

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

SP-18

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

SP-18

**Standing Committee on
Social Policy**

Better Schools and Student
Outcomes Act, 2023

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Tuesday 16 May 2023

**Comité permanent de
la politique sociale**

Loi de 2023 sur l'amélioration
des écoles et du rendement
des élèves

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Mardi 16 mai 2023

Chair: Brian Riddell
Clerk: Lesley Flores

Président : Brian Riddell
Greffière : Lesley Flores

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

ISSN 1710-9477

CONTENTS

Tuesday 16 May 2023

Better Schools and Student Outcomes Act, 2023, Bill 98, Mr. Lecce / Loi de 2023 sur
l'amélioration des écoles et du rendement des élèves, projet de loi 98, M. Lecce..... SP-481

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
SOCIAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DE
LA POLITIQUE SOCIALE**

Tuesday 16 May 2023

Mardi 16 mai 2023

The committee met at 0901 in room 151.

**BETTER SCHOOLS AND STUDENT
OUTCOMES ACT, 2023**

**LOI DE 2023 SUR L'AMÉLIORATION
DES ÉCOLES ET DU RENDEMENT
DES ÉLÈVES**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 98, An Act to amend various Acts relating to education and child care / Projet de loi 98, Loi modifiant diverses lois en ce qui concerne l'éducation et la garde d'enfants.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Social Policy will now come to order. We're meeting today for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 98, An Act to amend various Acts relating to education and child care.

We are joined today by staff from Hansard and by Catherine Oh from the office of the legislative counsel to assist us with our work should we have any questions.

We're also joined virtually by counsel from the civil law division, education and colleges and universities branch, of the Ministry of the Attorney General: Karen Yee and Sara Weinrib.

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

Before we begin clause-by-clause I would allow members to make comments to the bill as a whole. Afterward, debate on the bill will be limited to specific items under consideration. Members, pursuant to standing order 83, are there any brief comments or questions on the bill as a whole?

As you will notice, Bill 98 is comprised of three sections and three schedules. Since the majority of the bill is set out in the schedules, I propose that we stand down sections 1, 2 and 3 of the bill to postpone their consideration and start with schedule 1, section 1. Do members agree?

We will now begin our clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 98. Please refer to your road map.

Let's start with schedule 1, section 1. Motion? I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move that subsection 1(1) of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "remedial

training or education" in subclause 31(5)(e)(ii) of the Early Childhood Educators Act, 2007 and substituting "a specified continuing education or remediation program".

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any debate? Are the members ready to vote? Let's vote: All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 1, section 1, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 1, section 1 is now carried, as amended.

Schedule 1, section 2, government motion number 2: I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move that section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"2. Section 33.2 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

"No hearing

"(8) Despite clause 33(1)(a), the discipline committee need not hold a hearing or afford to any person in opportunity for a hearing or an opportunity to make oral or written submissions before making a decision or giving a direction under section 33 if,

"(a) the matter has been referred to the committee under subsection 31(5) or (9) and involves or includes an act referred to in subsection (2) of this section; and

"(b) the member has been convicted or found guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) for the same conduct or action that is the subject of the matter and,

"(i) the time for an appeal has expired, or

"(ii) an appeal was dismissed or abandoned and no further appeal is available.

"Same

"(9) For greater certainty, section 33 applies, with necessary modifications, even if, in accordance with subsection (8) of this section, a hearing is not held."

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried. It's now amended.

Shall schedule 1, section 2, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 3 to 4 of schedule 1. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections together. Is there any agreement? Is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 1, section 3 to 4, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Government motion number 3 on section 5 of schedule 1: I recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move that section 5 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 59.2(3)(a) of the Early Childhood Educators Act, 2007 and substituting the following:

“(a) it is alleged in a complaint or report against a member received by the college that the child was the subject of sexual abuse, a prescribed sexual act or a prohibited act involving child pornography and, in the opinion of the college, the member’s practice facilitated the relationship between the child and the member or the member’s access to the child; or”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any debate? Are the members prepared to vote? All in favour? All those opposed? Motion 3 is carried.

Shall schedule 1, section 5, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 1, section 5, as amended, will carry.

0910

There are no amendments to sections 6 and 7 of schedule 1. Therefore, I propose that we bundle these sections together. Is there agreement on that? Is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 1, sections 6 to 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 1, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 1, as amended, carries.

Now we’ll go to motion number 4, schedule 2, section 1. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 1(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Is there any debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We support the idea of technical apprenticeships for students in Ontario. However, what we don’t support is rubber-stamping a high-level concept that has no details attached, especially as the government is legislating first—and this will be law—and then they will finally consult with stakeholders, including labour unions and employers and teachers and educators, on what the details will actually be. We believe that the government should consult first and then come back with a plan that is actually set in legislation.

We also heard from Shad Canada the concern that this change ends up removing opportunities for experiential learning, other than apprenticeships, and I don’t think it’s actually the intention of the government to narrow the number of experiential learning opportunities for students. We recommend doing your homework first and then coming back with legislation that has the broad support of all stakeholders in this sector.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: We think many of the motions brought forward by the NDP might be better dealt with in regulations. But we recommend voting against this motion because addressing labour market needs for the skilled trades and helping students enter the skilled trades, as we’ve said, is a key government priority. Amendments to

the Education Act introduced as a part of this bill are intended to set the groundwork for developing an accelerated apprenticeship pathway. The government does plan to consult on the provision and take into account these considerations. If passed, the amendments would be proclaimed at a future date, pending the feedback received over the course of consultations.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government’s consultation process on this bill in general, not to mention the technical apprenticeships part of the bill, has left a lot of stakeholders very nervous about what the government actually means by consultation. If the government doesn’t even intend to put these portions of the bill into force when the bill is passed, then why are we being asked to put the cart before the horse now and pass these with no idea of what the end result is actually going to look like?

If this is a key priority for the government, then why not take the time to consult with stakeholders, get it right and come back with a strong proposal that everybody—government, opposition and stakeholders in this sector—can support?

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

Mr. John Fraser: I just want to say very briefly about leaving things to regulation, as my colleague has just described here. About three years ago, we passed a bill in health care that left to regulation a patient bill of rights. I would like to ask the member across, who is a PA to health, whether those regulations have actually been fulfilled and we have a patient bill of rights. I ask that question because it’s been about three years and that regulation is not done, and the patient bill of rights, as we’re describing here the kind of things, the work that’s being done by regulation, is really important. So I’d ask MPP Martin if she knows the answer to that question.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Mr. Wayne Gates: Can we have a recorded vote, please?

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It’s lost. Shall schedule 2, section 1 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Schedule 2, section 2, motion 5: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “in consultation with teachers and their representative unions, education workers, students, parents, guardians, francophone

communities and school boards” at the beginning of paragraph 0.1 of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: During our two days of testimony last week, we heard significant concerns from many stakeholders about the need for consultation and setting provincial priorities, most significantly from Franco-Ontarians. We had AEFO, ACÉPO and AFOCSC, who all told us that the bill, as drafted, and does not respect the constitutional right of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education systems.

We also heard concerns from Catholic stakeholders, including the Catholic school trustees, about the potential for the bill to override the denominational rights of Catholics within the Catholic school system. Many of the public school boards, including the Ontario Public School Boards’ Association, the Toronto District School Board, the Toronto Catholic District School Board, the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board and the many school boards that sent in written submissions flagged the need for consultations in this and other areas, especially because, as they described at great length, school boards do significant consultations with local parents and local stakeholders. They take into account the feedback of people on the ground, the differing needs according to regions, and there is no requirement here in the bill that the minister do anything of the kind—no requirement that the minister consult with anybody on what the priorities are.

We also heard from many stakeholders, including the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance, ARCH law clinic, the Ontario Autism Coalition and others about the need for inclusion for kids with disabilities, which will only happen if the government is prepared to consult with stakeholders on what kinds of barriers exist for kids with disabilities.

We also heard from all four of the unions representing teachers and education workers that they were not consulted on the bill, even though they are the ones who hold immense expertise in the area of pedagogy and childhood learning and are the ones who actually know what conditions are in schools on the ground for our kids right now.

It is so important that the minister actually consult with these stakeholders to understand what is happening in our schools, to respect the constitutional rights of francophones, of children with disabilities. But unfortunately, the process by which the government developed this bill and tabled this bill, including the failure to consult with many of the stakeholders affected by this bill, doesn’t give anyone confidence that the minister is actually going to consult with a single person before developing these priorities unless he is actually required to by the legislation. That’s why I think it’s absolutely essential that we add consultation to this legislation.

0920

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against the motion, because through the legislative changes proposed in the Better Schools and Student Outcomes Act, the

government’s goal is to ensure a unified system focus on improving student outcomes now and for years to come. School boards across the province should be working toward accountable, consistent standards for student achievement. We believe that all students can learn and be successful and that they should be served by a school board that strives to make meaningful progress to meet these standards, regardless of where they happen to be located in the province.

The ministry does and will engage with a range of education sector partners, including school boards, to support the implementation of the provincial priorities framework if the bill is passed. The ministry values school boards’ knowledge of and connection with their local communities, and they will be able to continue leveraging their expertise in these areas to deliver on the province’s priorities in a way that is responsive to local needs.

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

Mr. John Fraser: I would be inclined to support my colleague across the way, just in the fact that it’s not what reality is and not what has happened so far in terms of consulting with outside stakeholders in bill after bill after bill, whether it’s in education or health care.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We heard from so many of the stakeholders, including the public school boards, about the difference in conditions on the ground. It’s not the same in the north as it is in Toronto. It’s not the same for francophone boards as it is for anglophone boards. If the government wants to create some kind of uniform outcome without taking into account any of the regional differences, any of the cultural differences, any of the rights of francophones and Catholics to manage their own system, they’re going to fail abysmally.

The only way to achieve any kind of uniformity or equity in outcomes is to actually talk to people about what is happening on the ground, to understand what their needs are and to set them up with the resources to succeed. The minister imposing priorities from Toronto on everybody isn’t going to accomplish that.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to clarify that the Minister of Education has meetings very often with all stakeholders. It’s not just the minister who takes meetings; the PA takes meetings and staff take meetings as well. When we are developing a bill we take those voices and concerns that were brought forward. We do differentiate, knowing that we are not Toronto-centric; we are also very aware of the needs of our urban boards as well. I just want to put that out.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Just to her comments: It was very clear during committee hearings that you did not consult with any of these unions. Every union that came here said you didn’t consult. That is the truth. That’s exactly what

happened. It's tough for me to sit here and say that you consulted. You didn't consult with the unions that work with these kids every day, with the teachers who they represent, so it's not accurate.

My Liberal colleague did say that all bills are like this. For whatever reason you don't talk to the unions—the OFL; doesn't matter what it is—that represent over one million workers. I appreciate your comments but they are certainly nowhere near accurate.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I disagree about what we do in the Ministry of Education and I disagree with you calling me a liar. I have said that we consult. We have regular meetings with all stakeholders within our boards of education.

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

Mr. John Fraser: So why in this bill are we hearing from French boards and school boards across Ontario that they weren't consulted about it and that they are concerned about some of the things that are being put forward here?

I don't think anybody is calling anybody a liar here, but what we're saying is the work that needs to be done is not being done. You don't have to consult forever, but you have to talk to the people who are affected by the measures you are putting forward. If you're not, don't be surprised when they say what they say. That's all.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'd just like to remind all members to watch their language, and let's practise some civility.

Further debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's move to motion 6. MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “and well-being” after “student achievement” in paragraph 0.1 of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This was an amendment that was requested by the Ontario Public School Boards' Association in reflection of the fact that the Education Act actually says that the duties and powers of the school board are to “promote student achievement and well-being.” As noted by other witnesses, if we don't focus on student well-being, we won't be able to achieve student achievement outcomes. Our kids are not just test scores and graduation rates, and we don't just want worker bots that come out of our education system. We actually want

kids who are healthy, good, kind, caring citizens, students who have good mental health and good social practices.

We also know that student achievement is contingent on student well-being and that one of the reasons why many of our children are struggling in our schools right now is because of the mental health crisis and the fact that half of our schools don't actually have any mental health resources to support students. So it's really paramount that we not only promote academic outcomes for our students but that we actually promote their well-being within our schools.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against this motion because if the bill is passed, the government will be able to move forward with a regulation prescribing provincial priorities on student achievement. The regulation will provide greater details on the priorities and will include factors that support high student achievement, including well-being. We know that well-being is a key component of student achievement, which is why boards are already required by the Education Act to promote student achievement and well-being and develop a multi-year plan aimed at achieving this and other goals.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: To ask us to trust that these things will be in the regulations is an awful lot of “just trust me” from a government that has refused to invest in the mental health and well-being of our students by making sure that they have the resources that they need, by giving them the smaller class sizes that will actually allow them to succeed, that will give them the special education supports that will actually allow them to be at school, let alone succeed. I don't think there are very many parents, students or teachers and education workers in this province who have a lot of trust in this government that we are going to see regulations that actually prioritize the well-being of students. I think it's absolutely essential that this be included as a legislative requirement.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I would just say that actions speak louder than words, and this government has invested over, I think, an increase of 420% or 460% in mental health resources into schools. So I think that the record of the government speaks for itself about our concern about student well-being. I'm very proud of the steps our government has taken to ensure that mental health resources and special education resources are made available to students.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government's record absolutely does speak for itself when 91% of schools are saying they need additional resources to support mental health, 50% of schools have no mental health resources at all and less than one in 10 have regularly scheduled access to a mental health professional.

When your entire education sector is saying that you need more support for mental health, what you're providing is not enough. Twenty-seven cents per day per child after a massive global crisis and disruptions of three years is just not enough to support our children, and our children are paying the price for the government's refusal to act on this. That's why, again, I think it's incredibly important that we all agree, we set in the legislation, that student well-being will be first and foremost among the priorities of the Ministry of Education.

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

Mr. Matthew Rae: Good morning, everyone. Not to correct my lovely colleague from Eglinton–Lawrence, but we've actually increased mental health funding since we formed government in 2017-18 by 555%. And 100%, I think all of us agree the well-being of students is paramount, especially coming out of the pandemic. It's already outlined in the Education Act. Section 169.1 requires boards to promote student achievement, obviously, and well-being, and develop multi-year plans for that aspect. It's already in a piece of legislation, legislating that aspect. As my colleague from Eglinton–Lawrence alluded to earlier, this sets the groundwork to continue to build on that work that we have already done.

0930

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: There's a lot of this bill that is already in the Education Act, including the requirement for school boards to develop multi-year plans and to communicate with parents. The government doesn't have any problems with repetition when it comes to those topics, so why do they have such a problem when it comes to repetition to say that well-being will be central when it comes to the minister setting priorities for the education system?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Now we'll go to number 7. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "subsection 11.2(1)" in paragraph 0.1 of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act and substituting "subsection 11.2(1) in such a way that ensures that students with disabilities will be fully included in and fully benefit from the activities and measures to which the policies and guidelines relate".

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We heard very loudly and very clearly from witnesses and through the written submissions that children with disabilities are being excluded from full participation in our schools right now and that nothing in this bill will change that unless the bill is amended to ensure that students with disabilities will be fully included and will fully benefit from every part of the legislation. Right now, not only is there no requirement for the minister to consider children with disabilities when setting priorities, there's no guarantee that children with disabilities or special needs will even benefit from the priority-setting.

This amendment was recommended by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many stakeholders who wrote to us in support, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH disability, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and many individuals.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against the motion because the ministry is committed to ensuring students with disabilities can fully participate in educational activities. However, the amendment is not inclusive of the range of students in Ontario's education system. Student achievement priorities will be outlined, as we said, in greater detail in forthcoming regulation and will include a number of factors that support high student achievement, including well-being. The government is committed to continue working with sector partners to meet the diverse needs of the students across the province to make sure that they can reach their full potential.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government has been sitting on the K to 12 education review committee's report, which was widely consulted on and has broad public support, and they haven't done anything to actually implement that report. They haven't provided the funding that school boards need in order to be completely barrier-free by 2025, and they're not providing the special education funding that would actually allow kids with disabilities to be at school full-time, let alone the supports they need to actually participate in education and be successful in education.

I don't think there are too many stakeholders who believe that we should just trust that the regulations are somehow going to magically include children with disabilities. I think it's really essential that we respect the rights of all children in Ontario to an equitable education and that we say front and centre in this bill that we are going to include the rights of children with disabilities and make sure that they are fully included and fully able to benefit from the priorities set by the minister and by any other changes implemented by the minister. I think that is so important, and it's not happening now.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: As we said about the last motion, this as well is already included in legislation. Boards are already obligated to include students with disabilities.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: As I said last time as well, there are other things in this legislation that are already in the Education Act and that didn't stop the minister from bringing forward this legislation. So why is there a reluctance to reiterate that we should be supporting and fully including children with disabilities, especially since that's not happening in our schools right now?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Gates, Fraser, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's go to 8. Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government has refused to amend this section so that it respects the rights of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own French-language education system and the rights of children with disabilities to an equal education in Ontario, so I believe that this clause should be deleted. Otherwise, this legislation could be subject to a court challenge for failure to respect the constitutional rights of francophones and people living with disabilities in Ontario.

We all know how expensive this government's court battles can be when they defend unconstitutional legislation. I think we would all rather see the money go into our education system and actually provide supports to our children. We do not support this section as it is currently worded.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I oppose this motion. The proposed amendment removes the minister's authority to establish policies and guidelines regarding the provincial priorities in education related to students' achievement and removes the requirement for schools boards to comply with these policies and guidelines. This motion does not align with the intent of the bill, which is to promote consistency in school board practices on priority-setting and performance. School boards' obligations to comply with

student achievement priorities are fundamental to the educational priorities framework established through Bill 98.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: What is also fundamental is the constitutional rights of Franco-Ontarians and of children with disabilities. This legislation doesn't currently respect those rights. We can't support a clause that doesn't respect the constitutional rights of some Ontarians.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: The bill is in line with the Constitution. According to all the information we have from legal counsel etc., we understand that the bill is in line with the Constitution. It wouldn't be presented otherwise.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Is Bill 124 in line with the Constitution? Was Bill 28 in line with the Constitution?

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: We are discussing Bill 98, thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Gates, Fraser, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We'll now move to motion 9. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "in consultation with teachers and their respective unions, education workers, students, parents, guardians, francophone communities and school boards" at the beginning of subparagraph 3(a.1) of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against the motion because the government will work, as we said before in response to the similar motion we've already discussed, with education sector partners to help ensure a staged and successful implementation of the bill. That includes consultation with the sector and pedagogical experts to inform curriculum content.

0940

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The Minister of Education didn't even consult with teachers and education workers and other stakeholders in introducing this legislation, so there's no faith from stakeholders that the minister will

actually engage in consultations when reviewing pedagogy or curriculum. He is not an expert in pedagogy or curriculum. It's very important that curriculum be reviewed in consultation with teachers, who are the experts, along with other stakeholders in the education system and especially, once again, with francophone stakeholders to respect the rights of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system.

One of the biggest complaints I hear from Franco-Ontarians is the fact that their curriculum is not specific, linguistically or culturally, that often they are forced to use English-language materials or things that have been badly translated. It's incredibly disrespectful to the rights of Franco-Ontarian students and incredibly disrespectful to the right of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system. Any curriculum review that's being done by the ministry should be done in consultation with these partners in order to have any validity or meaning.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to put it on record that the team that writes curricula is usually seconded teachers from boards all over the province who sit on that committee to write curricula. So when we say that teachers' voices are not in, I just want to put on that record.

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

Let's go to number 11—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Lesley Flores): Number 10.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'm sorry—number 10. I can't count. I've only had one coffee today. MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “and labour market needs” at the end of subparagraph 3(a.1) of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: We are opposing this motion. The importance of labour market needs is very important. We have a high unemployment rate within our youth because we are not preparing students for the labour market.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The committee heard multiple concerns last week from witnesses about the minister trying to narrow the purpose of education to just produce good workers rather than well-rounded citizens who are able to succeed in life. There's also no clarity here on who is determining what labour market needs are or what it would mean to align curriculum with labour market needs. Should our grade 1 and 2 students be learning job-ready skills because that's what the labour market needs, or should we just be giving them a good foundation to succeed in school and in life?

This also ignores the fact that most kids in school nowadays won't have only one career in their lifetime but

will have several careers. It's more important to learn a range of skills along with creativity, flexibility and adaptability so that they can adjust to changes in careers and learn new careers throughout their life rather than coming out of high school only fit for one job.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? Any further comments or debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. We'll now move to number 11. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “in consultation with teachers and their representative unions, education workers, students, parents, guardians, Francophone communities and school boards” at the beginning of paragraph 3.4.1 of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This was another amendment that was requested by the Ontario Public School Boards Association. Once again, it's really important to reflect the local circumstances on the ground, to recognize the fact that school boards, like us, are elected officials and have some right to say what kind of training would be appropriate to them in their role. It's also necessary to reflect the rights of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system, the denominational rights of Catholics with regard to their education system and the rights of children with disabilities to have their needs reflected in the education system.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Just to clarify, we're not removing trustees. We are putting in standardized training. Having served as a trustee, when trustees had the option to do human rights training, they did not. When trustees had the right to do training around leadership, they did not. So standardized training, which is a framework of what trustees need so that they can actually fulfill their role, is an important part of this bill.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This amendment doesn't remove the training; it just requires that the training be developed and delivered in consultation with school boards and with other stakeholders within the education system, which I think is entirely fair, because how is the Ministry of Education here in Toronto going to know what might be required by a school board member in Thunder Bay or North Bay, for instance? How is the Ministry of Education going to know what might be relevant and

required for a school board member who is working in Conseil scolaire Viamonde, which represents over 200 municipalities and land that's the size of 35 English school boards? I think it's disrespectful to set up standardized training and not actually consult school board members and other stakeholders on what should actually be included in and covered by that training.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Like I said, we're not removing the local piece. Standardized training around stuff like human rights, around leadership, does not circumvent localized priorities.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We'll now move to motion 12. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(4) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "a fee" in paragraph 6.1 of subsection 8(1) of the Education Act and substituting "a fee to be paid by publishers".

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: As written, the text of the bill would allow the minister to charge a fee to anyone for the review of textbooks. I don't believe that's actually the intent of the bill, so I think we want to be very clear on who is being charged. We don't want to allow a situation where under-resourced school boards could receive a bill for the review of textbooks down the road. There's no need to have that kind of broadness. We want to be really specific about who is paying the fee, and so this just adds the clarity that it's publishers.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: In this day and age where there is so much content coming from all different places, school boards will not get a bill for reviewing a textbook. Putting in "publishers" limits who you can charge, because there are so many different ways that information and knowledge come forward to boards now.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once this legislation is in place, it's in place regardless of who is in government. So this government might be confident that they will never charge a fee to school boards, but they can't promise school boards that no fee will ever be charged, because the legislation allows school boards to be charged a fee for the review. I don't think that's the intent of the government. I

think we want to create certainty for school boards that the fee is intended for the content producers, not for the school boards, who will be the end users of those textbooks. All we're asking for here is to provide that clarity to school boards.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I just think that the proposed motion is overly broad, so we can't support it the way it's drafted.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: It was just too narrow, but—

Mrs. Robin Martin: Overly narrow, sorry.

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

Mr. John Fraser: Just on a point, how is actually saying exactly who you're going to charge the fee to too broad?

Interjections.

Mr. John Fraser: Too narrow? Yes, okay. Thank you.

I don't think I would agree there. I think a publisher is anybody who puts out information, whether it's online or whether it's on paper or whether it's in audio. I think that term is fairly—it captures a lot. But that's just my opinion.

0950

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's move to 13. MPP Pasma, you're recognized.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(5) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, this is a part of the bill that deals with technical apprenticeships. We support the idea of expanding access to technical apprenticeships for students, but we don't support rubber-stamping a high-level concept with no details attached, especially as the government is legislating first and then consulting. The government should consult first then come back with legislation that has broad support from stakeholders and from all sides in the Legislature.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: We recommend voting against this motion. As has been alluded to by my colleagues previously in the debate this morning, if passed, the amendments would be proclaimed in the future after the consultations with the minister, outlined in his remarks to this committee, moving forward. So this is just setting the groundwork for that.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Just quick, I can tell you that this is very important, but Unifor or IBEW, two of those members that sit on the board for skilled trades, were not consulted on this language. Again, not consulted, not consulted—it really is a theme when it comes to bills with your government.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's move to the next one, number 14. I will recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 2(7) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is another amendment suggested by the Ontario Public School Boards' Association because this section would allow the minister to establish and require boards to comply with policies and guidelines governing board communication with parents, including form, content and frequency. Boards are already communicating regularly with parents. They have expert communications staff who know their local communities and student populations best, who know the best ways of communicating with local parent populations and what their accessibility needs are. Instead of overruling board practices and dictating communication from on high, the ministry should be working collaboratively with school boards to provide provincial messaging through existing formats that take into account local needs and priorities and that will minimize confusion for students and parents.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: We're voting against this motion. I think that improving access to information for parents and families is the fundamental of this bill. School boards are getting information, but we also hear a lot from families that they don't get information. They don't know what's going on in boards. This includes ensuring parents and families across the province can have the benefits of more consistent information-sharing and engagement practices so that they have the tools and information they need to be more fully involved in their child's education and to support their success. All research and documentation shows that students are far more successful when their parents are involved in their education.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We will move to motion 15. I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(8.1) Section 8 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Curriculum review, principles of universal design

“(1.1) Any curriculum review referred to in subparagraph 3(a.1) of subsection (1) shall include a review of whether and to what extent the curriculum incorporates principles of universal design in learning and accounts for any recommendations that have been made for reforming the curriculum so that it is accessible to students with disabilities and all kinds of learners.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This was another request by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many stakeholders, including Easter Seals, the Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and many more, because right now the legislation has no requirement that actually requires the minister to take into account accessibility and the needs of all children when conducting a curriculum review.

We know that right now, there are children with disabilities who are being excluded. This is one of the things that was identified by the K-to-12 education review committee. It's really important, if we're going to give the minister the power to review a curriculum, that that review actually take into account accessibility and ensure that our curriculum is universally accessible.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: When we're talking about students with disabilities, one of their parents' big requests, as well, was really about more information and being able to fully participate and get information from boards and the education system. The government will continue to work with its sector partners to help ensure a staged and successful implementation. This includes consulting with supporting ministry policies like curriculum review guidelines, where details on the process and operationalization of the initiatives would reside. The government recognizes the importance of ensuring students with disabilities can

fully participate in and benefit from Ontario's publicly funded education system.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We're not seeing that commitment from the government right now, not least because many children with disabilities aren't even able to attend school full-time. Some of them aren't able to attend school at all. Many of them don't have the supports that they need to actually fully participate in school, so I don't think there are many stakeholders within the disability community who actually believe that the government is going to include universal access and the needs of children with disabilities in their curriculum review unless the legislation actually sets that out as a mandated requirement.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We will now move to motion 16. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(8.2) Section 8 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Curriculum review: rights

“(1.2) Any curriculum review referred to in subparagraph 3(a.1) of subsection (1) shall be conducted in a way that fully respects francophone and denominational rights.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Any further debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Right now, there's no requirement in this legislation for the minister to actually respect the constitutional right of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system, *par et pour les francophones*. It allows a curriculum to be imposed on French-language school boards that does not meet the needs of francophone students. There is also no requirement that the curriculum reviews respect the denominational rights of Catholics in managing the Catholic school systems. We think it's imperative that these rights be reflected in the legislation and so this just adds that requirement.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I would recommend voting against the motion because the government recognizes and acknowledges the specific importance of its French-language and denominational education partners, and is

strongly committed to doing so to help stage implementation if the bill is passed. However, the proposed amendment is redundant, as the government is already obligated to respect protected language and denominational rights.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government is required to respect francophone rights, and yet francophone students are using a curriculum that was developed for English students, that doesn't reflect their culture and that, in some cases, is still in English and in other cases is poorly translated. I don't think that there are many francophone education stakeholders who actually believe that this curriculum review will take place in a way that respects their rights to management of their own education system unless the minister is compelled to by the legislation.

1000

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We'll now move to motion 17. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(8.3) Section 8 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Training for school board members, etc., disability barriers

“(1.2) Any policies or guidelines setting out training referred to in paragraph 3.4.1 of subsection (1) shall include training on the removal and prevention of recurring barriers faced by students with disabilities, as identified by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee in its Final Recommendations Report for the development of a proposed Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education Standard under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005.”

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I recommend voting against this motion because the government will continue to work with its education sector partners to help ensure a staged and successful implementation. This includes consultation to inform provincial training requirements, including consideration of training on removal and preventing barriers for students with disabilities upon implementation.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government has not implemented this report despite the broad amount of support and the fact that it was a committee that was established by the Ministry of Education. There are many barriers that continue to exist for children with disabilities within our education system, including the fact that many children with disabilities aren't even able to attend school full-time within our education system. The parliamentary assistant referred earlier to the necessity of providing standardized training that trustees might not take if left to their own devices, and I think certainly if we're going to mandate training on human rights, then training on disabilities and removal of barriers for children with disabilities would be an important aspect to include in mandatory or standardized training for school board trustees.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I think, when last checked, human rights does include children with disabilities.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: If human rights does include children with disabilities, then why is the parliamentary assistant opposed to including training on removing barriers for children with disabilities in the legislation?

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: As per the previous motion about standardized training, that will be implemented. We'll look at that during implementation.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. We'll now move to 18. I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(8.3) Section 8 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Training for school board members, etc., disability barriers

“(1.3) Any policies or guidelines referred to in paragraph 27.3 of subsection (1) respecting school boards' communication with parents and guardians shall include,

“(a) a requirement that communication aimed at a parent or guardian with a disability must be fully accessible to the parent or guardian; and

“(b) directions that implement the recommendations respecting information that school boards should make readily available to parents and guardians of students with disabilities, as identified by the K-12 Education Standards

Development Committee in its Final Recommendations Report for the development of a proposed Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education Standard under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This requires that the training for school board members include what the communication needs for parents and guardians are, if parents and guardians have a disability. It could include things, for instance, like the fact that a PDF is not always readable by an online voice reader or the importance of including alt text on photographs. This is information that not everybody has unless they receive training on what kinds of communication methods and tools are appropriate for people with disabilities, and so if the government is going to mandate training, I think it would be important to include training for school board members on how best to communicate with parents who have disabilities.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Our recommendation is to vote against this motion because the proposed Better Schools and Student Outcomes Act is meant to increase accountability, transparency and ensure a collective focus on student achievement so that every student is set up for success and is able to participate in their education. The government recognizes the importance of ensuring students with disabilities can fully participate, as well as their parents, in Ontario's publicly funded education system.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We're not actually ensuring transparency and ensuring that every student can fully participate and have equitable outcomes in the system if some parents aren't able to understand or even read the communication material that's being provided by boards, and may not know what their rights or opportunities are, simply because someone can't open a document or read a newsletter that was provided, which is why I think it's incredibly important that all parents be able to read communications from the school board. This training would ensure that school board members all have the training necessary to understand what kinds of methods and changes that might involve.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Grewal, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Now we'll go to 19. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(11) Section 8 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Implementation of recommendations re exclusions of students, etc.

“(3.1) The minister shall, within four months after the Better Schools and Student Outcomes Act, 2023 receives royal assent, require school boards to implement the recommendations made by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee in its Final Recommendations Report for the development of a proposed kindergarten to grade 12 education standard under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 respecting exclusions of students from school and reduced school days.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The K-12 Education Standards Development Committee was created by the government. They did the work they were tasked with, conducting a comprehensive review of K-12 from the perspective of students with disability. They consulted broadly in the development of that report, and the report is strongly supported by people living with disabilities and educators. But the government has not acted on the report since it was tabled. When the AODA Alliance has reached out to school boards to ask why they’re not implementing the report, they have told them that they are waiting for directions from the Ministry of Education on whether and how to implement the recommendations in the report.

If the minister wants to start exercising central control to improve outcomes for students, then surely he will want to do that to ensure students with disabilities are able to fully participate in our education system without barriers and make sure that this report is fully implemented in Ontario.

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

Mrs. Daisy Wai: I recommend voting against this motion, because this proposed Better Schools and Student Outcomes Act is meant to increase accountability, transparency and ensure a collective focus on students’ achievement so that every student is set up for success and is able to contribute to Ontario’s economy.

The government recognizes the importance of ensuring students with disabilities can fully participate in and benefit from Ontario’s publicly funded education system. The government will continue working with affected parents and partners to meet the diverse needs of the students in the province so that they may reach their full potential.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Currently, every student is not being set up for success. That’s what this committee found in its final report, that there exist many barriers still for children with disabilities within our education system. The

government has not implemented that report. The government is not addressing the fact that school boards don’t have the funding necessary to actually be barrier-free by 2025, as required by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. The government is not providing enough special education funding for school boards to actually provide the supports that children with disabilities need to fully participate in school, to have the supports that they need to be successful at school.

There is no trust on the part of stakeholders that the government is just going to remove barriers down the road just because they want to. I think it’s incredibly important that we include in this legislation a commitment to fully implementing this report and making sure that all children with disabilities have full access to education in Ontario.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Grewal, Jordan, Martin, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We are now going to recess until 3 o’clock, the same room. We are now in adjournment.

The committee recessed from 1007 to 1501.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome back. The Standing Committee on Social Policy will now come to order. We will be resuming clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 98, An Act to amend various Acts relating to education and child care.

Please refer to your road map. The last thing we had to finish was: Shall schedule 2, section 2 carry? Those for? Those against? The motion is carried.

We’ll now move on to schedule 2, section 3, page 20. The Chair recognizes MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, we support the idea of a technical apprenticeship and expanding those opportunities for students, but we do not support rubber-stamping a high-level concept with no details attached, especially as the government is legislating first and then consulting. The government should consult broadly with stakeholders, with unions, and come back with a concept that everyone can support in legislation, instead of legislation with details TBD and no guaranteed consultation plan.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? Any further debate? Are members prepared to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion does not carry.

We'll move on to motion 21. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “and after consultation with school boards” after “Lieutenant Governor in Council” in subsection 11(5) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We heard concerns from the Ontario Public School Boards' Association last week, the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board and other witnesses that “business activities,” the language in the bill, is so broad that it essentially allows the minister to regulate anything that a school board does. Why bother even having locally elected representatives if the minister is going to control every single thing that they do? At least, the minister should be consulting with these locally elected officials on the regulations.

We also heard concern from the Ontario Catholic School Trustees' Association about the lack of respect for denominational rights in regulating all the activities of a school board, and concern from the AFOCSC about the potential for this particular clause to limit French-language school board community activities.

Very often, French school boards play a very particular cultural role that English school boards are not called upon to play in preserving and protecting the language and culture, and so that may entail playing a different role in supporting community and cultural activities than what the anglophone school boards are doing. They also have concerns that the minister should be required to consult with school board trustees before implementing regulations that could affect any part of the board's activity, and they requested that we make it mandatory that the minister will only introduce regulations after having consulted with school boards. So this amendment respects the feedback that we heard from all four school boards of all four education systems within Ontario.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: J'aimerais vraiment que les gens prennent le temps de comprendre que pour les jeunes qui vont dans une école francophone, d'avoir un projet de loi comme on a là qui dit que le ministère peut vraiment décider, peu importe ce que le conseil de l'école a décidé—l'impact que ça l'a pour les francophones. On s'est battu longtemps pour venir à bout d'avoir nos écoles francophones, pour venir à bout d'avoir nos conseils scolaires francophones. D'avoir un projet de loi, une petite

ligne sur la page 6, qui pourrait nous enlever tout ça, ça rend les étudiants, les parents, les enseignants, les aides-enseignants, les conseils scolaires très, très nerveux.

L'amendement qu'on demande de faire, ce n'est pas grand-chose. C'est juste de dire qu'ils vont consulter. Mais au moins, ça démontre une bonne volonté, parce qu'en ce moment, de la façon que la loi est écrite, il y a un manque de bonne volonté, de respecter l'histoire difficile des Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes d'avoir accès à une éducation dans leur langue.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: The government is committed to working with its sector partners to help ensure successful implantation of the bill, if passed, so that Ontario's publicly funded education system is uniformly focused on student achievement regardless of where students live, regardless of where their schools are, improving student outcomes with a focus on important things like reading, writing and math.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, the fact that the government failed to consult with incredibly important stakeholders like the teachers' unions on this bill does not give a lot of confidence that the government is actually going to work in partnership with the many stakeholders in the education sector in setting regulations that will determine to a large extent what can and cannot happen within the education system.

Insofar as there has been consultation, we heard from some of the school boards last week that they were told by the government, “The committee hearing is your consultation.” Well, the school board partners came to that committee meeting, and they told the government, “We don't feel that this clause of the bill adequately protects the rights to French-language education in Ontario.” They are asking the government to make changes that will protect French-language education in Ontario. The government is refusing to make that change.

So I don't think there's any confidence on the part of Franco-Ontarians that the government is going to actually use their regulatory power to protect the right of Franco-Ontarians to continue to preserve their language and culture within the education system or to respect the constitutional right of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system just because the government said so at committee. I think it's really important that we respect the feedback that was given by stakeholders in the committee meetings and make this change to the legislation.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: When the representative from the French public board and French Catholic board shared their views on this bill, they made it really clear that they are nervous that this bill could set back the Francophone populations to before we had our own schools, before we had our own boards. We don't want to go back there. We don't want to go back to the point where schools were a

place where francophones got assimilated. We don't want this. There is a risk there, a risk that you cannot take.

1510

We're asking for a small amendment that says that you will consult. Show some knowledge of the history of French teaching in this province. We have been there before, when the government would decide, and we know what that did: It assimilated thousands and thousands of francophone students. We can't go back there again. We have to make sure we have our French boards, we have our French public and our French Catholic boards. They are the ones the closest related to our schools. They are the ones who know how you make sure that francophone children in Ontario don't get assimilated into the English language.

English is everywhere in Ontario. As a Franco-Ontarian, you have to get up every morning and say, "I will continue to speak French" and put in the time, the effort and the energy to continue to speak French. Otherwise, you catch English like the flu. It's really, really easy to only speak English.

You have to respect what they have told you. Otherwise, bad things will come. You will end up in front of the courts. You will end up losing one more battle. Or you could change a few words in your bill to respect what they're asking you to do.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We'll now go on to section 3, schedule 2, page 22. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 11(5) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: As we said in the debate on the previous motion, it is incredibly important that the francophone boards be allowed to manage their own activities in a way that reflects and respects the role that school boards play in language and cultural activities within the community. We also heard significant concerns from the English-language school boards that "business activities" is so broad that it essentially allows the minister to regulate anything and everything, which eliminates the need to actually have locally elected trustees across the province. Since the government wouldn't even add a requirement to consult, we believe that this clause should be deleted from the bill.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: We're voting against. The motion is about strengthening accountability over school board spending so that there's more transparency on how public funds are spent and how it supports student outcomes. That is the foundational piece to this bill. Families and taxpayers deserve to know how public funds are spent and what boards have accomplished, which is what this proposed legislation aims to achieve.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: You have to read what is written in the bill: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the minister may make regulations prescribing activities relating to a board's business activities and governing boards' participation in those activities."

If this was to say what you've just said, that we want to make sure that we have more transparency and accountability—we have no problem with transparency and accountability. We would like more transparency and accountability in all levels of government, including the provincial level of government, but that's not what that says. What it says is that the minister can prescribe the activities of the board. That has nothing to do with oversight. That has nothing to do with accountability. It has to do with a French board who wants to do something that is not common in the English boards won't be allowed to do that anymore, because the French boards do provide education in different ways. When you deal with people who live as a minority, a minority language, it changes everything, so the way that they teach, the way that they interact, the way that they keep the students interested in staying in French school is really, really different. But now, they could be prescribed to do the same thing as what—if it's good for the English school, it's good for the French school also. This is what they read when they read section 5. They don't read more transparency and accountability; they would agree with that. They read, "The minister may make regulations prescribing activities" of the board, because this is what's written on the page, and that's not acceptable.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are members ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's move on to motion 24—

Interjections: It's 23.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It's 23? I've already got it marked off, 23. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “and after consultation with school boards” after “Lieutenant Governor in Council” in the portion before clause 11(6)(a) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: So, again, this is a clause that allows the minister to regulate anything with regards to school board controlled entities. We heard significant concerns from public school boards about this, including the fact that it gives the minister control over entities that have never been under the control of the ministry, including the Ontario school board exchange. So it's a significant change to the model of governance, which raises questions about why we're bothering to elect local school trustees. And once again, there are concerns that if the minister can regulate anything with regard to school boards, that it fails to respect the rights of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system along with the denominational rights of Catholics to manage their education system.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: So we all know where we are in the bill. It says, “school board controlled entities.” We've never had this before. It has never been the control of the provincial government to do this. It was always in the control of our school boards to manage those. Why does the provincial government—we have enough of a mandate within the provincial government without taking on responsibilities that do not fall under the provincial government. So if you are sitting there as a French school board, you can't help but think the government wants to give itself more power because they want to change some of the decisions that are made at the local level. Otherwise, why would the government give itself powers over school board controlled entities when they've never had that control before? It has always been under the control of our school boards and things have done just fine.

So if what you want is to control the school board, then be ready for pushback, because what's written on that piece of paper is not acceptable to the francophone community. Whether you look at the public board or the Catholic board, this is not acceptable. You could do some minor tweaks to the bill to show good will, to show that you understand the importance of having a French Catholic and French public school board. But as long as you don't show this, then we will read what's written on that piece of paper and interpret it for the years and years and years that the francophone populations have had to fight the provincial government.

1520

The provincial government giving itself more power over decisions that are made at the local level by francophones, for francophones, with francophones is not okay. You have to respect that, and that bill is not doing this. You have a chance to change it or to spend millions

of dollars in court fighting the francophone community. Your choice.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Yes, just to my colleague's point—

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: Thank you. I appreciate that. I should have waited.

This is all about power and control. My colleague said about spending their money; they're not spending their money. They're spending taxpayers' money in the courts continuously on almost every bill that they do. Everything goes to the courts. Yes, they can make little changes, but so far, we're zero for 23. That's the number of amendments that they've decided to turn down so far. We'll see how it goes the rest of the afternoon.

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

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Oh, I'm sorry. MPP Martin. I didn't see you there.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Thanks very much, Chair. I just want to say, as I said before, that the government recognizes and acknowledges the specific importance of its French language and denominational education partners. We'll always do that. We'll work with them on implementation of the bill if it's passed. The government, as we know, is already obligated to respect protected language and denominational rights. We feel that what's important here is delivering quality education to the children of Ontario, and that's what this bill is about.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It's lost.

We'll now go to motion 24. I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 11(6) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, we heard significant concerns from witnesses last week about this part of the bill, about the impact that it has on the work that locally elected school boards do, the fact that it's a significant change in governance that puts entities that have never been under the control of the ministry under the direct control of the minister, that it does not reflect the constitutional right of francophones to manage their own education system or the denominational right of Catholics to manage their education system.

Because the government voted against a motion to require any kind of consultation from the minister with

these partners before making regulations that could have an extensive impact on the education system, we believe that this power should be removed from the act entirely.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: You can all read:

“(a) defining ‘school board controlled entity’ and prescribing persons or organizations that are school board controlled entities;

“(b) prescribing requirements relating to finance and accountability and requiring school board controlled entities to comply with the requirements.”

The minister is giving themselves power to do all of this: “Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the minister may make regulations in respect of school board controlled entities, including”—and it goes on.

You have to take into account the years and years since regulation 17 that took away the right of francophones to go to a French school. This is the reality of our province. This is our history—a history that our grandparents lived through. They are still there to tell us what it was like. Many people my age went to a French school that was under an English school board that was part of an English school, and they would have a couple of classes for the French kids. You know what came out of this? English kids. Because you cannot continue to do this.

This is how francophones read that part of the bill. Try to see it through the eyes of the history of Franco-Ontarians in this province, and you will see that what we have now, you would not accept it if it was your child. You would not accept it if it was the story of your grandmother who was denied access to education in French because of a provincial government law, regulation 17, that took that right away from us.

You cannot continue to go down with this. You will be heading to court, or you can make little changes like we are putting forward that will appease the great level of uncertainty within the francophone population.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I’ll just remind everyone to make all their statements through the Chair.

I’ll now recognize MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I just want to assure the member from Nickel Belt, MPP Gélinas, that, in fact, everybody over here can read. I am so delighted that she actually read the provision out that she did because it was made to seem as though there was a long list of powers that the minister was giving himself, when in fact what it says is that he can designate what is a school board entity and he can prescribe requirements relating to finance and accountability. As the school boards use taxpayer dollars, I think that is what Ontarians would expect.

That’s what this change is about. It is not an appropriation of power over a massive amount of power or getting rid of school board trustees. It is a simple accountability measure, and we think that is what school boards should do to serve the people of Ontario better.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: School boards already have a mandated role in ensuring financial accountability and transparency. That’s why they are elected. Just like us, they have to go and face the voters every four years, and the voters can determine whether they feel they’ve provided sufficient transparency and accountability. There are no limits here on what the minister can regulate with regard to school board entities, because we just tried to limit it and say that the minister has to develop these regulations in consultations with stakeholders within the education system, including trustees, and that was defeated by the government. So this is about unlimited power to the minister, without even the requirement to consult with people.

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

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I’m sorry, I didn’t see you there. MPP Barnes. I need extra eyes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I’m just, again, restating that it’s about strengthening financial accountability so that there is more transparency in how school boards and their controlled entities are spending public funds. We have heard continuously from communities, we have heard continuously from parents that they do not understand how money is being spent in boards, and they don’t understand where money goes in boards. So this is, again, a response to that oversight.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Shall schedule 2—

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Page 25. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 3(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This section of the bill provides significant new powers to the minister to regulate areas of school board activity that are incredibly broad because of the fact that it includes anything that can be defined as a board’s business activity. It includes entities controlled by the school boards that have not been previously controlled by the school boards.

There is no requirement that the minister consult with any partners within the education system, which does not show any respect to the constitutional right of Franco-

Ontarians to manage their own education system or the denominational rights of Catholics to manage their education system. It shows immense disrespect for the role of locally elected school board trustees and makes their role moot, because why are we electing local trustees when the minister can overrule them with anything, with no consultation with anyone?

1530

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: If we keep reading in section 3: « la prise et la mise en oeuvre des mesures qui y sont précisées en ce qui concerne la prestation de services en éducation spécialisée. » There's a part of the English bill that is actually in French, just to make sure that the francophones know that it's going to apply to them, and it's going to apply to them dans la prise et la mise en oeuvre des mesures.

Everything is there to make francophones nervous about something that doesn't add value: to have a minister make regulation regarding school board controlled entities when we haven't even defined "school board controlled entities." Some of the school board controlled entities right now are funded by different ministries than the Ministry of Education. Will the Minister of Education have control over those entities that are not even funded by his ministry? That's the way we read this part of the bill right now, and for the francophone population, this is very dangerous.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Shall schedule 2, section 3 carry? We'll now vote on that.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried.

Schedule 2, section 4: There's nothing in there. Shall schedule 2, section 4 carry? Those for? Those against? It's carried.

Let's move on to schedule 2, section 5. Number 26: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 5 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "After consultation with teachers and their representative unions, education workers, students, parents, guardians, francophone communities and school boards" at the beginning of subsection 11.2(1) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: So we heard significant concerns from stakeholders last week about the need for consultation when setting regulations pertaining to student achievement, most significantly from Franco-Ontarians. AEFO, ACÉPO and AFOCSC have told us that the bill as drafted does not respect the right of Franco-Ontarians to govern their own education system—un système par et pour les francophones.

We also heard concerns from Catholic stakeholders, including the Ontario Catholic School Trustees' Association, about the fact that the regulatory power of the minister has the potential to override the denominational rights of Catholics within the Catholic school system. The Ontario Public School Boards' Association, the Toronto District School Board, the Toronto Catholic District School Board, the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board and the many school boards which sent in written submissions all flagged the need for consultation in this area.

School boards already do significant consultations with local parents. There's no requirement here that the minister do the same, even though we know that local priorities, local realities on the ground, the resources, the tasks that different school boards have to do are all different, and we cannot be sure that the bill will actually support better student outcomes if there's no requirement for the minister to take into account any of the differences between the four education systems or the different local realities on the ground.

Furthermore, the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance, ARCH Disability Law Centre and the Ontario Autism Coalition all flagged the need for inclusion of kids with disabilities, which can only happen through consultation.

Also, when we're talking about student achievement, teachers and education workers are the real experts in student learning and pedagogy. They hold immense expertise in what is actually happening within our school system right now, but there was zero consultation with them on the creation of this bill. The lack of consultation in the process of creating this bill with so many stakeholders gives no one in the sector confidence that the minister will actually consult in developing these regulations unless he is required to by legislation, so that is why we are recommending that we add this requirement for consultation to the legislation.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: The government continues to commit to work with its sector partners to ensure successful implementation of the bill, if passed, so that Ontario's publicly funded education system is uniformly focused on

one thing: improving student outcomes, with a focus on important skills like reading, writing and math. To help staged implementation, elements of the bill, if passed, would come into force upon varying effective dates. Many of the legislative amendments are enabling, including this one, and will require regulations to support them. The government will continue to use these opportunities to engage and consult with the sector to inform a successful and staged implementation of the bill.

In the ministry, we do have teachers that help to contribute to the consultation around writing this bill, as well as writing curricula.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I'm happy with the comments that MPP Barnes just made, that the government commits to working with partners. Put it in the bill. Right now, there is a lot of uncertainty, I would say, and a lot of anxiety that—how come this bill came forward and some pretty important partners never knew anything about it? They got a briefing once the bill was already written. They were never consulted on it, and yet they have decades of advocating for our education system to get better.

You have said that your government is committed to working with partners. Put it in the bill that you will consult with teachers, their representatives, education workers, students, parents, guardians, francophone communities and school boards. Those are the groups that felt that they want to make sure that the government talks to them. You've said that your government is committed to do so. Put it in writing in the bill. You will help to de-escalate the anxiety and the frustrations that are building in and around this bill.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gates.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'll go quick. I just want to say that you've been talking about consultation from their side a number of times when they respond to our amendments, but let's be clear—and we saw this during committee: There's no consultation with teachers; there's no consultation with unions; there's no consultation with educational workers; there's no consultation with students; no consultation with parents; no consultation with their guardians; no consultation with the OFL. They're showing absolutely no respect for the right of the francophone community at all—and their communities and their school boards.

And it's very similar with a lot of bills that I've been listening to the last little while. You keep talking about consultation, but when we did consultations with Working for Workers, it was the same thing; you didn't consult with anybody. That is the theme over and over again. You continue to say you're going to consult; put it in the bill. It's not a big ask. Put it in the bill. You'll have another 50 opportunities to support our amendments to put it in the bill to make the bill better.

1540

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I just want to reiterate that we cannot achieve uniform outcomes in student achievement by having a minister dictate from Toronto to all four education systems no matter where the school board is operating in the province, no matter what their local circumstances are or what kind of resources they have as a school board and expect that it's going to achieve uniform outcomes across the province.

We've seen in the past how, when the ministry dictates uniform requirements for the education system, it can have devastating outcomes for the French-language system, including when the ministry changed the funding formula and the length of time for teachers' college to address a problem that existed in the English-language school system, and they decimated the French-language education system in terms of the availability of teachers. We are still struggling to address that scenario now with inadequate funding from the government.

I think it's incredibly dangerous to impose uniform requirements on four education systems with incredibly different local realities without at least consulting with the people who are affected by the minister's decisions.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to say the Minister of Education consistently meets with all stakeholders. It is something that they do constantly. It is a constant conversation that the ministry has with all stakeholders at all times.

When you were talking about uniformity across boards, we are talking about the expectation of every child to be successful in school, of every child to be able to graduate, of every child to be able to be successful from school. An expectation of achievement for students to build a life after school is not unattainable.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I want to remind you that during deputations, members on your side would ask people coming to depute, "Do we need a school for 25 children?" That's a question that was asked regularly. I can tell you that in my riding, whether you go to Gogama or whether you go to Foleyet or whether you go to many areas in my riding, we have little schools because it's not reasonable to put a four-, five- or six-year-old on the bus for two hours to make it to the next big city. It's a one-and-a-half-hour ride if everything goes well on Highway 144 to go from Gogama to Timmins, which is the next big school. So yes, we have little schools. It's the same thing with Foleyet. Are you going to put a seven-year-old on a two-hour bus ride one way to go to Timmins in the morning and come back? No. We build little schools.

When the rules are made at Queen's Park, with a minister who may have nothing but the best of intentions, the way it gets rolled out throughout our province can sometimes be devastating. We have lived through devastations. We know what it means when a good-hearted minister in Toronto makes decisions that affect the people in northern, rural Ontario, who I represent. You have to

consult with them. You'll have to see that the reality on the ground is very different.

Are those students successful? Absolutely. I can name you nurse practitioners and physicians who were educated in those little schools, and they are very successful. They got a really good education with the reality of where they live, but this can only happen if you take the time to listen to them to know their reality.

That's not what this bill does. Someone sitting in the minister's chair as the Minister of Education will make decisions that will have a direct impact on communities that he probably doesn't even know where they stand on the map, never mind the reality of the kids who go to school every single day in those little, isolated schools.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you, Chair. I thank you for my colleague's comments—a little confused, but happy to read into the Hansard. We heard, actually, from one of the groups, the independent school bus operators, SBO, here at committee. They were consulted. The minister outlined a new transportation funding formula. We're increasing funding for school transportation, addressing concerns we heard in northern Ontario and rural Ontario, which I represent here in this place. So we're continuing to consult with those people around school transportation—since my colleague brought it up, that's the reason why I'm addressing that right now. I know the minister will continue to do that, along with his PA.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Since we're in the process of reminding members of the testimony last week, I'll just remind the opposite side that we also heard from all four teachers' unions that they were not consulted on this legislation. We also heard from school board partners that they were told that the committee process was supposed to be the consultation on the bill. What we've seen is that they came to the committee in good faith, told us about their concerns with this legislation, proposed amendments, and so far, none of the amendments that they've put forward have been adopted. I think it's absolutely essential that we build into the process that it be mandatory that the minister consult, because there's not a lot of faith from education stakeholders that the government will actually consult with stakeholders beyond a few pet stakeholders.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I have a concern that we're quoting or paraphrasing what was said in committee. I'm not quite sure what rule it would fall under, but I think it's inappropriate in the sense that it's misleading. I know the member opposite said that many members over here asked about closing or said we were going to close little schools, and that was part of her recent comment, but that was, of course, in the context of school sharing, I think. I don't recall anyone saying we were going to close little schools, but I do recall there being provisions in the bill where schools might be shared between school boards. So I'm a

little concerned that we're just putting on the record our paraphrasing interpretation, hermeneutical interpretation, of what we think was said at committee, but we all were there, so we heard committee, and there's a Hansard of it. I just would suggest that we don't need to talk about what was said at committee or paraphrase it in a way that is not reflective of the reality. I think that's a bit misleading.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I agree that we have Hansard that is really good at quoting exactly what was said. It was MPP Kusendova, who was speaking French at the time, and asking l'ACEPO—that morning that she was there in committee, she asked three times, "Do you think that we should have a school for 25 kids?" It's on Hansard; everybody can see it.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Chair?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I just wanted to add to that comment. I understand French perfectly well. I understood everything MPP Kusendova said, but I agree—and what I said before was it was in a certain context, and that context is not being relayed when we're paraphrasing. I'll leave it there.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Thank you, MPP Martin.

I just want to remind the committee members that we're discussing motion 26 and that we should keep the debate to motion 26.

Mr. Wayne Gates: This is all on 26.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): I want to remind the members again that we're discussing motion 26. Thank you.

Mr. Wayne Gates: That was on 26.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Thank you.

Are we ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote, Chair.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): The motion is lost. Motion 26 is lost.

Motion 27: MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 5 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "and well-being" at the end of subsection 11.2(1) of the Education Act.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Again, this is an amendment that was put forward by the Ontario Public School Boards' Association, which noted that the Education Act actually says that the duties and power of school boards are to promote student achievement and well-being. What we have

in the bill right now is a regulatory power that only focuses on student achievement, with no reflection of the fact that student achievement and well-being are very closely linked. As noted by other witnesses, including the Catholic teachers, we shouldn't just be focused on test scores and graduation rates, but on developing well-rounded children and youth who are good, kind, caring, empathetic, compassionate citizens who are critical thinkers.

1550

We also know that student achievement is contingent on student well-being and that our students cannot learn when their mental health and their physical well-being is not being supported, when they don't have the resources that they need in order to be well and to fully participate in school. Unfortunately, what we see right now is a situation where half of our schools have no mental health resources whatsoever. So we think it's incredibly important, if the minister is going to give himself the power to regulate on student achievement, that that student achievement also take into account the relationship between achievement and well-being.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all know that we are in the part of the bill that talks about regulation regarding provincial priorities. This is the part of the bill that talks about provincial priorities and the power of the minister to make regulations. All we're saying is, "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing provincial priorities in education in the area of student achievement"—and all we want to do is add to this, "and well-being."

We all know that the need for mental health support for our kids has increased exponentially through the pandemic. The pandemic has been really, really tough on all of us. It has been really difficult on children, and many of them need support.

To give the minister the right to regulate provincial priorities, you have to take into account not only student achievement but also student well-being.

I would make a little parenthesis that there are children with special needs, there are children with disabilities, there are children who get a whole lot more than just achievement from the support they get in our schools, and it would be very important to show that they are included, and you do this by, if you're going to give the minister the power to do this, having the power to look at not only student achievement but their well-being. It makes a world of difference. People learn in different ways. People learn different things. If you take their well-being into account, chances are that they will be more productive adults for the rest of their lives. We are not all created equal, but our education system gives the opportunity for each and every one of us to achieve our best potential, and you do this by including children's and students' well-being in everything that you do.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I would just say, we've already discussed, debated and rejected the idea of inserting "well-

being" in motions 6 and 7 brought by members of the opposition. I would recommend voting against this motion, as well. I'll give the explanation again.

If the bill is passed, the government will be able to move forward with a regulation prescribing provincial priorities on student achievement. The regulation will provide greater details on the priorities and will include factors that support high student achievement, which includes well-being.

We know that well-being is a key component of student achievement, which is why boards are already required by the Education Act to promote student achievement and well-being and develop a multi-year plan aiming at achieving this and other goals.

And let me just say, I'm very proud of our government for increasing mental health funding in schools by some 555% since we've come to office.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, the Education Act also already requires boards to develop multi-year education plans and to communicate with parents, and that hasn't stopped the government from putting that requirement in Bill 98, so I see no reason why the Education Act including well-being means that we can't put it as a requirement here. In fact, despite the member's assurances, we have a situation where 91% of our schools are asking for additional support with mental health; where there are now fewer psychologists available to students than there were under the Liberals; where, after three years of disruptions on a historic level, the government is only spending 27 cents per child per day on mental health supports when we have an incredible mental health crisis in our schools.

So I don't think there's a lot of trust when the government says, "Just trust us that we will take student well-being into account as we regulate on student achievement." I think it's very important that it be a requirement set that in legislation, that we are going to have regulations that will reflect the fact that student achievement is contingent on well-being and that students cannot achieve if they do not have the conditions to have good mental health and a good sense of well-being in our schools.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? Are you ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): I declare the motion lost.

The next motion, motion 28: MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 5 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 11.2 of the Education Act:

“Provincial priority: disability barriers

“(1.1) If the Lieutenant Governor makes a regulation under subsection (1), the regulation shall include, as provincial priorities in the area of student achievement,

“(a) the removal and prevention of recurring barriers faced by students with disabilities, as identified by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee in its Final Recommendations Report for the development of a proposed Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education Standard under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005; and

“(b) the requirement that students with disabilities must be able to fully participate in and fully benefit from any other provincial priorities in the area of student achievement.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This amendment was once again recommended by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance, and it was supported by many, many stakeholders who wrote to us in support, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and many, many individuals who wrote to us, because what we have right now is a situation where children with disabilities are being excluded from full participation in our schools.

There is absolutely nothing in this bill that will change that, unless the bill is amended to ensure that students with disabilities will be fully included and will fully benefit from every part of the legislation. Right now, there is no requirement whatsoever for the minister to even consider children with disabilities in setting priorities for student outcomes, and there’s no guarantee that children with disabilities or special needs will even benefit from the priorities that are set for the school system.

This is an amendment that will ensure that when the minister is making regulations with regard to the education system, the regulations will include a priority to remove and identify barriers that are faced by students with disabilities. That was recommended by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee, which, again, was a committee set up by the ministry that consulted broadly on its final report. It has very widespread support from the disability community and from educators, and a requirement that when the minister is setting other priorities, the minister must consider the impact on children with disabilities and ensure that they will be able to fully participate in and fully benefit from those priorities.

Otherwise, we see in so many instances within our school system right now children with disabilities are an afterthought and are simply left behind or not even able to fully participate in our school system—not even able, in many cases, to attend our school system. This makes it very clear that we are going to do the work of removing those barriers, providing equitable education to children with disabilities in Ontario.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I would recommend voting against the motion, because the bill, if passed, will ensure a collective focus on student achievement for every student, including students with disabilities.

The Ministry of Education is continuing its work with the Ministry for Seniors and Accessibility to review the recommendations of the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee and develop a plan to continue work to prevent and remove barriers for students with disabilities.

1600

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We know that we are failing many, many children with disabilities right now, whether it be a child with spina bifida who needs to be brought to the toilet or whether it be a blind child or children on the autism spectrum. We are failing many of them.

They came. They talked to us in deputation. They asked that we make changes. We all know that the strength of Ontario is that we have an educated population. This is what makes Ontario so successful: It’s because of our education system. But when you leave more and more people behind, then their chances of being successful in Ontario decrease exponentially.

This is to make sure. We know how to do this. We know how to include every child with every disability. We have the knowledge, we have the skills to do this. We need the political will to include them in every step we take so that Ontario’s education system continues to be the great equalizer—that it doesn’t matter if you are blind, if you are in a wheelchair, if you are on the spectrum, if you have any sort of disability, we know how to make you successful. Our schools, our education system knows how to do this.

Let’s put them in the bill. Let’s make sure, with the changes that are coming with that bill, that they will be included, that they will be successful, that they will be supported. They came. They asked for us to do this. The least we can do is say, “We heard you. We will put you in the bill. We won’t leave you behind. We care. You matter to us.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? Are we ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): I declare motion 28 lost.

Motion 29? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France G elinas: I move that section 5 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 11.2 of the Education Act:

“Provincial priorities: rights

“(1.2) Any regulation made under subsection (1) shall fully respect francophone and denominational rights.”

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP G elinas.

M^{me} France G elinas: The francophone population has spoken very loudly about this bill. For us, education is the way to make sure that there continues to be Franco-Ontarians in this province. Without a strong education system that respects the fact that it is tough to live in a minority situation every day of your life, we’re not going to be there in a couple of generations. As Franco-Ontarians, we all know this. They came. They asked us to put reassurance in the bill.

The way the bill is written right now is very, very similar to the way the Education Act used to be, and the way the Education Act used to be was devastating to Franco-Ontarians. Our education system was a machine of assimilation of our francophone kids. We don’t want to go back there. We have lived through this nightmare and survived this nightmare and don’t want to go back.

You have to realize that they came, they talked to us, they told us that things need to change in the bill. I hope you will listen to them and add “fully respect francophone and denominational rights.” It’s something that I’m sure you intend to do. Put it in the bill to reassure them that it will be done no matter who is government after you. A bill is not something we change every three years. This educational bill, when passed—if passed—will be there for decades to come. Make sure it’s there. You intend to do it. You’ve said before that you will do it. Put it in the bill.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We are talking about constitutional rights here. Under section 23 of the charter, Franco-Ontarians have the constitutional right to manage their own education system. There is no need for the minister to be making regulations regarding provincial priorities that disregard the constitutional rights of francophones. We know that that would result in this legislation being challenged in court. Sadly, we’ve seen many expensive court challenges against this government’s legislation, with not a great track record for the government but a very expensive bill for citizens. So this amendment just ensures that the regulations set by the minister fully respect the rights of Franco-Ontarians to manage their own education system along with the denominational rights of Catholics to manage their education system. If the minister has no intention of making regulations that do not respect their rights, then why not add this text to the bill?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: It’s a bit like Groundhog Day: We’ve repeated the same issue around denominational rights and the rights of francophones in this province, and they are clearly established in the Constitution and with a

lot of jurisprudence. It would probably be ill-advised for the government to make regulations that went against either of those two.

But here’s the thing: The other thing that’s important is that you recognize that in the work that you’re doing—that recognition, that symbol of knowing that you know that it’s there, at least putting it in once or twice, right? The rights of francophones over their education system, putting it in there, it’s not going to hurt anybody, but it’s going to send a signal to the community that you understand that they’re there and that it matters.

We can say what we want about symbolism in bills, but it is important. It’s incredibly important to those communities who want to make sure that the things that have happened in the past to them are not going to happen again, and they won’t have to litigate to do it. So I would just encourage the members on the other side to support it. I just wanted to say that.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Quinn.

Mr. Nolan Quinn: I think it’s just important to get it on the record, even though my colleagues already have: The government is already required to respect the protections afforded to French-language and Catholic education rights holders in the managing and delivery of their education systems.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: So those boards and the people who represent the people who work in those boards came to us and said, “We would like to see that there.” I think that it’s important that we recognize that they asked us to do that, and we’re not doing that, so what message does that send to them? That’s just my question. I want to put it out there. I’m not trying to browbeat you or anything like that, but we seem to be going around and around and around on this, and I think that the solution would be to send some sort of positive signal to those communities that asked to be recognized. I don’t think it’s going to harm anyone in the bill or make the bill weaker or open up the government to anything that they’re not already opened up to; I’m just saying, send a message, send a symbol.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Quinn.

Mr. Nolan Quinn: Again, I’d like to get it on the record: The government is committed to working with its sector partners, including francophone and Catholic partners, to help ensure successful implementation of the bill, if passed, so that Ontario’s publicly funded education system is uniformly focused on improving student outcomes.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP G elinas.

M^{me} France G elinas: So I would say the francophone community is happy to hear the position that the member just put into the record. But with great respect, we won’t be there in 20 years. We won’t be there in 15 years. This government won’t be there, but the Franco-Ontarian populations and the struggle that we face will still be there.

To put it in the bill is what is needed, because we have fought those battles before. There will be governments after yours who will take this bill, read it as it is written and do damage to the francophone population, to the francophone education system. I'm not saying that that is for sure; I'm just saying that as long as the possibility is there, the Franco-Ontarians will push back because we have lived this nightmare before. You intend to do it? You intend to respect it? Put it in the bill.

1610

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I'm going to give you an example. Franco-Ontarians were protected by Bill 108, I think it was, in terms of the French Language Services Act, to get services in their own language. But in 1999, the government of the day, the Mike Harris government, decided that they were going to close the only francophone hospital in eastern Ontario despite the fact that they were already guaranteed, under another piece of legislation, the rights to those services. That's the point my colleague is trying to make, but in education. What she's trying to say is that the community needs to know that what happened at the Montfort is not going to happen in education, and she's right.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? Ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): I declare motion 29 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 5 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 6 and 7 of schedule 2. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? All those in agreement? If yes, is there any debate? Are the members prepared to vote?

Shall schedule 2, sections 6 and 7, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Going to schedule 2, section 8: Shall schedule 2, section 8 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Recorded vote.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Do we get to debate?

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Schedule 2, section 8: Debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against section 8 because, once again, the government is putting the cart before the horse by legislating a high-level concept that has no details attached and on which no consultation has taken place. It is important to support technical apprenticeships and to expand the number of students who have the opportunity to undertake a technical apprenticeship. But we are not elected as legislators to rubber-stamp high-level concepts; we are here to represent the voices of Ontarians, and we cannot do that if the government is bringing us legislation on which the homework has not been done and to which there are no details attached. So we believe that the government should consult first and then come forward with a fully finished plan in legislation.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: There are tons of apprenticeships in Nickel Belt. We are where all the mines are located. All of this is in Nickel Belt. Do we support apprenticeship? Yes, absolutely.

But what this bill does—it says, “A person shall be considered to be attending school when he or she is participating in equivalent apprenticeship learning.” It seems like we have to do our homework before we put things like this out. What does that mean for employers? What does that mean for WSIB coverage? What does that mean for everything that goes on with the thousands and thousands of apprenticeships that work in all of the mines and mining supplies that are just in my riding? We have a million questions as to what this means. You cannot put such a huge change in the way that apprenticeship is done—and I fully support apprenticeship. This is what makes the mining sector work. But you cannot do such a huge change with one little line that has not been defined, that has not been clarified and that makes every mining and mining-related supplier who has tons of apprenticeship people in their workplace very, very nervous.

We will be voting against this. Not a bad idea—just do your homework. Don't just put it as one line in a multi-page bill without having done any consultations with many of the sectors that are there to help people get their apprenticeships, that are employers of people who are doing their apprenticeship. As I said, I fully support; do your homework. Don't just put a sentence in there. You can't do that. As much as you say that you want the mining sector to bring the electric vehicle batteries and all of that, if the mining sector feels too nervous that they don't want to take apprenticeship kids anymore—students anymore; they're not kids, sorry—we're all going to be in big trouble.

This has not been thought through. The homework has not been done. Consultation has not been done. It is too

broad of a change to be in one line in the middle of a—I forgot how many—18-page bill.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? Are we ready to vote?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Schedule 2, section 8 is carried.

Schedule 2, section 9, motion 30: MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 9(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, this is an amendment that regards the technical apprenticeships, and we are being asked to rubber-stamp a proposal that has no details attached to it. We don't know whether or not a student will be required to have any oversight by a teacher when they are part of a technical apprenticeship. We don't know whether they're going to get an Ontario secondary school diploma at the end or whether they're going to be able to use workplace experience to apply for a GED down the road. The difference between that has a significant impact on the ability of students for future career opportunities. We have no idea what fields a student will be eligible to participate in a technical apprenticeship in. We have no idea what kind of oversight there will be from teachers as regards the curriculum if this is receiving school credit. We have no guarantees as to the safety of the student while they participate in the technical apprenticeship.

The government has not consulted with unions. The government has not consulted with employers. In fact, this remains a very high-level concept, and the government is asking us to put it into stone in legislation and then conduct the consultations to figure out the details. That's putting the cart before the horse, and we believe that the government should do their consultation first, come up with a solid proposal with all of the details worked out and then come back with legislation.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gates.

Mr. Wayne Gates: I'm going to repeat myself again when it comes to the apprenticeships. It made no sense to me that they had absolutely no consultation with Unifor, who sits on the skilled trades board. They had no consultation with IBEW on whether they're in favour of having kids out of grade 11—no consultation on the health and safety of those young men and women that are coming out of school to go and do this kind of work. I can tell you that most of the injuries in the province of Ontario are with

students during their first job, whether that's at McDonald's or whether that's with an apprenticeship program. So the health and safety of our kids and grandkids—no consultation with the unions on those two issues, and particularly health and safety.

1620

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I would recommend voting against this motion, because our government is working to ensure that all students can get ahead in this province and fill the skilled trades gap by better connecting Ontario students with these good-paying jobs. If the bill is passed, the provisions enabling an accelerated apprenticeship pathway would come into force upon proclamation in fall 2023. The government will consult with employers, unions, education stakeholders, trainers, parents, students and others to inform the development of the pathway. Following stakeholder consultations, the government will make a determination on whether and when to proclaim this provision.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: So again, I want to read into the record: “Subsection (3) does not apply when the person required to attend school is employed during school hours as part of equivalent apprenticeship learning.” When employers who have a ton of apprenticeship students read things like this, they feel like decisions have already been made. How do you know that you need to exclude a part of the different students who are taking their apprenticeship? It's because you've already thought it through. You've already thought it through, but you never consulted with the people who are the ones on the front lines training those apprentices so they could be electricians, bricklayers and everything else.

This entire part, I can tell you, for the mining industry, makes them really nervous. But there are other industries that become really nervous when they read things like this, when they read things like what will be done, what will be exempt from being done. Don't tell me that you haven't thought about it. How do you know that you need to exempt some of them if you don't already know what you're going to do? Normal human beings, when you read a thing that says, “Okay, the government wants to do this, but they will exempt some of them”—it really sounds like you've thought that through. You have a plan; you just haven't shared it with anyone.

And if your idea of consultation is to come to employers and say, “Here's what we have the intention to do,” you have some surprises coming at you, because we train a lot of apprentices in northern Ontario. They go on to be very, very good tradespeople in all sorts of trades. We support them 100%, but we also know what works and we know what doesn't work. They would like the government to listen to them, not to come with changes and then exceptions to those changes, because it really feels like you've already got the plans; you just haven't shared them with anyone.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: The education system has been running OYAP programs and SHSM for many years. We at the education ministry listen to barriers that are created for students in regard to going into pathways, and so we are committed to working with students and employers to remove those barriers, so that students who are going into the skilled trades remove that stigma around trades, to be acknowledged as any other student.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? MPP Gates.

Mr. Wayne Gates: Yes, just on both comments from our side and their side: I can't be more clear that I'm really, really concerned around the rules around the training and the availability of journeymen in these workplaces that are supposed to be working with these young apprentices. Think about it: We're talking about—I guess you can call them young men and young women. But we're talking about kids who are 16 and 17 years old—pretty young—with no consultation with two of the bigger unions, Unifor and IBEW.

I haven't heard anything about the employer's liability. How many employers want this to actually happen, knowing that they're going to carry an enormous amount of liability? I can tell you, and I'm going to repeat it again: Most of our deaths that are happening in Ontario are young people that are working in very dangerous jobs, and the trades jobs are very dangerous. A lot of young people—health and safety issues, what type of training they're going to get around that with a journeyman. I just think it doesn't make a lot of sense right now without at least talking to Unifor, IBEW, the building trades, consulting with them and saying, "Is this doable? Is this something that we can do? Can it be done safely?" That's probably the most important thing to me: Can this be done safely?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): Further debate? Are you ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): I declare motion 30 lost.

That being all the motions for schedule 2, section 9, shall schedule 2, section 9 carry? All those in favour?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Interjections.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Jordan): All those opposed? I declare schedule 2, section 9 carried.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): There are no amendment to sections 10 to 12 of schedule 2. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? If yes,

is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 2, sections 10 to 12, inclusive, carry? Those in favour? All those opposed? The motion carries.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Chair, that was sections 10, 11 and 12, right?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): That is correct.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Okay. I just want to make sure.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): We'll now move to schedule 2, section 13, motion 31. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Withdrawn, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay, withdrawn.

Then we'll go to motion 32. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Withdrawn as well.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Motion 32.1: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 13(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause to subsection 169.1(4) of the Education Act:

"(a.1) ensure that the plan published under clause (a) is made available in an accessible format other than as a Portable Document Format (PDF) document;"

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is another amendment that was put forward by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many organizations, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and many, many individuals who wrote into the committee.

We know that for people who have accessibility needs regarding online communication, the PDF format is not accessible to everyone, including two parents who use document readers. Therefore, it is very important that if the plan is going to be broadly accessible, it is available in a format that—it could be in a PDF, but it needs to be in another format as well to ensure that everybody has the opportunity to read it.

1630

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Basically, those documents will be available to the public and those documents are consulted by the public. If we want everybody in Ontario to be able to know what those documents are, they have to be put forward in a format that is inclusive of people's diversity. Sometimes, that means that for people who are blind, it needs to be in a format that their computer can read for them. Sometimes, it just means that you have to be able to put it bigger.

But I'm thinking that by 2023, with all of the facilities that we have out there, the least we could do is to make sure that a document as important as this is available to every family who wants to read it. It's as simple as that. We shouldn't even have to ask for this, but we do. They do, and they came, and they asked us that this needs to be in. I hope we will show respect for people with different

abilities, to make sure that they have access to those important documents as well.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against the motion, because boards already have existing obligations to provide materials in an accessible format under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, as well as obligations under the Human Rights Code to accommodate people with disabilities. School boards are expected to comply with these requirements.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Pasma is recognized.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: These obligations may already exist, but the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance came to committee last week and asked for this amendment. Clearly, the existing requirement in and of itself is not enough to ensure that all parents are able to receive information in an accessible format.

The AODA Alliance represents many stakeholders with varying disabilities in all parts of the province. As I mentioned earlier, this amendment was also supported by many, many other organizations that work with Ontarians with disabilities. They are all telling us that this amendment is necessary to ensure that the rights of parents with disabilities actually are respected.

I think it is important for us to listen to the feedback that we received from Ontarians about what is happening in the province and what could be done to strengthen the rights of people living with disabilities in Ontario.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are we ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let's go to 33. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 13(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 169.1 of the Education Act:

“Restriction

“(6.1) The minister shall not assign support personnel to work with a school board under subsection (6) if the work would be carried out during the period beginning on the day on which nominations close in respect of an election of the board, or in respect of an election for municipal council in the area of jurisdiction of the board, and ending on the day fixed for the first meeting of the new board or the new municipal council, as the case may be.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is an amendment that was requested by the Ontario Public School Boards' Association. This is a section of the bill that allows the minister to deploy support personnel to school boards that the minister believes are not doing sufficient work in meeting the priorities of the ministry with regard to student achievement. But the criteria for deploying support personnel to a board as set out by the bill are completely and entirely subjective and could lead to the minister interfering in school board elections by assigning support personnel during an election period. So ensuring that support personnel are not deployed during the period of an election campaign allows for local democracy to be exercised freely and fairly, allows trustees to be held accountable locally for their actions and ensures that the minister is not accused of interfering in local elections.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to clarify that this motion is about not supporting students during an election period. I just want to clarify. We're saying that if there are student needs—students or school boards that are in need—we do not want the minister to execute any kind of support or need for that school board until an election is over and until trustees are sworn in. I just want to clarify that's what this is.

Mrs. Robin Martin: That's what the NDP is proposing.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Okay. That's the proposal. Okay. Thank you.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: That is not what this amendment is. The minister can provide additional resources to a school board at any time. In fact, we certainly encourage him to provide additional funding so that school boards can meet the needs of students and allow them to hire more teachers and education workers, particularly qualified teachers and education workers, so that every student in Ontario gets the support they need, which they are certainly not getting right now.

But the text of the bill allows for the minister to deploy support personnel, which is not defined by the bill, based on entirely subjective criteria with regard to the minister's priorities, and the minister's priorities only. The minister deploying those personnel in the midst of an election campaign could be seen as interfering with the election and with the minister putting the minister's thumb on the scale of local democracy.

I am sure that the Minister of Education does not want to interfere in local democracy. I am sure that the members of the government side do not wish their minister to be seen as interfering in local democracy. What the stakeholders told us at committee last week is that, without this change, the minister could be seen as interfering in local elections. So this is an amendment that protects the integrity of our local election process for school board trustees.

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

Mr. Nolan Quinn: Knowing that most elections take about three months approximately at the beginning of the school year, we are worried about the students. There's no time period where a minister should not be allowed to preclude sending supports, if needed, for a board to meet their responsibilities. Not providing these supports in a timely manner could have a negative impact on the students and student achievement. Knowing that it is a three-month period that they are in an election, we are worrying about the students with this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'm going to recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Just so we all know that we are at the part of the bill the talks about the minister assigning support personnel to the board, not support personnel to the children. Those are support personnel to the board because the minister is unsatisfied with the board's progress. So the idea is that if the minister is not satisfied with the progress of the board and the board is undergoing an election, there's a good chance that whoever's board was there will be different after. That's the idea.

I would fully agree with the member who brought—if students need support, absolutely, send those resources every day, election or no election. That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about members of a school board, who get elected pretty much the same way we get elected. That is what this part of this bill is talking about. It's not talking about the children; it's talking about the members on the school board.

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

Mr. Nolan Quinn: I appreciate MPP Gélinas clarifying that for me. I'm fully aware of what this is about, but if a school board is failing and the trustees are failing, that is going to affect the students. So ultimately, under difficult circumstances, the minister should be able to step in, because it's affecting students' overall effectiveness at school, and ultimately that's what it's all about. So yes, it is about the board, but if a board is failing and needs supports, that will affect the everyday life of the students that go to that board.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: First of all, nobody is saying the government shouldn't provide additional resources to support schools that are struggling. In fact, parents are begging the government to provide additional resources to schools. Teachers and education workers are begging the government to provide additional resources. We in the official opposition have been begging the government to provide additional resources. Please, don't wait for an election period.

1640

However, when the text of the bill says that “the minister may assign support personnel to work with a board where ... the minister is unsatisfied with the board's progress in implementing the multi-year plan,” that leaves it entirely up to the subjective opinion of the minister as to whether or not the board is failing in its obligation. I am

sure that the current Minister of Education would never act with any lack of integrity in defining what boards are failing and what trustees are failing, but the text, as written, allows a Minister of Education to put their thumb on a scale and decide that a board of trustees or a particular trustee that they do not like is failing students and make a big deal of sending in support personnel in the middle of an election campaign, which is sending a message to local electors and putting the thumb on the scale of local democracy.

This is a very small window that is protected. I'm just saying, please, can we have fair and free election processes without any fear of interference and allow parents to hold trustees who are failing accountable and allow parents to determine when trustees are in fact failing.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: During that three months of election, parents will determine whether or not they trust trustees and whether or not they're going to vote them in. A multi-year plan is created by the school board, created by the staff and created by trustees. If the board and trustees have created a multi-year plan which they're not upholding, then they're not upholding the multi-year plan.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: But the point is that the bill has no objective criteria as to whether or not the board is meeting its plan. It simply says if “the minister is unsatisfied with the board's progress.” The minister could decide that any outcome is unsatisfactory and send in support personnel. We are saying that that at least should not take place during an election period.

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

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Oh, I'm sorry. MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: While I appreciate the concern over interfering in elections, I don't think there's any preclusion in the bill for the minister to be able to appoint a supervisor at any point in time, so I'm not sure that we need this. I'm not going to vote against it, but I think the minister already has powers that far exceed this with regard to the supervision of a board. But I understand what you're saying; we don't want him to use that power. But I'm not as concerned about that as you are.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 13 carry? All voting for? All voting against? Carried.

Let's go to schedule 2, section 14, motion 34. MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 14 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "and well-being" after "student achievement" in section 169.2 of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, this is an amendment that was requested by the Ontario Public School Boards' Association to reflect the fact that the Education Act says that the duties and powers of school boards are to "promote student achievement and well-being." We can't actually accomplish student achievement unless we are also thinking about student well-being, because one is contingent on the other. Students cannot achieve when their well-being is not looked after, when they are in conditions that are not supporting their mental health, when they are in conditions that are dangerous or scary or unsupportive. So it is very important that, as this is a section that deals with the board's development of multi-year plans, in thinking about a multi-year plan for student achievement, the board is taking into account at the same time student well-being over the coming years.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: It goes on to say, "Every board shall develop the multi-year plan referred to in clause 169.1 ... in a manner consistent with the policies and guidelines established under paragraph 0.1 ... with the aim of achieving goals related to the provincial priorities in education in the area of student achievement..." The government has said that they want to take well-being into account; you have to put it in in writing. We all know that school boards have a duty to take well-being of students into account. You also have to show that the government, when they will use their power to give a provincial priority, won't only look at achievement. You have to look at well-being.

Put it in. This is the way the education system works. This is an obligation of every board. If the provincial government uses their power to assign priority based solely on student achievement at the expense of student well-being, it will fail. Put it in. That's the way education works.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let's move to motion 35. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 14 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 169.2 of the Education Act:

"Same

"(2) The multi-year plan shall also specify the measures and actions the school board will take to ensure that students with disabilities can fully participate in, benefit from and be included in the school board's programs and activities."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, this amendment was put forward by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many stakeholders, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, the March of Dimes and many, many individuals who wrote in to us.

Right now, not only is there no requirement for school boards to consider the needs of children with disabilities in developing multi-year plans, there's no guarantee that children with disabilities or special needs will even benefit from the multi-year plans, not least because many children with disabilities are not even able to fully attend our schools currently and fully participate in education because of the barriers that exist within our school system and because of the lack of funding for special education and the lack of supports that many of them suffer from.

So it's very important that if we actually expect that the multi-year plan is going to achieve better outcomes in student achievement, then we cannot leave any students behind. We must make sure that boards are tackling the barriers that exist to full inclusion of students with disabilities and that students with disabilities are able to fully attend and fully participate in education and in all of the school board's programs and activities. That's what this amendment will accomplish by ensuring that that is taken into consideration in the creation of the multi-year plan.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: It's sort of a little bit sad that in 2023, we have to tell organizations that students with special needs and students with disabilities need to be included in their multi-year plan, but this is the reality. As a government, you have to take responsibility for every member of our society. That includes children and students with different abilities. If you don't tell every school board that they have to include them in the plan, they often do not. The responsibility is upon you to make sure that the multi-year plan has measures and actions that the school board will take to ensure that students with disabilities can participate, they can benefit and they are included in the board's programs and activities.

1650

A pretty basic request for 2023, but it came from a place of power. It came from a place of people who deal with people with disabilities all the time, who are telling the government, "You have to put that in. You have to help us."

Put those words in so that kids with disabilities are included. I hope you will.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against this motion because the bill, if passed, will ensure a collective focus on student achievement for every student, including students with disabilities. School boards are expected to develop multi-year plans that reflect the needs of their students and local communities, including students with disabilities.

The Ministry of Education is continuing to work with the Ministry for Seniors and Accessibility to review the recommendations of the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee and develop a plan to continue work to prevent and remove barriers for students with disabilities.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Students with disabilities are not being included now as it is. That's what we heard loudly and clearly from the Ontario Autism Coalition, from the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance. Unless we actually take proactive steps to ensure that students with disabilities are being included, I have no faith that it's going to happen, regardless of whatever the good intentions of the government may be. We're not seeing that inclusion happening now, so continuing to do more of the same and saying absolutely nothing in this legislation is not going to achieve better outcomes for students with disabilities.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is declared lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 14 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Would the committee like to take a five or a 10-minute break?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Oh, it's carried. Did you want to take a break?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): You're good? Okay, let's continue.

Let's move to schedule 2, section 15, motion 36. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that that subsection 15(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, this is a section regarding the set-up of technical apprenticeships, but there are no details in this bill. This remains a high-level concept, with many, many questions about how it will actually work in practice. The government has failed to consult with anyone in developing the text of this bill. They want to set it in stone and then figure out all the details by consulting, which is putting the cart before the horse. We believe that actually coming up with a good proposal for technical apprenticeships, which I think everybody on this committee actually wants to see happen, requires consulting first, doing your homework and then coming forward with legislation.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Again, I am fully in support of apprenticeships, fully in support of the trades. We have good union jobs all over Nickel Belt. If there are any trades listening, there are jobs open in Nickel Belt right now. Feel free to come. But that being said, employers take the training of apprentices as a big responsibility. As my colleague has said, they are at higher risk of harm and death. They are at learning. They want to bring this forward. We have decades of experience in training apprentices in my neck of the woods. They want this to work. They see possibility to do things better, but they are all very anxious and worried that we see bits and pieces through the bill that look like there's a plan that has been thought out and that will be without their input. And they are worried, because if it's done wrong, many employers will shut their doors to apprentices. There's just too much risk for them. We don't want that to happen.

Take that thing about apprenticeship out, go do your consultation, talk to the big trade unions out there. They will be more than happy to sit with you and tell you what works, what doesn't work. Talk to the big employers who employed all of those trades. I can name you many from my riding that have trained thousands and thousands of trades. They want to be consulted before a whole bunch of what can and can't be done, as my colleague says, goes into stone. Once it's in the bill, you cannot change it in regulation. You have to live with the words of the bill. It's either you show us who did you consult with to bring that forward, or you do the consultation and then bring it back.

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

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you there. I recognize MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Thank you. It is the ministry's position that we want to help students that are interested in

the skilled trades to be able to enter the skilled trades faster. It leads to student engagement and leads to student achievement. It is a key priority for the government. Amendments to the Education Act introduced as part of this bill are intended to set the groundwork for developing an apprenticeship pathway, which we will consult.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I don't understand why, if this is a priority for the government, you wouldn't take the time to consult with stakeholders, with unions, with employers, with students, with teachers and educators and make sure that you get the details right, because right now, we are being asked to rubber-stamp something that could be devastating to young people and could be devastating to their career opportunities down the road. We have no idea whether or not there is going to be any association with a teacher who will be revealing what people are learning on these apprenticeships, whether it will merit credit that will count towards their Ontario secondary school diploma, whether they will finish the apprenticeship with an OSSD, which we know opens doors to many employment opportunities in the future, or whether it will be left entirely up to the student to try to figure out how to apply for a GED down the road.

We have no idea what trades will be included in these technical apprenticeships. We have no idea if they're appropriate for students in grade 11 and 12 to be participating in. We have no idea whether or not the skill level would be actually more appropriate for a student who already has an OSSD. We are being asked to put this into legislation with no idea of what the outcomes are for students, with no idea of what the outcomes are for employers and with no idea of what the outcomes are for our labour force. If this is a government priority, then do it right. Respect the role of unions, of employers and of us as legislators and come with a fully fleshed-out proposal that we can debate the merits of and we can hear from stakeholders on again at committee, and then we can all gladly pass it into law.

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

Mr. John Fraser: My colleagues make a really good point: The reality is the government can do whatever it wants to do. We know that. So why not just get it right? Why not put a bit more meat on the bones? If you want to do it right—there are legitimate concerns with the risks, the quality of the programs that are going to be delivered. It's legitimate. I think if you were sitting on this side, you would look at it and you would say exactly the same thing to me if I was putting that forward. There's nothing there, but you're doing something that's really important. I just wanted to point that out.

1700

I think you've got to put a bit more meat on the bones. Kudos to you. You can do whatever you want, whenever you want. You have the majority; there's enough of you, but you have to do more than what you've done here, just to indicate that you understand that there are things that

are important to establish in this important program that needs to be done. And you put others in a bad position when you don't put that on there. We want to get it done. What do you do? If you were on this side, you'd say exactly the same thing to me, and it would be right.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: As we said in response to motion 30, in the fall of 2023 the government will consult with employers, unions, education stakeholders, trainers, parents, students and others to inform the development of the apprenticeship pathway. Following stakeholder consultations, the government will make a determination on whether and when to proclaim the provisions in issue.

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

Mr. Wayne Gates: I wasn't going to respond, but I'm confused a little bit—I know it's a long day sometimes up here. That member just said that they will consult. Why wouldn't you consult ahead of time, so that we get this right, so that we're not jeopardizing our young 16- and 17-year-olds, whether male or female? Why wouldn't you talk to the unions? I've talked to the unions. I've talked to Unifor. I've talked to IBEW. I've talked to the building trades. They're saying that nobody talked to them. And yet, we have a government—after we've done, what, 40 of these—promising again and again and again that they'll consult. My issue is, why wouldn't you consult ahead of time? I am concerned about the health and safety of our kids. I've taken people out of the plant who got killed on the job. What's the availability of the journeyman who's going to be able to train them? Why didn't you talk to the employers?

They're going to consult after the fact. That makes no sense to me; I'm sorry. I wasn't going to say anything—but because that member said they're going to consult after this is done.

I appreciate the time.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'll recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I'll just say this. I know you're concerned about the same things. That's why it should be there. What you're saying, though, is, that it's kind of a carte blanche and you can do whatever you want before having talked to people. There's not even any language that talks about what the things are that we have to consider, what the things are that we have to consult on.

Risk, health and safety, quality of the programs, availability of a journeyman—all stuff that's really important. So even if you put that in there, it would have given all of us more comfort—not just us, because I can see, on the other side, that you're concerned about that; I don't think that you're not.

So I think it's a legitimate point that's being raised. The difficulty is, none of us want to slow anything down. But what are we voting for?

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare the motion lost.

We will now go to motion 37. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 15(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding “unless doing so would impose undue hardship on the board” at the end of paragraph 8.1 of subsection 170(1) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is a section of the act that says—I’ll just read it out—that school boards will be required to “collaborate with municipalities to plan for the early and integrated development of school sites and the establishment of child care centres within schools to meet current and future needs of the board.” This is a good example of why it can be incredibly dangerous to impose uniform requirements on all school boards across the province without any regard to the differences between education systems, local needs and resources and the differences in particular between the French-language school boards and the English-language school boards.

We heard last week at committee that the Conseil scolaire Viamonde serves nearly 200 municipalities and covers a territory that is represented by 35 English-language school boards. It is not reasonable in any way to expect that the Conseil scolaire Viamonde can collaborate with municipalities in any way similar to the 35 English school boards that exist in the same territory.

It is absolutely imperative that we reflect the differing demands in resources according to region and school board. This amendment makes it clear we value collaboration with municipalities. We want school boards to do that. But there becomes a point at which requiring it is unreasonable, because the expectation it is placing on a school board is simply not reasonable, given the number of municipalities in their territory and given the resources available to them.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? You’re in the corner of my eye. MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: With this bill, we are requiring school boards to collaborate. One of the reasons around looking at this was around the French boards and the expanse of space that they cover and their ability to get schools built within a close proximity to where students live. This is the government committing to ensuring early and integrated planning between school boards and the municipalities to enable schools to be built faster so that students can go to school closer to home.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: If you are doing this for the francophone community, the francophone community is telling you, “Thanks, but no thanks.” The four public school boards cover a humongously big geographical area. Think about it; we have four public French school boards that cover the entire province. For many of them, it is not reasonable to ask them to collaborate with municipalities because they cover so many municipalities with one school. We haven’t got as many public French schools as we’ve got English public schools.

To add “unless doing so imposed undue hardship on the board”—I would say most of the boards that will use that part of the bill will be the French boards, who cover a huge geographical area. If you are doing this for the French boards, they don’t want any part of this. Give them a way out. If it makes sense, if it works, they will be happy to work with the municipality. They will be happy to get their support. They often are able to get land for free or no development charge. They work with the municipalities. The first part is okay. If they can, they will collaborate with the municipality. But be cognizant that in some cases, it makes no sense. Give them a way out.

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

Mr. Matthew Rae: This is actually from my time as PA to education. Now I’m PA to municipal affairs and housing, so I have a unique perspective on this, Chair. It actually comes also partly from our municipal colleagues. For example, the Zorra township in Oxford county passed an MOU motion. They’re looking to establish an MOU around schools, libraries, child care centres all in one location. So these changes in this legislation, if passed, help those municipalities to facilitate those discussions with their local school board, in this case, Thames Valley District School Board.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Nobody is saying Thames Valley District School Board shouldn’t co-operate or collaborate with Zorra township. In fact, I’m sure Thames Valley District School Board wants to collaborate. That’s what we’ve seen and what we heard from our witnesses last week. But we also heard from our witnesses last week that this requirement is not the same in its impact on English-language school boards and French-language school boards.

This amendment that we are suggesting does not say, “Don’t collaborate with municipalities.” It doesn’t say, “School boards are prevented from collaborating with municipalities.” We are just reflecting the reality that the requirement is not the same for French-language boards as it is for English-language boards.

If you are going to request that the Conseil scolaire Viamonde collaborate with nearly 200 municipalities that could be collaborating with 35 English-language school boards, that could be full-time work for multiple people for the Conseil scolaire Viamonde. Are we going to

provide resources for them to have people who are doing that work full-time, or are we going to expect that the board carries out that intense level of collaboration with the existing resources that they have, which are already not enough to provide the supports that every child needs?

1710

This is a simple amendment that reflects the fact that we are asking too much of some boards if we are expecting them to collaborate with every single municipality at the same degree and allows them to not collaborate when it creates a situation of undue hardship.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gates, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. We'll now go to motion 38.

I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that subsection 15(4) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding be amended by adding “unless doing so would impose undue hardship on the board” at the end of paragraph 19 of subsection 170(1) of the Education Act.

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

I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This amendment changes the text of subsection (4), which currently adds the following text to the Education Act:

“Co-operation re child care

“19. co-operate with service system managers, as required by subsections 51(4) and 52(2) of the Child Care and Early Years Act, 2014, for the purposes of developing and implementing child care and early years programs and services plans.”

Once again, we know that school boards want to be collaborating in the development and implementation of child care and early-years programs and services. In fact, in many cases the integration of child care in schools results in pupils attending schools, so it's particularly important to the francophone school boards that we support French-language child care systems that are integrated with the school system but, in imposing a uniform request, once again we are asking very different things of the francophone school boards and the anglophone school boards.

The anglophone school boards represent far fewer municipalities, far fewer child care centres than the francophone ones. We have one school board, the Conseil scolaire Viamonde, that represents the same territory as 35 English language school boards. It's not really fair to ask them to do the same work as 35 school boards.

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

I recognize MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I think there's a little confusion as to how this works. When a school wants to open a child care centre, they have to do an application. The application goes through the service managers and the ministry. It has nothing to do, really, with whether or not they can establish child care within a school; all it has to say is that if the school wants to implement a child care, they apply and they implement a child care. The only limitation that is done towards child care is whether it's serving francophone, Indigenous, marginalized students. Outside of those limitations as to whether or not a child care can be established, it is mute.

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

I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all know that French schools had daycare in their schools way before it was even thought of by the English schools. Why? Because that was a way to make sure that children would have enough knowledge of the French language to be able to go to the French schools. Daycares in French schools had been there for a very long time, and then the idea was good enough that the English schools started to do it too. That's for another talk.

But what we're asking them to do right now is to cooperate with service system managers. In most cases, they do this, but they don't do this for the very many different service managers who happen to be within the school board's geographical area. It makes no sense for them to invest the time, the effort, the energy to connect with dozens of system managers who are responsible for the different geographical areas.

The French schools have been doing daycare in their schools for a very, very long time. They know that it's successful, and they know how to set this up. Give them a way out, unless doing so would impose undue hardship on the board. This is how you will bring more daycare to more people and decrease the big wait-list of people who are trying to get their children into daycare. Give them a way out, just because of the geography that the French boards have to cover because there are so few French public school boards for such a big geographical area.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Again, this point is moot because French schools, as she said, can establish child care in French schools; there is no limitation on whether or not they can. If they are establishing a child care, they will have to do it with whichever SSM is located in the area.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Does that mean that we don't need this at all, that we could take it out, if it already exists? I'm all for that.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Because we're not speaking specifically to the French—we're speaking to all of the school boards. All licensed child care is under SSMs. They

have to go through an SSM to be licensed as a child care centre.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 15 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

There are no amendments to sections 16 and 17 of schedule 2. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 2, sections 16 to 17, inclusive, carry? I'll ask you to vote now in favour. Opposed? It carries.

Let's go to schedule 2, section 18, motion 39. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 18 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following clause to subsection 193.1(1) of the Education Act:

“(0.a) the extent to which school sites, parts of sites and the property of the school board are accessible to persons with disabilities;”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is another amendment that was requested by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many stakeholders, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes, and the many, many individuals who wrote to us in support of these recommended amendments. This is a section of the bill that requires boards to report to the minister information regarding school sites, including the board's plans for current and future school sites.

This adds an amendment requiring that when boards make these reports to the minister, they include information on the extent to which school sites, parts of sites and the property of the school board are accessible to persons with disabilities.

1720

This is very important because we know that our schools are not fully accessible to students with disabilities. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act requires that our school buildings be barrier free by 2025. Unfortunately, the government has not provided funding to school boards to actually meet that requirement, but we know that we have an obligation to remove barriers for students and make our school buildings accessible to

all students. So this ensures that the minister has information on the extent to which our schools are barrier-free and the extent to which they are accessible, and also the work which still needs to be done in Ontario to make our schools fully accessible to all people.

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

Mrs. Daisy Wai: The government recognizes the importance of ensuring that students with disabilities can access school sites and properties and will continue working with sector partners to meet the diverse needs of students in the province so that they can reach their full potential. Any future requirements in this regard would be more appropriately addressed through the supporting policy documents and guidelines.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: The bill itself says that the board shall provide—and I read from the bill: “the condition of school sites, parts of school sites and property of the board; and ... the board's plans for the acquisition, sale, lease or other disposition of school sites, parts of school sites or property of the board.”

We go into quite a bit of detail as to what should be included. It is not unreasonable to say that you will also have to provide how accessible the property is. We're asking them to provide the ministry with all sorts of information regarding the sites; to add information about accessibility in 2023 I think is a must.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: If the minister is fully committed to making sure our schools are fully accessible to all students with disabilities and barrier-free, then surely the minister would will to know where there are barriers to the full inclusion of our students and where our schools are not fully accessible so that this can be addressed. I would be very surprised if this is information that the minister does not want to know.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

We'll now move to motion 40. I will recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I move that section 18 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 193.1 of the Education Act:

“Availability, publication

“(3) The minister shall make the information and reports available to all school boards and shall publish them on a website of the government of Ontario.”

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Again, this is something that comes from the French school boards. It’s always the same thing. The French school boards are in expansion. They’re trying to acquire new sites for their schools. The English boards have been there way longer, have way more infrastructure, and they often don’t want the French boards to know because if they sell it on the private market, they will make millions of dollars that would help them with their budget, but if they give it to the French board, then they don’t make as much money.

It’s always the same: The old English schools that don’t have a schoolyard, that don’t have a gym, that don’t have a library, that don’t have anything, they are willing to give those to the French board to set up French schools in those. What the French boards have asked for is to make that information available. When the French board is trying to set up a new school, it is extremely difficult—and I’ve lived through this—to find out which one of the English school boards has a school for sale. They will wait until the French board has signed an agreement and has bought a lot, and then, oh, a miracle: a school that would have been perfect for the French board to set in is now put up for sale.

This can’t continue. We have to add that the minister will make the information and reports available to all school boards and will publish them on a website, so taxpayers get value for their money and French kids get into French schools faster than what we have now.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The government’s members have said repeatedly that the intent of this bill is to increase transparency and accountability in our education system. The francophone school boards came to us last week and said that this is a desperately needed measure to increase transparency, so I think it would be very important for us to vote for this measure, which actually provides the transparency that is being asked for by stakeholders in the education sector.

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

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let’s go to motion 41. I recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 18 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 193.1 of the Education Act:

“Publication

“(3) The minister shall make the information and reports provided under subsection (1) available to the public and publish them on the ministry’s website.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: This amendment is being put forward for exactly the same reason we just debated. It’s to make sure that there’s accountability and transparency around the disposition of property, for which mostly French boards—not exclusively, but mostly French boards—have been disadvantaged.

We build schools in our communities to support education. When we can’t use those schools for the purpose of education, whether it’s French or English, that’s wrong. So I urge the government to support this amendment. I don’t think it’s going to harm the government or harm the minister or somehow reduce the minister’s power or the government’s powers to see this is done. What it will do is, it will give more information to those boards that are interested so that the thing that’s trying to be achieved in this bill can happen.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? MPP Barnes is recognized.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I recommend voting against this. The ministry intends to treat this information and its confidentiality in a manner consistent with approaches taken for a wide variety of information reasons as collected by the ministry. The ministry will continue to work with school boards to share relevant information to support information-sharing.

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

Mr. John Fraser: Is there anyone that can explain to me why the confidentiality of information that’s generally public at board meetings is somehow important or needed or required?

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: The information will be treated to the same levels of confidentiality that already exist within the ministry. If it is just surplus property that needs to be put out there, it will be put out there, but whatever documents that fall under confidentiality will continue to be under confidentiality.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: This is the system we have in place, and this is the system that deputants came and told us does not work. It doesn’t work. It needs to change.

1730

I don’t blame the English boards for wanting to sell old schools on the open market. There will be a developer who wants to put a condo up there, and they will pay them millions of dollars for the site. But those sites were paid for by the taxpayers. Those sites could be used for French schools. That will only happen if the government makes that information available. Otherwise, this is the status quo.

Now, the government will have more information about the site, but that information won’t be available to school boards who are trying to build. This is the situation right

now and that will continue to be the situation after. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. It is not accountability. It is not transparency; it's the opposite of it.

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

Mr. John Fraser: School boards are there because we want to make sure education is accessible to people in a community. That's their main purpose. But they've also got another purpose that is sometimes superseding that first and primary purpose, and that is they become development corporations. They become land barons. What has happened in our city is that there are schools that are available and are needed for the education of children in that community, in whatever language. The financial interests of the board supersede the need for those kids to get a decent education in a building that's close to them.

I think that's wrong. I thought that's what we were trying to achieve with this bill, to shake things up a bit and say, "Hey, folks, you can't do this anymore. You can't hide it. You can't bury it." So when I hear we're going to maintain the same confidentiality, I think, "That's not what I thought you were trying to do with this bill," so that's why I'm having a hard time understanding it.

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

Interjections.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Did you recognize me?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I did.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Sorry. I didn't hear. I'm a bit deaf.

As we said, there's concern that some of the information we're talking about may have market sensitivity, so the ministry will determine whether and how much information will be shared publicly, and the ministry will continue to work with school boards to share the relevant information to support information sharing among school boards.

I think we agree that's what we're trying to do in this legislation, as you pointed out. We are trying to make sure that the properties are made available. But there still are things we have to recognize as the reality of land deals. There are certain things that may be market-sensitive. That's all we're being concerned about and trying to be cautious about.

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

Mr. John Fraser: No, I made my point.

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

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 18 carry? All in favour? All opposed? It carries.

Schedule 2, section 19, motion 42: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

"Priority

"(3.1) Property being sold, leased or otherwise disposed of under subsection (3) shall first be offered to other school boards and to such public bodies as may be prescribed by regulation."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is an amendment to section 19 of the bill, which gives the—which states that the power—sorry, long day—states that the board may sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board in the circumstances prescribed by the regulations. These are public lands that are purchased by taxpayers. I know I've heard many, many concerns from stakeholders, but also from residents of Ottawa West—Nepean, that the text of the bill further down allows the minister to make regulations that require the school board to sell school properties to anyone at any price. There is real and genuine concern that this power may be abused to prioritize the interests of developers rather than the interests of taxpayers who paid for this land. The minister himself has said that the goal of this legislation is to ensure that school properties are moved between coterminous school boards, where one board has excess property and another school board has need of that property. But the legislation as currently written doesn't actually require that prioritization of other school boards.

We also know that quite often many other public bodies have really legitimate uses for that land, which—because, again, this is land that has been paid for by the taxpayers—should be prioritized.

I know the city of Ottawa has passed a resolution in the past that they will take advantage of opportunities to purchase school board lands when they become available, and the city of Ottawa has expressed its concern that the government's changes in this legislation will take away the capacity of the city of Ottawa to acquire properties that would help the city to provide services and programs to residents.

This is an amendment that makes it very clear that when a board sells, leases or otherwise disposes of property, it is other school boards and other public bodies that will get the first crack at being able to make use of that land.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: That is presently the practice that exists now. When a school board has surplus property, it needs to be offered to all other school boards. If school boards do not take it, then it's offered to the municipalities. If the municipalities do not take it, it's offered to the province. If the province doesn't take it, it's offered federally, and then it goes to market.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: If that is currently the process, then I'm sure the government will have no complaints about putting that into the text of the legislation. But I will note that what we've heard from the minister in his public comments is actually proposing a different process which takes municipalities and the federal government and other public bodies out of that process; that goes from offering the property to coterminous school boards to offering it to the ministries of housing and long-term care, straight to the open market.

I think it's incredibly important that we protect the ability of other public bodies to acquire this land which has been paid for by taxpayers.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I object to the member—the minister did not say that he was going to circumvent school boards.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: If this is what we intend to do, it's good. It should go to school boards. It should go to government. So let's put that in writing, because it is not in legislation right now; it can be changed at any time. You understand the power of legislation. You are doing it for the apprenticeship, to show how important legislation is. This is also very important. Many of the schools, basically, will end up with developers who want to make millions of dollars at the expense of our kids not having access to schools in areas where it's easy for them to get to, to get the education they need. Let's put that in the bill.

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

Mr. John Fraser: What I'm trying to understand right now is how the process of circulation is established under law—I'm assuming that it's probably policy and not regulation. Would I be correct? Does anybody on the other side know that? I just don't know off the top of my head.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I think there will be regulations.

Mr. John Fraser: The reality is, the motion that you're putting forward does talk about regulations. I suspect that it's a policy right now—this circulation—and not regulation. So this does establish the ability for the government to create regulations that will determine that circulation.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Pardon me?

Ms. Patrice Barnes: It's in regulation.

1740

Mr. John Fraser: It's in regulation? Okay. It's currently in regulation right now.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Please make your comments through the Chair.

Mr. John Fraser: No, it's fine. I'm sorry.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Please continue.

Mr. John Fraser: I'm working on it. Give me a moment. I know it's a long day, and we're all tired.

What I'm trying to understand is—because I have heard that the intent is to change the process of circulation, to go to different people and exclude different bodies. I think we build schools for a public good: to educate children. It's a publicly funded building and piece of land. So I think what my colleague is trying to get to is that we've got to try to keep that for the public good. We've got to have a proper process of circulation, and long-term care homes and other things that have been described are important too. Essentially they're provincial; it would be the province taking an interest in those.

I guess the question is—I don't really see the problem with this; I don't see how this amendment somehow affects or restricts the province's ability to establish that regulation. I guess the other question is—never mind. I won't ask that question.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I'm good.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further discussion or debate? Are we ready to vote?

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's go to motion 43, and I'll recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsections to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Right of first refusal

“(3.1) When a school site is sold, leased or otherwise disposed of, the board shall first offer the site to another school board or public body prescribed by the regulations and shall give them the opportunity to make an offer that is acceptable to the board.

“Partition

“(3.2) A school site cannot be partitioned for sale, disposal or lease without the approval of the minister.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: This amendment is sandwiched between two amendments here by my colleagues. It's pretty straightforward. We just debated the right of first refusal, so I'm pretty sure that my pleas will fall on deaf ears again, but I would encourage the members opposite—I think it's a reasonable amendment. I do think it's reasonable. You've got someone on the opposite side saying the minister has to give their approval, so I don't think it's vexatious or something I'm trying to pull the wool over your eyes with. I encourage you to support it.

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

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare the motion lost.

We will now go on to the next one, motion 44, and I'll recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Restriction re: subdivision of school site

“(3.2) No person shall apply for approval to subdivide a school site without the minister’s written consent.”

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: This came directly from the French school boards, because what happens is that once an English school board does not need a school anymore, they will sell the parking lot to the school, they will sell the playground to the school, they will sell everything they can, and then they'll say to the French school board, “You can have our school.” So the French school board moves in with a school that has no parking lot, no way for a bus to let the kids get out, no way for the kids to go play outside. Why? Because they want to balance their budget, and then they can make money off their property. I don't blame them for this, but I can tell you that, on the French side, we pay a heavy price. There has to be ministerial consent before they can do this.

Nobody wants a school that has no parking. Nobody wants a school that has no area for kids to go play outside. But have a look at the French schools out there. What schools do not have an area for kids to go play outside? The French schools. Which schools do not have a parking lot attached to their schools? The French schools, because we are stuck with the old English schools that nobody wants, that have already been portioned off, and this is all that is left. This has to change.

They came. They told us that they wanted that change. They told us that this is a problem. The government has to respond and act upon this. The minister needs to sign off; otherwise, this will continue.

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

Mr. John Fraser: I'm just going to repeat myself. You have members of the opposition saying that the minister needs this power, and on the other side, you're saying, “No, he doesn't,” which is a really unusual thing to have happen, because usually we don't do that. We say we don't want the minister to make regulations—

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: Well, in opposition, that's what you do. You guys did it on this side; we'll do it on that side.

But my point is that the boards came and asked us for this. It's reasonable. If someone is going to sterilize a property because they're going to sell off pieces that are

important to it, whether it's a school or anything else, that's going to affect the use of it, and the minister's interest is ensuring that children in the province of Ontario receive an education, hopefully as close to home as possible, in a building that's decent, that has a parking lot, that has a decent playground. So it's a reasonable amendment, and it's not overly prescriptive. It's actually granting, I would say, fairly wide powers, so it really shocks me when the other side is saying no, so I'm hoping you're going to say yes.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: Thank you, MPP Fraser, for your analysis of the situation. Of course, there could be other explanations as to why the government doesn't want to give this power or to vote for this power. I would recommend voting against this motion. The motion would have significant implications and could hinder necessary severances, like to support municipal services. The minister will continue to work with school boards as the ministry will to inform implementation.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I'll recognize MPP Fraser first.

Mr. John Fraser: I'm sure that the minister will be very quickly able to support the severance of property to ensure that municipal services were provided. If that's the reason that you're not supporting this, you're going to have to come up with something else.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'll recognize MPP Pasma now.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: As my colleagues have said, to allow for the subdivision of school sites results in the creation of smaller lots that are unusable by other school boards. This is actually an amendment that was recommended by the Office of the French Language Services Commissioner of Ontario in their 2016 report. The commissioner said in that report that allowing the subdivision of lots creates unfair competition between school boards and the private sector. If the government's intention with this legislation is to ensure that every child gets equitable access to education in order to be able to achieve and meet the minister's priority outcomes for the education system, then surely the government will want to take this opportunity to actually implement this recommendation of the French Language Services Commissioner and make sure that francophone students, in particular, have equitable access to reasonably sized schools.

1750

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

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

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

Let's move to motion 45, and I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 194(5) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We've just heard from the government that there was absolutely no need to make any change to the current process by recognizing that public bodies and school boards have the priority for school land or school buildings when they are disposed of by a school board. There was also no willingness on the part of the government to give the minister the power to prevent the subdivision of school boards.

So there's really no need for this text to be in the bill because this legislation, by the government's own admission, changes absolutely nothing to the existing reality. We've heard lots of complaints from the government side about duplication, so surely the government won't want to duplicate things now.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I just want to put on the record that I don't agree with any of the comments made by the person who moved the motion, MPP Pasma. We think this is an important part of the bill, to be responsive to demographic trends across the province. So we intend to keep this in the bill.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: This is something that we heard was very important to the French board, to the French schools, to the francophones of this province. It says right now that a board shall sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the school board in the circumstances prescribed by the regulations that nobody has seen, that nobody knows what's going to be in those regulations and that could make things worse than how bad they already are.

Things are not good right now for the French boards trying to open up new schools so that francophone students can have access to education. Those regulations could make things worse. It makes the community really anxious. It has to go.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I believe that the minister, in his evidence, had indicated that part of the reason that we were taking steps in this area was to assist the French boards. That's the reason for the provision. Regulations, it's my understanding, are posted for comment.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: If the aim is to help the French boards, I would say thank you, but the French boards came and told us how they wanted to be helped, and that was not it. This is not how you help the French boards. You help the French boards by listening to what they asked for. They asked that we have approval of the minister before

selling off or subdividing a school site. They made it clear what would help them. This is not it.

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

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Okay, let's go to 47, and I'll recognize—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Lesley Flores): Forty-six.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Forty-six.

Mr. John Fraser: Someone is taking attendance up there.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Yes, I know. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "The minister may direct a school board" at the beginning of subsection 194(6) of the Education Act and substituting "After giving a school board at least 30 days notice and an opportunity to make written submissions, the minister may direct the school board".

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We heard significant concerns from school boards about the fact that there are many factors that influence whether or not a school board has the opportunity to make use of the land now or in the present—uses that the school board might have for schools and lands that go beyond current school accommodation, including the fact that school boards plan on a 14-year cycle and that there is always a need for school spaces for students to be moved to when schools are being renovated or when construction is delayed.

School boards should at least have the opportunity to be meaningfully consulted on what the land might be required for before the minister can direct them to dispose of that land, particularly in terms of future growth or what the bigger picture needs of the school board are, especially since land values are rising rapidly and if the school sells off a property and then needs to turn around and buy a new property later in a close location, that would be a huge cost to taxpayers. This is also something—when the primary reason for selling off a school, as the minister has said, would be to provide a school to coterminous school boards, we don't want to rob Peter to pay Paul. Both school boards should have the opportunity to state what their needs are for that school property and allow the minister to make an informed decision before ordering the sale of a school.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Encore une fois, c'est une demande qui a été faite par les conseils scolaires francophones, qui disent que si on continue à faire ce qu'on a fait dans le passé, on va continuer d'avoir des barrières avant que les conseils francophones soient capables d'avoir accès à des écoles qui existent déjà, qui ont déjà été payées par les contribuables. Maintenant, tout ce qu'on demande c'est de leur donner 30 jours—30 jours pour être capables de faire une offre, 30 jours pour être capables de savoir ce qui est à vendre et quelle école pourrait leur être disponible.

Le gouvernement dit qu'ils veulent aider les conseils scolaires francophones. Les conseils scolaires francophones sont venus nous dire ce dont ils avaient besoin. J'espère qu'ils vont les écouter.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let's go to motion 47, and I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "to another school board or public body prescribed in the regulations" before "if it is not needed" in subsection 194(6) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is the section of the bill that allows the minister to direct a board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site if it is not needed to meet current or future pupil accommodation needs of the board. This is different from the decision of the board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a property. This is the board being forced to do so by the minister.

This is an amendment that was requested by the school boards, that this power be restricted only to selling, leasing or otherwise disposing of these properties to a school board or public body as prescribed in the regulations, because there is no reason why the minister should be directing boards to sell land that is paid for by the taxpayer to a private entity.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Seeing the time, this committee now stands in recess until 6:30. There is food available in committee room number 1.

The committee recessed from 1800 to 1831.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): We're all back and going again. We were talking about 47, and MPP Pasma, you made your initial statement.

Further discussion? MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Again, this is a recommendation that—the francophone school board came, they did the deputation, they told us the changes that they would like to see to make sure that what has happened in the past does not happen again.

So all we're asking to do is to make sure that it will be offered to another school board or public body prescribed in the regulation if it is not needed. It is not being done right now. Many francophone school boards have run into issues. They are trying to expand. They need to build more schools. We could save the taxpayers a ton of money if we give them the opportunity to buy surplus schools from other school boards. That's all they're asking to do. I hope you will support it.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further discussion? I recognize MPP Pierre.

Ms. Natalie Pierre: I recommend voting against this motion because the motion is not required, as the top priority for surplus school board property will remain in public education. Forthcoming regulations will showcase school board pupil accommodation needs as being the top priority. The ministry will continue to work with school boards to inform implementation.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further discussion? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We already discussed how the current process requires school boards to offer land that they're disposing of to other school boards and public bodies, but this is an entirely new power to the minister—that the minister can actually force school boards to dispose of school property, whether that's selling or leasing. If, as the minister has said repeatedly, this power is needed in order to actually be able to equitably accommodate students across school boards, then there's really no need for this power to extend beyond school boards and public bodies. That is what this amendment does and says—that the minister's power to direct a sale is limited to instances where the land is not needed, to restrict that sale being directed to only another school board or public body. There is really no need for the minister to be directing school boards to sell land that has been acquired with the funds of public taxpayers to private developers or private entities. There is really no reason for that. So please support this amendment that restricts the minister's power to selling to school boards and public bodies.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further discussion? No? Okay. Ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let's move on to motion 48. I recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 194(6) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“Direction by minister

“(6) The minister may direct an English-language district school board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board to a French-language district school board if it is not needed to meet current pupil accommodation needs of the English-language district school board or the pupil accommodation needs of the next 10 years, as determined in accordance with the regulations.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: This is just another amendment that follows along what we’ve been debating all afternoon: about the need to ensure that French-language school boards have access to surplus school properties. I hope you can support it.

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

Ms. Natalie Pierre: I recommend voting against this motion because, through the new surplus property framework, the ministry will look at the needs of all coterminous school boards. Prioritization will continue to be given to boards that might be facing access limitations, and the ministry will continue to work with school boards to inform implementation.

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

Mr. John Fraser: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. We’ll go to motion 49.

Mr. John Fraser: Withdraw.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): We’ll go to 49.1.

Mr. John Fraser: Withdraw.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Motion 49.2.

Mr. John Fraser: No. Sorry, folks. I know you got your hopes up there.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): We were on a roll there.

Mr. John Fraser: We were on a roll, yes.

I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 194(6) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“Direction by minister

“(6) The minister may direct a board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board if it is not needed to meet the board’s current pupil accommodation needs or its pupil

accommodation needs for the next 10 years, as determined in accordance with the regulation.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Just hold for a second.

Mr. John Fraser: Did I miss something?

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: No, I don’t think there’s a 49.3.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I’ll ask MPP Fraser to read that again, the direction of the minister, subsection (6).

Mr. John Fraser: “Direction by minister

“(6) The minister may direct a board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board if it is not needed to meet the board’s current pupil accommodation needs or its pupil accommodation needs for the next 10 years, as determined in accordance with the regulation.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: Again, I think this is a perfectly reasonable motion that gives the minister the power to direct those surplus schools to be on the market for other boards who can use those to fulfill the educational needs of children in the community. I hope you can support it.

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

Mr. John Fraser: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Fraser, Gélinas, Jordan, Martin, Pasma, Pierre, Quinn, Ray, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is carried.
1840

Now, we’ll go to section 19 of schedule 2, motion 50: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 194(6) of the Education Act.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This section of the bill allows the minister to direct a board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site. We have tried to restrict the capacity of the minister to sell or lease those school sites to another school board or public body, which the minister has said is actually the intention of this legislation, and the government has defeated an amendment on that front. So as it’s written, it gives unlimited power to the minister to order school boards to dispose of properties. That is deeply concerning to Ontarians, especially given how developers always seem to get a sweetheart deal out of this government.

I don’t think what we want to see is a situation where there’s a fire sale of public properties that have been paid for by the taxpayer at bargain-basement prices. What we actually want to see is a situation where lands that are owned by school boards, buildings that are owned by school boards are being used to support education first and

foremost and public programs and services in communities where they are no longer needed. Since the government is not willing to put any restrictions on the minister's power, I think this is an incredibly dangerous clause as it is written.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Committee members, MPP Pasma has moved an amendment. This proposed amendment is out of order as it is inconsistent with a previous decision made by the committee on this section of this bill.

Now, let's go to motion 51. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Disposition to other school board

“(6.1) The minister may direct a school board to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board to another board whose area or jurisdiction overlaps or is adjacent to the selling school board if the property is not needed to meet current pupil accommodation needs of the selling school board or its pupil accommodation needs of the next 14 years, as determined in accordance with the regulations.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We heard from the francophone school boards concern about having future pupil accommodation needs in the act with a completely unlimited time horizon, as that puts them at a disadvantage given their current needs, that other school boards could argue that their pupil accommodation needs in 30 or 40 years require the land. But what we heard from the English school boards is that they plan on a 14-year cycle because that's how long students are in school in Ontario. In order to ensure that students will be able to complete school in their local community, which I think is a goal that we all would like to see for our education system, it's important that school boards be allowed to plan for the next 14 years for pupil accommodation needs rather than limiting them to a shorter time frame.

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

Let's go to motion 52. MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Section 23 of the charter

“(6.1) The minister shall direct the sale, lease or disposal of a school site if the minister is satisfied that the sale, lease or disposal of the site would contribute to protecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: That amendment follows on the one that we just passed unanimously—thank you—and what it does is recognize that one of the main reasons that we're here and we're making amendments to this bill, a number

of them, is to ensure the access for francophone school boards to school properties. I think it's reflective of what we're trying to do here, and I would encourage the members opposite and beside me to support.

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

Let's move to motion 53. I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the Bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Whether compensation required

“(6.2) If the minister issues a direction under subsection (6) requiring a school board to dispose of property to another school board, the minister shall consider, in accordance with any prescribed rules, whether compensation should be paid to the selling school board in connection with the disposition of property in order to ensure that the selling school board receives fair market value for the property.”

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: Basically, this is an indemnity clause that would compensate boards when purchasing a property from another school board at a fair market value. Without this amendment, the French-language school board, with fewer funds, would be disadvantaged in obtaining a school site, despite the provision in the bill.

The idea, again, came from the francophone school boards who want to make sure that, given that they are smaller—they still get paid the same amount of money by student, but there are less francophones in Ontario than there are anglophones. There are only 600,000 of us; there are 14 million English-speaking. So given that they have less funds, the ministry could come in and help with compensation. They've asked for this. I think it would make sense on both sides, and it would also make the relationship between the English board and the French board a little bit more harmonious.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: The disposition of school board surplus property is already required and will continue to be at fair market value.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: The point is that francophone school boards are not always able to pay fair market value for a school, and so having an absolute requirement that it be the school board that is acquiring the land, that pays fair market value, disadvantages francophone school boards who desperately need new property. This allows some flexibility so that it's not necessarily the school board that is paying fair market value in order to be able to acquire land, because we know—as we've covered many times this afternoon—that it is our francophone school boards that desperately need access to additional property and additional school buildings, so we don't want to do anything in the act that actually disadvantages our

francophone school boards from actually being able to acquire additional land.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Let's go to motion 54. I recognize MPP Fraser.

1850

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Written submissions

“(6.2) Before directing the sale, lease or disposal of a school site, the minister shall provide the board that owns the school site with at least 30 days to make written submissions about the proposed direction.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: I think it's pretty self-explanatory. The board should have a right to respond, and I think 30 days is a fair time frame.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote—oh, I'm sorry. MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: We had tabled a motion very similar to this. We also think that 30 days is reasonable.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? Go ahead, MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: Does anybody think it's unreasonable? I'm just checking. Thank you, Chair.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: We passed the bill giving consideration around the 10 years—a school board property that won't be needed for 10 years; we did that consideration. The minister will be in consultation with boards as to the need of property and how they're disposed of. So you've got to make a strong case past 10 years for a property to be disposed of. We've put in the piece around 10 years, so the minister will continue to consult with boards in regard to this.

Mr. John Fraser: You think I'm going to be satisfied with just one?

Ms. Patrice Barnes: No—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Please wait until I recognize you.

Further debate? Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is lost.

Let's go to motion 55. MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Je propose que l'article 19 de l'annexe 2 du projet de loi soit modifié par adjonction du

paragraphe suivant à l'article 194 de la Loi sur l'éducation :

« Restriction : centres de garde desservant la communauté francophone

« (6.3) Malgré le paragraphe (6), le ministre ne doit pas ordonner à un conseil de vendre, de louer ou d'aliéner d'une autre façon un emplacement scolaire ou une partie de celui-ci si un centre de garde desservant principalement la communauté francophone a été établi dans l'enceinte de l'école. »

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: C'est vraiment pour protéger les garderies. Donc, s'il y a une garderie francophone établie, on veut vraiment que les ordres du ministre prennent compte du fait qu'il y a une garderie établie. Ça pourrait que les besoins en éducation versus les besoins en garde d'enfants soient différents, mais qu'ils partagent un site. Donc, c'est pour s'assurer que les besoins de garderie sont pris en considération.

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

M^{me} Chandra Pasma: Ce projet de loi donne au ministre le pouvoir d'ordonner que les emplacements scolaires soient vendus s'ils ne sont pas nécessaires pour les besoins actuels du conseil scolaire. Mais nous avons entendu des inquiétudes exprimées par des intervenants francophones, et notamment l'ACÉPO, que les installations scolaires sont parfois utilisées pour les centres de garde qui servent la même population que les conseils scolaires de langue française. Et nous savons que les garderies francophones sont très importantes pour le transfert de la langue française et de la culture francophone, et que les jeunes qui fréquentent des garderies de langue française sont plus enclins à fréquenter les écoles de langue française après.

Alors, il est très important que les centres de garde puissent continuer de louer les locaux des conseils scolaires. Cet amendement assure que les centres de garde francophones seront reconnus comme essentiels pour répondre aux besoins actuels et protégera les garderies pour les enfants francophones.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's move to motion 56. I recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: Given that motion 53 didn't pass with regard to indemnity, I'm going to withdraw.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Motion 57. MPP Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: Chair, I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 194(11)(a) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“(a) for the purposes of subsection (6), governing the circumstances when a school site, part of a school site or other property is not needed to meet a board’s current pupil accommodation needs or its pupil accommodation needs for the next 10 years, and authorizing the minister to determine whether the—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): MPP Fraser, I’m just going to interrupt you for—

Mr. John Fraser: Did I miss—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): We’re on 57.2.

Mr. John Fraser: Oh, okay. Sorry.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Yes, and it should be 57.

Mr. John Fraser: Motion 57, sorry. So, 57, I withdraw; 57.1, withdraw; 57.2—I’m sorry. Because they’re just versions of the same—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay, so let’s start again.

Mr. John Fraser: I apologize.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): No problem.

Mr. John Fraser: I thought you said 57.2.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Let’s go to 57.2, and I’ll recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: All righty. I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 194(11)(a) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“(a) for the purposes of subsection (6), governing the circumstances when a school site, part of a school site or other property is not needed to meet a board’s current pupil accommodation needs or its pupil accommodation needs for the next 10 years, and authorizing the minister to determine whether the circumstances exist.”

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

Mr. John Fraser: I think it’s pretty straightforward.

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

All in favour? All opposed? The motion is carried.

Okay, let’s go to motion 58.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Withdrawn. Let’s go to motion 59. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 19 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 194 of the Education Act:

“Accessibility for persons with disabilities

“(11.1) Despite anything in this section, a school board shall not sell, lease or otherwise dispose of a school site, part of a school site or other property of the board, and the minister shall not direct a board to do so, if the site, part or property is more accessible for persons with disabilities

than another site, part or property being retained by the board.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is another amendment put forward by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance with the support of Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and the many, many individuals who wrote to us in support of these proposed amendments.

As we’ve discussed this afternoon, there remain many barriers to participation of students with disabilities in our schools, including the fact that our schools are not fully accessible. They are required to be barrier-free by 2025, but the resources and funding have not been provided to school boards to actually achieve that goal.

1900

This is a small amendment to the section that allows the minister to require a school board to sell or lease a school property by requiring that the minister take into account the relative accessibility of the site, and that the minister will not be directing the sale of our more accessible school sites while leaving less accessible sites within the school board’s portfolio, so that over time our accessibilities improve instead of worsening.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 19, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It is carried.

Shall schedule 2, section 20 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It is carried.

Let’s go to schedule 2, section 21, motion 60: I recognize MPP Gélinas.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Je propose que l’article 21 de l’annexe 2 du projet de loi soit modifié par adjonction du paragraphe suivant à l’article 195.1 de la Loi sur l’éducation :

« Idem : droit garanti par la Charte

« (1.1) Le ministre ordonne à deux conseils ou plus de conclure des arrangements les uns avec les autres pour la construction, la propriété, le contrôle, la gestion, l’entretien, l’exploitation, la location ou l’utilisation conjointes d’un emplacement scolaire, d’une partie de celui-ci ou d’un autre bien d’un conseil si le ministre est d’avis que l’arrangement contribuerait à donner effet aux

droits et privilèges garantis par l'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. »

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: We are in the part of the bill where the francophone boards are the most nervous of it all. We used to have in Ontario, basically, English school boards that controlled where francophone students would go to school. We fought really hard and finally got French boards. The French boards were able to say, "No, we're not going to put our French kids in English schools anymore. We will have our own."

All of this is at risk right now with this bill. So, what that does is put in our legislation article 23 that specifically talks about the right of francophones to French education.

Ils ont surtout peur que le ministre utilise ses nouveaux pouvoirs pour nous faire revivre ce qu'on a vécu dans le passé, où les enfants francophones ont dû aller à l'école dans une école anglophone prédominante.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: Our government recognizes that the French-language education system in Ontario is essential to the vitality of our province's francophone community. However, the amendment proposed in this motion is not necessary as the government is already required to respect the rights of French-language and denominational rights holders and the charter. The ministry will be consulting with the four school board trustee associations regarding how best to maximize school capacity through these arrangements including through French board to French board arrangements.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: I cannot tell you how happy the francophone population would be to see those words in legislation. As long as they are words spoken by a government who means well, it's all good, but it's not legislation. We all know that governments change, that Ministers of Education change. You can state what you want to say, and it will be true for as long as you are in power and as long as your Minister of Education is Mr. Lecce. But we all know that at some point we will have a new Minister of Education. We all know that at some point we will have a different ministry in a different government, and this is why the words that are spoken need also become words written in law, because this is the only way we can assure that those good intentions will be carried out for ever, amen.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: As ACÉPO noted in their written submission to us, article 23 of the charter actually guarantees that when the number of students in a francophone school justifies it, students who hold minority language education rights actually have the right to their own instructional establishment in which they can learn and play and grow in an environment that is entirely in French.

We've heard many stories about the impact of forcing francophone children to be in a situation where they are surrounded by English and the difficulty that francophone students have of actually being able to learn their language well and resist the pressure of English around them. This is an amendment that reflects that right.

We have seen governments before try to introduce legislation or make policies that do not respect charter-protected rights, including the charter-protected right of Canadians to collectively bargain and the charter-protected right of Canadians to strike, and so I think it's incredibly important that we don't take these charter-protected rights for granted but that we actually put it right in the text of the legislation that the charter rights of francophones will be protected and that the minister will only direct school boards to collaborate when it will actually advance the rights of francophone students instead of putting those rights at risk.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay. The motion is lost.

Let's go to motion 61. MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I move that section 21 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 195.1 of the Education Act:

"Section 23 of the charter

"(1.1) The minister shall direct the boards to make an arrangement described in subsection (1) if the minister is satisfied that the arrangement would contribute to protecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms."

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

Mr. John Fraser: This is pretty much the same amendment as we just debated. There's always a second chance, folks; you can see the light. I think the francophone community would like to see that in the bill—I don't think; I know. That's it, Chair. Thanks.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: We are in a section of this bill that talks directly to joint use of schools. I don't know why we would put something like this in a bill when we know the history of French education in this province, but it is there. The least we can do is pass this amendment, which is almost identical to ours. But if you prefer that one, I'm all for it.

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

1910

Shall schedule 2, section 21 carry?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Oh, I'm sorry. Motion 62. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Withdrawn.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Shall schedule 2, section 21 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

Shall schedule 2, section 22 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

Now we're going to look at schedule 2, section 23, and motion 63. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 23 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 196.1 of the Education Act:

"Limitation re accessibility for persons with disabilities

"(1.1) The minister shall not require school boards to use a particular functional specification, design or plan unless the specification, design or plan requires that the school buildings or premises being constructed, renovated or added to be accessible for persons with disabilities."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is a clause of the bill that allows the minister to require school boards to have to use particular design specifications or plans when constructing, renovating or making additions to a school building.

This is an amendment that was recommended by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes, and many, many individuals.

Right now, the minister could recommend a design that is not accessible to all students. We've already heard this afternoon that there are far too many school buildings in Ontario that are already not accessible to people with disabilities and far too many barriers to full inclusion of students with disabilities.

This just ensures that the specifications, designs or plans that are being imposed on school boards are completely accessible for persons with disabilities.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: People representing people with different abilities and needing to be accommodated are asking for this to be in the bill so that if the government is going to come out with standard plans for expansion for schools—to make sure that we take into account the needs of every child and students and teachers who need to be accommodated for a disability.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Let's go to motion 64. I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 23 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 196.1 of the Education Act:

"Same

"(1.2) The minister shall require, in connection with a school board's construction, renovation or addition to school buildings or premises, that the board ensure that the building or premises meets the accessibility requirements for the built environment, as identified by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee in its Final Recommendations Report for the development of a proposed Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education Standard under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is in another amendment put forward by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many stakeholders and many, many individuals. Once again, this K-12 Education Standards Development Committee was a committee that was created by the Minister of Education. It had widespread representation from people living with disabilities on the committee, in addition to people from the education sector. They did comprehensive public consultations before finalizing their report and identified many barriers that need to be addressed in order to achieve full inclusion of students with disabilities in Ontario. Unfortunately, the government has so far not implemented that report. But this is an amendment that ensures that if the minister imposes particular specifications or design with regard to construction, renovation or addition, the building and the premises will meet the accessibility requirements as laid out by the K-12 Education Standards Development Committee.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Mr. Brian Riddell: The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 23 carry? Okay.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I'm getting tired. All those in favour? All those opposed? I'm human, what can I say? Carried.

Now we'll go to schedule 2, section 24, motion 65. I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 218.3(1) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“Breach of code of conduct

“(1) A member of a board who has reasonable grounds to believe that another member of the board has breached the board's code of conduct may notify the board chair, in writing, of the alleged breach.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is the section of the bill that deals with the code of conduct and when members of the board are submitting complaints. The text, as it exists, allows those complaints to be submitted as well to the director of education if the notice relates to the conduct of the board chair. But what we heard from school board stakeholders, including the Ontario Public School Boards' Association and the Toronto District School Board, is real concerns about including the director of education in this process. They are the sole employee of the school board. This pits the elected trustees against staff, and it confuses the governance and operations role within the local school board level. The Ontario Public School Boards' Association's template for best practices suggests instead that if the complaint is against the chair, it should be handled by the vice-chair. So this amendment removes that role of the director of education here.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: It is always very difficult. Think about it: The board is your employer, and you receive a complaint against the chair of your employer. To put this responsibility on the director of education is really putting whoever has this position in a very awkward situation. How do you handle complaints against your employer? It's usually the other way around: It's the employer who handles complaints against employees. So the idea is to leave it at the level of the board. Don't get the one employee of the board involved.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: The government continues to believe the director of education is the appropriate individual to receive complaints regarding alleged breaches of the trustee code of conduct in the event that the chair or vice-chair are the subject of complaints. In addition, through government motion 66, the government is proposing additional flexibility to prescribe an alternate individual, if required, and as the result of feedback through consultations or implementation.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. We'll go to motion 66. MPP Martin.

1920

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsections 218.3(1) and (2) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

“Breach of code of conduct

“(1) A member of a board who has reasonable grounds to believe that a member of the board has breached the board's code of conduct may notify the following persons in writing of the alleged breach:

“1. The director of education, if the notice relates to the conduct of the board chair or vice-chair.

“2. In all other situations, the board chair.

“Same

“(1.1) If a person other than those described in paragraph 1 or 2 of subsection (1) is prescribed by regulation, the notification shall be given to the prescribed person instead of the persons described in those paragraphs.

“Same

“(2) If notification of an alleged breach is given under subsection (1), the person to whom the notification was made shall,

“(a) immediately provide a copy of the written notice to the member whose conduct is the subject of the alleged breach and to the entire board; and

“(b) if the matter is not resolved within 10 days after the member received the notice under clause (a), or within such other time period as may be prescribed by regulation, refer the matter to an integrity commissioner appointed by the board.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? Oh, you had something else?

Mrs. Robin Martin: I was just going to say we stand behind the integrity-commissioner-led process and the importance of enshrining this framework in legislation to ensure a fair and impartial approach to the resolution of trustee code of conduct complaints.

At the same time, we acknowledge that this will be a transformational change for school boards and through the amendments proposed in this motion, the government is adding flexibility in the procedural elements of the legislative scheme related to integrity commissioners which would allow the process to reflect sector feedback and lessons learned during implementation.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: I'm just curious: Under the same "(1.1) a person other than those described ... is prescribed by regulation," could you give me an example of who that other person could be?

Mrs. Robin Martin: I think it's just meant to leave open the possibility of somebody else could be the vice-chair, for example.

M^{me} France Gélinas: Okay.

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

Let's go to motion 67, and we'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 218.3 of the Education Act:

"Training

"(3.1) The minister shall ensure that any person on the roster of integrity commissioners receives ongoing anti-racism training."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is within a section of the bill that allows the ministry to create a roster of integrity commissioners who will decide complaints that are filed by board members.

We heard some incredibly powerful testimony as a committee about the experience of racism within the education system by Trustee Kathy McDonald and by Anchor Canada and the importance of deliberately addressing racism and how essential it is that an integrity commissioner have both training and experience in anti-racism. In fact, Ms. McDonald said no one should be appointed as an integrity commissioner if they do not have training and experience in anti-racism.

This amendment ensures that every single integrity commissioner will have anti-racism training.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: I recommend voting against the motion because integrity commissioners are professionals with a depth of experience and expertise in investigating code of conduct matters across public and private institutions. They are expected to carry out their duties with fairness and impartiality.

A future regulation would prescribe further details on the integrity commissioner appointment process. The minister will consult with the four trustee associations on the development of the roster of integrity commissioners to be used by school boards. Once created, boards themselves will be responsible for appointing an integrity commissioner from the roster.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We don't know that integrity commissioners will be people who have experience in this matter because the bill is entirely silent on what qualifications an integrity commissioner must have. It feels like we're being asked to just trust the government an awful lot this afternoon, and this is another area where we're being

asked to trust that this is something that may be contained in the regulations down the road.

What we heard from our witnesses who are people who have, unfortunately, experienced deeply disturbing experiences of racism, anti-Black racism, within our education system is this is an absolute necessity for integrity commissioners, that we really cannot afford to have integrity commissioners who do not understand racism and who do not have anti-racism training. This ensures that every single integrity commissioner that is appointed by the minister will receive anti-racism training and will be well equipped to deal with the all too unfortunate incidences of racism that occur within our education system.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all heard that racism is real, it is live, it happens and it hurts a lot of people. To put it clearly in legislation that whoever—because we don't know who the integrity commissioners will be. We don't know what their training will be. We don't know what their experience will be, but at least we will make sure that they have anti-racism training.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare the motion lost.

We will now go to motion 68. I'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding "but, in any case, a person's name cannot be added to the roster unless the person has a demonstrated record of anti-racism activities" at the end of subsection 218.3(5) of the Education Act."

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Once again, we heard incredibly powerful testimony about the experiences of racism within the education system and the importance that integrity commissioners be people who are well equipped and able to deal with issues of racism, that they have training in anti-racism and experience in dealing with racism and anti-racism activities. We heard this very loudly and clearly from Trustee Kathy McDonald and Anchor Canada. Once again, Ms. McDonald said no one should be appointed as an integrity commissioner unless they have this training and experience. Right now, the bill is completely silent on what kinds of qualifications an integrity commissioner must have in order to be appointed. This

ensures that people are not appointed to be integrity commissioners in Ontario unless they have demonstrated that they have a record of anti-racism activities.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? I'll recognize MPP Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: While I recognize that the intent of this amendment is the same as the last amendment, which I supported, I can't support it, because I'm just concerned about the subjective nature of what's been described here: "Demonstrated a record of anti-racism activities." I think that that could be very subjective. I fully support the last amendment that I voted for; I just can't support this one.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Fraser, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I declare the motion lost.

We'll now go to motion 69. MPP Quinn.

Mr. Nolan Quinn: I move that section 24 to schedule 2 of the bill be amended by striking out subsections 218.3(6) and (7) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

"Investigation

"(7) Subject to subsection (8), the integrity commissioner appointed by a board shall commence an investigation into the alleged breach of the board's code of conduct no later than 14 days after being appointed under subsection (2), or within such other time period as may be prescribed by regulation, and shall provide the member with the opportunity to respond to the allegations, as well as a right of reply, where appropriate."

1930

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all know that it's important to have a time frame when you're dealing with such investigations. But we don't have a time frame as to how long it would take to appoint an integrity commissioner. If this process drags on, the person who the complaint has been made against could be made to wait a very long time, and nothing good comes of that.

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

Let's go to motion 70. We'll recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 218.3(6)(b) of the Education Act.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate—oh, just a second, please. Committee members, MPP Pasma has moved an amendment. The proposed amendment is out of order as it is inconsistent with a previous decision made by the committee on this section of the bill.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I don't even get to read it?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): She should be able to read it.

Interjections.

M^{me} France Gélinas: I read it anyway. I thought she just did.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Let's move to motion 71. I recognize MPP Pierre.

Ms. Natalie Pierre: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 218.3(15) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

"Time limit

"(15) The integrity commissioner shall make a determination with respect to a complaint of an alleged breach no later than 90 days after commencing the investigation, or within such other time period as may be prescribed by regulation, unless the integrity commissioner notifies the board and the member who is the subject of the complaint that an extension is necessary and of the reasons for the extension."

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are we ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is passed.

Let's go to motion 72. I'll recognize MPP Jordan.

Mr. John Jordan: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 218.3.2(3) of the Education Act and substituting the following:

"Notice of appeal

"(3) The board or the member who appeals the integrity commissioner's determination shall give written notice of the appeal to the other party and the deputy minister no later than 14 days after receiving written notice of the integrity commissioner's determination, or within such other time period as may be prescribed by regulation."

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

Let's go to motion 73. I recognize MPP Wai.

Mrs. Daisy Wai: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 218.3.2(7) of the Education Act.

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

We'll now go to motion 74. I'll recognize MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: I move that section 24 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following section to the Education Act:

"Regulations re codes of conduct

“218.3.3 The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations respecting codes of conduct and processes relating to alleged breaches of a code of conduct, including regulations,

“(a) prescribing the person to whom notice must be given under subsection 218.3(1.1);

“(b) prescribing a time period for the purposes of clause 218.3(2)(b) for referring a matter to an integrity commissioner;

“(c) prescribing the qualifications of integrity commissioners;

“(d) prescribing fees to be paid to integrity commissioners, or the manner of calculating such fees, and requiring boards to pay them;

“(e) prescribing the process, including the participants and their roles in the process, by which a person may be added to the roster of integrity commissioners;

“(f) governing reviews of the roster of integrity commissioners, which may include prescribing the timing and frequency of reviews and how long a person may be on the roster;

“(g) prescribing rules and procedures that shall apply to the code of an investigation of an alleged breach of a board’s code of conduct and to the process of making a determination whether there was a breach;

“(h) prescribing a time period for the purposes of subsection 218.3.2(3) for giving a written notice of appeal;

“(i) governing hearings required under subsection 218.3.2(6) and prescribing rules and procedures that shall apply to the hearings.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): MPP Rae, would you please reread (g) again?

Mr. Matthew Rae: Chair, you’re killing me.

“(g) prescribing rules and procedures that shall apply to the code of an investigation”—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): That’s not (g).

Mr. Matthew Rae: Sorry, Chair. My apologies.

“(g) prescribing rules and procedures that apply to the code of an investigation”—

Interjection: No.

Mr. Matthew Rae: This is (g)—

Interjection: It’s “to the conduct,” here.

Mr. Matthew Rae: —“to the conduct of an investigation”—

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Yes. You kept saying, “to the code of.”

Mr. Matthew Rae: Sorry—“applying to the conduct of an investigation”—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay, just a second. Would you start from the beginning, MPP Rae?

Mr. Matthew Rae: Of (g)?

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Of (g).

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you.

“(g) prescribing rules and procedures that shall apply to the conduct of an investigation of an alleged breach of a board’s code of conduct and to the process of making a determination whether there was a breach;”

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

Mr. John Fraser: I’m inclined to support this, but I have one question and it’s a bit cheeky. We’re doing this

for trustees, but it’s been a year and a half with a serious situation on municipal councils and nothing has been done about an integrity commissioner or any of the work that needs to be done around harassment and violence at municipal councils.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Chair, on a point of order, that’s not about this bill.

Mr. John Fraser: No, it’s just a message to send back to your caucus. Thank you.

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

Shall schedule 2 section carry?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Lesley Flores): It’s schedule 2, section 24, as amended.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Okay, this is contagious, and I blame MPP Rae for it.

Shall schedule 2, section 24, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It’s carried.

1940

Shall schedule 2, section 25 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

Schedule 2, section 26, number 75: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 26 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 233 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Restriction

“(3.1) A regulation made under subsection (3) shall not require a school board to restrict, in any way, the use of any funds the board has received in connection with making up a shortfall in the funding of programs, services or supports for students with disabilities.””

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This is another amendment that we received from the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance that is supported by many stakeholders, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes, and many, many individuals who wrote to us.

We know that there’s inadequate funding for students with disabilities in the province and that the impact of underfunding is very different for students with disabilities because it prevents their full and complete participation in our education system. Often, when school boards are not receiving adequate funding, it’s students with disabilities who suffer as the school board looks to save money—including eliminating special class placements or congregate classes for students with disabilities, taking away supports from students with disabilities.

Our amendment would ensure that any regulations made under this section shall not restrict the funds the board has received for students with disabilities; that funding for these students with disabilities is protected and will not be used to offset shortfalls in funding in other areas from the ministry.

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

Mrs. Robin Martin: The Education Act mandates all school boards to provide special education programs and/or services for students with special education needs. School boards are required to use what they receive in special education funding only for special education.

Ontario will continue to support students with special education needs and disabilities so they have access to the supports they need to succeed in school and beyond. Over the past several years, the ministry has invested in direct student supports, educator professional learning, and new resources for families and educators to support this. The government has made major investments in special education, which include \$3.4 billion for the additional costs of programs, services or equipment required by students with special education needs.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: The member just told us what is happening now, but all of this could change with section 26, which talks about how the minister may require a board to restrict the use of any revenue, prescribe the maximum amount that a board can spend on a specific purpose etc. So to make sure that the intents that were there before, that any money that comes to support students with disabilities could only be used for that—that protection needs to be back in. We did not have the regulation-making powers of the minister before to require the board to restrict the use of any of their revenue, but we will have them once this bill passes. So it becomes important to make sure that what was there before will continue to be there after this bill passes, and that's by voting in favour of this amendment regarding what we—that has happened in the past, that the funds for special programs for students with disabilities could only be used for—but now, all of this could change because of the changes brought about by 26. So we're putting it back in to make sure that the intention is there, not only in words, but in writing.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost. Shall schedule 2, section 26 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion carries.

Schedule 2, section 27: Shall schedule 2, section 27 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

Schedule 2, section 28: Is there any debate? I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against this clause to the bill, which adds directors of education before supervisory officers in the Education Act. We heard

loudly and clearly from the school boards a genuine concern about allowing the Minister of Education to involve himself in the performance review for directors of education.

As we've heard earlier today, directors of education are the only employees of the school board. School boards already have a process for conducting those performance reviews. It's important that the school boards be allowed to conduct that performance review of their sole employee without the minister inserting himself into that process.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: It becomes really difficult for a person when their employer is the board of directors, but they will be assessed by somebody completely different than their employer. Don't put that upon any workers in Ontario. Directors of education are workers just like everybody else who works for a living. Their supervisor, their boss, their employer is the trustees, the board of education. They are elected officials, elected trustees, who hire the director of education. This is their employee, and the employer is the board. To say that somebody else will have a say in your performance appraisal is something that could be very, very stressful on anybody who happens to be in that job.

You want the best employee possible to take those very important positions. Let them be responsible to their employer, not to a third party that they don't report to, that they were not employed by, that they never signed a contract with. This is wrong. You don't treat people like this. If you're going to do a performance appraisal, it is your employer who decides what your performance appraisal looks like and the consequences of that, not a third party that has nothing to do with the employer/employee relationship.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Shall schedule 2, section 28 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried.

Schedule 2, section 29: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against this clause as well, because, once again, this is a change to the Education Act that allows the Minister of Education to insert himself into the performance reviews of directors of education. We heard grave concerns from the school board trustees in their testimony before this committee that the minister should not be interfering in these performance reviews. The directors of education are the sole employees of the school board, and it is part of the governance role of locally elected school board trustees to conduct that performance review.

1950

School boards do have a process for performance reviews. It's not as if these reviews aren't happening. The minister has no business involving himself in the performance reviews of directors of education.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Shall schedule 2, section 29 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It carries.

Schedule 2, section 30: MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against section 30 of the bill, which is another section which allows the minister to insert himself into the performance reviews of directors of education. As we've heard from our stakeholders, the school board trustees, this is an issue of grave concern to them since the director of education is their sole employee, and they already have existing performance review processes for the directors of education.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Shall schedule 2, section 30 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried.

Schedule 2, section 31: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against this section, which is another section which allows the minister to insert himself into the performance reviews of directors of education, who are the sole employees of boards of trustees. It's the role of boards of trustees to do performance reviews for their employees.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Shall schedule 2, section 31 carry?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It's carried.

Schedule 2, section 32: I recognize MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: We recommend voting against this section, which is another section which allows the minister to insert himself into the performance reviews of directors of education, who are the sole employees of the school board. We heard grave concerns from school board trustees who appeared before this committee about allowing that to happen.

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

M^{me} France Gélinas: We all know that there could be tensions between what a school board decides, what the school board mandates their director of education to do and what the province wants them to do. Those sections 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 are really problematic, because if a school board gives a directive to their directors of education to bring the government to court—it could very well happen, by the way, after you pass this bill; I'm just putting it out there—then the Minister of Education could give a very bad performance appraisal to this director of education, who may lose his or her job because they followed the directives of their employers, who are duly elected trustees.

This entire section—28, 29, 30, 31, 32—gives the minister power over elected officials. We elect our trustees to make those decisions, to select the director of education and to be accountable to the director of education. Will they always be in perfect alignment with what the Ministry of Education wants to do? No, we already know this. We've already seen that in Ontario, that they are not always—but that's how democracy works. That's why we elect trustees, that's why we elect provincial politicians and that's why we elect federal politicians. We're not always aligned, but this is what democracy is all about.

To say "We will give the Minister of Education overriding powers over the people of Ontario who elected democratically their trustees" is wrong. It's wrong on every level. It doesn't matter if a director of education is the one who ends up putting their name forward to bring the ministry to court and the government to court. They are allowed to follow the directive of their democratically elected trustee, no matter how much the Minister of Education likes or hates it. That's called democracy.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Shall schedule 2, section 32 carry? All those in favour?

M^{me} France Gélinas: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

Nays

Gélinas, Pasma.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Carried. There are no amendments to sections 33 to 35 of schedule 2. Therefore, I propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: No.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Shall schedule 2, section 33 carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Schedule 2, section 34: Shall it carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 2, section 35 carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 2, as amended, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Thank you very much for tonight—

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Lesley Flores): Oh, no, we're not done.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I was on my way out.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Lesley Flores): There's more. Schedule—

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): What do you mean there's—oh, my God.

There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3. Therefore, I propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Okay. Is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 3, sections 1 to 2, inclusive, carry? All in favour? All—okay, carried.

Schedule 3, section 3, number 76: MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 17.1 of the Ontario College of Teachers Act, 1996:

“Same, teaching all learners

“(2) A professional teacher education program offered by a post-secondary educational institution shall not be accredited unless it includes effective training on how to teach all learners, including students with disabilities.”

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: This was another amendment that was recommended by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Alliance and supported by many, many stakeholders, including Easter Seals, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital, ARCH Disability Law Centre, the Ontario Autism Coalition, March of Dimes and many, many individuals who wrote into the committee.

2000

All children in Ontario have the right to an equitable education, and children with disabilities may require specific accommodations or supports, and awareness of best practices for teaching children with disabilities is incredibly important. This is something we heard from many, many stakeholders before the committee, especially with regard to the Right to Read report and the fact that many teaching practices with Ontario are not based on the best science of teaching children to read, because in fact many teachers are not aware of this.

This amendment ensures that all teachers who receive their teachers' education in Ontario learn about the best, most effective practices to support children with disabilities in our schools.

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I just want to note that the current accreditation regulation requires that initial teacher education programs must provide a student of a program of professional education with knowledge and understanding of the current Ontario curriculum and provincial policy documents that are relevant to the student's areas of study and curriculum, including planning and design, special education, equity and diversity, learning assessment and evaluation.

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

Ms. Chandra Pasma: And yet, disability stakeholders are coming to our committee and telling us that there are still many barriers for children with disabilities in Ontario, including the fact that teaching methods are not always adapted to the needs of children with disabilities. So it's clear that the current situation is not enough to actually support children with disabilities.

This amendment makes it very clear that all teachers who receive their education in Ontario must be informed on best practices on how to teach all learners, including students with disabilities, so that nobody is left behind in our education system.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Are we ready to vote?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Fraser, Gélinas, Pasma.

Nays

Barnes, Jordan, Martin, Pierre, Quinn, Rae, Wai.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): The motion is lost.

Shall schedule 3, section 3, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 4 to 6 of schedule 3. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Are members prepared to vote? Shall schedule 3, sections 4 to 6, inclusive, carry? All in favour? All those opposed? It carries.

Schedule 3, section 7, motion 77: MPP Barnes.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: I move that section 7 of schedule 3 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“7. Section 30.2 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“No hearing

“(8) Despite clause 30(1)(a), the discipline committee need not hold a hearing or afford to any person an opportunity for a hearing or an opportunity to make oral or written submissions before making a decision or giving a direction under section 30 if,

“(a) the matter has been referred to the committee under subsection 26(5) or (9) and involves or includes an act referred to in subsection (2) of this section; and

“(b) the member has been convicted or found guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada)” or “the same conduct or action that is ... subject of the matter and,

“(i) the time for an appeal has expired, or

“(ii) an appeal was dismissed or abandoned and no further appeal is available.

“Same

“(9) For greater certainty, section 30 applies, with necessary modifications, even if, in accordance with subsection (8) of this section, a hearing is not held.”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Would you please reread “(b)”?

Ms. Patrice Barnes: You’re punishing us.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): It happens to all of us.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: “(b) the member has been convicted or found guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code (Canada) for the same conduct or action that is the subject of the matter and,

“(i) the time for an appeal has expired, or

“(ii) an appeal was dismissed or abandoned and no further appeal is available.

“Same”—

Mrs. Robin Martin: That’s enough.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Okay.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): That’s good.

Ms. Patrice Barnes: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): Further debate? Ready to vote? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 3, section 7, as amended, carry? All in favour? All opposed? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 8 to 21 of schedule 3. I therefore propose we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there debate? Are members prepared to vote?

Shall schedule 3, sections 8 to 21, inclusive, carry? Um—

Ms. Patrice Barnes: “All those in favour?”

The Chair (Mr. Brian Riddell): I can’t even think anymore. I was going to say “flavour.”

All in favour? Opposed? Good. Carried.

Shall schedule 3, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Turning to section 1, contents of this act: Shall section 1 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Section 2, commencement: Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Section 3, short title. Shall section 3 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall Bill 98, as amended, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Thank you, everyone, for attending this long and enduring event.

The committee adjourned at 2009.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Brian Riddell (Cambridge PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

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

Ms. Patrice Barnes (Ajax PC)

Mr. Wayne Gates (Niagara Falls ND)

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

Mrs. Lisa Gretzky (Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest ND)

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

Mrs. Robin Martin (Eglinton–Lawrence PC)

Ms. Natalie Pierre (Burlington PC)

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

Mr. Matthew Rae (Perth–Wellington PC)

Mr. Brian Riddell (Cambridge PC)

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

Mrs. Daisy Wai (Richmond Hill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud L)

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal (Brampton East / Brampton-Est PC)

Ms. Chandra Pasma (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Lesley Flores

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel