

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

HE-38

**Standing Committee
on Heritage, Infrastructure
and Cultural Policy**

Planning Statute Law
Amendment Act, 2023

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Wednesday 29 November 2023

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

HE-38

**Comité permanent du
patrimoine, de l'infrastructure
et de la culture**

Loi de 2023 modifiant
des lois en ce qui concerne
l'aménagement du territoire

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Mercredi 29 novembre 2023

Chair: Laurie Scott
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Présidente : Laurie Scott
Greffier : Isaiah Thorning

Hansard on the Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

ISSN 2816-7252

CONTENTS

Wednesday 29 November 2023

Planning Statute Law Amendment Act, 2023, Bill 150, Mr. Calandra / Loi de 2023 modifiant des lois en ce qui concerne l'aménagement du territoire, projet de loi 150, M. Calandra.....	HE-817
---	--------

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE,
INFRASTRUCTURE
AND CULTURAL POLICY**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DU PATRIMOINE,
DE L'INFRASTRUCTURE
ET DE LA CULTURE**

Wednesday 29 November 2023

Mercredi 29 novembre 2023

The committee met at 0900 in committee room 1.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):

Good morning, honourable members. In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, it is my duty to call upon you to elect an Acting Chair. Are there any nominations?

MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: Good morning. I nominate the great member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):

Thank you. Do you accept the nomination?

Mr. John Yakabuski: I accept.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):

Are there any further nominations? Okay. There being no further nominations, I declare nominations closed and MPP Yakabuski elected Acting Chair of the committee.

PLANNING STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 2023
LOI DE 2023 MODIFIANT
DES LOIS EN CE QUI CONCERNE
L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU TERRITOIRE

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 150, An Act to enact the Official Plan Adjustments Act, 2023 and to amend the Planning Act with respect to remedies / Projet de loi 150, Loi édictant la Loi de 2023 sur les modifications apportées aux plans officiels et modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire en ce qui concerne les recours.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Good morning, members of the committee. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We are here to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 150, An Act to enact the Official Plan Adjustments Act, 2023 and to amend the Planning Act with respect to remedies.

We are joined by staff from legislative counsel, Hansard and broadcast and recording. Please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak, and as always, all comments should go through the Chair. Are there any questions before we begin?

There being none, the Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all members and staff electronically. Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill, and if so, to which section? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Just to make sure I'm at the right spot: This is where I'm supposed to move my—no? I apologize. Sorry.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We will now begin clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. Bill 150 is comprised of three sections which enact two schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest we postpone these three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement on this?

I will begin with schedule 1, section 1, of the Official Plan Adjustments Act, 2023: government amendment number 2.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Sorry, Chair. Amendment number 1: Has that been read out yet, or—

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We're doing it by section. We've agreed. So we will be coming back to that.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Understood.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We will get back to that, MPP Armstrong.

Government amendment number 2: MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: I move that the table to section 1 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by,

(a) striking out "18 to 20" in column 3 of item 4 and substituting "18, 19 and 39";

(b) striking out "5, 24, 32, 33, 39 and 44" in column 3 of item 7 and substituting "5, 24, 25, 32, 33, 39, 42 and 44"; and

(c) striking out "40 to 45, 47, 48, 58 to 61" in column 3 of item 13 and substituting "40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 58, 59, 60 i), 61".

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Is there any debate?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I understand the amendment, for portion (a)—

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I recognize MPP Armstrong.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Thank you, Chair. You're doing a wonderful job.

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

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I recognize the government's amendment (a), which is "striking out '18 to 20' in column 3 of item 4 and substituting '18, 19 and 39'." However, the two other items, (b) and (c)—I wonder if the government could give us an explanation on those, be-

cause I understand the rationale for (a), but just the rationale for (b) and (c) would be very much appreciated.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: I'm happy to oblige my colleague. Item (b) relates to Niagara region and includes modification number 25 in order to maintain prohibitions of asphalt plants, concrete plants, brick manufacturing plants and similar uses within the Niagara Escarpment Plan area. Item (b) also proposes to include modification 42 to realign the boundary of the Grimsby and Beamsville protected majority transit station areas to align with the settlement area boundaries in order to ensure that urban development does not encroach into the greenbelt area.

Then item (c) relates to York region and removes modification number 43 from the bill in order to correct an error in the underlying official plan design, which otherwise would have created conformity issues with the Oak Ridges Moraine plan, where the Oak Ridges Moraine plan protects a higher level of drinking protection for source water protection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Armstrong, do you want to continue?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I just have a response to that, if I could. So (c), I understand, sounds like a correction, if you could verify that. However, (b) seems a little bit newer to me, and I just wondered: What kind of feedback did the government receive in order to propose that (b) amendment to the bill?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Rae, do you want to respond to that?

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you to my colleague. As the minister mentioned yesterday in his remarks, we're reverting to those original plans that were passed earlier.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: So, just to clarify, was this a request of the region or the municipalities for those official plans, or was this something that was changed with the urban boundary amendments and the amendments by the minister? Is that what we're talking about here? Was it just something that you intended to do but then neglected to do in the bill? Is this correcting the bill itself, or are these additions to the bill?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: Some of the amendments today, MPP Shaw, will be around to ensure that we protect the greenbelt area. Some of the original official plans were proposing development within the greenbelt area, for example, or Oak Ridges moraine, for example, and so that's to ensure that. And as the minister mentioned yesterday, we're reverting to those original official plans that were brought forward but ensuring that those protections from the provincial level remain.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? Are we ready to vote on the amendment?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Chair?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Armstrong?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: I appreciate the government's feedback; I really do. I just want to ask for a recess. I do want to consult with my researcher a little further on one of the amendments that was proposed in this section for the government bill.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We'll have a five-minute recess.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Oh, I'd like a 20-minute recess. I have to get a hold of the researcher.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): It will be a 20 minute-recess. We'll be back at 9:29.

The committee recessed from 0909 to 0929.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The committee is now back in session. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We will now resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 150.

Pursuant to standing order 131(a), I will now put the question on government amendment number 2. All those in favour, please raise your hands.

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): It's a recorded vote.

Ayes

Armstrong, Blais, Coe, Grewal, Kusendova-Bashta, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Shaw.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you very much. Amendment number 2 is carried.

We will now move to amendment number 3 on the part of the official opposition. MPP Armstrong.

0930

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Thank you, Chair. As this amendment has already been dealt with in the government's amendment in number 2, we will be withdrawing NDP amendment number 3, as it's a duplication.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Amendment number 3 on the part of the official opposition has been withdrawn.

Shall schedule 1, section 1, as amended, carry? Any debate? No debate. All those in favour? It's carried.

We'll now proceed with schedule 1, section 2, government amendment number 4. Any debate? Oh, you've got to move it? Okay, sorry. Let's have that amendment, MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: I move that subparagraph 1 i of section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"i. Map 1B, Urban System Overlays, is modified by,

"A. deleting the Gormley GO major transit station area symbol, and

"B. Removing from designated greenfield area the lands underlying the overlay that is noted in modification 60 i) referred to column 3 of item 13 of the table to section 1."

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: So item A deleting the Gormley GO major transit station—it says, “symbol.” Can I get the government’s side to describe or explain why this is here? Why the need for deleting this? Is it just the symbol or does it actually have to do with the development at Gormley?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: So the motion in whole and the items referred to, to my colleagues: It would amend the bill to correct an underlying topographical error in the minister’s November 4, 2022, decision on the regional municipality of York’s official plan, which should have originally referred to “designated greenfield area,” instead of “designated greenbelt area.” This typographical error is also partly addressed through the reference in item B as well—60 i) in motion 2 that we also just passed.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I’m not trying to be annoying, but is it a typographical or topographical error, because you said typographical the second time? I just want to know: Is it a typo or is it that you’re actually changing the shape files—

Mr. Matthew Rae: Typo.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Then you’re adding B; is that correct? That’s an addition? So A is to correct a typo in the bill; is that correct? Then B is an addition?

Mr. Matthew Rae: B is the—

Ms. Sandy Shaw: The addition?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): No, they’re both removing it.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Oh, that’s different. Sorry, I wasn’t here for the minister’s hour lead yesterday.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? Shall the amendment carry?

Ms. Sandy Shaw: I’m sorry. Unfortunately, we’re going to have to call for a recess. We have our researcher on the phone. But I think 20 minutes just to be sure. I do apologize. I just wasn’t able to be here when the minister made the speech to the committee or ask questions.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We’ll have a 20-minute recess until 9:55.

The committee recessed from 0935 to 0955.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order.

We will now resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 150. Pursuant to standing order 131(a), I will now put the question on government amendment number 4.

Interjection.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We can’t debate.

All those in favour? Any opposed? Amendment number 4 is carried.

We will now proceed with official opposition amendment number 5. MPP Armstrong.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: Amendment number 5: An Act to enact the Official Plan Adjustments Act, 2023 and to amend the Planning Act with respect to remedies—motion to be moved in committee, moved by—I move that

paragraph 1 of section 2 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subparagraph:

“iii. Map 1A, land use designations, is modified by designating as agricultural area the lands within the city of Vaughan and the city of Markham that are outlined in red on figure 1, attached to official plan amendment 7 adopted by the regional municipality of York pursuant to bylaw” 21-101.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Could you reread that last line, MPP Armstrong?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: “Attached to official plan”?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Just the last line.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: The last line: “to bylaw 2021-101.”

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

Just to be clear: We are only considering everything after the words “moved by.”

Any debate on the motion for the amendment? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: We moved this amendment forward because the regional official plan amendment from York changed the designation of what are called “greenbelt fingers” in this area. It changed the amendment from “agriculture” to “rural.”

This request actually came to the region of York from the De Gasperis family. That was their request to the region of York, because this is land that they own. That was the request that came to the region of York—it was TACC Developments, actually; pardon me. The region of York did approve this change from agricultural to rural, but this amendment was never approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It was never approved by the minister, and when the region submitted their official plan, they included mapping that reflected this amendment, despite the fact that it was never approved by the minister.

We’ve been discussing the greenbelt and the importance of agricultural land for quite some time. We know that the intention of Bill 150—and also Bill 136; I forget what it’s called, but the rolling back of the greenbelt changes—in spirit is about protecting important land in the greenbelt. It’s my understanding that the greenbelt fingers land area has important and interconnected waterways, so it’s important that this area be given the same kind of consideration and protection that the government has chosen to give to the other areas that they changed and now are re-changing.

I would just like to say that the government—I think it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing himself who said, “There’s no government in the history of Ontario that’s going to protect the greenbelt more than us.” I take him at his word, and this is an opportunity to make clear that this oversight is corrected.

To be clear, the regional official plan amendment 7 was never approved by this government, the Ontario government, and so the re-designation of these greenbelt lands only occurred as a consequence of the minister’s approval, which came as part of the changes that they made.

1000

The mapping reflects a change that was never approved by the minister, and that is why, in our opinion, we think that we need to add this, the following paragraph. I believe it's in keeping with the spirit of what this government is trying to do, which is to correct, if I can say it, what they see as an error of their ways when it came to protecting greenbelt lands and when it comes to protecting agriculture and farmland.

As you know, the designation to rural allows development on that, including that TACC Developments has land, I guess, contiguous to this, and their intention, possibly, would be to include what they call "active parklands"—that could include a golf course—as part of that development. I'm sure, as much as we all like to golf sometimes—sometimes you like it, sometimes you hate it; I think that's what I can say honestly about that sport. But this is not the intention that we have for these precious lands, so again, this is why we're moving this. We think these are important water systems that need to be protected, like the rest of the greenbelt. So we're moving this amendment.

We're hoping that the government will see fit to pass this amendment to complete what—their goodwill and their intention to reverse any changes that were intended or that otherwise impact the integrity of the greenbelt and the wetlands and the connected waterways that are part of it. Certainly, as we all know—can we all say it together? How many acres of farmland do we lose every day in Ontario? It's 319 acres. I don't know how many times we've said that in the House. That is why we move this amendment forward.

To finish: It was never approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The region of York put it on the map; it said it looked like it was changed—it never was—and that was what was submitted as the regional official plan. So this is correcting what essentially was—an oversight, would you call it? That's the politest word I can think of. It was something that was put in there that was not officially approved. It wasn't officially approved by the ministry, but it's on the map, and people look at the map and they think that it has received the official change when, in fact, it did not.

I appreciate the government listening to me on this. It's kind of complicated but also not. It's complicated in the way that this came to be in the original official plan amendment, but it's not complicated if, in fact—again, taking the government at their word on the road-to-Damascus change that they had in terms of protecting the greenbelt, this is in keeping with the intent and the spirit of what this government intends to do.

Unrelated to this, I also just want to say, because I have the floor, the other amendment that I wanted to talk about—I appreciate that the change, the typo, was that you had said, "Greenland." I understand now that you cannot make amendments to an entire—isn't Greenland, like, a country? So I appreciate why you had to make that amendment. Thank you very much.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I think this conversation highlights and denotes the reason why these kinds of decisions should be made at the local municipal council, because our procedures and our standing orders don't allow for the kind of process that is maybe needed to understand these lands. There's no professional planning staff here with mapping to show us what we're talking about, who can answer our questions in a detailed way about what the redesignation from ag to rural allows for. The proponent or the applicant isn't here to defend himself or his company's interests.

Both of those things are processes that exist at the municipal level, where, in an open forum, there is a presentation from the applicant as to why he or she or their company is requesting a particular change to the official plan or to zoning etc. There's an opportunity for that individual or that corporation to bring a professional planner to that forum, to outline the planning rationale for that decision. There's an opportunity for the municipality to respond with their own planners or other subject matter experts. Then, there is, of course, the opportunity for public engagement.

Throughout the entirety of that process, there is an opportunity for elected officials from the committee to ask those subject matter experts and ask those applicants detailed questions—and, as I've mentioned before, the ability for there to be a presentation and a PowerPoint screen up on the wall for everyone to see, so we can actually know what land we're talking about. Lands that are defined in figure 1, on amendment 7, in bylaw 2021-101—I would challenge any member of the committee right now to articulately and accurately describe what those lands actually are. And that's not an aspersion. We are visual people by nature. It's much easier to understand what we're talking about if you can see the lands on a screen and know what we're talking about.

I have a question. These lands I've heard described as the greenbelt fingers: I appreciate that they are designated ag, but are they actually in the greenbelt or are they just beside the greenbelt? I don't know that. I'm legitimately just asking that question.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I don't know the answer to that. Any more final remarks, MPP Blais?

Mr. Stephen Blais: No, I'm just hesitant to vote on something when we don't have the answer to the question, and we haven't been able to receive advice from land use planners or even anyone from the ministry, really.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Thank you, MPP Blais.

Any further debate? MPP Rae.

Mr. Matthew Rae: Thank you to my colleagues for the discussion this morning. As the minister mentioned in his remarks yesterday, we're reverting to the official plans that were adopted by the regional municipalities. MPP Blais explained that process. I know he has experienced that, being a former councillor before being elected to this

place. This motion would not align with the region of York's adopted plan when they submitted it to the ministry. If there are issues or concerns from the NDP colleagues, they should call the chair of the region of York.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Any further debate? MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: Certainly. I'm going to ask the government members to explain, then, if your intention is to roll back changes that unintentionally rezoned greenbelt lands—and I take your point. I'm assuming that these are greenbelt lands, and I think we need to have a clear answer to that. I do also appreciate your point, that it is quite true—I mean, so much of this comes from our researchers because of the detail and the complexity of this. Also, again, no aspersions intended, but the timing between when these bills come to committee and the timing from which we have to have amendments doesn't make it easy to do our due diligence on this.

My question to the government would be: Despite you saying that you are rolling this back to what was approved by the minister in November, which was the official plan, can the government side tell me how this sits with you when what you're saying is that you are trying to make sure you are protecting greenbelt lands? That's a question for the government side.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Armstrong.

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: It's a very important bill. The government is trying to right a wrong, and we appreciate that very much. It's a small bill, but there's a lot of important content in this bill. One of the major sections of the bill is about legal immunity. We get that sometimes there are legal cases that the government doesn't want to get involved in because of all of the history that's happened around the greenbelt, so I do appreciate that.

But two years ago, Jeff Burch asked the former minister about amendment 7 to York region's official plan, ROPA 7, which would allow the destruction of farmland within the so-called greenbelt fingers by redesignating these lands from agricultural to rural. Our concern about why we're bringing this amendment forward—because we don't feel that Bill 150 restores the agricultural designation of the greenbelt fingers into York. So that's the justification for that.

Yesterday, when the minister was presenting to us—and I understand completely; we are not experts on these lands and developments, unless you go out there and take a tour, and again, even when you do that, you still don't have the expertise. So the minister deferred to the ministry staff, but the explanation didn't sound like it was a fulsome way of not putting this amendment into Bill 150.

I ask the government members to really consider putting this into the bill. It's not going to hurt anything, unless—again, is there some legal reason that we're not aware of that's being challenged by the developer in this particular area? Because maybe—and I'm just being hypothetical—the bill that we're passing today hasn't retroactively touched that issue, and the lawsuit could have

been filed prior to this bill. That could have been an accidental oversight of the government.

Really, it is a harmless amendment that we can put into Bill 150, unless, like I say, the government and government members know something that we are not privy to. Because our critic, Jeff Burch, had asked the previous minister, and we didn't get straight answers then, so there is a lot of scandal around it. We're thrilled that this government is correcting the error of their ways and trying to restore trust when it comes to the greenbelt land.

I ask if the government knows of any reason why this amendment is a harmful suggestion to the bill. What would be the logic for not having it, knowing that we've been questioning this for two years?

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): Further debate? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I've been trying to understand the implications of this amendment, and I took the request from the parliamentary assistant to heart when he suggested that we reach out to municipal officials in York region. I have been doing so, and a senior official has asked me to give him a call to clarify this. So I am hoping we could take a 10-minute recess, so that I can confer with senior municipal officials in York region per the suggestion from the parliamentary assistant.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): We won't be taking a 10-minute recess, because we will be recessing within the next two minutes until 1 o'clock.

Mr. Stephen Blais: So if I can have an appropriate recess now, I can make the phone call.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): You'll have a lot of time between 10:15 and 1 o'clock. First, I have to ask if there's further debate.

MPP Shaw.

Ms. Sandy Shaw: First of all, I think that's brilliant, by the way, I just have to say. Thank you very much.

Also, to add to that, I know we are breaking soon, but really, this is the point: being that this is a request from TACC Developments. We know that this government is under criminal investigation by the RCMP precisely for this kind of preferential treatment, this kind of oversight, when it comes to applying the rules properly in the province.

And I will add to this that the planners in York opposed this. They opposed this amendment. The official planning experts opposed this amendment for all the reasons that I described, and that has to do with the importance of these lands.

Despite the fact that this request was backed by a number of York region developers—and unfortunately, many again connected to donations to the Premier's Conservative Party—it would seem to me that this government would want to go out of their way to clear up any suspicion, any kind of innuendo, any kind of scandal connected to the ways in which they dispersed and basically carved up and sold off these important lands.

I said that I'm taking the government at their word that they want to correct these wrongs. This is an important one that you need to correct.

The Acting Chair (Mr. John Yakabuski): I'm sorry to the members of the committee, but we have reached the hour of 10:15. This committee will now recess and reconvene at 1 p.m. this afternoon, in the same committee room.

The committee recessed from 1014 to 1300.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you, everyone. We're back in committee here for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 150.

I believe you left off on amendment number 5, the NDP amendment. Is there any further discussion or debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong: May I ask for a recorded vote?

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Yes, certainly. We're going to have a recorded vote.

Ayes

Armstrong.

Nays

Coe, Grewal, Kusendova-Bashta, Pang, Rae, Sabawy.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Amendment number 5 is defeated.

Shall schedule 1, section 2, as amended, carry? Any debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 1, section 2, as amended, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 1, section 2, as amended, is carried.

There are no amendments filed to sections 3 to 6. I propose we bundle them. Is that okay? All agreed?

Oh, MPP Blais, do you have—

Mr. Stephen Blais: There's an amendment to section 3.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I think your amendment is coming. We're going to go back to that one. Is that okay?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Okay. Yes.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): That's what I'm told. I'm sure that the Clerk is correct.

All those ready to vote on—

Interjection.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Okay, I didn't do the debate. Any debate on sections 3 to 6? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 3 to 6 of schedule 1 carried.

We'll now go to schedule 1, as amended. Any discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 1, as amended, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 1, as amended, carried.

Moving to schedule 2, the Planning Act, schedule 2, section 1: Is there any discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 2,

section 1, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 2, section 1, carried.

Moving to schedule 2, section 2: Is there any discussion or debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 2, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 2, section 2, is carried.

Then we have to vote on schedule 2 as a whole. Any discussion or debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 2 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 2 as a whole is carried.

Back to the first page of Bill 150, section 1: Any debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall section 1 of Bill 150 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Section 1 is carried.

Going to section 2: Is there any debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Section 2 is carried.

Moving to section 3: There's an amendment by the independent, amendment number 1. MPP Blais, would you like to read it?

Mr. Stephen Blais: I move that section 3 of the bill be amended by striking out "Planning Statute Law Amendment Act, 2023" and substituting "Getting it Undone Act, 2023".

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): Thank you, MPP Blais. I do have a ruling. Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order. As Bosc and Gagnon note in the third edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice, an amendment is accordingly out of order "if it is tendered in a spirit of mockery."

MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Well, I challenge the Chair's ruling. Madam Chair, I'd ask for unanimous consent to consider the bill. The minister himself yesterday said that this represented a reset of government policy and that he was undoing previous legislation. So it's not out of mockery; it's out of an honest interpretation of the minister's comments, and a plain-language description of what the statute and bill actually proposes to do, so that Ontarians can understand the information held within the bill.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): There's actually no debate on the ruling, but I will go back: You are seeking unanimous consent, and I'll ask the members—

Mr. Stephen Blais: No, I'm seeking unanimous consent to debate and address the motion.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): I hear noes, so there is no further—

Mr. Stephen Blais: It's unfortunate the government doesn't want a plain-language description of the bill.

Interjection.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I'm not debating; I'm describing.

The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott): We will now go to the voting. Shall section 3 carry? Are all the members ready

to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 3 carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The title of the bill shall carry.

Shall Bill 150, as amended, carry? All of those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Debate? Discussion? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I shall report the bill to the House, as amended.

Is there any further business in the committee? Seeing none, this committee now stands adjourned until 1 p.m. on Thursday, November 30, 2023.

The committee adjourned at 1307.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY

Chair / Présidente

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong (London–Fanshawe ND)

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong (London–Fanshawe ND)

Mr. Lorne Coe (Whitby PC)

Mr. Hardeep Singh Grewal (Brampton East / Brampton-Est PC)

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

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

Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon (Beaches–East York L)

Mr. Billy Pang (Markham–Unionville PC)

Mr. Matthew Rae (PWerth–Wellington PC)

Mr. Sheref Sabawy (Mississauga–Erin Mills PC)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Stephen Blais (Orléans L)

Ms. Sandy Shaw (Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest–Ancaster–Dundas ND)

Mr. John Yakabuski (Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke PC)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Ajay Ramkumar, research officer,
Research Services