know that the government, while we were hearing witnesses saying that we should remove this schedule, said, "Why would you support something that applies to something that doesn't exist?"

I would argue, actually, given the changes that were made in the spring to essentially change the LPAT rules back to the old OMB rules, this means that this support centre is more important now than ever.

When the old OMB rules were in place, citizens were having to spend millions of dollars, in some cases, opposing inappropriate land use decisions in their communities. I can tell you that municipalities were having to spend millions of dollars. In my riding alone, in Guelph, we've spent multiple millions of dollars at what were the old OMB hearings.

With the new OMB regime coming back into place—albeit under a new name, the LPAT—I think it's more important now than ever for citizens to have a resource centre. With the old rules back in place, you're going to start seeing more appeals again, because the government has opened the floodgates for a number of appeals to happen.

The new LPAT rules restricted the number of appeals that could be brought forward. So if the centre was underutilized, it was likely because there was a more restrictive nature in the kinds of appeals and the number of appeals coming forward.

Now that those restrictions have been removed, I fundamentally think we're going to go back to the old regime where there were a lot of appeals. Citizens are going to need support in navigating the complexity of those appeals. That's exactly what this centre is for. This is exactly what citizens fought for in the creation of the centre initially. It's exactly why so many citizens' groups came to this committee and said they need this support centre to help them navigate the appeals process.

So if you want to stand up for citizen participation and engagement in local planning, including in the appeals process, I highly recommend removing schedule 3 from the bill.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Schreiner. Further debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I think that this schedule needs to go. We've made compelling cases, I think, throughout the deputations. The voices of the citizens that came before us in London, in Peterborough and here in Toronto were very clear that the changes you're making, in particular to schedule 16 and schedule 9, on this piece of legislation will leave citizens' voices on the side. To hear citizens themselves actually say, "Now we're back to the OMB, and now we don't even have"—with the newly named LPAT—"help to navigate this system."

We strongly opposed the elimination of the Local Planning Appeal Support Centre this summer.

Communities still have outstanding concerns about the government's choice to make it harder for municipalities and citizens to fight back against big developers. In particular, the changes to the Aggregate Resources Act will leave citizens on the sidelines. One example that I'd like the government to listen to, but I don't know what's going on over there—I don't know—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Sorry, if I could just ask that conversations be kept to a whisper or taken outside. Thank you.

0910

Ms. Catherine Fife: I can see that there's some confusion. The Hallman pit, for example, Madam Chair: The Hallman pit is in Wilmot township. It's an aggregate proposal to destroy 200 acres of prime farmland. The ARA changes will potentially allow the aggregate business to go below the water table—7% of Waterloo region's water comes from that water table. The municipalities will be sidelined by schedule 16; the ministry itself will be sidelined by schedule 16. The only line of defence on source water protection in the province of Ontario, if this bill goes through as it is, will be citizens fighting at what is essentially the OMB in Ontario. We will need those citizens' voices.

To be really clear with the government: I know that you want to put your brand on everything and do a public relations exercise, but this particular—the LPAT was actually designed to help citizens navigate through a very complex system, and you didn't even give it a chance to be successful. So you can't say—I remember one of the

members saying, "Well, there is only one appeal per municipality across the province of Ontario," or per riding. Their centre actually didn't even have a fighting chance to be successful. So for citizens, for instance, in Waterloo region, who had to fight for the hard countryside line and try to get the OMB to even uphold provincial strategy around good places to grow—can you imagine being a citizen trying to get a stand-alone agency to uphold the provincial government's directive? You can see that there's a huge power imbalance in there.

So I would ask that the government members on the other side allow the Local Planning Appeal Support Centre to continue. So pull this part, pull this schedule and give it a fighting chance to be successful so that citizens actually have some support to fight for their source water protection, fight for progressive planning strategies, to fight organizations like Nestlé, where Nestlé has trumped the municipality in bidding for a well head. That's where we are right now in Ontario: A corporation outbid a city, a municipality which has an elected responsibility to ensure that that township and that region has water. What could be more important than water?

This support centre was put in place so that those citizens could go up against these corporations that have hundreds of millions of dollars to fight in court and that have lawyers on retainer 24/7. Let the centre stand. It's a small consolation. This is a government that's trying to rebrand desperately. Why not give us schedule 3?

I have other points, but I don't know if you're listening. But it's going to be tested in the Hallman pit, and I'm looking particularly over to my colleague MPP Harris. That pit is actually going to put source water protection at risk in Ontario, if it goes below the water line. Now that we're removing the oversight of the municipality, we're letting the aggregate company write its own site plans—how, in anyone's mind, can you think that this a progressive direction to take?

So that is my appeal to remove schedule 3 in its entirety.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Fife.

Before we continue debate, I just want to let everyone know there's a 30-minute bell, so at about the five-minute mark I'll be recessing so that we can attend to the vote.

Are the members prepared to vote on schedule 3?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote, please.

Interjection.

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Yes, I just wanted to add one more thing to the debate, because I'm hoping the government is going to listen to us on this. There have been examples where citizens have utilized the LPAT support—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I'm sorry, MPP Schreiner. I'm having some trouble hearing you. I would kindly ask members to keep their comments to a minimum so that I can hear Mr. Schreiner. Thank you.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Oh, I thought maybe it was a microphone issue.

So in Niagara region, the Thundering Waters development was successfully appealed through support from the LPAT support centre.

I was just reading about the Kitchener versus parking garage—by an academic, so somebody who is an academic but still didn't have the skills and knowledge to navigate the complexity of the system, who successfully used the support centre to appeal a decision.

I could go on and give you more examples. But I just wanted to say that this myth, that somehow this centre was not utilized, doesn't reflect the fact that citizens utilized this centre successfully and could continue to utilize this centre successfully.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 3 carry?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Glover, Schreiner, Stevens.

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

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I would kindly ask members to make their comments through the Chair and keep conversations to a minimum. If I can hear you, everyone can hear you, and it's distracting. Thank you.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 45 of schedule 4 of the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Shall sections 1 through 45 of schedule 4, inclusive, carry? Carried.

We will now vote for schedule 4 as a whole. Shall schedule 4 carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3 of schedule 5 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 through 3 of schedule 5, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 4 of schedule 6 to the bill. I therefore proposed that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Shall sections 1 through 4 of schedule 6, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Carried.

We turn now to schedule 7. There are no amendments to sections 1 through 2 of schedule 7 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Shall sections 1 through 2 of schedule 7, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 7 carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 17 of schedule 8 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle

these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 through 17 of schedule 8, inclusive, carry? Carried.

There is a notice: The Green Party of Ontario recommends voting against schedule 8 to the bill; the Ontario NDP recommends voting against schedule 8 to the bill. Is there any debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: As you can see, we have some serious concerns around schedule 8. When the Chiefs of Ontario came to committee, they were fairly clear in their resistance to the way that this bill has been constructed, the way that this bill was crafted, without due consultation. The Indigenous governments have raised concerns that the changes in schedule 8 would have serious impacts on treaty rights and consultation. So if you want to end up back in court, that's where you're going if schedule 8 passes as it is.

This is a direct quote from their presentation: "Matawa First Nations call on the Ontario Legislature to not provide unanimous consent on Bill 132, and that it not proceed to third reading; and instead refer Bill 132 schedule 8—Mining Act provisions—specifically to a standing committee as the unilateral imposition of this legislation impacts the inherent Aboriginal and treaty rights of Matawa First Nations and our members. Moreover, the Matawa chiefs call on Ontario to enter into meaningful discussions on these critical matters related to mining that affects us."

0920

I think in this day and age of reconciliation—we all received a copy of all of the reconciliation recommendations. I think that one of the most strong arguments that was made was particularly by Chief Yesno, who said that they want to be part of the economic fabric of this province and they want to be part of this process. By leaving them in the backroom, by leaving them on the sidelines and not having them at the table, you're actually compromising confidence in the economic decisions that you're making with regard to mining.

We've actually seen this before, and so I raise it to this committee and to the government side by saying that I first sat in this House in 2007, and I watched then-Finance Minister Dwight Duncan announce the Ring of Fire. The Ring of Fire has many issues, but one of the key issues that has prevented it from being actually a ring of fire, and just a kind of ring of smoke, is that seven court cases were lodged because basic due diligence and respect of First Nations—who are treaty rights holders in northern Ontario—was not respected. And so, the government, in their haste—and you're copying the Liberals almost verbatim here—ended up in court, and all production on three mines, that I know of, came to a full stop. It couldn't proceed. It was halted due to court orders because Indigenous communities, who are treaty partners—and this is not how you treat partners.

You don't say to partners, "We're going to introduce this bill. We're going to change the rules of engagement. And we don't want to hear from you." If you have a true partner in the Indigenous communities, then you actually invite them to the table before you craft the legislation, and then you ask for their feedback and you incorporate that feedback and that knowledge, that First Nations knowledge, into the schedule, in this instance schedule 8.

What I found very telling was the exchange around the northern Ontario act when the chief was saying—because he was making the connection that one piece of legislation, in this instance, the Mining Act, affects other northern acts; it affects other legislation. These things don't happen in silos. I think they made a compelling case to be a true partner in this process by saying that more investment would come to this province, more investment would come to these projects if investors knew that the government had truly honoured their commitment around treaty agreements. And that just has not happened. We're essentially—the "help us help you" sort of moment here is that we've seen this playbook before.

I know my colleagues who have sat here for the last seven years with me know that the Ring of Fire is a failed project because the Liberals failed to do their basic due diligence with regard to Indigenous communities. So why would you embed that injustice in a piece of legislation? This is what reconciliation is supposed to be about. You're supposed to interrupt the cycles of power imbalance. You're supposed to create new and positive relationships by building trust. This does not build trust. This builds more lawyer jobs in the province of Ontario. You're going to end up in court.

What really does shock me is that this is a red tape bill that many people told us we need to put some yellow tape around, because this is a piece of legislation that is deeply flawed and that requires caution, not just on schedules 8, 9 and 16, but the way that it was crafted indicates a very sloppiness, if you will, and a failure to actually embed some core principles. If the goal is to reduce red tape, this schedule in and of itself will create more red tape and it will hold up economic development in northern Ontario, which is, as of yet, untapped.

So I would urge the members, the government members, if you are not supportive of the principles of treaty rights and of Indigenous communities as true partners, if that doesn't work for you, then at least look at the economic impact of this schedule, of really stalling what could be a community benefit project, so everybody wins on a go-forward basis. The local community wins because they get good jobs. There's sustainable and positive resource extraction, because that's what Indigenous communities know how to do. They have that knowledge. We need that knowledge, and then you avoid going to court. So it's like a win-win-win, but not if this schedule 8 goes through.

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I just want to echo some of the concerns that my colleague just presented around a lack of consultation with Indigenous nations.

When you have the Matawa First Nations come to committee and you have the Chiefs of Ontario come to committee and raise serious concerns around schedule 8,

and in two respects, actually: the lack of consultation on schedule 8 in and of itself, and the threats to consultation contained within the changes of schedule 8, to me, that would give you pause to say, "You know what? Let's back off on schedule 8. There are other parts of bill that let's move forward with, but on schedule 8, let's actually listen to Indigenous people. Let's pull this schedule and let's get it right."

The irony is I believe the government makes the argument that we want to remove red tape to facilitate business development. Well, actually, I would argue that by not engaging in proper consultation, it's actually going to delay business development. This is why I'd echo my colleague's comments. The Ring of Fire has been delayed. We've seen other resource projects across the country delayed and sometimes even cancelled due to the lack of proper consultation.

I think the Indigenous nations that came here to committee indicated quite clearly that they want to be economic partners, they want to be a part of resource development in the north and they want to be treated with respect as partners. I think schedule 8 will actually likely delay economic development in the north.

Just while we're on this schedule, I wanted to say how problematic it is, the cancellation of the energy and water reporting and benchmarking program. If you're going to make good, sound decisions, and particularly around energy and water conservation, which we know, given the climate crisis we're facing, is critically important, but also just given the rising cost of energy, is essential to helping building owners save money by saving energy—it's the lowest-cost solution to our energy needs—the best way to know what you need to do is actually have the data to report on it and make informed decisions. That's exactly what the benchmarking program is all about. I think it takes us backwards in terms of helping building owners save money, save energy and save water.

Give the government an opportunity here: Let's remove schedule 8 from this bill.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: I forgot to mention the speed by which this piece of legislation has moved through the House. Specifically, the duty to consult: I want to get this on the record, because I think that this would be a very costly measure for the government. When the Chiefs of Ontario came, they said that the duty to consult has not been honoured.

"In its current state"—and this is directly from their statement—"the bill can be interpreted as softening the requirements of consultation with First Nations." That's what the Chief was saying to the government members when he came here.

"For example"—and language matters in legislation as in all matters, but he says, "the suggested phrasing in the Mining Act states, 'the director is satisfied appropriate consultation with Aboriginal communities has been carried out in accordance with the regulations.' This phrasing can be understood as granting greater discretion to the director while also allowing the minister to provide approval without confirmation of consultation." I think we're fundamentally talking about an issue of trust, and I've already referenced the poor relationship that the Liberal government had with Indigenous communities, particularly as it relates to resource extraction in mining.

They go on to say, about the timelines, "First Nations in Ontario continually seek to work with state bodies based on a government-to-government relationship. Flexibility and reasonable time frames must be afforded to First Nations to meaningfully assess the impacts on and to adequately respond to issues that implicate First Nations' rights.

"As it stands, 30 days to review this legislation is inadequate. The bill, as noted, potentially impacts First Nations rights in several ways" that came before this committee. "Diplomatic relations between First Nations and Ontario must be founded on respect, equity, empowerment and environmental righteousness and justice to our First Nations. The first step" to develop this "relationship is ensuring that First Nations may contribute to this legislation to strengthen it."

0930

They go on to say, "Garnering support for a bill is difficult and it takes time." I know that this government is very focused on time. You're very focused on moving things quickly and countering that narrative that everything in government moves slow. But there are some reasons why legislation takes time. "First Nations in Ontario remain steadfast and grounded in protecting and enforcing First Nations' rights. Therefore it may be prudent"—this is Chiefs of Ontario warning the government. They say, "Therefore, it may be prudent for Ontario to grant more time so that any possible infringements on First Nations' rights or potential legal issues may be avoided."

I think that they came to this committee in good faith. They've given you fair warning that not being part of the drafting of this legislation and not being part of the economic development conversation is something they will fight—because they actually have to fight.

This is something that all committee members heard. I'm sure you took it back to whoever is making the decisions as they relate to Bill 132, but I guess at some point, someone on the government side decided to say, "You know what? We're going to move ahead regardless." That's a very poor decision, and at the end of the day, you wear it. The staffers who make these decisions: They're not on the ballot next time. You're on the ballot.

We introduced this land acknowledgement here in this Legislature, which is great; we talk the talk on reconciliation. Chiefs of Ontario has given you some very tangible reasons to pull schedule 3. Just pull it, and go back to the drawing board on it. Then, bring it back to us as a stand-alone piece of legislation—which is what it should be. It should be a stand-alone piece of legislation because it's the key piece to driving economic development in northern Ontario.

Let's put people to work in northern Ontario, not the lawyers.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Fife. Further debate? MPP Glover.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'm thinking about this schedule in the context of an Indigenous ceremony that we had yesterday at the Legislature here. It was the blanket ceremony. For 400 years, First Nations peoples' rights to this land and in this land have been stripped away, slowly and often violently. I'm looking at the decision-makers, the people—all of us—who will be voting on this, and I don't know if any of us have Indigenous heritage, yet, against the will of the Chiefs of Ontario and Matawa First Nations, we're voting to strip them of the duty to consult, and we're going to end up in court. If there is a commitment to reconciliation in this room and in this province, then we should be consulting with the Ontario council of chiefs and Matawa First Nations. We should be going back to them with this schedule and saying, "Hey, what actually makes sense?"

I would also echo the comments of my colleagues here. When I was teaching a course at York University on the history and economics of Ontario, I had the CEO of Detour Gold come. Detour Gold is a big mining project northeast of Timmins. Before they put a shovel in the ground, they made agreements—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Sorry, MPP Glover. You're going to have one minute left because I'm going to then adjourn the committee for the vote.

Mr. Chris Glover: Fair enough. Thank you—they made agreements with five different First Nations to provide jobs, to provide training, to provide a guarantee of environment clean-up when the project is done, and they were able to proceed. But this is going to end up in court, and it's going to delay the mining projects that we actually want to get through.

I would urge the government members to vote against this schedule.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Glover.

A recess right now for the bell, but please come back immediately after the vote. We will resume five minutes after the vote, obviously unless it's 10 o'clock. Thank you, everyone.

The committee recessed from 0935 to 0950.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We're now going to resume today's session.

Further debate on schedule 8? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I was just looking for something from the government side as to, now that you've heard again how the Chiefs of Ontario feel about the lack of consultation on this piece of legislation, and now that you know they want to be true partners throughout this process and they've identified the fact that they will hold the government to account, because they have to—it's in their own constitution; they have to fight for their rights—and now that you know that this schedule and this piece of legislation will likely end up in some sort of a legal position, why is the government so determined to just leave it as is and not fix it?

Is there any will on the other side of the room to address what we now know are tangible barriers to economic development with regard to mining in northern Ontario? Will the government at least entertain or move an amendment to pull schedule 8 and bring it back as a stand-alone piece of legislation?

This is just an honest question to the government side.

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: This is an opportunity for the government to explain or even respond to the Chiefs of Ontario and the Matawa First Nations around the issue of consultation, because I do think it's critically important to development in the north, in particular. I don't want to see that development tied up in the courts because we haven't fulfilled our duty to consult. Maybe the government knows something the opposition doesn't know, but we're giving them an opportunity to explain.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested. Are the members prepared to vote on schedule 8? Shall schedule 8 carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Glover, Schreiner, Stevens.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Schedule 8 is carried.

Turning now to schedule 9: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 57 of schedule 9 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 57 of schedule 9, inclusive, carry? Carried.

We're now on government amendment 1, section 58, of schedule 9 to the bill. MPP Skelly.

Ms. Donna Skelly: I move that section 58 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(1.1) Paragraph 2 of subsection 50(2) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

"'2. Subject to the regulations, to provide public access to information submitted under paragraph 1, other than commercially sensitive information.'"

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Any debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I'm just wondering: Who would determine what is commercially sensitive information in this? Why wasn't it included? Is there some rationale that the government side could give us as to why it wasn't included originally? Who asked for this particular part?

And, third, who determined what is commercially sensitive? Because we do know now that we are going through such an extensive FOI process—we've never filed so many FOI requests in our lives—that sometimes being commercially sensitive is the excuse for not sharing what should be publicly available information. So I guess I would just ask the government—or perhaps maybe the legislative counsel can provide it—who in this instance provides what is commercially sensitive?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Further debate?

Ms. Catherine Oh: I'm sorry. I don't know who that would be.

Ms. Catherine Fife: You don't know?

Ms. Catherine Oh: I can't really answer that question. This is about how this would be implemented by the government.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): So to clarify, that would be a question for ministry counsel or for the government.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Okay.

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Would there be an opportunity to define what "commercially sensitive" is—so not about how it would applied or implemented but just how it would be defined?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): You can either ask that of the government members here, or you can request that of ministry counsel, to come up with a definition.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: We would have to go to ministry counsel? Okay. Would the government like to maybe try an explanation, then?

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. We have counsel here from the ministry. Would you like to come up? Please state your name for Hansard, and then you may answer the question.

Mr. David Gaskell: My name is David Gaskell. I'm counsel for the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.

About the question, about defining "commercially sensitive information": There is authority in the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act for the Lieutenant Governor in Council through—

Mr. Chris Glover: Could you speak more slowly?

Mr. David Gaskell: Oh, sorry, sir.

Interjection.

Mr. David Gaskell: Okay. No problem.

There's authority in the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, which this is an amendment to, for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to define through regulation any term that is not otherwise defined in the act. So as "commercially sensitive information" is not defined, this term could be defined through regulation in the future, if necessary.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Further debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: So it would have to be defined in regulation. Who would define that?

Mr. David Gaskell: The Lieutenant Governor in Council, through regulation.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Okay. But right now it's not defined?

Mr. David Gaskell: Correct.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Okay. Thank you very much.

With that new information, we'll be voting against this amendment.

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

Thank you. You may step down.

Seeing none, shall section 58 of schedule 9—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Oh, my apologies. Where are we? Sorry. We are on government amendment number 1, section 58 of schedule 9 to the bill. It was moved by MPP Skelly. All those in favour?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Could we have a recorded vote?

Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Glover, Schreiner, Stevens.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Carried.

Shall section 58 of schedule 9, as amended, carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 59 through 81 of schedule 9 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 59 through 81 of schedule 9, inclusive, carry? Carried.

The Green Party of Ontario recommends voting against schedule 9 to the bill, and the Ontario NDP recommends voting against schedule 9 to the bill. Is there any further debate? MPP Schreiner.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Chair, we recess at 10; is that right? So I'd actually just move that we recess rather than start the debate on this.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We cannot recess until 10 on the dot, because this is brought by the House. However, I can ensure that when we resume, you can continue with your allotted time.

MPP Schreiner, you have the floor.

Interjection.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Yes, there we go.

First of all, there are so many concerns about schedule 9 to this bill, so I'm going to start with—

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): MPP Schreiner, thank you for your time. It's now 10 o'clock.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We will resume consideration of Bill 132 at 2 p.m. sharp. Thank you, everyone.

The committee recessed from 1000 to 1400.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on General Government will now come to order.

Pursuant to the order of the House dated November 7, 2019, we will now resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 132, An Act to reduce burdens on people and businesses by enacting, amending and repealing various Acts and revoking various Regulations.

Before we resume consideration of schedule 9, I would like to take a moment to remind committee members that at 5 p.m. today I am required to interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections and schedules of Bill 132 and any amendments hereto.

At that time, I will allow a 20-minute waiting period, if requested, pursuant to standing order 129(a). From that point forward those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and I will call the vote on them consecutively.

We will now begin where we left off, on schedule 9 of the bill.

Mr. Schreiner, you have the floor.

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on schedule 9. I want to cover three important areas. I think it's important to have them on the record.

First of all, we had a number of people come to committee with some deep concerns about the lack of consultation, particularly on the changes in schedule 9, especially expressing concerns about the 30 days allotted for Environmental Registry comments on significant environmental changes to an omnibus bill. We had people who are lawyers saying this, who are experts in the field.

We also had people like the Chiefs of Ontario come to committee and express some deep concerns about the lack of consultations with them on such significant changes.

I actually think, if we had had an opportunity to have dialogue, there possibly were some ways that schedule 9 could have been amended to accommodate some of the changes the government wants to make while addressing the concerns that many people in the environmental and First Nations communities have expressed with this particular bill.

I just want to talk briefly about administrative monetary penalties, or the AMPs regime, because I am concerned that the changes in schedule 9 will make it cheaper and easier for polluters to pollute. In particular I want to focus in on the removal of the reverse onus clause.

I understand that the government has made the case that expanding AMPs to a wider group of polluters is a good thing, and I actually agree with them on that. It is a good thing. But the problem is, if you remove the reverse onus clause you essentially almost make the AMP regime ineffective and almost inoperable. So on the one hand you're saying, "We'll expand AMPs"; on the hand you're actually cutting the effectiveness of AMPs at the knees by removing the removing the reverse onus clause. Why is that the case?

Under the current rules, if a polluter appeals, with the reverse onus clause it's the polluter's responsibility to show that they were not responsible, not the government's or a complainant's. By removing that onus and taking it off of polluters, it makes it much easier from a legal standpoint for polluters to get away with polluting. Essentially it makes the AMP regime, even an expanded AMP regime, less effective.

I worked with some environmental lawyers to look at if there were some ways we could put forward some amendments to fix the situation. My staff, to their credit, put a lot of work into it. At the end of the day the advice I received was that it was kind of like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic, that in the short period of time we have here it just can't be amended to be fixed.

But if at some point there are some opportunities to have that conversation, if we had proper consultation—I would recommend just removing this schedule and we can talk about some ways to fix it.

In particular, one of the concerns I have here the removal of caps on polluter penalties. The per-day fines create a strong incentive, when there is a toxin being spilled our waterways, for polluters to fix the situation as fast as possible. If you cap the fines and you remove the per-day fines, then it reduces the incentives for polluters to stop polluting. That's a direct threat to our waterways.

I think government has a responsibility to protect water. Having multi-day fines in place, with per-day penalties, is an incentive to reduce spills.

I want to remind the government that this regime was brought into place because of the Imperial Oil spill near Sarnia that put hundreds of thousands of litres of toxins into the St. Clair River. This regime was put in place to make sure that type of accident didn't happen again, and if it did happen again, there would be penalties in place to ensure that the toxic spill would end quickly and be cleaned up quickly.

I finally want to, just briefly, talk a bit about the pesticide section of the schedule 9 as well. The one thing I want to remind the government is—and I know some of the pesticide regimes that were brought in, particularly around neonicotinoid pesticides and how they affect grain farmers was controversial, but it was also very controversial, the bee kill-offs that beekeepers were facing in Ontario. I just want to remind members opposite that bee farmers are farmers as well.

As a matter of fact, the beekeeping industry in Ontario is almost a $900-million industry. To threaten that industry threatens an important economic player in this province. In addition to that, bees provide another $500 million of benefits to farmers through their pollination activities. Reducing the protections for pollinators through the changes to the Pesticides Act, to me, threatens an important agriculture industry in Ontario. We should be standing up for those farmers as well. Again, if we had time, I think there are some opportunities where grain farmers and beekeepers could work together to figure out a regulatory regime that would work for both.

The Ontario Beekeepers' Association has expressed concerns around the regulatory changes here, and in particular, the regulatory changes that provide accountability. The accountability measures and some of the reporting requirements that are required in the current act help beekeepers figure out where to place their beehives, and it also in many respects helps farmers to determine where there are real pest threats where it's appropriate to have neonicotinoid applications, and areas where the threats don't exist and it may not be appropriate. But if we don't have the regulatory regime in place to have that kind of information available to farmers, to beekeepers, to people in the pesticide industry, then I think we're doing a real disservice to the people of Ontario.

Finally, I just want to close by saying that I realize the government is not eliminating the cosmetic pesticide ban, but the information we received from witnesses, both in their testimony and in their written testimony, suggests that the government is significantly weakening that cosmetic pesticide ban. That's a direct threat to public health. That's exactly why we've had the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario express concern. It's why we've had doctors express concern. As a matter of fact, I had a registered nurse come to my office last week expressing concerns around the watering down of the cosmetic pesticide ban, because these are our parks. These are areas where kids play, where they're directly exposed to toxins. To weaken that regime, I think, takes us in the wrong direction.

I strongly encourage the government to just withdraw this schedule. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's bring the appropriate stakeholders together. Let's come up with some solutions that don't threaten our waterways and public health and safety.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Schreiner. Further debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think schedule 9 garnered a fair amount of debate with delegations that came before us, because almost every environmental group in the province of Ontario came to this committee, indicated how concerned they were by the changes to the administrative monetary penalties, talked to this government about the lack of consultation—which was zero—and really articulated how, ironically, this red tape bill will actually create more red tape: because in principle we do know that the use of administrative monetary penalties, as an alternative to prosecutions in appropriate cases, keeps these disputes out of the court systems, because the penalty regime is well known to companies across this province. They understand that with every day of a spill, of an industrial accident where chemicals are released into the environment, their penalties increase day after day after day. They accrue. So this acts as a deterrent to companies polluting in the province of Ontario.

1410

What the government has proposed—and I want to be respectful of all the voices that came to this committee, with only three days of committee sessions. I want to thank the researchers for compiling all of the feedback. It needs to be articulated, once again, how dangerous schedule 9 is to our environment in the province of Ontario and also, ultimately, to our economy. One delegate said that this red tape bill needs to have some yellow tape around it. This is a cautionary tale for this government.

Under the Environmental Protection Act, under schedule 9, the environment—Ecojustice Canada came and said, "Maintain the ministry's current ability to issue" an administrative monetary penalty for "contraventions where a discharge may cause an adverse effect, instead of narrowing that power to circumstances where the adverse effect is likely."

The smart money, the smart investment, is on prevention around the onus for certain proceedings that relate to discharges. This was Ecojustice Canada as well, and Environmental Defence. They said to not repeal section 145.5, which puts the onus on violators to prove that the violation did occur, or that the spill did not cause an adverse effect, under the total penalty under schedule 9, section 16, EPA. This was by multiple groups, everyone from the Federation of Tiny Township, the Grand River Environmental Network, the LHIN in London, the North Shore Environmental Resource Advocates, the Matawa First Nations, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the Ontario Rivers Alliance and the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario to even the Thames River Anglers Association. They said to not replace the $100,000-per-day maximum penalty with a $200,000 total maximum penalty.

In essence, the deputations that spoke to this said that once the $200,000 penalty is issued or known to the polluter, then they know they are scot-free after that. There's no deterrent to deal with a spill. There's no deterrent to address it. There's just a one-time fee. You're actually, through this schedule, making it easier to pollute in the province of Ontario. That is what these environmental groups told us.

Under the same monetary benefit—this was the Canadian Federation of University Women. They came and they said to include and factor in the considerable monetary costs to health, land, environment and people in determining penalties.

Under "Payment prevents conviction," under schedule 9, section 16, EPA, section 182—this was Environment Canada as well. They said to not limit the ministry's ability to prosecute a polluter that has also paid an administrative monetary penalty. Why would any government limit their own powers in addressing pollution? Why would you tie your hands like that?

Under the five-year review, under schedule 9, section 16—retain the existing mandatory five-year reviews of penalties. Why wouldn't you review a policy or a procedure as a government?

Under other recommendations: Retain and update the municipal industrial strategy for abatement regulations.

What is really astounding to me is that there—tomorrow the Auditor General is going to come out with a report. She's going to—I hope—just totally decimate your Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan, which, ironically, if the rhetoric is to be believed on that plan, this legislation

undermines. You are actively walking a contradiction on the environment and, ironically, on the economy.

The Canadian Environmental Law Association says, "Schedule 9 of Bill 132 proposes to amend and expand the AMP regime to three other environmental laws. While this sounds like a good idea in theory," and we heard those good ideas at committee, "CELA is concerned that the wording of the amendments is counterproductive and may undermine the effectiveness of AMPs.

"For example, under schedule 9, the availability of AMPs under the three other laws depends on regulations that have not yet been made, and there is no clear deadline in Bill 132 for making these regulations."

If you don't know this now, if you don't know how much distrust there is already with your government and the environment, you are actually embedding that distrust into a piece of legislation.

"Even if the regulations are quickly developed"—this is continuing on from the Canadian Environmental Law Association—"schedule 9 proposes to change AMPs from a per-diem penalty to a per-contravention penalty. This is a rollback from current AMP provisions which state that AMPs can be imposed for every day that the offence continues."

Where is your evidence? Where is your research? Who told you that this was going to be a good idea? Because there's a true lack of accountability, there's a true lack of transparency into who is driving these changes on environmental law in Ontario.

The statement goes back to say that the "per-diem approach should be retained since it can result in higher penalties for multi-day offences, which will have a greater deterrent effect on polluters."

There's no good rationale for moving away from the per diem. None was presented by the government, and yet delegation after delegation said to this government, "AMPs are working. Why would you disrupt them?"

It goes on to say: "Finally, in cases where an AMP is issued, schedule 9 will make it easier for polluters to appeal the penalty by removing the reverse onus that exists in the current AMP regime. This onus correctly puts the burden on polluters to prove on appeal that the alleged facts did not occur; however, schedule 9 proposes to remove this onus. In our view, this is a major step backwards, and should not be enacted." So not only are you going to make it easier for polluters to pollute in Ontario, but then you're going to make it easier for them to appeal any sort of resistance, any sorts of barriers. You've already removed the citizen voices that were empowered to actually work through the appeal centre.

For these and other reasons, schedule 9—entirely—can't be supported. In fact, I would question the motivation of the government for bringing schedule 9 forward. It defies all common sense. It is exactly in the wrong direction that this province should be going. It will undermine our ability as a province to keep our lakes, our rivers, our land safe, and there's just complete and utter silence from the government side.

There is no good reason to move in this direction. It runs counter to all of your language that you've used on your own Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan. You've actually removed voices that have informed governments since the 1970s by removing and abolishing the Ontario pesticides advisory council. This is a non-partisan group that has given advice to government and to the environment minister since 1970. It really does beg the question, if schedule 9 is to go ahead as is—and I would love for anyone on that side of the table to say, "You know what? We're going to remove it. We're going to pull it."

It's irresponsible. It's fiscally irresponsible; it's bad for the economy; it's bad for the environment. I would love to hear a government member say that.

And I have to say, when we started this whole process and we went to our ministry briefing—we had less than 20 hours to actually go into that briefing and ask informed questions. I think even the ministry's people were surprised that the government is going in this direction. Why would you weaken your own tools in your tool box that we always hear this government talking about? Why would that happen?

Madam Chair, the New Democrats will not be supporting this schedule, and the first opportunity we get, we're going to reverse this.

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

Mr. Chris Glover: I just want to echo some of my colleague's points here. I want to quote from the Canadian Environmental Law Association. They say, "Schedule 9 proposes a wide-ranging series of amendments to the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), including: (i) revision of the main anti-pollution prohibition in section 14(1) of the EPA; (ii) repeal of provisions currently used to regulate motor vehicle emissions; and (iii) repeal of provisions addressing complaints that contaminants have caused economic loss or damage to livestock, crops, trees or other vegetation."

The other thing they talk about in schedule 9 is the impact on water resources, because "Schedule 9 of Bill 132 proposes to insert the revised administrative penalty regime into the" Ontario Water Resources Act. "CELA's"—the Canadian Environmental Law Association's—"concerns about the new regime are outlined in appendix C below."

1420

They said that it "proposes to exempt hydroelectric dams from having to obtain a permit to take water ... under section 34 of the" Ontario Water Resources Act. It talks about all the impacts on this.

When this government is talking about cutting red tape, they talk about cutting unnecessary barriers to business. But when you're talking about environmental protections, those are not unnecessary barriers to business, those are the things that actually keep us and our communities safe. So I would ask all the members here not to vote for schedule 9. It's absolutely important for all of us to stand up for the environment, not just for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren.

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

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I'm going to follow along my colleagues here on how they've voiced strong opposition to schedule 9 within this bill. Making changes to several pieces of this legislation to remove environmental penalties is the most important thing that we should pay attention to as members here on this committee. Environmental penalties that were calculated on a daily basis was brought forward by many people who came. Residents from Peterborough, Toronto, London—some travelled a great distance to speak to us as a committee as a whole. There are two concerns on this large bill, particularly in schedules 3, 9 and 16. It is noted through here. They really voiced their concerns on how they were not consulted and their concerns on how there was no consultation.

A major change in schedule 9 is in the language around prohibiting the discharge of contaminants, from the word "may" cause an adverse effect to "likely." This change in the wording from "may" to "likely" is like saying "should" or changing it to "shall"—it's very, very important that we pay attention to this—and could create a large loophole or create a very big grey area around prohibiting discharge of contaminants into our waterways, our rivers, our lakes. This is serious, that little change in wording that the government might not be paying attention to.

Making changes from day-to-day fines to violators to a one-time deal—this isn't like rolling back the prices in Walmart. A day-to-day penalty will make sure that the violators contaminating our waterways and our environment—the penalties will stand up and make sure that they clean up and that they won't be violating it, because a day-to-day fine, I feel, is making sure that they have to look at their pocketbooks more than they do for a one-time fine.

But most of all, I really feel that I have to stick with my colleagues and say that I hope that this government will pull schedule 9, and really look into it and change the things that the residents came to speak to us on.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Before we continue, I'd just like to take a moment to remind all honourable members on both sides to please address your questions and comments through the Chair. I respectfully ask for the co-operation of all honourable members in this matter. Thank you.

Further debate? Seeing none—

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote, ma'am.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested. Shall schedule 9, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Glover, Schreiner, Stevens.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I declare the motion carried. Schedule 9 is carried.

Turning now to schedule 10, there are no amendments to sections 1 through 18 of schedule 10 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Shall sections 1 through 18 of schedule 10, inclusive, carry? Carried.

There is a notice. The government recommends voting against section 19 of schedule 10 to the bill. Any debate? Seeing no debate, we'll move on.

Shall section 19 of schedule 10 carry?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Was it section 19? I'm sorry.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes, schedule 19 of schedule 10. Shall it carry?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Don't you have a recorded vote on it?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): No one has asked for a recorded vote.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Okay.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Shall section 19 of schedule 10 carry? The motion is lost.

Shall section 20 of schedule 10 carry? Carried.

There is a government amendment: paragraph 3 of section 21 of schedule 10 to the bill. MPP Skelly?

Ms. Donna Skelly: I move that paragraph 3 of section 21 of schedule 10 to the bill be amended by striking out "subparagraphs 16 i and 16 ii" and substituting "subparagraph 16 i".

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Any debate? MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Just a question to the government: When I review this amendment or this motion, I believe this change would undo a repeal of regulation-making powers related to life insurance lending limits that is being recommended to be put back into the previous amendment. Is that accurate?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate or comments?

Ms. Catherine Fife: I just wondered if the government could speak to their amendment, because I'm just trying to get some clarity around this.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): You can also request ministry counsel for clarification.

Ms. Catherine Fife: If ministry counsel is available, I am interested in getting clarity.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Is ministry counsel—thank you. Thank you for joining us today. Please state your name for Hansard, and you may begin.

Ms. Josephine Atri: My pleasure. Josephine Atri, senior counsel, Ministry of Finance, legal services branch.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Thank you. I'm just trying to get some clarity around what this motion, this amendment, does by striking out subparagraphs 16 i and 16 ii. Am I correct that it would undo the repeal of the regulation-making powers related to life insurance lending limits?

Ms. Josephine Atri: That's correct, because currently in section 4 of 35.9(2), there is reference to prescribed requirements. By taking out 16 ii, you would be removing

that. That's why we need this small correction to just refer to subparagraph 16 i.

Ms. Catherine Fife: But the lending limits haven't been changed?

Ms. Josephine Atri: No.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Okay, thank you.

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

Shall section 21 of schedule 10, as amended, carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 22 through 46 of schedule 10 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 22 to 46 of schedule 10, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 10, as amended, carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 21 of schedule 11 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 21 of schedule 11, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 11 carry? Carried.

Moving now to schedule 12: Shall section 1 of schedule 11 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 of schedule 11 carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 12 carry? Carried.

Turning now to schedule 13: Shall section—

Interjection.

1430

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Oh, my apologies. There is a typo. We'll return to schedule 12.

Shall section 1 of schedule 12 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 of schedule 12 carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 12 carry? Carried.

Turning to schedule 13, shall section 1 of schedule 13 carry? Carried.

Section 2: There is a government amendment, number 3, to section 2 of schedule 13 to the bill. MPP Skelly?

Ms. Donna Skelly: I move that section 2 of schedule 13 to the bill be amended by striking out "at least four regular meetings" in subsection 16(1) of the Public Libraries Act and substituting "at least seven regular meetings".

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you. Any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Shall section 2 of schedule 13, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall section 3—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): You have to vote on the actual amendment first.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): We did. We just did.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): And you did the section as amended?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Yes.

Shall section 3 of schedule 13 carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 12, as amended, carry?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Jocelyn McCauley): Schedule 13.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Okay. My apologies here—these notes.

Shall schedule 13, as amended, carry? Carried.

Turning now to schedule 14: There are no amendments to sections 1 through 3 of schedule 14 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Shall sections 1 through 3 of schedule 14, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 14 carry? Is there any debate?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: I'd like to—

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Yes, I'd like to raise my objection to section 2 of this schedule. We had people come to committee and, I think, raise really important concerns around changes to the Occupational Health and Safety Act. In particular, whenever somebody manufactures, distributes or supplies new biological chemical agents, the requirement that they notify their director should be retained, because if we're going to protect the health and safety of workers, the director needs to know that information. Then the director can not only inform workers and companies of that, but also, if we retain what is there, the director can also require that a manufacturer provide a report or assessment.

To me, this just seems so critically important to maintaining health and safety. How do you maintain health and safety if you don't have the information and the director doesn't have the power to actually direct companies to rectify the situation? So I strongly object to section 2 of schedule 14.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: I just want to get on the record, because we've received a written submission, actually, from the Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council of Ontario with regard to the new biological and chemical agents—schedule 14, section 2, on the Ontario Health and Safety Act, section 34. This is in your research package, so I don't know if you've had a chance to see it, but the building and construction trades council of Ontario have said: "Do not repeal section 34 of the OHSA, which requires manufacturers of chemical and biological agents to report new agents to the ministry."

CUPE also came and did a verbal delegation to us in Peterborough. In fact, they think the building and construction trades council of Ontario thinks we should strengthen section 34 of the OHSA and direct that all information that has been submitted be included in the chemical database.

This didn't come up as much as I thought it would. I think it's one of those sort of sleeper issues that will catch us by surprise at some point. But even in discussions with the firefighters last week when they came to Queen's Park for their lobby day, I asked; firefighters usually cover health and safety issues very carefully because they're running into these buildings where products are being stored or kept, and having an accurate database that is not reliant on the federal government—because this was the duplication argument: that there's too much duplication

and too much red tape. I have to say, in the conversation with firefighters—because they were talking about the changing nature of their jobs, in that everything was burning so quickly. The nature of their jobs has changed because the products that are kept and stored are very dangerous.

I think this ultimately does come down to a health and safety issue. We will not be supporting these changes because we just don't think that it's a duplication issue; we think it's a due diligence and a health and safety issue.

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

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Can I ask for a recorded vote, please, Chair?

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): A recorded vote has been requested. Shall schedule 14 carry?

Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Glover, Schreiner, Stevens.

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

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 15 of schedule 15 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 15 of schedule 15, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Is there any further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 15 carry? Carried.

Turning now to schedule 16: Shall section 1 of schedule 16 carry? Carried.

There is a government amendment to section 2 of schedule 16 to the bill. MPP Skelly?

Ms. Donna Skelly: I move that section 2 of schedule 16 to the bill be amended by striking out "road degradation" in subsection 12(1.1) of the Aggregate Resources Act and substituting "ongoing maintenance and repairs to address road degradation".

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Shall section 2 of schedule 16, as amended—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Oh, sorry. All those in favour of the amendment? All those opposed? Seeing none, the amendment is carried.

Shall section 2 of schedule 16, as amended, carry? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 3 through 65 of schedule 16 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 3 through 65 of schedule 16, inclusive, carry? Carried.

There is a notice: The Green Party of Ontario recommends voting against schedule 16 to the bill.

There is a notice: The Ontario NDP recommends voting against schedule 16 to the bill.

Is there any debate? MPP Schreiner?

Mr. Mike Schreiner: Thank you, Chair. I guess we'll give the government an opportunity to backtrack on this one because I don't think you want to open the can of worms you're going to open with schedule 16, because I guarantee you that concerns around aggregate extraction are in communities across the province. I think that's why we heard so many concerns, whether we were in London or Peterborough or Toronto. We heard concerns from people all over the province about the weakening of aggregate resource extraction regulations. I want to specifically address some, and make sure they're on the record.

We've had a number of organizations say, "Do not add an exemption that requires the minister or the LPAT not to have regard for road degradation when considering whether a licence should be issued or refused to an aggregate company."

A significant expense for rural municipalities in particular is the road degradation you see due to gravel trucks. Think of how many small communities in particular have hundreds of trucks every day hauling gravel on their roads. That's going to fall on the backs of municipal property taxpayers, and it really should be something that the people who are causing the degradation on the roads should pay for.

1440

You're essentially asking for rural property taxpayers to have their property taxes go up. I think that's exactly why the Association of Municipalities of Ontario was opposed to it. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture raised concerns. In the north, the Dufferin agricultural committee raised concerns as well. So I would recommend that the government, just from a fiscal standpoint, withdraw schedule 16, because I don't think they want to be the ones responsible for seeing road costs and municipal property taxes go up, particularly in rural communities.

The next one that I find especially concerning is the proposal to essentially make municipal bylaws that place restrictions on below-water-table aggregate extraction inoperable. That's the last line of defence for many municipalities in protecting their water. Municipal governments have a duty to protect their water. As a matter of fact, I would argue that everyone in this Legislature has a sacred responsibility to protect our water. I think it's probably why that particular section has the most people speaking out against it. The list is so long here, it's hard to keep track of everyone.

In particular, I want to talk about NDACT's opposition to this, because that's the farm organization that fought the mega-quarry in Melancthon township. That's the farm organization that has started the Food and Water First campaign. One of the reasons that a Boston hedge fund selected Ontario for the largest open-pit mine—or what would have been proposed as the largest open-pit mine—in North America was because Ontario, from their perspective, had the weakest regulations for aggregate resource extraction of any jurisdiction in North America, and so they chose Ontario. Luckily, people fought back against that. As a matter of fact, 30,000 people went to a

farm north of Shelburne for Foodstock, and 40,000 people went to Soupstock in downtown Toronto to stand up for protecting water.

Oftentimes, it's the municipality that is the last line of defence, whether it's the hidden quarry in Rockwood or the Hallman quarry in Wilmot township or other quarries around the province. I think that is why so many groups, including local anglers, are opposed to this change. As a matter of fact, it's interesting, because I believe it was AMO that suggested that this change might even create more red tape. What they're anticipating, and I think they're right, is that a number of municipalities will appeal decisions to LPAT and actually hold things up through the appeals process, which is going to cost municipalities lots of money, it's going to cost aggregate companies lots of money and it's likely going to cost citizens' groups lots of money. Now that we've taken the LPAT resource centre away from them, it's even going to be a bigger challenge for citizens to speak out.

I think if you're going to stand up for local democracy, if you're going to stand up for citizens having the right to protect their water, if you're going to stand up for farmers having the right to protect prime farmland, this section needs to be removed from the bill.

Next, I want to talk about the concerns that numerous organizations—in particular, AMO—raised about allowing a licensee to amend their site plan or propose a new site plan without first obtaining written approval or allowing them to file their own site plan changes. That's just like putting the fox in charge of the henhouse, that level of self-regulation. Again, oftentimes, when a quarry operator in particular wants to expand the footprint of their site or they want to significantly change what's happening within their site application, that could have real effects on air quality because of dust, which is exactly why the nurses' association and others have raised concerns about air quality issues. It can affect the amount of truck traffic on roads, which is why so many municipalities have expressed concerns about this. It can affect water quality, which again, is why numerous municipalities, including AMO, have expressed concerns around this. To allow this to proceed—I really want to suggest to the government that they've opened a can of worms that they do not want to open. As a matter of fact, I think the delegates who came to this committee and people I hear from all across the province actually want to see the regulations around aggregate extractions strengthened, not weakened.

As a matter of fact, most people have said to me, "We want a full environmental assessment for every aggregate proposal that goes below the water table." They would like to see more restrictions placed on below-the-water-table aggregate extraction, not less.

My warning to the government is, you're going to have anti-quarry community groups popping up all over the province. It could actually slow the ability of companies to extract aggregates, because we need responsible aggregate extraction. We need aggregates to build roads, infrastructure etc. We even had environmentalists here talking about the fact that they want to work, and have been working, with the aggregate industry to develop green gravel or sustainable gravel proposals. I think this is a can of worms that the government doesn't want to open.

I know I've spoken for a while, but I just can't let the changes to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act under schedule 16 go without voicing my concerns here as well. The Wildlands League, in particular, raised a really important concern that proposed amendments to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act would mean that new permits that are not required to promote forest sustainability will not be subject to forest renewal requirements and will be approved by the minister under a legal standard that does not—does not—prioritize forest protection.

One of the things that makes forestry so highly respected in Ontario is the sustainable forestry practices we have in Ontario—and a shout-out to the forestry sector and the people who work in that sector for the sustainable practices that we're known for around the world. As a matter of fact, a significant amount of our crown forest land is Forest Stewardship Council certified. I would argue that one of the competitive advantages Ontario has is that we're able to differentiate ourselves from competitors in other jurisdictions because of our sustainable forestry practices. To weaken those practices I actually think harms the industry itself, as well as our environment and public health when it's related to forests.

I strongly ask the government to withdraw schedule 16. Schedules 9 and 16—we can talk about problems with a lot of those schedules, but schedules 9 and 16 are highly problematic, and the government is going to own these. Here's your chance to at least remove schedule 16 from the bill.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: I guess I'm going to go, on schedule 16, to the place where Gravel Watch Ontario went. They really started off with how problematic this legislation is in how it was designed and how it was crafted, because it goes back to consultation and who the government is listening to.

Gravel Watch came here and said, "After the current government was elected in June of 2018, we did what we traditionally do and reached out to the newly appointed MNRF minister"—did the congratulations and reached out to engage with them. They never heard back. I know that the parliamentary assistant endeavoured through the delegation to try to reach out to them, but you have to admit that it's after the fact. These are stakeholders who have a lot of knowledge about how aggregate affects water tables in the province of Ontario, and they were caught by surprise by this move.

In particular—they make a lot of good points, but I think what caught them most by surprise is, "While Bill 132 explicitly removes the ability of municipalities to zone for above or below groundwater table extraction, it does not provide any information on the proposed 'more robust applications process.' It creates the risk and threat immediately, but only references the possibility of some future element that may mitigate it. They see a number of these

changes under the ARA "which weaken existing controls on aggregate extraction activities."

I think this was, for the most part, the very consistent message that we received from people who found out about the act. People were basically chasing the information on schedule 9 particularly. Once again, our researchers captured those concerns very well in their report to us. Everybody from GWO said to clarify the conditions for expansion of operations into road allowances. They said also to clarify the range of amendments that are exempted from the minister's approval.

1450

You see, you've left so much open for interpretation and for regulation after the fact that, Madam Chair, there is no clarity. If you don't have clarity around environmental laws, then you have an opening for those laws to be compromised. We've seen this in our history, especially with Elmira, out in Waterloo region.

Some of the other recommendations that came forward—and I liked this. This was the wonderful lady who has been fighting an aggregate application process for 13 years. Do you remember her, in Peterborough? She came and she said that we recommend a one-cent-per-tonne payment for aggregate companies to pay into a contingency fund to help fund the LPAT process for citizens. So you had a citizen come to our committee and ask for a levy to be placed on the aggregate companies so citizens could fight the aggregate companies. That's where we are right now in the province of Ontario, especially since this government has removed the appeal centre, the resource that citizens had at their disposal.

Other delegates said to not weaken the safeguards in place to protect local groundwater and communities; to not allow operators to carry on low-risk activities without an aggregate licence; restrict aggregate extraction sites to areas outside protected areas such as designated groundwater recharge areas; conserve our natural resources and to not give the aggregate industry free rein.

I have to say, even with these delegates who came, they want the government to find the balance. They want them to say, "Okay, you know what? We know that we'll need aggregate for our infrastructure, but we want to make sure that's sustainable." They're not anti-aggregate; they're anti-water-contamination. That was the message that we got from so many of them.

The Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario said to consider the impacts of aggregate extraction on air quality, including from transportation of aggregates.

One of these other letters that we received was from Tim and Doreen Lett, from Washago, from Simcoe North. They document for us what their lives are like when an aggregate pit is formed in their community. They talked about the property values reducing. They talked about the blasting and the noise. They talked about the silica dust: "Large plumes of dust are regularly seen emanating from the"—this is the Fleming quarry. They talked about the traffic and the gravel trucks that have totally changed the entire nature of their community with traffic, from a health and safety perspective and also from a congestion perspective. They go on to say, "It is incomprehensible to my wife and me that the province of Ontario is considering easing the standards which govern the approval and operation of aggregate quarries. We're not anti-quarry or anti-aggregate. We understand that the province of Ontario needs to ensure there's a steady supply of aggregate across the province in order to support road and residential/commercial construction.

"But in our current age where we are, and should be, hypersensitive to the protection of the environment and the impact that environmental destruction has on human health, the province of Ontario should not be seeking to ease the regulatory hurdles which govern the approval of aggregate operations."

Aggregate extraction is an incredibly destructive industrial activity and should not be allowed to operate near residential or environmentally sensitive areas. This is a couple who has the lived experience. They've shared their lived experience with us as legislators, and they have appealed to common sense.

When you look at the legal perspective that was given to us by the Canadian Environmental Law Association, they said very clearly: "Schedule 9 of Bill 132 now proposes to amend and expand the AMP"—sorry. It goes on to say, "Unfortunately, schedule 16 of Bill 132 contains amendments to the Aggregate Resources Act that weaken or remove some important safeguards that currently exist in law .... schedule 16 proposes to make municipal bylaws 'inoperative' if they restrict the depth of aggregate extraction in order to protect groundwater." Why would you ever enable this to happen?

"Schedule 16 also proposes to expand the ability of aggregate companies to self-file their own changes to site plans without ministerial approval." Removing municipal oversight, and then also doubling down on removing ministerial approval: This is completely contradictory to progressive planning directives, and obviously carries some risk with it. In their view, these and other aggregate reforms are undesirable and unnecessary and should not be undertaken by the Ontario government. They recommend that all of schedule 9 be removed.

Finally, the issue of AMO coming—I've been here for seven years, and I've never seen the Association of Municipalities of Ontario come to any committee of any stripe and ask for indemnification. Your back has to be up against the wall if you are a duly elected council person and you have a responsibility to protect source water protection, and then the provincial government comes in and allows for potential pollution to happen, to go below the water table. They're very clear—and I know that this government is struggling to work with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. In their deputation, they say, "First, and of most importance, is the opportunity to rectify"—so they've asked, one of their clear recommendations of this committee—"a shortcoming relating to both the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Aggregate Resources Act. While the proposed amendments to the Aggregate Resources Act" change the application process where below-water-table "extraction is proposed (rather than just amending an

existing licence), this still leaves municipal council members vulnerable. The Safe Drinking Water Act identifies a duty of care for owners of drinking water sources. If drinking water is contaminated, the Safe Drinking Water Act reads such that individual council members can be jailed."

So this is where we are in the province of Ontario: Council members have come to a provincial government committee and asked the government to not hold them to a level of accountability, whereby if an aggregate company goes below the water table and contaminates that water source, they don't want to go to jail. That can't be easy for government members to hear. That was an uncomfortable presentation, in some respects.

I understand that the region of Waterloo was going to be coming here tomorrow, and I understand that this was on their radar, for sure, because, as I've mentioned, the Hallman pit in Wilmot township is proposing to be developed, at the expense of 200 acres of prime farmland.

So what does AMO do? They come and they say, "They owe a duty of care to the public and they must undertake due diligence to ensure they have done all they can to ensure drinking water is safe to drink. Without a concurrent amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act, council members will be responsible for decisions on applications that the province makes."

So you're passing the buck, you're passing the responsibility, and you're overriding locally elected, democratically elected councils.

They go on to say, "This is unfair and we believe unintended."

And yet, you didn't bring an amendment forward and try to fix it. So that's saying to us on this side of the table that you're okay with city council members taking the blame for a provincial policy which could put source water protection at risk.

AMO says flat out, "Council members need to be indemnified where contamination results from a provincial approval process.

"If this bill is not amended to assure municipal governments that there will be no below-water-table extraction without municipal agreement, or provide indemnification, municipal governments will have no alternative but to appeal applications to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) to demonstrate due diligence at a minimum."

So you are actually creating more red tape. You're going to force municipalities to appeal a decision made by the provincial government. You have to see that this doesn't make any sense. It's not ironic—it's a regressive move. I look forward to this issue coming up at the bear pit at the next AMO meeting back in Ottawa in the summer.

1500

They go on to say—they're not even my words. They say, "This will greatly increase red tape and administrative burden for the LPAT and municipal governments—not to mention delay decisions for aggregate businesses which would risk new investment in the industry." You are creating an administrative process which will be burdensome for municipalities and for the LPAT—even the watered-down LPAT—and now you will also slow down new investment in the aggregate industry, because you will be signalling to those sectors that you're willing to let the chaos continue. You're okay with it.

When the concrete association comes to lobby us and we go to their fundraiser, they say, "Please don't let it get so bad that municipalities will be fighting at the appeal process, at the LPAT. We need to tell our sector investors that the government is on our side." But you're serving up municipal councils and you're saying, "Here you go."

I know that this will be an issue in Peterborough for sure. Yes, it will be an issue in Peterborough. It's definitely going to be an issue in Wilmot. It will definitely be an issue in Chatham-Kent—for sure—because now, you've basically said, "You know what? It's a free-for-all."

AMO goes on to say to the government—because this was to you—"There seems to be a lack of recognition about hydrogeology and the connections between surface water and aquifers, and the links between aquifers. By creating a pathway for contaminants into one aquifer, there is a danger that neighbouring aquifers will be contaminated."

You know what's bad for business? A contaminated aquifer. It really is. Waterloo region has been carrying the costs for Elmira for the Imperial Oil spill. Imagine getting a good price for your house when you don't have access to clean drinking water in a municipality. Why would it ever be worth the risk? Where's the return on investment on this risk assessment? The government could provide no facts on that.

This goes on to say, "The time frame for contamination to move through other aquifers may be very long, or only a few years. A provincial approval for below-water-table extraction conflicts with drinking water source protection. Modelling for vulnerable water sources has been limited to wellhead areas and intake areas, not all vulnerable aquifers, so the science is incomplete." This is a huge gamble that the government has decided to take on below-water-table extraction.

AMO goes on to say, "Another shortcoming of the proposed amendments is the removal of the power of the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal"—this is quite telling, that municipalities are now looking to citizens to help them fight the provincial government—"to 'have regard to road degradation that may result from proposed truck traffic to and from the site.' AMO's advice is that this would create significant hardship for municipal governments who are attempting to create and maintain safe roads. Should this bill not be amended," they go on to say that this is essentially going to be a downloaded cost to municipalities.

As you know, on the public health front, they are already bracing for your next set of cuts that are going to be coming forward. Their recommendation is to "amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to indemnify municipal council members where drinking water sources are contaminated due to a provincial decision, such as an aggregate extraction permit." So they've actually asked to be alleviated of their legal responsibility and liability as city councillors or municipal councillors, because they project that schedule

16 undermines their ability to do their job. When you partner this with Gravel Watch and their delegation, where they said, "How come you're not listening to people who have this knowledge and who have this advice," and then you look at AMO, which is going to have to pick up the mess that this schedule creates—I think it's quite telling that this government didn't try to amend it. You didn't try to amend your own bill when AMO presented, definitely, a strong argument.

All I have to say at this point in time is that it seems that the government is just willing to be complicit, because you didn't bring forward the amendments that were very clearly articulated by your own stakeholders. Certainly Waterloo region and the Wellington Water Watchers showed up in force. They made compelling cases, and I have to say we're on their side. It is a smarter business move. It is a way to build a strong economy, when you have clarity of rules around roles and responsibilities around environmental laws. That creates a level playing field so that businesses know where they stand.

Interjections.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I clearly have the full attention of the government, so with that, Madam Chair, I will conclude my comments.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Thank you, MPP Fife. Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Bailey, Harris, Khanjin, Pettapiece, Skelly, Dave Smith.

Nays

Fife, Schreiner, Stevens.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): Schedule 16, as amended, is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 through 18 of schedule 17 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Shall sections 1 through 18 of schedule 17, inclusive, carry? Carried.

Interjections.

The Chair (Ms. Goldie Ghamari): I'd just remind all members to kindly keep conversations to a minimum.

Turning now to schedule 17: Shall schedule 17 carry? Carried.

We'll now return to the first three sections of the bill.

Shall section 1 carry? Carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Carried.

Shall section 3 carry? Carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Carried.

Shall Bill 132, as amended, carry? Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Carried.

Thank you, everyone. With that, today's session is done. Have a great day.

The committee adjourned at 1508.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Présidente
Ms. Goldie Ghamari (Carleton PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président
Mr. Daryl Kramp (Hastings–Lennox and Addington PC)

Mr. Robert Bailey (Sarnia–Lambton PC)
Ms. Jessica Bell (University–Rosedale ND)
Ms. Goldie Ghamari (Carleton PC)
Mr. Chris Glover (Spadina–Fort York ND)
Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)
Mr. Daryl Kramp (Hastings–Lennox and Addington PC)
Mr. Sheref Sabawy (Mississauga–Erin Mills PC)
Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)
Mr. Mike Schreiner (Guelph G)
Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens (St. Catharines ND)
Mrs. Daisy Wai (Richmond Hill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants
Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)
Ms. Andrea Khanjin (Barrie–Innisfil PC)
Mr. Randy Pettapiece (Perth–Wellington PC)
Ms. Donna Skelly (Flamborough–Glanbrook PC)
Mr. Dave Smith (Peterborough–Kawartha PC)

Also taking part / Autres participants et participantes
Ms. Sandy Shaw (Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest–Ancaster–Dundas ND)
Ms. Josephine Atri, senior counsel, Ministry of Finance
Mr. David Gaskell, counsel, Ministry of the Environment

Clerk / Greffière
Ms. Jocelyn McCauley

Staff / Personnel
Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel