

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

HE-16

Journal des débats (Hansard)

HE-16

Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy

Protect Ontario by Cutting Red
Tape Act, 2025

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

Loi de 2025 pour protéger
l'Ontario en réduisant les
formalités administratives

1st Session
44th Parliament

Monday 8 December 2025

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Lundi 8 décembre 2025

Chair: Hon. Laurie Scott
Clerk: Tanzima Khan

Présidente : L'hon. Laurie Scott
Greffière : Tanzima Khan

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.

Hansard 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



Journal des débats et services linguistiques
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

Monday 8 December 2025

Protect Ontario by Cutting Red Tape Act, 2025, Bill 46, Ms. Khanjin / Loi de 2025 pour
protéger l’Ontario en réduisant les formalités administratives, projet de loi 46,
Mme Khanjin HE-351

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**

Monday 8 December 2025

Lundi 8 décembre 2025

The committee met at 0900 in committee room 1.

**PROTECT ONTARIO BY CUTTING
RED TAPE ACT, 2025
LOI DE 2025 POUR PROTÉGER L'ONTARIO
EN RÉDUISANT LES FORMALITÉS
ADMINISTRATIVES**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 46, An Act to amend various Acts / Projet de loi 46, Loi modifiant diverses lois.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We are here for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 46, An Act to amend various Acts.

We are joined by legislative counsel in the room and various ministry officials virtually via Zoom to assist with questions members may have. As always, 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? Seeing none, we will now begin the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 46.

Before we begin with considering the specific sections of the bill and accompanying schedules, I will allow members to make comments to the bill as a whole. Afterwards, debate will be limited to the specific amendment, section or schedule under consideration. Committee members, pursuant to standing order 83, are there any comments or questions on the bill as a whole? MPP Bourgouin.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Since you asked for general comments: Definitely, I am a bit concerned with section 5, schedule 8, for forestry. Allowing other companies to operate on a different permit is like having two standards for our forests. The reason why our forests are doing so great is because we put in regulations for forestry, and they are known around the world to be the best standards. We should be proud of that. To water down these regulations, I think, is a mistake.

I know we're going to be talking in these schedules about these, but I want it on record that these comments—it's a serious point. Having two standards for forestry and other industry, I think, is a mistake.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you very much, MPP Bourgouin.
MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I too have a fair number of concerns with the bill; perhaps they'll be addressed today following the amendments.

I think it sounds nice to call something "cutting red tape" or "red tape reduction," but when that legislation, when that cutting of that red tape, actually makes the situation for consumers more challenging or at least more uncertain, I think that isn't cutting red tape; that's creating additional corporate loopholes to take advantage of Ontario consumers.

When you look at the breadth and the scope of this legislation, with some 22 schedules—everything from the Municipal Act to the Consumer Protection Act to the sex offender registry and so on and so forth—I think it does a disservice to what we're sent here to do, which is to have honest debate and serious debate about a wide breadth of issues. But when that wide breadth of issues is slammed into a single piece of legislation and labelled as red tape reduction, I really think it takes away from the process and what I think Ontarians expect of us, because, as you know, the rules, the standing orders of the Legislature and of committee only allow certain amounts of time for conversation and for debate about particular issues or questioning of the minister etc. When you're trying to go over 22 different subject areas—really, this bill is 22 different subjects, all labelled "red tape reduction"—it really takes away from what I think the intent of what Parliament is supposed to be about and, really, what expectations Ontarians have.

We have deep concerns with schedule 5 on consumer protection, and some other aspects of the bill. If the government is open to addressing those concerns during debate and clause-by-clause today, then we'll see how things go, but we hope that in the future the government will be more considerate of trying to address some of these issues in a more in-depth way.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Saunderson.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: Red tape reduction has been a very critical part of this government's mandate, going back to 2018. This is, I think, seventh or eighth in a succession of acts aimed at reducing red tape, and I can tell this committee, because I sit also on the economic affairs and finance committee, we've been out for pre-budget hearings, and what we're hearing from stakeholders, small businesses and actually even public sector areas where they have red tape in their own mandates is

that they want us to continue what we're doing to reduce red tape. It's an all-of-government approach.

So just like we're hoping that our businesses and our private sector and public sector service providers can find efficiencies, this government has to find efficiencies. That's why this is such an all-of-government, broad mandate that is going across all of government. That's why you have 20 pieces of legislation being impacted here, because we're trying to make sure that, as we move across our entire government, we're making things more efficient and productive.

We're saving small businesses thousands of hours each year and billions of dollars in red tape and fees that we're trying to get out of the way so that our economy can thrive. And now more than ever, with what's going on south of the border, we need to be focused on that.

So we will not apologize for this legislation. We're very proud of it. We're going to push it forward. We think it's important. We're hearing from the people it impacts that this is having real, on-the-ground benefits for them. We had Ms. Kwiecinski from CFIB here talking about tax reduction and red tape reduction being one of the critical things for small, independent businesses across Ontario. We think that this is part of that agenda. We will continue to do it.

We're very proud of this legislation and look forward to getting through this clause-by-clause today.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Are there any further comments before we start?

Seeing none, Bill 46 is comprised of three sections which enact 22 schedules. To deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest we postpone these three sections to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement on this? Okay.

There are no proposed amendments or notices to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 1 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Okay. Shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 1 carry? Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 1 carried.

Shall schedule 1 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 1 carried—get the rhythm going here.

There are no proposed amendments to schedule 2 in the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 2. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Yes? Shall sections 1 to 3 of schedule 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 2 carried.

Shall schedule 2 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 2 carried.

There are no proposed amendments to schedule 3 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 3. Is there agreement to bundle these sections?

Okay. Shall sections 1 to 3 of schedule 3 carry? All those in—

Mr. Stephen Blais: Sorry, is there an option to have further discussion?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes. I'm sorry. Any discussion? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: This is one of the examples I was referring to in the introductory comments. This schedule is a very important thing to do to help law enforcement and to help keep children not only here in Ontario but in other jurisdictions across Canada and North America safe. I think it quite rightly could have and should have enjoyed its own legislation to have a fulsome conversation and discussion about it so that members of all parties could have had an up-and-down vote—yes or no—on this important issue and not have it clouded with some of the other considerations that are included in this legislation.

I'll be asking for a recorded vote on this, Madam Chair.

Ayes

Babikian, Blais, Bourgouin, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 3 carried.

Shall schedule 3 as a whole carry? A recorded vote is again asked for.

Ayes

Babikian, Blais, Bourgouin, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. I declare schedule 3 as a whole carried.

0910

Schedule 4: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 4 of the bill. I therefore propose we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 4. Is there an agreement to bundle these sections? Thank you, agreement.

Any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 4 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 4 carried.

Shall schedule 4 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 4, as a whole, carried.

Now we're going to go to the amendments. In schedule 5, section 1, we have amendment number 1, which, MPP Blais, would you like to speak to?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Yes, Madam Chair. Let me just get the legislation up here in front of me and make sure I'm looking at the correct thing. Throughout this process of this bill and through the debate this fall, we've articulated concerns that the legislation, despite what the government is saying, actually opens the door for the potential—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Blais, I'm sorry; please read the amendment into the record first.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I apologize. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that section 1 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by striking out “except in accordance with the regulations” at the end of subsection 47.1(3) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2002.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you.

Mr. Stephen Blais: As I was saying, Madam Chair, throughout the fall we’ve expressed some concerns about this schedule, that, despite the government’s rhetoric and what they’ve said in the chamber and outside, it opens up the door to—the protections that currently exist in the law to protect reward points from expiring, this provision actually allows the government to write a regulation in which rules could be created that would allow reward points to expire with the passage of time.

The minister has said that that is not his intent. We will, for the moment, take him at his word on that. This is an opportunity for the government to demonstrate that that is in fact their intent.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

I’m sorry, MPP Bourgouin. Did you want to debate?

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: A couple of words.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Pardon me?

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: I just wanted to speak on the motion.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, please, go ahead.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: This is the perfect opportunity for the government to codify, to put it here and move this amendment from the Liberals forward. This is a time to prove—right before Christmas, too; why would we want to remove points from consumers? We feel that this motion should be supported.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Further debate?

Yes, MPP Blais?

Mr. Stephen Blais: For those who haven’t read the fine details of the legislation, all those watching at home, if the amendment were to pass, the section would read, “A consumer agreement under which rewards points are provided shall not provide for the expiry, cancellation or suspension of rewards points” and then there would be a period.

This amendment proposes that that’s how that sentence reads, and the words that are currently in the legislation—“except in accordance with the regulations”—get deleted.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, this is on amendment number 1. Are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote is asked for.

Ayes

Blais, Bourgouin.

Nays

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 1 of schedule 5, section 1, lost.

Amendment number 2 to schedule 5, section 1: I believe, MPP Bourgouin, you need to read it into the record first, please.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: I move that section 1 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by striking out subsections 47.1(3) and (4) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2022 and substituting the following:

“Expiry of”—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Bourgouin, I’m sorry. We have to go back. I believe you said the wrong date after “of the Consumer Protection Act.”

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Oh, sorry: 2002. I said 2022, right? I apologize for that.

“Expiry of rewards points

“(3) A consumer agreement under which rewards points are provided shall not provide for the expiry, cancellation or suspension of rewards points.

“Consumer’s recourse

“(4) If a consumer is a party to a consumer agreement under which rewards points are provided and the rewards points expire or are cancelled or suspended, the consumer may request that the supplier credit back to the consumer any rewards points that were expired, cancelled or suspended.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bourgouin.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Yes. It’s a little bit of what we just spoke about in the first motion. This is an opportunity for the government to codify what this legislation should read. We heard in the House that they said, “No. In fact, this protects even more.” But why not put it, right now, right here, today, so we protect consumer points? As my colleagues read previously to this motion, that’s not what the legislation says.

We have a perfect opportunity to make it clear, so that it is protected. I ask the government to pass this motion so that if we’re going to say it’s protected, we know it’s going to be protected. It’s going to be written in black and white. It’s not written in black and white.

Right before Christmas I think is not the time to remove any points, especially where we are living economically right now. People are struggling; points go far for what we, the consumers, are accumulating them for.

I think it’s a perfect opportunity to pass this motion and protect these points, indeed, in the legislation. We have an opportunity here to do so. I ask the members across to vote in favour of this motion.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Yes. I 100% agree: Reward points have become a factor in household budgeting. Whether it’s at your local pharmacy, your grocery store or, perhaps, when you fill your tank up with gas, many families—I would suggest probably everyone around this table has one or two or maybe five reward points cards in your wallet or your purse. It’s how families buy that extra Christmas gift in a couple of weeks. It’s how they supplement the grocery bill. Families are getting absolutely crushed and hammered with skyrocketing grocery

prices. Reward points saved up over the span of a year, or maybe two, could help them buy that turkey dinner so that they can celebrate with their family in the traditional way that they always have and that, perhaps, the current economic situation won't allow them to.

I remember when my wife and I bought a house and moved in in December. When you buy a house, you've got closing fees, you're hiring movers, or maybe you're painting. There are some additional expenses to your household budget that aren't always there. That was going to be a pretty tight Christmas for us. So we used our Air Miles points to buy gas cards for my father and our father-in-law. We used points to buy each other some stocking stuffers so that we could continue to enjoy a semblance of what Christmas is normally like for us, given the financial restraints we were under that month because of the new house purchase.

In Ontario today, loyalty reward points are protected, in law, very clearly, from expiring as a result of the passage of time. That was legislation that was passed in December 2016. It was passed unanimously by the Legislature. That includes seven members of the government sitting today. The Deputy Premier voted for that bill. The House leader voted for that bill. Madam Chair, you voted for that bill to protect reward points from expiring as a result of the passage of time. I think it was the right thing to do then; it's the right thing to keep in legislation today.

0920

The minister has said on a number of occasions in the Legislature that it is not the government's intent to allow reward points to expire. If that is in fact the case, if he has been honest and forthright with the Legislature, which is his duty and responsibility, then it should be made clear in the legislation that there is no opportunity for reward points to expire with the passage of time.

Allowing the government to write regulations; effectively, having cabinet write regulations—those discussions and debate are secret until the end result is made public. Without a full public debate as to the why and the if and the how and whatever reasons they might have for going down this route, I think it's irresponsible and not what Ontario consumers and families expect.

Moreover, as my colleague mentioned, to do so the first week of December as families are finalizing their Christmas shopping, as they're making plans to host or attend any number of Christmas dinners, Hanukkah celebrations or other family holiday celebrations that might be taking place over the course of December, for them to now have to worry that at some point in the future their government, who they trusted to protect their rights and to be sound fiscal managers and to ensure that their family can afford the nice things that come with hard work—for them to now have to think about that at some point in the future that little extra that helps us supplement the budget might not be there, I think that's a stress and anxiety people don't need.

Remember, we have thousands of people in Ontario laid off or about to be laid off with private sector changes. In Ottawa, we have tens of thousands of public servants

who are walking on eggshells because their jobs may no longer be there in the new year. That includes public servants; that includes people working in crown corporations. That is an economic reality that Ottawa doesn't often have to deal with. Ottawa's economy is generally protected from the ups and downs of international trade irregularities and the ups and downs in the economy because it's the public service, but if all of a sudden, thousands of people are no longer working, that's going to be a painful hit.

Then, to not have those points there for them to help fill up with gas, or not have those points to buy the little extras at the pharmacy or maybe even to pay for your entire grocery order, that's going to hurt. So this is an opportunity for the government to say explicitly, "Our intent is not to allow reward points to expire; our intent is to enhance consumer protections, and so we're going to take the ability for them to expire out of the law."

Finally, Madam Chair, I think it's—the minister says that this is enhancing consumer protection because now a consumer who has had their reward points taken away from them will be able to sue the company. Well, I'm sorry; I'm not sure if the minister has used a lawyer lately, but I don't think people are going to hire a lawyer to sue over \$200 or \$300 worth of reward points. That doesn't mean those reward points don't have extraordinary value to that family, because \$200 or \$300 worth of reward points, say, on your Optimum card, that's a grocery order at Loblaws, that's those extra sundry items at Shoppers Drug Mart. Optimum is now the reward point provider at Esso, so that's a couple of tanks of gas at Esso.

So while it's not going to make or break families, they're not going to spend thousands of dollars hiring a lawyer to sue massive national companies over a couple of hundred dollars' worth of reward points, but that couple of hundred dollars at a time like this, at Christmas, or maybe in the spring when your kids are finishing school and you want to get them that extra little incentive to get good grades, or maybe it's when the soccer bill comes in and you're trying to make sure that Johnny and Jane can play soccer this summer and you can still buy gas and put food on the table.

When those bills come due, that extra 200 bucks or 300 bucks is going to mean a lot to a lot of families.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bourgouin.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Je vais dire quelques mots en français parce que c'est plus facile de m'exprimer en français, dans ma langue natale.

En fin de semaine, j'étais au Shoppers. Et puis on sait, Shoppers, ils ont des points. Une dame qui était après attendre—elle voulait avoir une prescription. Et puis sa prescription—je ne sais pas ce que c'était, mais j'ai entendu combien sa prescription coûtait. C'était comme 50 ou près de 60 piastres, et puis elle n'avait pas l'argent pour payer sa prescription.

Des fois, on prend pour acquis 50 \$ ou 60 \$. Ce n'est pas beaucoup d'argent pour certaines personnes, mais pour du monde, c'est la différence entre acheter du manger

ou acheter une prescription. Ça, c'est un exemple. C'est un exemple qu'elle, pour ces points—imagine-toi si elle perd ses points. Probablement, pour elle, ça fait la différence entre aller chercher—et puis on sait qu'à cette heure, à Shoppers, il y a beaucoup de manger. Il y a des oeufs. Il y a du lait. Il y a tout pour nourrir sa famille.

C'est pour ça que c'est tellement important, madame la Présidente. On dit au gouvernement—they disent que non, les points ne sont pas touchés. Ils ne perdront pas leurs points. Mais la législation démontre que—ce que le projet de loi dit n'est pas la même chose. C'est pour ça qu'on dit que c'est maintenant le temps de les mettre dedans.

Si le gouvernement est sérieux, comme le ministre l'a dit, que non, ils ne perdront pas les points—je reviens encore à la pauvre dame qui était là et qui ne pouvait même pas payer pour sa prescription et puis je m'imagine si elle perd les points. C'est pour ça que, que ça soit au Walmart, que ça soit n'importe où, toutes les places qui ont des points, à l'essence, au Esso—tous ces points-là que très souvent on prend pour acquis et dont les personnes ont besoin.

Faisons la bonne chose avant Noël. Ça fait la différence, peut-être, pour mettre plus de manger sur la table pour certaines familles. On sait plus que jamais le monde va aux banques alimentaires. On est dans une crise alimentaire. On est dans une crise où, financièrement, le monde a de la misère. Ils ont deux emplois à temps partiel, et puis même, il y en a qui ont des emplois à temps plein; ils ne sont même pas capables de payer le loyer et de payer le chauffage et puis le manger. Ils se ramassent aux banques alimentaires.

Et puis là, on a un système qui aide un peu à répondre à des besoins des familles. On dit juste de le mettre clair. Vous dites que c'est couvert, mais mettons-les. Passons la motion puis sécurisons ces points-là une fois pour toutes pour qu'on passe à d'autres choses.

Mais je pense que ce serait une erreur de voter contre cette motion-là pour protéger ces points-là. Gardez cette personne-là en tête. Je ne sais pas si vous avez vécu ça, mes collègues, mais je peux vous dire que ça vient nous chercher, là. Parce que si elle n'est pas capable de payer ça, quoi d'autre—quand le pharmacien lui a dit combien ça coûtait, tu as vu que juste tout son corps a changé. Elle a dit : « Put a pin in it. » Je vais y penser. Je vais revenir.

Penser et revenir pour une prescription de 60 \$, ça veut dire que, financièrement, ces personnes-là ont de la misère. Pensez à cette personne-là mais que ce soit le temps. On a une chance de mettre ça très clair, de protéger ces points-là. Vous dites que c'est protégé, mais—vous ne devriez pas avoir aucun problème à passer cette motion-là.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Saunderson.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: I'll be very quick. Both Minister Khanjin and Minister Crawford have been very clear: This does not change the status quo. Reward points will not expire—end of story.

And just to MPP Blais's second point, as a former parliamentary assistant to the Ministry of the Attorney General, I think access to justice, access to the courts is a

benefit. We heard from a witness during our hearings on Bill C-46 that she felt she had lost reward points with a bank that were quite extensive—in the thousands of dollars. So the opportunity to be able to pursue that civilly on top of the accountability for the institution that issued the points, I think, is a critical overlay and one that will be well received for those that choose to pursue it. And you don't have to have a lawyer to go to Small Claims Court—or the Superior Court, if your claim exceeds \$50,000.

So in the right form, the right time, the right access is all part of our policy to make justice accessible for proper remedies for our constituents.

0930

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Certainly, access to justice is important and valuable, and adding the ability to sue companies is not a problem; it's relying on that as the avenue for consumer protection that is the problem.

If the government is actually not intending to go down the road of changing the regulations that would allow for consumer agreements to include language about the expiry of points with the passage of time, which is basically what is the consequence of the legislation—if that isn't their intent, great. But why not just make that clear in the bill?

I am not aware of governments who vote themselves power that they don't intend or one of their stakeholders doesn't intend or want them to use. So if you don't want to use the power, if your intent isn't to use the power, then don't give yourself the power. And that's what this motion and others that are in the package allow the government to demonstrate.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? MPP Bourgouin.

M. Guy Bourgouin: J'ai entendu les commentaires de notre collègue du gouvernement.

Quand je vous ai mentionné la personne qui ne pouvait pas payer sa prescription, pensez-vous qu'elle est capable de se payer un avocat? Puis comme ce qu'il a dit, en plus, il nous dit : « Mais ils n'ont pas besoin de les utiliser, les avocats. » C'est du monde qui sont déjà dans la misère. Ils ne connaissent pas le processus. Pensez-y, là. Ils sont dans une situation où ils veulent juste être capables de nourrir leur famille, ou bien donc, acheter leurs médicaments, puis ils se débattent pour ça. Pensez-vous qu'ils vont prendre le temps, sérieusement, d'aller se représenter pour des points?

C'est ridicule de penser comme ça. Puis si vous avez besoin de cette protection-là pour dire que, bien non, ils vont être protégés s'ils veulent aller en cour ou s'ils veulent aller se défendre, bien, c'est que vous avez l'intention de les enlever.

Mettons la motion. On dit qu'ils n'auront pas besoin de faire ça. Pourquoi se donner les pouvoirs ou donner des pouvoirs au monde? C'est parce que le langage ne couvre pas. Vous le savez, qu'il va y avoir des situations de litige. C'est signe qu'ils vont avoir des chances de perdre leurs points. Mettons ça au clair, qu'ils ne sont pas obligés

d'aller là. Protégeons nos consommateurs, comme les personnes qui ont—le petit peu de points qu'ils ont.

Bien non, on va dire : « Bien non, ils sont protégés. Ils vont pouvoir aller en cour. » Ils ne vont pas y aller. Ce monde-là, ils n'ont pas les moyens. Y en a-t-il qui en ont? Peut-être. Mais je peux vous dire, la majorité du monde, ils n'auront pas les moyens de le faire. Puis non seulement ça, ils ne sont pas dans une situation pour comprendre tout le processus.

Écoute, il y a du monde qui vient dans tous vos bureaux qui sont dans la misère et qui cherchent juste à naviguer notre système qu'on a, actuel, sur toutes sortes d'autres programmes. Vous pensez qu'ils vont être capables de passer à travers de ça? C'est ridicule de penser ça de même, de penser qu'ils vont être protégés par la loi. Non, ils ne le sont pas comme c'est là.

J'ai entendu encore mon collègue du gouvernement dire : « Mais non, le ministre—deux ministres ont dit qu'ils étaient protégés. » Mais, alors, il ne devrait pas avoir de problème à mettre ça là. Il ne devrait pas avoir de problème, parce que ça, ça garantit qu'ils ne seront pas touchés. C'est clair; c'est noir sur blanc.

On a l'opportunité de le faire aujourd'hui. Faisons-le, protégeons-le, pour ne pas arriver plus tard, puis dire : « Oh, on a fait une erreur », comme on a tendance à voir beaucoup avec les projets de loi du gouvernement. « Oh, on a fait une erreur. On part de reculons. »

Ne jouons pas avec les points des gens, le peu de points qu'ils ont pour être capable d'aider leur famille à faire une fin de mois quand ils ont déjà de la misère à arriver. Je vous demande de faire la bonne chose puis de passer cette motion-là, puis mettons-le clair que c'est protégé.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment 2?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Blais, Bourgouin.

Nays

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment 2 lost.

Moving to amendment 3—MPP Blais, if you could just read that in first.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I move that section 1 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 47.1(10)(d) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2002.

And just for those who don't have the bill in front of them, 47.1(10) states:

“In addition to the power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations under section 123, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations governing matters relating to consumer agreements under which rewards points are provided, including”—and then item

(d) is “governing the expiry, cancellation or suspension of rewards points.” And then it has subsections.

This motion tries, again, to remove the ability of the government—today's government, tomorrow's government, a government five years from now—from passing regulations governing the expiry, cancellation or suspension of reward points.

If you don't want reward points to expire, you shouldn't pass regulations governing the expiry, cancellation or suspension of reward points. You shouldn't need to because they can't expire, so why have rules around expiry?

If the government is being honest with themselves and with the people of Ontario and with the Legislature that their intent is not to allow reward points to expire, why do they need power allowing them to write regulations governing the expiry, cancellation and suspension of reward points? Because the law today is clear: Reward points cannot expire with the passage of time. It's black and white.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment number 3? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Blais, Bourgouin.

Nays

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 3 lost.

Moving to amendment number 4, MPP Bourgouin—I'm sorry, wait a minute.

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): We have a ruling, but you can read the amendment into the record, if you want to.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Maybe we should read the ruling and I can just withdraw.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): On NDP amendment number 4, section 1 of schedule 5, I'm ruling this amendment out of order as it is identical to the previous motion on which the committee has already decided.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: I will withdraw the motion.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Amendment number 4 is withdrawn.

Moving to amendment number 5: MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I move that section 1 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 47.1 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2002:

“Same, limitation on regulation-making power

“(10.1) A regulation made under clause (10)(d) shall not permit the expiry, cancellation or suspension of rewards points due to the passage of time alone.”

Again, Madam Chair, the government is giving itself the power to pass regulations about the suspension, cancellation and expiry of reward points. They're arguing that their intent is to make it so that consumers can sue or otherwise complain for some relief. I assume that's the regulations that they intend to pass around the expiry of reward points, to give consumers that ability. That's a wonderfully fine ability to have.

This would simply make it abundantly clear that despite that authority to give consumers the ability to complain, sue, seek recourse for the expiry of reward points, it will be explicit that the government cannot create regulations that would allow the expiry, cancellation or suspension of reward points due to the passage of time alone. It makes it abundantly clear. It protects the ability for consumers to seek recourse, and it stops the government from being allowed to pass regulations that would create that situation in the first place.

As we've been discussing today, families are stretched. The economy is not in a good spot. We have record unemployment in some cases—record youth unemployment—levels that haven't been seen since the early 1990s. Every week, we have an announcement of another major corporate entity proposing layoffs. We have the public service in Ottawa proposing layoffs or other workforce adjustments. Those are going to be major hits to families across the province, in all corners of the province.

0940

Not only that, but we're approaching Christmas and the holiday season. This is a time of year when, for most families, spending goes up. You're hosting larger family gatherings with more food and celebrations. You're buying presents for your kids and your loved ones. You're going to Christmas concerts or other events in the community, many of which used to be free and now have a \$5, \$10 or \$15 cover charge just to get in. It's an expensive time of year, and reward points are often used by families of all economic classes to help bridge the gap this time of year, and at other points where things get a little tough.

So again, being explicit that the government cannot write rules that would permit points to expire, be cancelled or be suspended because of the passage of time, I think, just sends a very clear signal to consumers: "Don't worry; your points are protected. If you're going to go to the effort of signing up for one of these cards and you're going to be loyal to Loblaws and go buy your groceries there every week, and you're going to use Shoppers Drug Mart for your pharmacy and you're going to go to Esso because they all participate in the same Optimum program; if you're going to demonstrate that loyalty to those companies, that loyalty is going to be returned to you by not letting your points disappear. And the government is going to be loyal and true to you by saying, 'Do you know what? We're not going to let companies even try, because we're not going to pass rules or laws that open that door.'"

The minister was here last week, and she said that this legislation closes a loophole. I think it opens an enormous loophole. It opens the door to allow reward points to expire. It's a loophole so big that when the Eglinton

Crosstown eventually starts running, it could drive right through it.

We don't want reward points to expire simply because time has passed: The page in the calendar turns and now, all of a sudden, your points are gone or they're worth less etc. We want families to be able to use these reward points. Many—I would suggest most—families save up their points either to use at those crunch times of the year like the holidays, or because some of the nicer items you can use those reward points for require a substantial number, and you've just got to save for them over the course of time. So they should not be punished for that diligence. Their points should be allowed to continue to increase as they spend, and those points should maintain their value until they're cashed in. They certainly should not expire simply because the calendar has turned from one month to the next.

This is an opportunity for the government to back up in law what they've said here today, what the minister said here last week and what the minister has said in the Legislature a few times now. If your intent is not to allow reward points to expire, then say so explicitly in law and make it against the law for the government to even try.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate?

Mr. Aris Babikian: I have a point of order. I want clarification from you and the Clerk. The member used unparliamentary language by describing the government as dishonest. Is that unparliamentary language allowed to be used in the committee?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): MPP Babikian, the rules are a little different, so I can't ask him to withdraw, but I would say to you to be cautious in your wording, please.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Thank you.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate on amendment number 5? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Blais, Bourgouin.

Nays

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 5 lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 1 carry? Are the members ready to vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): All those in favour, please raise your hands—did you say "recorded vote"? I'm sorry, MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I did.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes. Sorry. I thought you said "no," and then I just had a flashback. You said "recorded vote."

Ayes

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 5, section 1, carried.

There are no proposed amendments to sections 2 to 5 of schedule 5. Shall we bundle them? Thank you.

Shall schedule 5, sections 2 to 5, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 5, sections 2 to 5, carried.

Now we're going to schedule 5, section 4. There is a Liberal notice. MPP Blais, would you like to read that? Just schedule 5 as a whole.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Yes. Not to belabour the point, but our recommendation is to vote against the schedule in its entirety now that the government has refused, by my count, I think, on four occasions to, in law, clarify the intention of the schedule. The intention that the minister has testified at committee is the intention that the minister has said in the Legislature on at least one, if not two occasions is the intent of the government, which is to enhance consumer protections.

I think we've articulated quite clearly how the legislation, as written, opens an enormous loophole to allowing this government or future governments to write regulations that would allow the consumer agreements that govern reward points to create rules in which they would eventually expire as a result of the passage of time or other factors, Madam Chair.

Right now, the law is explicitly clear: Reward points cannot expire with the passage of time. It is a law that seven members of the government caucus voted for at Christmas in 2016. It includes, as I mentioned before, the Deputy Premier. It includes the government House leader. It includes the Chair of the committee and four other members of the government.

They knew in 2016 when, if people recall at the time, Air Miles was trying to allow reward points to expire for their customers. It was national news because people had been saving their Air Miles to either take trips or to buy consumer goods, etc. All of a sudden, Air Miles said, "You know, use them or lose them," and people were quite rightly outraged by that.

It wasn't government legislation nine years ago; it was a private member's bill nine years ago. Mr. Potts wrote that legislation. I presume he did what we all do, which is to speak to our colleagues and make the case that says reward points shouldn't expire just because time has passed. He made that case the first week of December. It was clearly a compelling case because the Legislature voted for it unanimously, and the bill received royal assent before the end of the month—a Christmas miracle, you

might say, Madam Chair, that consumers would have their reward points protected forever.

Now, nine years later, on more or less the same timeline, the Grinch is sneaking into the homes of Ontario families in a 23-schedule bill to open the door to allowing the largest of corporate interests to take away reward points from Ontario families. They're taking the lollipops out of the stockings. They're putting all the gifts in the giant bag, and they're throwing those bags in Santa's sleigh.

The Grinch eventually changed his behaviour. The Grinch heard the songs of Whoville, and his heart grew three sizes, if you remember the story.

We've tried to get the government to listen to the songs of Ontario taxpayers. We've tried to give them the opportunity for their hearts to grow so that the Grinch could save Christmas. Instead, Madam Chair, they are going to pass legislation that allows the grocery chains, the largest pharmaceutical companies, largest gas stations and all others to allow your reward points to expire simply because you're not using them fast enough.

0950

And so we think that's wrong. We think families deserve the continuity of their reward points—reward points that they've been diligent in saving; that are essential to supplement family budgets this time of year and others, especially as the economy continues to get worse; and especially as Ontario families are losing their jobs, both in the private sector and in the public sector.

We think that reward points play a valuable role in household budgeting, and we want to see them protected. So we recommend voting against schedule 5 to ensure that the current legal framework that protects reward points from expiring stays in place.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on Liberal notice to schedule 5?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote is requested.

All those in favour of the notice—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Of just schedule 5, I'm sorry. It's a motion—a little different.

Shall schedule 5 carry? A recorded vote is requested.

Ayes

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 5 carried.

Moving to schedule 6, there are no proposed amendments to schedule 6 to the bill. I therefore propose that we

bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 6. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Thank you.

All those in favour of schedule 6, sections 1 to 2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, sections 1 to 2, carried.

Shall schedule 6 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6 as a whole carried.

On schedule 7: There are no proposed amendments to—

Interjection.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Tanzima Khan): Schedule 8.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Oh, it's 8. Okay. Sorry—my mistake.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): That's okay. The Clerk has—

Interjections.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): It doesn't seem so— at some point.

But anyway, on schedule 7: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 7 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 7. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Okay.

All those in favour of sections 1 to 3 of schedule 7, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 7 carried.

Shall schedule 7 as a whole carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7 as a whole carried.

Now, to schedule 8: There are no proposed amendments to sections 1 to 4 of schedule 8 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 4 of schedule 8. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Thank you.

All those in favour of sections 1 to 4, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 4 of schedule 8 carried.

Now we go to the NDP amendment to section 5, so amendment number 6. MPP Bourgouin.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: I move that section 5 of schedule 8 to the bill be amended by striking out section 41.3 of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, 1994 and substituting the following:

“Removal of forest resources

“41.3(1) A person may remove forest resources that are in a crown forest for the purpose of allowing an activity other than a forest operation to be carried out on the land that requires the forest resources to be removed in accordance with a permit described in sections 41.4 and 41.4.1.

“Removal not a forest operation

“(2) No decision or action of the minister under this part, and no action taken under a permit or in accordance with an authorizing regulation, is a forest operation within the meaning of this act.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bourgouin.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: The reason I was so anxious to get to this this morning—I say this in the morning, but that

being said, I come from the forest industry. And I'm proud to say I'm from the forest industry.

Puis, comme j'ai dit en anglais, je suis un produit de l'industrie forestière. Puis je suis fier de le dire aussi. Pourquoi? Parce que, comme j'ai déjà dit un petit peu plus de bonne heure ce matin, les ressources naturelles, les industries forestières font un travail exemplaire. Puis ils sont reconnus à travers le monde. Ils ont une certification qui rend notre bois environnemental, qui respecte les droits des travailleurs, qui respecte les espèces en danger.

Puis là, aujourd'hui, on traite avec une motion—pas une motion, mais on traite avec une motion, oui. Mais notre motion demande de retirer ce que le gouvernement propose dans ce projet de loi-là qui dit qu'il va y avoir un processus pour l'industrie forestière, puis, pour les minières et les autres industries, eux autres, ils vont avoir des règlements beaucoup moins rigides à suivre. Fait qu'il y a deux standards.

Il y a un standard où on dit qu'on est les meilleurs au monde. On protège les espèces en danger. On protège l'environnement. On protège pour faire certain des droits des travailleurs pour être capable de dire que notre forêt, c'est la mieux administrée, puis on est fier de le dire.

Puis sur l'autre bord, par exemple, les autres vont pouvoir ni plus ni moins avoir un permis, puis faire la même chose que l'industrie forestière fait: bâtir des chemins, ne pas respecter, peut-être, les règles environnementales, les règles pour les espèces en danger. Quand on dit traverser un « cold water creek », on dit ça en français, il y a des processus très clairs à suivre. On ne peut pas mettre des calvettes juste pour mettre des calvettes pour enterrer ça, puis c'est fini, là. Il y a des règlements très rigides. Puis il y a une raison pourquoi ils sont rigides.

L'industrie forestière fait un travail, puis ils suivent les règlements qui sont pour récolter l'industrie forestière. Vont-elles se faire enlever les « stumpage fees », les compagnies? Les autres compagnies, vont-elles payer des « stumpage fees »? Vont-elles être sujettes à toutes les mêmes choses? Non, elles ne le seront pas.

Pourquoi on crée deux standards quand on a une industrie, comme c'est là, qui souffre, qui a besoin d'aide? Puis là encore on va les garder encore plus rigides, puis les autres ne le seront pas. Il y a une raison pourquoi on ne veut pas toucher à l'industrie forestière puis qu'on veut garder la certification. Puis aussi, ils veulent garder leur certification, je vais vous le dire, parce que je pense que c'est important s'ils veulent être capables de vendre leur bois internationalement. Tu ne peux pas vendre leur bois s'ils n'ont pas cette certification-là aux États-Unis non plus, parce qu'il n'y a personne qui veut l'acheter. Les grosses chaînes ne veulent pas vendre le bois s'il n'y a pas cette certification-là.

Fait que là, on va voir aussi que peut-être—qu'est-ce qu'ils vont faire avec le bois qu'ils vont couper? Les minières qui vont « clearer »—ils appellent ça « clearing ». Qu'est-ce qu'ils vont faire avec ça, ce bois-là? Vont-ils juste le « chipper »? Ils vont le passer dans les tronçonneuses, puis ils vont en faire du bois qui devrait être—en anglais on dit que c'est du « wasteful logging ». Ce qui devrait être

envoyé aux usines de sciage devrait aller à l'usine de sciage. On va juste « chipper » ça, puis on va le faire? On ne le sait pas. Le projet de loi ne parle rien de tout ça. On ne dit rien qu'ils vont avoir un permis.

Qu'est-ce qu'on va faire avec les Premières Nations? Tu sais, quand les industries forestières font un travail exemplaire, elles travaillent très fort avec l'industrie. Je ne te dis pas qu'elles sont toutes parfaites, madame la Présidente, mais je peux vous dire qu'il y a du travail qui se fait, puis il faut le reconnaître aussi, de l'industrie.

Fait que là on va voir sur l'autre bord, par exemple, et ils vont avoir un permis. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait avec les trappeurs qui sont sur leur territoire, et ça fait longtemps qu'ils sont là? S'il faut qu'on « clear » une région où il y a un camp de trappeurs, où est la « trapline » de la Première Nation ou d'un trappeur—parce que l'industrie travaille très étroitement avec les trappeurs. On ne sait pas. On ne le sait vraiment pas.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: No, no, I'm not done. I'm just saying, je pense—

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, keep going.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Okay. I thought you wanted to interrupt me.

Fait que, quand je regarde ce projet de loi, je me dis que, premièrement, c'est injuste pour l'industrie forestière. C'est injuste pour une industrie qu'on reconnaît qu'ils font un travail exemplaire à travers le monde, puis qu'on les utilise tout le temps. Tu sais, les forestières canadiennes sont bien administrées puis sont là. Mais sur l'autre bord, par exemple, on vient complètement enlever le même « level playing field »—si je peux utiliser le terme en anglais—pour dire que bien, vous autres, l'industrie forestière, vous allez vivre avec ces lois-là, mais le reste, ça n'applique pas aux autres.

1000

C'est irresponsable d'un gouvernement de faire ça, quand on a des raisons. On a mis ces règlements-là. Ils ne sont pas là pour juste le plaisir, ces règlements-là, ou juste pour nuire aux autres opérations. On a mis ça pour protéger notre environnement, protéger notre forêt.

Vont-ils replanter les arbres qu'ils ont coupé? Mais non, ils vont voir, si c'est une mine, qu'il y a d'autres choses qu'on doit protéger aussi.

Ça fait que je me dis : « Où ce qu'on s'en va? » Quand un gouvernement est prêt à tout faire pour—on sait qu'on est dans une crise économique. Ce n'est pas ce qui est le problème. Mais il ne faut pas non plus enlever toutes les réglementations, puis protéger l'environnement, puis protéger les espèces en danger, puis les Premières Nations. Est-ce que ça veut dire qu'il va y avoir de la consultation avec les Premières Nations? On sait que la consultation, ce n'est pas le gouvernement qui est le plus respectueux quand ça vient à ça.

Ça fait que je demande au gouvernement de supporter cette motion. Je pense qu'il faut que ça soit retiré de ce projet de loi-là, que ça reste comme c'était avant, qu'il y ait un standard pour toutes les industries, quand ça vient à aller opérer sur nos terres de la Couronne, parce qu'il y a

une raison pourquoi on est reconnu à travers le monde : c'est qu'on fait un bon travail comme province. N'allons pas diluer de quoi qu'on fait très bien, juste parce qu'on pense que c'est la bonne chose à faire.

Il y a du « red tape » qui est important; je suis prêt à le reconnaître. Mais il y en a d'autres, par exemple, qui ne devraient pas être retirés, parce que je pense que c'est une erreur qu'on fait dans notre industrie forestière, non seulement.

Aussi, je pense que ça protège notre forêt; protège le droit des Premières Nations, le « pre-informed consent »; puis aussi les espèces en danger.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment number 6? Seeing none—

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, a recorded vote. Are members ready to vote?

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes, amendment number 6.

Ayes

Blais, Bourgouin.

Nays

Babikian, Dowie, Kanapathi, Saunderson, Vickers.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare amendment number 6 lost.

There are no amendments to—no, amendment 7. Okay. Amendment number 7, sorry about that. Get this all lined up.

MPP Bourgouin, please begin with amendment number 7.

M. Guy Bourgouin: I move that section 5 of schedule 8 to the bill be amended by adding the following sections to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, 1994:

“Conduct of removal of forest resources

“41.4.1(1) A permit to remove forest resources shall ensure that the removal is conducted in accordance with,

“(a) an applicable forest management plan; and

“(b) an applicable work schedule.

“Exception

“(2) The minister may, in writing, direct that subsection (1) does not apply to the removal of forest resources conducted by or on behalf of the minister if, in the opinion of the minister, the removal is necessary to provide for the sustainability of a crown forest.

“Compliance with manual

“41.4.2 A person who removes forest resources in a crown forest shall comply with the Forest Operations and Silviculture Manual.

“Approval for harvesting

“41.4.3(1) A person shall not begin to remove forest resources in any year unless the minister has approved, in writing, the removal in the area in which the removal is to occur.

“Crown changes

“(2) The minister may withhold approval under—”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I just have to go back. I think you meant “charges.”

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Sorry, which one? Okay, “crown charges.” Sorry, I said “changes,” right?

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Yes.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: “Crown charges”—thank you.

“(2) The minister may withhold approval under subsection (1) if the person is in default of payment of any crown charges.

“Measurement of resources

“41.4.4(1) A person shall not remove forest resources in a crown forest from the place of removal unless the resources have been measured and counted by a licensed scaler.

“Methods of measurement

“(2) A person who measures, counts or weighs forest resources shall do so in accordance with the scaling manual.

“Exceptions

“(3) Despite subsections (1) and (2), the minister may direct that forest resources be measured, counted or weighed at a place other than the place of removal and in such manner as the minister may direct.

“Records

“41.4.5 A person who removes forest resources from a crown forest shall keep such records as are prescribed by the regulations.”

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Debate? MPP Bourgouin.

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Yes. You see in this motion that when it comes to forestry, there is a lot more than just cutting trees.

Comme on peut voir par cette motion, ce n'est pas juste de couper des arbres et puis de faire un chemin. On oublie que l'industrie forestière, c'est beaucoup plus technique que de juste retirer des arbres de la forêt.

On parle dans cette motion qu'un « scaler »—c'est quoi un « scaler »? Ça, c'est la personne qui mesure, pour chaque arbre qui est coupé—disons qu'un contracteur va couper du bois, ou un « owner operator », pour être capable d'être payé, il mesure le diamètre de l'arbre. Et aussi, ils sont payés sur une table de volume qui dit comment long est l'arbre.

Fait que, si on décide d'enlever toute cette réglementation-là, encore, c'est pour vous démontrer qu'il y aurait deux standards. C'est pour ça qu'on met en motion pour faire clair que ce n'est pas juste une question de rentrer puis clarifier ça, puis couper des arbres; il y a un processus qui dit que ce bois-là ne devrait pas être juste « chippé ». Parce que si on regarde—s'il est juste « chippé », c'est du « wasteful logging ». On a une responsabilité comme gouvernement de faire certain que si on coupe un arbre dans la forêt, et bien, qu'il soit amené au plan spécifique pour être capable d'être coupé en deux-par-quatre, en deux-par-six ou en un autre produit, et pas juste—de ne pas être « scalé », de ne rien faire de ce qu'on fait en forêt comme c'est là. Parce que, comment qu'ils vont être payés, ces contracteurs-là qui vont aller—ils vont être payés tant de l'heure quand ça devrait être très spécifique.

Parce que c'est pour ça qu'on a des réglementations et qu'on est reconnu dans le monde—pour des raisons comme celles-là, où on demande de dire que c'est important de protéger notre industrie forestière, de protéger la forêt.

Puis on semble oublier que : « Ah, non, c'est du “red tape”, ça. C'est du “red tape” de consulter avec les Premières Nations. C'est du “red tape”, toute la question des espèces en danger. Ce n'est pas important, ça. On va juste garder l'industrie forestière à faire ce qu'ils ont fait. »

On parle souvent du caribou des bois, mais le caribou des bois, il y en a dans notre région. Mais il y a une raison, il y a une manière de le protéger pour que ça soit bon pour l'industrie forestière, puis bon pour la province aussi pour protéger ces espèces en danger-là.

Que ce soit l'original—les originaux, c'est la même affaire. Les industries forestières, ça fait des années qu'on opère pour protéger l'habitation des originaux. La martre : la martre, c'est la même chose. On oublie que ces petits animaux là, ils ont besoin d'être protégés, puis c'est pour ça que c'est un plan. L'industrie forestière fait des plans de 20 ans, de 10, 20 ans. Puis si au moins les amendements s'en allaient tous en consultation publique—et ça, ça veut dire que les consultations publiques n'existeront plus non plus en passant. Ça, c'est le ministère qui va décider tout. Le ministre va dire : « Non, vous pouvez aller là, puis voici les règlements que vous allez suivre. » Puis ça ne s'applique pas, tout ce que le reste de l'industrie fait. Il y a une raison pourquoi on a demandé de la consultation publique, pourquoi ça s'est rendu là : pour les mêmes raisons que la certification est importante pour l'industrie forestière.

Ça, est-ce que ça veut aussi dire que si tout le bois—disons que moi je suis une minière, puis je m'en vais et je suis obligée de faire une route pour me rendre là où mon site va être. Je « clear cut » toute la région. Tout ce dont je viens de parler, toutes les protections, que ça soit pour les « cold water creeks »—parce qu'il y a des « creeks » beaucoup plus sensibles pour les eaux. Vous ne le savez pas, mais l'industrie forestière, avant de couper, là, c'est tout déjà délinéé, et tu ne peux pas t'approcher d'une « creek » ou telles choses.

1010

Pensons aussi en passant, madame la Présidente, que tous les entrepreneurs, ce qu'ils appellent les « remote hunting camps » puis « fishing outfitters », eux autres, là, quand on voit du “clear cut” à l'entour de—que ça soit leur site des « outfitters » pour la pêche ou ils font les deux, les trois quarts du temps. Ils n'aiment pas voir des « clear cuts ». Non seulement ça rend leur lac beaucoup plus accessible, mais ça démontre qu'ils ne sont plus « remote ». En fait, ils perdent de la clientèle à cause de tout ça.

L'industrie forestière travaille tout avec ça. Ça fait que là, tout d'un coup on va dire : « Mais M. le ministre vous dit non. C'est bon. “Red tape”, on enlève ça. » C'est ça qu'on fait. C'est ça qu'on fait : on crée des doubles standards, puis on met en danger tout ce processus-là.

Pourtant c'est des entrepreneurs qui ont mis beaucoup d'argent. Il y a beaucoup de ces entreprises-là, ces « outfitters », que je peux vous dire que ce sont des

millions de dollars qu'ils ont investis, puis c'est de la clientèle qu'ils ont bâtie avec les années. Je peux vous dire, madame la Présidente, qu'ils ne sont pas très contents d'entendre bûcher près de leur lac quand ils disent qu'ils viennent de vendre un « package deal » à un Américain ou un Canadien ou quelqu'un d'autre d'ailleurs pour venir à la pêche et qu'ils disent : « Non, je t'ai vendu ça "remote", puis je suis capable d'entendre toutes les machineries qui sont après bûcher. » Vont-ils respecter, aussi, s'il y a une démarcation entre—tu sais, il faut que tu sois à telle distance, un kilomètre peut-être, du lac, pour protéger cette industrie-là?

On ne sait pas. Le ministre peut juste—« Tiens, on va signer ça, puis allez-y. On n'a pas de compte à rendre à personne; c'est du "red tape". Allez bâtir ça. »

Puis ce bois-là qu'on va vendre à l'industrie, est-ce que ça va mettre leur certification—à cause que ça n'a pas été suivi par les normes qui étaient supposées. Pourquoi tu penses que dans l'industrie forestière, on disait qu'il fallait qu'il y ait un plan pour dire : « Non, vous allez respecter tout ce que nous on respecte »? Parce que le bois, s'il était vendu à l'industrie, on savait qu'il venait d'une bonne source. Maintenant la bonne source n'existera pas.

Comment vous allez justifier ça? Comment qu'on justifie ça à nos concitoyens, qu'on vit de l'industrie forestière? Chez nous, ce n'est pas rien qu'une forêt pour nous. C'est notre gagne-pain. C'est où on chasse. On va souvent en forêt, puis on prend soin de notre forêt. Ça fait partie de notre culture, madame la Présidente. Ce n'est pas juste rien, la forêt, pour nous.

Mais on semble penser que c'est très important puis on va enlever toutes le « red tape » et on ne mettra plus de protection. C'est une question de protection. Parce qu'une fois que les lois environnementales ne sont pas respectées, il peut y avoir des gros problèmes qui suivent avec ça. On n'a qu'à penser à Grassy Narrows, on a qu'à penser à Attawapiskat, on a qu'à penser à tout le reste qui n'a pas été pas respecté, puis là on vit avec des conséquences que personne n'aime, qu'aucun gouvernement n'aime. Mais ça c'est une réalité qui est là constamment.

C'est pour ça qu'il y a des consultations publiques. Mais là, il n'y en aura plus de consultations publiques, parce que ça peut être juste signé : on te donne un permis ; va faire l'opération. Vous autres la communauté, vous autres les concitoyens, vous êtes du « red tape ». On vous tasse; c'est plus important. Les Premières Nations, c'est la même chose : « Non, vous êtes du "red tape". On vous tasse, pas important. Les espèces en danger, vous êtes du "red tape", pas important. On signe, ça presse, faut passer les choses. »

On est dans une difficulté économique. On dirait qu'on se permet de tout faire sans avoir de consultation, sans avoir aucune conscience écologique. Ça n'a aucun sens, la direction dans laquelle on s'en va. Puis je peux vous dire qu'on a entendu à maintes reprises par tous les parties : « Dis non; il faut qu'on accélère le processus, mais pas à tout prix »—pas à tout prix. Pourquoi tu penses que vous avez tellement de problèmes avec les Premières Nations? Et là on dit qu'on est ouvert au développement écono-

mique, mais pas à tout prix, parce qu'on doit respecter nos territoires, puis nos traités, puis faire certain qu'on protège pour cette génération. Il y a plus de cette génération-là.

Je pense que c'est irresponsable d'un gouvernement de dire que toutes les excuses sont bonnes pour user le « red tape »—ça, je peux user—pour éliminer toutes les protections qu'on a mises depuis ce temps-là, parce que les protections ne viennent pas du jour au lendemain.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Sorry to interrupt, but it is now 10:15.

Thank you, members. The committee is now recessed until 1 p.m., and we can pick up from there."

The committee recessed from 1015 to 1300.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We will resume clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 46, An Act to amend various Acts. We will resume debate on amendment number 7 of section 5 of schedule 8.

I will return the floor to MPP Bourgouin.

M. Guy Bourgouin: Vu que j'ai eu la chance de parler pour plusieurs—puis, je suis sûr que mes collègues du gouvernement puis aussi mon collègue du troisième parti ont eu une chance de penser à ce que j'ai dit durant l'heure du midi. Je suis sûr que mes collègues vont supporter la motion avec toute l'information que j'ai donnée pour essayer de les convaincre comment que c'est important pour l'industrie forestière, fait que—I thank you for the time on this motion.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate on amendment number 7? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: We don't have a logging industry in Ottawa, really, so I rely on conversations with experts and people who live in communities that have logging industries. And some of those conversations are actually with members of my family, in the past. My grandfather worked for Beaver Lumber up in Mattagami, in Val-d'Or in northern Quebec. And actually, my father-in-law worked for the Ministry of Natural Resources—I'm not sure what his proper title was but he would describe it as a forest ranger—up in Sioux Lookout and in Wawa. That's where he spent most of his career.

Over the years, between two old men trying to impress their grandson or their son-in-law, I was regaled with stories about this, that or the other thing. I can tell you that, to the points that my friend was making this morning, not just the business of logging but the environment of the forest is critically important, both for the economy in those communities but also for the cultural elements that the member was talking about. Whether that's grandfathers and fathers and sons learning how to hunt and trap and go exploring in the forest, whether it's Indigenous communities exercising their historical and treaty rights to do the same thing, ensuring that those spaces are available for those things to happen is critical, and what happens on crown land is important to protecting those elements.

So as we consider how the forest product on crown land might be used for the benefit of our economy, whether that's in home building or other things, we need to ensure

that there are necessary protections to support those ongoing cultural practices and cultural elements and those historical things that have made living in those communities, living in the north, so important and vital.

I would hate to see the government, in an effort to cut red tape, actually negatively impact the value of grandfathers and fathers and their sons—and I don't want to exclude women, but in our family, that's what it was—passing on those traditions, whether it's hunting or just exploring the forest and benefiting from that. Sometimes when we rush to cut red tape, there are downside consequences, and I think that's what my friend Mr. Bourgouin is trying to articulate in his reasonable amendments. I hope the government might listen.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Are the members ready to vote on amendment number 7, then? All those in favour of amendment number 7 please raise your hands.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote?

Mr. Guy Bourgouin: Recorded vote. Yes, please.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I'm afraid it's too late. I did check, though.

All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 7 lost.

Shall section 5 of schedule 8 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 5 of schedule 8 is carried.

There are no amendments to section 6 to 16 of schedule 8. Is there agreement to bundle these? Agreed? Thank you.

Shall sections 6 to 16 of schedule 8 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 6 to 16 of schedule 8 carried.

Shall schedule 8, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 8, as a whole, carried.

Going to schedule 9: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 9 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 9. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Seeing agreement, are the members ready to vote? No debate?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Babikian, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 9 carried.

We now come to a Liberal notice to schedule 9. MPP Blais, if you want to speak to that.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I don't need to speak to it, Madam Chair. That's fine. Thank you.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Okay, then. Shall schedule 9 as a whole carry?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Babikian, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Schedule 9, as a whole, is carried.

Going to schedule 10: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 10 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Okay. Thank you.

Is there any debate? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of schedule 10, sections 1 to 2, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10 carried.

Shall schedule 10, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 10, as a whole, carried.

Moving to schedule 11: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 11 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 34 of schedule 11. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Agreed.

Are members ready to vote? Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 34 of schedule 11 carried.

Shall schedule 11, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 11, as a whole, carried.

Schedule 12: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 12 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 5 of schedule 12. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Thank you.

Is there any debate? 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 1 to 5 of schedule 12 carried.

Shall schedule 12, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 12, as a whole, carried.

Schedule 13: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 13 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 13. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Agreed.

Is there any debate? Shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 13 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 13 carried.

Shall schedule 13, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 13 carried.

Schedule 14: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 14 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 14. Is there agreement? Seeing

agreement, shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10 carried.

Shall schedule 14 as a whole carry—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): It was sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10 that was carried—

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): —in schedule 14, sorry.
1310

Shall schedule 14, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 14, as a whole, carried.

There are no proposed amendments in schedule 15 to the bill. I therefore propose we bundle sections 1 to 5 of schedule 15. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Agreed. Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. I declare sections 1 to 5 of schedule 15 carried.

Shall schedule 15, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 15 carried.

Schedule 16: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 16 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 16. Is there agreement to bundle? Everybody is agreed? Okay. Any debate? MPP Blais.

Mr. Stephen Blais: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. We are recommending that we vote against this schedule, because we are challenged to understand why the collection and use of so much data and information about Ontarians is necessary to accomplish the goals of red tape reduction. This schedule gives the government authority to collect and use and then disclose enormous amounts of personal and private data about you and me and our neighbours and our family and every other Ontarian, and it's not entirely clear to us that that's a good idea and nor is it clear to us that that will in any way help reduce red tape and make things more efficient for businesses here in Ontario. We recommend voting against it as a result of that, Madam Chair.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Any further debate? Seeing none—

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote is asked on sections 1 to 3 of schedule 16.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 16 carried.

Shall schedule 16, as a whole, carry?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote? Yes.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Schedule 16 is carried.

Schedule 17: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 17 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 17. Is there agreement to bundle? Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Seeing none, I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 17 carried.

Shall schedule 17, as a whole, carry?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote.

Ayes

Babikian, Blais, Bourgouin, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 17, as a whole, carried.

Schedule 18: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 18 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 18. Is there agreement to bundle? Thank you. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 18 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 18 carried.

Shall schedule 18, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 18, as a whole, carried.

Schedule 19: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 19 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 19. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Thank you. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 to 3 of schedule 19 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 19 carried.

Shall schedule 19, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 19 carried.

Schedule 20—I believe there is an amendment, amendment number 8. I'll look to the government side: MPP Kanapathi, if you would read the amendment into the microphone.

Mr. Logan Kanapathi: I move that section 1 of schedule 20 to the bill be amended by adding “or persons performing activities that relate to resource recovery or

waste reduction in Ontario” after “part IV” in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 52.1(1) of the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Thank you. Any debate or discussion? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 8, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 8 carried.

Shall section 1 of schedule 20, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 1 of schedule 20, as amended, carried.

There are no proposed amendments to sections 2 to 9 of schedule 20. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 2 to 9 of schedule 20. Is there agreement to bundle? Thank you. Any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 2 to 9 of schedule 20 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 2 to 9 of schedule 20 carried.

Shall schedule 20, as amended, carry?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Recorded vote? Yes.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare schedule 20, as amended, carried.

Schedule 21: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 21 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 2 of schedule 21. Is there agreement to bundle these sections? Agreed. Any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 21 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 2 of schedule 21 carried.

Shall schedule 21, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 21, as a whole, carried.

Schedule 22: There are no proposed amendments to schedule 22 to the bill. I therefore propose that we bundle sections 1 to 3 of schedule 22. Is there agreement to bundle? Thank you. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 to 3 of schedule 22 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare sections 1 to 3 of schedule 22 carried.

Shall schedule 22, as a whole, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 22 carried.

We're now going to return to sections 1 to 3 of the bill. Shall section 1 of the bill carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are members ready to vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote, yes.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare sections 1 to 3 of the bill carried.

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Sorry—section 1 of the bill carried.

Shall section 2 of the bill carry? Is there any debate?

Interjection.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): It's a recorded vote—no debate; recorded vote.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 2 carried.

Shall section 3 of the bill carry? Is there any debate?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): A recorded vote is asked for.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare section 3 carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Is there any debate? Are members ready to vote? Recorded vote?

Mr. Stephen Blais: I was going to debate.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Oh, please. Sorry. I'm moving too fast. I apologize.

Mr. Stephen Blais: It's like there's something else to do this afternoon.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I'm listening for the bells that may be coming. So sorry.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I will just re-up our concern that for a bill that is as vast as this, that encompasses many things that have nothing to do with red tape whatsoever, to be considered a red tape reduction bill is, I think, a little bit ridiculous. I think the government should consider that as it moves forward in time with future legislation.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on the title of the bill?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare the title of the bill carried.

Shall Bill 46, as amended, carry? Any further debate?

Mr. Stephen Blais: Just a recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Babikian, Gualtieri, Kanapathi, Sandhu, Saunderson.

Nays

Blais, Bourgouin.

The Chair (Hon. Laurie Scott): I declare Bill 46, as amended, carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? Is there debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare that the bill shall be reported to the House.

Thank you very much for your patience. This concludes the business for today. The committee now stands adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1322.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY

Chair / Présidente

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

First Vice-Chair / Premier Vice-Président

Mr. Guy Bourgouin (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)

Second Vice-Chair / Deuxième Vice-Président

MPP Tyler Watt (Nepean L)

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Mr. Aris Babikian (Scarborough–Agincourt PC)

Mr. Guy Bourgouin (Mushkegowuk–James Bay / Mushkegowuk–Baie James ND)

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

MPP Catherine McKenney (Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre ND)

Mr. Amarjot Sandhu (Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest PC)

Mr. Brian Saunderson (Simcoe–Grey PC)

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

MPP Tyler Watt (Nepean L)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Stephen Blais (Orléans L)

Mr. Andrew Dowie (Windsor–Tecumseh PC)

MPP Silvia Gualtieri (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville PC)

Mr. Logan Kanapathi (Markham–Thornhill PC)

MPP Paul Vickers (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Tanzima Khan

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Kristi Cairns, legislative counsel