

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

JP-36

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

JP-36

**Standing Committee on  
Justice Policy**

Combating Human Trafficking  
Act, 2021

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament  
Friday 14 May 2021

**Comité permanent  
de la justice**

Loi de 2021 sur la lutte  
contre la traite des personnes

1<sup>re</sup> session  
42<sup>e</sup> législature  
Vendredi 14 mai 2021

---

Chair: Daryl Kramp  
Clerk: Thushitha Kobikrishna

Président : Daryl Kramp  
Greffière : Thushitha Kobikrishna

### **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

## CONTENTS

Friday 14 May 2021

Combating Human Trafficking Act, 2021, Bill 251, Ms. Jones / Loi de 2021 sur la lutte contre la traite des personnes, projet de loi 251, Mme Jones.....	JP-809
--	--------



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
JUSTICE POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT  
DE LA JUSTICE**

Friday 14 May 2021

Vendredi 14 mai 2021

*The committee met at 0901 in committee room 2 and by video conference.*

**COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING  
ACT, 2021**

**LOI DE 2021 SUR LA LUTTE  
CONTRE LA TRAITE DES PERSONNES**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 251, An Act to enact, amend and repeal various Acts in respect of human trafficking matters / Projet de loi 251, Loi édictant, modifiant et abrogeant diverses lois en ce qui concerne les questions de traite des personnes.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Good morning, folks. We are commencing the justice policy meeting, doing clause-by-clause. The following members are participating remotely: We have Parm Gill, Suze Morrison, Nina Tangri, Toby Barrett, Jeremy Roberts, Mike Harris, and we have, in the room here, Christine Hogarth. At this point—did I miss one?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** MPP Yarde, you have just joined. Could you please identify yourself for Hansard and say where you're at? MPP Yarde, could you please state for Hansard your name, and are you in the province of Ontario, sir?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Yes, Kevin Yarde, and I'm in Ontario.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Fine, thank you very much. I see now Mr. Gurratan Singh. Are you in the province of Ontario as well?

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes, I am.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Great. Thank you very kindly.

The Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all the members and the staff electronically. I presume that everybody would have a copy of that. Are there any questions now before we begin clause-by-clause today?

Seeing none, we will now begin the clause-by-clause consideration. Colleagues, Bill 251 is comprised of three sections that enact four schedules. In order to deal with this bill in an orderly fashion, I would suggest that we postpone the first three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first, before we get to the amendments. Is there agreement on this? I see concurrence. Thank you very kindly.

With that, colleagues, we are now going to turn to schedule 1 of Bill 251. On each schedule, I will ask, "Is there any debate?" I will then ask, "Are the members ready to vote?" Then I shall say, "Shall the section carry? All those in favour will please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand," and then I will state whether it is carried or lost.

So we will now move to schedule 1, section 1. Yes, Ms. Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following definitions:

"'chief of police' means,

"(a) a chief of police as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Police Services Act, or

"(b) a First Nations constable who is in charge of a group of First Nations constables described in clause (b) of the definition of 'police force'; ('chef de police')

"'officer' means,

"(a) a police officer as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Police Services Act, or

"(b) a First Nations Constable; ('agent')

"'police force' means,

"(a) a police force as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Police Services Act, or

"(b) a group of First Nations constables who are employed by an entity that has an agreement with the Solicitor General; ('corps de police')"

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. Is there any debate on this amendment?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me. Go ahead, Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** The reason for this amendment is to align the definitions from the Accommodation Sector Registration of Guests Act with other provincial statutes such as the Missing Persons Act and the Police Services Act. It's also important to note that there is a commonly understood definition of terms amongst related provincial statutes.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you very kindly. Is there any debate on this amendment? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise their hand.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me. I just have to make sure that all members are ready to vote. I see all the members ready to vote here. I don't see a nay sign,

so we will now go ahead, then. All those in favour, please raise your hand. Okay. All those opposed, please raise your hand. The motion is carried.

MPP Singh, you have an amendment. Please, sir.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes, if the Clerk can assist me at all—if the Clerk is able to send me the amendment package. I'm just going through my files, and I'm just wondering if that's something the Clerk can send off to me right now, if you could just email it to me immediately.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** Yes, I can email that to you and also share it on the screen as well.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Perfect. Thank you so much.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. Point of order: Mr. Yarde, please.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** I'd like the amendment package emailed to me as well.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay, then the Clerk will do that, and it will be shown on the screen.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** MPP Morrison, you have your hand up.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Yes. If it's okay with my colleagues, I do have the amendment package up in front of me. I can proceed with moving the second amendment while my colleagues wait for the package. If that's good, I can go ahead and do that.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** I have the amendment package; I just don't have the entire package.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Just give us a sec here. We're just getting our act together here as well.

MPP Morrison, were you going to speak to this, or Mr. Singh? Did you wish to make an amendment to it?

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Yes, I would like to move that section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following definition:

“short-term rental unit’ means all or part of a dwelling unit rented out for less than 28 consecutive days in exchange for payment.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate on this? Yes, MPP Morrison.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Our intent here is to ensure that short-term rentals are not missed by the provisions of the bill that deal specifically with hotels and some of the enforcement pieces around hotels. I think it's particularly important to recognize that as much as 50% of known trafficking cases, according to Project Recover, took place in cities with short-term rentals. We know that in debate this was brought up by several stakeholders and several members wanting to ensure that the short-term rental piece was not omitted from the bill, so I hope this will be perceived as a friendly amendment.

**0910**

I know that there were government members that spoke to the need to include short-term rental housing within the bill. I think our only concern is that this isn't just left to regulations, that it's actually captured within the bill itself.

I don't know if my colleagues have anything else to add to that.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Sure. Thank you. We certainly understand what the NDP are bringing forward, but at this point we have to vote against this motion. We will put that in regulation because, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, consultations on the Accommodation Sector Registration of Guests Act have been limited to preliminary engagement with the accommodation sector. As the short-term-rental sector has not been properly engaged, it's premature to include the short-term-rental accommodation sector in this legislation. We will look at it in regulation.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Ms. Morrison, please?

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** I think what I just heard from my colleague is that the government hasn't properly done its homework before bringing this bill before the House.

If you're saying you haven't properly engaged all of the sectors, that's work that should have been done before you tabled legislation, to be quite frank. Saying, “We couldn't consult with folks because of COVID,” I don't think is fair or proper. We have managed to maintain pretty much every aspect of the business of the Legislature as operational. I don't think there's any reason why the government couldn't and shouldn't have had an opportunity to engage with that sector virtually, despite the pandemic. I think using the pandemic as an excuse for not having done your homework on this bill is not an appropriate response.

This was identified as an issue by government members, by NDP members, by all members of the House in debate. It's been raised by stakeholders. Short-term rentals make up a significant portion of sites of human trafficking and the way that you have written this bill does not include them in the same way that hotels are. I think it's a glaring omission.

We've put forward a simple amendment that would include them within the bill. I see no reason why this needs to be pushed off to regulation with no legislative oversight and no guarantee or commitment that it will actually happen. This is why it's important to put things in the bills themselves. I think just saying, “We didn't consult because of the pandemic”—no, it's your job to do your homework before you bring bills before this House. Thank you very much.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Can I have Mr. Yarde, please?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** I just want to go on record as well, instead of reiterating everything that my colleague mentioned. The government says they want to deal with human trafficking. As we all know, and we had stakeholders telling us as well, Airbnb as well as short-term rentals are areas where we see a lot of human trafficking taking part. I think we should be able to add this just as we have the requirements for hotels and motels. It is quite simple to add it into this bill, instead of waiting to add it at a future date, which just doesn't seem plausible to me.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Point of order. MPP Harris, point of order.

**Mr. Mike Harris:** Not a point of order, I just wanted to take part in debate.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you very kindly. We will get to you in a second.

My apologies, Mr. Yarde. Carry on.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** That's it. It is very important and, as my colleague mentioned, using COVID as an excuse as to why you weren't able to discuss this with stakeholders in short-term rentals is nonsensical, as far as I'm concerned.

I think we should add it instead of waiting until a later date. Because if we all care about dealing with these abuses then I think we should add it now instead of waiting. The government says that they want to deal with human trafficking, so they should add this to the bill instead of waiting.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. I have MPP Hogarth, followed by MPP Harris.

MPP Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** We have done our homework. This is a multi-ministerial approach. As we debated in second reading numerous times, over and over, we have been very clear that short-term-rental accommodations take many forms, so they're not missed.

There are also several companies and platforms online that are moving short-term rentals, such as Airbnb, Vrbo, Booking.com and Expedia, so this is something that we're going to capture in regulation.

Homework has been done. This is not missed. This will be captured in regulation. I still ask my colleagues to not support this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. MPP Harris?

**Mr. Mike Harris:** Yes, just to build a little bit more on what MPP Hogarth has said as well: There are also quite a few municipal bylaws that have changed over the last little while and are going to continue to change in regard to short-term rentals and what those are defined as through municipalities.

So putting something like this in the act itself would mean that every single time one of those pieces change, we'd have to go back and we'd have to amend the actual act, rather than doing it through regulation. You can amend regulations and put new regulations in, take old regulations out much easier, and it's much more flexible to be able to do that rather than have to, quite frankly, go through the process that we're doing right now every single time we would need to make an amendment to what a short-term rental is. I just want to make sure that that's on the record.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. Further comment? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me. MPP Morrison, you have the floor.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Recorded vote, please.

## Ayes

Morrison, Gurratan Singh, Yarde.

## Nays

Barrett, Gill, Harris, Hogarth, Roberts, Tangri.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** The motion is lost.

Colleagues, shall schedule 1, section 1, as amended with the two amendments, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

We will go to section 2 of schedule 1. I see no amendments. Shall schedule 1, section 2, carry?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** My apologies. First, is there any debate on this section before we continue? Seeing none, then shall schedule 1, section 2, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Section 2 is carried.

We will now go to schedule 1, section 2.1. We have, from the NDP, a new section. Debate on the section? Yes, MPP Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes. We're referring right now to schedule 1, section 2.1?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I believe this was a consequential amendment that required this if motion 2 is passed. So the fact that our motion 2 failed—this is a consequential amendment and it's probably out of order.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** I'll just confer with the Clerk. Give me a second.

0920

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** According to legislative counsel, it's not necessarily out of order. It would just beg the question of what a short-term rental is and the term would be decided by the courts. You're certainly free to withdraw the amendment if you would like.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes, Mr. Singh.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes, I'm okay to withdraw this amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Fine. Thank you very much. We will consider it withdrawn.

Colleagues, shall schedule 1, section 2—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** We will now go to schedule 1, section 3. I see no amendments before us. Are there any amendments for schedule 1, section 3? Seeing none, shall schedule 1, section 3, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, we will now go to schedule 1, section 4. We have a number of amendments here. I think on section 4, the government has amendments. Yes, Ms. Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I move that section 4 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "a police officer or First Nations constable" wherever it appears and substituting in each case "an officer" and by striking out "the police officer or First Nations constable" wherever it appears and substituting in each case "the officer".

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Any further debate on this issue? MPP Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I'm happy to share. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This motion is just going to amend this provision in order to align it with amended definitions under section number 1, so our first motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall the amendment carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

NDP: subsection 4(1) has an amendment, I see. Is there any debate, or basically—do I have an NDP member on subsection 4(1)? Yes, Mr. Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** The following amendments that we had put forward, schedule 1, section 4(1), and schedule 1, section 4(2)—if the Clerk finds them acceptable, then yes, we'll move those, and I can start with schedule 1, section 4(1).

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. It's in order. Do you wish to speak to that, Mr. Singh?

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes. If the Clerk or I could put it on the screen, just to make sure I'm referring to the correct one.

I move that subsection 4(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “requiring the owner or manager of a hotel, or the owner or operator of a business in a prescribed class, to produce” in the portion before clause (a) and substituting “requiring the owner or manager of a hotel, the operator of a short-term rental unit or the owner or operator of a business in a prescribed class to produce”.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you, Mr. Singh. Is there debate on this section? Yes, Ms. Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** He can go first.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I can just provide initial comments into what the motivation is for this amendment. This is an amendment which is connected to our previous amendment we had put forward, and this effectively addresses the point of what we were discussing earlier around issues that arise with short-term rentals and the record-keeping obligations created here that amend the hotel act.

This is an issue that was brought up a variety of times by members in our caucus, stakeholders and a variety of folks who question why short-term rentals were not captured under this legislation. Because of that, we've seen the government make suggestions during debate that they would address the omission at later stages of the bill process through regulations, but apparently we are not seeing them address it at this amendments stage. That's something that's important to us, and we want to ensure that this is captured in this legislation.

These following amendments seek to add short-term rentals in exactly the same manner as the government has set out in its requirements for hotels and motels under the hotel act. We specifically want to capture things like Airbnb, and we would not—in the NDP's position, this

just seems like a very reasonable and appropriate amendment, and we don't see why the government would oppose this.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you, Mr. Singh.

Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Similar to our first conversation we had with the NDP amendment, this is something that we're going to capture in regulation. Legislation is actually the wrong tool to use, because regulations are flexible enough to capture new businesses. To come back and forth and reopen a bill—it makes more sense and it's faster to do this through regulations. So we will—at least I will, and I encourage my colleagues not to support this amendment, as this will be captured under regulations.

As MPP Harris said, some of these short-term rentals are regulated and defined under municipal bylaws, and several municipalities have implemented regulations to govern short-term rentals' operations.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All in favour? All opposed? The motion is lost.

We will now go to the NDP for subsection 4(2). Mr. Singh, did you wish to speak to that again? Please go ahead, sir.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I move that subsection 4(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “in the register of a hotel or” in the portion before clause (a) and substituting “in the register of a hotel, a short-term rental unit or”.

**0930**

Similar to our second amendment, this is an amendment which is looking to address other short-term rentals under the record-keeping obligations included here that amend the hotel act. As I said earlier, just to reiterate my point very quickly, we know Project Recover, an agency that's, of course, familiar with trafficked persons, reports that as much as 50% of known trafficking cases in cities took place in these types of short-term rentals. The government has made a very clear intention that this is something that they want to capture and they have yet to do so. So we're hoping the government puts forward this reasonable amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Once again, I recommend voting against this motion. Once again, it's the same conversation as we've had already, so I don't think I need to repeat myself. We will capture it in regulations.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Are the members ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? Lost.

Okay, colleagues, we will now go to NDP subsection 4(4). Mr. Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I move that subsection 4(4) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “manager of a hotel and” in the portion before clause (a) and substituting “manager of a hotel, the operator of a short-term rental unit and”.

As I have iterated earlier, this is to ensure that other short-term rentals like Airbnb are included when we're talking about amendments to the hotel act.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Once again, for similar reasons I have stated earlier, I recommend voting against this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Seeing no further debate, all in favour? Opposed? Lost.

Okay, colleagues, we now have a new one from the government. It's a new subsection, 4(5) and 4(6). Does the government want to speak to the motion? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** This is motion 8, correct?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Subsections 4(5) and 4(6).

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Thank you. I move that section 4 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsections:

“Urgent demand report

“(5) An officer who makes an urgent demand under subsection (2) shall, within the prescribed time frame, provide a written report to the member of the police force that is designated by their chief of police to receive such reports.

“Content of report

“(6) The report shall contain,

“(a) the reasons that, in the view of the officer who made the urgent demand, the requirements under clauses 4(2)(a) and (b) were met in the circumstances; and

“(b) any other prescribed information.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Debate on the amendment?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** This motion would amend the act to require officers to provide a written report to the designated officer within their police services regarding the use of the urgent demand power under section 4(2), which allows police to immediately view guest registry information without a production order, which contains emergency circumstances. This requirement aligns with the current obligations for police making urgent demands for records under the Missing Persons Act, 2018. This motion is responsive to advice on the act from the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner in order to support transparent and accountable use of the urgent demand power to ensure it is used effectively to achieve vital public safety goals. This amendment would specify the contents of the officer's report and require it to be provided to the designated member of the police services. It would also include regulation-making authority to prescribe additional content in the report.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All in favour, please raise your hand. Opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 1, section 4, as amended, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Now we have schedule 1, section 4.1, in which the government has a new section. Who wishes to speak to

this? Ms. Hogarth—once she has a little bit of liquid. Okay. Carry on, please.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I move that schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“Annual report

“4.1(1) On or before the prescribed date in each year, every chief of police shall prepare an annual report under this section and shall,

“(a) in the case of a municipal chief of police, provide a copy of the report to the board of the police force;

“(b) in the case of a chief of police who is in charge of a group of First Nations constables, provide a copy of the report to the entity that employs them and that has an agreement with the Solicitor General; and

“(c) in the case of the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police, provide a copy of the report to the Solicitor General.

“Report public

“(2) After receiving a report, a board or entity shall,

“(a) provide a copy of the report to the Solicitor General; and

“(b) make the report available to the public in the prescribed manner.

“Same

“(3) After receiving the report from the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police, the Solicitor General shall make the report available to the public in the prescribed manner.

“Content of report

“(4) The annual report for a year shall contain,

“(a) the total number of urgent demands made by the officers under subsection 4(2) in that year and the number of human trafficking investigations to which they relate; and

“(b) any other prescribed information.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. Any debate on the amendment? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Similar to the previous amendment, this allows for transparency and accountability.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, all in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 1, section 4, as amended, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we'll now go to schedule 1, section 5. I see an amendment here from the NDP: subsection 5(1). Who is proposing this amendment with the NDP? Mr. Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Just a few moments as I pull that up on screen, just to make sure I'm referring to the right one.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Take your time.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I do have it here; if I have the incorrect one, just let me know. I move that subsection 5(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “An owner or manager of a hotel, or an owner or operator of a business in a prescribed class, who fails” at the beginning and substituting “An owner or manager of a

hotel, an operator of a short-term rental unit or an owner or operator of a business in a prescribed class who fails”.

As we’ve said earlier, this is in reference to short-term—our hope is that the government will adhere to its own recommendations and include other short-term rentals in the amendments to the hotels act.

0940

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** We recommend voting against this motion for similar reasons we mentioned in the beginning of this clause-by-clause session. This will be captured under regulation, as stated earlier.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you very kindly. Further debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? Lost.

We will now go to NDP subsection 5(2). Is there a proposal? Yes, Mr. Singh, please—or Mr. Yarde. I’m not sure who is—

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** If Mr. Yarde wants to put forward the amendment, I have no problem with that.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Well, we’re not speaking to it. First of all, we’re just proposing the amendment. Do you have it in front of you?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Yes, I have it because I just received—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Go ahead then, Mr. Yarde, please.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Yes, I’ll just wait for it to come up here.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** I move that subsection 5(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “a hotel or” and substituting “a hotel, a short-term rental unit or a”.

As we’ve been mentioning throughout this morning, we would like to see included short-term rentals in this bill, so that’s the addition to this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Sure. I guess similar to what we’ve been saying, this is going to be captured under regulation, so I recommend to not support this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? All in favour, please? Opposed? Lost.

Shall schedule 1, section 5, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Section 5 is carried.

Okay, colleagues, we have schedule 1, section 6, and schedule 1, section 7. Can we lump them together? Do we have concurrence? Anybody opposed to that? Then we will do that. Shall schedule 1, section 6, and schedule 1, section 7, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we will now go to schedule 1, section 8. I see the government has an amendment. Go ahead, Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I move that section 8 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“8. (1) The definition of ‘chief of police’, ‘First Nations constable’, ‘officer’ and ‘police force’ in section 1 of this act are repealed.

“(2) Section 1 of this act is amended by adding the following definitions:

“‘‘‘chief of police’’ means,

“(a) a chief of police as defined in section 2(1) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, or,

“(b) a First Nations officer who is in charge of a group of First Nations officers described in clause (b) of the—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me, Ms. Hogarth. Section (a): Please repeat that again for us.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Where am I going? Back to—

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** Back to (2)(a) “a chief of police as defined in.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** We just didn’t catch it.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Okay, “chief of police” means?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** Yes, “‘‘‘chief of police’ means.” Yes, if you can go from there.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** “‘‘‘chief of police’’ means,

“(a) a chief of police as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, or

“(b) a First Nation officer who is in charge of a group of First Nation officers described in clause (b) of the definition of “‘‘‘police service’’; (“‘‘chef de police’’)

“‘‘‘First Nation officer’’ means a First Nation officer appointed under the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019; (“‘‘agent de Première Nation’’)

“‘‘‘officer’’ means,

“(a) a police officer as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, or

“(b) a First Nation officer; (“‘‘agent’’)

“‘‘‘police service’’ means,

“(a) a police service as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, or

“(b) a group of First Nation officers who are employed by an entity that has an agreement with the Solicitor General; (“‘‘service de police’’)

“(3) Subsection 4(5) of this act is amended by striking out ‘police force’ and substituting ‘police service’.

“(4) Clause 4.1(1)(a) of this act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(a) in the case of a chief of police of a police service maintained by a police service board, provide a copy of the report to the board;’

“(5) Clause 4.1(1)(b) of this act is amended by striking out ‘First Nations constables’ and substituting ‘First Nation officers’.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. Debate on this amendment? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Sure. This motion would amend the definitions as stated earlier in the Accommodation Sector Registration of Guests Act at a later date to align with those in the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, which has not yet been proclaimed into force.

Alignment between the provincial statutes is important to ensure that there are commonly understood definitions for terms and that the act applies appropriately to police services and First Nation police services.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Shall schedule 1, section 8, as amended, carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, do I have concurrence to lump schedule 1, section 9, section 10 and section 11 together? We do not have concurrence. Okay. Mr. Yarde, did you wish to—no, you still want to—okay, we’ll deal with them one by one then.

Schedule 1, section 9: Is there any debate on this section? Are the members ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we will now go to schedule 1, section 10—yes, MPP Harris, please.

**Mr. Mike Harris:** Thank you, Chair. I just wonder what the objection from MPP Yarde would be to bundle these sections together as there are no amendments and it doesn’t seem like he is interested in debating them.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Mr. Yarde, would you like to comment?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** Someone walked into the room, and I was motioning to someone coming into the room. What do you do? Sorry we’re not all there in the same room. Sorry.

0950

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you very kindly. It’s very much appreciated. We all can use a little levity in these times, so I think that’s wonderful.

Will I have concurrence to lump sections 10 and 11 of schedule 1 together? Seeing that, all in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 1, as amended, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, we now move on to schedule 2. We have the possibility of lumping the first three sections, section 1, section 2 and section 3, of schedule 2. Is there concurrence to lump these? No objections? Okay. Schedule 2, sections 1, 2 and 3: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, we will now go to schedule 2, section 3.1. I believe we have the NDP with a new section. Yes, Mr. Singh? Mr. Singh, go ahead.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** You’re muted. Just give us a second here. There, we have audio now, Mr. Singh; my apology. Carry on.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** No problem. This is section 3.1 of schedule 2?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I move that section 3.1 be added to schedule 2 to the bill:

“Amendments before review

“The minister shall not propose changes to the strategy before carrying out the review required under section 4 without first consulting the following:

“1. Persons who have experienced human trafficking.

“2. Members and representatives of communities that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking.

“3. Sex workers and their advocates.

“4. Experts in the protection of civil liberties.

“5. Experts in public safety, health care provision and other areas relevant to the ending of human trafficking in Ontario and the support of persons who have experienced human trafficking.”

A little bit by way of what our intention is with this and what we are hoping: The government has currently excluded folks or individuals from these areas, and now the minister must consult with them. We’re ensuring that this consultation encompasses other subject experts, sex workers and their advocates who feel that the policies could result in an adverse impact upon their areas of work. We’re hoping that you include this list of individuals to ensure that those who are involved in sex work, and their advocates, are properly included in government consultations.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Yes, Ms. Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I want to thank the NDP for bringing this forward. We will have an amendment coming forward, amendment number 14, but right now this amendment, as it’s written, is not required as the minister is already required to engage with persons who have experienced human trafficking, and members and representatives of the committee that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking, as well as others that the minister considers appropriate. We will be bringing an amendment forward for number 14. I suggest that we don’t support this motion, as we will be bringing forward an amendment for 14.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. We’ve heard the member on that, on the consideration of another motion, but we’re on this one.

Further debate? Mr. Singh.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** As stated, this is an amendment that is largely to ensure that the government does its due diligence and consults with folks who are most impacted by legislation around sex work. It’s very important to us that these kinds of consultations include folks from this industry.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** As I mentioned, we will be bringing forward an amendment in the next motion. That’s number 14.

But right now, the act already includes a requirement in section 4(4) that a person who has experienced human trafficking and members and representatives of communities that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking are consulted.

The Solicitor General, as I mentioned earlier, does solicit the views of the public and consults with others the minister considers appropriate.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you very kindly.

NDP motion on schedule 2, section 3.1: All in favour? All opposed? Lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 3, as amended, carry?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Oh, it's not even amended. My apologies.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Mr. Chair, may I call for a five-minute recess?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes. Colleagues, we have a request for a brief recess. We'll call you right back in a few minutes.

*The committee recessed from 0957 to 1006.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** We will reconvene, and I see a new member here. I see Mr. Smith. For the record, name and are you in Ontario, sir?

**Mr. Dave Smith:** I am MPP Dave Smith, and I am in beautiful God's country, Peterborough.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay, thank you very kindly.

Colleagues, we are now going to deal with schedule 2, subsection 4(4). The government has also suggested that they will be moving a similar amendment subsequent to this. The Chair has conferred with the Clerk. If it were identical or very, very similar, the Chair would declare the government motion out of order, but I've been advised that there are enough legal-effect differences in the bill that we will proceed by accepting both schedules to come forward. We will introduce first the NDP one and then it will be followed by the government one. That is my explanation off of that.

Now we will deal with schedule 2, subsection 4(4), NDP. Who's speaking to that, please? Mr. Yarde, please.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** If you can bring it up on screen for me, I'd appreciate it.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** You bet.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I'm having a hard time—can you hear me right now?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes, I can hear you perfectly.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Because I just lost audio from—oh, no, here we go. He's fixing it right now. I'm good now; I'm good.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Mr. Singh, did you hear my explanation with regard to the motion?

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** No, I just had some type of issues. If you could repeat it—I'm okay now.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Sure, I'd be pleased to. The NDP motion and the potential government motion after had some similarities. Were they deemed to be very, very close or close to being identical, the Chair would have ruled the government motion out of order. However, in conferring with legal and with the Clerk, there are enough legal effects that would be different in that that we will be proceeding with both. They're both authorized.

We will deal, first of all, with the NDP one, and then we will deal with the government's. So we are dealing with your subsection 4(4).

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** This is schedule 2, subsection 4(4), correct?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** That is correct, sir, yes.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Okay, perfect. First, I'll read the motion in. If you could put it on screen just to make sure I have the correct one. This is motion number 14, correct?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Correct.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I move that subsection 4(4) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

**1010**

“(4) The minister shall ensure that the following are consulted as part of the review:

“1. Persons who have experienced human trafficking.

“2. Members and representatives of communities”—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me, Mr. Singh, we just missed a bit on recording. Could you just go ahead, right from the start, and redo it again? My apologies.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** No problem. No need to apologize, Chair.

I move that subsection 4(4) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(4) The minister shall ensure—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** “Same.”

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** “Same

“(4) The minister shall ensure that the following are consulted as part of the review:

“1. Persons who have experienced human trafficking.

“2. Members and representatives of communities that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking.

“3. Sex workers and their advocates.

“4. Experts in the protection of civil liberties.

“5. Experts in public safety, health care provision and other areas relevant to the ending of human trafficking in Ontario and the support of persons who have experienced human trafficking.”

Just quickly, with respect to our reasoning for this, this is consequential to our earlier motion. We're asking that the list of individuals that the minister and the ministry must consult with are inclusive of these individuals.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** For the reason that we're bringing forward an amendment, I would be suggesting that we vote down this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, all in favour? Opposed? Lost.

Yes, Ms. Hogarth?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** We have an amendment. I move that subsection 4(4) of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Same

“(4) The minister shall ensure that persons who have experienced human trafficking and members and representatives of communities that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking are consulted as part of the review, including:

“1. Racialized groups, including Indigenous and Black communities and organizations.

“2. Sex workers and sex worker advocates.

“3. Individuals and organizations involved in the protection of civil liberties.

“4. Individuals and organizations involved in public safety, health care provisions and other areas relevant to supporting persons with lived experience in human trafficking.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Any further debate on this? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, shall schedule 2, section 4, as amended, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Schedule 2, section 5: Is there any debate on schedule 2, section 5? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Yes. Shall schedule 2, section 5, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

We will now go, colleagues, to schedule 2, section 6. I believe the government has new subsections 6(4) and 6(5) to introduce. Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I move that schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsections to section 6 of the Anti-Human Trafficking Strategy Act, 2021:

“Other information

“(4) A regulation made under subsection (1) shall not permit or require the collection, use or disclosure of personal information if other information will serve the purpose of the collection, use or disclosure, as the case may be.

“Extent of information

“(5) A regulation made under subsection (1) shall not permit or require the collection, use or disclosure of more personal information than is reasonably necessary to meet the purposes of the collection, use or disclosure, as the case may be.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Is there debate on this motion? Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** This motion supports increased privacy rights and is responsive to the advice from the Information and Privacy Commissioner’s office. This motion would provide greater clarity that the regulatory provisions cannot require more personal information is collected, used or disclosed than what is reasonably necessary to achieve the provision’s purpose.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we have an amendment from the NDP on a new subsection, 6(4). Mr. Yarde.

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** I move that section 6 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Same

“(4) The minister shall ensure that the following are consulted as part of the consultation required under subsection (3):

“1. Persons who have experienced human trafficking.

“2. Members and representatives of communities that are most adversely impacted by human trafficking.

“3. Sex workers and their advocates.

“4. Experts in the protection of civil liberties.

“5. Experts in public safety, health care provision and other areas relevant to the ending of human trafficking in Ontario and the support of persons who have experienced human trafficking.”

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Is there any further debate on this section?

**Mr. Kevin Yarde:** As we’ve been mentioning throughout this morning, Chair, we want to ensure that those who are excluded are added in this bill. This schedule is to make sure that all those who are not in the bill are added.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Ms. Hogarth.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** I’m pleased that, with our amendment number 14, these people are included.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Seeing none, all in favour? Opposed? Lost.

Colleagues, shall schedule 2, section 6, as amended, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

We will now go to schedule 2, section 7. We have motion 17 from the NDP, on subsection 7(3). Mr. Singh.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** I move that subsection 7(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “if the inspector has reasonable grounds to believe that an individual in the place is at imminent risk of harm” at the end.

#### 1020

The intention of this is to place limits on the broad powers of search and seizure that the government has given to undefined inspectors created here, who would inspect businesses that are related under schedule 1. These inspectors appear to be directly employed by the ministry since the powers to investigate—and, in the case of the police, to arrest—are available to police and child welfare agencies in suspected cases of human trafficking.

The creation of these inspectors has rightfully caused some concern. They appear to function similarly to inspectors and investigators for the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of the Environment or the Ombudsman, for instance. But without more known, it appears almost as if they will function potentially like a morality squad. Inspectors will have overly broad powers without further definition. We don’t want to prevent the investigation and the elimination of sex trafficking of exploited persons and minors, but without more of a commitment by the government to be transparent in their aims—we are attempting to limit the powers of the ministry. We’re just trying to bring balance to this.

We recognize that folks who are marginalized need inspection to ensure that they’re safe, and we also recognize that those are powers that currently exist within a variety of other inspectors, but this new category given is overly broad. It creates a lot of concern around individuals who can just investigate without any checks and balances in place. In the absence of any further explanation or context given by the government, this is us trying to curb potential overreach of power that this new class of investigators would have.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Mr. Roberts.

**Mr. Jeremy Roberts:** Thank you, Chair. Respectfully, through you to the member opposite: I don't think this is actually a good amendment, given that it misses the point of the inspectors. The inspectors here are to inspect for compliance with the regulations in this act; they're not actually inspecting if human trafficking has or is likely to take place. So tying inspections to risk of harm goes way beyond the scope of the intent of an inspector's role. I don't think this amendment is actually pertinent to the role of inspectors, given that, again, they are just inspecting to see if regulations are being upheld within these businesses, making sure that appropriate information has been posted, for example. Again, it has nothing to do with actually inspecting on the grounds that the member opposite was alluding to.

My recommendation, respectfully, would be that the amendment be withdrawn. If the opposition chooses to go forward, we will vote it down, as it's not pertinent to the role of inspectors.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay, colleagues, I see Dave Smith and then Mr. Singh. In the order that I saw the hands, Mr. Smith, followed by Mr. Singh.

Go ahead, Mr. Smith. One second, and then we'll have you off.

**Mr. Dave Smith:** Thanks, Chair. It took a bit to get me unmuted.

I'm really, really confused by why anyone would suggest that this was a good amendment to make to this bill. The inspectors are coming in to look for things like if the appropriate poster has been put up. If we need to make sure that there is an individual who is even at risk of harm because a poster isn't posted properly, we're really missing the mark on this completely. This is about prevention and education and doing things so that people know what we're trying to accomplish with this bill. It's so that companies and hotels have the proper information. To suggest that they shouldn't be doing something like put a poster up unless there's someone who is at imminent risk of harm really misses the mark. I am absolutely baffled as to why the opposition would think that this would be appropriate, to prevent someone from making sure that things like a poster or flyers or literature are available unless someone is being sexually trafficked at that point. It's beyond belief that they would come up with this type of an amendment. I will absolutely be voting against it if they don't withdraw it.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Back to you, Mr. Singh, please.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** When we talk about the addition of new powers to any additional inspector, the language from the government—we've heard them describe it as "it is likely not able to" or that this is their "attempt" or "trying to." This is the testimony that we've heard from the government right now, and these are precisely the concerns that we're hearing.

There's no disagreement that we do not want to prevent the investigation and elimination of sex trafficking of

exploited persons or minors. The problem is that when you're creating a new category of investigators or inspectors and you do not define the scope of those inspectors, then the result could be overly broad powers given to these inspectors which could be ambiguous and could result in their having an overreach of their mandate.

In the absence of the government providing clear guidelines and definition in the scope of this new set of inspectors, it is important that we ensure that those inspectors do not overstep their area of practice. The government is putting forward the creation of a new set of inspectors with a lot of ambiguity. There are a lot of concerns around that ambiguity, because it opens up potential civil liberties issues around people's ability to be unduly inspected without clear guidelines on what the limits of that inspector are.

So in the absence of the government's clarity on something they should be doing—they should, respectfully, be making sure that any new set of inspectors has a very focused area in which they are able to practise or inspect—then this is our hope to provide that limit to this new set of inspectors.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Further debate? Mr. Roberts.

**Mr. Jeremy Roberts:** Respectfully, again, the role of inspectors is outlined in the legislation, and arguably the amendment being proposed by the opposition is what would expand the scope of inspectors by expanding them into inspections based on risk of harm. Again, the role of inspectors is clearly defined in the legislation as saying that these folks are looking to make sure that businesses are upholding the regulations that are laid out in this legislation. We do not want to have their scope expanded, as this amendment would propose to do. So again, respectfully, I would recommend that this amendment be withdrawn; if not, the government will be voting against.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay, colleagues, further debate? Are we ready for the vote, then? All in favour of 7(3)? All opposed? Lost.

Colleagues, shall schedule 2, section 7, as amended, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, we have a number of sections with no amendments before us here. We have schedule 2, sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Are we comfortable with putting them together? Seeing no objections, then, we will call for the vote on schedule 2, sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, shall schedule 2, as amended, carry?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Recorded vote, please.

1030

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. Colleagues, a recorded vote for schedule 2.

**Ayes**

Gill, Harris, Hogarth, Roberts, Dave Smith, Tangri.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Opposed?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** Opposed, seeing none.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Effectively, it's carried, then. Thank you.

Colleagues, we're going to go to schedule 3, section 1. Is there any debate on this section? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Did you wish to speak?

**Mr. Jeremy Roberts:** Chair, I see that there are no amendments proposed to sections 1 through 8 of schedule 3. I would propose that we bundle them.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** I would love to do that, but I do have a notice with the committee that I do believe the NDP wish to speak to a couple of them, moving forward.

I'll check with the NDP right now. I have notice before me that the NDP wish to speak to schedule 3, section 2, and schedule 3, section 5. Is that correct?

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Yes, Chair. I believe you will have—am I unmuted? Am I good? Can you hear?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** That's fine, Mr. Singh. As long as I know. We will deal with them when we come to that issue, then.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** Chair, just for clarity's sake—I'd rather seek the clarity now than afterward. We're looking at notices against section 2 of schedule 3 and subsequently section 5 of schedule 3, correct? Those are the two notices that you have before you, Chair?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** That's correct.

**Mr. Gurratan Singh:** So we'll deal with those schedules as they come forward.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay; dandy; fine.

Starting one by one, then, we will deal with schedule 3, section 1. Schedule 3, section 1: We've had no debate on that. Shall it carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Schedule 3, section 2: Is there any debate on this section? Seeing no debate, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 3, section 2, carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Can I lump schedule 3, section 3 and section 4, together? I see no notice. Are we comfortable lumping the two of those together? Fine. Schedule 3, section 3 and section 4: Is there any debate on these? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Schedule 3, section 5: Is there any debate on this section? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we can lump schedule 3, sections 6, 7 and 8, if there is concurrence from the committee. No objections? Then we will deal with schedule 3, sections 6, 7 and 8. Is there any debate on the sections? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Now, colleagues, shall schedule 3, as amended—

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna):** There are no amendments.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Oh, no amendments. There were just notices, no amendments. Okay. Fine. That's carried. Shall schedule 3, section 8, carry?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Oh, I missed that. Thank you. Correction to the Chair, then: Shall schedule 3 carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we're going to slip to schedule 4. Are we comfortable lumping schedule 4, sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, together? We're comfortable. Are the members ready to vote? We are. Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Shall schedule 4 carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Colleagues, we dealt, obviously, with section 4 to start with, so we will now deal with sections 1, 2 and 3, but we'll take them each rather than together.

Shall section 1 carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

We'll go to section 2. Shall section 2 carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, section 3, which is the short title: Shall section 3 carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues, we're getting very, very close to the end here. Thank you so much for your co-operation today. Shall the title of the bill carry? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Shall Bill 251 carry, as amended?

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. A recorded vote is asked for.

### Ayes

Gill, Harris, Hogarth, Morrison, Roberts, Gurratan Singh, Dave Smith, Tangri, Yarde.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. Thank you very kindly. Carried; passed.

Colleagues, shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay, colleagues. Thank you all for your patience with dealing with some of the rust on the Chair. It's much appreciated. Thank you for your courtesy as well and your time to be here—the extra time today—away from our ridings. Once again, we all have responsibilities that we try to uphold to the best of our values, principles and beliefs. Thank you very much, once again, each and every one of you. Travel safely on your way home.

I'd certainly like to thank our capable Clerk and our technical people here for giving us sound advice and counsel as we move through this.

Thank you. Have yourself a great day, folks. Adjourned.

*The committee adjourned at 1041.*

## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY**

### **Chair / Président**

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Hastings–Lennox and Addington PC)

### **Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente**

M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard (Ottawa–Vanier L)

Mr. Will Bouma (Brantford–Brant PC)

M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard (Ottawa–Vanier L)

Mr. Parm Gill (Milton PC)

Mr. Daryl Kramp (Hastings–Lennox and Addington PC)

Ms. Natalia Kusendova (Mississauga Centre / Mississauga-Centre PC)

Ms. Suze Morrison (Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre ND)

Ms. Lindsey Park (Durham PC)

Mr. Gurratan Singh (Brampton East / Brampton-Est ND)

Mrs. Nina Tangri (Mississauga–Streetsville PC)

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos (Oakville North–Burlington / Oakville-Nord–Burlington PC)

Mr. Kevin Yarde (Brampton North / Brampton-Nord ND)

### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Mr. Toby Barrett (Haldimand–Norfolk PC)

Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

Ms. Christine Hogarth (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)

Mr. Jeremy Roberts (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean PC)

Mr. Dave Smith (Peterborough–Kawartha PC)

### **Clerk / Greffière**

Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna

### **Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Eric Chamney, legislative counsel