

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

## **Official Report of Debates (Hansard)**

JP-16

## **Journal des débats (Hansard)**

JP-16

### **Standing Committee on Justice Policy**

Protecting Ontario's Streets  
and Communities Act, 2026

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
44<sup>th</sup> Parliament

Thursday 8 October 2026

### **Comité permanent de la justice**

Loi de 2026 visant à protéger  
les rues et les collectivités  
de l'Ontario

1<sup>re</sup> session  
44<sup>e</sup> législature

Jeudi 8 octobre 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:

### **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 :

<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.

### **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 8 October 2026

Protecting Ontario’s Streets and Communities Act, 2026, Bill 119, Mr. Kerzner / Loi de  
2026 visant à protéger les rues et les collectivités de l’Ontario, projet de loi 119,  
M. Kerzner .....JP-363



## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
JUSTICE POLICYCOMITÉ PERMANENT  
DE LA JUSTICE

Thursday 8 October 2026

Jeudi 8 octobre 2026

*The committee met at 1500 in committee room 2.*PROTECTING ONTARIO'S STREETS  
AND COMMUNITIES ACT, 2026  
LOI DE 2026 VISANT À PROTÉGER  
LES RUES ET LES COLLECTIVITÉS  
DE L'ONTARIO

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 119, An Act to enact two new Acts and to amend various other Acts / Projet de loi 119, Loi édictant deux nouvelles lois et modifiant diverses autres lois.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Good afternoon, everyone. The Standing Committee on Justice Policy will now come to order. We're here to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 119, An Act to enact two new Acts and to amend various other Acts.

We are joined by staff from legislative counsel and the ministry.

Please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak. As always, all comments should go through the Chair, please.

Are there any questions before we begin? I don't see any, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all members and staff electronically. Do you all have the amendments?

Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill, and if so, to which section? MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I want to just provide a question with respect to the process for the votes. Can we have a recorded vote on every amendment, or do we have to make the request at the beginning of every amendment?

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

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Isaiah Thorning):** If you would like to make a blanket request for all amendments, we can take that route.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I would like to make a request for a recorded vote on every amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Agreed.

We will now begin clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Bill 119 is comprised of three sections, which enact 16 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest we postpone these three sections in

order to dispose of the schedules first. Is there agreement on this? Yes. Please note that there is.

Are there any questions, comments or amendments to any section of the bill, and if so, to which section? I don't see any.

Is there any general debate on the bill as a whole? No, I don't see any.

We will start with schedule 1, Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 19. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate? I note none.

Are the members ready to vote on Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017, sections 1 to 19? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It carries.

Shall schedule 1 carry? Debate? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hand. Schedule 1 carries.

We're on schedule 2, Christopher's Law (Sex Offender Registry), 2000. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 17. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate? All right. I'll call the question.

All those in favour of schedule 2, Christopher's Law (Sex Offender Registry), 2000, sections 1 to 17, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It carries—sections 1 to 17.

Shall schedule 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Schedule 2 carries.

We are now on schedule 3, Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Is there any debate? I see none.

Shall sections 1 to 2 of schedule 3 carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3 carry.

Schedule 3, section 3: We have amendments from the third party.

MPP McCrimmon, number 1—please introduce your amendment.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 3.1 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019:

"Strategic plan content

"(1.1) The police service board's strategic plan must include the full text of all directives issued to the board under subsection (1)."

Can I explain?

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

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** Section 3 of schedule 3 gives the Solicitor General the power to issue a directive to a police services board and establish priorities through that board, and it must be reflected in the board's strategic plan.

This amendment would require that boards publish the full text of the directives that they receive. This would ensure full transparency, giving local communities understanding of how these directives are influencing their police forces.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Did you want to speak to it more fully beyond that?

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** No.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Okay.

Further debate on the amendment as stated? Further debate? I'll call the question.

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** The proposed amendment to section 3 of schedule 3 is lost.

MPP McCrimmon, could you please move forward with your amendment 2 to section 3 of schedule 3?

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 3.1(4) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019.

Subsection 3.1(4) exempts the police board directives from part III, regulations, of the Legislation Act. That is the section that requires public posting, consultation and putting the directives on the public record. For directives of such importance, I believe that that should be the minimum standard.

1510

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate on the proposed amendment? MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** Thank you to MPP McCrimmon for advancing this amendment as well as the previous amendment.

What we believe is important, in the Ontario NDP, is that we have open government. Information should be transparent, made available in a timely fashion. Something as important as policing, that we all require, that is absolutely critical to advancing community safety, health and well-being—something that every single citizen in Ontario is deeply invested in. There should be no reason why information that's coming from the province to the police service board should not be made available to the public. If it is, of course, a sensitive matter, a matter of commercial interests, naturally there would be opportunities to hold that in confidentiality—but this is not the case.

So I think that the amendments coming forward from the third party are reasonable. It's also speaking to the spirit of an open and democratic society.

I think that we're treading into some very dangerous territory now, where the Solicitor General wants to issue ministerial directives. Basically, what we all know and what we've learned, coming up through the ranks of municipal politics or public civic life, is that you don't want politicians directing the police. That's what the Solicitor General is proposing and giving himself powers to do; worse than that is that he wants to do it in this cloak of secrecy, shutting out the public and basically blinding them to what is his will and his will only. It's not acceptable. And exempting his ministerial directives from the legislative requirements through the Legislation Act is no different than exempting yourself from having to follow the rules, such as removing yourself from FOI requirements—same thing. We cannot extend that abuse of power to policing and law enforcement.

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

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

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

MPP McCrimmon, please proceed with your amendment 3 to section 3 of schedule 3.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 3 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 3.1 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019:

"When effective

"(5) A directive issued under this section does not take effect until the police service board,

"publishes the directive for public consultation for a period of 30 days; and

"the directive is confirmed by a vote of the police service board."

I think that this amendment is simple. It's a 30-day wait period to—

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** MPP McCrimmon, I think—

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** Sorry?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** The Clerk will let you know.

You need to restate the reading of the amendment. You left out a word, I think.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Yes, the letters. For example, you've got to say "(a) publishes" and "(b)."

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I'll reread it.

“When effective

“(5) A directive under this section does not take effect until the police service board,

“(a) publishes the directive for public consultation for a period of 30 days; and

“(b) the directive is confirmed by a vote of the police service board.”

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

Did you have any more explanation you wanted to provide?

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I was just going to say that I think this helps to protect the independence of the police service board. While the boards can receive government directives in an advisory manner, this amendment would require public consultation and a board vote before they're implemented.

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

**Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens:** I want to thank the third party for bringing this forward.

This amendment is actually asking for public consultation. And what is wrong with public consultation, when we are the upper level of government? I think that public consultation is very important. For a period of 30 days, it is just opening it up, for transparency and showing the democratic right of the public. It holds this government a little bit to account, too, where the police service boards need to vote on any changes that the minister might be trying to ram through at any given time. I think it's very important that we encourage the public to come forward and ask questions. A period of 30 days is very little; it's kind of a wait period, and it's also giving the government—making it look like they're trying to be transparent, where they should be at all times, and held accountable.

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

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I want to lend my voice to this debate and my strong endorsement to this amendment.

In the city of Toronto, we have the largest police force and service in the country, as you can imagine. And 51 division, which is a division of services, one of my—all of my area. My riding used to be significantly larger, running from downtown Toronto to midtown, and I used to be represented and served by three divisions: 51 division, 52 division, and 53 division. As you can imagine, it's a very busy police service.

I take great pride that our Toronto Police Service is constantly talking to the community. When we were working through their modernization plan, eventually presented to city council, they went through pretty broad consultation. They set up town halls. They wanted to hear from the community on how they want to be served. And what they heard from the community is that they wanted community-based, neighbourhood officers; they wanted to make sure that they had a relationship with their officers. Citizens were able to present their views. I think that was a really constructive exercise that helped everyone—council as well as the police service and, of course, most importantly,

the police officers—so that they understood how they could best deliver the world-class service that we receive.

There is really nothing to fear about public consultation. We are public servants. Our whole job and responsibility is talking to the public.

So it is very concerning if members of the government have received instructions from the Premier or the Solicitor General's office to vote against public consultation, something that really sits as the cornerstone of the foundation of democracy. That is extremely concerning.

I want to recognize and welcome MPP Beattie, because this is the first time that we're connecting. I hope you are able to think independently, develop some good habits, participate in the debate wholly, because that's why you're here. You're here to serve your community, as we all are elected to serve our community. So please make sure you exercise your voice on behalf of your community. And I'm pretty sure that your community will want to be informed about any major changes that take place with respect to the aspects of law enforcement and policing.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Is there any further debate on section 3 of schedule 3, the amendment from the third party? Any further debate? Clerk, I'm going to call the question.

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

#### 1520

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

Members, shall schedule 3, section 3, carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hand. It carries.

There are no amendments to sections 4 to 12. I'd like to propose, with your agreement, that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Is there any debate on schedule 3, sections 4 to 12? I note none.

Schedule 3, sections 4 to 12: All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Schedule 3, sections 4 to 12, carry.

Schedule 3, section 13—it's on page 12 of your package. We have amendments. The first is from the third party—section 13 of schedule 3, 3.1, and it's in your package.

MPP McCrimmon, will you please introduce the amendment and any explanatory narrative that you have?

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 13 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 80.1 of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019:

“Same

“(3.1) Before publishing personal information in accordance with subsection (1), the commissioner shall

make reasonable efforts to ensure that written notice is given to any individual whose identity or personal information could reasonably be inferred from the information to be published and for them to be given an opportunity to respond before the information is published.”

That’s a recommendation directly taken from the Information and Privacy Commissioner’s letter that she sent to the committee. I think victims, survivors and family members bear the risk of being identified from public information. And despite people’s best efforts, mistakes are made. So I think we should give them notice of potential risk, just the same as the people being posted. And that’s where this comes from.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Any further debate on the proposed amendment? MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I’d like to once again lend support from the Ontario NDP, the official opposition, to the intent of this motion brought forward by MPP McCrimmon.

There is a lot of sage wisdom that was provided by the Information and Privacy Commissioner in their submission to this committee. I recognize that there’s probably far more that the commissioner would like to see this committee take action on, especially since there is so much evolving thought with respect to privacy and how information is shared and gathered. It speaks well of this committee’s wisdom should we take that advice.

Whether it’s the Auditor General or the Integrity Commissioner or the Lobbyists Registrar or the Information and Privacy Commissioner—any of these independent accountability officers, these direct advisers to the Legislative Assembly—nothing is worse than when we disregard their professional advice. They’re doing this not for their own health, as you can imagine; they’re very busy people. But their job is literally to provide advice to us, so that they can guide us with their counsel on how we can be better lawmakers. When we are serious and we take their advice into consideration, of course we can debate it—it is entirely at our discretion, because no one compels us to do it.

But I think when it comes to information and privacy and how we address this very important piece of work, none of us knows more than the commissioner—none of us. So I don’t see a reason why we should not adopt this motion and respect the professional advice that was given to us. This is wise counsel; we should accept it.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Is there any further debate? Further debate? I note there is none, Clerk. I will call the question on the proposed amendment 3.1 from the third party, section 13 of schedule 3.

### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gaultieri, Sarrazin.

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

We will move to the next proposed amendment from the government members, 4 in your package.

The parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General, MPP Gaultieri, please.

**MPP Silvia Gaultieri:** I move that section 13 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out “subsection 36(1)” in subsection 80.1(4) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 and substituting “subsection 36(2)”.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Did you have any explanatory narrative you’d like to offer?

**MPP Silvia Gaultieri:** No.

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

Debate on the proposed amendment? MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** It’s not so much debate, Chair, but I’m wondering if the member can read out the specific section that it’s substituting, because I had some difficulty following, to be quite honest.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** MPP Gaultieri, to the request, please.

**MPP Silvia Gaultieri:** I recommend voting for this motion because subsection 80.1(4) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, includes a reference to subsection 36(1) of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, MFIPPA, which is a provision of MFIPPA that allows individuals to request access to their personal information. Subsection 36(2) of MFIPPA allows individuals to request corrections to their personal information.

As drafted, subsection 80.1(4) would prevent individuals from requesting access to their personal information under MFIPPA but would not prevent individuals from following the MFIPPA process for requesting corrections to personal information. Replacing the reference to subsection 36(1) with a reference to subsection 36(2) of MFIPPA would prevent individuals from requesting corrections to their personal information under MFIPPA and ensure that a person uses the prescribed process instead, as intended.

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

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** To the member: Is this a matter of a technical amendment or is this a matter of a substantial amendment? I’m trying to understand this.

1530

**MPP Silvia Gaultieri:** I see it as a technical amendment.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** Thank you.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** I allowed the question across the floor, but typically, when I call for further debate, it’s not permitted—just so we know, going forward. I allowed it that time, but I thought, because we needed some explanatory background—okay?

MPP Stevens, please.

**Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens:** With that clarification, I was going to ask the member if she could—but it’s okay with that clarification. Thank you very much.

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

Any further debate? I don't see any, Clerk. I'm going to call the question.

All those in favour of the government's amendment 4, section 13 of schedule 3, please raise your hands.

#### Ayes

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

#### Nays

Stevens, Wong-Tam.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** The motion is carried.

We're going to move to the next amendment, 4.1, from the third party, section 13 of schedule 3. MPP McCrimmon.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 13 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 80.1(4) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019.

Can I—

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Yes, just explain the background.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** This is another recommendation from the Information and Privacy Commissioner. The bill transfers authority for personal information from the FIPPA and the Municipal Freedom of Information—both acts—to regulations under the Community Safety and Policing Act. The commissioner has specifically recommended that this subsection should be removed and has warned that creating parallel privacy laws could create confusing, inconsistent and diminished privacy rights. This amendment would keep the authority over personal information under the FIPPA and MFIPPA regime.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Any debate on the proposed amendment? I see none. Mr. Clerk, I'm going to call the question.

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

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

MPP McCrimmon, please introduce your third amendment, 4.2, for section 13 of schedule 3.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** This is the third recommended amendment from the commissioner.

I move that section 13 of schedule 3 to the bill be amended by striking out “or” at the end of clause 80.1(5)(a) of the Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019 and by adding the following clauses:

“(a.1) once there is no longer any reasonable belief that the person poses a significant risk to other persons or to property and the disclosure of the personal information is no longer necessary to reduce that risk;

“(a.2) if the information relates to a record suspension or conviction that has been overturned; or”

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Go ahead.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** This is the third one for the Information and Privacy Commissioner. This amendment creates a legal requirement that, once there's no longer a belief that this person poses any risk, or their conviction has been overturned, their information should be removed from the website. This is a just reason to restore someone's privacy.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Any further debate? I note that there isn't. I'm going to call the question.

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

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

Members, shall schedule 3, section 13, as amended, carry? Is there any debate? I note there is none. All those in favour of schedule 3, section 13, as amended, raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 3, section 13, as amended, carries.

Members, there are no amendments to sections 14 to 34. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Is there any debate? I note none.

Members, shall schedule 3, sections 14 to 34, carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. It's carried.

Shall schedule 3, as amended, carry? Is there any debate? No? All right. All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Clerk, schedule 3, as amended, has carried.

We're now on schedule 4, which is the Enforcement of Canadian Restraining Orders Act, 2026. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 10. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate? I note that there is none.

Shall schedule 4, sections 1 to 10, carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hand. Schedule 4, sections 1 to 10, carry.

Shall schedule 4 carry? All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 4 carries.

We're on schedule 5, Intercountry Adoption Act, 1998. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 16. With your concurrence, I propose that we bundle them. Thank you. Is there any debate? I note that there is none.

1540

Shall sections 1 to 16 within schedule 5 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 5, Clerk, has carried.

We're now on schedule 6, Pill Presses and Precursors Act, 2026. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 12, and I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Any debate? I hear none. I'll call the question.

On sections 1 to 12: All those in favour, please raise your hands. And there's no one opposed. Sections 1 to 12 carry.

Shall schedule 6 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 6 has carried.

We're now on schedule 7, which is the Planning Act. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3, and with your concurrence, I would like to bundle them, please. Agreed? Is there any debate? I don't see that there's any debate. I will ask the question.

Shall schedule 7, the Planning Act, sections 1 to 3, carry? Please raise your hands. Those opposed? Schedule 7, sections 1 to 3, carries.

Shall schedule 7 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 7 carries.

Schedule 8, Police Record Checks Reform Act, 2015: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 6. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Any debate? No.

On sections 1 to 6 of schedule 8: All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Sections 1 to 6 of schedule 8 have carried.

Shall schedule 8 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 8 carries.

We're on schedule 9, Prevention of and Remedies for Human Trafficking Act, 2017. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 13, and with your concurrence, I'd like to bundle them. Agreed? Thank you very much. On sections 1 to 13 of schedule 9: Any debate? No.

All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed—there isn't. Sections 1 to 13 of schedule 9 carry.

I'm now on schedule 9, section 14. We have three proposed amendments from the third party.

MPP McCrimmon, could you please introduce your first amendment, which is found in section 14 of schedule 9—4.3, please, in your packages.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 14 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by striking out the definition of “dispute threshold” in subsection 28(1) of the Prevention of and Remedies for Human Trafficking Act, 2017 and substituting the following:

“‘dispute threshold’ means, with respect to a debt amount, double the monetary jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court, as set out under section 23 of the Courts of Justice Act.”

It does change the definition of the dispute threshold to double the monetary jurisdiction. It increases the current

maximum amount of debt that can be disputed without going to the Superior Court from \$50,000 to \$100,000. That has been the experience—that it has been more than \$50,000 of forced debt, so they should have the opportunity to get rid of up to \$100,000 of forced indebtedness.

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

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** My comments will be short, just to once again say that we will be supporting this motion. Anything—any gestures, any reform—that will actually support survivors and make it easier for survivors is what this committee should be prioritizing as its actions. And this motion, this amendment, does that.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate? Further debate? I'm going to call the question.

### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Clerk, the proposed amendment 4.3 to section 14 of schedule 9 is lost.

MPP McCrimmon, back to you, please, for the second amendment.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 14 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following section to the Prevention of and Remedies for Human Trafficking Act, 2017:

“Reimbursement of coerced debts

“33.1 A creditor who received payments from a debtor in respect of a coerced debt any time on or after the day the Protection from Coerced Debts Incurred in relation to Human Trafficking Act, 2023 received royal assent shall reimburse the debtor for any amounts paid.”

This requires creditors to reimburse survivors who paid off their debts since passage of Bill 41 in December 2023, who were found to have been coerced under the framework of this bill. It's intended to try to make up for the uncertainty caused by the delay in the implementation.

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

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I want to lend our support for this amendment.

When Bill 41 passed in the Legislature with all-party support, I think there was a moment in the House when we recognized collectively that those who were already victims of human trafficking, who were forced into modern slavery and then forced into these coerced debts—I think every single one of the members recognized what a horrific ordeal the survivors went through, but also that the crime didn't necessarily stop once they were freed.

I think we all recognize how important it is to give people a path to rehabilitate and to rebuild their lives, and they can't do that when they've got a six-figure debt that they were forced into hanging over their heads.

1550

It's not the survivor's fault that they were captured and trafficked. And it's certainly not the survivor's fault that the government has now taken too long to move forward with regulations and commit to do what they promised to do, at a time when we felt—I think, all of us—a certain amount of hope that we were taking a positive step forward to supporting survivors of human trafficking, those who were forced to take on these horrific debts. This particular motion, this gesture is really what I would consider an integrity-driven measure; one that will correct what has slowed down the process. It's a gesture and a message to survivors that this government and everybody in the Legislative Assembly sees their pain, recognizes how difficult it is, and that we will take some action, even if it's through this motion, to fix it as soon as possible. They should not be punished because the government is dragging its feet.

So I want to really strongly lend our support to this amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate? Further debate? I note that there isn't any. I'm going to call the question, then, on the third party's second proposed amendment, 4.4, to section 14 of schedule 9.

#### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

#### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Clerk, the proposed amendment 4.4 to section 14, schedule 9, is lost.

MPP McCrimmon, please introduce your third amendment, 4.5, to section 14 of schedule 9.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 14 of schedule 9 to the bill be amended by adding the following section to the Prevention of and Remedies for Human Trafficking Act, 2017:

“Credit scores

“33.2. Every consumer reporting agency within the meaning of the Consumer Reporting Act shall ensure that the credit score of a victim of human trafficking is not negatively affected by any missed debt payments that occurred on or after the day the Protection from Coerced Debts Incurred in relation to Human Trafficking Act, 2023 received royal assent, and that the victim's credit score is restored to the level that would have applied if the missed debt payments had never occurred.”

This is just making sure that these people are not penalized for having missed payments, through negative items on their credit reports or a reduced credit score. Again, it's intended to try to make up for the uncertainty caused by the delay in implementing the legislation. It has been almost three years now, so it needs to be implemented soon. That's what that is—it's an attempt to try to make amends for the long time it has been delayed.

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

**Mrs. Jennifer (Jennie) Stevens:** This is a very supportive amendment to this bill.

We have to send a very strong message to the victims and let them know that once they're trying to get themselves back on their feet and back into the community—we have to make sure that we're making their lives seem as normal as they were prior to becoming a victim.

It's already hard enough for an individual to try to claw their way back out of debt, and then to see that they have six figures in debt again—just because they missed a payment that occurred on or after, they should not be penalized once again. It's not their fault that they were coerced into debt. I think this restores their faith that we hear them, we're listening, and we care. I think that's a very important thing that we have to let victims know—that every individual in the House hears them, sees them and understands. That little bit of tribute—that they can get out of debt, and making sure that we protect them is a little piece of very, very good gesture.

So I'm fully supportive of this amendment.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Any further debate? MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I'm just going to add my voice to this because I want us to all recognize that you cannot function in modern-day society without at least some credit. You can't rent an apartment. You can't get a credit card. You can't take out a student loan without some digital credit footprint that allows you to move forward.

Let us recognize that this motion, this amendment, puts the onus on the credit collecting agency, the consumer reporting agency, to make sure that they prioritize, when they're notified that someone was a victim of human trafficking and they were forced into debt—so it could have been through violent threats; it could have been through knife, being subjected to violence; it could have been at gunpoint. They were coerced into this debt. And if anybody has ever tried to function in modern society as an adult without some access to credit—it's just not possible anymore. This motion actually relieves those survivors from having to do that onerous work after they have finally gotten out of a horrific situation where they have been exploited—and it takes no effort from the government whatsoever, because it really is a requirement of the consumer credit reporting agency to do that work. So there's really no cost to the government. There's no cost to us, as MPPs. It is a simple and elegant solution to what is a long-standing problem for survivors once they have been removed and once they've escaped those exploitive relationships.

Richard Dunwoody was here. He told us that he spent his time and his energy and his own money to fight and to help survivors. He did that on his own, as a private citizen.

This is a very simple path forward that will help survivors take another step toward rebuilding their lives.

Please support this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate? I see none.

**Ayes**

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

**Nays**

Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Clerk, the proposed amendment 4.5, section 14 of schedule 9, is lost.

Members, shall schedule 9, section 14, carry? Is there any debate? I hear none. All those in favour of schedule 9, section 14, carrying, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 9, section 14, has carried.

Clerk, there are no amendments to sections 15 to 18. I propose that we bundle them. Agreed? Thank you. Sections 15 to 18 found in schedule 9: Debate? None.

On sections 15 to 18, found in schedule 9: All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed? Sections 15 to 18 found in schedule 9, Clerk, have carried.

Shall schedule 9 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 9 has carried.

Members, we're moving to schedule 10, which is the Private Security and Investigative Services Act, 2005.

We are moving to schedule 10, section 1. Is there any debate? No. Shall schedule 10, section 1, carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 10 found in section 1 has carried.

**1600**

We'll move now to schedule 10, section 2. We have amendment 4.6, proposed by the official opposition. MPP Wong-Tam.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** I move that section 2 of schedule 10 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 2 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Working group

“(10) The Standing Committee on Justice Policy shall establish a working group to review and make recommendations with respect to modernizing this act.

“Same

“(11) The working group shall be comprised of such stakeholders as the committee on justice policy considers appropriate, including subject-matter experts such as employers of private sector guards, registered employers of in-house guards, law enforcement, private investigators and agencies, unions representing guards, guard training entities and other related associations and organizations.

“Same

“(12) The working group shall report its recommendations to the Standing Committee on Justice Policy by December 31, 2027.”

And I'm happy to explain this motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Would you, please? Thank you.

**MPP Kristyn Wong-Tam:** We heard from a number of stakeholders and members of the public on Monday.

The recommendations coming from them and the requests coming from them were wide-ranging. Several individuals were asking for the ability to have armed guards sitting outside schools and places of worship.

We heard from the president of the Association of Professional Security Agencies, the APSA, who gave us a very lengthy written submission as well as what I thought was a really constructive and very informative oral presentation. What I had left with was that schedule 10, as it exists right now in the bill, is a largely supportable schedule, I think. But it was really Mr. Max Warmuth's presentation that quite moved me. He's the president of the APSA. What he submitted, both through his presentation here in the committee room as well as written submission, was that there is a need to modernize the act in total. This is the Private Security and Investigative Services Act. I want to draw your attention, committee members, to some words that he shared with us—this includes why the current framework is no longer enough: “Schedule 10 is useful but surgical. It improves regulatory administration and certain enforcement tools, but it does not address the structural conditions that allow non-compliant operators to flourish. Ontario's private security sector is facing a crisis of integrity, and the consequences reach beyond commercial interests of security agencies.” If that isn't a call for action and a call for the government and all of us to pay attention to the sector, I am not sure what is.

We heard from Cadillac Fairview, which is one of the largest commercial mall operators in the country, with sizable multi-billion dollar assets in iconic neighbourhoods and strategic placement with respect to tourism, visitor experience and retail shopping destinations. They cited some very specific concerns that they had, as well. And they are one of the largest employers of in-house security—my friend MPP Allsopp noted that in his remarks and question to them.

What we have now heard is that it's very easy to get a security licence. All you need to do is a 40-hour online course. You have to clear some basic police checks. Then you go on to the ServiceOntario website and you give a small amount of money. And voila, just like that, in two days, you will be a licensed security guard in the province of Ontario. As you can imagine, because the rules are so relaxed and there isn't really any oversight, what Mr. Warmuth cited is that there is now a market where there is significant abuse of guards. The classification and the duties carried out by these guards should be reviewed. There has to be more consistent training, so therefore the public—who is expecting that if there's a security guard standing at the door, the threshold of a place of worship, they know how to act, they know how to respond in the case of an emergency.

There's a whole host of considerations here that I think were placed before us, including the fact that there's a request for enhanced training and integrity of tests. Apparently, there are training entities where—not only do you get trained by these entities, but they give you the answers to the test. So it's a process that's no longer shielded and protected by integrity.

There are considerations to front-line security guard safety and what is expected of them and what exactly they are signing onto.

There have been cited concerns in the deputation around digital licensing and how it should be convenient and it should continue; however, certain digital credentials may be also difficult to alter and subject to breach.

There should be some type of minimum agency entry standards; surprisingly, there are none. So that means that there are 900 agencies that are employing security guards. You just have to apply for an agency licence, and you become an agency employer of security guards.

There are 130,000 security guards in the province of Ontario, which demonstrates to us that this is not necessarily a small sector. All of these individuals are supposed to have some role that is almost akin to law enforcement or policing. So if we expect our police officers to be trained, to keep in step with the expectations of the public, I think, at minimum, we need to give some consideration to how this committee thoughtfully and collaboratively moves forward on modernizing the Private Security and Investigative Services Act.

Our motion is straightforward—it's "let's work together." Let's bring those subject matter experts into a working group so that they can give their very best advice to this committee on how we proceed, so that we can avoid employee misclassification, we can avoid wrongdoings when it comes to subcontracting, and we can protect the consumers, and ensure that good workplace employment standards are there, that we get out the bad actors who are exploiting the workers and the guards and we only have the very best when it comes to private security agencies that are licensed and that can employ, that we have the very best in class, the very best-trained security guards, regardless of if they are working on behalf of the public sector—because we have private security from time to time in government agencies—as well as working for the private sector. So that's what this motion is. Let's get to work. Let's fix this, because, clearly, schedule 10 is a start, but apparently we have a lot more work to do.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate? Further debate? I will call the question on proposed amendment 4.6, section 2 of schedule 10.

### Ayes

Stevens, Wong-Tam.

### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

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

Shall schedule 10, section 2, carry? Is there any further debate? Further debate? I'll call the question.

Shall schedule 10, section 2, carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 10, section 2, Clerk, is carried.

Committee members, there are no amendments to section 3 to 18 found in schedule 10. Your concurrence, please, to bundle them—agreed? Thank you. Any debate? I note none.

**1610**

On sections 3 to 18 found in schedule 10: All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Clerk, sections 3 to 18 found in schedule 10 of Bill 119 have carried.

Members of committee, shall schedule 10 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 10, Clerk, found in Bill 119 has carried.

We're now on schedule 11, the Provincial Animal Welfare Services Act, 2019.

Committee members, there are no amendments to sections 1 to 2. With your concurrence, please, I will bundle them. Agreed? Agreed. Any debate? No? There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 found in schedule 11 of Bill 119. All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Sections 1 to 2 found in schedule 11, Clerk, have carried.

Shall schedule 11 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 11 found in Bill 119, Clerk, has carried.

Committee members, we're now on schedule 12, Provincial Offences Act.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 21, and I would seek your concurrence to bundle them, please. Agreed? Thank you. Any debate? I note none.

Clerk, on sections 1 to 21 found in schedule 12: All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Clerk, sections 1 to 21 found in schedule 12 of Bill 119 have carried.

We have, from the third party—found on page 40 of your package—a notice for schedule 12. Any debate on it?

MPP McCrimmon, would you introduce the notice found in schedule 12, please?

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I'm recommending voting against schedule 12 of the bill.

The reason for the notice rather than a motion is that if the committee wishes to remove an entire schedule from the bill, the rules of parliamentary procedure require that the committee vote against the schedule rather than pass a motion to delete it.

I'm arguing against removing the requirement that a justice be present to support a plea deal. If this passes, it means the prosecutor informs the court through a prescribed method just recorded by a Clerk, without a justice being present—that's why the notice is for it.

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

Shall schedule 12 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Clerk, schedule 12 of Bill 119 has carried.

Committee members, we're now on schedule 13, found on page 41 of your package: Social Work and Social

Service Work Act, 1998. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2. With your concurrence, I would like to bundle them, please. Thank you very much. Any debate? I note that there's none.

On sections 1 to 2 found in schedule 13 of Bill 119: All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Clerk, sections 1 to 2 found in schedule 13 of Bill 119 have carried.

Shall schedule 13 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Clerk, schedule 13 found in Bill 119 has carried.

We're on to schedule 14, Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3. Your concurrence, please, to bundle them—agreed? Thank you. Any debate?

Clerk, sections 1 to 3 found in schedule 14 of Bill 119: All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. Sections 1 to 3 found in schedule 14, Clerk, have carried.

Section 4, found in schedule 14: We have a proposed amendment from the third party. MPP McCrimmon, please introduce it—and a little narrative dealing with the explanation.

**Mrs. Karen McCrimmon:** I move that section 4 of schedule 14 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 38(1)(a.2) of the Special Investigations Unit Act, 2019.

The rationale for this: Section 4 gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which is the Premier and his cabinet ministers, the power to add officials to the SIU Act's oversight but also to exempt them from parts of the act. By removing clause (a.2), it removes the power to only partially apply the act, preventing the Lieutenant Governor in Council from limiting the SIU's oversight.

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Further debate on proposed amendment 5 to section 4, schedule 14? I note, Clerk, that there is none. I will call the question on the proposed amendment.

### Ayes

McCrimmon, Stevens, Wong-Tam.

### Nays

Allsopp, Babikian, Beattie, Gualtieri, Sarrazin.

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

Shall schedule 14, section 4, carry? Is there any debate? I note that there's none. I will call the question. Shall schedule 14, section 4, carry? All those in favour, raise your hands, please. All those opposed, raise your hands. Schedule 14, section 4, found in Bill 119, has carried.

Shall schedule 14, section 5, carry? Is there any debate? No. All those in favour of schedule 14, section 5, raise your hands, please. All those opposed, raise your hands. Clerk, schedule 14, section 5, found in Bill 119, has carried.

Committee members, shall schedule 14 carry? Is there any debate? I note there's none, Clerk. I'll call the question. Shall schedule 14 carry? Raise your hands, please. All those opposed, raise your hands. Clerk, schedule 14 has carried.

Committee members, we're on schedule 15, Towing and Storage Safety and Enforcement Act, 2021. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 6. With your concurrence, I would like to bundle them, please. Agreed? Okay. Any debate?

On sections 1 to 6 found in schedule 15 of Bill 119: All those in favour, raise your hand. All those opposed, raise your hand. It's carried.

**1620**

Shall schedule 15 carry? Is there any debate? Okay. All those in favour of schedule 15, raise your hands, please. All those opposed? Schedule 15 found in Bill 119 has carried.

We are now on schedule 16, Victims' Bill of Rights, 1995. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 8. I propose that we bundle them, please. Agreed? Thank you. Any debate?

Committee members, on sections 1 to 8 found in schedule 16 of Bill 119: All those in favour, raise your hands, please. Opposed? It carries.

Shall schedule 16 carry? Any debate? I'll call the question. All those in favour, raise your hands. It's unanimous. Thank you, committee members.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Lorne Coe):** Okay. We need to return to sections 1, 2 and 3 on the very first page of your package.

Is there any debate on section 1? I see none, Clerk. I'll pose the question. All those in favour of section 1 of Bill 119, please raise your hand. It's unanimous. Section 1 is carried.

On section 2, commencement: Is there any debate? I note none. All those in favour of section 2, commencement, please raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. It's unanimous. Section 2, commencement, has carried.

Section 3, short title: Is there any debate? I will call the question. Shall section 3, short title, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. It's unanimous. Clerk, section 3, short title, has carried.

Members of the committee, shall the preamble of the bill carry? Any debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Mr. Clerk, the preamble of the bill has carried.

Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, raise your hands. It carries.

Shall Bill 119, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Bill 119, as amended, carries.

Shall I report Bill 119, as amended, to the House? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. It's carried.

Committee members, thank you so much. It has been a really long week. I know that. But everyone really did a good job. I appreciate it very much.

*Interjections.*

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

There being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned until October 28 at 1 o'clock, when we'll have the Honourable Greg Rickford coming in to talk about his estimates.

*The committee adjourned at 1626.*

## **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**

Mr. Aris Babikian (Scarborough–Agincourt PC)

Mr. Jeff Beattie (Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton–Est–Stoney Creek PC)

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

### **Clerk / Greffier**

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

### **Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Eric Chamney, legislative counsel