

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

SP-33

Journal des débats (Hansard)

SP-33

Standing Committee on Social Policy

Improving Real Estate
Management Act, 2024

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Wednesday 21 February 2024

Comité permanent de la politique sociale

Loi de 2024 sur l'amélioration
de la gestion des biens
immeubles

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Mercredi 21 février 2024

Chair: Brian Riddell
Clerk: Lesley Flores

Président : Brian Riddell
Greffière : Lesley Flores

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7400.

House Publications and Language Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service linguistique et des publications parlementaires
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

ISSN 1710-9477

CONTENTS

Wednesday 21 February 2024

Improving Real Estate Management Act, 2024, Bill 151, Miss Surma / Loi de 2024 sur
l'amélioration de la gestion des biens immeubles, projet de loi 151, Mlle Surma..... SP-965

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
SOCIAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DE
LA POLITIQUE SOCIALE**

Wednesday 21 February 2024

Mercredi 21 février 2024

The committee met at 0901 in committee room 1.

**IMPROVING REAL ESTATE
MANAGEMENT ACT, 2024**

**LOI DE 2024 SUR L'AMÉLIORATION
DE LA GESTION DES BIENS IMMEUBLES**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 151, An Act to amend various statutes regarding infrastructure / *Projet de loi 151, Loi modifiant diverses lois relatives aux infrastructures.*

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Social Policy will now come to order. We are meeting today for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 151, An Act to amend various statutes regarding infrastructure.

Today, we are joined by staff from Hansard and by Tamara Kuzyk from the office of legislative counsel to assist us with our work, should we have any questions.

The proposed amendments, which have been filed with the Clerk, have been distributed to the members electronically and in hard copy.

Before we begin clause-by-clause, I will allow members to make comments to the bill as a whole. Are there any comments? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: This has, of course, been a rushed process, which is disappointing, as we're here discussing Bill 151 and talking about the real estate holdings and the real estate agenda of this government through Infrastructure Ontario. When we're talking about public assets, we think of the Ontario Science Centre. We see the mess that Infrastructure Ontario and their contractors have made with their maintenance, and that they have allowed a backlog to happen, arguably as part of that broader agenda.

As we've seen, the government wants to do away with the science centre as we know it and love it, and has other plans—plans, I will add, that the province doesn't get to see. The contract, the lease, anything to do with real estate holdings, the government pulls behind that cabinet confidentiality, that cabinet curtain.

We don't have accountability in the province of Ontario for anything. I would challenge the government to point to numbers, to point to a budget, to point to a contract that anyone in Ontario is allowed to see. Really, now, the only way we have access is through the Auditor General and what we can glean from their reports. I say that because here we are with this bill, the second part in a series of pieces

of legislation, as the minister told us yesterday, to pull more holdings under the control of Infrastructure Ontario, to make their role permanent with that many more public gems, public treasures, public agencies. I think Ontarians, broadly, have concerns. Specifically, we heard from a deputation who says this is not in the best interests of the average Ontarian, of the taxpayer. We don't have that accountability. This is another example. We're here for clause-by-clause, to wade through this fairly small bill with really big and significant ramifications.

I asked questions of the minister yesterday about why the need for more and more privatization, more and more opportunities to pull public entities behind that government and cabinet curtain where, ultimately—and we talked about it a bit in here—we don't know for whose benefit. We don't know what the actual agenda is. The government can talk about public accountability. That is nonsense, when we have seen a trend to pull more and more away from public scrutiny, public accountability, public transparency.

I don't understand what this bill is actually for. Is the ROM planning to sell off its assets and its property; is Science North planning that? Does the government know something that the rest of the province doesn't and they want to stop it? Or is this just a matter of gathering all of these pieces so that they can ultimately make the decision, so that they can, as a government, find the right buyer—maybe someone they play golf with? I don't know. But any major deals in the province of Ontario, we don't get to know.

The government members can shake their heads. Maybe they're going to say that I'm imputing motive, but I'm asking real questions. How dare I? As a citizen of Ontario, how dare I ask questions about what really is the goal here with this bill? What really is the point of this? It sure as heck is not to remedy any of the challenges brought forward by the Auditor General.

That report, that I have somewhere here flagged issue by issue—those issues are not before us in this bill. Those issues are not being fixed, because those issues had to do with Infrastructure Ontario and them being a lacklustre—“lacklustre” is a nice way of putting it—property manager and landlord. And yet, here the government is, making their role permanent, pulling more in, gathering more potentially self-serving control. We don't get to know, and we'll never get to know, because I'm sure it will be commercially sensitive. It will be pulled behind that curtain.

Chair, of course, we have challenges with this bill. I've raised them in debate. I look forward to the one-hour lead

when I get to discuss it again in the Legislature. I'm sure the government members are excited about that too. But I'll leave it there for today.

This bill is problematic; the government knows it, but Ontario doesn't even understand how problematic. We may never know what the government's actual agenda is, but we get to see it as it unfolds in front of us.

We have many questions. Again, we don't get any answers.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any other comments? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I want to start by saying hello to everyone and thanking all of the hard-working members of the committee for enabling us to bring this forward, to have the public hearings, and to help bring us to this moment of clause-by-clause.

We heard from the minister yesterday about the stated purpose of this legislation. Her responses to my questions about whether it can protect from cronyism, corruption, rewarding friends were entirely unsatisfactory. We heard the same answers repeated over and over again, which were a pivot from what I was trying to get at. Her answer was simply to repeat the purpose of the bill, which, as I was able to demonstrate, simply isn't satisfactory, and that this bill, in fact, is—

Interjection.

Mr. Adil Shamji: You should say it louder so I can hear you.

This bill is, in fact, permissive of allowing some potentially past practices that we've seen, for example, in the greenbelt.

That being said, I am committed to working with everybody and trying to make this legislation as great as we can make it. I look forward to discussing some very constructive amendments that will help us move this forward in a way that can be in the best interests of all Ontarians.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any other comments? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I am also puzzled as to why this bill is coming forward now. Science North has no intention of selling anything. The ROM has—why are we bringing this forward? Those agencies all have boards of directors that are there as volunteers; they give of their time, their effort, their energy to make their community better. At the base of it, if a real estate decision was to be made, they would use the same time, effort, energy to make their community better. Now the government will have power to take away the decision-making of volunteer, duly elected boards of directors.

0910

I know that we are in a housing crisis. I have put on the table the crisis in Gogama, with a brand new gold mine across the street—1,800 workers living in bunkers when the government owns homes that, three and a half years later, they still haven't put on the market.

To say that Infrastructure Ontario has a good record—I've been on public accounts for a long time. The Auditor General tabled the report in 2017 and showed that changes needed to be made at Infrastructure Ontario so that we get value for taxpayers' money. She did a follow-up of her

recommendations, and yet nothing has changed—to the opposite: Infrastructure Ontario is costing the taxpayers more and more because of the privatization of its management and maintenance of all of the real estate assets that they own, to the same for-profit companies that have already been assessed and proven not to be up to snuff.

And now you're telling us that the government is going to be basically in charge of real estate like the McMichael Canadian Art Collection, like the Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion—public health. This makes a lot of people nervous. We do have a housing crisis. If it was because you see opportunity to build housing with the real estate that exists within Infrastructure Ontario—or that will exist after Bill 151 passes—then why don't you put in the bill things such as, "If we're able to use real estate that belongs to Infrastructure Ontario for housing, then 20% will be below market rate, 20% will be affordable housing," whenever this happens. Show that you are committed to making things better for Ontarians—not for rich, well-connected insiders who donate to your party. Right now, you have a bit of a track record that doesn't look too bright. We're at the point where the RCMP will be investigating some of the decisions that you've made; this has an impact. We live in a democracy. People need to trust their government. When you have to change and backtrack on what happened in the greenbelt, then show the people of Ontario that you are there for the right reasons, that you understand that the housing crisis needs to be addressed. Show goodwill. Show that you understood what people are trying to reach out to us about.

The housing crisis is real—one in 10 going to food banks; the number of people homeless that increases all the time; the encampments that you find everywhere.

So when you use as an argument, like the minister did yesterday morning, that this bill will help with the housing crisis, then put something behind it that shows that it's true, that it will help the people—not well-connected insiders who don't want public assets to be going toward mental health and addictions. They don't want public assets to be used to help people on the street. They want public assets to be sold to them so they can make millions of dollars. This is what people read and this is what people hear when you put a bill like this forward. Show goodwill. Show that you want to help people and make changes.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any further comments? I recognize MPP Brady.

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady: I'd like to echo the sentiments of MPP Gélinas. I, too, feel that this bill undermines the decision-making powers of some of the boards of directors of these agencies. Inferring that we don't trust their decision-making decisions does little to establish that trust and accountability that the minister spoke about a few times in her remarks yesterday.

It is a tiny housekeeping bill, and it has me a bit suspicious. The minister, in her remarks, continually talked about how we need this bill because we need to build hospitals, we need to build schools, we need to build long-term care. And yet, when I directly asked her what my constituents could expect from Bill 149 and whether or not we would

see an acceleration of these critical pieces of infrastructure being built, she said there would be no direct impact and we can't build these pieces of infrastructure overnight. I understand that. But then why use your 20 minutes to talk about how we need this piece of legislation because all of these things are going to happen—when she admitted that they won't happen? So I am very suspicious of this very tight housekeeping bill, as well.

I won't belabour my remarks, other than the fact that if we want to establish trust, accountability and transparency, I don't think this is the bill that we're doing it in.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to reiterate: We have no issues about asking questions. What we object to is the impugning of integrity. As government and opposition, we should really focus on the bill at hand and not mudslinging across the aisles.

We have heard in committee about the fact that the government should have oversight of public property. It is not a plan to remove the board; it is a plan for the government to have insight into how organizations are moving property that is publicly owned. While real estate is one of the government's greatest resources, currently there is no centralized process to manage or make decisions about real estate.

That is why the province has taken the next step in its plan to establish a framework to act more holistically and to effectively manage real estate to support priorities that people in Ontario need, like building long-term-care homes, like building housing. Centralizing and realigning the management of real estate will allow Ontario to operate more effectively, make informed decisions that align with our overarching goals, and mitigate risks, while ensuring consistency and transparency in the process.

This builds on initiatives introduced through the Reducing Inefficiencies Act, 2023, which is yet to be enforced, which created a framework to remove or modify the realty authority of prescribed organizations. This initiative is part of the province's plan to improve the overall management of real estate. It would allow the province to act more as one holistic organization, which would lead to better management and maintenance of real estate, resulting in long-term efficiencies, improving economic growth and saving taxpayer money.

Through the proposed greater streamlining of real estate, our government would be strengthening the accountability for how we spend taxpayer dollars, to ensure we protect the services of the people of Ontario now and in the future.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any further comments?

We will now begin our clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 151, and we will start with section 1, subsection (2), page 1, motion number 1. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 10 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Referendum

“(4) If the acquisition or disposition by the authority of a freehold interest in real property would necessitate the

relocation or dissolution of any entity, the minister shall not approve the acquisition or disposition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I'm happy to speak to this. Yesterday, we heard many arguments for and against this legislation and many different justifications. We heard from Minister Surma. We also heard from MPP Martin. When she spoke about how government gets its mandate from the people and that it must govern in accordance with what the people have directed—that they get their mandate from elections, for example—I found those remarks very moving and inspiring. I agree that there should be very clear mandates when major decisions are being made of significant consequence to the people of Ontario, when it comes to potentially moving things, such as the science centre or any of the institutions listed in this legislation.

0920

Therefore, inspired by her remarks, I am proposing here that any sort of major change that would relocate or change the acquisition or disposition of any entity can only happen on the basis of a public referendum. We all know that this is an approach that is also very agreeable and favoured by the government; we currently face in the chamber other legislation advocating for a public referendum. So I look forward to uniting with the government members in supporting this.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Jordan.

Mr. John Jordan: I strongly recommend not supporting this amendment. The government is made up of elected officials. They're elected to make decisions on behalf and in the best interests of the public. Referendums cost money. We cannot be doing a referendum for every decision that this government has already been given the authority to make. That's why we have debates. That's why we have committees. That's why we have debates within the chamber.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Adil Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I just want to point out, I will certainly remember MPP Jordan's remarks when we debate the Get It Done Act in the chamber later this afternoon and in the days to come.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I'm just curious if I could ask legislative counsel if she has any idea as to how much work and cost to hold a referendum—any idea of the work involved?

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: I admit that I do not. I'm not sure if that's something that government counsel could speak to. But I am not familiar with how much it would be, no.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Do you know the process that needs to happen for a referendum to take place?

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: Nothing is specified by this motion. A process could presumably be developed, but the motion itself does not specify a process.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour, please put your hand up. All those opposed, please put your hand up. It is lost.

We will now move to section 1, subsection (3), motion 2. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 10 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Significant property

“(5) The minister shall not make a determination as to whether to approve the acquisition or disposition of a freehold interest in real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition or disposition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition or disposition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: As we’ve seen under the current government, many decisions have been made where either business cases have not been presented or they have been purported to happen and to have been thorough and comprehensive. Yet, under greater scrutiny, it is found that those supposed business cases, in fact, have been deeply flawed, and in many cases have even been called out and contradicted by the Auditor General.

Therefore, I am recommending and proposing that this legislation be amended to ensure that a business case is always present for anything of considerable societal significance or any sort of deal valuing \$2 million or greater, and for there to be significant time for that business case to be reviewed and presented to the public. I think it promotes the government’s own agenda of accountability and transparency, and it should be very easy to support.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Jordan.

Mr. John Jordan: I also recommend voting against this amendment. The amendment aims to introduce the release of commercially sensitive information during a negotiation process, which will jeopardize potential outcomes, which could diminish prospective outcomes for all parties involved. This also adds more steps to the process, which contradicts our aims of reducing red tape and building efficiencies within the system.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I like being in a committee and talking about the need for public consultation and business cases. That seems new, depending on the bill. However,

even if there were a business case that the public actually recognized as a business case—certainly, with this minister we’ve seen business cases with quotes that don’t hold water. But even if we had a substantive business case and public consultation, I wouldn’t want to vote for something that would sell off our public assets of, as it’s worded here, “societal significance.” I just want to be careful that even if those terms were met—I certainly wouldn’t want to see Science North be able to be sold off, or the McMichael or whatnot.

The government member just spoke about “commercially sensitive” and whatnot. I think we all have a sense that that’s a head-nodding term, that we don’t want to share secrets and whatnot, but this government loves that term and puts everything behind that curtain.

I think that it isn’t about being costly or inefficient or whatnot to have full and involved public consultation. In fact, it’s kind of the way that decisions have been made since the beginning—not with this government, but generally speaking, in a democracy.

So I like that we’re talking about business cases—real ones, though—and public consultation. It’s just that I don’t want to talk about the sell-off of assets, because when we think about Hydro One, for example, a business case and public consultation still happened, and we’re still sad and we still have harboured resentment—just a reminder to members of the committee.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I really like the idea of bringing in “societal significance.” In the list of agencies where the government would be responsible for the real estate, we have the Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion. We all know that right now, the government is looking at cutting the number of public health labs that are available for the people of Ontario; more specifically, closing down the public health lab in Timmins and the public health lab in Sault Ste. Marie. I’m bringing those forward because if you look at “societal significance” for the people of the north, all the way up the James Bay coast, those labs and their real estate infrastructure have a lot of societal significance. When the government takes their decision to simply close them because they can and because the for-profit lab industry is just biting at the bit to make more money off of our public health care system, then I would certainly like that considerable societal significance be taken into account.

I think this is a smart way to look at real estate assets. Yes, they are assets that some people want to make money out of, but you could also look at them as assets that benefit our society through supporting our publicly delivered health care system rather than bringing in more and more private entities into the delivery of our health care system.

0930

I just thought that I would mention that I really like the wording that the member brought forward.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour, put your hands up,

please. All those opposed, please put your hands up. The motion is lost.

We will now go to section 1, subsection (4), motion 3. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Section 10 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Housing

“(6) If a disposition by the authority of a freehold interest in real property would be for housing development purposes, the minister shall not approve the disposition unless the minister has ensured that at least 20% of the housing units to be developed on the property are to be either sold at below-market rates or rented on a rent-geared-to-income basis.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: Yesterday, we heard from the Minister of Infrastructure that one of the reasons for centralizing this decision-making process—as my colleague MPP Brady also mentioned in her remarks today and asked yesterday, one of the reasons for this is to centralize and therefore ensure that any decisions regarding the sale of these properties or these lands is used for, and I’m paraphrasing, a higher purpose to the people of Ontario. Those higher purposes were suggested to be any of a number of things: long-term care—I forget all of them, but certainly housing was mentioned, as well. I agree; housing is a major issue. We face a crisis in our midst right now—an apparently ambitious goal of hitting 1.5 million homes by 2031. We have a government that is failing on that, and I understand that they want to do everything possible in order to catch up on that.

That being said, we want to make sure that if any housing is developed, it is the kind of housing that will help the people who need it most. I know we often hear from government members about the need for affordable or, as they like to say, “attainable” housing. This common-sense amendment will ensure that that higher purpose that the Minister of Infrastructure was talking about, that so-called ambitious goal that the Premier has of developing not just more housing but more affordable and attainable housing—this amendment will ensure that that happens. And I look forward to getting their support.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Again, I’m glad to be able to sit in a committee and have conversations about below-market-rate housing or rent-geared-to-income housing, and factoring in that there’s a need. Here in this amendment, it sets out a minimum of housing units that be developed have those—meet those criteria. Even further to that, we would love to see this government talk about supportive housing and what that actually can look like in our communities, and ways to bring that in, ways to build that, ways to develop it.

Any time that we’re talking about not just housing but, specifically, rent-geared-to-income, supportive housing,

affordable housing—we’re missing so much in terms of the actual housing supply in our communities. People are really struggling, so I appreciate the opportunity to have this conversation.

I’m interested in hearing how the government could justify voting against incorporating minimums to ensure that there are sufficient below-market-rate rental units or rent-geared-to-income units.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Quinn.

Mr. Nolan Quinn: The purpose of this bill is focused on centralizing the realty authority of government agencies to ensure that government as a whole is making coordinated decisions. This bill is not directly focused on disposing agency realty for the purpose of housing. Prior to any dispositions of property, we work with the municipalities and other bodies of government to ensure we are capturing the needs of the community while ensuring the government is getting the best value possible. This motion does not offer clarity on what below-market rates or rent based on income would be defined as. This would fall under the domain of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: My first point is that this government is speaking out of both sides of its mouth, because yesterday it said the purpose of this is for a higher purpose to Ontarians. Now I’m hearing from the member across that those higher purposes don’t matter.

The other point I want to raise is, this amendment has been criticized for not defining rent-geared-to-income or below-market rates. What we actually just learned is that, for years now, this government has been talking about attainable housing without having a definition of what that is. Why is it that they can get held to a standard where they don’t define their own words, where they use them repeatedly in legislation, in the chamber, here in committee, and yet, for a simple amendment on terms that are commonly used by people across the housing sector and Ontarians who are suffering at home—why do they have this double standard?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We were all here yesterday, at about the same time when the minister went on and on about the housing crisis in Ontario, about how real estate plays a role into making sure that every Ontarian is housed. She mentioned the billions of dollars invested in a number of units to be built.

I would say, show the people of Ontario that you hear them. Show the people of Ontario that housing is not just McMansions on the greenbelt; that housing will be affordable; that there will be transitional housing for people struggling with mental health and addictions or homelessness; that there will be supportive housing for people who want to age in place; that there will be rent-geared-to-income for everybody who works really hard at minimum wage but can’t afford to feed themselves and their families and pay rent; that we have a government for the people.

This is your opportunity to do this. This is the opportunity to show people that you've heard them, that you have put actions to the words.

The minister was there for an hour yesterday. For the great majority of time that she talked, she talked about housing. She was talking about Bill 151. She is the minister responsible for Bill 151, and she talked about the need for housing.

Let's go from talking about the need for housing to having words in the bills that go forward that talk about supportive housing, that talk about rent-geared-to-income, that talk about below-market, because a million-dollar home is out of reach for most Ontarians.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Thank you to the member opposite for her comments.

I don't think we had the same impression of what the minister said as you have indicated or as MPP Shamji indicated. She mentioned housing, but it was part of a much wider-ranging commentary. She talked about the Centralization of Broader Real Estate Authority initiative, a multi-phase initiative which aims at improving the management of real estate by centralizing and realigning decision-making to ensure real estate decisions align with government-wide objectives like building more housing units—that's an objective—including affordable housing and long-term care. This is part of a multi-phase initiative, of which housing is going to be one of the beneficiaries, but also long-term care and hospitals and other things.

The proposed legislation here, if passed, would help build, in part, on the initial framework created through Bill 69, the Reducing Inefficiencies Act, and that would enable the government to act to direct more as one holistic organization while managing real estate for the province. In phase 2 of the centralizing broader real estate initiative, the Ministry of Infrastructure, is proposing a new bill—this one, Bill 151—which modifies the realty authority for organizations and one proposed organization to hold interests in land subject to limits imposed under section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act and to realign the realty authority of six other organizations through a more tailored approach in order for the government to more holistically and efficiently manage real estate.

0940

So this legislation is part of this broader initiative, of which some of these other objectives will benefit. But the broader initiative is about centralizing real estate management and streamlining authorities, and it's not specifically geared at housing.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I would like to begin by thanking the member across for providing such a clear and transparent answer. It is actually helpful to hear that this is part of a multi-phase process. I also want to thank her for enumerating phase 1 and phase 2.

I was wondering, just so that we can understand what the overall horizon is for this, if she could elaborate on phase 3 and phase 4, so we can understand how this fits into that.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those against? I declare the motion lost.

We will now go to section 1, subsection (5), motion 4. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 1 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(5) Section 10 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“No vesting in crown

“(7) The authority is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: There's a part of the bill that makes certain sections subject to section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, and it basically means that the ministry could take away the entity's right to hold land altogether. The impact of that is that that land would become the property of the crown. It does not feel right for that to be able to unilaterally happen, and so, by saying this—that they would not be considered entities under 11.0.1—it means they would not be subject to the clause and they would retain their autonomy.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Can I ask legislative counsel, is there a difference between “No vesting in crown” and the Ministry of Infrastructure? The amendment says, “The authority is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act,” but given that the title is “No vesting in crown,” would that also apply to other ministries?

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: The motion speaks specifically to the effects of the application of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act. That is a provision that has been enacted but is not currently in force. Once it's in force, the minister can make regulations prescribing entities for the purposes of that section. An entity prescribed for the purposes of that section is not permitted to—and I'm just reading from the provision here—“hold, control, acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise land etc.” Property owned by that entity vests in the crown, so that's with the notion of—this motion basically ends up carving out the possibility of that section applying to the authority. So it does not permit the vesting of that authority's property in the crown under the operation of that section.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Do you know how to say “vesting” in French? I don't know what that word means. But I can look it up.

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: I don't. I can pull up the French version of section 11.0.1, which speaks about vesting in the crown.

M^{me} France Gélinas: No, that's okay. I'll look it up. Sorry.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Nolan Quinn: Every agency noted under this bill has been assessed through collaboration between the entity, the oversight ministry and the Ministry of Infrastructure. It was decided between the parties that the entity fits the

initiative of the bill. Thus, the realty authority of the entity is proposed to be changed as dictated to fit the goals of reducing inefficiencies and saving taxpayer dollars. The proposed amendment is misaligned with the advice of the Auditor General and other third-party reports.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I find it very confusing when this government chooses to follow the recommendations of the Auditor General and when they choose not to. Perhaps someone can explain to me how they're doing this, apart from throwing darts at a dartboard.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote?

All those in favour? All those against? I declare it lost.

Shall section 1 carry? All those in favour? All those against? I declare it carried.

We will now go to section 2, subsection 7(2.1), motion 5. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection 7(2.1) of the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology Act and substituting the following:

“No vesting in crown

“(2.1) The centre is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: Well, I would reiterate the comments that I made in regard to the last amendment that I proposed; specifically, that the autonomy of the science centre be respected and that it not be vested in the representatives of the crown—notably, the executive council, which has dropped the ball multiple times, such as with the greenbelt.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I'm glad to have the opportunity to highlight something that I said yesterday about the Ontario Science Centre and their backlog of repairs that this government and Infrastructure Ontario, as the landlord, allowed to grow.

The Ontario Science Centre said in its business plans that it was able to handle the repairs but not the bigger issues, and that it was sort of at the mercy of the landlord and the private contractor.

If we actually allowed agencies and entities to make their own decisions like grown-ups, perhaps they would be in a better state. I don't have faith in—especially because of what we have seen with the Ontario Science Centre.

So retaining that autonomy—certainly, after this committee process, I do not have a clearer understanding of the goals of the centralization. I don't understand the actual agenda of this government. I certainly have learned by experience not to trust their agenda.

I also think that this is an amendment that should definitely be considered by the government, as should this entire bill.

The government members have not answered why centralization and why taking away the autonomy of these agencies is a good thing; they've just said it is a good thing and can point to various times that the word “centralization” is used in the province. But in terms of retaining au-

tonomy and actually being the agencies that they have long been, which—certainly the ones in front of us have been effective managers of their own affairs. I think that autonomy is the right direction.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mrs. Robin Martin: We've already spoken to a similar motion, so let me just say the purpose of centralization is for better oversight management of the assets. That's why we're moving in this mode to centralization, and because it was recommended by various authorities who wrote on the subject.

Every agency under the bill has been assessed through collaboration between the entity, the oversight ministry and the Ministry of Infrastructure, and it was decided between the parties that the entity fits the initiative of the bill. Thus, the realty authority of the entity is proposed to be changed as dictated to fit the goals of reducing inefficiencies, saving taxpayer dollars etc.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

0950

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I appreciate the reminder about the consultation process. As we heard yesterday, the minister said that many or most—and I don't remember her exact words—of the agencies impacted were onside. Okay, but those that weren't—we asked what their concerns were. The minister said, kind of broadly, that their questions were around centralization and what it would actually mean and what it would actually look like for them. That wasn't shared, but the entities involved, by the minister's own admission, have questions around what centralization is going to mean for them. This centralization for centralization's sake, or “It's going to be better because—just trust us” is so absurd. So I guess we'll wait and see what it actually looks like, and if this really is a privatization scheme—as are most things with this government.

Again, back to the autonomy of the agencies—I think that is the right direction.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I cannot tell you how difficult it is for the people I represent to believe that centralization, under the ministry, will bring better oversight and management of assets.

You have all heard me tell you the story of assets that this ministry has owned for decades in Gogama, that many, many people want to buy. Those are homes that police officers used to live in before you closed the OPP detachment in Gogama, homes that people who worked for MNR used to live in before you closed—actually, they closed the MNR in Gogama. You already have full oversight of those real estate assets. You already manage those assets. You should have sold them three years ago. You could put them up for sale this afternoon, and I guarantee you that by Saturday, they will all be sold to people who want to live and work in Gogama. And yet, three years and two months after I wrote seven letters, from the Premier to all of the ministers involved, nothing has been done.

So to tell us that you want to centralize, put it under the ministry, so that there's better oversight and better management of assets—nobody believes you. You have to show

them that things will get better. You have to show them that you've learned from your mistakes and are ready to move forward in a different way. The centralization of oversight and management of assets in Bill 151 does not give anybody the assurance that things will be better, that you have learned anything.

Infrastructure Ontario—I'm sorry; the Auditor General put it in black and white. They are poor managers, and they are doing a poor job at maintaining the real estate assets that we already own, and yet none of that changes. All that Bill 151 does is centralization of the oversight and the management of assets, which you already do poorly—which the Auditor General told you what to change and which you're refusing to change. I feel like we're going in circles here, but not in a good way.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: The purpose of this bill is the centralization of the real estate authority, streamlining regulatory authorities etc. for the management of realty in the province. The purpose of this bill is not reforming Infrastructure Ontario.

The Auditor General's report which is being referred to was written in 2017 about what happened before that.

The minister did say, when she was here, that steps had been taken to improve Infrastructure Ontario's management.

She even undertook to look into the Gogama situation for the member opposite, but she continues to raise the issue. I'm sure the minister will be able to look into that and find some steps that can be taken.

Nothing in this bill precludes making changes to how Infrastructure Ontario manages assets, going forward. I'm sure the ministry will do a good job of trying to make sure that it is doing the management of assets in the best way possible going forward, as we do in every file, to make sure that we protect the public interest.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We will now go to section 2, new subsection (2), motion 6. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Referendum

“(2.2) If the acquisition or disposition by the board or centre of real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the board or centre shall not proceed with the acquisition or disposition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: This amendment is very important, and this amendment is dedicated to the constituents of Don Valley East and every person across our province and country

who believes in the science centre. For decades, it has been a source of significant cultural, educational and economic significance. And yet, under this government and this Minister of Infrastructure, they have presented a flawed business case about moving the science centre to a location that is half the size, with less programming, on a taxpayer-funded mega-garage costing all of us \$600 million. They have done that without asking the permission of any of us.

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that all decisions relating to the science centre, its real estate and its property are run through the people of Ontario, specifically through a public referendum.

We know, in regard to the opposition to relocating the science centre, that there is universal opposition. Tens of thousands of people have submitted signatures in the form of a petition. There has been province-wide opposition, demonstration, support from all levels of government. And this government persists in trying to relocate the science centre.

If this government is serious about wanting to listen to the people, then they will have no problem supporting the idea of a public referendum, as they are proposing to do with the Get It Done Act.

This is very simple. If you care about the people, support a public referendum so that we can decide what happens to the science centre.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We will now go to section 2, new subsection (3), motion 7. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 2 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Referendum if government ownership

“(2.3) In the event that section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011 begins to apply in respect of the centre, any subsequent disposition or acquisition of real property or assets connected to the centre or its operations to which that section applies may not be effected unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the disposition or acquisition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the disposition or acquisition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I've already previously articulated the merits of having a referendum connected to things of important cultural or societal significance, and I will refer all members back to that and look forward to your support.

Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it carried.

1000

We'll now go to section 3, subsection 7(1), motion 8. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection 7(1) of the Connecting Care Act, 2019, and substituting the following:

“Powers, limitations

“(1) The agency has the capacity, rights and powers of a natural person for carrying out its objects, except as limited by this act, and is deemed not to be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: Again, I refer members of this committee to my earlier comments in regard to ensuring that agencies and entities, after this legislation, retain the ability to hold land altogether and that it not be forced to be vested to the crown.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I’m just seeking clarification from counsel. As it has here, the Connecting Care Act—could you remind me what specifically this is seeking to achieve? Which agency?

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: I’ll just look at that act.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Or I’ll ask the member who moved it.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I’ll wait for legislative counsel to provide the more comprehensive answer.

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: The corporation that’s being referred to here, the agency that’s being referred to, is—Health Program Initiatives is the reference to it in section 3 of the Connecting Care Act.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: So is this the public health stuff?

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk: It pertains to public health.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I wanted to take this opportunity, as we’re talking about Bill 151 and, in this case, the Connecting Care Act and the ability of an agency to retain its autonomy, essentially. The committee received a submission from the Ontario Nurses’ Association. Everything has been very quick, so they didn’t have the opportunity to come and present, but I did want to read from their submission, because I think it’s relevant here—an appeal to the government to rethink their course of action when it comes to public health.

ONA wrote: “If passed, the Improving Real Estate Management Act, 2023, gives the Minister of Infrastructure oversight over properties that belong to Public Health Ontario, Ontario Health and Ontario Health atHome. Public health care infrastructure in Ontario is invaluable. It is critical that buildings, labs, hospitals and other public health care facilities continue to provide social benefit.

“We are concerned that the proposed legislation makes it easier for the government to sell off public health facilities to private, for-profit developers. We urge the Standing Committee on Social Policy to amend the legislation so that public health properties cannot simply be handed over

to well-connected developers. Instead, unused properties should be repurposed for community use. Examples of this include building non-profit community health centres, long-term care homes and co-operative and supportive housing projects.”

That was sent to us by Erin Ariss, the president of the Ontario Nurses’ Association.

We have talked about creeping privatization. We have talked about the lack of trust for this government. This is a submission that came to this committee that raises those issues; that says where we have agencies or where we have real estate that is owned by the public and that is for public good, they want assurance and protections that the government can’t, on a whim, sell it or can’t make decisions that might be the most cost-effective or the most lucrative or the most interesting to a donor or what have you but instead, as they have said, retain the ability for these holdings to be for the public good.

I’m glad to be able to share their voice in this committee. I certainly think that giving the government more centralized decision-making control takes the ability of the public to determine what is the best use of its public assets further and further away from our communities and ultimately away from what’s best for our health care.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We will now go to section 3, new subsection (2), motion 9. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Referendum

“(3.1) If the acquisition or disposition by the agency of real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the acquisition or disposition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer the committee to my earlier comments about the merits of a referendum in decision-making on agencies and entities of considerable cultural and societal significance.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the motion lost.

Section 3, new subsection (3), motion 10: I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Significant property

“(3.2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not make a determination as to whether to approve the acqui-

sition or disposition of real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition or disposition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition or disposition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members of the committee to my earlier comments around the importance of establishing a business case. I anticipate some of the concerns that will be expressed, potentially around concern of red tape. I want to be very clear that we must not interfere with the process of democracy and that the will of the people needs to be expressed, needs to be heard and cannot be steam-rolled for the purpose of convenience.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Seeing the time, we will now be adjourned. This committee will stand in recess until 1 p.m.

The committee recessed from 1008 to 1303.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Good afternoon, everyone. We will now resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 151.

We are on section 3, subsection (4), motion number 11. The motion is not moved.

Shall section 3 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 3 is carried.

We will now move to section 4, subsection (3), motion 12—not moved.

Subsection (4), motion 13—not moved.

Section 4, subsection (5), motion 14—not moved.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I gave you five minutes. Shall section 4 carry?

Interjection: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

French, Gélinas, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried.

Section 5, subsection (2), motion 15: I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: Good afternoon. I apologize that I am late. I was being asked by a bunch of reporters about this government’s health care failures, so, unfortunately, I had to speak with them.

I move that section 5 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 6 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““No vesting in crown

“(4) The corporation is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I think I’ve already spoken to the merits of this amendment before. We want to make sure that the institutions and agencies retain some autonomy and that their property is not vested in the crown.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I just want to say thank you to legislative counsel. She found the French translation, and I now better understand what we’re talking about.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Can you share the word for “vesting” en français?

M^{me} France Gélinas: « Délégation autoritaire ».

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost.

Shall section 5 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Gélinas, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried.

We’ll now go to section 6, subsection 5(14), motion 16. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 6 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection 5(14) of the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act and substituting the following:

“No vesting in crown

“(14) The commission is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I won’t belabour the point. I think I’ve made my arguments for this already.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I’ll just jump in with the fact that this is regarding the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act and that it seeks to keep this entity away from the minister’s reaches so that it won’t fall under the regulation-making authority. That’s how I understand it.

As we've talked about in the past, that would be a good thing to do when it comes to this government.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I think MPP French actually raises a superb point. One of the things that this bill will do is it will prevent a greenbelt 2.0—by allowing this government to concentrate power and land in the hands of their friends and donors.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost.

We'll now go to new subsection (2), motion 17. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 6 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 5 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Referendum

“(15) If the acquisition or disposition by the commission of real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the commission shall not proceed with the acquisition or disposition unless,

1310

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: Again, I've enumerated many of the arguments for why this is a good idea, and I invite the government members, by offering them one more chance, to support the idea of a referendum, which we already know they love.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote?

All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost. Shall section 6 carry? Ready to vote?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Gélinas, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare it carried.

We'll now go to section 7, subsection (1), motion 18. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 7 of the bill be amended by striking out subsection 7(1) of the Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion Act, 2007 and substituting the following:

“Powers, limitations

“(1) The corporation has the capacity, rights and powers of a natural person for carrying out its objects, except as

limited by this act, and is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP Shamji again.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I think I've made my comments and arguments on this one.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I don't understand why public health agencies have been included. They don't own a whole bunch of assets. The only ones interested in getting the assets of public health are private health providers. It makes me very nervous.

I want to share what the Ontario Nurses' Association has shared with all of us. It is in the shared folder, but I also want to share it. It's addressed to you, Chair. They said:

“Dear Mr. Riddell,

“Re: Protecting public health care infrastructure in Ontario”

They went on to say that the Ontario Nurses' Association “is deeply concerned by the government's decision to privatize components of health care. Last year, we strongly opposed Bill 60, Your Health Act, 2023, which allowed more private for-profit clinics to perform surgeries and diagnostic procedures. We also opposed Bill 135, the Convenient Care at Home Act, which established the structure where for-profit provider companies can operate and erode Ontario's public home care system. ONA continues to have deep concerns regarding the use of for-profit nursing agencies and for-profit LTC homes.

“If passed, the Improving Real Estate Management Act, 2023 gives the Minister of Infrastructure oversight over properties that belong to Public Health Ontario, Ontario Health and Ontario Health atHome. Public health care infrastructure in Ontario is invaluable. It is critical that buildings, labs, hospitals and other public health care facilities continue to provide social benefit.

“We are concerned that the proposed legislation makes it easier for the government to sell off public health facilities to private, for-profit developers. We urge the Standing Committee on Social Policy to amend the legislation so that public health properties cannot simply be handed over to well-connected developers. Instead, unused properties should be repurposed for community use. Examples of this include building non-profit community health centres, long-term-care homes and co-operative and supportive housing projects.”

I just thought I would share this letter that was tabled with the committee and addressed to you.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Thank you.

Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Motion 19: I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 7 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Referendum

“(5) If the acquisition or disposition by the corporation of real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the acquisition or disposition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: Let’s put power in the hands of the people. It’s for the people.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the motion lost.

We’ll go to subsection (3), motion 20. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 7 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Significant property

“(6) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not make a determination as to whether to approve the acquisition or disposition of real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister responsible for the administration of this act tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition or disposition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister responsible for the administration of this act conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition or disposition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I want to underscore the importance of making sure that decisions by the executive council are made thoughtfully on the basis of evidence and the best financial recommendations, as opposed to on the basis of who their friends and donors are. This amendment will assure that.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Seeing as how this part of our discussion is around public health infrastructure—in Bill 151, the government is talking about centralizing control of a few assets or entities in their real estate holdings. As we have heard today from the Ontario Nurses’ Association, they have real concerns that this legislation is going to make it easier for the government to sell off public health facilities to private, for-profit developers. We’ve been urged not to go ahead with that.

What we’re here talking about is a question of public consultation or business case. I’ve been the critic for infrastructure, transportation and highways for a while, keeping an eye on this government, and their idea of a business

case is not something that holds water. Public consultation can never just be a tick box; although, we’ve seen that, unfortunately—not just this government, the last one.

Regardless of what the asset is, or the agency—or in this case, public health infrastructure—I wouldn’t trust this government even with a business case or public consultation to make decisions that are indeed in the best interests of Ontarians.

Back to the letter from the Ontario Nurses’ Association: They said, “Public health care infrastructure in Ontario is invaluable. It is critical that buildings, labs, hospitals and other public health care facilities continue to provide social benefit.”

I think that we need to stand by their statement and retain public control of our assets. Certainly, under no circumstance should we allow this government to sell it off, with or without the tick boxes.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We’ll now go to subsection (4), motion 21. I recognize MPP Shamji.

1320

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 7 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

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

“Housing

“(7) If a disposition by the corporation of real property would be for housing development purposes, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the disposition unless the minister responsible for the administration of this act has ensured that at least 20% of the housing units to be developed on the property are to be either sold at below-market rates or rented on a rent-geared-to-income basis.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: We just want to make sure that the “higher purposes” that the Minister of Infrastructure spoke about yesterday in her justification for why the executive council should be making these decisions are respected in ensuring that everyone has access to housing; specifically, those who need affordable and attainable housing.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Before the pandemic, the government made it clear that they wanted to—they did—cut \$100 million from our public health. At the time, we had 36 public health units; we now have 34, and they want to bring it down to 10, which, in theory, means that 24 buildings presently used by public health would become covered by this.

Most public health units are very well located. They have been in Ontario for a very long time. They’re often in good locations within their communities. If the government goes ahead with their plans to go from 34 public health units to 10 and becomes the owner of those 24 buildings, it would be important that they do not become million-dollar condos—but at least, if you’re going to use this real estate for housing, that some of it goes to below-market

rate, some of it goes to rent-geared-to-income, and some of it goes to transitional housing and supportive housing for people who need it the most.

So I like the idea behind this amendment.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Shall section 7 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Gélinas, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare it carried.

We'll go now to section 8, new subsection (2), motion 22. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 8 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 6 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“No vesting in crown

“(4) The centre is deemed to not be an entity for the purpose of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer you to my earlier arguments about the merit of tackling this issue in the way I've proposed.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Shall section 8 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Gélinas, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare it carried.

We'll go now to section 9, subsection (3.1), motion 23. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 8 of the Royal Ontario Museum Act:

“Referendum

“(3.1) If the acquisition or disposition by the museum of a freehold interest in real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the acquisition or disposition under subsection (2) or (3) unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: Can you not imagine how the public has a vested interest in what happens to the Royal Ontario Museum? Let's put the power in the hands of the people, and let's do it together.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I wanted to check: Are we talking about the Ottawa Convention Centre or the Royal Ontario Museum?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: The Royal Ontario Museum.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Sorry.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay. Further debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We'll go to section 9, new subsection (5), motion 24. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 8 of the Royal Ontario Museum Act:

“Significant property

“(5) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not make a determination under subsection (2) or (3) as to whether to approve the acquisition or disposition of a freehold interest in real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister responsible for the administration of this act tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition or disposition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister responsible for the administration of this act conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition or disposition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: What we must prevent with the Royal Ontario Museum is what we are seeing with the Ontario Science Centre. Let's get a business case. Who knows? We don't actually know the explicit purpose of this legislation. I fear—first, they went after the science centre; next, it's going to be the Royal Ontario Museum; next, it's going to be the CN Tower; next, it's going to be Casa Loma. We want the business case in the people's House, and we want to have a chance to hold their feet to account and make sure that it actually works for everyone.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): MPP French, I recognize you.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I appreciate the passionate comments of my Liberal independent colleague, who talks about, first, the science centre and, next, the world.

I will say, first it was the 407, and then it was hydro. In the 10 years that I've been here, I still am very sore and angry about the sell-off of Hydro One. I was here during

that time, and we watched the government of the day—whichever government it is could stand to learn the same lesson. In that case, the whole province rose up and stood in opposition to a government decision, and that decision was still made regardless of the business case or regardless of the argument or regardless of the public involvement. I've never seen such big provincial campaigns to prevent the sell-off of our public assets.

So I will never be okay with conditions being met like this—a tick box business case or public consultation, although I respect both—of selling off our public assets and gems.

In this case, we're talking about the Royal Ontario Museum, and we'd darn well better not see this government try to sell that off for parts. I wouldn't put it past them, but I certainly hope that is not the game that is afoot.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I appreciate the spirit of MPP French's comments. I do want to say, that is actually the reason why the first amendment preceding this one about the Royal Ontario Museum was about a referendum that would be binding. So that one would be perhaps a superior check and balance.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all know that the ROM is a gem in downtown Toronto. It's just up University Avenue from here, on Bloor Street. They are undergoing massive renovations right now to be even more accessible, to be even more able to serve the public and allow us to discover arts in a way that only they are able to put forward. They are fantastic at what they do. They do have a board of directors of people who know visual arts inside and out, who are able to make the best decisions possible for the mandate of this gem, the Royal Ontario Museum.

1330

I'm very worried that they have been included in Bill 151. I'm worried that the government has some plans for this. It is a very desirable piece of real estate up the street from Queen's Park, at the corner of Bloor. I sure hope that I'm wrong.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Section 9, new subsection (6), motion 25: MPP Shamji, I recognize you.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 8 of the Royal Ontario Museum Act:

“Housing

“(6) If a disposition by the museum of a freehold interest in real property would be for housing development purposes, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the disposition unless the minister responsible for the administration of this act has ensured that at least 20 per cent of the housing units to be developed on the property are to be either sold at below-market rates or rented on a rent-g geared-to-income basis.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I've already articulated the arguments for doing this. I can already anticipate the counter arguments. Let's just get them on record.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We'll now go to new subsection (7) of section 9, motion 26. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 8 of the Royal Ontario Museum Act:

“No vesting in crown

“(7) The museum is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members to my previous comments. They will already be able to anticipate that. I already anticipate their counter-arguments. Let's get them on record.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: This part of our conversation is about the Royal Ontario Museum.

This is a government, in this piece of legislation, that is seeking to centralize and increase government control.

In this case, I think this is seeking to protect the autonomy of the Royal Ontario Museum. It's the ROM. I have so much more faith in them than I do in this government.

Yes, I would support this initiative.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Shall section 9 carry?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare it carried.

We'll now move to section 10, new subsection (4.1), motion 27. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 10 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 7 of the Science North Act:

“Referendum

“(4.1) If the acquisition by the board or centre of a freehold interest in real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the acquisition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: First, this government went after the Ontario Science Centre. Next, they are going to go after Science North Act—against—against—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Take your time.

Mr. Adil Shamji: It’s coming—will go against our northern science centres as well. So I want to make sure that the people have their opportunity to have a say in science, education and culture.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We’ll now go to section 10, new subsection (6), motion 28.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 10 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 7 of the Science North Act:

“Significant property

“(6) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not make a determination as to whether to approve the acquisition of a freehold interest in real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I recognize that this proposal may not be suitable to everyone on the basis of historical precedents, and I appreciate that. That being said, it looks as though this legislation may be run through. This is our opportunity to support something that can make it at least a little bit stronger.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: My colleague from Nickel Belt has spoken to this committee about Science North and about the wording that we have before us here, about “considerable societal significance,” when it comes to some of our public assets and community spaces. Science North is awesome, and I think the focus in the north, in that community—would really worry about this government’s agenda, especially because it hasn’t been forthcoming.

People up north have no idea why Science North would be on the government’s—not just on their radar, but on their list of assets to snake and take. We don’t know what the agenda is. Anything to do with the future of Science North should absolutely involve public consultation, public involvement and public priority, because when it comes to the health of the community—the member from Nickel Belt also spoke about the need to address mental

health and addictions issues, and how we utilize public space makes a difference to mental health and well-being.

So here’s another opportunity for the government to do better. We’re quite nervous about why it’s on their hit list in this case.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We’ll now go to section 10, new subsection (7), motion 29.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 10 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 7 of the Science North Act:

“No vesting in crown

“(7) The centre is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members to my earlier comments about similar amendments.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I’m glad I have the opportunity to again say that I think that keeping entities like Science North away from the minister’s reach and regulation-making ability—because regulations happen, of course, behind closed doors and not in statute. I think retaining agency autonomy is much better, always preferable—but especially in this case—to this government’s control.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 10 carry?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare it carried.

1340

We’ll now go to section 11, subsection 27.8(1), motion 30. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that subsection 11(3) of the bill be amended by striking out subsection 27.8(1) of the Connecting Care Act, 2019, and substituting the following:

“Powers, limitations

“(1) The service organization has the capacity, rights and powers of a natural person for carrying out its objects, except as limited by this act, and is deemed to not be an entity for the purposes of section 11.0.1 of the Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members to my earlier comments about amendments along precisely this vein.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We'll now go to section 11, new subsection (4), motion 31. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 11 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) On the later of the day this subsection comes into force and the day section 9 of Bill 135 comes into force, section 27.8 of the Connecting Care Act, 2019, as enacted by the bill, is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Referendum

“(3.1) If the acquisition or disposition by the service organization of real property would necessitate the relocation or dissolution of any entity, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the acquisition or disposition unless,

“(a) a referendum concerning the acquisition or disposition is held; and

“(b) the referendum authorizes the acquisition or disposition.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members of this committee to my earlier comments about amendments along a similar vein.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Section 11, new subsection (5), motion 32. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 11 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(5) On the later of the day this subsection comes into force and the day section 9 of Bill 135 comes into force, section 27.8 of the Connecting Care Act, 2019, as enacted by the bill, is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Significant property

“(6) The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not make a determination as to whether to approve the acquisition or disposition of real property that is valued at more than \$2 million or has considerable societal significance unless the following requirements are met:

“1. At least 60 days before making the determination, the minister tables in the assembly a business case for the acquisition or disposition that was authored by the successful bidder in a procurement process held by the government for the purpose.

“2. After the business case is tabled, the minister conducts a public consultation respecting the acquisition or disposition for a period of not less than 30 days.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members of this committee to my earlier comments about my amendments.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I haven't been saying it every time, but obviously we refer members to our earlier comments.

All of these motions being put forward are among the same categories, either a referendum or a business case or not to be an entity or—what's the fourth category?—having the housing. The comments we made at the original motions that were like that apply to all of these, and that's why we're not just repeating those comments every time.

I just want to get that on the record, because MPP Shamji says every time that he refers us to his other comments.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I thank MPP Martin for her clarification.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

We'll now go to section 11, new subsection (6), motion 33. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 11 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(6) On the later of the day this subsection comes into force and the day section 9 of Bill 135 comes into force, section 27.8 of the Connecting Care Act, 2019, as enacted by the bill, is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Housing

“(7) If a disposition by the service organization of real property would be for housing development purposes, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall not approve the disposition unless the minister has ensured that at least 20 per cent of the housing units to be developed on the property are to be either sold at below-market rates or rented on a rent-g geared-to-income basis.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I refer members of the committee to my earlier comments about amendments along this vein and am referred to their comments back in response.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the motion lost.

Shall section 11 carry?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Anand, Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

Nays

Brady, French, Shamji.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare the section carried.

Section 12: We have motion 34. I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: I move that section 12 of the bill be amended by adding “that is not earlier than June 5, 2026” at the end.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Adil Shamji: I anticipate that on June 5, 2026, there will be a more enlightened government in place, and one that is not scandal-plagued and under RCMP criminal

investigation and that can be better trusted with the magnitude of the responsibility enshrined in this bill.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I recognize MPP French.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I'm wondering if the member who moved this could enlighten us as to why June 5, again?

Mr. Adil Shamji: There's an election, I believe, on June 2 or 3, 2026.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Oh, okay. I would just add that June 5 is my birthday, and so I was wondering about the significance. However—

Mr. Deepak Anand: Happy birthday in advance.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Well, thank you. I'm looking forward to, for my birthday, being part of a New Democratic government which will not move forward with this piece of legislation. So I think the forward thinking is good—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I would just say to you, happy birthday, then.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: That's getting a little ahead of ourselves. We don't need to age that fast. But it's inevitable—death, taxes and, fortunately, a New Democratic government in 2026. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I just want to mention that it's clear from this proposed amendment from the independent member MPP Shamji that it's not the legislation that he objects to; simply the fact that it's a Conservative government. That makes me feel better because now I know that all of these other objections were just show, because it's the government he opposes, not the legislation itself. So I appreciate the fact that he brought forward this amendment and clarified that.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I recognize MPP Shamji.

Mr. Adil Shamji: To further clarify my intention and the spirit of the amendment, this is introduced as a last line of defence simply because the government has taken every opportunity to ignore every potential protection and oversight. So as a measure of last resort, I hope that at least we can hand this legislation over to a more trustworthy government.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate?

Mr. Nolan Quinn: How did those 15 years go?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): MPP Quinn.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay, I'm going to say it for the last time: Further debate? Ready to vote? All in favour? All those opposed? I declare it lost.

Shall section 12 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it carried.

Section 13, the short title: Shall it carry? All those in favour? All those opposed?

Ms. Jennifer K. French: We don't get to debate it?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): No.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It's just the short title. If you want to debate it, you can.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: Thank you. I would be happy to take this last opportunity, a kick at the can.

The short title of this act being Improving Real Estate Management Act—I believe that remains to be seen. I don't understand how centralizing for the sake of centralizing is going to improve management when we have seen the track record of Infrastructure Ontario as a poor landlord.

Anyway, I don't support the title, but I do appreciate that this government really tries to name their behaviours and their acts with roses and sunshine.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Ready to vote?

All those in favour of section 13, the short title, carrying? All those opposed? I declare it carried.

Shall the long title of the bill carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare it carried.

Shall Bill 151 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? All those in favour? All those opposed? It is carried.

Go ahead.

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady: Sorry. Thanks, Chair. There was a letter from the nurses being referred to today. Was that in the shared folder? My folder was empty.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): She'll send it to you both again, just so you have it.

Again, I thank everyone for their civility today. It has been an exciting bill to talk about. I thank you all.

The committee adjourned at 1352.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Brian Riddell (Cambridge PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

M^{me} France Gélinas (Nickel Belt ND)

MPP Jill Andrew (Toronto–St. Paul’s ND)

Ms. Patrice Barnes (Ajax PC)

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady (Haldimand–Norfolk IND)

M^{me} France Gélinas (Nickel Belt ND)

Mr. John Jordan (Lanark–Frontenac–Kingston PC)

Mrs. Robin Martin (Eglinton–Lawrence PC)

Ms. Natalie Pierre (Burlington PC)

Mr. Nolan Quinn (Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry PC)

Mr. Brian Riddell (Cambridge PC)

Mr. Adil Shamji (Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est L)

Mrs. Daisy Wai (Richmond Hill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Mr. Rick Byers (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Ms. Jennifer K. French (Oshawa ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Lesley Flores

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Tamara Kuzyk, legislative counsel