



Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario  
Second Session, 41<sup>st</sup> Parliament

Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario  
Deuxième session, 41<sup>e</sup> législature

## **Official Report of Debates (Hansard)**

Monday 3 April 2017

## **Journal des débats (Hansard)**

Lundi 3 avril 2017

**Standing Committee on  
Social Policy**

Subcommittee report

**Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Rapport du sous-comité

### **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:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **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.

---

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



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

# CONTENTS

Monday 3 April 2017

Subcommittee report ..... SP-285



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

## COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA POLITIQUE SOCIALE

Monday 3 April 2017

Lundi 3 avril 2017

*The committee met at 1401 in room 151.*

### SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Good afternoon, everyone. The social policy committee will now come to order. We'll be considering the report of the subcommittee on hearings and clause-by-clause. I understand, Mr. Fraser, that you're going to be moving it.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Then why don't you proceed, sir?

**Mr. John Fraser:** Your subcommittee on committee business met on Thursday, March 30, 2017, to consider the method of proceeding on Bill 68, An Act to amend various Acts in relation to municipalities, and recommends the following:

(1) That the committee meet in Toronto on Tuesday, April 4, Monday, April 10 and Tuesday, April 11, 2017, for the purpose of holding public hearings.

(2) That the Clerk of the Committee post information regarding public hearings on Bill 68 on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the Legislative Assembly's website, Canada NewsWire, the Globe and L'Express.

(3) That the deadline for requests to appear be Monday, April 3, 2017, at 9 a.m. for the public hearings on Tuesday, April 4, 2017.

(4) That the deadline for requests to appear be Friday, April 7, 2017, at 9 a.m. for the public hearings on Monday, April 10 and Tuesday, April 11, 2017.

(5) That, should the hearings be oversubscribed, the Clerk of the Committee provide a list of all interested presenters to the subcommittee following each of the deadlines for requests.

(6) That each caucus provide a prioritized selection of witnesses based on the list of interested presenters received from the Clerk of the Committee for the hearings on Tuesday, April 4, 2017, by 11 a.m. on Monday, April 3, 2017; and for the hearings on Monday, April 10 and Tuesday, April 11, 2017, by 11 a.m. on Friday, April 7, 2017.

(7) That the witnesses be offered up to 10 minutes for their presentation followed by 10 minutes divided equally among the caucuses for questioning by committee members.

(8) That the deadline for written submissions on Bill 68 be 6 p.m. on Tuesday, April 11, 2017.

(9) That the research officer provide the committee a summary of testimonies by 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 13, 2017.

(10) That amendments to Bill 68 be filed with the Clerk of the Committee by 12 noon on Tuesday, April 18, 2017.

(11) That the committee meet for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 68 on Monday, April 24 and Tuesday, April 25, 2017.

(12) That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to make any preliminary arrangements to facilitate the committee's proceedings prior to the adoption of the report of the subcommittee.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you, Mr. Fraser. Do you move adoption?

**Mr. John Fraser:** I move adoption.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I have questions: Mr. Hatfield had his hand up first, then I'll go to Mr. Hardeman.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Thank you, Chair. I was just wondering—it's a very simple question, just on procedure—must a member of the committee be attendant at the subcommittee meeting to make the motion?

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I'll ask the Clerk for advice.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Katch Koch):** Any member of the committee can move a motion for the adoption of the subcommittee report.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Phew. Thank you. I wouldn't want someone else to have to go through and read it all over again.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you, Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. Hardeman.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Thank you very much to Mr. Fraser for a well-read report. As I was listening to the reading of the report and I got to (3), I don't think, in all my years I've been here, that I've ever seen a bill that was introduced in November or December, and finally, at the end of March to the beginning of April, it gets to committee, and then the government wants to give a one-day notice between the time we told the people that there's going to be a committee and the committee hearing starts—one day. I don't think I've ever seen that before. You would think it was some kind of an emergency situation out there—that we had to have a bill passed today in order to send the fire trucks out because

the building is on fire—with the speed that this is being put through.

Having said that, I want to commend the staff for being able to get—I understand all the delegations are on for the hearing tomorrow. So obviously, they must have been ready. I understand that that was because the government had already notified them that this was going to happen.

It brings up another little bit of a problem I have. The government deciding what's going to happen before the subcommittee even gets to deal with the bill coming from the House seems rather strange. I thought that the process was that the bill is referred to committee, the subcommittee has hearings and decides what to recommend to the committee, and that's the way the process will go through. The majority of the committee carries it, sends it to the committee here and then it gets passed. Obviously, that's not the way this government works. They want to get it out of the way quickly so that nobody has a chance to talk about it. I think that's rather sad, because I think this bill has a great impact on a lot of people who don't know yet that we're having this meeting today or tomorrow or next week, or that, in fact, in just a few weeks, this is going to be in for third reading, when there will no longer be any ability to make any changes to it. In fact, it's only three weeks away that this will be all over.

Having said that, I can't change any of that. That's the government's wishes, so I guess the government has the right to do that. The people get to judge every four years as to whether to believe the government has been open and transparent about how they've dealt with municipalities or all stakeholders. They will get to decide.

One of the things that I did bring up at subcommittee and that didn't get into the report is that we should, at the very least, hear from the people in the north, who are not able to be here. I think we all know that we've heard—if we've heard it once, we've heard it a million times—about one-size-does-not-fit-all consultations. Just because we've had a lot of debate about it in southern Ontario, that doesn't mean that people in Thunder Bay have heard what's going on here. They don't even get the same media that we get. Their media comes from Manitoba. We had some contact from those people who had some real concerns about that.

Before I get into that—it would deal more with the amendment I want to make to the motion. With the Chair's permission, I'll read my proposed amendment into the record.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Yes, please, if you would, Mr. Hardeman.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I move that the subcommittee report be amended by adding:

“That the committee meet in northern Ontario on Tuesday, April 18, Wednesday, April 19, or Thursday, April 20, for the purpose of holding public hearings, and that the Clerk be authorized to advertise this meeting in any northern media that he deems appropriate.”

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you. And you have multiple copies of that?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have copies for everyone. I am just so prepared.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I appreciate that.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I don't want to waste time.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** No, I understand. Thank you. With that—

**Mr. John Fraser:** Do you have something more? If he's—

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** If I might, as everybody is getting the amendment—I have two comments here from northern Ontario. One is from Thunder Bay and one is from Conmee, the township just outside of Thunder Bay.

The one from Thunder Bay is actually written in the paper, but I just want to read one paragraph from it: “Bill 68 would freeze the multi-residential property tax ratio. Thunder Bay's commercial and industrial tax ratios already exceed provincial ‘thresholds’ so only half of any tax increase to those classes will be allowed to flow through to the municipality.”

So there's a real concern there about the impact that it's going to have on their ability to tax and who is going to pay the taxes. Of course, if you've been involved with municipal taxation, you will realize that when they're already beyond the bands of fairness between industrial-commercial and residential, that means when they increase the taxes, they have to tack it onto the homeowners because they can't increase the distance between the tax rate between industrial-commercial and the homeowners. This is very detrimental to a municipality that's suffering from a declining industrial tax base, because we have fewer of them paying it. So then all that, not only the tax increases but all the increases of the lost taxes from industrial-commercial, goes onto property, and they have a real concern with that.

**1410**

That's just from the mayor of Thunder Bay, but that would be true for every municipality in the north. I dare say that there are many municipalities in the north that didn't know that was actually in this bill. That's why, again, this motion is so important: so that we go there and hear from the people what they think about it.

The other one—I mentioned about the township of Conmee. It's actually a letter to the minister, Bill Mauro, Minister of Municipal Affairs.

“The recent Municipal Act review is considering a possible change that will impact municipalities by removing them as an eligible recipient to receive excess funds through the tax sale process.

“The Ministry of Municipal Affairs is considering changes as to who is eligible to apply for the excess funds from a tax sale and this will directly affect every municipality in Ontario. During the first reading of Bill 68 municipalities have been removed from the list of those who can apply for payments out of court and receive the excess funds. If funds remain unclaimed the province would be the only eligible governing body that could receive the excess money from the tax sale. A further complication for municipalities is the timeline for

an application to be finalized. Bill 68 has changed the current timeline from one year to 10 years.

“The township of Conmee is requesting that a review be undertaken immediately before second reading has commenced to ensure that municipalities can in fact be eligible to apply to the courts and receive the excess funds through the tax sale process. Further, it is requested that the current one-year timeline remain in effect for the waiting period to apply for the out-of-court payments.”

That, again, is one of these things that is going to affect every municipality in Ontario, but particularly it’s going to impact those municipalities that are having the greatest difficulties, as we speak, with declining assessment, declining ability to tax, and more and more tax sales. It’s going to delay the way they can handle the tax sales and it’s going to change who gets the money in the end from the people who just walked away from their property and left it behind because they couldn’t afford to pay their bills.

I’m just putting them on the table. I think those two are great examples—and there are many more—of why it’s so important that we give the people in the north an opportunity to speak to this bill, give them sufficient time to review it and then to come and speak to the bill as to how we could make it better so it doesn’t hurt their budget, as both mayors are putting forward here it will. That’s why I think we should go to the north and that’s why I put this amendment forward.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you, Mr. Hardeman. I have Mr. Fraser speaking to the amendment. Mr. Fraser.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Yes. You’ve explained that so clearly, it will be hard for them to top your explanation of that challenge. The committee is quite aware of that now.

There is opportunity, first of all. From an association, through AMO, they have a regular table through which they meet with the minister. There’s regular contact. They have representation and can contact individually. I know that the minister is from the north and is quite in tune with the north. There is an opportunity—we had one last week—in a lot of the hearings I’ve been in for deputations to come in over the telephone. I find those very effective—not any less effective than having somebody right in front of me. Technology is a wonderful thing to help connect people together.

I appreciate what the member is saying. I don’t think it’s necessary for us to extend another three days of hearings. I think we can, within those meetings that we’re having here, accommodate those viewpoints, those expressions of concern or support for the bill through the hearings here and through telecommunications, but by the selection of the committee. If the member opposite feels very strongly about the concerns being expressed in the north, there will be an opportunity through the committee, if he so wishes or if they so wish, to choose those delegations in the selection process as outlined in the subcommittee report.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you, Mr. Fraser. I have Mr. Hatfield.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** Thank you, Chair. I guess it’s one of those good news/bad news situations.

I fully support the suggestion that the committee travel to the north to hear first-hand from the north, because I know their opinions are quite different from the larger municipalities in the south, and the committee should hear those ideas first-hand. However, the dates that have been suggested by the member from Oxford fall under a constituency week, and I, for one, am personally booked for that week already. I won’t be able to get out of the arrangements that have been made, so I would not be available on the dates that he has suggested. The following week, I have no problem with that at all. So if he wants to change the dates, I’m willing to go along with that, but I can’t go along with the dates that he has suggested.

But I repeat, and we’ve said it before in various committees that we all sit on—the importance of travelling a bill in the way the tradition of this House used to be, prior to this government. It was quite common to go to the north, or to go to the east or the south and hear from the people directly, as opposed to putting the onus on them to come to Toronto, to come to Queen’s Park and have their voices heard. I think, especially in the north, when the ridings—some of them are as large as France or larger—that you go to those communities or at least one central community that they can all get to. I believe the member had suggested Thunder Bay at one time. I’m not sure if that’s where he’s suggesting this time, but it makes sense. It makes perfect sense to me. If it’s one day or two days—one in the east and one in the west.

But I just can’t commit to the days that he has suggested during our scheduled constituency week.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Thank you, Mr. Hatfield. Mr. Hardeman?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** First of all, Mr. Chair, I’d like to, again, draw your attention to the actual wording. It is not two days in the north. I think I may have put an extra “and” in there when I read it, but it is “April 18, Wednesday, April 19 or Thursday, April 20.” So it’s one of those three.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** But it’s still in the constituency week.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I guess I would point out—that’s why I want to get to that. I think it’s important to point out that the important people at that meeting that we hold in the north are not the members of the committee; it’s the people in the north.

Each party—I may have a little trouble in mine to get another caucus member; I’m sure Lorne will take it on to go on our behalf. But I think it’s important that the committee is there, not necessarily who is on the committee. At clause-by-clause, I think it’s important that the critics are there, but I think that generally to hear what the public has to say, it’s important that Hansard hears it and that the government side hears it when it comes time to amend the bill.

The other thing I just wanted to comment on, just quickly, is Mr. Fraser’s comments about the consulta-

tions taken so far. We talked to AMO, we talked to all the municipalities in the south, but if you look at all the consultations and all the discussions on the MOU and all that, they are all the same people—but these people weren't it. They don't come to those meetings. They come once a year to AMO and they're part of the process, but they're represented by a majority of people from southern Ontario.

These problems that are read into the record are primarily in the north. The people from AMO would not likely have brought those to our attention. I think they were just examples of how important it is that we hear from them directly.

**1420**

I think that, yes, they can call in, but looking at the timing we've given them to do that—unless they were involved with it today, they didn't get that secret notice from the ministry. They won't know about this until it hits the airwaves. After our committees are all over, they'll hear that it's all done.

As you noticed, this letter here was still saying that they wanted this done before second reading. This is the first, I'm sure, that every member of this committee—this is the first time that we've all heard about this letter. So I think it's important that we take the time to do it right. If it's on the wrong day, I'd be happy to accept a different day.

But for us to just write them off—they're not important enough to take time to hear them—I think it's just wrong.

With that, I'll leave the debate.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Fraser.

**Mr. John Fraser:** Chair, just to respond to Mr. Hardeman, whom I have a lot of respect for: That is not the case. That is not the case at all. You read very clearly into the record right now those concerns, which you really eloquently and very clearly expressed. As I said, I'm not sure whether another deputation is going to be able to do as good a job as you, but I'm ready to listen to them.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Oh, far better.

**Mr. John Fraser:** I'm ready to listen to them.

There is an opportunity for us to do what we have been doing for a considerable time now, which is accepting deputations from people who can't be here. I was at a committee hearing last week where a third of our deputations were by phone. I listened to those people as intently as I listened to the people who were in front of me—perhaps more intently—to the words that they were saying, just simply by the fact that they were calling in.

I think that there is ample opportunity, with the time that has been allocated to have public deputations for this bill, to hear those people. There's ample opportunity for the parties opposite, if that is their choice, to identify those parties which they feel should be most concerned, and to make sure, when they make their deputation, that it's selected as part of the committee selection process. I mean, it's clear.

I don't think it's necessary for us to sit another day. I don't think it's necessary for us to travel. I think we can

achieve what it is we want to achieve, through what we've set up here, by virtue of what we've been doing, not just for a few years but that the Legislature has been doing for quite some time.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I have Mr. Hatfield, and then Mr. Rinaldi.

Mr. Hatfield.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** As has just been stated, as the member from Ottawa South has said, I too have great respect for the member from Oxford, but I am offended that he would suggest that this committee is thinking that the people in the north are just not important enough for us to listen to them in person.

As the critic for municipal affairs, I would like to be at any hearing where we're talking about a bill coming out of municipal affairs. I stated that I couldn't be there on the date that he had suggested. He stated that it doesn't matter that I'm not there. The fact is that the people would be there, addressing the committee. I can buy that. My personal preference would be that I would be there.

But please don't suggest to the committee—don't put words in the mouth of the committee, if you will. You're saying if we don't do it, we're saying, "You're just not important enough for us to go there." I want to go there. I just can't go on the dates that you have suggested.

I don't think it's fair to the other members of the committee. If they vote against this motion, I do not believe that by doing so, they are saying to the people in the north, "You're just not important enough for us to go up to see you."

As a member of a party with more seats in the north than any other party currently, I must say that the people of the north know that they are listened to by the members of my party, the New Democrats, and they have elected them time and time again, exactly for that purpose. I believe we represent the north very well.

I want to go to the north. I want to hear from them directly. I can't go on the dates that you have suggested. But I'm certainly not saying to them, by saying to you that I can't make it on those dates, that it's because, as you said, the people in the north just aren't important enough for us to go up there. That is not the case whatsoever.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Rinaldi.

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** I guess I'm going to be blunt. I'm a bit disappointed by the member opposite, as being a former president of AMO, to make comments that AMO doesn't represent every municipality that's a member of AMO. As a former ROMA board member, I take that with great exception. I think AMO does a fantastic job. He should know; he was president of AMO. And he did a fantastic job, because I was a ROMA board member during his tenure. But just to suggest that they don't represent—we need to talk to 444 municipalities individually because we don't trust AMO? I just think that's not right.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Hardeman?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Yes. I guess I'll start from the top down. I think, first of all, I want to say that these two

letters point out that these folks don't believe AMO is necessarily speaking to all of the issues that they want to be heard about. That's why they didn't send this to AMO; they sent this to the minister. That's just the point I'm trying to make. It's not that AMO doesn't speak for municipalities. There are an awful lot of people in the north who never get the opportunity to speak to AMO or to this committee because they're busy at home doing things, and they don't all get in the car and drive to Toronto every day so they can talk to the people that they need to talk to.

I think it's interesting—and kind of together with Mr. Hatfield's and Mr. Fraser's comments. Obviously, if the committee feels it's important enough that those people in the north are heard, the committee would vote in favour of doing that. There's no other way of saying it. I'm assuming that they're going to do that and we're going to go to the north. But if they don't, then I have to assume that they didn't want to go to the north.

I think it's Mr. Fraser who said that we can do all we want to do from here. But what I'm saying is that people in the north can't do all they want to do from there. And so I think we need to bring the two together, and I don't think it's fair to ask them to come all the way here. I think we should be going there.

With that, I'll say no more.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Okay. I have Mr. Hatfield. Any other speakers?

**Mr. John Fraser:** I'll just—

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** And then Mr. Fraser. Mr. Hatfield.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** I suppose in political life these days, there's this sense of alternate facts and the use of language to distort reality. If it were journalism, I suppose you could say it was tabloid journalism. It's like somebody says, "Will you join us for a drink?" and you might have 100 reasons not to, and they turn around and say, "Oh, you're too good to join us, are you?" That's not the case at all.

If I vote that I can't go on the dates that you suggest, that's not me saying to anyone in the north, "I don't want to go to the north." I want to go to the north; I just can't go on the dates that you suggested. For you to turn that around and say, "You don't want to go to the north"—that is just not right.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Fraser.

**Mr. John Fraser:** I'll just restate that there is ample opportunity for presentations and deputations, and the member opposite, in making his selections, can ensure that those people who are of concern to him get chosen. That way those deputations will come to us at committee.

I suggest we vote on the amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Seeing no other discussion, people are ready for the vote. All those in favour of the amendment, please—

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Recorded vote, please.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I will take a recorded vote.

## Ayes

Coe, Hardeman.

## Nays

Fraser, Hoggarth, McMeekin, Rinaldi, Vernile.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** The motion is carried. Sorry—no, no. I misspoke, my friends. The motion failed.

We are back to the main motion, which is—

**Mr. John Fraser:** I move that the committee adopt the report of the subcommittee.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Hatfield?

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** I would like to make an amendment, Chair: that the committee meet in northern Ontario on Tuesday, April 25; Wednesday, April 26; or Thursday, April—I'm going by your dates—the following week from what was voted on in the previous motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Hatfield, we're going to have to write that down and circulate it. Members are agreeable to a 10-minute recess while we do that? They're agreed. Okay. We're recessed.

*The committee recessed from 1428 to 1437.*

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** The meeting reconvenes. Mr. Hatfield, do you want to speak to your motion or do you want to read it out and then speak to it?

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** I'll read it out again, Chair. Thank you very much.

I move that the report of the subcommittee be amended by adding the following:

"That the committee meet in northern Ontario on Tuesday, April 25, Wednesday, April 26 or Thursday, April 27, 2017, for the purpose of holding public hearings; and

"That the Clerk be authorized to advertise the meeting in any northern media that he deems appropriate."

I make this motion knowing that it may be subject to failure. However, I want it on the record that as a New Democrat, I agree with the Conservatives: This committee should travel to northern Ontario. We should listen to the voices of northern Ontario that aren't always heard in southern Ontario.

I make the motion because I was not available to go on the dates that the member from Oxford had suggested, and therefore I could not support his motion. I didn't vote against it, but I could not support it. So I'm making this motion to declare my allegiance to the north, if you will, that I'm available on other dates to go, and even if I can't attend, someone from my caucus—there are so many of them from the north—would certainly attend. But I want it on the record that we would support travelling this committee to the north to listen to those northern voices.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Any further discussion? Mr. Fraser.

**Mr. John Fraser:** For the reasons that I stated earlier and not to have Hansard have to enter them again, I think we can serve the people of the north, as we have through committee for years and years in different circumstances,

by making sure that those delegations that request to appear before us be given priority, and members of both parties opposite have the ability to do that. I think we can achieve what we need to achieve by doing that. I don't think it's necessary for us to travel—and I agree with the member's point from earlier, which was, just because we don't travel doesn't mean that we don't care.

Those are my comments. I'm prepared to vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Hardeman.

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** As Mr. Hatfield said, there's very little difference between this motion and the motion that we put forward before, except they changed the dates. We will be supporting the motion.

I do have a challenge with this motion—well, I guess maybe I don't need it. The mover of this motion suggested that this motion, in his opinion, was not likely going to pass, but if it did pass, we're overlapping on other parts of the report, because those days were already occupied for other purposes. I'm not sure, Mr. Chair, whether you accept this motion without changing those others, making the presumption that it won't need—

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** One bridge at a time.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** If, in fact, this amendment passes, then we would amend the main motion before us, the report from the subcommittee.

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** I look forward to doing that, Chair, with great anticipation.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Mr. Hardeman?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I yield to the Clerk, but are we making the supposition that if this amendment passes, in fact, the other amendments we're going to make would pass?

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** If this amendment passes, then we would have to further amend the report of the subcommittee. The date of the clause-by-clause and other things would have to be moved. You raise a valid point, but first we have to determine whether this amendment changes.

Mr. Hatfield?

**Mr. Percy Hatfield:** The Clerk did mention to me during the break that, indeed, that would be the case: that

if this passes, we would have to make some other alterations, which I'm prepared to do. But I think it's one bridge at a time, and not a bridge too far, and we should pass this one before we move on to consider other dates.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** Sorry, Mr. Fraser. You look—

**Mr. John Fraser:** Can I call the vote?

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** I understand. The first question I have is: Is there anyone else who wants to speak to this? There being none, then we will go to the vote.

**Mr. Lorne Coe:** Recorded vote, please.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** A recorded vote has been requested.

#### Ayes

Coe, Hardeman, Hatfield.

#### Nays

Fraser, Hoggarth, Rinaldi, Vernile.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** The amendment fails.

With that, we go to the main motion, which was moved by Mr. Fraser. Any further discussion? There being none, we'll go to the vote. All those in favour?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** A recorded vote is requested.

#### Ayes

Fraser, Hatfield, Hoggarth, McMeekin, Rinaldi, Vernile.

#### Nays

Coe, Hardeman.

**The Chair (Mr. Peter Tabuns):** The motion passes. We have our road map for the next while.

With that, the committee is adjourned.

*The committee adjourned at 1445.*



## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY**

### **Chair / Président**

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

### **Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Bramalea–Gore–Malton ND)

Mr. Lorne Coe (Whitby–Oshawa PC)

Mr. Vic Dhillon (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest L)

Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)

Mrs. Amrit Mangat (Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud L)

Mrs. Gila Martow (Thornhill PC)

Mr. Ted McMeekin (Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale L)

Mr. Lou Rinaldi (Northumberland–Quinte West L)

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Bramalea–Gore–Malton ND)

Mr. Peter Tabuns (Toronto–Danforth ND)

### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Mr. Percy Hatfield (Windsor–Tecumseh ND)

Ms. Ann Hoggarth (Barrie L)

Ms. Daiene Vernile (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre L)

### **Clerk / Greffier**

Mr. Katch Koch

### **Staff / Personnel**

Ms. Laura Anthony, research officer,  
Research Services

Mr. Michael Vidoni, research officer,  
Research Services