

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

JP-2

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

JP-2

**Standing Committee on  
Justice Policy**

Committee business

**Comité permanent  
de la justice**

Travaux du comité

2<sup>nd</sup> Session  
42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament

Thursday 10 March 2022

2<sup>e</sup> session  
42<sup>e</sup> législature

Jeudi 10 mars 2022

---

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

ISSN 1710-9442

# CONTENTS

Thursday 10 March 2022

Committee business.....	JP-3
-------------------------	------



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY

Thursday 10 March 2022

## COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE

Jeudi 10 mars 2022

*The committee met at 0900 in committee room 1.*

### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Good morning, everyone. We are calling this meeting to order right now. We are here today to discuss MPP Collard's motion filed pursuant to standing order 129. The procedure for debating this motion is under standing order 129, and it is as follows—might I just say thank you for the letter, Madame Collard. That's obviously why we're proceeding today.

The member will move the motion today to start with, after which time we will have 30 minutes to discuss the motion, with 10 minutes' speaking time allotted to each party. Once the motion has been moved, the mover of the motion will have an opportunity to make any remarks, and then we will proceed in rotation. The rotation will be, obviously, the member, the opposition and the government. You will have 10 minutes, and then when we finish that rotation at the end of the 30 minutes, the question will be put on the motion.

Copies of the motion have been distributed to each member. I presume each member has a copy of the motion.

Madame Collard, I would ask that you please move the motion.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Pursuant to standing order 129, I move that the Standing Committee on Justice Policy undertake a study into the role and actions of the Ministry of the Solicitor General regarding the convoy occupation in Ottawa that was allowed to go on for more than three weeks.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you. You can start off, please, if you wish.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Thank you, everyone, for being here. It seems that even after two years, I'm still living first-time events. Last week, I voted for the first time from my seat after two years of being elected, and now I have a full committee room to talk to for the first time. It's really great.

Regarding that motion, I want to say that the reason for bringing it forward is that there are a lot of uncertainties about the actions that unfolded from the beginning of the occupation in Ottawa. The people of Ottawa and the people of Ontario have lost confidence in the ability of our government to act appropriately to protect them from others who abuse rights protected by our constitution. People have felt abandoned by their own government, and

to this day people are still asking how this was allowed to happen and to go on for so long. Why did it take so long for the government to act? Why did the Solicitor General state that 1,500 officers had been sent to Ottawa when the number was actually closer to 150?

More recently, after it came to light that a provincial political appointee on the Ottawa Police Services Board participated in the occupation of Ottawa, the government fired its three appointees to the board. So the firing of these three political appointees actually raises more questions than provides answers. What confidential information did the provincial appointees have access to? What information did the appointees share with the Solicitor General or its ministry? What were the interactions between the government members and their appointees?

These are all questions that people are asking to this day, and I think that people deserve transparency and full disclosure about the role that the province played during this occupation.

A study by this committee could assist in revealing important information to ensure that this kind of situation never happens again. It is therefore a good use of this committee's resources, and it is in the public interest.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Accordingly, there are 10 minutes allotted for each presentation. So if there is a little bit of time left over, there will be an opportunity for debate at the end. Otherwise, there's no opportunity for debate within the excess time after the 10 minutes.

We will now go to the official opposition. Mr. Harden.  
*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** A clarification—thank you very much. What would we do without the Clerks?

The opportunity for debate must take place if there is any debate during that 10-minute time for presentation, not after. It's not rolled over onto that. So we have a few minutes left for debate, if anybody wishes to debate the issue right now based on the presentation by Madame Collard.

Mr. Harden.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Chair, it's nice to see you this morning. It's nice to see all you colleagues this morning.

I want to thank my friend from Vanier for bringing this forward. I also want to ask her specifically, because I know that the Vanier MPP office was receiving the same volume of calls that our office was receiving—I wonder if she can explain, just for the benefit of this committee, some of the situations residents were put in.

I had occasion, with the member, to attend a number of meetings with police, bylaw, and business improvement associations, and we heard about the impact on several small businesses and folks working.

I also know that this occupation had a huge impact on people who are vulnerable—seniors, persons with disabilities, persons living alone. I know these are people you care about a great deal.

I wanted you to have the opportunity to elaborate a little bit on the context for your residents in the situation where, as your motion is posing the question—what was the Solicitor General doing? I was wondering if you could elaborate for our benefit.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** If you want to know more about the impact on the people of Ottawa, it was—I guess you had to be there to really see it. If you didn't get direct calls from people in distress, you may not understand the level of anguish that was going on.

Vulnerable people, like women who needed access to shelter, were actually intimidated.

We saw a number of microaggressions with people on transit—removing masks from people's faces.

Businesses were intimidated. Their front doors were targeted with all sorts of objects.

There was real fear. People were fearful to come downtown. Businesses had to remain closed, and the ongoing—I guess it was just the whole unbelievable situation that this was happening day after day after day, without seeing any kind of progress, any kind of action on the ground. People were dismayed to see that nothing was being done, that nothing was being put together to address this, until after three weeks.

When the federal government got involved and they put a tripartite table together to have the municipal, the provincial and federal governments sit down together, there was nobody from the provincial government who was there to plan on addressing the issue—so a lot of concerns about the trust of people into the government.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Go ahead, Mr. Harden.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Thank you for that response.

I'm also wondering—because it's not lost on people in Ottawa that inasmuch as the Premier had early declared his support for this movement, later revised within a matter of days to label it what it was, a convoy occupation—why we didn't see, as the member is suggesting, immediate action from the Solicitor General, but it seemed to follow pretty quickly after the actions in Windsor on the Ambassador Bridge.

I've had a number of residents ask me, why did the severe actions, the emergency declaration from the province only happen subsequent to what was happening on the Ambassador Bridge? This matter was an emergency for Ottawa residents long before that. We had people who were deprived of access to their home care workers. I can report to this committee that there was an entire social housing building, mostly of seniors and people with disabilities, that had to be emptied and relocated to a long-term-care facility because people couldn't get access to

their personal support workers out of the riding. There were enormous impacts on people's well-being before the actions at the Ambassador Bridge. I'm wondering if the member had that same query to her office. This really only seemed to become an issue when this convoy occupation was impacting one of the major economic thoroughfares of the country. I'm wondering if you had any comments on that.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** That's very correct. People were almost thankful that this was happening in Windsor, because finally they were getting the attention of the government.

This is also an important question that this study by the committee could explain—and maybe reassure people that there was some good reasoning behind that. We need to get to the bottom of it. We need to understand how it happened and why it happened that way and make sure that we prevent it from happening again.

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

**Mr. Joel Harden:** The other question on my mind, friend from Vanier, is, how do we make sense of the fact that the three provincially appointed members to the police services board by the Premier and the Solicitor General—obviously, that office plays a major role in those appointments. These people have now, we're told, voluntarily offered up their resignations. One of these members was seen at, as the member said, the convoy occupation protests in person and has claimed subsequently that this was to do research for police services board meetings. Two other members have voluntarily offered their resignations for reasons that I don't understand. Beverly Johnson and Daljit Nirman—both of these members, and Mr. Robert Swaita, who was seen at the convoy occupation protests, agreed with a measure that the police services board had proposed before this occupation, of a modest reduction in the police budget in the city of Ottawa so that funds could be used for people in mental health crisis and to fund dedicated mental health crisis response workers. So I'm trying to understand. The three provincially appointed members are now gone for reasons that are not entirely clear to me. Our mutual friend Rawlson King, the first Black councillor in our city's history, is also gone from the board. It would seem that every single person on the Ottawa Police Services Board who was in favour of a very modest reduction—I believe it was a percentage point—in the police budget so we could have a dedicated team of first responders with skills to de-escalate people in mental health crisis, which is a major issue in our city. I'm going to assume it's a major issue in everybody's community. All of these people are gone.

**0910**

I'm wondering if the member is also wondering, as we put this motion to the floor, what was the Solicitor General's advice? Why did these three people voluntarily offer up their resignations? Why were these resignations accepted? I can understand in the case of Mr. Robert Swaita why there would be major concerns—but why for Mr. Nirman and Ms. Johnson? Do you have any thoughts on this matter as well?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Madame Collard, we still have five minutes left in this round.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** That's a good point, and that's one of the main reasons why I brought this motion forward. There are more questions that remain unanswered. We saw the government reacting to Mr. Swaita being involved at some level, being supportive of this occupation, and yet we knew that he had access to privileged information, like confidential information about police tactics and police strategy on the ground. So this raises a lot of suspicion. Again, that's why we need the study. We need to explain to people. It's a question of confidence. This is also affecting the confidence of the people in the police services. There are a lot of puzzles there. The Solicitor General has oversight over the Ottawa Police Services Board. The police services board has oversight over the police services. So what are the implications? What are the relations? What happened? We need to find out. It's very important.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Mr. Harden, you have five minutes remaining.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Back to Mr. Swaita: I do find it odd that this was a gentleman who is on record—and we all have a right, as citizens of this province, to donate to whatever political party we want. I'm not saying anything is untoward about that. But we know for a fact that Mr. Swaita donated at least \$8,000 to the Progressive Conservatives of Ontario since 2015 through himself and, previous to the election financing rule changes, through his business. So we know that that support for the Premier exists. That's Mr. Swaita's right.

What troubles me, though—and I ask the member this: Does she not worry, as I do, as people in Ottawa Centre do, that Mr. Swaita took it upon himself to begin research by attending these protests? This is our community. Where this happened, on Wellington Street, is right across from Parliament Hill. That's in the middle of Ottawa Centre's north end. Mr. Swaita felt, I suppose, the need to research what was happening in the heart of the convoy protests on Wellington—the bouncy castles, the beer gardens, the stage with the VIP deck, the hot tub, the saunas, the merriment. But I never once heard Mr. Swaita talk about the folks MPP Collard mentioned in her community, who also exist in ours—people who were, frankly, harassed on their way to work, people who had their businesses shuttered for weeks. I know of at least six buildings—and these are all verified police-filed incidents—where either the power or the water was shut off. There was one building where there was an arson attempt. The people making this attempt openly identified as convoy supporters and attempted to duct-tape the doors shut. There was another building where there was an attempt to handcuff the front doors shut. I have said throughout that I believe the people doing these things were an extremist minority who took advantage of this large occupation as cover for them to carry out truly hateful acts. But I never once heard Mr. Swaita talk about this in the course of his research.

So I'm wondering if the member has any concerns, as I do, about the selective nature of Mr. Swaita's research, his ties to the Premier, what advice he was giving the Solicitor General based on this extremely narrow research. Does the member have any concerns as well?

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Thank you for that question.

Understanding the ties between the government and the police services board is very important because it had a direct impact on the event.

I was meeting every day with residents, with business owners, with representatives of the BIAs, with representatives of the police and bylaws. What we were hearing systematically, every day, is that the police were not intervening because they didn't have enough resources. So why was that? Why didn't they have the resources available that they needed after asking the province? And that was after two weeks. Every day people were asking the police, "Why is there no action on the ground?" We were being told that thousands of officers were being sent. Well, I was on the ground, and I didn't see a thousand more officers on the ground. It seemed to be handled by a handful of police officers. Every time they would try to move in, they would be surrounded by protesters. So they seemed to have some kind of intelligence about what the police actions were going to be. That's very concerning. Everybody was aware of that on a daily basis. Everybody was asking the same question every day: "Why aren't the police moving in?" And we were given the same answer: "We don't have the resources." So why?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Mr. Harden, you have under three minutes.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Okay. The exact same questions were being posed all over the city.

Here's the thing that I think marked the turning point—and I'm curious to know where the Solicitor General's office was on this. People in downtown Ottawa grew so frustrated, Chair, if you can believe it, that members of a dog-walking, child-minding, cookout Facebook group organized a civilian blockade around the corner from my home in Old Ottawa South, where I live in the riding. I found about it literally the night before and in the dog park the morning of. That's how out of control the situation became. I went to the scene and did my very best, with members of the Ottawa Police Service, to keep people safe. That is a chaotic situation that I actually am concerned the Solicitor General played a role in putting residents of our city in, where they felt it necessary to take the law into their own hands to delay the—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** We'll just pause for one second. I don't believe it would be right to insinuate motive for anybody behind this, particularly government officials—

**Mr. Joel Harden:** I take your point, Chair. If the member is correct and the Solicitor General did not act quickly enough or at all, what I'm suggesting in my commentary, through you, is that residents of Ottawa felt the need to act, and that's an extremely dangerous

situation. I have to say, for the record, I am so proud of every single person who did that peacefully.

There was dialogue that day with those convoy protesters. We talked, and we figured out a lot. In fact, we have a lot in common.

I wonder if the member has any comments on the Solicitor General's office putting us into a situation where it got that bad and something like that happened.

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** Mr. Chair.

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

**Ms. Christine Hogarth:** The member is just assuming, is what's going on.

I think you shouldn't be assuming of what you think conversations happened.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Madame Collard, you still have three minutes left.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** I think MPP Hogarth just raised a valid point. You're right: We shouldn't be assuming. We should be getting the answers that we need. I don't want to assume anything.

I'm worried because, as MPP Harden suggested, the situation where civilians decided to take matters into their own hands, because they weren't feeling supported by their own government, by their own police force, could have led to an horrific situation. It could have led to lost lives. People were very worried about that.

Again, through my meetings I was having daily with the police services, business owners and bylaws, they were asking us, "Please don't encourage people to go out on the street." People reached out to my office to say, "You should be organizing a protest against the protest or against the occupiers." The situation—

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Two minutes.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** —was escalating.

Again, we just need the answers. Let's not assume. Let's do the study. Let's get the answers we need.

0920

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Thank you, Madame Collard. You still have a minute and 52 seconds after.

Ms. Morrison, you have a minute and 16 seconds left.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Thank you so much. I quickly wanted to get on the record some of the things that we heard in my community, here in Toronto Centre, with regard to the occupation.

With regard to some of the horror stories that we were hearing, we were also seeing blatant homophobia coming from the occupation. There were reports of houses with Pride flags on them that were being vandalized with feces. When the protests were looking to move to Toronto—and, as many of you know, my riding of Toronto Centre neighbours onto the Legislature here—we had massive road closures. The whole of our downtown east core was basically shut down for several weekends in a row, and the road closures went up right to Church Street, the home of the Church and Wellesley Village. I have to tell you, the queer and trans folks in my community were horrified and terrified that the blatant homophobia that was happening in Ottawa was about to come to our streets, into the homes of thousands of queer and trans folks.

Would the member like to comment on the government's failure to act in the face of blatant homophobia in response to this?

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

You have one minute and 52 seconds left.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Thank you. Will I have another chance at the end for closing remarks? That's it?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** No, you have 10 minutes total.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Okay. I just want to say to the member's comments that it is unfortunate that this was actually reported consistently. That's very concerning.

I want to say that what happened in Ottawa is unprecedented, but not in a good way. The whole world was watching as occupiers took our national capital hostage, and it actually fuelled other anti-democracy movements to invade other major cities. This is an additional reason why we need the answers. We need to learn from this. We need to learn lessons to put in place mechanisms and policies to ensure this never happens again.

We are leaders. Canada is leading the world on so many fronts. We can't let democracy be hurt and handicapped by the events that have happened. That's all I'm asking for. This study is not to put blame on anyone; it's to find out what happened, why it happened that way, and what we can do in the future to make sure that we never find ourselves in that position again. That's all I have to say.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** We will now go to the government for 10 minutes. Mr. Harris.

**Mr. Mike Harris:** I want to thank the member for bringing this motion forward today. I think there are obviously some very important questions to be answered about what happened in Ottawa. I think that there were a lot of challenges that were faced by the residents in that city. I want to thank you both, and other members of Ottawa ridings who we have here in the Legislature, who took time to get out to meet with people and understand what a lot of those concerns were from residents. I know you were all very intimately involved with many projects in trying to make sure that people were safe, and I want to applaud you for that.

There are a few things I want to go over here, and it's not my intent, necessarily, to get into debate here today.

It pains me a little bit to hear members of the committee saying, "We're not blaming anybody. We just want to find out what happened"—but to me, it sounds a lot like people are trying to score political points by using this situation to do that. We hear a lot of assumptions coming from the other side of the table here, without any concrete evidence into the claims that they're making—and you actually had to raise that point with one of the members of this committee.

Looking at what's going to happen over the next few months as we wrap up what has happened and digest everything in Ottawa—there is going to be a mandatory federal inquiry into the invocation of the Emergencies Act. I'm not sure if the member is aware, but that study will be ongoing by the federal government, into the response at



Parliament Hill and more into the city of Ottawa. The government of Ontario is also required to publish a report following the provincial state of emergency. So we've got two reports, or two inquiries, so far, that will be ongoing. There will also be a third by the Ottawa Police Services Board, as it has referred the handling of the matter to the Ontario Civilian Police Commission for review. There are also individual civil and criminal matters before courts here in the province.

I want to make it very clear that we on the government side, and as members of this House, don't necessarily object to the committee at some point studying what has happened, but I think it would be prudent to allow these three inquiries to flush out everything beforehand, and then we would have an opportunity to dive a little deeper into it later on. Again, we're not opposed to seeing something like this happen, but you have three independently run inquiries that are going to be happening over the next few months, and I think it makes a lot of sense to see what comes out of those first.

The other thing that really struck me here today is the members of the opposition, whether it be the NDP or the Liberal members, trying to insinuate that the Solicitor General and the government should be directly directing police. There has always been a very, very strong break between what the government does in regard to policing so that we aren't directly influencing things that are happening on the ground. If there's help that's needed, if there are opportunities for us to collaborate as government and as the Ministry of the Solicitor General and we're asked to do those things, then absolutely, we will.

I had an opportunity to visit Ottawa on some ministry business during the occupation. I also spoke with some police officers later on who were actually part of trying to remove folks from the downtown core. I want to thank them. They did a great job of trying to deal with, as MPP Collard said, a very unprecedented situation. I think that's something that has been lost on a lot of members of this House. It's not just about the people of Ottawa or the protesters, but it's also about the peace officers and police officers who had to put their lives on the line, quite frankly, to be able to bring the city of Ottawa back to the standing that it deserves.

As I said, I don't plan on getting into debate over this. With whatever time is left, I'd like to just go ahead and move voting on the motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** That will be fine, but I do believe we have another speaker first.

You have four minutes, 54 seconds left, Mr. McDonell.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** I just wanted to say one thing: Being a neighbouring region to Ottawa—I had the opportunity to talk to our police forces, and I think you have to put it in perspective. We are not flush with OPP officers, and the request was for more than a third of the Ontario police officers in the province. I think that there had to be arrangements to allow people to be there, to reschedule days off. I give the example: There are six detachments in Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry. There are two police officers on at night in each one of them. Do we send one

and leave one? Those are the logistics. You needed a plan. They were there the day they needed them, but they couldn't be there for weeks.

I think the reason for the federal plan really is, how do we handle these going forward? Can we rely on our scarce resources? Especially in the last number of years, a lot of our hirings have been towards mental health, which was not the need of those days. We were looking for police officers.

Anyway, I just wanted to add that. We are neighbouring, and we did talk to the local police forces. They are already strained. To ask for 40% of the police force of Ontario takes some organizing and a plan, and I think that's what they were waiting for.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Madame Collard, we have 40 seconds left, if you'd like to offer any comments on closing.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** I understand and I appreciate that there is going to be a study on the use of the Emergencies Act powers. This is into the legality of using this, not into the facts and what happened.

And I never said that the Solicitor General should give directions to the police. But the Solicitor General has oversight over—and they were asked for resources. She could have sent some resources, and that's what was being asked.

On the point that was made about not sending all the OPP to Ottawa: When they were sent, the situation was resolved in two days. So they could have gone there at the beginning of the crisis, not at the end.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** The time has now elapsed for the government. No more questions from the government.

Mr. Harden, you have 12 seconds left.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Could we have 10 minutes, Chair?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Excuse me?

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Does the opposition have 10 minutes?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** It's 10 minutes total.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Oh, there are not more rounds?

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** One round, and that is it.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** So we shared the 10 minutes.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** No. It's 10 minutes, 10 minutes, 10 minutes, whether you were in question and answer or whether you were in statements.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Point of order.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Yes, point of order.

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Just so I understand procedurally, Chair: MPP Collard had 10 minutes and didn't use up the totality of her time, so we used part of that 10 minutes for debate. The government members just had 10 minutes and didn't use up the entirety of their 10 minutes. I'm assuming that MPP Morrison and I now have 10 minutes.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** No. My understanding—and I have been advised of the structure—is, it's a total of 10 minutes for each party and/or independent to speak in total. So whether you are speaking and/or responding, that is counted against your time of 10 minutes.

The government spoke for seven minutes. Madame Collard spoke, total, for 10 minutes. The official opposition spoke for 10—

**Mr. Joel Harden:** No, we asked questions to the member.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** It is included. It has to be included in that 10. This is a 30-minute session. It is 10 minutes, 10 minutes, 10 minutes total time of your speaking, regardless of whether it's a question or a statement. So at this point, this is now over, and we will have to go to the vote.

As Chair, I will just make one comment. Having served at ground zero for almost 12 years—I was serving as the national chair of public safety and national security for this country—I do understand the concerns, believe me, very, very much so, and personally.

Are the members ready to vote? Thank you. All those in favour, please raise your hand.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Oh, we wanted—

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Recorded vote, please. Ms. Morrison—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Joel Harden:** Pardon, Chair. Point of order.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Point of order?

**Mr. Joel Harden:** I heard the Clerk mention it's too late for something.

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Point of order.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Point of order, Ms. Morrison.

**Ms. Suze Morrison:** Apologies. I'm hoping for, perhaps, the discretion of the Chair and the Clerk, appreciating this is our first time back in in-person committee in almost two years. As we get used to getting back to the procedures, I acknowledge that we were probably about 10 seconds late in requesting our recorded vote—but if we could have the permission of the Chair to proceed with the recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** The Chair will consider that, based on the legality of whether or not we can do that procedurally.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** Okay. What we'd need is unanimous approval by the committee to have a recorded vote, based on the circumstances. Do we have unanimous approval?

**Interjections:** No.

**The Chair (Mr. Daryl Kramp):** No, we do not. I'm very sorry, Ms. Morrison.

Now we will go back to your vote. All opposed? The motion is now lost.

Thank you very kindly for coming in on this important issue this morning.

*The committee adjourned at 0934.*



## **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)

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

Ms. Christine Hogarth (Etobicoke–Lakeshore PC)

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

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

Mr. Jim McDonell (Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry PC)

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

Mr. Randy Pettapiece (Perth–Wellington PC)

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

Ms. Donna Skelly (Flamborough–Glanbrook PC)

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

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

### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mr. Joel Harden (Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre ND)

Mr. Mike Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

### **Clerk / Greffière**

Ms. Thushitha Kobikrishna

### **Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Andrew McNaught, research officer,  
Research Services