

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

JP-9

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

JP-9

**Standing Committee on
Justice Policy**

Committee business

Keeping Criminals Behind Bars
Act, 2026

1st Session
44th Parliament

Thursday 23 April 2026

**Comité permanent
de la justice**

Travaux du comité

Loi de 2026 visant à maintenir
les criminels derrière
les barreaux

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Jeudi 23 avril 2026

Chair: Lorne Coe
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Président : Lorne Coe
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.

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
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
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

ISSN 1710-9442

CONTENTS

Thursday 23 April 2026

Committee business.....	JP-183
Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act, 2026, Bill 75, Mr. Kerzner / Loi de 2026 visant à maintenir les criminels derrière les barreaux, projet de loi 75, M. Kerzner.....	JP-184

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE LA JUSTICE

Thursday 23 April 2026

Jeudi 23 avril 2026

The committee met at 0900 in committee room 2.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Justice Policy will now come to order.

We're here to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 75, An Act to enact the Constable Joe MacDonald Public Safety Officers' Survivors Scholarship Fund Act, 2025, and to amend various other Acts.

We're joined by staff from legislative counsel and staff from the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Agribusiness; the Ministry of the Solicitor General; the Ministry of the Attorney General; and the Ministry of Transportation.

As is always the case in our deliberations as a committee, please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak, and as always, comments should go through the Chair, please.

Are there any questions before we begin? MPP Wong-Tam, please.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you, Chair. I'm just asking for some clarification on the request for recorded votes. Would it be agreeable that I make this one request now, so that all the votes are recorded—substantial votes, substantial amendment changes—or do you want them to be asked at the beginning of the moving of every amendment?

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): I'll defer to the Clerk, please.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Okay. Thank you.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): You can make a blanket request, if you would like. If there are specific sections that you would like to request a recorded vote on, it would be more timely to do it after the debate, just before the Chair is putting the question.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. That was incredibly helpful.

Then, Chair, I request that we have a recorded vote for every substantial amendment and for the final item, as reported.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): I think that's acceptable, and that's the way we're going to proceed, unless there's some concern about that.

Are there any further questions? MPP McCrimmon.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Chair, I have a motion that I would like to move. I believe the Clerk has sent it to everyone.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): I'd like you to introduce it and read it into the record, then the Clerk will distribute a copy of it so that all members of the committee have it, then we'll debate the motion.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Okay, thank you, Chair.

I move that the Standing Committee on Justice Policy conduct a study pursuant to Standing Order 113(a) on the operation of the Ministry of the Solicitor General; and

That the committee meet for hearings on Monday, May 4, 2026, from 1 p.m. until 4:10 p.m.; and

That the Deputy Solicitor General, correctional services, be invited to appear at 1 p.m. on Monday, May 4, 2026, and that the Deputy Minister shall have 20 minutes to make an opening statement followed by 70 minutes of questions and answers, divided into two rounds of 10 minutes for the government members, two rounds of 10 minutes for the official opposition members, and two rounds of 10 minutes for the third party; and

That the Solicitor General be invited to appear at 3 p.m. on Monday, May 4, 2026, and that the Solicitor General shall have 20 minutes to make an opening statement followed by 70 minutes of questions and answers, divided into two rounds of 10 minutes for the government members, two rounds of 10 minutes for the official opposition members, and two rounds of 10 minutes for the third party; and

That legislative research provide a draft copy of the report to the committee as soon as possible following the hearings; and

That the committee meet for the purpose of report-writing on the following days: Wednesday, May 6, 2026, from 1 p.m. until 6 p.m.; and Thursday, May 7, 2026, from 1 p.m. until 6 p.m.; and

That, prior to adjourning on the final day of report-writing, the Chair shall put the question on the adoption of the report; and

That the final version of the committee's report, as agreed to by the committee at the end of the final day of report writing, be presented to the House no later than Monday, May 11, 2026.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP McCrimmon. We're going to pause for a moment so that the Clerk can provide copies of the motion, then I'm going to come back to you for your framing of the motion, please.

MPP McCrimmon for the framing of the motion, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: You know my background is in military aviation, and I am a believer in the flight safety—pass, no-fault. Don't overlook something. And

right now, with the mistaken release of prisoners—and the numbers are going up. They're not coming down; the numbers are actually increasing. We need to do something because otherwise, our constituents and the people of Ontario will lose faith in the work that we do to keep them safe.

I think it's a very serious thing. I don't want to find—I don't need to find fault. That's how we do flight safety; we don't assign blame when you do a flight safety investigation. You find out what went wrong and what you can do to fix it. That's the kind of framing that I would like to bring to this particular motion.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP McCrimmon.

On the motion, please, MPP Stevens.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I do have to commend the member for bringing this forward. I definitely do believe that right now, as stated, our jails are over-packed. They are putting not only the inmates in trouble but also our corrections officers.

Making sure that all are safe is important. However, the release of—

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Inmates.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Thank you—inmates over the past couple of years has been alarming and I think that the Deputy Solicitor General of correctional services, when he appears, will be able to then state their case on what's going on with our correctional services and within our jails. This will give them a perfect opportunity to be able to make sure that they answer to the constituents that we are constantly answering to. I think that they deserve an answer all the time. I know that this government says that they're transparent and they're willing to speak to our constituents, so I would really like to give the opportunity for our constituents to hear from the Deputy Solicitor General as well as the Solicitor General at that time.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you for your comments.

I have MPP Wong-Tam, please, on the motion.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I want to lend my voice to say that I strongly support this motion. There have been several troubling news articles, oftentimes information that is obtained through FOI requests, about the operations of corrections that are now additional concerns for citizens of Ontario. One hundred and fifty inmates accidentally released is not a minor incident; it's a significant incident.

The Solicitor General in question period sometimes has contradicted himself, and I would imagine even the Solicitor General may be wanting the opportunity to clarify his position, perhaps in a setting that's not so theatrical, one where he is supported by parliamentary assistants and his ADMs, so that we can get to the bottom of this.

Ultimately, we have a crisis in the corrections system, and the person who is responsible is the Solicitor General. We know that there is overcrowding in our jails: two to three—and sometimes I've heard now four—inmates to a cell. It is inhumane. Even international human rights organizations have cited the challenges in Ontario's corrections system. We have heard from corrections officers very loudly and clearly that the conditions that they work in are unsafe and untenable and certainly not sustainable.

Of course, we've heard from the families of those who are charged and legally detained and in government custody, but also legally innocent until they have reached their trial. Those families have talked about how difficult it is for them to reach their family members who are in government custody. There are doctors who we've heard from in this committee who have spoken up about how challenging it is and how violent it is.

So, absolutely, I support this motion. I want to thank the member for bringing it forward, and I think that the residents of Ontario, the citizens of Ontario, would like to see more answers coming from government.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP Wong-Tam.

Any further debate on the motion? Any further debate on the motion? I'm going to call the question.

0910

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Clerk, please note that the motion is lost.

The Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all members of this committee and staff electronically. Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill and if so to which section? I see no hands. Yes, I do. Thank you, MPP Wong-Tam.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you very much, Chair.

I wanted to ask the Clerk to clarify for all of us the order in which the amendments will be recognized by the Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): To the Clerk.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning): The opportunity that the Chair has offered is under standing order 83. It's for general debate on the bill.

As we make our way through the bill, the Chair will notify you by caucus if there is an amendment to be moved.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

KEEPING CRIMINALS BEHIND BARS ACT, 2026

LOI DE 2026 VISANT À MAINTENIR LES CRIMINELS DERRIÈRE LES BARREAUX

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 75, An Act to enact the Constable Joe MacDonald Public Safety Officers' Survivors Scholarship Fund Act, 2026 and to amend various other Acts / Projet de loi 75, Loi édictant la Loi de 2026 sur le Fonds Joe MacDonald de bourses d'études à l'intention des survivants d'agents de sécurité publique et modifiant diverses autres lois.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Any further questions? We will now begin clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 75.

Bill 75, members of the committee, is comprised of three sections which enact seven schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I'd like to suggest we postpone these three sections in order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement, please, on that process? Thank you very much.

We'll now proceed with schedule 1, which is the Animals for Research Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 5, therefore I propose, please, that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you.

Any debate? Any debate? Mr. Clerk, I note that there is none.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Recorded vote, sir?

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Did you want a recorded vote?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Yes, sir. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): I'm going to call the question. All those in favour raise your hands—

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Sorry, Chair. What I would like to do is withdraw my request for a recorded vote for any items that do not have amendments attached to them.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Okay.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Yes, sorry about that.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much; so noted.

For schedule 1, which is the Animals for Research Act, sections 1 to 5, all those in favour raise your hand, please. All right, schedule 1, sections 1 to 5, is carried.

Thank you. We're now on schedule 1, section 6. We have an amendment from the third party to section 6 of schedule 1.

MPP McCrimmon, please, when you are ready on your amendment. Thank you.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Thank you, Chair. This is about rehoming. It calls on the operator of the facility to take every reasonable step to rehome the animals, rather than destroy them. This particular topic was raised by Animal Justice.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): You need to read it, please. Thank you.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Oh, okay.

“Rehoming

“(2.1) The operator of a research facility shall ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to offer animals for rehoming following their use in research experiments.”

Interjection.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Okay. I move that section 6 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.1) Section 14 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Rehoming

“(2.1) The operator of a research facility shall ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to offer animals for rehoming following their use in research experiments.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Members of committee, debate on the proposed amendment?

I have MPP Wong-Tam, please, on the amendment.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I want to specifically cite that the language of rehoming is not a concept in the act itself. I don't necessarily have a problem with the concept of rehoming, but just that the language is not in the current act. It is language used in the Animals for Research Act. I wanted to just cite that we don't have a definition around rehoming here. But the concept itself is agreeable.

We have a motion that is going to, I think, support what the third party is trying to do, but perhaps give it a bit more clarification, which does not use the rehoming language. So that's the only thing I would offer. It basically complements one another, and it actually does achieve the same outcome, but we don't introduce the new language that is not already in the act.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right. Thank you for that.

Further debate on the motion? Further debate? Hearing none, I'm going to call the question. All those in favour of the proposed amendment, as stated, raise your hands, please. All those opposed? Thank you. That amendment, as read, is lost.

We're going to move on, committee members, to the NDP proposed amendment to section 6 of schedule 1, (1.1). Who is going to present the amendment, please? MPP Wong-Tam.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I move that section 6 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.1) Section 14 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Home

“(2.1) The operator of a research facility shall ensure that all reasonable efforts are made to sell, gift or otherwise transfer ownership of an animal, as a pet or for working purposes.”

This is an amendment to the bill that is asked for by many animal rights advocates, including legal experts from Animal Justice. We believe that this new text will allow research facilities to sell or gift those animals to loving homes at the conclusion of the experiments. It does not require that there be any priority given to adopting animals rather than killing them, as is their usual practice.

We want to ensure that those animals that were so inhumanely treated under those research conditions can find a path to a loving environment towards their end of life. I think that what we're doing here with this legislation is groundbreaking. I do support the overall spirit of the bill as it pertains to schedule 1 and any amendments we have for the Animals for Research Act.

But this is the motion that I was describing, that contrasts the language that was in the third party's motion around rehoming, and hopefully this gives more clarification to it.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much.

On the proposed amendment: Further debate? Further debate? I'll call the question.

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment, as read, is lost.

We're going to move forward, then. Shall schedule 1, section 6, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Mr. Clerk, it's carried.

0920

Members of committee, we'll now move to schedule 1, section 6.1. We have a proposed amendment from the third party to section 6.1. That's schedule 1.

MPP McCrimmon, when you're ready, please, with your proposed amendments.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 6.1 be added to schedule 1 of the bill and the act as follows:

"6.1 The act is amended by adding the following section:

"Obligation to report

"14.1 Every veterinarian or other prescribed person who has reasonable grounds to believe that an animal in the possession of a registered research facility or of a licensed operator of a supply facility is being abused, being subject to undue physical or psychological hardship, privation or neglect, shall report their belief in accordance with the prescribed requirements, if any, to the chief inspector appointed under this act."

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Debate on the proposed amendment? Any debate? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Again, this is a supportable amendment. Animal Justice has requested this as well.

This amendment would fill a significant enforcement gap that is not there as of now. Current animals in registered research facilities are exempted from the PAWS Act protection and reporting mandates. As a result, the general duty that a veterinarian has to report animal cruelty under the section 14 of the PAWS Act does not legally extend to laboratory animals or animals at supply facilities. This duty should apply only to veterinarians, the professionals best placed to recognize animal suffering—consistent with the approach in the Ontario general animal welfare law and similar laws in other provinces that are there, which limit mandatory reports to licensed veterinarians.

We had an incident within St. Catharines where a veterinarian was very cruel to a lot of animals. We did have a public outcry for that veterinarian, who lost his practice.

I think we have to fill that gap. It's important that we do this and we fill that enforcement gap and we make sure we have teeth in that. This is very supported by the NDP.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? Further debate?

I'm going to call the question. On the proposed amendment from the third party to section 6.1 of schedule 1: All those in favour, please? All those opposed? The proposed amendment from the third party to 6.1 of schedule 1 is lost, Mr. Clerk.

I'll move now, please, to schedule 1, section 7. We have an amendment before the committee from the third party to section 7 of schedule 1.

MPP McCrimmon, please, when you're ready to move your motion.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 7 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out "medical" wherever it appears in section 15.1 of the Animals for Research Act.

This came from Animal Justice, and it said that Ontario should ban all invasive research, not just for medical research. That's where this particular amendment came from.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Debate on the proposed amendment from the third party to section 7 of schedule 1? Debate?

I note, Clerk, that there is no debate offered, so I'm going to call the question. All those in favour of the proposed amendment from the third party to section 7 of schedule 1 raise your hands, please. All those opposed to the third-party amendment to section 7 of schedule 1? As noted, the motion is lost.

Shall schedule 1, section 7, carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hand. Clerk, schedule 1, section 7, carries.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 8 to 9. Therefore, I would propose we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you very much.

Is there any debate to sections 8 and 9 before I move on? I note that there isn't any.

Therefore, sections 8 to 9—those in favour? There are no amendments to them. Carry? All those opposed? Noted. It carries.

We're on to schedule 1, section 10. Of schedule 1, section 10, we have a proposed amendment from the third party: subsection 10(2) of schedule 1.

MPP McCrimmon, please, on your proposed amendment.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that subsection 10(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(2) Clause 20(6)(c) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

"(c) sell or loan the dog or cat to the operator of a registered research facility in Ontario who has requested the operator of the pound to sell or loan a dog or cat, as the case may be, if the research facility will,

"(i) provide the dog or cat with medical intervention that will benefit the dog or cat, or

"(ii) will not significantly harm the dog or cat's physical or psychological welfare and will not impact the dog or cat's ability to be offered for adoption at the conclusion of the research."

"(3) Subsection 20(7) of the act is amended by adding 'or' at the end of clause (b) and by repealing clause (c).

"(4) Clause 20(7)(d) of the act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of subclause (i) and by repealing subclause (ii)."

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right, thank you.

Is there any debate on the proposed amendment? Clerk, I note that there isn't any debate on it.

Members of the committee, on the proposed amendment from the third party of subsection 10(2) of schedule 1. All

those in favour? All those opposed? The amendment, as read, is lost.

We'll move forward then to a proposed amendment from the official opposition, again from subsection 10(2) of schedule 1. Who will speak to the amendment? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I think this is a really important part of the amendment process.

I move that subsection 10(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Clause 20(6)(c) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(c) sell or loan the dog or cat to the operator of a registered research facility in Ontario who has requested the operator of the pound to sell or loan a dog or cat, as the case may be, if research facilities will,

“(i) provide the dog or cat with medical intervention that will benefit the dog or cat, or

“(ii) will not significantly harm the dog or cat physically or psychologically welfare and will not impact the dog or cat's ability to be offered for adoption at the conclusion of research.”

Interjection.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: So I read all that for nothing? Fair enough. Sorry; my apologies for the delay. I'll withdraw what I just said and I'll move on to this motion, then, if that's okay with you, Chair.

0930

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right. Thank you.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that subsection 10(2) of schedule 1 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Clause 20(6)(c) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(c) sell or loan the dog or cat to the operator of a registered research facility in Ontario who has requested the operator of the pound to sell or loan a dog or cat, as the case may be, if the research involving the dog or cat,

“(i) will include providing the dog or cat with medical intervention aimed at benefiting the dog or cat, or

“(ii) will significantly harm the physical or psychological welfare of the dog or cat and will not impact the ability of the dog or cat to be offered for adoption.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): MPP Stevens, can you re-read the last paragraph in that motion?

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Okay.

“(ii) will not significantly harm the physical or psychological welfare of the dog or cat and will not impact the ability of the dog or cat to be offered for adoption.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you.

Members of committee, on subsection 10(2) of schedule 1 on the amendment as stated, debate.

MPP Wong-Tam, please.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: This is pertaining to the practice of municipal pounds releasing cats and dogs to the first available buyer. We know that there's tens of thousands of cats and dogs that are oftentimes brought into municipal pounds. They could be lost—a beloved family member.

The pound, then, within the current laws of Ontario, which is quite outdated and I would say arbitrary, has the obligation of holding that animal for just three mere days. Then, afterwards, they have the obligation to sell those animals for a few dollars—\$2 and \$6, respectively, between cats and dogs—to research facilities, to laboratories, to just about anybody, without any checks or balances.

What we have learned is that this is an outlier of a law that exists in Ontario and nowhere else in Canada and it probably should have been struck from the books a very long time ago. So while we have the opportunity, while Bill 75 is before us, I think it's important that all of us recognize that animals that are turned over to the pound are then being sold for very little money to research labs.

I understand a lot of the animals that are being procured are actually not going to labs per se that are about developing new science or technologies for life-saving interventions for human beings, but rather it's oftentimes cosmetic trial runs and testing.

We have seen incidents and cases where family members lost their dogs. I don't know if anyone has ever lost their dog, but I know I see these notices in my neighbourhood: “Lost dog. Lost cat.” Sometimes those notices stay up. Every now and then, there's a happy reunification story. That is going to be eliminated for the family who lost their animals for whatever reason if they're not able to reunite in three days.

This is, I think, a very important loophole that needs to be closed. It's a practice that's quite outdated. I don't know why it was ever on the Ontario books, but certainly, I think that the citizens of Ontario who don't know this is happening would be quite outraged to think that we had an opportunity to fix this now and we bypassed it.

I want to just give a nod to the third party who has also put forward a motion comparable to this. I'm hoping that with some comments from myself and perhaps the other members, the government members who voted down a comparable motion would have a change of heart.

Think about Fifi. Think about all the Caseys, the little beagles that have been lost. Think about every single notice that you see in your own neighbourhoods when your residents come up to you and tell you that they've lost their animals, how heartbreaking it is, and that their little boys and little girls are hoping to be reunited.

So, if you see it in your heart to make sure that that animal that's lost—that beloved family member that's lost—can find a way back to their cherished homes, this is one way that we can help them.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP Ciriello, please.

MPP Monica Ciriello: I just want to speak briefly on it and recommend why we're voting against this motion.

The motion, as drafted, is vague and would, if carried, create uncertainty for operators of research facilities in terms of how cats and dogs could be sourced from pounds. Should the bill pass, a regulation could be made setting out a framework under which a pound could sell a cat or a dog to a research facility. So there is no need to support an amendment, as a desired chance can be done by regulation following further consultation.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP Wong-Tam, please.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Thank you for MPP Ciriello's comments. I would say that there is much more clarification in this motion that is up-front and transparent, than left to regulations that may or may not come forward with any consultation. The government has a record of hiding activity in consultation afterwards, and the public has a hard time following.

I would say that this is the most transparent way of advancing the elimination of pound-sourced animals for research. This is something that legal scholars within the animal community have asked us for. They have vetted this bill. They have pored over it with their own lawyers—every single one of them. I know this because I've spoken with them at great lengths about what they wanted to see, and they want to see this amendment come forward in this way, in this bill.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I do want to reiterate what MPP Wong-Tam has said, in that we are the only province in Canada with a legally mandated system of pound seizure. It's a quite controversial practice that has been banned in many other jurisdictions. So we should highlight that we shouldn't try to be leaders on this, but we should really get in tune with the rest of Canada and make sure that our province is a leader.

I really do think that this is a really needed amendment, after the animal rights associations asked for this. And this about it: only three days. That's all we're giving, and that's such a short time frame and is so insufficient to ensure that lost pets can get back to their family members—seniors or whomever—and be reunited with family members.

I think we need to put some teeth into this legislation, and this amendment does do that and does fill in that gap.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate?

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsop, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment is accordingly lost.

We'll now move onto another amendment from the official opposition found in section 10 of schedule 1.

When you're ready please, MPP Wong-Tam.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I move that section 10 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Clause 20(7)(c) of the act is repealed.”

And I'll wait for your recognition.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): When you're ready, go ahead.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: This is another request that has come forward from the legal community that advocates for animal justice.

Ontario is currently the only province in Canada with a legally mandated system of pound seizure. This is a highly controversial and, I would add, outdated practice that has been banned from every single jurisdiction across the country. It is not required anywhere else, not by way of municipal bylaw or statute under any province or any territory.

0940

Under the Animals for Research Act, municipal animal shelters right now are permitted to sell unclaimed cats and dogs to licensed research facilities after a minimum redemption period of just three days. This short time frame is absolutely insufficient. I think we all know that. We've heard so many stories in our communities about animals being lost and then recovered weeks later, because sometimes it takes that long to reclaim our animals. We want to ensure that we give every opportunity to those lost and beloved cats and dogs to be reunited with their families.

I know that I have lost a cat on several occasions. It just kept running away when I was a kid. And somehow, this little cat—Creamers was its name; Peaches and Cream with Chocolate Chip was the full name, but I shortened it to Creamers. I was a little kid; I had named her after an ice cream, I think. My cat would constantly run away, and during the time she would run away, I would be so incredibly sad as a kid. I would be up and down every single street in our neighbourhood looking for this cat. I think most of the times, I was able to get the cat back quickly, because she became well known as a runaway cat, but then there were times where it took longer. I would hate to think that somebody would have scooped up Creamers, brought little Creamers to the pound and then three days later, my cat would be carved up on some lab table.

This act and this motion we've moved forward to ban the pound procurement of animals for research is really for every little boy and girl that has lost their cat or dog. I think that we have an opportunity—I've said it before, but I'm hoping that this is the third time we can try to do this—to make sure that we can show those who are asking us to tighten up and strengthen animal protections in Ontario to do so. Animals that are turned over to the pound are often-times lost animals. They are beloved family members. I think that we would all want the community members and constituents in our ridings to have every single opportunity to be reunited with their lost animals.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP Wong-Tam.

Further debate on the proposed amendment from the official opposition, section 10 of schedule 1?

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsop, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment is lost.

We'll now move, committee members, to the official opposition amendment found within section 10 of schedule 1.

When you're ready, please introduce the amendment, MPP Stevens.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that section 10 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Clause 20(7)(d) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

“(d) during the redemption period, the dog or cat is in a pound and is ill or injured and in the operator's opinion is incapable of being so cured or healed as to live thereafter without suffering.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much. MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I'm going to continue on with what my colleague has said here. It's really important that we put teeth into this bill.

I'm going to remind this committee that Ontario is the only province in Canada with a legally mandated system of pound seizure, which is a very controversial practice that has been banned in many other jurisdictions throughout Canada and other areas. It's an outdated practice, as my colleague has said. I can actually say that with three days, it's a very small time frame for anyone to be able to capture their pet that has gone missing.

I did have a cat, and I'll go into my cat story, too—Freakster. He was microchipped and he was brought into the pound. His microchip failed and they didn't contact me; they contacted somebody in Hamilton. We happened to go in six days later and we saw Freakster there. Now, imagine if three days—my daughter would have been devastated that her beloved cat had been put to sale or put into the arms of harm because it was an unclaimed cat and it was given to a licensed facility for research and didn't give us the opportunity.

Now, I will say that we do have to put teeth in this legislation—again, I have to say that—and be mindful that Ontario is the only province in Canada with a legally mandated system of pound seizure. It's actually cruel to not only the individuals who have lost their beloved animal—it could be a hamster, it could be all the way to a cat or a dog, or even a canary. Sometimes we find them in our pounds too, and they are often used for research facilities as well. We don't want to see our animals in harm.

I am very supportive of this motion, and I'll leave it at that.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP Stevens.

Further debate? Further debate? I'll now call the question on the NDP official opposition motion to amend section 10 of schedule 1.

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment is lost.

Members of committee, shall schedule 1, section 10, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. It's carried.

Members of committee, we will now proceed to schedule 1, section 11. Before us is a proposed amendment from the third party, found in section 11 of schedule 1, on page 5 of your package.

MPP McCrimmon, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 11 of schedule 1 to the bill be amended by striking out “medical” in paragraph 5 of subsection 21(2) of the Animals for Research Act.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP McCrimmon. Do you want to frame the proposed amendment?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Thank you, Chair. It's the same logic: All invasive research should be banned.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much. Debate? Note that I see none. I'll ask another time: Any debate? I see none, Mr. Clerk.

On the proposed amendment by the third party found in section 11 of schedule 5, on page 5 of your package: All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment, as stated, is lost. Thank you.

Shall schedule 1, section 11, carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Noted; thank you. It's carried.

There are no amendments to sections 12 to 14. I would like to propose that we bundle them. Agreed? That's agreed. Any debate on sections 12 to 14? I note that there isn't any, Mr. Clerk. Thank you. All those in favour of sections 12 to 14, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. It's carried.

0950

Shall schedule 1 carry? Any debate? I see no debate on schedule 1. All those in favour of schedule 1, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 1 is carried.

Members of the committee, we're now going to move to schedule 2. For those who might be watching us or listening in, schedule 2 is the Bail Act.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 5. Therefore, I propose we bundle them. Agreed? There is agreement, Mr. Clerk. Is there any debate on sections 1 to 5 found in schedule 2? I don't see any. Shall sections 1 to 5 found in schedule 2 carry? All those in favour? Any opposed? No hands going up. Sections 1 to 5 found in schedule 2, entitled Bail Act, are carried.

We're now, members of the committee, within schedule 2, section 6. We have two proposed amendments from the third party.

MPP McCrimmon, for section 6 of schedule 2, your amendment is found on page 6 of our package. Please proceed. Thank you.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 6 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out paragraphs 1 and 2 of subsection 8.0.1(1) of the Bail Act and substituting the following:

“1. If the order sets out the accused’s promise to pay a specified amount if the accused fails to comply with a condition of the order and further orders that the amount must be paid as a security deposit, the accused shall pay the amount specified in the order to the person specified in the regulations, at the time and in the manner specified in the regulations.

“2. If the order sets out a surety’s promise to pay a specified amount if the accused fails to comply with a condition of the order and further orders that the amount must be paid as a security deposit, the surety shall pay the amount specified in the order to the person specified in the regulations, at the time and in the manner specified in the regulations.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much. Did you want to frame it a little bit more?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: This would shift the regulation slightly from being one that requires the accused or the surety to pay up front, to one that requires bail to be paid only upon violation of the bail order.

This change will ensure that the inability to pay bail up front by either the accused or the surety will not be a barrier to an accused being released on bail while their case is being tried. This will also allow for the justice responsible to be able to exercise their judgment on the necessity of a security deposit in individual cases as opposed to requiring a security deposit in every instance.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much, MPP McCrimmon.

Debate on the proposed amendment from the third party, found in section 6 of schedule 2, entitled “The Bail Act.” Any debate? MPP Stevens, please, on the proposed amendment.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: This provides a carve-out for paying a bail deposit up front, and I think that it’s very important that we as committee members—we sat last Monday, I believe it was, and listened to many legal advice from different agencies and different agents across Ontario that came here to speak, to say how unfair cash bail will be for our more vulnerable and, actually, for our Indigenous persons throughout Ontario.

I think it’s really important that we look at—it’s not really, may I say, a fair way to do bail, for the rich to be able to afford to say, “You know what? I’m out because I do have a very large bank account,” but we do have more vulnerable individuals throughout Ontario that will not be able to pay this. And a lot of them could have mental health issues or—it’s not that they were hardcore criminals, that they’re being painted with that brush. But they might not be able to afford that, and I think that our jails are already overcrowded, packed and unsafe, and I think that we should be able to make sure that everyone has a fair way to be able to pay bail. So I’m fully in support of this.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP Stevens. I have MPP Wong-Tam, please, on the amendment.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Yes, thank you. I’d also like to strongly lend my voice in support of this amendment. It’s absolutely incumbent on us to recognize that, in the judicial process, justices and justices of the peace are already considering risk when it comes to safety, and bail is not one that’s granted liberally in these courts. Bail, oftentimes, if granted, comes with, already, a significant number of conditions—in very minor cases is bail granted without conditions that have to be met, whether it’s the Bail Verification and Supervision Program, which is grossly underfunded—but we need to ensure that the justices and the justice of the peace have opportunities to assess, through the ladder principle, in what conditions would bail be granted and what conditions would bail have to take. The universal mandatory cash bail requirement that the government is proposing, as we’ve noted—as noted by many of the legal scholars, just about every single one that appeared before this committee—is flagrantly unconstitutional.

So this does reinstate and give those justices and justices of the peace a bit more latitude, and I think that it should be supported.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you for that. Further debate? Further debate?

On the proposed amendment from the third party, section 6 of schedule 2, entitled the Bail Act, on page 6 of your package: All those in favour of the proposed amendment, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment, as read, is lost.

MPP McCrimmon, could you please introduce your next proposed amendment found in section 6 of schedule 2, entitled the Bail Act, found on page 7 of your package, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 6 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 8.0.1 of the Bail Act:

“Screening

“(1.1) Subsection (1) applies only if, before the release order is made, a crown attorney confirms to the justice responsible for making the release order that, in the crown attorney’s opinion,

“(a) there is a reasonable prospect of conviction; and

“(b) it is in the public interest to pursue the charge against the accused.”

1000

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Debate, please. MPP Stevens, when you’re ready.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I want to re-highlight on cash for bail found in the schedule 2, as it discriminates against marginalized communities in Ontario and lower-income individual, as I stated earlier, families who cannot or do not have the upfront cash to be able to prove their innocence. It puts an undue hardship, may I say, on sureties, holding them accountable rather than an individual—in a way that individuals seeking bail possibly are on remand. And in Ontario, that means that they’re innocent until proven guilty in most cases.

Our jails, as I said, are already overcrowded, putting at risk the inmates as well as the general public and as well as our correctional officers or our jail guards. I think that it's very important that we make note here that we're already short over 2,000 beds within our correctional services across Ontario and this is just going to put an awful burden on our system when you're not giving a fair trial or a fair justice to other individuals. Cash for bail is just putting that burden up.

I just wanted to make sure that that was on the record, and the official opposition is not for this part of schedule 2. Cash for bail has to be struck from it. And I will go into that later on with my amendments.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP McCrimmon, please—on your proposed amendment.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: This amendment is based on the Ontario Bar Association's recommendation for the use of charge screening. Charge screening is a procedural tool that requires the crown to demonstrate a reasonable prospect of conviction based on the current case, as well that it is in the public interest to pursue the charge against the accused.

Requiring that both these conditions be met would ensure that the strength of the case is being taken into consideration before proceeding, reducing the number of accused who will be given credit for time served in weaker cases and ensuring that those subject to higher bail standards are those whose cases are more likely to end in conviction.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate?

On the proposed amendment to section 6 of schedule 2 found in the Bail Act: All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Mr. Clerk, the proposed amendment, as read, is lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 6, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Mr. Clerk, please note that schedule 2, section 6 has carried.

Members of committee, there are no amendments to sections 7 to 12 found within schedule 2. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? It's agreed, Mr. Clerk. Schedules 2 to 12: Shall they carry? All those in favour? Any debate beforehand?

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: Debate.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): I see none. Now, we have a hand.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Sorry, yes. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Thank you for recognizing me and I do apologize for speaking over you.

I do want to really make a point that schedule 2 has been believed to be unconstitutional and I don't know why we would support a schedule that could be ruled unconstitutional by the courts. So I put that forward and let the committee members know and let the government know.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Any further debate, please?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): This is on section 7 to 12, found within schedule 2 of the Bail Act—when you're ready, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: So we're not doing section—

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): We're going to bundle them.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Oh, bundling. Okay.

I feel that the witness testimony that we heard during the committee—to me, it said that it is not going to make things safer, it is not going to prevent crime, and it will really increase the burden on communities and create an unequal justice system. I just want to get that down on record, because I don't think being eligible for bail should be based on your ability to pay.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you for that.

Any further debate? I'm going to call the question.

Shall sections 7 to 12, found within schedule 2 of the Bail Act in your package, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? It's carried, Mr. Clerk.

Is there any debate on schedule 2? Yes, MPP Stevens.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Just for clarification, is this where I give notice?

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): We had some prior discussion. MPP Wong-Tam brought it to the Clerk and I. We agreed.

MPP Wong-Tam?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I want to just highlight for the committee that every single lawyer, legal observer and expert who came before this committee all advised us to not advance with schedule 2, the government's draconian efforts to reform the Bail Act.

We have not seen cash bail mandated in Ontario for close to 50 years. There is a reason why that legislation on the books was struck. It found that the harm that was done to disenfranchised communities—especially those that are from northern remote communities, that were poor, that were oftentimes Indigenous, that are Black—were unduly harmed. We are already seeing in corrections an over-representation of Black and Indigenous communities, people living with mental health and addictions, and people who have no homes who are simply incarcerated because the government has failed to do its job to address the impacts of poverty and homelessness.

We want to be tough on crime, absolutely. If you've done the crime, you should do the time. But simply put, this schedule is so poorly thought out. We recognize that the government is trying to hide behind its record of not doing a very good job of keeping Ontarians safe. Because if you were to be doing a better job of keeping Ontarians safe, you would fix the court. If you wanted to fix bail, you would fix the courts. If you wanted to keep criminals off the streets, you would fix the courts. Right now, Ontario has the longest wait time for trial of anywhere in the country.

I can't stress enough how unconstitutional and unlawful schedule 2 is, the mandatory requirement for cash bail. I asked the Solicitor General right here in this committee room whether or not people in Ontario had a constitutional right to reasonable bail under section 11(e) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In his second attempt

to answer that question, he deferred and said, yes, he'll leave it to the courts. Schedule 2 of this act takes away that discretion from the courts. It eliminates the ladder principle that the justices and the justice of the peace should have. It erodes any sense of assumption of innocence, which is legally guaranteed under the charter.

I think that what we need to recognize is that, for what the government is trying to do, which is literally give us—the short name of the bill for a working title is Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act. Where are you going to keep them? The jails are overflowing. You've got only eight shelter beds in the jails when you have so many people who actually need housing. So yes, you're going to make things significantly worse than they are.

And you haven't addressed the root causes with respect to why we have so many people who are living with mental illness and addictions, including those in your own families, in families of people that you care about and know, who are not able to get a detox bed or able to get any other access to mental health and addictions supports. You are going to make things significantly worse.

And while they are kept in government custody, they are not receiving any treatment. The rates of recidivism, as we have learned from speaker after speaker in this committee—because we already did an entire bail study—there are no programs for rehabilitation active and successful in corrections at this moment. People come out more traumatized, and they're going to come out further harmed.

I want to just speak for just one quick minute, because I have to say it: The corrections officers in Ontario corrections are under so much duress. What we are doing to them and what this government is doing to them is so grossly unfair. They are working under the worst unsafe conditions, and they are being asked to do more and more with less and less. You are proposing to build modular jails—you will fly them in anywhere you want—but the reality is, there is a crisis on the ground that needs immediate attention now.

So while you are ready to stack the jails with more Black, Indigenous, poor individuals, homeless individuals, people with mental illness and people with addictions, you are not getting to the root cause, which is preventing crime at its source. You are not making our communities safe with this bill. This bill is unconstitutional, it is unlawful and I think it's absolutely shameful should this government vote for it and advance it any further.

For the committee members: You don't have to wear this. You could do something different. You don't have to follow Doug Ford off the cliff.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right. Thank you for that.

I'm going to call the question, please—oh, MPP McCrimmon.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

Nays

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Schedule 2 has carried.

We are about a minute away from a recess and we will be continuing again at 1 p.m. for clause-by-clause. With the agreement of the committee, before we move into schedule 3, I would like to suggest that we recess now, so that we can all get into our seats at Queen's Park without running in.

This committee is now recessed. We will continue our discussions of this particular bill, Bill 75, at 1 p.m. for clause-by-clause. Thank you so much, everyone. Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

The committee recessed from 1013 to 1300.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on Justice Policy will now come to order, please.

We're resuming clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 75. We're starting, for your reference, on schedule 3, the Constable Joe MacDonald Public Safety Officers' Survivors Scholarship Fund Act, 2025. I'm on schedule 3, section 1. We don't have any amendments that I see.

Is there any debate, please, on schedule 3, section 1? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I'll call the question. All those in favour of schedule 3, section 1, please put your hand up. Thank you. All those opposed, please? Clerk, schedule 3, section 1, is carried.

Committee members, we now move to schedule 3, section 2. We have one proposed amendment from the official opposition: subsection 2(2) of schedule 3. Your page reference is 7.1 from the package distributed by the Clerk.

I will move to MPP Stevens to introduce the proposed amendment and any framing that's required.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out "who died in the line of duty or in other prescribed circumstances" at the end and substituting "who died in the line of duty, whose death was presumptively the result of post-traumatic stress disorder or who died in other prescribed circumstances".

I apologize for my reading, but my eyes aren't that good anymore. They're old.

Would I be able to speak on that, Chair?

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Yes, please, but on the amendment.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Yes. Thank you.

So we fully support this amendment, of course. I'm going to let you know the reason for this amendment. Just last week, we heard from many individuals who came and spoke, and one of them was Lexi Bowman, whose father did die in the line of duty. She supported this initiative of schedule 3. It's very supportable in that it provides funding to spouses and children of service members who died in the line of duty.

But we heard during the stakeholders' delegations that day, in the past week, that there were major gaps—that it

did exist. It existed in the line-of-duty members who died by suicide. If we remember, they are excluded from the fund. And that completely fails to recognize that PTSD is actually—it doesn't mean “pet the service dog,” may I say—a major component and illness that is a result of, and being treated by, front-line workers, and front-line workers are often suffering with PTSD.

The children of those who died by suicide are not less deserving of this assistance—and I think it's a wonderful, wonderful thing, the Joe MacDonald public safety fund. However, the children of those who died by suicide are not less deserving of assistance for a better future, and we have to all agree on that.

This amendment is fully supported by the Ontario Provincial Police Association. I've had several conversations with them. I am supportive of this amendment.

You know, I have a very good friend that lives in St. Catharines, Shawn Bennett, and his wife, Melodi. Shawn is a firefighter for the city of St. Catharines. They started a company that provides service dogs and training service dogs for members who do suffer from PTSD. They hold several cohorts throughout the year, and always, always have a full course. And that's just for front-line workers suffering with PTSD.

So it shows that we desperately need this to be covered within this schedule. This amendment is just purely common sense. I've talked to Minister Kerzner several times, and we both agree that it is so important that we do protect the front-line workers and make sure they are looked after, and make sure that when suffering PTSD, the last thing you have to worry about is what's happening with their family, because they're already experiencing such a traumatic situation with the individual.

I do really want to express that the individuals that came here were really wanting to see this change and this amendment to the Constable Joe MacDonald public safety officers' survivor scholarship, and I think it's warranted. I hope the government does see that this is a very common-sense solution. We're just adding in, actually, what the provincial police association is asking for. Many other front-line individuals—firefighters, EMS, all of them—should be included. It's very important for the families and their survivors.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much. MPP Stevens, do you want recorded votes?

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Yes, please. Absolutely.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right.

Any further debate? MPP McCrimmon, please, on the proposed amendment.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Having served places around the world, I have lots of friends who suffer from PTSD. I could only imagine what the first responders see, whether it's firefighters, paramedics, police. They've seen the same kind of trauma that military members have seen.

We had for a long time a very significant higher rate of suicide amongst military members who had served in conflict zones. It wasn't until we actually started acknowledging it and addressing it—and what we've seen is that

it's their families who are suffering, of those who were successful at suicide and many who thought about it.

Because of the trauma that I have seen and the challenges I have seen other members go through, I would certainly not want any of their families disadvantaged because of the trauma that their parent experienced serving us. It is real, and it needs to be addressed. All the first responders agree with this, and I would suggest that you would find all the veterans' groups and military groups would agree with this as well.

So I'm going to support this amendment because I think it is so important that these people—these young people, especially, and these families—not be disadvantaged because of the trauma that their parent went through because they were serving us.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? I have MPP Allsopp, please, when you're ready, sir.

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: I'd like to start by concurring with my colleagues on the committee and thanking MPP Stevens for bringing this forward.

As the former chair of a police services board, I know first-hand the amount of trauma our officers and their families are subjected to; the effects of PTSD and the inability, at times, to work; and, unfortunately, that many officers do succumb to PTSD and depression because of the things they've seen in the line of duty.

I thought the testimony we had the other day from Lexi Bowman was particularly impactful, talking about her father Craig, as well as what we heard from other police chiefs and the Police Association of Ontario as well.

The reason that we won't be supporting this amendment is simply because the act already provides sufficient regulatory authority to add these in regulation. The concern here is that if we only put in one about PTSD and enshrine that into the act, it means that there will be one that will be elevated but maybe other circumstances and other prescribed issues that won't be elevated in the same fashion.

We feel that through regulation we'll be able to do this more nimbly. We'll be able to adjust in real time to operational, fiscal and policy concerns and be able to include more people and more families struck by other issues resulting from careers in service.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Is there any further debate? MPP Stevens.

1310

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: You know, this is going to be a missed opportunity, I think, for the government not to vote for this amendment, because I think this is where we should be putting in changes to the bill. This is where it should be done properly. If you can say that you're going to put it in regulation, I think this is the time that we do it. We amend this bill now, and then we work on critiquing it in the future.

If you're going to miss this opportunity and not give the children of someone whose life has been taken by death by suicide, I think we're grossly not meeting the current situations for people that are in firefighter services and EMS. There are so many front-line services that we do see

that are on a rise, from taking their lives because they're under PTSD.

I do feel, though, that if we're going to miss this opportunity—and the government is—that I definitely do want a recorded vote. I want it so noted that the official opposition is wanting this amendment. We want it so noted that we are deeply in favour of it, and that the government has voted the amendment struck down.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much.

Further debate? MPP Allsopp, please.

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: I appreciate those comments. I just want to reiterate that it's not a matter of not supporting this particular proposal; it's a matter of the fact that the act already has sufficient regulatory authority to add this and other conditions into the regulation. So we feel that would be a more appropriate, more nimble, more responsive way to do it, but we are in support of the concept in general.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? I note none. I'm going to call the question.

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): The proposed amendment is lost.

Before proceeding to the next section: Shall schedule 3, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. It's carried.

We're moving to section 3 of schedule 3. We do not have any amendments in that particular section. Any debate? I'll call the question. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 3, section 3, is carried.

We'll now move to schedule 3 of section 4. We have a proposed amendment: subsection 4(1) of schedule 3. You can find that on page 8 of your package.

MPP McCrimmon, please, when you're ready.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I'm going to withdraw this amendment in favour of the amendment of the official opposition.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much, MPP McCrimmon.

I'll move, please, to the official opposition. Who's going to speak to your proposed amendment? MPP Stevens, please, thank you.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that subsection 4(1) of section 3 to the bill be amended by striking out "who died in the line of duty or in other prescribed circumstances" and—

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Hold on. The Clerk is just going to come over and point out—you've got to read from the package.

Interjection.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Okay. Sorry. I will start over again, if it's okay with the Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Please. That's why I interrupted you.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that subsection 4(1) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out "who died in the line of duty or in other prescribed circumstances" and substituting "who died in the line of duty, whose death was presumptively the result of post-traumatic stress disorder or who died in the prescribed circumstances".

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you. And if you could speak to framing of the proposed amendment, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: The reason why we are substituting it with "who died in the line of duty, whose death was presumptively the result of post-traumatic stress disorder or who died in the prescribed circumstances" is because suicide is currently automatically recognized as presumptively occupational-PTSD-related under applicable legislation in Ontario, WSIA.

Though PTSD-related suicides that been recognized, presumably the awarding of this scholarship for this would be limited to recognized instances. If the government don't themselves table an amendment—we would like to see that because, as I explained earlier, we have to make sure that PTSD is recognized. That it is really, really something that you're missing the boat on if you don't recognize it within this schedule.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate, please? MPP Allsopp, when you're ready.

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this. It follows much in the same logic as we discussed under the previous motion, 7.1, which is to say this act already has sufficient regulatory-making authority to allow these changes to be made in regulation after further consultation with families, with doctors, with experts, with members of our first responders and our police services.

The other thing I would point out is the language here is inconsistent. In the previous amendment, the language that they wanted was "who died in other prescribed circumstances." In this one, they have "who died in the prescribed circumstances." I think "the prescribed circumstances" seems to refer to the ones already outlined in the amendment and doesn't leave room for other circumstances.

So I think, on both points, we'll be opposing it: because we have the regulation-making authority to add in something like this, and the language being inconsistent and vague.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP McCrimmon.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Let's be clear: The government is opposed to supporting families of a member who died by suicide. This is exactly the reason why we are here, to actually amend the legislation so it does what we want it to do.

I just wanted to make my point.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Back to MPP Stevens, please, on the amendment.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I have to agree with the third party. It seems to me that, because they're not voting in favour of amendments at a committee level—

which is when we should be proposing recommendations and fully debating on it.

As I said, this was a request from the Ontario Provincial Police Association. They would like to see the fund be extended to spouses and children of our members who have died by suicide or because of the line of duty, in addition to the line-of-duty death. This is something that is so impactful on family members that we can make the change here and really put some teeth into this piece of legislation.

We've already gone over schedule 2 on how it's going to harm individuals, and now we're on schedule 3. It's just as easy as saying that this is a wonderful, wonderful memorial tribute and a scholarship fund and recognizing safety officers' surviving members of family. However, I think that this is going to really, really not hit the mark where we need to put teeth in this and make sure that the family members who have lost a loved one or significant other in their life know that the government has their back and understands what they are actually going through. Because we don't know. Unless you've actually experienced someone in your family and you're raising children and they need to have this education fund—as members, I don't think we can sit here and make that judgment.

But I think we can put an amendment into the bill and make sure that those individuals that came here—including the provincial police association: Let them know we heard them and we're not voting against something that really, really will make a difference in schedule 3 within this bill.

1320

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right. Thank you, MPP Stevens.

On to MPP Wong-Tam, and what I want to hear now on the amendment is reinforced information—not that I've already heard.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I'll do the best that I can, Chair, and thank you for recognizing me.

Chair, we know that front-line officers, all public safety officers, including paramedics and fire—it's oftentimes said that they run into a situation that is dangerous while the rest of us are running out. I get to serve and we all get to serve members of the public without having to wear a bulletproof vest. I serve the public every single day and every single day, I know—almost; just about—that I am going to go home safely. That is not the same when it comes to our public safety officers.

The recognition of the harmful effects of post-traumatic stress disorder is one that the public safety officers, the front-line officers I've described—they have been trying to get this government and the previous government's attention to this very difficult-to-diagnose disorder. It's a disorder that can be rather debilitating. It's a disorder that appears in very different symptomatic ways.

And I think that, through previous NDP legislation, they were able to be supported by having their PTSD recognized. That was a big, significant milestone: even just acknowledging that the problem exists. This simple and

elegant gesture from MPP Stevens goes that additional distance.

We know that 15% to 30% of front-line officers are living with some form of PTSD. That is just what they are going through. You cannot look at and experience traumatic events every single day and not have some of it come home with you vicariously. That is just the truth. And so, by way of this amendment, it demonstrates to everyone who works in dangerous situations that, number one, this government does recognize the harm that they subject themselves to at tremendous sacrifice to themselves, their physical and mental health, but also the additional burdens that their families carry.

I think that I know that the government members may have marching orders to vote down every single motion and amendment that comes from the opposition or third party. I get you want to do that. However, let's rise above that. Let's show the front-line public safety officers that this is not a partisan issue. We recognize the pain that they've been living with. Let's show them the compassion that they are asking for, which is to make sure that their workplace-related symptoms—anything that causes and leads to an unnatural, early death—are going to be sympathetically and passionately looked upon by every single party in this House. That extends to the grace that we offer their families, their spouses, their children.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? MPP Allsopp, please.

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: Just very briefly, I wanted to assure the members opposite that this has nothing to do with partisanship or voting down amendments that have been brought forward by the opposition.

I think all of our public safety officers, including the police, the firefighters, the paramedics, know that this government has been incredibly supportive of our public service officers, including reinvesting in the police college, including earlier checks for firefighters for cancers. We have done a number of changes that benefit all of our public service officers and I expect that you will see many of the things that you are discussing right now in regulation, but this is how we would prefer to do it because it allows us to be more nimble. It allows us to do further consultations to make sure that the provisions that being brought in are broad enough, that cover enough people. We certainly don't want to send something off—get it approved, have it go to royal assent—that doesn't encapsulate the totality of the families and the suffering that is occurring, and making sure that we are making those criteria as broad and as sweeping as possible.

To the members opposite: I understand sometimes there's a need to play politics a little bit. This is not what this is, and from our side, we have been very supportive of our public service officers.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? I'm going to call—new information?

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: You bet.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): MPP Wong-Tam, please.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: To MPP Allsopp: I believe he contradicted himself by simply saying that if the bill

receives royal assent, it will be completed in its totality. We know that regulations are oftentimes left months and sometimes years out. That is simply not good enough—not good enough for the families that came forward and asked us to take action today.

If the government members are determined to show us that we are wrong, that they are not playing games, then support this motion today. That is how you demonstrate to the families that you are listening.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you. Further debate?

I'm going to call the question. Are members ready to vote? Shall the amendment carry?

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): The proposed amendment is lost.

I would like to move now, please, to the Liberal amendment. Subsection 4 of schedule 3 is on page 9 of the package that was distributed by the Clerk to the members of this committee.

MPP McCrimmon, can you please introduce the proposed amendment, and once you're completed with that, any framing to support it, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 4 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“Bachelor’s and master’s degrees

“(3.1) The prescribed criteria described in subsection (3) must allow for the granting of scholarships for programs that grant bachelor’s degrees, master’s degrees and any other degrees that are set out in the regulations.”

It changes it to include master’s degrees. I think that is something that one of the witnesses specifically asked for. When you lose the major breadwinner in a household—and we still want the children of these heroes to be able to go to school if they want to go. I don’t think there should be any artificial ceiling on that. I think we should support them as far as they can go.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much, MPP McCrimmon.

Further debate, please? Further debate? I note that there isn’t any, Clerk. I’m going to call the question. Are members ready to vote? All those in favour of the proposed amendment, as read, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. The amendment is lost, Clerk.

Is there any debate on schedule 3, section 4, of the bill? I see none. I’ll call the question. Are members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Schedule 3, section 4, is carried.

We’re still on schedule 3 of the Constable Joe MacDonald Public Safety Officers’ Survivors Scholarship Fund Act, 2025. I have no amendments, committee members, for schedule 3, section 5. I’m going to put the question. Shall schedule 3, section 5, carry? Is there any debate on it? All those in favour? All those opposed? It’s carried.

We’re now on schedule 3, section 6, and we have a proposed amendment from the official opposition, clause 6(g) of schedule 3. It’s in your package on page 9.1.

I will turn to MPP Stevens to introduce the amendment and then frame it, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I move that clause 6(g) of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subclause:

“(ii.1) ‘death was presumptively the result of post-traumatic stress disorder’,”

If I may, Chair? The reason why this is being put forward is because suicide is not currently automatically recognized as a presumptive occupational—PTSD-related under the applicable legislation in Ontario, the WSIA, though PTSD-related suicides have been recognized. Presumably, the awarding of this scholarship for this would be limited to recognized instances.

1330

We wanted to make sure this was in there, recognizing that this is important wording, that it’s presumptively the result of post-traumatic stress disorder, and those words were put in.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much.

Is there further debate on the proposed amendment? I have MPP Wong-Tam, please. Thank you.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: I would direct the members to take a look at section 6. The header relates to regulations. The minister may make regulations, and there are a number of prescriptions of what those regulation parameters are. These are the guardrails that are set out at this committee. These are the guardrails set out in schedule 3 in Bill 75.

If we don’t make this amendment, it will be very difficult, extremely difficult, for the Solicitor General to make this change in regulations afterwards, because you’re asking him to do something outside of what is agreed upon in this bill.

I know your intentions are to try to put together something comparable to what we’ve suggested—I don’t know; that’s what you have said. The problem is, if you go ahead without making this change, the change that MPP Stevens has advanced, you’re going to not be able do what you have said. Your intentions are in regulation afterwards, because there will be no parameters and language in the schedule that specifically say that PTSD is recognized. That’s what is so problematic.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you very much, MPP Wong-Tam.

Further debate? I’m going to call the question. Shall the proposed amendment carry?

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Clerk, please note that the proposed amendment is lost.

Committee members, we are now going to ask the question: Shall schedule 3, section 6, carry? Is there any debate on that? I see none. I'll put the question. All those in favour of schedule 3, section 6, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 3, section 6, has carried.

There are no amendments to sections 7 to 8. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Is there any debate on the bundling? No? Okay. I'll ask the question: Shall schedule 3, sections 7 and 8, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Sections 7 and 8 are carried.

Shall schedule 3 carry? Any debate? Yes, MPP Wong-Tam.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Oh, no. I was voting in favour. Sorry, sir.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): It's okay.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: It was a residual, lingering hand.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): All right.

I'm going to put the question forward, please. Shall schedule 3 carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Noted and carried.

Members of the committee, we are now on schedule 4, which is the Coroners Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Okay. Is there any debate on that? Any debate? I'll ask the question, then: Shall schedule 4, sections 1 to 3, carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? No? Okay. Are you ready to vote? All right. All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. It's carried. Sections 1 to 3 carry.

Shall schedule 4 carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Schedule 4 has carried.

I might need my glasses soon. My eyes are getting tired too.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Well, I've got them here with me, and I put drops in, but it's not helping.

Anyway, we're on schedule 5, which is the Highway Traffic Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 through to 18. I propose we bundle them. Agreed? Okay. Is there any debate? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Do I do my—oh, no, sorry, no debate on that at all. Just keeping you on your toes.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Okay, fine. All right.

On sections 1 to 18, schedule 5: All those in favour, hands up, please. Thank you. All those opposed? It's carried. Sections 1 to 18 of schedule 5 are carried.

We're moving on now. Hold on. The Clerk is helping me turn the pages. We are now, members, on schedule 5, the Highway Traffic Act. It's schedule 5, section 19. It's 9.2 in your package, and then we have a proposed amend-

ment to section 19 of schedule 5. I know MPP Stevens is waiting to introduce it.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Yes, thank you, Chair.

I move that section 19 of schedule 5 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“Commencement

“19. This section comes into force on the day the Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act, 2025 receives royal assent.”

Can I explain why?

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Yes, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: The reason why we put this amendment in is because this amendment will bring the changes to the Highway Traffic Act into force when the bill receives royal assent, rather than coming into law on a day to be declared by the Lieutenant Governor.

Our thoughts with this amendment are that if this government really, really wants to be so much tougher on penalties—as it's been stated—for dangerous driving and distracted driving, why not have their amendments come into force as soon as possible? We've seen before that this government gives royal assent to bills, over and over again, and then it doesn't come into force for months and months and months later.

The basic line is, if we want to be tough on crime then be tough on crime and send a message to Ontarians that dangerous driving will not be tolerated.

1340

We did hear delegations here of dangerous driving from a young family that actually had lost their father. They were out on a Sunday drive. Let me reiterate what their feelings were that day, when they got in a really bad accident. It was a dangerous driver that caused the death of their father.

I think that we should really send a message. This committee should. And I hope that you vote for this amendment. It is a common-sense amendment. It's just asking you: Instead of waiting for royal assent, let's do the action now. Let's put it in law right now and make sure that our message to dangerous drivers and tough-on-crime penalties is done right now, today. That's all I'm asking.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): MPP Stevens, can you repeat, please, the sentence that follows number 19?

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: “This schedule comes into force on the day the Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act, 2025 received royal assent.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you. I appreciate that.

Further debate? Yes, MPP Allsopp?

Mr. Tyler Allsopp: Just very briefly: The member opposite said, “Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act, 2025”; I believe it's the Keeping Criminals Behind Bars Act, 2026.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Just give us a moment. We're going to confirm the bill.

MPP Allsopp, the short title of the bill does have “2025” in it. Okay? But thank you for your comments.

Further debate? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: Thank you, MPP Allsopp, for that really good find, looking into 2025. However, I'm hoping that you will still consider my amend-

ment, because it really is putting a message out there to make tougher penalties on drivers that are distracted or dangerous.

Let's all join together and raise our hands in supporting this motion.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour—oh, sorry. See, I turned that way and I didn't see your hand go up. MPP Wong-Tam, please, on the amendment.

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam: Yes, thank you. Just for the record, the title of the bill is correct as named in the amendment moved by MPP Stevens.

I want to bring attention to the actual sentence that this amendment is amending, the way the sentence is written is:

“Commencement

“19. This schedule comes into force on a day to be named by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.”

Whereas MPP Stevens's amendment has this coming into effect as soon as it receives royal assent, which will probably be no later than June 4, when we have all the bills at that time being signed off on.

I don't know on what day in the future in 2026 or 2027 the Lieutenant Governor will be signing off on this particular schedule in the government's bill as it is written. If the government can give me an indication of when that day in the future they believe they will bring this schedule and bill into force and effect is, you can let us know if it's going to be sooner than June 4.

But I think we owe it to all Ontarians to act as quickly as possible to update and strengthen our laws in the Highway Traffic Act, to send a very clear message that if you break the law and you kill someone with your vehicle, you are going to do the time. That is something that MPP Stevens's motion does, giving the quickest resolution on an update to strengthen the bill; whereas the government's bill, as it is currently written in schedule 6, sends us off into the future sometime to be determined later.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Next up, I have MPP McCrimmon, please, on the amendment.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: If you check the other schedules, the other schedules are according to my honourable colleague's amendment. This is the only one to be named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

So I have to agree. Otherwise, if you don't enact this at the same time, you're enacting those other schedules, what is this about? Is this just to pretend? Is it showmanship, theatre to make people think that you are getting tough on these things that you're really not? So, if you're serious—if you're serious—then you implement it and you make it come into force the same as every other schedule, not this one separately.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? Further debate? Further debate? Shall the proposed amendment carry?

Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

Nays

Allsopp, Ciriello, Darouze, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): The proposed amendment from the official opposition, found on page 9, is lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 19, carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? I see no debate. All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Schedule 6—we're on page 16 of your package. Schedule 6 is the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015. I have no amendments noted in schedule 6, section 1. Is there any debate? Any debate? Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 6, section 1 is carried.

We'll move to schedule 6, section 2, where we have an amendment from the third party. Section 2 of schedule 6 is found on page 10 of the package. MPP McCrimmon, please.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I move that section 2 of schedule 6 of the bill be amended by adding the following subsections to section 14.1 of the Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015:

“Report on compliance with service standards

“(8) The minister shall prepare an annual written report assessing,

“(a) the compliance of police record check providers with the prescribed service standard; and

“(b) the effectiveness of the prescribed service standards in improving the police record check process.

“Publication of report

“(9) Before the end of each year, the minister shall,

“(a) table the report described in subsection (8) in the assembly; and

“(b) make the report available to the public on a government of Ontario website.”

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you. Do you want to frame that?

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

This schedule will require police-record-check providers to meet new standards. This amendment will require the minister to track compliance with these new standards. This will ensure transparency and public accountability in the instance of upholding the standards legislation. It's no use putting up in-standards legislation if you're not going to enforce it and you're not going to track it.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Debate? MPP Stevens, please.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: This amendment is definitely supportable from the official opposition. This amendment just requires the Solicitor General to prepare and table an annual report documenting if service providers are complying with police-record-check service standards.

1350

I can't think of an any more simple amendment that can be put forward here. It will definitely make sure that it puts checks and balances in place.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Further debate? Further debate? Are the members ready to vote? Shall the proposed amendment carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. The proposed amendment, Mr. Clerk, is lost.

Shall—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Sorry, I need everyone's attention, please. Thank you. All right.

Shall schedule 6, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. And all those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 6, section 2, is carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 3 to 5. I would propose, please, that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Any debate? Any debate? Any debate? I see none. Shall sections 3 to 5 of schedule 6 be approved? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed? It's carried. So sections 3 to 5 of schedule 6 have carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Schedule 6, Clerk, is carried.

We're now on schedule 7, which is the Provincial Animal Welfare Services Act, 2019, of the bill. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 5. Consequently, I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Okay. Any debate? Any debate? Any debate? I see none. Shall sections 1 to 5 of schedule 7 be approved? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Sections 1 to 5 of schedule 7 have carried.

Shall schedule 7 carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? Any debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 7 is carried.

I should have put my glasses on.

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): As we agreed at the beginning, we're going back to the three sections and the preamble. We're going to start with the preamble.

Is there any debate on the preamble? Any debate on the preamble? I know, Clerk, that there isn't any debate. I've been asking three times, so I don't get in trouble. I'm not trying to curtail debate, so I'm asking three times. I know it's excessive, but I'm doing it. Shall the preamble carry? All those in favour, put up your hands. All those opposed,

please put up your hands. Please note, Clerk, that the preamble has carried.

We're going to move to section 1 of the bill. Shall section 1 carry? Is there any debate? Any debate? Any debate? I see none. I'm going to call the question. Shall section 1 of Bill 75 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed, please? Section 1 of Bill 75, Clerk, has carried.

Shall section 2 of Bill 75 carry? Is there any debate, please? Debate? Debate? Shall section 2 of Bill 75 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Section 2 is carried.

Section 3 of Bill 75: Is there any debate? Debate? And debate? Shall section 3 of Bill 75 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Section 3, Clerk, is carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Any debate? Any debate? Any debate?

MPP McCrimmon, please, on the title of the bill.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: I just want to make a point here, in that chiefs of police were here, firefighters were here, families were here, and the government didn't listen to any of them. That's the point I want to make: no listening, no reflection of all that testimony that was here.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you, MPP McCrimmon.

Any further debate? All right; I'll call the question. On the title of the bill: All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. It's carried.

Shall Bill 75 carry? Any debate? Debate? Debate? Noting none, I'll call the question. Shall Bill 75 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? Any debate? MPP Stevens.

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens: I just want to make it noted on the record that in schedules 1 and 2 the official opposition made some pretty significant amendments, and it's unfortunate that they were not voted for. So we'll be waiting for this to be able to express our dismay on the government not accepting our amendments.

The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe): Thank you for that.

Any further debate? I don't see any. Shall I report the bill to the House? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Carried.

There being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned. Thank you so much for all of your help. Clerk, thank you very much for your help. I appreciate everyone's attention this afternoon.

The committee adjourned at 1400.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE POLICY

Chair / Président

Mr. Lorne Coe (Whitby PC)

First Vice-Chair / Première Vice-Présidente

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Second Vice-Chair / Deuxième Vice-Présidente

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Kanata–Carleton L)

Mr. Tyler Allsopp (Bay of Quinte / Baie de Quinte PC)

MPP Monica Ciriello (Hamilton Mountain / Hamilton–Mountain PC)

Mr. Lorne Coe (Whitby PC)

MPP George Darouze (Carleton PC)

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

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

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Kanata–Carleton L)

Mr. Stéphane Sarrazin (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell PC)

MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam (Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre ND)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens (St. Catharines ND)

Clerk / Greffier

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Bruno Falardeau, legislative counsel