

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

F-62

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

F-62

**Standing Committee on
Finance and Economic Affairs**

Protect, Support and Recover
from COVID-19 Act
(Budget Measures), 2020

1st Session
42nd Parliament
Friday 4 December 2020

**Comité permanent
des finances
et des affaires économiques**

Loi de 2020 sur la protection,
le soutien et la relance
face à la COVID-19
(mesures budgétaires)

1^{re} session
42^e législature
Vendredi 4 décembre 2020

Chair: Amarjot Sandhu
Clerk: Julia Douglas

Président : Amarjot Sandhu
Greffière : Julia Douglas

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

ISSN 1180-4386

CONTENTS

Friday 4 December 2020

Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020, Bill 229, Mr. Phillips / Loi de 2020 sur la protection, le soutien et la relance face à la COVID- 19 (mesures budgétaires), projet de loi 229, M. Phillips.....	F-3153
---	--------

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

Friday 4 December 2020

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES**

Vendredi 4 décembre 2020

The committee met at 0901 in room 151 and by video conference.

PROTECT, SUPPORT AND RECOVER
FROM COVID-19 ACT
(BUDGET MEASURES), 2020

LOI DE 2020 SUR LA PROTECTION,
LE SOUTIEN ET LA RELANCE
FACE À LA COVID-19
(MESURES BUDGÉTAIRES)

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 229, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact, amend and repeal various statutes / Projet de loi 229, Loi visant à mettre en oeuvre les mesures budgétaires et à édicter, à modifier ou à abroger diverses lois.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Good morning, everyone. We are assembled here today for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 229, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact, amend and repeal various statutes.

We have MPP Stan Cho with us in the committee room and the following members participating remotely: MPP Shaw, MPP Piccini, MPP Fee, MPP Hunter, MPP Kanapathi, MPP Thanigasalam, MPP Smith, MPP Mamakwa and MPP Arthur. Julia Hood and Sibylle Filion from legislative counsel will be here on the call to assist us with our work. should we have any questions for them.

A copy of the numbered amendments filed with the Clerk has been distributed electronically. The amendments are numbered in the order in which the sections and schedules appear in the bill.

To make sure that everyone can follow along, it is important that all participants speak slowly and clearly. Please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak. Since it could take a little time for your audio and video to come up after I recognize you, please take a brief pause before beginning. Are there any questions before we start?

Seeing none: As you will notice, Bill 229 is comprised of three sections and four schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest that we postpone the first three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first. This allows the committee to consider the contents of the schedules before dealing with the sections on the commencement and the short title of the bill. We would return to the three sections after completing consideration

of the schedules. Is there unanimous consent to stand down the three sections and deal with the schedules first? Agreed.

Before we begin schedule 1, I will allow each party to make some brief comments on the bill as a whole. Afterwards, the bill should be limited to the section or amendment under consideration. Are there any comments? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you, Chair, and good morning. I would just like to comment in general. It has been said many, many times that this bill is a bill that was purported to address COVID recovery, and there are so many sections in this bill that have nothing to do with COVID recovery. Particularly, again, I need to emphasize the outrage that my constituents and everyone from across Ontario have shared specifically around schedule 6. There was not one single deputant who supported schedule 6, and the vast majority of them actually asked that this schedule be entirely withdrawn. I just want to express my complete disappointment in this government for putting forward a budget that, under the cover of COVID, slips in these significant changes to the conservation authorities that nobody asked for.

The second thing I'd like to say—with your indulgence, Chair—is that it's completely unreasonable that we would receive 91 pages of amendments and be given less than 24 hours for consideration before we bring them to committee. This is the pattern of this government: to rush through legislation and not give people an opportunity to weigh in on it. We've seen that with committee, and we've seen that with all of their time allocation bills.

I understand that it seems to be the government's strategy now to try and catch independents and the opposition flat-footed, without providing the time and the information that they deserve, that would help them exercise their role as an MPP as they see fit. It's one thing for this government to play antics with their opposition in the House, but I would just say it's entirely disrespectful and borderline shameful that they would do this, and it doesn't give legislators the time to consider such a large bill and to ensure that these amendments are in order and that they are improving the legislation.

I will end with my complete disappointment with what appears to be the government's complete disregard for our parliamentary democracy. With that, away we go.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further comments? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you to the members of committee. The budget bill, Bill 229, is obviously an important piece of legislation that will affect the people of this province not now but far and deep into the future. The inclusion of schedule 6 has been so problematic. For the three days of hearings that we've had as a committee, repeatedly, from municipalities, from many conservation authorities, those in rural communities as well as in urban areas have come forward to say that this is not needed, that it will be a hindrance to conservation authorities fulfilling their mandate to protect environmentally sensitive areas, and that the changes that the government has proposed in Bill 229 for schedule 6 would be disastrous for flood prevention. It would actually significantly harm provincially significant wetland areas.

What is so disappointing to see is that, even after three days of hearings, the government has not listened. The government has, in fact, reinforced their intention to disregard environmental protections and our wetland areas and sensitive areas and is just moving ahead with their own agenda, whether that's to take power to themselves in terms of the minister and away from locally operating conservation authorities or if it is an agenda to develop over wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas. So it's clear that the government is not listening but is intent on its own agenda, and all of this in an omnibus bill that really seeks to hide what the government is doing. That is very disappointing, because there isn't real and true consultation with those stakeholders who are directly impacted. Rather, it's a take-it-or-leave-it approach. That's not what we should be doing.

When it comes to schedule 8, that was also a concern that surfaced as a result of the three days of hearings that we held in this committee. Schedule 8 would provide an exemption for the forest industry which would allow that industry to capture, to harass and to kill endangered species and species at risk, without even accounting for their actions. This is an extremely concerning schedule, and the government is not responding to red flags. The Auditor General has provided a report that calls out the weaknesses in the Ford government on the protection of endangered species. The Auditor General has said, in fact, that this government has not made this a focus, does not have the capacity to carry out any sort of mandate to protect endangered species and Ontario's biodiversity. Rather than responding with corrective action, instead the government is continuing on a path of weakening conservation efforts in favour of industry. This is wrong. We need to account for each and every species that is lost, and we need to ensure that there is appropriate monitoring and tracking, at the very least. Schedule 8 is, once again, an egregious attack on the environment and on Ontario's biodiversity.

0910

Furthermore, only three witnesses, I believe, came forward in the time that was allowed for hearings on this bill. It really speaks to the fact that there wasn't enough time for appropriate feedback and consultation on such an omnibus bill. But nevertheless, the effects of schedule 22

are shocking and far-reaching, because there will be approximately 250,000 seniors who are, right now, hunkered down and worried about COVID. They're worried about surviving this pandemic. And while our seniors are worried about surviving the pandemic, instead of protecting them, the government is, instead, putting through legislation that will take away their retirement security and an investment that they made decades ago—all with the stroke of a pen in schedule 22.

This is wrong. This is, once again, the government legislating contracts and not at all regarding the concerns of those individual lives and their families. Their investments will evaporate. It puts their and their families' financial security at severe risk. And no consultation—I'm sure those 250,000 seniors are trusting that the contracts that they signed all those years ago will be there when they and their families need it, only to find out that they won't be there because the government has, through the power that it has in legislation, taken away their contractual rights.

This is wrong. This is damaging. Yet here we are, on the day we're doing clause-by-clause, and we know that the government is not listening, is not responding in any way to the concerns raised by these seniors in our province.

So when we look at the responsibility of this committee and the fact that, today, we have to deliver the clause-by-clause—it's all been legislated for us to do that so that the bill can go back for third reading—these are the concerns that we have. We have noted those concerns and want to record those concerns so that the people who came forward to this committee know that, yes, we were listening as independent members, that we were listening as opposition members, but that the government itself is not listening, because this is your bill. This is a bill that you brought forward to this committee. It represents your priorities. We are utilizing this committee as a way to improve the bill and to make it serve the needs of the people of Ontario.

But if the government refuses to listen and to respond, then those consequences are really on your shoulders because you have been told. You've been told about the risk to our environment and to protected lands and wetlands and the risk of flooding. You've been told about the dangers of disrupting the biodiversity of the province. You've been told about the exposure that you're causing the vulnerable seniors in this province, who have signed contracts in good faith and now, with your legislation, are about to become less secure at a time when they need more security in terms of COVID. We don't know what the results are going to be in terms of the economy for the short and medium term, as well as the long term. And yet, you have not chosen to listen.

I believe that there has been a severe lack of meaningful consultation on these substantive changes that you're making to the lives of the people of Ontario, particularly schedule 6, schedule 8 and schedule 22, the sections that will wipe away the rights of those individual seniors who have invested in those universal life insurance policies.

Hopefully, we can have a meaningful discussion today, Chair, and we can hear the other side and make decisions that actually improve this bill, rather than doubling down on wrong-headed proposals by the government. I look forward to our day's deliberation. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, MPP Hunter. Further comments? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I'll be brief in my remarks. I just wanted to thank everyone today and thank the staff for their work on this and thank everybody. We sat through over 800 hours of deputants: 500 deputants, 800 hours of consultation. I've held six specifically in my riding and heard from hundreds and hundreds—thousands—of constituents. I'd like to thank PA Cho and Minister Phillips—PA Cho, who joined me and Minister Phillips on multiple occasions in my riding to hear from a number of concerned residents of mine. In this bill, those concerns have been addressed.

I would like to start—as a rural Ontario member, I got elected on a mandate to give agriculture and our rural Ontarians a voice. A couple of things we heard: On Friday, February 7, we had 315 people pack the Keeler Centre for a robust consultation that incorporated conservation authorities, municipalities, ag members, concerned constituents and environmental activists. We had robust consultation and one of the best consultations I think I've ever seen, where people were scheduled—at each table, we had a differing perspective. So you didn't just roll in with your friends and all sit at the same table for echo chambers, as we often see on social media. It was a great debate.

I'd like to touch on a few things. This bill gives agriculture a voice on the conservation authorities, a big win for our ag community. Notification of trespassing: We heard from John Corcoran, a constituent of mine from Whispering Springs. That was a significant issue, and a number of farmers expressed a lot of concern there. The ability to now notify the owner before entry I think is a prudent move.

Core programming: One of the big concerns was just mapping out that core flood mitigation programming, because I think a lot of people have been concerned that, in the case of the Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority, only 11% of their budget is actually spent on flood mitigation. If we can realign the budgets to spend more money on flood mitigation, to refocus and redouble our efforts on protecting source water, that's a good move. That's what people in my community want to hear and want to see from conservation authorities, and I'm proud that we're doing that.

In addition, when we talk about, as I said, mapping that core programming, it gives duly-elected municipal councillors the ability to say, "Look, this is not a core function, but we want the CAs to do that." It gives council, it gives the public the ability to really see that. So I think that was a big piece.

In addition, moving on to seniors, I've got, I think, the second- or third-highest seniors population in my riding. It's debatable. So that tax credit for seniors, accessibility—I spoke to seniors last night. This is going to be huge.

We've already increased funding for seniors' programming in our riding. It's good for their mental health. It's good to keep them active. Again, tangibly—not rhetoric, but tangible programming at Cobourg Community Centre, at Ruth Clarke community centre, additional funding. I'd like to thank MPP Cho for making those investments. That has benefited seniors in our community.

The tourism sector: As we move beyond COVID, I think Ontarians understand that a good bill in response to COVID means addressing how we protect our environment. It means addressing how we pivot Ontario as a tourism destination. Again, I'd like to thank Minister MacLeod and the finance ministry for addressing that with the staycation tax credit. I know many Ontarians and many in my riding are looking forward to robust consultations on that, as we have had on this budget. I'm looking forward to facilitating that, because I think it's going to be really, really important.

I think it's 26% over the age of 65 in the northern Peterborough area riding that I represent, so this is going to be huge, that seniors' tax credit to age in place. It's going to be good for our health care system. That's what our front-line workers are telling me: community paramedicine programming, additional funding for base funding for our hospitals, transitional bed funding to take alternate-level-of-care patients out of the ERs and into the most appropriate setting of care. These are all things that this budget seeks to address, and I'm just really happy as a rural Ontario MPP that we're seeing that after years of neglect.

0920

Finally, I would say, just to touch again on that tourism piece, that that's going to be critical as we challenge Ontarians to look inside the borders of our province in 2021. Hopefully we'll see a vaccine plan come out nationally. I know, under the leadership of General Hillier here in Ontario, we've got a plan and we're working on that. But I'd like to see Ontarians coming out to Northumberland–Peterborough South, the beautiful rolling hills of Northumberland, the northern shores of Rice Lake in Peterborough county. It is going to be important that they can take time—and hearing from a lot of my tourism operators, again, some clear timelines and some guarantees and a focused discussion on how we can preserve the environment, but how we can balance that to ensure that they can sustainably and effectively market themselves as a destination and have a thriving business. I know that many tourism operators in my community are really excited for what the summer of 2021 looks like in this province of Ontario, thanks to measures this government has put in place in the budget.

There's just so much more to touch on, but I'd like to thank everybody that has put time into this, and specifically our Minister of Finance, that have gone out in ridings that our government opposition held—just a real effort to seek consultation from Ontarians. I'm really looking forward to a number of the schedules here passing to benefit the members of my community. Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to have a few remarks.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further comments? MPP Mamakwa.

Mr. Sol Mamakwa: Good morning, everyone. It's great to be here. It's great to hear about all the issues that we're outlining in the budget, the bill itself.

There are good things and not-so-good things that happen in Ontario. One of the things I always try to bring about is that sometimes it may sound great, what this government is doing, like it's just all so positive, but in the backyard of Ontario, when you have communities that have no access to clean drinking water and then the government just tells me that it's not their responsibility, they just pass it off—who are we? Are we like chopped liver?

Yesterday, I asked a question regarding clean drinking water and that's what they said: "That's a federal responsibility." When we talk about Ontarians, who are we? I think that's a responsibility, like when we—certainly there are measures to recover from COVID-19, but they want access to the lands and resources in the north? That's not acceptable. And then on the northern community, they want to be part of the solution on-reserve. This is enough. Where is the humanity in it? You cannot continue to just say good words about First Nations people, Indigenous people in this province, when you don't want to be part of the solution in the water crisis.

I have a community that's evacuated. Today is 46 days. Two days ago, they had a funeral for a suicide during the evacuation. They had a young girl. They're evacuated; it's a water crisis in a pandemic. How do we recover from that? It's just not enough saying, "That's a federal responsibility."

I just wanted to share those comments. It's just important that sometimes it sounds all good when we talk about how things are, what's happening, but we cannot forget. Do not forget the First Nations people. Do not forget Indigenous people. That's all I'm saying.

I know I had submitted last year UNDRIP, my private member's bill, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Yesterday I heard the federal government announcing theirs, and the province of Ontario and this minister are saying, "Give us 60 days. That's not enough to review the bill." You guys are passing bills like that, really quick. What's the difference? But anyway, those are my comments. Meegwetch.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further comments? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Chair, can I request a recess at this moment?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): You can move a motion for a recess.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I'm going to move a motion for a short recess, please.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): For how long?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I was going to say, with MPP Hunter—go ahead.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: We do have the option of having a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That's only before a vote, I think, pursuant to standing order 132. So that's only before the vote that you can ask for a 20-minute recess. At any other time, you have to move a motion and members have to vote.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: But also, it's ahead of a motion on that as well.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Sorry. Can you repeat?

Mr. Dave Smith: Chair, if you take a look at the time allocation motion that governs what we're doing today, there is a provision for a single 20-minute recess, and that's it.

Mr. David Piccini: Maybe we might want to do it after we get going.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Pursuant to section 132(a), a member can request a 20-minute recess when the Chair has asked for a vote. The time allocation motion only covers the deemed state after 6:30.

Do we have a motion for a recess, MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I move that we recess now.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): For how long?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Twenty minutes.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw has moved a motion for a 20-minute recess. Is there agreement? I heard a no. Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please—MPP Hunter, do you have a comment?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes. I'm asking for a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, we are voting on that. Okay, so pursuant to standing order 132(a), after MPP Shaw's motion, MPP Hunter has requested a 20-minute recess. So we can recess for 20 minutes. Do you want the full 20 minutes?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes, thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We'll come back at 9:48. The committee is in recess until 9:48. Thank you.

The committee recessed from 0928 to 0948.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Good morning. Welcome back. Can the members have their video on, please? All right, thank you.

Before we recessed, we were voting on MPP Shaw's motion regarding a 20-minute recess. Are the members ready to vote on MPP Shaw's motion? All those in favour of MPP Shaw's motion, can you please raise your hand? All those opposed? Motion lost.

All right, so we'll move to schedule 1 now: schedule 1, section 1. I see there are no amendments to sections 1 to 10 of schedule 1. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate? No debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 1, sections 1 to 10 inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 1, as a whole, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 1 is accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 2 now. Since there are no amendments to sections 1 to 17 of schedule 2, I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate? No debate. Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 2, sections 1 to 17 inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 2, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 3. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 8 of schedule 3. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate? No debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 3, sections 1 to 8, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 3, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Schedule 3 is accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 4. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3 of schedule 4. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? No debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Shall schedule 4, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 4 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Schedule 4 is accordingly carried.

We move to schedule 5 now. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 5. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? No debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Shall schedule 5, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Schedule 5 is accordingly carried.

We move to schedule 6 now. Is there any debate? MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: The amendments to this schedule, amendments number 6 and number 7—I would like to suggest that those are out of order. The reason I bring this up now is that when we were considering Bill 3, it was made clear—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, we have to go through the amendments first.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We have to go through them in order.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: My question is that I would like to understand the procedure, because in Bill 3, what we learned was that once the section is voted on, we couldn't make amendments to it. They were ruled out of order. I don't want to be in a position where we can't talk about

whether or not these amendments are out of order. Will I have an opportunity to debate the fact that those two amendments are out of order if we do it after?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): What amendments?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Government amendments 6 and 7, which are amending portions of schedule 6.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, we'll be able to debate those amendments when we get to them.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Okay, thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate on schedule 6, section 1? No debate? Shall schedule 6, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Hunter, you have a comment?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Hi, Chair. I really want the Clerk as well; I don't know if there is a mike there. We're carrying this part of schedule 6, but there are amendments that deal with schedule 6 in a very different way, so why are we—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We are on section 1. We're going to amendments now after that.

Mr. Ian Arthur: Chair, I would like a recorded vote on each of the sections.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. When we go to the vote, you can ask for a recorded vote at that time.

Mr. Ian Arthur: No, I am pre-asking for a recorded vote on all sections of schedule 6.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Okay, sure.

Mr. Ian Arthur: Because it's too hard to jump in over Zoom, Chair, and I don't want the opportunity to be missed, we would like a recorded vote on each of the sections in this schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Sure, we'll do that.

Mr. Ian Arthur: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): All right, so we—yes?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: For the purpose of this section—so we're on section 6, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We are on schedule 6, section 1. It's just section 1. We'll go back to section 2 when there will be amendments.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: So we are on schedule 6, section 1.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. And there are no amendments to section 1 of schedule 6.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay, but we've proposed an amendment to the whole schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's a notice; it's not an amendment. That's a notice.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, can you confirm that we will still have a full opportunity to speak to that?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): At the end of the schedule, yes, you will have the opportunity.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. But is this not the time if you're dealing with amendments to schedule 6?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We are not dealing with the amendments right now. We're just on section 1 of schedule 6 and there are no amendments. We're going through section by section. Some sections have amendments; some sections don't have any amendments. So section 1 of schedule 6 doesn't have any amendments.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: When will we have an opportunity to speak to the section as a whole, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): At the end of schedule 6 when we vote.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): All right? Thank you.

Shall schedule 6, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Oh, sorry. MPP Arthur, you requested a recorded vote on this one as well? So a recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The motion is carried.

We'll go to schedule 6, section 2. I see there are government amendments, subsection 2(2) of schedule 6 to the bill. Are there any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Section 14 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Members of council appointed

“(1.1) When appointing members of an authority, the council of a participating municipality shall ensure that at least 70 per cent of its appointees are selected from among the members of the municipal council, subject to subsection (1.2).

“Exception

“(1.2) Upon application by a participating municipality, the minister may grant permission to the municipality to select less than 70 per cent of its appointees to an authority from among the members of the municipal council, subject to such conditions or restrictions as the minister considers appropriate.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith has moved a motion. Is there any debate? MPP Hunter. Unmute, please.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you for unmuting me.

I appreciate that in schedule 6, although the majority of the deputants who came forward expressed strong opposition to the—really, this is crippling conservation authorities. This schedule 6 is crippling conservation authorities with their ability to do their work and to protect environmentally sensitive areas and wetlands in the province.

A big theme of what we heard during the hearings really was about governance and it was about the government's insistence that all of the representatives on the conservation authority be municipal councillors. This is very problematic for councils like the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and its responsibilities that it has for municipalities like Toronto, where there are 24 council members—as mandated, actually, by the previous meddling of this government in the affairs of the city of Toronto to cut their council in half, against the will of the people of Toronto.

1000

Then putting in a requirement that only councils can serve on the boards of conservation authorities really took away the duty of care that people have when they serve on the boards and required members of conservation authorities to only represent their own municipalities, creating a condition of a dysfunctional board.

The amendment that the government has now put forward to change the threshold from all members being on municipal councils to 70% being on municipal councils, and then giving, once again, power to the minister to decide on local affairs just really reinforces the position of this government to constantly meddle in the affairs of local, municipal-led authorities without consultation, without input, without even an understanding of how this will benefit them and how this will help them to fulfill their responsibilities, which, in this case, on the conservation authority, is to protect environmentally sensitive areas, wetlands, and to protect people and property from the risk of flood, and of course, source water protections.

My concern is, does this respond to the real needs of representation on the boards of conservation authorities and avoid the challenges that were raised by those conservation authorities? There are 36 of them in the province. They're all different; they're all unique. We heard that they were unique to their local conditions, and we want to empower them to do the good work that they do in terms of flood mitigation and source water protection.

I believe that this amendment must speak to the needs of those local municipalities, who are the majority funders of conservation authorities. They do the work and they're doing it well. We heard about that. The government is simply intervening in their governance without thinking of their local needs, and that's a concern that I do want to register here today.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I would just like to further what MPP Hunter is saying about the lack of appropriate representation on conservation authority boards. Even if this is amended, this section will continue to fail

completely in its ability to provide for Indigenous representation.

As we know, and as we've been hearing from MPP Mamakwa and we've been hearing from other representatives, each area has unique concerns and unique considerations when it comes to protecting source water and the headwater protections. So again, I find, as is usual, the government does not take seriously their requirements under their treaties—Treaty 9, for example—and, as they say in French, there's a lot of “paroles en l'air,” which means, essentially, empty words. When they have been given an opportunity to put into legislation representation that would ensure we hear important voices from Indigenous communities, they fail to do so.

I think that the government should consider an amendment, or should have considered an amendment that would have required participation and representation from Indigenous governments across areas that are impacted by conservation authorities.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? No? Are the members ready to vote? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The motion is accordingly carried.

We have another amendment, government subsection 2(5) of schedule 6 to the bill. Are there any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 2(5) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 14 of the Conservation Authorities Act:

“Limitation on voting

“(4.0.1) The member of an authority appointed under section (4) shall not vote on,

“(a) a resolution to enlarge an authority's area of jurisdiction that is presented at a meeting called under section 10;

“(b) a resolution to amalgamate an authority with another authority that is presented at a meeting called under section 11;

“(c) a resolution to dissolve the authority that is presented at a meeting called under section 13.1; or

“(d) a resolution related”—sorry—“relating to any budgetary matter that is presented at a meeting held under section 16.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith, can you read part (d) just for clarity, please?

Mr. Dave Smith: “A resolution relating to any budgetary matter that is presented at a meeting held under section 16.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Is there any debate? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Once again, this amendment that has come in overnight—I didn't hear this in committee, in terms of this intention by conservation authorities. Where is this coming from? Why is the government putting in such substantial restrictions on the work of conservation authorities overnight? There's no opportunity to have input from those who are affected in this sweeping change. It really speaks to the fact that the government is undermining the work of conservation authorities. This amendment that we're now being asked to make a decision on has received no consultation and no input. It was just added the night before by the government, and that's unfortunate.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: Perhaps MPP Hunter would like to read the amendment again, because actually, this is something we did hear feedback on, that the government was doing some things that some people didn't believe they were getting proper representation on. What this does is it restricts the voting ability of someone who was appointed by the government. So we're giving the ability, then, for the municipalities and the local board itself to have that full voice and make sure that the province is not, as you're describing, doing some of the things that you're describing.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? MPP Arthur.

Mr. Ian Arthur: I would echo the sentiments of MPP Hunter. Regardless of the government's intent, this hasn't been put in front of those stakeholder groups. The government, frankly, screwed this up the first time, which is why over 50% of the applicants who appeared before this committee were asking for schedule 6 to be withdrawn.

You have universal opposition to this. You have been asked to go back to the drawing board by those stakeholders, be it the OFA, AMO, the Federation of Ontario Cottagers' Associations or every single environmental group. You have been asked to go back to the drawing board and not to do further amendments without those stakeholders getting to see them.

1010

This is subversive. It's a backroom, last-minute decision by the government. It is centralizing power in the ministry. It is not decentralizing power, which flies in the face of the history of the governing party, frankly; they are all about the decentralization of power and of individual areas having autonomy and the right for self-direction. It's not the right way to do this. You were asked to withdraw the schedule by every single stakeholder group who commented on it.

You can introduce this schedule at any time. It does not have to be in a budget bill. The reason it's in a budget bill

is so that you don't have to post it to the Environmental Bill of Rights and so you're not going to be sued again, but that's not the right way of doing this. You should have withdrawn it in its entirety, gone back to the drawing board and asked stakeholders for feedback on your changes before you proceeded.

Mr. Dave Smith: Point of order.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith has a point of order.

Mr. Dave Smith: Yes, I'd ask the member to withdraw for imputing motive.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I'll ask the members to refrain from imputing motive, please. Please just focus on the schedule we're discussing or the amendment, but please refrain from imputing motive.

MPP Arthur.

Mr. Ian Arthur: No problem. I do not believe I have to withdraw in committee. I believe that's a standing order of the House rules, and I will refrain from impugning motive. But it is already on the record, Chair, so I don't need to withdraw that, and I'm allowed to have my opinion about why the government is doing this in committee.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Yes, I would further that conversation by saying that whether or not that was imputing motive, it is completely mind-boggling as to why this is in here, so we're only struggling to understand who the government was listening to when they put in schedule 6.

I would just like to say that this is a disaster of a schedule, and it cannot be saved by amending a few sections. It needs to be completely withdrawn, and we've heard that not just from us, not just from the independent members; we heard it from almost all of the deputants, who said this schedule needs to be withdrawn. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture said that this schedule threatens farms and it threatens food production in the province of Ontario. If that isn't reason enough to withdraw the schedule, I don't know what is. Food security for the people of the province of Ontario—and you're still plowing ahead with this disastrous schedule?

To me, it's completely obvious that this government fails to understand at all the purpose of conservation authorities, because amending this with regard to municipal representation shows that you either don't understand or don't listen to the deputants, or don't care when they said the whole point of conservation authorities is that they deal with this in an integrated watershed approach, not municipality by municipality. That's an important consideration: conservation authorities have managed to achieve that ability to protect the watershed, not municipalities. All of this planning and all this work—decades and decades of planning and work—you are going to tear this down with this schedule.

Despite the fact that you will say we're imputing motive, what could your possible motivation be for a schedule that is opposed universally by everyone, that is so badly written that we have 91 pages of amendments that came overnight? Withdraw the schedule, and get it a little bit right.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Just to remind the members that imputing motive is a valid point of order, and members can raise concerns regarding imputing motive. Once again, I will remind all the members to refrain from imputing motive, please.

Any further debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just wanted to clarify: Were you discussing my last deputation?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We're discussing government amendment 2, subsection 2(5)—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just wanted to be clear, because I went out of my way to not impugn motive. I just wanted to know if that's what you were suggesting.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, I'm just clarifying that members can raise a point of concern if there's imputed motive.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): All right. Are the members ready to vote on government subsection 2(5) of schedule 6 to the bill? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The motion is accordingly carried.

We also have an NDP notice, section 2 of schedule 6. Is there any debate on that? Are the members prepared to vote? Recorded vote. All those in favour, please raise your hand. We're voting on section 2 of schedule 6.

Ayes

Fee, Hunter, Kanapathi, Dave Smith.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): All those opposed? MPP Shaw, you have a—sorry, MPP Shaw has a comment.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I think there's confusion on what we're voting on, Chair. I would ask you to clarify and to reset the vote, because it was not clear what we're voting on.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We're voting on NDP notice, section 2 of—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Oh, section 2—we're not voting on the notice?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Sorry about that. We're voting on section 2 of schedule 6. We do not vote on notices, so we're voting on section 2 of schedule 6. I apologize.

Mr. Dave Smith: As amended.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): As amended, yes, exactly.

Shall schedule 6, section 2, as amended, carry?
Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 2, as amended, carries.

We're now on schedule 6, section 3. Is there any debate?

We have two notices. We have an NDP notice, section 3 of schedule 6. Is there any debate on that? We have a government notice, section 3 of schedule 6. Any debate on that?

Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 3, carry? MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Sorry, why are we doing them together?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That's just to let the members know that there is an NDP notice and a government notice. We are not voting on that. We're voting on schedule 6, section 3.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. Shall schedule 6, section 3, carry?

Nays

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly lost.

Okay, we'll move to schedule 6, section 4. Is there any debate on schedule 6, section 4? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 4, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 4, is accordingly carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 5, is there any debate on schedule 6, section 5? I see there's a government

amendment, section 5 of schedule 6 to the bill. Is there a motion? MPP Smith.

1020

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 5 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out (subsection) in the portion before subsection (1.1) of section 17 of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting "subsections" and by adding the following subsections to section 17 of the Conservation Authorities Act:

"Representation from each municipality

"(1.2) An authority in respect of which more than one participating municipality has been designated shall appoint chairs and vice-chairs from among the members appointed to the authority by each participating municipality on a rotating basis so as to ensure that a member appointed to the authority by a particular participating municipality cannot be appointed to succeed an outgoing chair or vice-chair appointed to the authority by the same participating municipality.

"Exception

"(1.3) Despite subsections (1.1) and (1.2), upon application by an authority or a participating municipality, the minister may grant permission to the authority or participating municipality to, subject to such conditions or restrictions as the minister considers appropriate,

"(a) appoint a chair or vice-chair for a term of more than one year or to hold office for more than two consecutive terms; or

"(b) appoint as chair or vice-chair of the authority a member who was appointed to the authority by the same participating municipality that appointed the outgoing chair or vice-chair."

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith, can you please repeat the first paragraph, where it says "I move that section 5"? Can you please read the first line, please?

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 5 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "subsection."

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): All right. Thank you so much. A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 5, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 5, as amended, is carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 6. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 6, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 6, is accordingly carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 7, is there any debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I apologize. I had my hand up. I'm going to adjust my screen shot, because I'm putting up my hand, and it's out of the shot, so I do apologize for that.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you for letting us know.

Schedule 6, section 7: Is there any debate? Seeing none—

Mr. Ian Arthur: I believe MPP Shaw has—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, she has not.

Mr. Ian Arthur: No?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No.

There's also an NDP notice on section 7 of schedule 6. Is there any debate on that? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? We're going to vote on schedule 6, section 7. Shall schedule 6, section 7, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We're moving to schedule 6, section 8. Is there any debate on schedule 6, section 8? Seeing none, we also have an NDP notice for section 8 of schedule 6. Any debate on that?

Are the members prepared to vote? We're voting on schedule 6, section 8.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 8 is accordingly carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 9, we have a government amendment to subsection 9(1) of schedule 6 to the bill. Any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 9(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "Subject to the regulations" at the beginning of subsection 21.1.1(1) of the Conservation Authorities Act.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We have another government amendment to subsection 9(1) of schedule 6 to the bill, amendment number 5. MPP Smith, do you have a motion?

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 9(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "Subject to the regulations" in subsection 21.1.2(1) of the Conservation Authorities Act.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith has moved a motion. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It is accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 9, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 9, as amended, is carried.

Since there are no amendments to sections 10 to 14 of schedule 6, I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, sections 10 to 14, inclusive, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 15. I see there's a government amendment, new section 15.1, to be added to schedule 6 to the bill. Any motions?

MPP Shaw, do you have any comments?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: We're on government amendment number 6. Is that correct?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, you're right.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I would like to suggest that this amendment is entirely out of order, Chair. It creates an entirely new—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): An amendment has not been moved yet, MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any motions by the government? MPP Smith.

1030

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 15.1 be added to schedule 6 to the bill:

“15.1(1) The act is amended by adding the following section:

“Permission for development, zoning order

“28.0.1(1) This section applies to any application submitted to an authority under a regulation made under subsection 28(1) for permission to carry out all or part of a development project in the authority's area of jurisdiction if”—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith, I apologize to cut you off.

I apologize to the members. We made a mistake here. We still need to vote on section 15 of schedule 6. MPP Smith, we'll come back to you later.

Is there any debate on schedule 6, section 15? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I would like to debate, but I was also raising my hand, Chair, to try to ask a clarifying question. MPP Shaw has asked that this section be ruled out of order, and we were told that the timing was not appropriate. I wanted to get some understanding of when that would be appropriate, because I support this—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Once the motion has been moved.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. So right now, we are—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We are on schedule 6, section 15.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Not the amendment?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Not the amendment. We'll come back to the amendment, but right now we are on section 15 of schedule 6. We made a mistake, so that's why we went back to section 15. We'll come back to the amendment later.

So no debate on section 15 of schedule 6? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour?

MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I'm wondering, Chair, if we can take a recess at this time.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there an agreement? There's no agreement, MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Does there need to be an agreement?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): You have to move a motion.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: To request a recess?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, you have to move a motion.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. I move that we take a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A motion has been moved by MPP Hunter. All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed?

It's accordingly lost.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Why is there no granting the opportunity for a recess?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We already voted on that. Members didn't agree to the recess, so that's why the motion is lost.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Did the members need to agree?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, unless you're calling for a recess pursuant to standing order 132(a). That has to be called when we're about to vote on any motion.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Isn't that what we're doing?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We had not called for a vote yet on section 15 of schedule 6. We're still asking for debate. Are the members prepared to vote now? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I can't hear the Clerk, so it would be helpful just to clarify what the Clerk is saying. It's difficult to hear. When you say, “Are the members ready to vote?” that is the moment under the standing orders when we can call for a recess? Is that correct?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: So very shortly, then.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Sorry, Chair. So at this stage, for section 15, you are asking whether we have a debate on this section?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. At this point, we're asking for a debate. We'll shortly get to the vote as well.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. I would like to speak to this section, when we have the chance.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. Please go ahead.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Perhaps it is foreshadowing the very substantial last-minute, overnight amendments that are being proposed for this section. The entire section 6 has been vehemently opposed by all of the presenters who came forward to speak to the impacts on conservation authorities. They were so clear on the government interfering with the work of conservation authorities, who were doing good work, and the changes that are being proposed in schedule 6 are disrupting that.

Instead of the government withdrawing this schedule, doing proper consultation, being open or getting the input, they have come back with sweeping changes that have not been properly vetted. We haven't had the benefit of hearing from those impacted stakeholders on how changes to section 15 will impact their work and the consequences to local communities and to conservation authorities. We've had no opportunity to get that input or to even review, because this is a substantive, overnight amendment and change to section 15.

I just think that it's wrong and it sets conservation authorities further back at a time when we have a climate crisis and we should be thinking about how we improve our work with flood mitigation and protection, how we manage stormwater and its effect on our water systems. Instead, the government has, out of nowhere, created a development-focused amendment on wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas. It's of huge concern given the overwhelming witness testimonies that we heard about the risks of moving forward at all with schedule 6, let alone heading in the wrong direction of opening up more development opportunities on wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas. I think that's wrong. When you move in this direction, that doesn't give any respect to those witnesses who came forward.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? There is no further debate. Are the members prepared to vote on section 15 of schedule 6? MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: You will not be surprised that I'm moving a motion for recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I haven't called for the vote yet.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Oh. Close, though—getting there.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Is this the time?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. Can you move your motion?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I would move that we take a recess now, Chair.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Are you moving a motion or are you requesting—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I'm requesting a recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Requesting a recess. MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I was just confirming, Chair, that this was the appropriate time to request a 20-minute recess.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith?

Mr. Dave Smith: Perhaps the Clerk could forward the manual for committee so that MPP Shaw and MPP Hunter would have an opportunity during this recess to review the procedures—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you.

Mr. Dave Smith: —and when we come back, know when they can do those things.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you so much. MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: Thank you, Chair and Clerk and everyone. Just for the benefit of committee, after the Chair calls for a vote, you would say, "I move a motion pursuant to section 132(a)." That's how you do it. We've gone through this a few times, and we have a few members that have been here far longer than I—just for everyone's benefit, rather than the back and forth. This will actually expedite the coffee breaks much faster.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, MPP Piccini.

We have a request, pursuant to standing order 132(a), from MPP Shaw. MPP Shaw, how long do you want the recess?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Twenty minutes, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Twenty minutes' recess: We will recess and we'll come back at 11:01. The meeting is in recess until 11:01 a.m. Thank you.

The committee recessed from 1041 to 1101.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Welcome back. Before we went on recess, we were voting on schedule 6, section 15. Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter, Mamakwa, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. It's accordingly carried.

Can I request that members please turn on their cameras when we are voting? Thank you.

We have a government amendment, a new section, 15.1, to be added to the schedule 6 to the bill. Any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 15.1 be added to schedule 6 of the bill:

“15.1(1) The act is amended by adding the following section:

““Permission for development, zoning order

“28.0.1(1) This section applies to any application submitted to an authority under a regulation made under subsection 28(1) for permission to carry out all or part of a development project in the authority’s area of jurisdiction if,

“(a) a zoning order has been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing under section 47 of the Planning Act authorizing the development project under that act;

“(b) the lands in the authority’s area of jurisdiction on which the development project is to be carried out are not located in the greenbelt area designated under section 2 of the Greenbelt Act, 2005; and

“(c) such other requirements as may be prescribed are satisfied.

“Definition

“(2) In this section,

““development project” means a development project that includes any development as defined in subsection 28(25) or any other act or activity that would be prohibited under this act and the regulations unless permission to carry out the activity is granted by the affected authority.

“Permission to be granted

“(3) Subject to the regulations made under subsection (35) of an authority that receives an application” from ““permission to carry out all or part of a development project in the authority’s area of jurisdiction shall grant the permission if all of the requirements in clauses (1)(a), (b) and (c) are satisfied.

“Same

“(4) For greater certainty, an authority shall not refuse to grant permission for a development project under subsection (3) despite,

“(a) anything in section 28 or in a regulation made under section 28; and

“(b) anything in subsection 3(5) of the Planning Act.

“Conditions prescribed by regulations

“(5) A permission granted under this section is subject to such conditions as may be prescribed.

“Conditions specified by authority

“(6) Subject to subsection (7), an authority may attach conditions to the permission, including conditions to mitigate,

“(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic” breaches “or pollution or the conservation of land”—let me repeat that.

“(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic” breaches—sorry. Let me try one more time.

“(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land;

“(b) any conditions or circumstances created by the development project that, in the event of a natural hazard, might jeopardize the health or safety of persons or result in the damage or destruction of property; or

“(c) any other matters that may be prescribed by regulation.

“Hearing

“(7) An authority shall not attach conditions to a permission unless the applicant for the permission has been given an opportunity to be heard by the authority.

“Reasons for conditions

“(8) If, after holding a hearing, an authority grants the permission subject to conditions, the authority shall give the holder of the permission written reasons for deciding to attach the conditions.

“Request for minister’s review

“(9) The holder of a permission who objects to the conditions proposed in the reasons given under subsection (8) may, within 15 days of the reasons being given, submit a request to the minister for the minister to review the proposed conditions, subject to the regulations.

“Minister’s review

“(10) Within 30 days after receiving a request under subsection (9), the minister shall reply to the request and indicate in writing to the holder of the permission and the authority whether or not the minister intends to conduct a review of the authority’s decision. Failure on the part of the minister to reply to a request within the 30-day period is deemed to be an indication that the minister does not intend to review the authority’s decision.

“Same

“(11) If a reply given under subsection (10) indicates that the minister intends to conduct a review, the minister may in the reply require the holder of the permission and the authority to provide the minister with such information as the minister considers necessary to conduct the review.

“Information

“(12) The holder of the permission and the authority shall submit to the minister such information as was specified in the reply given under subsection (10) within the time period specified in the reply.

“Publication of notice of review

“(13) The minister shall publish on the Environmental Registry notice of the minister’s intention to review a decision made by an authority and shall do so within 30 days of giving a reply to that effect under subsection (10).

“No hearing required

“(14) The minister is not required to hold a hearing while conducting a review of an authority’s decision.

“Conferring with persons, etc.

“(15) Before making a decision with respect to a review, the minister shall confirm with any person or body that the minister considers may have an interest in the review.

“Minister’s decision

“(16) After conducting a review of an authority’s decision, the minister may confirm or vary the conditions that the authority proposes to attach to a permission granted under this section, including removing conditions or requiring that such additional conditions be attached to the permission as the minister considers appropriate.

“Same

“(17) In making a decision under subsection (16), the minister shall consider,

“(a) effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land;

“(b) conditions or circumstances created by the development project that, in the event of a natural hazard, might jeopardize the health or safety of persons or result in the damage or destruction of property; or

“(c) any other matters as may be prescribed by the regulations.

“Decision final

“(18) A decision made by the minister under subsection (16) is final.

“Appeal

“(19) The holder of a permission who objects to the conditions proposed by an authority in the reasons given under subsection (8) may, within 90 days of the reasons being issued, appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal to review the conditions if,

1110

“(a) the holder of the permission has not submitted a request to the minister to review the conditions under subsection (9); or

“(b) the holder of the permission has submitted a request to the minister to review the conditions under subsection (9) and,

“(i) 30 days have elapsed following the day the holder of the permission submitted the request and the minister did not make a reply in accordance with subsection (10), or

“(ii) the minister made a reply in accordance with subsection (10) indicating that the minister refused to conduct the review.

“Same

“(20) If the minister indicates in a reply given under subsection (10) that the minister intends to review an authority’s decision and the minister fails to make a decision within 90 days of giving the reply, the holder of the permission may, within the next 30 days, appeal the conditions proposed by the authority directly to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

“Notice of appeal

“(21) Notice of an appeal under subsection (19) or (20) shall be sent to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and to the authority by registered mail.

“Hearing by tribunal

“(22) The Local Planning Appeal Tribunal shall fix a date for a hearing of an appeal under subsection (19) or (20), give notice to all interested parties and give all necessary direction for the hearing.

“Powers of the tribunal

“(23) The Local Planning Appeal Tribunal has authority to hear evidence and to confirm, vary, remove or add to the conditions attached to the permission as the tribunal considers appropriate.

“Agreement

“(24) An authority that grants permission for a development project under this section shall enter into an agreement with respect to the development project with the holder of the permission and the authority and holder of the permission may agree to add a municipality or such other person or entity as they consider appropriate as parties to the agreement.

“Content of agreement

“(25) An agreement under subsection (24) shall set out actions or requirements that the holder of the permission must complete or satisfy in order to compensate for ecological impacts and any other impacts that may result from the development project.

“Limitation on development

“(26) No person shall begin a development project until an agreement required under subsection (24) has been entered into.

“Period of validity of permission and extension

“(27) A permission granted by an authority under this section may be granted for a period of time determined in accordance with the rules that apply to permissions granted by authority under a regulation made under subsection 28(1) and may be extended in accordance with the rules for extending permission set out in those same regulations.

“Offence

“(28) A person is guilty of an offence if the person contravenes,

“(a) a condition of a permission granted under this section; or

“(b) subsection (26).

“Penalty

“(29) A person who commits an offence under subsection (28) is liable on conviction,

“(a) in the case of an individual,

“(i) to a fine of not more than \$50,000 or to a term of imprisonment of not more than three months, or to both, and

“(ii) to an additional fine of not more than \$10,000 for each day or part of a day on which the offence occurs or continues; and

“(b) in the case of a corporation,

“(i) to a fine of not more than \$1,000,000, and

“(ii) to an additional fine of not more than \$200,000 for each day or part of a day on which the offence occurs or continues.

“Monetary benefit

“(30) Despite the maximum fines set out in clauses (29)(a) and (b), a court that convicts a person of an offence under subsection (28) may increase the fine it imposes on the person by” the “amount equal to the amount of the monetary benefit that was acquired by the person, or that accrued to the person, as a result of the commission of the offence.

“Rehabilitation orders

“(31) In addition to any penalty under subsection (29) or any other remedy or penalty provided by law, the court, upon convicting a person of an offence under subsection (28), may order the convicted person to,

“(a) remove, at the convicted person’s expense, any development within such reasonable time as the court orders; and

“(b) take such actions as the court directs, within the time the court may specify, to repair or rehabilitate the damage that results from or is in any way connected to the commission of the offence.

“Non-compliance with order

“(32) If a person does not comply with an order under subsection (31), the authority that issued the permission under this section may arrange for any removal, repair or rehabilitation that was required in the order.

“Liability for certain costs

“(33) The person to whom an order is made under subsection (31) is liable for the cost of any removal, repair or rehabilitation arranged by an authority under subsection (32), and the amount is recoverable by the authority by action in court of competent jurisdiction.

“Conflict

“(34) If the conditions in a permission granted under this section conflict with the terms of a zoning order made under section 47 of the Planning Act, the terms of the zoning order shall prevail.

“Regulations, minister

“(35) The minister may make regulations,

“(a) prescribing requirements for the purposes of clause (1)(c);

“(b) governing permissions granted under this section including,

“(i) requiring that the permission be granted within a specified time period after the application is submitted to the authority,

“(ii) prescribing conditions for the purposes of subsection (5), and

“(iii) prescribing matters for the purposes of clause (6)(c);

“(c) prescribing matters for the purposes of clause (17)(c);

“(d) governing agreements required under subsection (24) including,

“(i) prescribing the content of the agreements, and

“(ii) specifying the time within which agreements are to be conducted and signed;

“(e) exempting lands or development projects from this section or from a part of this section or the regulations made under this section, including from the requirement to enter into an agreement under subsection (24) or from including any provision of an agreement that is prescribed by a regulation under clause (d);

“(f) respecting anything that is necessary or advisable for the effective implementation or enforcement of this section.

“Regulations, Lieutenant Governor in Council

“(36) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations governing minister’s reviews requested under subsection (9) and appeals under subsections (19) and (20) and specifying circumstances in which a review may not be requested or an appeal may not be made.

“General or particular

“(37) A regulation made under subsection (35) or (36) may be general or particular in its application.

“Transition

“(38) This section applies to an application for permission to carry out a development project that was submitted to an authority before the day this section came into force if the conditions described in clauses (1)(a), (b) and (c) have been satisfied as of that day.’

“(2) Section 28.0.1 of the act, as enacted by subsection (1), is repealed.”

1120

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you so much, MPP Smith. We have some clarifications to ask. Can you go to page 2 of 8, where it says (3), “Permission to be granted”? Can you read the first line again, please?

Mr. Dave Smith: ““(3) Subject to the regulations made under subsection (35), an authority that receives an application for permission to carry out all or part of a””—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That’s good. Thank you. (6)(a)?

Mr. Dave Smith: ““(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion””—

Interruption.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, can you mute yourself, please?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Me?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, please.

Mr. Dave Smith: ““(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land;””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Page 3, number 15, the first line.

Mr. Dave Smith: ““(15) Before making a decision with respect to a review, the minister may confer with—””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That’s good. Thank you. Page 6, number 30, the third line.

Mr. Dave Smith: ““the person by an amount equal to the amount of the monetary benefit that was acquired—””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Page 7, number 33, the last two lines: “and the amount is recoverable.”

Mr. Dave Smith: Number 33?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The last two lines.

Mr. Dave Smith: ““and the amount is recoverable by the authority by action in a court of competent jurisdiction.””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, and (d)(ii), on the same page.

Mr. Dave Smith: ““(ii) specifying the time within which agreements are to be concluded and signed;””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you so much. An amendment has been moved by MPP Smith. Any debate? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, I just want to confirm: The time that I have for my remarks is 20 minutes?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. Maximum 20 minutes.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. I feel that this moment is really important for—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, you have something to say?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Yes. With all due respect to Mitzie Hunter, I would like to rule this entire amendment out of order.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is it a point of order, and on what grounds, MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Yes. This entire amendment, that I will note took over 20 minutes just to read, is out of order because, to begin with, it creates an entirely new section that introduces a major new theme which was not addressed in the bill. For all of the people that came before the committee—the conservation authorities, all the big city mayors, AMO, the Ontario farmers' association; it goes on and on and on—they did not have an opportunity to weigh in on this entirely new section. When we tabled an amendment to Bill 184—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, sorry to interrupt. It is allowed to create a new section.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Okay. Thank you, Chair. So that's the ruling of the Clerk?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The ruling of the Chair.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: When there was a ruling on Bill 184 to prohibit COVID-related evictions, it was deemed out of order because it created a new section. Can I get some clarity on why that was the case?

Mr. Dave Smith: Chair, I can answer that one really quickly. If you try to open—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I can't speak to Bill 184, MPP Shaw, because I was not there. I can't speak to the specific bill. MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: If you try to open up a section of a bill that is not—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Excuse me, Chair. I have the floor. If you want to acknowledge MPP Smith, that's fine, but currently I have the floor. Do I not, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, you do, but you were not speaking, so MPP Smith raised a hand. So, yes, go ahead, please.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Chair, that's not correct. I'm waiting for an explanation on why the amendment that we tabled on Bill 184 was deemed out of order specifically because it created a new section.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Just give me a moment, please.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you for waiting. MPP Shaw, if you have any concerns regarding

Bill 184, you can ask the Clerk of that committee. Social Policy is the committee.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: So that I understand, the ruling now of the Chair is that we are allowed to add a new section to a bill? Just for further clarity.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): As a clarification, if an amendment opens a section in the parent act that is not opened by the bill, it is out of order. However, creating a new section is allowed. If you have concerns—so creating a new section is allowed.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: First of all, I believe MPP Arthur is waiting to be allowed into the call.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): He has been allowed.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you, Chair. The other thing about this amendment, which I would suggest also—let's just be clear that this amendment is longer than bills this government has presented, like Bill 222 and Bill 218. This one amendment is longer than the entirety of bills that this government has put forward. And what it does, I would say, is that it is increasing the powers of ministerial zoning orders, which we're clear, which is their ability to make a bad deal worse, but that's the power that's authorized under—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith has a point of order, sorry.

Mr. Dave Smith: Thanks, Chair. You've already ruled on this.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Sorry?

Mr. Dave Smith: You've already ruled that this amendment is not out of order. There shouldn't be any more discussion.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We can still debate it, MPP Smith. However, I have ruled on the admissibility of this amendment. My ruling cannot be debated, but we can debate the amendment. MPP Shaw?

1130

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Well, I appreciate that, Chair, but I still wanted to say that my objection that this is out of order is because these amendments increase the power of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and that is not the subject of schedule 6. It's a different minister. In addition, this increases the power of ministerial zoning orders, which is—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Piccini has a point of order. MPP Piccini, you have a point of order?

Mr. David Piccini: Thank you, Chair. I understand debating a specific schedule, but again, the honourable member is going back to the merit of your ruling, Chair, and I think you have already ruled on that. So if we might continue.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw? If MPP Shaw is providing further details, we will let her do that.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Really, Chair, I do appreciate MPPs Piccini and Smith doing your job for you, but I was being quietly polite about this because it's difficult over Zoom. I had a couple of other concerns regarding whether or not

this bill was in order, and I didn't dump them all at once because I wanted to do this carefully.

So my other objections that my ability to debate this is—really, let's be clear that amendment 6 and amendment 7 increase the power of ministerial zoning orders. That's a power that is authorized under section 47 of the Planning Act, and that's a section that has not been opened by schedule 6. So I don't understand how they can amend that.

The second point that I have: These two amendments increase the power of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is not the minister that is the subject of schedule 6. So the government should be amending section 47 directly, not indirectly with this amendment, which is about the Conservation Authorities Act.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, reference to the Planning Act does not amend it. It does refer to it, though.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Right, but it's not amending the planning—it is amending the Planning Act, is it not?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, it does not amend.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: It's amending the powers under the act. Pardon me, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, it refers to the Planning Act. It does not amend it.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: But does it not, Chair, amend section 47, which is not part of the—which would not be open? Is it, indirectly, section 47 of a different bill? Because I would suggest, Chair, that when we tabled an amendment to Bill 159 to allow the Ontario Ombudsman oversight over delegated authorities, this also was deemed out of order because it indirectly tried to amend the Ontario Ombudsman order, and these amendments, 6 and 7, are doing exactly that. They're indirectly amending this. It's an indirect amendment, and they should have opened up the appropriate sections.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw, the zoning order has been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing under section 47 of the Planning Act. It authorizes the development for a project under this act, so it refers to it, but does not amend it.

MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair, for acknowledging me. I want to just really support MPP Shaw's concern that this amendment is out of order for the reasons that she has stated. I do recall, as part of this committee, when we were reviewing 215, I was not allowed to put forward an addition that referred to—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I apologize. MPP Cho has a point of order.

Mr. Stan Cho: Point of order, Chair. This is the third time that your ruling has been challenged, I'd like to point out for the record. I believe that your ruling was very clear.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): If you want, we can have legislative counsel speak to the amendment.

Ms. Sibylle Filion: Hi. Sibylle Filion, for legislative counsel.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. Go ahead, please.

Ms. Sibylle Filion: The purpose of this amendment is to speak to the powers of conservation authorities to issue permits when a zoning order has been issued under section 47 of the Planning Act. It relates to the powers of the conservation authorities in specific circumstances, the circumstances being the existence of a zoning order under the Planning Act.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That means it only refers to it; it does not amend it. I rule this motion in order. We can debate the motion, but not my ruling.

Any debate? MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes, I would like to debate this amendment that has been put forward—this late-night amendment—by the government members. It really calls into question and echoes attacks in the past that the government has tried to sneak into omnibus bills, which allow development over the greenbelt.

This is a substantive amendment and a substantive change that the government is putting forward with no consultation whatsoever. As members of the committee, we hardly had an opportunity to review it, let alone consult with any impacted stakeholders. And it's a threat: What I read in this amendment is a threat to the greenbelt and to environmentally sensitive and protected areas.

Why should Ontarians trust this government, under Premier Ford, with the greenbelt? We know that in private meetings, he has committed to opening up the greenbelt to development. Two times he has tried to make good on that by slipping into omnibus legislation the opportunity for the development on the greenbelt, and that includes in Bill 66.

Now, in—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Piccini, you have a point of order?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I apologize to MPP Hunter. MPP Piccini, it looks like you have a point of order?

Mr. David Piccini: Thank you, Chair. I would just remind everyone not to impugn motive.

I also wanted to remind the members opposite that the NDP and the government did work into the evening, as many Ontarians do, to get amendments in—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there a point of order, MPP Piccini?

Mr. David Piccini: —and that the Liberals did not, so the independent—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That's not a valid point of order. However, I will remind the members again to refrain from impugning motive.

Please, MPP Hunter. You may continue.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. Now, in a late-night amendment, Ontarians are once again being subjected to the threat of development in their greenbelt. This government is attempting to unilaterally authorize development and paving over of Ontario's protected wetlands and natural environments. This is unacceptable.

I vehemently oppose the inclusion of this amendment in the bill. As I've already stated, I oppose schedule 6, standing on the input of stakeholders and others who are fearful of the impact of schedule 6, the undermining of conservation authorities.

1140

I just want to read, in fact, a news release that came out this morning from Environmental Defence and Ontario Nature. They were carefully observing proceedings. They made very well-researched presentations to this committee, giving us fair warning about the risks of undoing the work of conservation authorities. The headline of this news release is, "Another Twist of the Knife for Conservation Authorities from the Ontario Government."

"Ontario government's proposed amendments to Bill 229, schedule 6 are a shocking escalation of attacks on public safety, natural values and safe drinking water." That is not a headline that any government should want to bear responsibility for.

"These new, and never previously discussed, amendments expressly force conservation authorities to issue permits for development, even if it will cause flooding or erosion and jeopardize human health and safety, if the government issues a minister's zoning order (MZO). They also force conservation authorities to accept and implement 'pay to slay' agreements with developers to allow natural values to be wiped off the landscape for a fee."

I noticed that fee in this amendment, and I just sort of thought, "What is the price of our natural environment? What is the price of clean water? What is the price of living free of flood zones? What is the price?" I've got to tell you, government members, the price is our very lives.

If you think back to Hurricane Hazel and all those lives that were lost, that is what has driven and spurred the work of conservation authorities: It's to save lives. It is to protect people, property and lives, yet here you are with a bill that actually authorizes, for a price, building on wetlands, building on environmentally sensitive areas—and not with the science and the independent work and diligent work of conservation authorities and the people who participate in them, but rather for a fee that's paid, a decision made far away from the local environment in a minister's office. It's a sad state that we are in, when the government is doubling down on, I guess it could be, deals that have been made to access those lands.

I want to continue with the news release from this environmental group—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I apologize to the member. It looks like MPP Piccini has a point of order.

Mr. David Piccini: Thank you, Chair. Again, I totally appreciate the member's right to express her opinion, but the member is again imputing motive of the government. So I just ask that she stick to the substantive bill at hand.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. I will once again request the member refrain from imputing motive, please. You may continue.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. And I quote: "This proposal appears to be aimed specifically at retroactively forcing the Toronto and Region

Conservation Authority to issue a permit for the destruction of 50% of the provincially significant Lower Duffins Creek coastal wetland complex against the authority's stated opposition. The MZO issued for this development is being challenged in court by Ecojustice on behalf of Ontario Nature and Environmental Defence.

"The provincial government is circumventing the planning process and shutting down public consultation and now they are ending the ability of any 'nuisance' bodies like conservation authorities to apply laws that protect wetlands, flood plains and source water protection areas." This is a quote from Caroline Schultz of Ontario Nature.

Members of this committee, our responsibility as representatives is not for the narrow interests, but should be broadly for the interests of all Ontarians, now and in the future.

I recall one of the deputants saying that—she gave the example of Jane Street and all the flooding that happens there all the time. I remember that, because I remember the big sinkhole that shut down that part of the city for quite some time, until it was, I'm sure, repaired by our engineers and by others. But I am also sure that there were some scientists there who talked about the risk in that area for natural flooding.

It's a great cost to our society to move forward with these knowingly—not mistakes of the past, when perhaps we didn't have the science and the knowledge, but knowingly. As part of legislation, you are burying it, imposing it, today, in 2020, in full knowledge of the risks, of the hazards, of the dangers of building over and paving over these watershed areas, and doing it for a price. You've put a price on it. You've set a price. But does that price really compensate for the potential loss of life? Does it compensate for the potential and ongoing need to protect property if nature does not co-operate? Have you even addressed or answered those questions?

I do want to also, for the record, read the concerns that the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has put forward, because I've worked with the TRCA for the last seven and a half years very closely in my riding and in my community of Scarborough–Guildwood, because it's a high-risk area. I know that the community is built on wetlands. I see it. I've actually canvassed in areas with homes built above waterways, and I've seen the path, because the river still travels.

If we were to pause and speak to our very wise and knowing council from Indigenous members of the community, I believe that they could tell us all of this history with the land. An omission of the government is not consulting the stakeholders, not consulting with anyone. But the egregious omission is not consulting with Indigenous peoples before making these types of sweeping changes, knowing that it is a requirement under the laws of this country that this consultation happens. Why does that not apply to the government of Ontario under Premier Ford? Why have we not consulted with Indigenous people about these changes that are being jammed down our throats unilaterally by the government? The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority—and this is—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I apologize to the member. MPP Piccini has a point of order.

1150

Mr. David Piccini: Point of order, Chair. That's factually incorrect. We had robust consultations at the Keeler Centre on February 7, a matter of public record, and the member can find that online.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): This is not a valid point of order, MPP Piccini. Disagreement on the facts is not a point of order.

MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I want to read what the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority said about schedule 6. They said that “there are substantial concerns regarding proposed amendments to conservation authorities’ roles in permitting, planning and enforcement ... This will impact” the “TRCA’s ability to independently represent its interests in respect of: advice provided to municipalities on natural heritage matters; advice provided to municipalities on natural hazard matters; advice provided to municipalities to ensure coordination with TRCA’s regulatory permitting requirements; and TRCA’s comments and concerns in its capacity as a landowner of public lands including sensitive landforms, conservation areas, and flood infrastructure ... Without these powers and the same powers as provincial officers, TRCA is unable to effectively stop significant threats and impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and hazardous lands (e.g., flood plains), such as illegal large-scale fill operations.” And this was their initial concern.

But the government, with this amendment, is continuing on its warpath of weakening environmental protections, opening the door wide to paving over of the greenbelt and, really, selling Ontarians for a price. I think it's disgraceful, and I'm not the only one. I am not the only one.

I want to continue with the quote from the Environmental Defence—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I apologize to the member once again. MPP Piccini, you have a point of order?

Mr. David Piccini: Once again, for the third time, Chair, the member is impugning motive. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I'll once again remind the members to not impugn motive, please.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. Here we have, from Environmental Defence and Ontario Nature: “After hearing articulate and sustained opposition from tens of thousands of Ontarians”—and I just want to pause there in my quoting of this information, because I have heard from thousands of people in my constituency office about their concerns for this issue. I don't know why the government is not listening, because people care about the work that conservation authorities are doing.

In my riding, which is a high-risk area—the Scarborough Bluffs: We've seen so much testimony about that, that the bluffs are gradually and slowly falling into the lake and taking property with them. Well, it's the work of the TRCA that shores up the shoreline in ways to reduce that

type of erosion. Nature is having its effect, but there are things that we can and should be doing, and it's only the sustained management and regulation of those areas that are seeking to protect people and property, and also the natural beauty and environment for future generations.

I talked about Highland Creek, a very fast-moving waterway. There's a lot that happens upstream of my riding that affects the movement of that water, but TRCA and all the extraordinary work that they're doing to reinforce those banks—can you imagine that their work is actually to move rock to shore up the riverbanks against the erosion of a fast-moving creek because of the effects of storm water runoff, of building decisions that we've made?

We heard about the importance of wetlands soaking up so much stormwater and keeping us all safe from flooding, yet the expressed purpose of this amendment is to do away with that. It is to take away the ability of conservation authorities like the TRCA, like the Grand River Conservation Authority and all the ones that presented to us. It's to take away their ability to make decisions about development on those same lands. Why would the government do this?

Just continuing with the words here: “After hearing articulate and sustained opposition from tens of thousands of Ontarians, all 36 conservation authorities, farmers and almost every municipality in the province, this government has decided to double down and legislate a requirement for conservation authorities to put the public at risk and destroy our future to make a few developers rich.” This is Tim Gray of Environmental Defence.

This is a disgrace, and I don't know how—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. I apologize to the member once again. MPP Piccini has a point of order.

Mr. David Piccini: Point of order, Chair: Again, the member is impugning motive. I was curious if you or the Clerk could clarify how many times a member is able to impugn motive in one speech. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. I'm reminding the members again and again to please refrain from impugning motive. I'll once again remind that—

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: So Chair—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Just be mindful of the wording, please. Thank you.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. Environmental Defence and Ontario Nature want this committee to know—and remember, public hearings are over. We are now in clause-by-clause. This substantive amendment that took over 20 minutes for the government member to read into the record, that was given overnight for our review, sneaking it in at the last minute to substantially allow development on wetlands, on environmentally sensitive areas—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thirty seconds left.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I want to be on record that I join with Environmental Defence and Ontario Nature to reiterate that schedule 6 must be withdrawn in its entirety

and not be put forward as part of Bill 229 in any way for approval.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, MPP Hunter. Any further debate?

According to standing order 109, unless expressly provided by the standing orders or by unanimous consent, no member shall speak for more than 20 minutes at a time in a standing or select committee. There's no limit on the number of times a member may speak unless otherwise agreed to by the committee. Thank you for your attention.

MPP Hunter's 20 minutes are over, and MPP Shaw, you have—please go ahead. We have one minute before we go to recess.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Yes, and so I will have the floor when we resume, if I begin my deputation now? is that correct?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Okay. Thank you, Chair. There's so much to say, but I would just like to begin by saying this amendment that we're discussing—it took MPP Smith almost 20 minutes to read this. It did arrive overnight and, as MPP Piccini said, people needed to work through the night on this. So my question is, is this how legislation should be made in the province of Ontario, slipped into a bill, amendments passed at the last minute without the appropriate time given to all stakeholders and members of this Legislature to opine?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. I apologize to cut off the member. We have to go to recess now. It's 12 noon. The committee stands in recess until 1 p.m.

The committee recessed from 1200 to 1300.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Good afternoon, and welcome back. Before we recessed, we were on government amendment number 6, and MPP Shaw had the floor. MPP Shaw, do you want to resume?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Yes, I will resume. I would like to say that, really, one of the biggest disappointments of this bill is that it is supposed to address COVID recovery, but the vast majority of it is an attack on the environment and environmental protections. The government's record on the environment is well established. They cancelled the cap-and-trade. It cost \$30 million to take this to court. Bill 66 attempted to open up the greenbelt for development. They had those stickers that were ruled unconstitutional. They pulled down windmills and charging stations. So it's not an environmentally friendly government. We know that. The Auditor General's recent report said that this is a government that will miss their own emission targets and that they failed to be compliant with the Environmental Bill of Rights. So that's the environment in which we see schedule 6 of this bill, Chair.

I know that Ontarians would never have expected, in 2020, a government that would relentlessly drag us backwards on environmental protections. Ontarians overwhelmingly are opposed to paving over the greenbelt. It's just been abundantly clear. And they're overwhelmingly in favour of environmental protections. They care about their environment, they care about green space, they care

about their protected wetlands. So it's shocking that this is what this government has chosen to do, rather than spend their \$9.3 billion of funds that they're sitting on, when in fact they turned their attention to pulling back environmental protections.

We heard from so many people across the province in our three days of testimony. People talked about good planning, they talked about the work that has been done, they talked about integrated watershed management. They made sense, and they came to say, "What this government is doing is so, so wrong-headed."

We heard from the city of Brampton, for heaven's sake. The city of Brampton is right now in the middle of an absolute health crisis and an economic crisis. Businesses in Brampton are folding up by the minute. They have outbreaks in schools and the one hospital that they have is overwhelmed. But they came to this committee to say that this schedule undermines all of the good planning that they've done. This is a city that has an official plan. They have clear zoning, clear land use planning. But at the same time, they also recognize that we're seeing ministerial zoning orders that would override all of this good planning, all of these good decisions. The city of Brampton also acknowledged that we need to address this from an integrated watershed planning approach.

We heard from the Federation of Ontario Cottagers' Associations. As we all recall, Premier Ford was in a tank, it seems to me, when cottage country was underwater last year and flooding. They had to say to us, "If not CAs, then who?" Well, this bill tells you who. The minister and insiders or people who have his ear are who are going to do this. Cottagers not only talked about wanting to protect the environment and protect wetlands and sensitive areas, but they also brought up the issue of the cost of poor environmental planning and flood mitigation; hence being underwater in areas around Barrie.

This lack of planning costs money in terms of shore erosion, infrastructure degradation, and all of this gets downloaded to the municipalities. And who pays the bill? It's taxpayers. It's taxpayers who pay the property taxes, who have to suffer these short-sighted decisions of this government that's hell-bent on development at all costs, hell-bent on not listening to all of the people of Ontario. It's absolutely [*inaudible*] that this government would not listen to their constituents and would not listen to the experts in the province.

We had a deputation from the Canadian Environmental Law Association. They have 50 years of expertise dedicated to environmental protection, and this government just chooses to not listen, to turn away. I don't know why. Without imputing motive—there has to be a motive, but it's not been made clear by this government. But the Canadian Environmental Law Association certainly feels, and they have written such, that this is really all about an attempt to open up sensitive lands that are under protection for development. You have no greater proof of that than what's happening in the town of Ajax. That's Minister Phillips's own riding. A ministerial zoning order in that city is opening up sensitive wetlands, to build what?

Affordable housing, because we're in the middle of an affordable housing crisis? No: to build a warehouse.

The testimony to me that was the most compelling or telling, I suppose, was from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. We know that farmers—conservation authorities have had about 60, 70 years of flood plain management and understanding of how our ecosystems work and how our watercourses work, but farmers have generations and generations of experience understanding how that works. They've lived on the farm and they know how it works.

They wrote to us and they also deputed. I'll read from their written deputation, which says, "Ontario's conservation authorities provide a watershed level planning perspective that transcends municipal borders, one that the" OFA "supports and one that deserves support, not only from the province but also from municipalities."

The Ontario Federation of Agriculture [*inaudible*] the MPPs who are proud of representing agricultural areas, agricultural—absolutely, you should be proud of that, because farms feed us all. But you should also protect those lands because agriculture is not an infinite resource. We're losing agricultural land and it needs to be protected. In Ontario, we can't continue to sustain a loss of agricultural land and our ability to produce food if we are not going to protect these lands. That's what the farmers are asking you for. It was so clear that the newly elected president of the OFA said directly to you that this bill that is before the House threatens farms and threatens farm production. Food security: I don't understand why the government would not be in the mood to listen to that.

In the city of Hamilton, we've done a lot of work here with our conservation authority. Hamilton has had some significant flooding. We had a once-in-a-hundred-years storm—which are happening all the time now, not once every 100 years. It almost put the lower city of Hamilton under water. From that, the conservation authority and great organizations like Environment Hamilton and the city of Hamilton have looked for ways to develop good, green infrastructure. No better example of that is what's been happening at Saltfleet marsh.

Hamilton is an escarpment, and at the top of the escarpment they're building a naturalized marsh, so that that will be a natural absorber of flood waters that are coming down from the headwaters in Ontario that flow over the escarpment to the lower city. Not only are they making environmental use of this land, they're protecting businesses, they're protecting residents and they're protecting infrastructure. Not only is it an environmental protection, it's a good protection for businesses. It makes good economic sense.

With this bill, I've heard from thousands and thousands of residents. They are opposed to this. Unfortunately, a local MPP, MPP Skelly, who represents Flamborough-Glanbrook, called this opposition just a lot of noise from special interest groups. Chair, that's not so. These are not special interest groups. These are people who genuinely love and care about our natural areas.

Recently, the city of Hamilton, as did many municipalities, AMO and all kinds of elected officials, has spoken

out. It gave unanimous support to a motion calling on the province to withdraw the conservation authorities changes in Bill 229. Some of the commentary during that was telling, and I think it speaks to the bafflement that we have across Ontario as to why the government would do this.

Councillor John-Paul Danko called the province's motivations "really mystifying," but still offered his best guess. He said, "In my opinion, what we're seeing from this provincial government is just actions that are putting profits by the development industry ahead of the people and property of Ontario residents."

Our mayor, Mayor Fred Eisenberger, said the province's attempt to expedite development is "filled with error and filled with hazard" for flood plains and water courses. "And it just makes absolutely no sense," which I agree with.

1310

And finally, Councillor Clark, who was a minister in Harris's government, said, "If the province doesn't change course and acknowledge its 'misstep,' it's destined to become a 'political albatross that you will not be able to shake.'" And honestly, I could not agree more.

What more does it take for this government, for the individual MPPs, to understand that this is something that is so objectionable to all walks of life, all people in this province, that, in fact, you will be hearing about this for years to come? And the consequences of these decisions will always, always roll back to this decision. When people's basements are flooded, this will be the reason that they will say that this has happened. When bridges are washed out in farm and agricultural land, this will be the reason. When there is more agricultural land that is lost to flooding, this will be the reason: that you did not protect at all these properties.

So Mr. Speaker, I guess it's on brand for this government, right? This is a government that does two things: It doesn't listen to stakeholders, doesn't listen to the opposition or independents and it doesn't take our climate crisis or protecting the environment seriously. It's clear from the Auditor General's report that you're failing on the environment in every way possible. Thank goodness for independent reports. The Auditor General has so many recommendations for this government that clearly they're not going to listen to, because they don't listen to the people of Ontario. But she said, "Biodiversity loss has been ranked as a top-five risk—by likelihood and impact—to economies over the next decade because of the economic value of the services that the natural environment provides."

She went on to say, "Ontario needs an effective protected area network to ensure the positive economic impacts attributed to protected areas continue."

We're talking about the economy in addition to the environment. Mr. Speaker, I said it before; I don't know why this government can't seem to understand how they can walk and chew. You can support the environment and you can move forward economic development. One doesn't have to be at the expense of the other. But yet again, this seems to be a government that is completely

single-minded in their pursuit of development and profits at the expense of things that people in this province care about. But this government does not seem to share the values of the vast majority of the people of the province of Ontario.

It's possible that you could say perhaps there are MPPs on the government side that have been there for a while and aren't too into what people care about. It's particularly younger generations that will inherit this mess from this government. You can appreciate that. But there are so many new MPPs, young MPPs of a generation that should understand that we don't have time to not only not have good environmental protections but to unravel the ones that we already have.

It is absolutely atrocious that we're even having this debate. It's atrocious that we even have to convince the government that the environment matters. How long in the House was it before the government would actually acknowledge the words "climate change"? I remember a time when they wouldn't even utter the words. So it's absolutely a betrayal of what the people of Ontario care about. It's absolutely a betrayal of all of the people who have come before this committee to share their honest, heartfelt concerns about what you're doing and to share their expertise and their wisdom and their collective knowledge. But apparently, this government [*inaudible*] think they have all the answers and they feel [*inaudible*] that not only do they not listen to these people, they decide rather to double down. And somehow—congratulations, government. You were able to make a terrible bill even worse. Who knew you could do that? But how did you do that? You did that by putting through an amendment, sneaking it in in the middle of the night: an amendment that is longer than half of the bills you put before the House in the last little while.

It shouldn't be that this entire bill that is supposed to be about economic recovery, a bill that people have been waiting for—I mean, businesses are closing. Five convenience stores a week are closing in the province. We just heard a report and I forget the numbers, but I think it's about 15,000 businesses that have closed in the province. I would be happy to have my record corrected on that, but whatever the number is, it's absolutely unacceptable.

Businesses in my riding have been doing everything they can to stay open. They are responsible. They follow the rules. They do everything they can to keep themselves, their employees and their customers safe and to serve their community, and they have been patiently waiting for help from this government. You would think that this would be a bill where they could say, "Finally, thank you. Relief has come. The government understands the situation that we're in," but no. Instead, this government decides to turn its mind to further diminishing environmental protections in this province and doing it in such a way that nobody gets an appropriate opportunity to weigh in.

We have Bill 213 before the House, which has in it a schedule that gives a sweetheart deal to the Premier's insider friend Charles McVety. They're debating this bill before the House in such a hurry that the Hansard was not

even ready for people to use to quote in the debates. So it's not only the substance of these bills that is objectionable; it's the way in which this government does not respect parliamentary democracy. They don't seem to respect that other MPPs, the opposition and independents, represent constituents as well, who expect that we should have a fair opportunity to weigh in on bills like this that do such destruction to the environment, and also bills like this that are a complete, abject failure in providing any relief for people who are struggling with the complications of COVID-19.

It bears saying that we heard from the Toronto Regional Conservation Authority and Conservation Ontario. We heard from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the Wildlands League, the Ontario Headwaters Institute and the Credit Valley Conservation Authority. We heard from the town of Ajax, where, as I said, a ministerial zoning order—of which we've had 30 since March—is proposing to build a warehouse on a wetland. We heard from the Canadian Environmental Law Association. We heard from the Crowe Valley Conservation Authority and the Grand River Environmental Network. We heard from Environmental Defence and the World Wildlife Fund. We heard from the David Suzuki Foundation. I mean, the list goes on and on.

All I can say is, who is this government listening to? After all of this, who are you taking your direction from? Without imputing motive, I can say who you're not listening to are these people who care about the environment. Mr. Chair, after all of this, I'm really seeing clearly that this government is an anti-environment, pro-development-at-all-costs government.

We, Ontario's official opposition NDP, join the hundreds of thousands of people in this province who are calling for schedule 6 to be withdrawn. The government should take this schedule out of the bill and take the time to get it right because, quite obviously, with all of these amendments and late-night deliberations, this government has not taken the time and has not listened. This is a flawed schedule for all kinds of reasons.

Thank you, Chair. I cede my time.

1320

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, MPP Shaw. Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

All right, we'll move to schedule 6, section 16. Any debate? Seeing none, we also have NDP notice, section 16

of schedule 6. Any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? A recorded vote. Shall schedule 6, section 16, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 16, is accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 17. Any debate? There's a government amendment, section 17 of schedule 6 to the bill. Any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 17 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "section" at the end of the portion before section 28.1.1 of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting "sections"—plural—and by adding the following section to the Conservation Authorities Act:

"Mandatory permits, zoning orders

"28.1.2(1) This section applies to any application submitted to an authority under section 28.1 for a permit to carry out a development project in the authority's area of jurisdiction if,

"(a) a zoning order has been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing under section 47 of the Planning Act authorizing the development project under that act;

"(b) the lands in the authority's area of jurisdiction on which the development project is to be carried out are not located in the greenbelt area designated under section 2 of the Greenbelt Act, 2005; and

"(c) such other requirements as may be prescribed are satisfied.

"Definition

"(2) In this section,

"'development project' means a development project that includes any development activity as defined in subsection 28(5) and any other act or activity that, without a permit issued under this section or section 28.1, would be prohibited under section 28.

"Permit to be issued

"(3) Subject to the regulations, an authority that receives an application for a permit to carry out a development project in the authority's area of jurisdiction shall issue the permit if all of the requirements in clauses (1)(a), (b) and (c) are satisfied.

"Same

"(4) For greater certainty, an authority shall not refuse to issue a permit to carry out a development project under subsection (3) despite,

"(a) the prohibitions in subsection 28(1) and the fact that the development project may not meet the criteria for issuing a permit under subsection 28.1(1); and

"(b) anything in subsection 3(5) of the Planning Act.

"Conditions prescribed by regulations

"(5) A permission granted under this section is subject to such conditions as may be prescribed.

"Conditions specified by authority

"(6) Subject to subsection (7), an authority may attach conditions to the permit, including conditions to mitigate,

"(a) any effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land;

"(b) any conditions or circumstances created by the development project that, in the event of a natural hazard, might jeopardize the health or safety of persons or result in the damage or destruction of property; or

"(c) any other matters that may be prescribed by regulation.

"Hearing

"(7) An authority shall not attach conditions to a permit unless the application for the permit has been given an opportunity to be heard by the authority.

"Reasons for conditions

"(8) If, after holding a hearing, an authority issues a permit subject to conditions, the authority shall give the permit holder written reasons for deciding to attach the conditions.

"Request for minister's review

"(9) A permit holder who objects to the conditions proposed in the reasons given under subsection (8) may, within 15 days of the reasons being given, submit a request to the minister for the minister to review the proposed conditions, subject to the regulations.

"Minister's review

"(10) Subsections 28.1(9) to (14) apply with necessary modifications to a minister's review conducted pursuant to a request made under subsection (9).

"Minister's decision

"(11) After conducting a review of an authority's decision, the minister may confirm or vary the conditions that the authority proposes to attach to a permit, including removing conditions or requiring that such additional conditions be attached to the permit as the minister considers appropriate.

"Same

"(12) In making a decision under subsection (11), the minister shall consider,

"(a) effects the development project is likely to have on the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land;

"(b) conditions or circumstances created by the development project that, in the event of a natural hazard, might jeopardize the health or safety of persons or result in the damage or destruction of property; or

"(c) any other matters as may be prescribed by the regulations.

"Decision final

"(13) A decision made by the minister under subsection (11) is final.

"Appeal

“(14) A permit holder who objects to the conditions proposed by an authority in the reasons given under subsection (8) may, within 90 days of the reasons being issued, appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal to review the conditions if,

“(a) the permit holder has not submitted a request under subsection (9) to the minister to review the conditions; or

“(b) the permit holder has submitted a request to the minister to review the conditions under subsection (9) and,

“(i) 30 days have elapsed following the day the permit holder submitted the request and the minister did not make a reply in accordance with subsection 28.1(9), or

“(ii) the minister made a reply in accordance with subsection 28.1(9) indicating that the minister refused to conduct the review.

“Same

“(15) If the minister indicates in a reply given in accordance with subsection 28.1(9) that the minister intends to review an authority’s decision and the minister fails to make a decision within 90 days of giving the reply, the permit holder may, within the next 30 days, appeal the conditions proposed by the authority directly to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

“Same

“(16) Subsections 28.1(24), (25) and (26) apply with necessary modifications to an appeal made under subsection (14) or (15).

1330

“Agreement

“(17) An authority that issues a permit to carry out a development project under this section shall enter into an agreement with respect to the development project with the permit holder and the authority and the permit holder may add a municipality or such other person or entity as they consider appropriate as parties to the agreement.

“Content of agreement

“(18) An agreement under subsection (17) shall set out actions or requirements that the permit holder must complete or satisfy in order to compensate for ecological impacts and any other impacts that may result from the development project.

“Limitation on development

“(19) No person shall begin a development project until an agreement required under subsection (17) has been entered into.

“Conflict

“(20) If the conditions in a permit issued under this section conflict with the terms of a zoning order made under section 47 of the Planning Act, the terms of the zoning order shall prevail.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you, MPP Smith. A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Sorry, we need a clarification on something before we go on a debate. Page two of four, number 7: Can you repeat that, please?

Mr. Dave Smith: “Hearing

“(7) An authority shall not attach conditions to a permit unless the applicant for the permit has been given an opportunity to be heard by the authority.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Chair, I’d like to rule this amendment, just like amendment 6, out of order. This is a major change to this schedule that strengthens the powers of ministerial zoning orders, which is a power that is authorized under section 7 of the Planning Act, a section that is not opened up by schedule 6 in Bill 229. It also expands the power of a different minister than the one referred to in the act, and the amendment also creates a new complicated compensation framework for developments that are approved via MZO.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Again, MPP Shaw, this section refers to the Planning Act, but it does not amend it.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate on the amendment? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I do want to speak to this amendment. As I listened to the government member read this amendment into the record, it’s a sad day in this province that we are not at all interested, or at least the government of the day is not interested, in the very strong concerns and issues that have been brought forward by so many: by the 36 conservation authorities; by almost all municipalities in this province; by so many environmental groups, who study the effects of legislation and its effects on the environment not just now, but into the future. And yet, instead of heeding those warnings, the government is doubling down on this change to the responsibilities of conservation authorities and diminishing their role in the province and the good work that they have been doing to protect habitats and environments and people.

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has given a loud and clear call that schedule 6 needs to be withdrawn. They’ve put out a release that really speaks to this. They say, “Despite unified warnings from municipalities, AMO, Big City Mayors, Conservation Ontario, conservation authorities, environmental not-for-profit organizations and tens of thousands of concerned residents”—many of whom have written to me in my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood—the government is refusing to remove schedule 6 and is putting even more risk through this legislation by having this amendment. It’s bypassing conservation authorities, the science-based decision-making and independence that they have, and it really reinforces the wrong-headedness of this government in issuing permits through minister’s zoning orders and now making that standard practice through this schedule 6. It’s the wrong thing to do, and you’ve heard it over and over and over again.

I want to continue with their release, because TRCA notes, “Conservation authorities use science to fulfill” their “mandate of protecting ... communities and conserving natural resources.” They actually conserve those resources for future generations. “Proposing legislation that intentionally increases risk to Ontario residents, properties and public infrastructure by forcing conservation authorities to issue permits where a minister’s zoning

order in support of development has been issued by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, goes against the Premier's own special flood advisor recommendations regarding our role in land use planning and is a shockingly disturbing and an unprecedented move.” This is by Jennifer Innis, the chair of the TRCA, who came to this committee and spoke so passionately. I know that she even mentioned my own riding and the Scarborough Bluffs and the work that they do there to protect lives and property with the erosion of the bluffs and the ongoing regulation that they do to those environments. They are saying that the government, with schedule 6, is hindering their work. It's hindering their efforts.

They go on to say, “This legislation, if passed, will create a two-tier system which will allow an applicant to bypass our well-established watershed policies and science-based regulations that serve to guide decision-making to protect ... communities and the natural environment.”

And yet here we are on this day, December 4, 2020: The government is bent on pushing forward with amendments and this schedule 6, in direct contravention of all of the known, established science and convention around watershed, natural habitat, resource and environmental management. This is a sad day.

I've been getting some responses from members of my constituency who are just shocked that instead of the government using its time and resources to focus on the urgent needs of the health of Ontarians and managing the COVID-19 crisis—instead of doing that, the Ford government has chosen to bring forward, in this omnibus legislation, sweeping changes to conservation authorities and to their ability to protect all of us. There was no need to do this. It could have been brought forward in its own transparent, stand-alone legislation with this huge series of amendments transparently put forward so that there could be scrutiny, so that there could be input and improvements made. But instead, you snuck it in, in an overnight amendment package that has had no input from members of the environmental community. They are shocked. They are outraged.

1340

The TRCA in their release goes on to say, “Government motions introduced today, if approved, could result in a situation where TRCA's board of directors would be forced to issue a permit in contravention to our mandate of protecting public health safety and conserving natural resources....” Organizations should not be forced to do that, to go against known science and their responsibilities to protect people and property and natural environments.

Certainly the NDP, the official opposition, has spoken. I've certainly spoken as an independent member and a member of the Liberal caucus in this House. We are opposed, our caucus is opposed, to schedule 6. We are completely opposed to it, and we ask you to reconsider, government members, and to withdraw this schedule, rather than charging ahead with these amendments that actually double down on a wrong-headed decision in the first place.

I want to also speak to the concerns raised around the greenbelt. Why should Ontarians trust the Ford government with the responsibilities for the greenbelt when your history is about putting in, sneaking in legislation to build on it, to pave it over, to sell it for a price? And Ontarians don't want that. They've spoken loud and clear, yet this series of amendments that you've put forward today puts that trust absolutely at risk, because Ontarians cannot trust this current government with not encroaching on the greenbelt. You see that by the way that a development bill has been snuck into amendments overnight, and there's already concern about the responsibilities of conservation authorities and their ability to do their work moving forward.

You're headed in the wrong direction. This is not about development. There are places to grow in Ontario and to intensify and to build more growth, but that does not have to happen on our greenbelt, and it does not have to happen in watersheds, natural environments that have been deemed by conservation authorities to be areas that should not be permitted, based on the criteria that they have established to protect environment and to protect people.

The TRCA, just to finish off on their statement, say, “These new amendments introduced by the government on permitting would essentially prevent our organization from fulfilling our core mandate of watershed protection through the sound management of natural hazards and natural resources. We drafted pragmatic amendments and presented these at standing committee and held additional meetings with the province to discuss potential solutions to address these areas of concern.”

They actually say, “While TRCA appreciated some of the changes made on governance and enforcement matters, ultimately, the province has disregarded substantive requests related to planning and permitting and come back with something worse in these areas.” Why would you come back with something even worse than what environmental groups and those whose job it is to know about natural environment management and watershed and resource management—why would you come back with an even worse proposal? You're headed completely in the wrong and the opposite direction.

Listening to the member on the government side read into the record this amendment was chilling. It really was chilling, because it really speaks to a disregard for people. It's certainly a disregard for science, a disregard for the natural environment and it's putting our future at great risk.

As I said, my riding of Scarborough–Guildwood is in a watershed area. Highland Creek runs through it; we've got the Scarborough Bluffs. It's right on Lake Ontario, beautiful Lake Ontario. Without the good work of the TRCA on all of the mitigation efforts that they are doing and the science of what they're doing, we wouldn't have as beautiful a community as we have.

I've been to Highland Creek during the salmon run. I've seen the salmon jump many feet to go back to their spawning grounds. I want that to carry on for many generations to come. I want salmon to swim back through

Highland Creek, year after year, to continue to spawn. That's the kind of Ontario I believe that we should be protecting. I don't want to see a disregard to watershed areas that is just up for development at any price. And the price, Environmental Defence has talked about that, that you've put a price on it and that you're selling Ontarians, really, with this amendment, and it's wrong.

I believe strongly that schedule 6 should be withdrawn and that the government should recognize its error and not double down by putting in these amendments today that go in the wrong direction. You should actually remove the schedule. Go forward, do public consultations, get the input and absolutely find ways of strengthening the work of conservation authorities across their entire mandate.

I thought the agricultural group that came forward wanted a stronger presence, but one that is specified. I thought that was a good balance, but not at the expense of everything else that is in this schedule, with the development amendments that have been put in place that completely disregard the management—and proactive management—of flood protection, of source water protection, of all of the things that are in the realm of protecting our environment, that the conservation authorities are so good at doing.

We're coming to a place where the disagreement and the difference in views is clearly, clearly obvious. It's obvious to me that the government is not at all listening or willing to listen, despite the overwhelming evidence from municipalities, from AMO, from Ontario's Big City Mayors, from tens of thousands of Ontarians who have taken this time to write in, to write the government, to write this committee, to write each and every member, and to say, "Remove schedule 6." Instead of listening to that, the government has come up with a way to make it even worse with these amendments.

At the very least, withdraw the amendments but, really, withdrawing schedule 6 is what I think needs to be done. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? MPP Arthur.

Mr. Ian Arthur: Again, I would like to echo a lot of the sentiments that have been put forward by my colleagues. When you're designing a piece of legislation and you introduce it to the Legislature and it receives the amount of feedback and scrutiny that schedule 6 has, I think that's indicative of the flaws in that piece of legislation.

1350

The entire time we were sitting in committee for the three days of committee earlier this week, Chair, the breadth of people who took the time to get to committee and voice their opposition to this schedule—I think that indicates how off the mark the government was in the drafting of this particular schedule in the budget bill. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario—the municipalities called for its removal. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture levelled heavy critiques of the schedule. All of the environmental groups, from the Canadian Environmental Law Association to Environmental Defence to

Ontario Nature to the cottage owners' associations—it was everyone, Chair, who was against this.

So, if you're the government—and I'm not imputing motive here at all; I'm just walking through it. If you're the government and, hypothetically, you introduced a schedule into a piece of legislation that was so far off the mark, why would you try and fix it rather than going back to the drawing board? You have introduced amendments that, again—if the government was that far off the mark in the first place with the schedule, what kind of faith would there be that the amendments actually address any of the concerns?

Frankly, they don't. They exacerbate them. In the very, very, very short time that stakeholder organizations have been able to have with these amendments, they actually are saying it's making it worse, Chair. The government is doubling down on a bad schedule and going forward with disastrous amendments. They're not going to fix the problems that were brought forward by stakeholders. They're going to actually make them worse.

People across Ontario are panicking about this right now, that these amendments were brought forward with very little time, slim to no time, for anyone to review them, to consider the implications of them, and they have actually gone so far as to expand the minister's power compared to the initial piece of legislation. That's something that flies in the face of the recommendations, Chair, which I know you heard. I know that every other member of the committee who sat through the deputants in the first three days of this week all heard the same thing. Chair, you heard it, we heard it, the government MPPs heard it. The criticisms were universal and they all said the same thing. These amendments do not address those comments. They do not address that feedback. In fact, they use this as a reason to actually expand powers further, as I said.

Again, as a pure hypothetical, not imputing the motive of this government, you have to be struck by the thought that some of these go so far that it might have been known that they were going to be extremely contentious and that introducing them closer to third reading of the bill was actually beneficial, instead of doing this sooner, where there was time to shine the light of the public eye on these amendments.

Legislation like this, with such far-reaching implications—this can affect basically every single resident in Ontario. We're talking about flood plains. We're talking about development decisions that are going to last for generations. These things are incredibly, incredibly important, Chair, and they should have been introduced in a way where the public had time to actually analyze them, where experts had time to actually analyze them. We have scientists who are really, really good at how this is done.

This government's distaste and hatred of conservation authorities is simply too much, Chair. It goes too far—too far. I know I'm not allowed to impute motive during this, but it's shocking that we can have that level of expertise out there that is universally telling us that we're going down a wrong path, and instead of retreating and going back to them and saying, "How could we actually do this

better?” the government has just doubled down and expanded the powers in this schedule again. Then we’re stuck, in one day—in one day—scrambling in this committee to both understand the far-reaching implications of this legislation and to make sure that the voices of stakeholders are on the record once again.

We’ve heard the releases being read into the record from a number of the different organizations that have spoken out. My inbox today has been flooded by organizations that are realizing what the government is actually doing with these amendments and panicking, scrambling to have their voices heard. There are statements from across the board. On the break for lunch, I read the CELA submission that they did—and these are submissions on the actual amendments; they’re not on the original bill, because they’ve had their voices heard once on the original bill, and they’ve realized that they were not listened to, that there was slim to no consideration given to those deputants; that a series of amendments that are, frankly, larger than the original schedule was drafted hastily, basically overnight by the government, introduced with no time for review and for folks to have an opportunity, as I said, to consider the implications of them.

It’s wrong, Speaker. It’s not how the Legislature is meant to operate. It’s not the intent of this committee to function in this way. The committee is meant to be a place where the public can be heard and MPPs have actual debate on the merits of a piece of legislation, but that is not what happens in this assembly. What happens is that the opposition MPPs voice the opinions of stakeholders, try to caution the government on what they are doing, try to ask them to come back, and government MPPs simply go ahead and vote how they’ve been told to vote in the face of all of this. There is no actual debate happening right now. There is no meaningful consideration of the implications of any of these clauses, any of these substitutions and any of these amendments. All there is is the opposition and independent MPPs trying to raise this as a problem and the government MPPs sitting through it and waiting until they put their hand up like they’ve been instructed to do.

It’s a shame that it is happening in this way and it’s a shame that this is part of a budget recovery bill, that we are in the midst of a pandemic and this bullheaded, headlong rush to disaster by the government is what we are being forced to spend our time on. We should be debating the economic recovery of Ontario, but we’re not, because the government wrapped up changes to conservation authorities—which have been on their agenda for a long time. They made it very clear from the minute they were elected that they see conservation authorities as an unnecessary obstacle and piece of red tape for the development that they would like to see pursued in Ontario. They’ve been very clear about that publicly, Chair. So instead of talking about economic recovery, instead of talking about the stimulus that is needed to help small businesses recover, to keep the lights on through this winter so that we can come out on the other side of the pandemic with the small businesses that form the backbone of our economy ready to hit the ground running, we are debating conservation authorities.

This should have been a stand-alone piece of legislation. This should have been brought forward as an amendment to the Conservation Authorities Act. If they had wanted to do this, it should have been toured as an individual bill, because there were countless other people who wanted the opportunity to testify on this, but there was not enough time to get them before committee.

It is totally reprehensible that it was stuck into an actual budget bill—a budget bill, not anything to do with the conservation authorities, not anything to do with the ministerial zoning orders. This is a COVID recovery bill, and the discussion today, as I said, should be on COVID. But it’s not. It’s on these amendments that were brought forward—and I do hope that MPP Hunter, MPP Shaw and myself are able to bring forward the voices of the community and the voices of the stakeholders in opposition to this. It is way too fast. It’s irresponsible. It is not reflective of good governance. I know that the government MPPs understand that. I know that they have been tasked with a job and it will be done and we will see this passed by the end of the day, but just to expressly be on the record, this is incredibly unfortunate and I do not support these amendments. We do not support these amendments. They should have been withdrawn and I would still like to see them withdrawn.

1400

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Please turn your video on when we vote. MPP Shaw, do you have something?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Recorded vote; we are doing that. I just want to remind—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, we are doing a recorded vote on—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: —ensure that we’re doing a recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. We are voting on government amendment 7.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We also have an NDP notice on section 17 of schedule 6. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 6, section 17, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 6, section 18. Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 18 carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 6, section 19. Is there any debate? I see there is a government amendment, number 8. MPP Smith, do you have a motion?

Mr. Dave Smith: I'm going to move a much smaller motion. I move that subsection 19(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "to the owner and to the occupier of the property" at the end of clause 30.2(1)(c) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting "to the owner or occupier of the property".

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We have amendment number 9 now, subsection 19(1) of schedule 6 to the bill. Motion, MPP Smith?

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 19(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out clauses 30.2(1.1)(a) and (b) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting the following:

"(a) the entry is for the purpose of ensuring compliance with subsection 28(1) or 28.1.2(19), a regulation made under section 28.5 or with the conditions of a permit issued under section 28.1, 28.11 or 28.12 or issued under a regulation made under clause 28.5(1)(c);

"(b) the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a contravention of a provision of the act or a regulation referred to in clause (a) or of a condition of a permit

referred to in clause (a) is causing or is likely to cause significant damage and,

"(i) the damage affects or is likely to affect the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land, or

"(ii) in the event of a natural hazard, the damage will or is likely to create conditions or circumstances that might jeopardize the health and safety of persons or result in damage or destruction of property; and"

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith, can you repeat line three of part (a), where it says "permit issued"?

Mr. Dave Smith: "permit issued under section 28.1, 28.1.1 or 28.1.2 or issued under a regulation"—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. A motion has been moved by MPP Smith. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 19, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We're now moving to schedule 6, section 20. I see there is a government amendment. Any motions? Mr. Piccini, do you have a motion?

Mr. David Piccini: Hold on for one second—no, I don't.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No? MPP Smith—

Mr. David Piccini: Yes. Can I go ahead?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, sure. Go ahead, please.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 20 of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"20(1) Subsections 30.4(1) and (2) of the act are repealed and the following substituted:

"Stop order

“(1) An officer appointed under section 30.1 may make an order requiring a person to stop engaging in or not to engage in an activity if the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that,

“(a) the person has engaged in, is engaging in or is about to engage in the activity and, as a result, is contravening or will contravene,

“(i) subsection 28(1) or 28.1.2(19) or a regulation made under section 25.8, or

“(ii) the conditions of a permit issued under section 28.1, 28.1.1 or 28.1.2 or issued under a regulation made under clause 28.5(1)(c);

“(b) the activity has caused, is causing or is likely to cause significant damage and,

“(i) the damage affected or is likely to affect the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or the pollution or the conservation of land, or

“(ii) in the event of a natural hazard, the damage will or is likely to create conditions or circumstances that might jeopardize the health and safety of persons or result in damage or destruction of property; and

“(c) the order will prevent or reduce the damage described in clause (b).

“Information to be included in the order

“(2) The order shall,

“(a) specify the provision that the officer believes is being or is about to be contravened;

“(b) briefly describe the nature of the contravention and its location;

“(c) briefly describe the nature of the damage being caused or likely to be caused by the activity; and

“(d) state that a hearing on the order may be requested in accordance with this section.’

1410

“(2) Subsection 30.4(9) of the act is amended by striking out the portion before clause (a) and substituting the following:

“‘Appeal

“(9) Within 30 days after receiving the reasons in subsection (8), the person who requested the hearing may appeal to the minister or to a body prescribed by the regulations and, after reviewing the submissions, the minister or the prescribed body may,”

I’ve just got to scroll down there.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): That’s it, I think.

Mr. David Piccini: Perfect. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): There are a few clarifications we need to have. The first page, in the middle, part (a)(i), can you repeat that, please? Page 1, (a)(i)—

Mr. David Piccini: Yes, happy to.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): —where it says “subsection 28(1).”

Mr. David Piccini: Yes. Sorry, Chair. I’m just bringing it up.

“The person has engaged in, is engaging in or is about to engage in the activity and, as a result, is contravening or will contravene.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Part 1(i), where it says “subsection 28.”

Mr. David Piccini: “An appointment officer appointed under section 30.1 may make an order requiring a person to stop engaging”—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, just (i), where it says “subsection 28.”

Mr. David Piccini: “(i) subsection 28(1) or 28.1.2(19) or a regulation made under section 28.5, or”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Then (b)(i), the (i) part: “the damage affects or is likely,” page 1.

Mr. David Piccini: Yes, “the damage affects or is likely to affect the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or the pollution or the conservation of land, or”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you so much. Is there any debate on MPP Piccini’s motion? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 20, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We will now move to schedule 6, section 21. I see there’s a government amendment. Do we have any motions? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 21 of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“21. Subsection 30.5(1) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“‘Offences

“(1) Every person is guilty of an offence if the person contravenes,

“(a) subsection 28(1) or 28.1.2(19);

“(b) a regulation respecting activities permitted under subsection 28(3) or (4) or a regulation made under section 28.5;

“(c) the conditions of a permit that was issued under section 28.1, 28.1.1 or 28.1.2 or under a regulation made under clause 28.5(1)(c); or

“(d) a stop order issued under section 30.4.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A motion has been moved by MPP Piccini. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 21, as amended—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I don’t know, was my video off? I’m voting against that motion.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, your vote has been recorded.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Can you see me now?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I would request the members to raise your hand as soon as the vote has been called, just so that it’s clear for the Clerk to have the proper count of the votes.

Shall schedule 6, section 21, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

Since there are no amendments to sections 22 to 24 of schedule 6, I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed.

Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, sections 22 to 24, inclusive, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We’ll now move to schedule 6, section 25. I see there’s a government amendment, number 12. Can we have a motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding “and” at the end of subclause 40(1)(b)(ii) of the Conservation Authorities Act, striking out “and” at the end of subclause 40(1)(b)(iii) of that act and striking out subclause 40(1)(b)(iv) of that act.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We’ll move to government amendment number 13, subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill. MPP Piccini, you have a motion?

Mr. David Piccini: I move that the English version of subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “Local Planning Appeals Tribunal” in clause 40(1)(f) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “Local Planning Appeal Tribunal”.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Piccini, I think you read the 14th amendment. We were on the 13th amendment: subsection 25(1), amendment number 13. I think you read amendment number 14.

Mr. David Piccini: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, can you read amendment 13?

Mr. David Piccini: Yes, forgive me. Amendment 13:

I move that subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause to subsection 40(1) of the Conservation Authorities Act:

“(c.1) governing budgetary matters relating to authorities including,

“(i) prescribing matters as budgetary matters for the purposes of clause 14(4.0.1)(d) and for the regulations,

“(ii) respecting the process authorities must follow when preparing a budget and the consultations that are required, and

1420

“(iii) providing for rules and procedures governing meetings at which budgetary matters are discussed, including the quorum for such meetings and the rules respecting voting on budgetary matters, and providing for those rules and procedures to apply despite anything in section 16.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Piccini, the first line where it says—did you say (e.1) or (c.1)? Did you say (c.1) or (e.1)?

Mr. David Piccini: I said “c,” but if it’s an e and my eyes have failed me, I apologize.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): So (e.1)?

Mr. David Piccini: Yes, the Clerk has far better eyes than I, so I think it’s (e.1). My apologies.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Okay. Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We’ll move to government amendment number 14, subsection 25(1), schedule 6 to the bill. Are there any motions? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that the English version of subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “Local Planning Appeals Tribunal” in clause 40(1)(f) of the Conservation Authorities Act and substituting “Local Planning Appeal Tribunal”.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We’ll move to amendment number 15. Any motions? Government amendment number 15: MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 25(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following clauses to subsections 40(1) of the Conservation Authorities Act:

“(i.1) governing transitional matters relating to the repeal of section 28.0.1 by subsection 15.1(2) of schedule 6 of the Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020 and any permissions that were granted under that section prior to the repeal and the enactment of section 28.1.2;

“(i.2) governing minister’s reviews requested under subsection 28.1.2(9) and appeals under subsections 28.1.2(14) and (15) and specifying circumstances in which a review may not be requested or an appeal may not be made;

“(i.3) prescribing a body for the purposes of subsection 30.4(9);”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

Amendment number 16: Can we have the motion please?

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 25(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following clauses to subsection 40(4) of the Conservation Authorities Act:

“(c.1) prescribing requirements for the purposes of clause 28.1.2(1)(c);

“(c.2) governing permits issued under section 28.1.2 including,

“(i) requiring that permits be issued within a specified time period after the application for the permit is submitted to an authority,

“(ii) prescribing conditions for the purposes of subsection 28.1.2(5),

“(iii) prescribing matters for the purposes of clause 28.1.2(6)(c);

“(c.3) prescribing matters for the purposes of clause 28.1.2(12)(c);

“(c.4) governing agreements required under subsection 28.1.2(17) including,

“(i) prescribing the content of the agreements,

“(ii) specifying the time within which agreements are to be concluded and signed;

“(c.5) exempting lands or development projects from section 28.1.2 or from a part of that section or the regulations made under that section, including from the requirement to enter into an agreement under subsection 28.1.2(17) or from including any provision of an agreement that is prescribed by a regulation under clause (c.4);”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It’s accordingly carried.

We'll move to government amendment number 17. Can we have a motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 25(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause to subsection 40(4) of the Conservation Authorities Act:

“(e) respecting anything necessary or advisable for the effective implementation or enforcement of sections 28 to 28.4.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? All right, no debate. We'll have a recorded vote. I'll request the members, please, if you can keep your hand up. When the Clerk names you, then you can put your hand down. So we'll have a recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to amendment number 18. Can we have a motion? Government amendment number 18. MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 25 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 40 of the act, as re-enacted by subsection (1), is amended by adding the following subsection:

“General or particular

“(5) A regulation made under this section may be general or particular in its application.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 25, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 26. I see there's a government amendment, number 19. Can we have a motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 26 of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Planning Act

“26(1) Subsection 1(2) of the Planning Act is amended by striking out ‘38(4)’ and substituting ‘38(4.1)’.

“(2) Section 1 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Limitation

“(4.1) A reference to a person or public body in paragraph 1 of subsection 17(24), paragraph 1 of subsection 17(36) and subsection 17(44.1), 22(7.4), 34(19) and 24.1, 38(4.1), 45(12), 51(39), (43), (48) and (52.1) and 53(19) and (27) does not include a conservation authority under the Conservation Authorities Act except where,

1430

“(a) an appeal made under or at issue in one of those provisions relates to a prescribed natural hazard risk; or

“(b) in the case of an appeal made under subsection 53(19) or (27), the conservation authority was the applicant for consent in the matter under appeal.

“Transition

“(4.2) Despite subsection (4.1), a conservation authority that was a party to an appeal under a provision listed in subsection (4.1) on the day before the day subsection 26(2) of schedule 6 to the Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020 came into force may continue as a party to the appeal after that date until the final disposition of the appeal.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): There's a bit of clarification we need, MPP Piccini. One page 1, where it says “Limitation,” line 2, did you state “(24.1)” or “24.1”? Can you repeat the second line of “Limitation,” please?

Mr. David Piccini: It's “paragraph 1 of subsection 17(36) and subsection 17(44.1), 22(7.4), 34(19) and (24.1).”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We also have an NDP notice. Is there any debate on this section? Shall schedule 6, section 26, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 27. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 27 carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 6, section 27 is accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 28. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 28 carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 29. I see there's a government amendment number 20. Can we have a motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 29(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subsection 15.1(1) and sections 27 and 28 come into force on the day the Protect Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020 receives royal assent.” And if I may just add a comma after the word “Protect” in the second line under “(2).”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 6, section 29, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We're now voting on schedule 6 as a whole. We have an NDP notice and an independent notice. Is there any debate? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. Just to clarify: Are they being handled together?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No, separately. We don't need to vote on the notices. We can still debate it.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Julia Douglas): There's no debating the notices; you're just debating the schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Okay. We're debating the schedule; we're not debating the notice.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Julia Douglas): The notice is just a—

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: We can't hear her.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A notice is just a notice that you're against that section or schedule. We don't need to debate it, so we are voting on schedule 6 as a whole.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Sorry, Chair. You asked for debate. I am prepared to debate.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): We can debate—we can we?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Julia Douglas): There's debate on the schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. We're debating the schedule, but not the notice.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I understand.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Okay. Please go ahead.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to clarify that up front, before missing the opportunity to speak to the schedule as a whole.

It has taken quite a time for the committee to go through the many amendments to this schedule. A huge reason for that is that, overnight, there were so many substantive amendments brought on by the government to its own schedule, and it substantially goes in the wrong direction from what we heard from the hearings, what we heard from the many, many people who are writing in to our offices. I know that even today I am getting letters from people who are so concerned about schedule 6 and what is happening to conservation authorities in this province.

I want the people to know that I'm listening, and members of the official opposition are also listening. Why the government is not listening, I don't know, because the message that people are sending from all parts of the province, from all areas, is that they don't want to see the conservation authorities lose their opportunity to protect the important and precious assets that are there in terms of the land and the water and all who rely on it.

I just was sent a letter from Ontario Nature that is speaking to all of the people within their network. They're so concerned about these amendments. They're so concerned about the permitting issues that basically will ascribe away from conservation authorities and put the power of decision-making just solely in the hands of the minister, regardless of what the impacts are on the environment.

1440

This is just a really unfortunate thing, that the government does not at all want to listen, does not want to be responsive to all of these concerns that are being brought forward by residents in many, many communities in the province. It's not just by the conservation authorities themselves, it's not just by groups that are comprised of experts—although we should definitely listen to them, because they have the science and they have the on-the-ground knowledge and the expertise—but it's everyday citizens that value the natural environment, not just for themselves, but for future generations. They want us to learn from the mistakes that were made in the past.

The fact that we are here and the government is about to use its majority on this committee to disregard those opinions of local municipal councils through AMO, of other local councils through the Big City Mayors' Caucus—pretty much every municipality that represents the citizens of this province is opposed to schedule 6. Government is not listening to the tens and tens of thousands of people, the growing number of people who are concerned about schedule 6 and, of course, the many, many environmental scientists and experts who are cautioning with serious caution.

We heard from Environmental Defence. We heard from the David Suzuki Foundation. We heard from the World Wildlife Fund. We heard from cottagers. They want water levels to not be too high or too low. They want natural environments to be protected. They want clean source water protection. They want the environment protected for future generations.

The farmers, who are great stewards of the environment, understand how to protect the land and the importance of the land to feed our population, and to strengthen

our economy. They, too, have concerns about why the government is interfering with the work of conservation authorities that are there to protect the natural environment, and they want to see stronger, fairer approaches from the government.

A big miss in all of what we talked about today is that these amendments that have been brought through—those very, very substantial amendments—were just basically dumped on the committee without any input, without any consultation, without any scrutiny, and are on the cusp of becoming law because the government is using its majority in this way. You have the power, so you're going to use the power that you have, rather than understanding you need to protect the voice of all Ontarians and make sure that those voices are heard by each and every representative.

Certainly what I'm hearing, what I'm sharing with this committee, is that schedule 6 should be withdrawn and we should not be going forward with schedule 6. We should be slowing down, doing proper consultation and proper input, and not interfering with the good work of the conservation authorities to protect watershed communities, to protect and have proactive programs for flood mitigation and management. I've said this many times through the hearings and throughout today's proceedings. I'm passionate about this.

My riding of Scarborough–Guildwood is where I grew up. I rode my bike in those ravines and along those creeks. Of course, like every kid, every teenager in Scarborough, the Scarborough Bluffs, and growing up in that—really, it is a majestic environment. To be honest with you, when you stand on the shores of Lake Ontario and you look up on those bluffs and you see nature, you feel nature, you feel that power of nature and you're humbled and drawn in because it's so beautiful. But we want future generations, you know, seven generations from now, to have the same awe at that shoreline and at those natural environments that we benefit from.

The only way we will protect and preserve those natural environments is by having very thoughtful and appropriate laws, regulations and the application of those laws and regulations that takes the environmental needs into account and balances that with the need for growth and for development. This bill misses that. It upends the role of the conservation authorities and diminishes their role, while at the same time overriding their permitting authority, overriding and circumventing their role in favour of development, in favour of those—I don't know who's asking for this, because nobody came to the committee to say—I guess those conversations were being held in private or in secret, because nobody came forward transparently in front of the committee to say that they want to diminish the role of conservation authorities. Nobody said that at committee: zero. And yet, here we are. That's what schedule 6 is doing. It's unfortunate and it's a sad day. It's a sad day.

We should be focused on the health of Ontarians, on protecting seniors in long-term care, on preparing for the hope of a vaccine and keeping everyone safe and virus-free. That's what we should be doing. We should be

focusing on COVID-19 and the health pandemic and the health crisis that we are in. Yet, instead, here we are with an omnibus legislation, debating the inclusion of schedule 6 and that there is no one that has come before this committee that has affirmed the government's action.

For that reason, I voted against schedule 6 and its amendments, and I will be voting against this inclusion of schedule 6 in Bill 229. As you see, the independent members have put forward a notice to withdraw schedule 6, and that is where I stand, that schedule 6 should be withdrawn.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I appreciate MPP Hunter using the expression “seven generations,” because this is what Indigenous communities understand, that we are stewards of the land and the environment and that it is not ours to dispose of as we see fit, which is what schedule 6 is doing. We are the keepers of the land, we are the stewards, and it is our job to ensure that seven generations from now will inherit the planet in a way that is sustainable and that we have done no further damage.

We have learned so much from water keepers, water protectors, Indigenous communities, who have been standing up and speaking up about how we have a responsibility for not just the environment, but to the water. The understanding that water is life is something that we should all share. It is shocking to see a schedule in a bill that goes so contrary to not only thousands of years of wisdom, but goes so contrary to every single person, committee, city, municipality, elected official, individual that we heard from at committee that spoke out against this. People are pleading with this government to do the right thing and withdraw this schedule.

1450

It is a shocking, shocking lack of responsibility and lack of accountability, not just on this government, who we've come to know as a government that is an anti-environment government. Everything that they've done to date has watered down the provisions that protect this environment. So I suppose we shouldn't be shocked or surprised that they would stick the knife in even further when it comes to people who have been working so hard to protect our environment.

I'm going to say, very specifically, stripping conservation authorities of their ability to protect and participate in land use planning appeals is one of the most breathtakingly irresponsible and dangerous aspects of the schedule, if that's not enough. If the government gets its way—it seems that they're not prepared to listen, so undoubtedly they will use their majority to ram this schedule through this budget bill. If they're allowed to do this, developers will be given, essentially, a green light to pave over wetlands and build subdivisions on flood plains. Subdivisions might even be not as bad as what they're doing in Ajax, for example. A ministerial zoning order is allowing a warehouse to be built on protected land—a warehouse, not affordable housing, in the middle of an affordable housing crisis.

If there's a subdivision—we've seen that this government does not support consumer protection. But what's going to happen when buyers own property on these flood plains? These buyers are going to be left to clean up the mess when the next flood puts them under water, and we've seen this happen.

So the question still stands: Why is this government so willing to sell out our environment? Why is it so unwilling to listen to the experts? Why do they want to silence expert voices that we've heard, from conservation authorities, from all kinds of people that speak about decisions that threaten people, their property and their environment? These are unanswered questions.

MPP Hunter and also Ontario's official opposition NDP have been saying now, not just with this bill, but with all bills, that this government does not want any kind of informed debate. They just want to push through their agenda and not allow the people of the province of Ontario to participate, and they certainly don't want to allow other MPPs, who are duly elected to represent their constituents—they don't want to hear from us. And if there's no further evidence of that, I would have to say it's Bill 213, which is before the House, that will allow Charles McVety, a notorious homophobe, to get special consideration by the Premier. And while this debate is going on in the House, the Hansard is not even ready for people to use to debate on what happened at committee.

The government has proposed over 30 pages of amendments to schedule 6, which is really over three times as many pages as were in the original schedule 6, so clearly—and these amendments don't address what people have been asking. You're just fixing the mess of the schedule that you put forward in the first place. Or what you're doing is doubling down. I mean, it's impossible to believe that you could make this schedule even worse, but I guess I underestimated you all.

You've refused to honour the spirit of the Environmental Bill of Rights—not only just the spirit, but the Auditor General said you have actually failed to uphold your responsibilities under the Environmental Bill of Rights. In this bill, there's no proper consultation. You haven't posted this on the Environmental Bill of Rights. Most certainly, that's a violation of the Environmental Bill of Rights.

Clearly, you're not listening to expert voices, municipalities, environmental organizations. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture—farmers who know watersheds more than anyone: not listening to them. You're upending good land use planning. All the people who have official plans, municipalities with zoning bylaws—you're not listening to any of them. Your own Greenbelt Council and the conservation authorities themselves have called this terrible, terrible legislation, and they've called on it to be withdrawn—your own Greenbelt Council. But instead, as we see, you've doubled down, you've made it worse with every page of new amendments that have been tabled without public notice or consultation. You've tabled these amendments overnight. One of the amendments was longer than half the bills that you've been putting forward,

saying that they're about COVID protection and investing in business. I mean, it's an amendment that's longer than half the bills you've put forward. It's egregious.

We've heard from people who say why the conservation authorities were put there in the first place. We learned a lesson from Hurricane Hazel where people lost their lives. But this is a government that doesn't like to learn those lessons. I mean, think Walkerton. This is a government that doesn't understand that the lessons that we learn from people losing their lives are important. These aren't just roadblocks in your relentless path to see development at all costs; these are considerations that have been put in place to keep people safe, to save lives—but you don't listen.

We said it before, and it was said by Councillor Brad Clark, this will be a political albatross over all of the MPPs who are voting in favour of this. These recorded votes will stand. These recorded votes will continually be a record of your failure to stand up and have a backbone and protect the environment if not for you, but for generations to come. It's your absolute moral responsibility to do this. So think hard over what the next vote will be, and it will be recorded.

I would say, honestly, I'm pleading with you. Help me help you. This will be a record that will forever mar your time in this place. Here's your opportunity to show constituents that you are actually brave enough to do the right thing. Do the right thing here, and if not withdraw this, vote against this terrible legislation. It will put people, property and, most certainly, the environment at risk.

So join us, the independents and Ontario's official opposition NDP, and withdraw this bill or vote against it. It's absolutely the right thing for you to do.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, as amended, carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's accordingly carried.

We'll now move to schedule 7. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 207 of schedule 7. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Sorry, Chair, there was a notice that was put forward by the independents. Is that not something that will be read into the record?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): I'll have the Clerk clarify what the notices are.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Julia Douglas): Hi, Ms. Hunter. The notices indicate an intention to vote

against a section to a bill. Since they are not an amendment, they do not need to be read into the record. The Chair indicates at which sections in the bill there are notices for the members' reference and knowledge, but simply the action of voting against that section of the bill is all you need to do for the notice. Typically, notices are not read in.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Thank you, committee Clerk, for clarifying.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): So is there any debate on sections 1 to 207 of schedule 7? Seeing none, are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 7, section 1 to 207, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, it is not a recorded vote. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

1500

Just a reminder to the members that the request for the recorded vote was only for schedule 6, so there was not a request for a recorded vote on schedule 7. If any members want a recorded vote, you have to ask for a recorded vote for schedule 7 or for whatever schedule or section.

We'll move to schedule 7, section 208. I see there's government amendment number 21. Any motions? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 208(1) of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out "that is imposed by this act, the regulations or an authority rule and" and substituting "imposed by, or from the application of any provision in, this act, the regulations or an authority rule".

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 7, section 208, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

There are no amendments to sections 209 to 231 of schedule 7. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 7, sections 209 to 341, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 7, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We'll now move to schedule 8. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 8. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 8, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Now we are on schedule 8, section 3. I see there's amendment number 22, an independent amendment. Do we have a motion? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that section 3 of schedule 8 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 47.1 of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, 1994:

“Required disclosure

“(1.1) The exemptions set out in subsection (1) apply only if the person who kills, harms, harasses, captures or takes a member of a species at risk, or damages or destroys the habitat of such a species; and

“(a) discloses to the minister that they have killed, harmed, harassed, captured or taken a member of a species at risk, or damaged or destroyed the habitat of such a species; and

“(b) demonstrates that their action was unavoidable and explains what, if any, steps were taken to avoid the action or mitigate the damage caused.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. A motion has been moved by MPP Hunter. Is there any debate? MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: It’s really important that schedule 8 be amended. We were given information from Ontario Wildlife Rescue, Wildlands and other groups. Groups like Environmental Defence wholly adopted the recommendations of those wildlife protection groups that, while the government’s intention is to double the forestry activities in the province, it cannot be done at the expense of endangered species and species at risk who are living in their natural habitats and who share this province with all of us. It is responsible stewardship to be very clear that if damage is done to species in the act of doing forestry or any other activity, that should be recorded. The person or persons responsible for that should be keeping account for that, and the government should be doing its job in protecting endangered species in this province.

The Auditor General has tabled a report on this, and has actually called out the government for not doing its job by not focusing on endangered species in the way that they should be focused on endangered species. As a result, it’s putting species at risk. The auditor has actually called upon the government to build its capacity to do things like monitoring and tracking endangered species and species at risk in this province, because of the serious concerns that we have. Once again, even though we’re doing a finance budget bill today, we are talking once again about our natural environments, natural habitats and the need to do more to protect those natural environments.

The changes that I am proposing today are meant to strengthen our environmental regulations and stewardship, and really to be more thoughtful about how we are approaching endangered species and species at risk, so that they are not threatened by the intention that the government has, which is to double its take on forestry. That’s what the objective is; it needs to be done in a way that protects endangered species. I don’t think that we should be compromising on that. We should be standing up and making sure that we protect the natural environment and recognize that endangered species live there and are sharing the environment with all of us.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Hunter, are you voting, or do you have something to add, as well?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Sorry, I thought you had called the vote.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, it is a vote. Thank you. I apologize.

All those in favour? All those opposed? It’s accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 8, section 3 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed. It’s accordingly carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 and 5 of schedule 8. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Great. Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Shall schedule 8, sections 4 and 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed. It’s accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 8 carry? All those in favour?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Hunter, you have a comment?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I do. Could we have this on division?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Are you asking for a recorded vote, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes, please.

1510

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Hunter.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 8 is carried.

We’ll now move to schedule 9. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3 of schedule 9. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there any agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 9, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It’s accordingly carried.

We’ll now move to schedule 9, section 34. I see there’s a government amendment, number 23. Can we have a motion? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 4(4) of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by striking out “Paragraphs 1 to 3” at the beginning and substituting “Paragraphs 1 to 4”.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 9, section 4, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

There are no amendments to sections 5 to 11 of schedule 9. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 9, sections 5 to 11, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 9 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is it as amended? Sorry. Schedule 9, as amended, yes. All those in favour? All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We'll now move to schedule 10. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 10. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 10, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 10 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Schedule 11: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 5 of schedule 11. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 11, sections 1 to 5, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 11 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Thank you. It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 12 now. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 24 of schedule 12. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 12, sections 1 to 24, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We're now voting on schedule 12 as a whole. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 12 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We'll move to schedule 13 now. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 9 of schedule 13. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 13, sections 1 to 9, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We're now voting on schedule 13 as a whole. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 13 carry? All those in favour,

please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 14. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 16 of schedule 14. I therefore propose that we bundle these section. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 14, sections 1 to 16, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 14 as a whole. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 14 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 15. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 15. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 15, sections 1 to 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Schedule 15 as a whole: Is there any debate? Shall schedule 15 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 16. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 16. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 16, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are on schedule 16 as a whole. Is there any debate on schedule 16 as a whole? Shall schedule 16 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 17. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 17. I therefore propose that we bundle these section. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 17 as a whole? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 17 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 18. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 13 of schedule 18. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 18, sections 1 to 13, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 18 as a whole? Shall schedule 18 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Schedule 19: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 19. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 19, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 19 as a whole? Shall schedule 19 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 20. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 20. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 20, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

1520

Any debate on schedule 20 as a whole? Shall schedule 20 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 21. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 5 of schedule 21. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 21, sections 1 to 5, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 21 as a whole? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 21 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 22, section 1. I see there's a government amendment, number 24. Can I have a motion? MPP Piccini.

Mr. David Piccini: I move that section 1 of schedule 22 to the bill be amended by striking out "requirement under this act" in subsection 15.1(1) of the Insurance Act and substituting "requirement imposed by, or ... the application of any provision in, this act, the regulations or an authority rule".

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Piccini, can read the third line, please? Just the first part of the third line, after "imposed."

Mr. David Piccini: Oh. "Authority."

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): The one above that, the third line.

Mr. David Piccini: "Imposed by"—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): "Or from the"—

Mr. David Piccini: "or from the application of any provision in"—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 22, section 1, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 22, section 2. There's a government amendment, number 25. MPP Piccini, do you have a motion?

Mr. David Piccini: I move that subsection 2(1) of schedule 22 to the bill be amended by striking out "requirements under this act" in paragraph 4 of subsection 121(1) of the Insurance Act and substituting "requirements imposed by, or provisions of, this act, the regulations or an authority rule".

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 22, section 2, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Now, we're on schedule 22, section 3. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 22, section 3, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 22, section 4. There is an independent notice. Is there any debate? MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I just think it's important—I believe there were a couple of witnesses who came forward at the hearing to speak to this and, really, to sound the alarm. Many Ontarians purchased universal life policies. I want to be clear that there isn't the resale of any policy allowed in Ontario. These policies allow for insurance protection as well as investment vehicles, and these policies were very attractive back in the 1990s and the early 2000s. Many insurers sold them with interest rate guarantees as marketing tools to increase their market share. These policies were widely sold, and there are approximately 250,000 policies that are still active—of course, many of them being held by seniors and the elderly. Although universal life policies are still being sold today, these products no longer have interest rate guarantees.

So other than through the language contained in sections 4 and 5 of schedule 22, policyholders would not be aware of these adverse consequences that are going to affect them should this pass unamended. Further to that, the technical language contained in both these sections would not be readily understood by the average policyholder and, as a result, the adverse impact to their rights as policyholders would be difficult to understand.

These amendments by the government to the Insurance Act change the contract terms without any agreement on the part of policyholders to do so, and to the policyholders' detriment. This disadvantages Ontario's seniors. As I said, at a time when we should be dealing with the pandemic and keeping our seniors and the elderly safe, the government has put, in an omnibus legislation, this change that will adversely disadvantage Ontario's seniors. We should not be doing that. The contract should be honoured.

When people sign insurance contracts—I remember one of the deputants saying insurance was around before Confederation, beginning in the 1840s, and when people sign those contracts, they expect that they will be there for life to benefit themselves and their families. So why the government is stepping in to adversely affect seniors and policyholders in a contract that they have between insurance companies—I'm not sure who asked the government to do this, why there has not been consultation in an open and transparent and proactive way before this was slipped into Bill 229 surreptitiously, because it's just not something that is going to benefit the 250,000 policies that are still active and being held by seniors in Ontario.

So I've put forward these amendments in the hope that we remove these harmful parts of the legislation so that we

protect seniors and those who have faithfully contributed to these policies, thinking that they are contracts that would be honoured. And now, because the government is doing this legislation, it's going to harm them. I don't think that we should be doing harm to our seniors.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I just want to be on the record as saying that this speaks to the government really pulling the rug out from all kinds of people in Ontario and hoping that they won't notice. If someone duly signs a life insurance contract—they last a long time, hopefully. And people signed these in good faith. They have been dutifully paying their premiums and expecting that a deal is a deal, that a contract is a contract.

I find that this should have had consultation. My guess is seniors across this province don't know what is happening in this bill. And how could they, with the speed at which this government rams things through the House? It just speaks to this government's lack of respect of contract law. We saw the government come to power; the first thing they did was tear up all kinds of duly signed contracts at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to taxpayers. So they certainly don't mind tearing up contracts when someone else is paying the premiums, which would be the taxpayers of the province of Ontario.

They want us to do the same thing with the contracts that were signed with independent brewers across the province. There was an outcry with that.

1530

I am the finance critic, and I have received what I would consider an extraordinary letter from the US Chamber of Commerce, which wanted to remind this government about the sanctity of contracts and that they should be honoured. I'll just quote from letter. They said, "Our strong concern is that terminating an existing contract, and doing so without compensation ... risks sending a negative signal to US and other international investors about the business and investment climate in Ontario." Doesn't that say it all?

Individual investors—retail investors is what they're called in the finance industry—they don't have a chance. They don't have hundreds of thousands of staff that are working on behalf of lobbyists or vested interests—or for the finance ministry, for example. This speaks to the fact that the individual cannot have consumer confidence in investing in financial instruments in this province if the government is prepared to just rip up contracts and change them when their backs are turned.

It is, in my opinion, shameful that this government would not take into consideration seniors who may rely on the income, the investment portion of these investment instruments. This is a government that is the only province in Canada that has not banned deferred sales charges, which seniors' organizations across the province have said really detrimentally impact the financial well-being of seniors. They're banned in every province except Ontario. This Premier dismissed the recommendations from their own securities regulator that they get rid of deferred sales

charges; they dismissed that. Instead, they have allowed these charges, which are difficult to understand for the average investor, to stand. They take away the value of portfolios of seniors in this province who rely on these for income so that they can have a decent and secure life into retirement.

I think this is something that should have had more robust consultation. It needs to be pulled out. You need to make sure that people are aware of this. Meaningful consultation means that people know that it even exists in the bill. But based on the fact that you ram everything through the House and hope that no one notices, I can't imagine that you would care to respect the seniors of this province and make sure they're made aware of this before, as I said, you pull the rug out from underneath them.

The government, again, has done a disservice to the people of the province of Ontario, particularly seniors. This needs way more—actually, it needs not way more consultation, it needs some consultation. Let's start with that. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: If I may, I also just want to add that because Ontario is unique in terms of its protection of individual policyholders by not allowing policyholders to sell their plans—and that's what makes Ontario different. I know in other provinces, they might be having complications when it comes to policyholders, but in Ontario, there is a prohibition from selling their plans.

Also, by way of consumer protection and consultation, there is the Financial Services Regulatory Authority, a body that is under the Ministry of Finance, where any concerns for consumer protection can be made and, frankly, where there is a mandate for consumer protection.

The lack of consultation on this sweeping change to the contract between policyholders and their insurance company, and that the net result is that 250,000 active members are going to be adversely affected—the majority of them seniors and the elderly, who are counting on those products—is really egregious. That's why the independent members are advising that sections 4 and 5 of schedule 22 just be withdrawn, so that the government can go out and do its work of consulting before making this type of change that has this damaging and detrimental effect to disadvantage seniors in Ontario.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? All right, seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 22, section 4, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 22, section 5. Just for your information, there's also an independent notice on schedule 22, section 5. Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 22, section 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

There are no amendments to sections 6 to 10 of schedule 22. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 22, sections 6 to

10, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 22, as amended? Shall schedule 22, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 23. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 23. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 23, sections 1 to 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 23 as a whole? Shall schedule 23 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We are on schedule 24 now. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 24. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 24, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 24 as a whole? Shall schedule 24 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 25. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 25. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 25, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 25 as a whole? Shall schedule 25 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 26. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 15 of schedule 26. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 26, sections 1 to 15, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Is there any debate on schedule 26 as a whole? Shall schedule 26 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 27. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 27. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 27, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

1540

Any debate on schedule 27 as a whole? Shall schedule 27 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 28: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 4 of schedule 28. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 28, sections 1 to 4 inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 28 as a whole? Shall schedule 28 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 29: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 9 of schedule 29. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 29, sections 1 to 9, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 29 as a whole? Shall schedule 29 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Schedule 30: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3 of schedule 30. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 30, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 30 as a whole? Shall schedule 30 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 31: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 31. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 31, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 31 as a whole? Shall schedule 31 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 32: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 4 of schedule 32. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 32, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 32 as a whole? Shall schedule 32 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 31, section 1. I see there's an independent amendment, number 26. Can we have a motion?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Hi there, Chair. This is 33?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's 33, section 1, yes.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that subsections 10(1) and (2) of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Can you repeat the wording again, please?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that subsections 10—

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It is subsection 1, actually, MPP Hunter. It has to be read in as "subsection 1(1)," not "10."

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. Maybe I'm not seeing something here, but if the Clerk has seen it on hers, I will defer to that.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, it is subsection 1(1) of schedule 33.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay—that subsection 1(1) of section 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): "Schedule 33", sorry.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: —of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Julia Douglas): Oh. She's reading motion 27.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): It's motion 26. I think you're reading the wrong motion, maybe.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Am I reading the wrong one? Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes. You're reading 27; we're on 26.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay, sorry about that.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): No problem. Any debate? Or maybe you can repeat it again, MPP Hunter, please.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes, Chair. I'm just making sure I have it. Yes, so it's number 26, correct?

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, right.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Okay. Sorry about that, Chair.

I move that subsection 1(1) of section 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Schedule 33—do you have “section” there?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, thank you. Is there any debate?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I should just speak to this, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Yes, please.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I think it's an important affirmation of the role of teachers and certified teachers. Ontario has some of the best-trained teachers: two years of teachers' college, many coming with prior degrees as well and more advanced degrees. We have a very rigorous professional development process for Ontario teachers. We know that the number one and the most important qualification, really, in learning is the teacher, and so our investment in public education over the years makes Ontario's education system really one of the top education systems in the world.

The role of the Ontario College of Teachers is important in that system of education, of the public and publicly funded education system that we have in this province. We should be creating opportunities to utilize that wealth of knowledge that Ontario teachers—Ontario's well-trained and educated teachers—bring to the profession. Their role and their participation in the oversight and governance of the body that certifies them is really important.

I agree with ETFO. I know they came forward and spoke to committee about section 33 of the bill. The purpose here is to support the role of teachers at the table for their college.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of MPP Hunter's motion, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 33, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Now we are on schedule 33, section 3. Just for your information, there's an independent notice.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Oh, sorry—schedule 33, section 2. Is there any debate on schedule 33, section 2? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule

33, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Now we are on schedule 33, section 3. There's an independent notice. Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 33, section 3, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Now we are on schedule 33, section 4. There's an independent notice. Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 33, section 4, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 5. There's an independent notice as well. Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 33, section 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

1550

Schedule 33, section 6: There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 6, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 7: There's an independent notice, as well. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 7, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are on schedule 33, section 8. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 8, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We're on schedule 33, section 9. There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 9, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 10. I see there's amendment number 27 from the independents. Can we have a motion, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes. I move that subsections 10(1) and (2) of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Please go ahead, MPP Hunter.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, I appreciate the committee's indulgence here, because schedule 33 is dealing with changes to the Ontario College of Teachers that have been long on the books, that needed to be changed. Of course, any activities of sexual abuse should not be taken lightly and should be treated with the utmost strictness and consequence. We have to make sure that Ontario students are protected and that their safety is number one. That is an important aspect of schedule 33.

But the parts that deal with diminishing the role and the voice of certified teachers in their own oversight body and governance should be struck out. That's the purpose of the independents going through all of the layers of schedule 33 to vote against certain sections that would diminish the role of Ontario's certified teachers. So I want to just reinforce supporting their role, supporting their professionalism and the professional judgment that our teachers

have, and, of course, their excellent training and preparedness for the role that they have—a very important and essential role as teachers in our public education system.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 33, section 10, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 11. Just for your information, there is an independent notice. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 11, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Now we're on schedule 33, section 12. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 12, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 13: There is also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 13, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We're now on schedule 33, section 14. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 14, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 15. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 15, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 16: There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 16, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 17. I see there's an independent amendment number 28. Can we have a motion, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes, Chair. I move that subsection 17(1) of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): A motion has been moved by MPP Hunter. Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 33, section 17, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Now we're on schedule 33, section 18. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 18, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 19: There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 19, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 20. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 20, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 21. I see there's a government amendment number 29. Can we have a motion? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that subsection 21(4) of schedule 33 to the bill be amended by striking out "Paragraphs 1 to 3" at the beginning and substituting "Paragraphs 1 to 4".

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Shall schedule 33, section 21, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 22. There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 22, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 23: There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 23, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 24: There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 24, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 25: There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 25, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 36. There's also an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 26, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 27. We have an independent amendment number 30. Can we have a motion? MPP Hunter.

1600

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that subsection 27(1) of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's lost.

There is amendment number 31. Can you move the motion, MPP Hunter? Independent amendment number 31.

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Yes. I move that subsections 27(5) and (6) of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour of MPP Hunter's motion, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 33, section 27, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 28: There is an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 28, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 33. There are no amendments to sections 29 to 31 of schedule 33. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement?

Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 33, sections 29 to 31, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Now we are on schedule 33, section 32. There is an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 32, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 33: Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 33, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 34: There is an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 34, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 35: Is there any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 35, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 36: There is an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 36, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 33, section 37. There is government amendment number 32. Can we have a motion? MPP Smith.

Mr. Dave Smith: I move that section 37 of schedule 33 to the bill be amended by striking out subsections 68(2), (3) and (4) of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996 and substituting the following:

“Roster during transition

“(2) During the transition period,

“(a) a roster of eligible panellists shall be established in accordance with the regulations, if any;

“(b) the transition supervisory officer and the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint persons to be on the roster of eligible panelists, and the transition supervisory officer shall ensure that a sufficient number of persons are appointed to the roster for the purposes of establishing panels under subclause (d)(i);

“(c) the transition supervisory officer may appoint persons to be on the roster established for the purposes of the accreditation committee and the accreditation appeal committee, and the transition supervisory officer shall ensure that a sufficient number of persons are appointed to the roster for the purposes of establishing panels under subclause (d)(ii); and

“(d) the transition supervisory officer may direct the registrar to establish a panel, in accordance with this act and the regulations, if any,

“(i) from among the persons appointed to the roster of eligible panelists, to exercise the powers and duties of a statutory committee, other than the adjudicative body of chairs, or

“(ii) from among the persons appointed to the roster established for the purposes of the accreditation committee

and the accreditation appeal committee, to exercise the powers and duties of those committees.

“Panels during transition

“(3) During the transition period, any reference in this act or the regulations to a committee established under subsection 15(1), the accreditation committee or the accreditation appeal committee, shall be read as a reference to the corresponding panel established under clause (2)(d) of this section, with necessary modifications.

“If matter not complete at end of transition period

“(4) A panel established under clause (2)(d) shall continue to deal with any matter before it on the last day of the transition period until the matter is disposed of.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Smith, can you repeat, on the first page, part (c), the last line?

Mr. Dave Smith: “purposes of establishing panels under subclause (d)(ii); and”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate on this? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We also have an independent notice on this. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 37, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 33, section 38. There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 38, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 39: There's an independent notice. Any debate? Shall schedule 33, section 39, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 33, section 40: There's an independent amendment, number 33. Can we have a motion, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that section 40 of schedule 33 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Commencement

“40(1) Subject to subsection (2), this schedule comes into force on the day the Protect, Support and Recovery from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020 receives royal assent.

“(2) Section 2, subsection 27(4) and section 30 come into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): MPP Hunter, can you please repeat with “40,” “Commencement,” line 2, “Protect, Support”?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: “Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), 2020 receives royal assent.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All those in favour of MPP Hunter's motion, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 33, section 40, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

1610

Is there any debate on schedule 33, as amended? Shall schedule 33, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 34. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 34. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 34, sections 1 to 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 34 as a whole? Shall schedule 34 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 35. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 4 of schedule 35. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 35, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 35 as a whole? Shall schedule 35 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 36. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 21 of schedule 36. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 36, sections 1 to 21, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 36 as a whole? Shall schedule 36 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 37: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 28 of schedule 37. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 37, sections 1 to 28, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 37 as a whole? Shall schedule 37 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We are now on schedule 38. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 6 of schedule 38. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 38, sections 1 to 6, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

There's an NDP notice on schedule 38 as a whole. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 38 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 39: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 4 of schedule 39. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 39, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 39 as a whole? Shall schedule 39 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand, please. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 40, section 1. Any debate on schedule 40, section 1? Are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 40, section 1, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 40, section 2. There is an independent amendment, number 34. Can we have a motion, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that section 2 of schedule 40 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 10(8) of the provincial parks and conservation act, 2006.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Can you repeat the last line?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: —of the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? Are the members ready to vote on MPP Hunter's amendment motion? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

There's an amendment number 35 from the independents. Can we have a motion, MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that section 2.1 be added to schedule 40 to the bill:

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

““Species at risk program

““11.1(1) The minister shall develop and implement a monitoring program to collect information about the types and populations of species at risk and their habitat in each provincial park and conservation reserve.

““Reporting

““(2) Within five years after the day this section comes into force, and within every five years thereafter, the minister shall prepare a report on the status of species at risk and their habitats in provincial parks and conservation reserves based on the results of its monitoring program.

““Publication

““(3) The minister shall make every report described in subsection (2) available to the public.

““Definition

““(4) In this section,

“““species at risk” means a species that is listed as extirpated, endangered or threatened on the Species at Risk in Ontario List established under the Endangered Species Act, 2007.””

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Well, I just think it's important to note that this was brought forward during consultations and hearings. It speaks to the recommendations from the Auditor General to strengthen the protections of endangered species in the province by the province establishing appropriate monitoring and tracking of endangered species. It would actually allow the government to fulfill one of the areas that, it has been noted, is lacking.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 40, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 40, section 3: Any debate? Shall schedule 40, section 3, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

We're now on schedule 40, section 4. I see there's an independent amendment, number 36. Can we hear a motion?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: I move that section 4 of schedule 40 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 14 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“List of authorizations for commercial purposes

“(6) The minister shall maintain a list of every authorization granted under subsection (1) for a person to use or occupy land in a provincial park or conservation reserve for a commercial purpose.

“Contents of list

“(7) The list described in subsection (6) must include the purpose of the commercial activity and detail the potential environmental impact of the use or occupation of the land.

“Publication

“(8) The minister shall make the list described in subsection (6) available to the public.”

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any debate? MPP Hunter.

1620

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Chair, section 40 of this bill reduces consultation and ascribes more power once again for environmental and natural environments—which parks and conservation reserve areas are—to the minister.

It provides an exception to public consultations where, in the minister's opinion, the environmentally sensitive aspects have been already considered in another process of public participation, whereas the bill does not say in what span of time that consultation should have taken place.

It authorizes the minister to open land in parks and conservation reserves for private and non-commercial purposes. It gives the minister the power to have land in provincial parks or conservation reserves surveyed and to annul all or part of a survey or subdivision of such lands. Unauthorized buildings or structures or crown property may be disposed of, and it authorizes the minister to recover expenses of the disposal as a debt to the crown.

The minister is allowed to establish and to charge fees and allow revenues to be deposited into a separate account for purposes related to conservation reserves.

The main aspect to this is that the process of consultation and stewardship that is needed is diminished and that once again more powers are being centralized with the minister for environmental matters. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly lost.

Shall schedule 40, section 4, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 5 to 23 of schedule 40. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 40, sections 1 to 23, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

There's also an NDP notice on schedule 40 as a whole. Is there any debate? Shall schedule 40 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

We're now on schedule 41. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 8 of schedule 41. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 41, sections 1 to 8, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Any debate on schedule 41 as a whole? Shall schedule 41 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 42: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 42. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 42, sections 1 to 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 42 as a whole? Shall schedule 42 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand, please. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 11 of schedule 43. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 43, sections 1 to 11, inclusive, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Thank you. Carried.

Any debate on schedule 43 as a whole? Shall schedule 43 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It's accordingly carried.

We are now on schedule 44. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 44. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? Any debate? Are members ready to vote? Shall schedule 44, sections 1 and 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Any debate on schedule 44, as a whole? Shall schedule 44 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand, please. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

In the beginning, we stood down sections 1 to 3, so we will now go back to sections 1 to 3. Any debate on section 1 of the bill? Are the members ready to vote? Shall section 1 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Section 2: Any debate on section 2 of the bill? Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Section 3 of the bill: Is there any debate on section 3 of the bill? Shall section 3 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Now, go back all the way to the last page. Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Accordingly carried.

Shall Bill 229 carry? Is there any debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: It's been a long day. If a citizen had taken the opportunity to listen to this debate, or this clause-by-clause consideration, on what was to be a budget bill, no one could forgive them if they didn't think this was about the budget at all, and no one could forgive them if they didn't think that, in fact, the government has taken the opportunity, under the guise of helping people through a budget bill—they slipped in a huge schedule that is really what this bill is all about. The amendments that were given to us overnight, the amendments themselves—one amendment was larger than some of the bills, longer than some of the bills, notably Bill 222 and Bill 218—just an amendment itself.

I would also say that if what people thought is that it looks like the government's made a complete bollocks of schedule 6, they would be correct, because the amendments that they required to make this bill worse than it already is were remarkable. I'm disappointed, and so will the people of Ontario be as they slowly become made more aware of the fact that the government completely turtled when it came time for them to protect the people of Ontario. This budget does, really, nothing to protect individuals living in long-term care.

We had the government's own commission urgently recommend that the government move on four hours of hands-on care in long-term care. The government—what is the word—cynically supported the NDP's motion to make sure that there were four hours of hands-on care, but when it came time for the budget, when it was time for you to put your money where your mouth is, there isn't a single dollar here to ensure that our seniors living in long-term care get any better help, any more help than what they're receiving. We know that long-term care is in crisis. The Canadian Armed Forces told us, your independent commission is telling us, but here you are sitting on your hands. In fact, you are spending less than the budget spending you predicted in March, \$100 million less on long-term care in a time when what we need is more investment, not less.

1630

The most recently verified independent figures show that the government still has \$9.3 billion of unspent money. Now, if that were not the case, a request to see Treasury Board orders might help clarify that; the government doesn't respond to those. If that were the case, the current figures that are before estimates would show something different.

People are cynical about what this government does with their money, what this government does to pull the wool over the citizens of Ontario. You used the budget deficit: The Auditor General had to slap you down not once, but twice to say that the number that you put forward was incorrect. In this budget, if you stripped away time-limited, one-time emergency payments, if you took out the \$6.5 billion every year that you are spending to subsidize

a privatized hydro system, there's not a lot in it for individuals in the province of Ontario.

I would say that it really is such a failure of this government to see what's going on in the province. Businesses are closing. People are struggling. Instead of spending the money, instead of putting programs in place—the government can say they've allocated funding, but there are no programs. There is no money rolling out the door. And they've given themselves the wiggle room to use their contingency funds and their reserve funds—which are in the billions and billions of dollars, an unprecedented amount of prudence, layers upon layers of prudence—they've given themselves the wiggle room to use that to reduce the deficit.

My feeling, and I'm sure most people's in the province of Ontario now, is that it would be prudent to spend the money to save Main Street. Once these businesses are gone, they're gone. Once lives are lost in long-term care, there is no replacing them.

My final words to this government are that you ran on a slogan. The Premier was going to put money back in the pockets of the little guy. Here was your chance, and the little guy's pockets are still empty. Hopefully, moving forward, the government will listen to what people are concerned about. Hopefully, the government—unfortunately, it seems they're not—will stop attacking the environment, stop denying climate change and start to listen to the constituents and put forward legislation, put forward a budget, that helps people, that doesn't just help you.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you. MPP Hunter?

Ms. Mitzie Hunter: Indeed, it has been quite the day in terms of the clause-by-clause review of budget Bill 229. What a disappointment it is that this bill does not go far enough to deliver on the protection and the supports that Ontarians need at this time of a health crisis.

I can't overstate how critical this budget is in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and to the economic recession. Ontarians were depending on this government to respond to the immediate and urgent needs they have, and sadly, this government is doing too little, too late, and it's disappointing. It's disappointing that we've been here for almost eight hours and we have not touched on the things that really are important to ending the COVID-19 pandemic. We have not at all discussed health care. We have not talked about long-term care. We have not talked about, in any substantive way, the needs of Ontario's two million students and the learning they need to achieve through this pandemic, and the lack of investments in making class sizes smaller and schools safer. In fact, I'm sure there are students, teachers and education workers in a school—perhaps even in my own community in Scarborough, but somewhere in Ontario—who have had to go home because of an outbreak. There is no protection here for those students.

Instead, the province has plunged into a state of chaos and confusion because the government has refused to proactively invest in those things that really matter, and yet it has spent its time under the cover of COVID on

schedule 6, meddling with the business of conservation authorities—locally, municipally funded and managed agencies; 36 of them across the province. That’s what we have spent most of our day deliberating on, because the government decided to dump, at the last minute, an enormous amendment in the middle of a schedule when everyone who presented at committee has stated that they opposed it and it should be withdrawn.

This is the government doubling down and referencing in that amendment the greenbelt. It does nothing to protect the greenbelt, because you haven’t actually put that in law in the Greenbelt Act; you simply just referenced it. It’s empty words, just like how we could not rule out of order the implementation of those schedules because referencing an act does not make it part of this amendment. It’s just words, so it does not give anyone any comfort that they can trust this government to not encroach on those lands and build on the greenbelt.

I don’t take comfort in it, and I know many Ontarians do not trust this government with the greenbelt, because they’ve made so many attempts: In Bill 66, they had to withdraw the schedule, and other times that you’ve tried to go after those protected lands—for what, for development? That’s called selling off our future. Why would we do that? The work of conservation authorities is to protect our future. It is to protect our ability to coexist with the natural environment in a way that is managed, in a way that is practical and productive. I’ve certainly seen, first-hand, the value of their work. Why this government is going after those authorities, I don’t know. I just have to say, it’s kind of a Conservative pattern, to undermine the work of environmental organizations, and it’s very sad.

We’ve also talked about the need to protect endangered species in this province, and you’ve been sanctioned by the Auditor General that you’re not doing enough. Instead of responding to that, you have ignored it and done even more damage today by passing those schedules, and schedule 8 in particular, that impacts natural habitats of endangered species and species at risk. It’s a disappointing day, I have to say. When I think of schedule 6 and schedule 8, it’s a disappointing day.

And then we talked about our seniors, 250,000 policyholders who have signed contracts in good faith, and you are legislating away their rights without even consulting them. I think the government should be ashamed. And all at a time when our province and everyone in our province—I just held a virtual town hall in my community last night. All of the focus that people had was around how do we get through COVID-19, together, and safely. That is what we should be focusing on. As a government, you should be focusing on that, and as a province.

There’s so much that we could have done with the budget bill and with the budget itself, but unless it becomes a priority of the government, unless you see education as an investment rather an expense; unless you see the need to accelerate the work on long-term care, bringing forward the four hours of average daily care and the fact that you did not listen to your own commission’s recommendation to do that, is a missed opportunity.

We heard from Darla who is a personal support worker in Timmins. She and, I believe, 14 of them cover a huge geography and are working so hard. I remember what she said: She enjoys her clients she works with in home care. She’s working hard and she deserves more from this government. She deserves more.

1640

The people in this province are counting on the government to do those things that really matter and are important to them, and not to be doubling down on things that are petty and that are not a priority at this time, such as schedule 6, which is really ripping out the ability of conservation authorities to do their work, to do their permitting work, to make their decisions unencumbered, rather than worrying about a central ministry not giving them the freedom to do their work locally.

Local choice matters. Local decision-making matters. Local authorities matter, because they are closest to the communities in which they are making the decision. This government should be respecting local municipalities. Through AMO, through the big city mayors, everyone is telling the government to keep their hands off of conservation authorities. Allow them to do the work that they were designed for and that they know already how to do, without the provincial government’s interference.

The province hardly funds the work of conservation authorities, so why does it want to take over their ability to independently make their decisions in the best interests of the mandate which they have, which is to protect the watershed areas and the source water management?

We know that the provincial Conservatives have a horrible, terrible record on that. When you think about Walkerton and the lessons learned with that, why there’s a constant eroding of environment protections by this government and why you’re seeking to sell out the precious watershed areas and wetlands that we have that do an enormous job of absorbing and filtering the water that we rely and depend on—I don’t have an answer for that, because it’s so short-sighted. You’re not thinking about present or future generations.

I think it’s a disgrace. I really do. There were times today when I had chills just listening to the callousness of the government, charging ahead with changes that nobody asked for, they didn’t consult with anyone on. They’re not listening when people put up their hand and say, “Slow down. There is damage. Caution.” Don’t barrel ahead because you have a majority and you’re going to demonstrate that because you have that power and you are going to use it, regardless of the consequences.

I believe that the people of Ontario have been given a disservice today with Bill 229 and these aspects that have been highlighted, certainly by the opposition members and by the independent members today. It’s unfortunate that the government is not listening, and it’s unfortunate that the people of Ontario are not being well-served when it comes to protecting their natural environments, when it comes to protecting seniors, when it comes to making investments in public education, when it comes to making investments in long-term care and health care, and when it comes to making sure that everyone is getting the support

that they need to recover from the economic recession that is facing everyone as a result of the COVID pandemic.

The time that we have as legislators should be spent focusing on those core priorities that the people of Ontario have, right now, as they look to make it safely through the pandemic, and coming into 2021 where there is the hope of having a vaccine. They want to be able to receive that vaccine. I'm not sure I'm very confident in the government's ability to roll it out, because I can tell you that as we were doing our consultations in my community, people, seniors, parents are saying, "Where can we get a flu vaccine?", because they are nowhere to be found, and we are in December. There is nowhere that they can go to get this vaccine.

The government has a long way to go. Those are the things that they should be focused on in terms of the coordination and the implementation, not on conservation authorities, who actually are doing their work, who actually are focused on their mandate. The government is looking to disrupt and to destroy a system that is working instead of doing the hard work—we're in the throes of a second wave—to fund and support local public health agencies, so that we can have the appropriate testing, contact tracing and assessment that we need during this pandemic. It is so lacking. There's a lot of work ahead of us, and we have to continue to do that work.

I do want to thank the Clerk and the team as part of the Legislature that supports this committee, including leg counsel and all of those researchers and everyone who supports us in this committee. It's challenging work.

We're in a virtual environment. It does make it challenging, and I want to recognize the support that they give to us as members of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs. I want to say, thank you, Chair, and I wish everyone a good, safe weekend.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Thank you so much. Further debate? All right. Are the members ready to vote? Shall Bill 229 carry? All those in—MPP Shaw?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Recorded vote, please, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Recorded vote. Shall Bill 229 carry?

Ayes

Stan Cho, Fee, Kanapathi, Piccini, Dave Smith, Thanigasalam.

Nays

Arthur, Hunter, Shaw.

The Chair (Mr. Amarjot Sandhu): Accordingly carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Carried.

Thank you, everyone. It was a long day. Thank you for raising your hand maybe a thousand times. This committee now stands adjourned until further notice. Thank you, and have a good weekend.

The committee adjourned at 1648.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Président

Mr. Jeremy Roberts (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean PC)

Mr. Ian Arthur (Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles ND)

Mr. Stan Cho (Willowdale PC)

Ms. Mitzie Hunter (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Mr. Logan Kanapathi (Markham–Thornhill PC)

Mr. Sol Mamakwa (Kiiwetinoong ND)

Mr. David Piccini (Northumberland–Peterborough South / Northumberland–Peterborough-Sud PC)

Mr. Jeremy Roberts (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean PC)

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)

Ms. Sandy Shaw (Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest–Ancaster–Dundas ND)

Mr. Dave Smith (Peterborough–Kawartha PC)

Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam (Scarborough–Rouge Park PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Amy Fee (Kitchener South–Hespeler / Kitchener-Sud–Hespeler PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Julia Douglas

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Julia Hood, legislative counsel

Ms. Sibylle Filion, legislative counsel