

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

F-8

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

F-8

**Standing Committee on  
Finance and Economic Affairs**

Progress on the Plan to Build Act  
(Budget Measures), 2022

1<sup>st</sup> Session  
43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament

Thursday 1 December 2022

**Comité permanent  
des finances  
et des affaires économiques**

Loi de 2022 sur la progression  
du plan pour bâtir (mesures  
budgétaires)

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

Jeudi 1<sup>er</sup> décembre 2022

---

Chair: Ernie Hardeman  
Clerk: Michael Bushara

Président : Ernie Hardeman  
Greffier : Michael Bushara

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

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

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

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

---

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



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

ISSN 1180-4386

## CONTENTS

Thursday 1 December 2022

Progress on the Plan to Build Act (Budget Measures), 2022, Bill 36, Mr. Bethlenfalvy / Loi de 2022 sur la progression du plan pour bâtir (mesures budgétaires), projet de loi 36, M. Bethlenfalvy .....	F-61
---	------



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

Thursday 1 December 2022

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES  
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES**

Jeudi 1<sup>er</sup> décembre 2022

*The committee met at 0901 in committee room 1.*

**PROGRESS ON THE PLAN TO BUILD  
ACT (BUDGET MEASURES), 2022  
LOI DE 2022 SUR LA PROGRESSION  
DU PLAN POUR BÂTIR  
(MESURES BUDGÉTAIRES)**

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 36, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact and amend various statutes / Projet de loi 36, Loi visant à mettre en oeuvre les mesures budgétaires et à édicter et à modifier diverses lois.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Good morning, everyone. I call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs to order. We're meeting today for the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 36, An Act to implement Budget measures and to enact and amend various statutes.

Julia Hood from legislative counsel is here to assist us with our work, should you have any questions for her. We also have the ministry counsel appearing today, in person and over Zoom, if you have any questions for them.

A copy of the numbered amendments filed with the Clerk has been distributed electronically. The amendments are numbered in the order in which the sections and the schedules appear in the bill. If a member indicates that they wish to move additional amendments, we will take a short recess to allow the member to consult with legislative counsel to draft the motion.

Are there questions before we start? Seeing none, before we begin with the consideration of specific sections of the bill and accompanying schedules, I will allow members to make comments and ask questions on the bill as a whole, or to generally highlight any amendments they intend to bring forward. Afterwards, debate will be limited to specifically on the amendment, section or schedule under consideration.

Committee members, pursuant to standing order 83, are there any comments or questions on the bill as a whole? MPP Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I want to thank research for compiling what we heard from delegations. I do want to point out to the government members that when you put out a call for delegations on Thursday at 5 o'clock and you close it on Monday at 5 o'clock, you get very few people. So if the government is serious about consultation, then give people more time to appear.

For us, the fall economic statement—and I've been very clear, on behalf of His Majesty's official opposition—misses the mark, especially given what we're seeing in our health care system. The fall economic statement, traditionally, is an opportunity for the government to adjust and to respond to what has happened between the budget period, the original budget that was tabled, and midway through the year. On this, the government failed, so it will be no surprise that we won't be supporting the fall economic statement.

We have introduced an amendment. We would have introduced many, many, many more amendments, had we been permitted to do so, but because the fall economic statement did not significantly address health care or education, which are the pressing issues that we're seeing in Ontario right now, we were limited based on what we could amend. That, in itself, should be a strong indicator to the government that if you're not addressing the core issues—like the pressure on the pediatric ICUs, like the emergency room closures, like the backlog in surgeries—and you're not adjusting for that in a fall economic statement, then you're completely and utterly disconnected from the people who we're elected to serve.

And I just want to say, even though we're very limited in the delegations that came before us, certainly the one that stands out for me is Rachel Muir from the Ontario Nurses' Association Local 83. I thought her testimony was so powerful because it does counter, in a very real and direct way, what we're hearing from the Minister of Health—and from the Premier, for that matter. When I asked her, "The minister says the plan is working," she came back at us and said, "There is no plan." There are lots of words, there may be even good intentions, but if those intentions are not resourced, then they're just empty words.

The other delegation that struck me was the National Chronic Pain Society. They identified some concerns with how the government is readjusting how you are investing in health care. They basically just were pleading with the government to not apply a cookie-cutter approach to chronic-pain solutions, which are those nerve blockers. Limiting them to 16 is not going to be an effective way to address this, and then there are other costs that are associated with it.

But I really do want to go back to the testimony when the Minister of Finance was before us. I questioned him on Bill 124. Since that questioning, the court ruling obviously came out on Tuesday. It's fairly unprecedented that a

court—once again, the government had to go to court, or the people had to take the government to court; I want to thank those people for doing so. But at the end of the day, the judge ruled that Bill 124 was unconstitutional.

Some of the members, actually, on the finance committee were not here when Bill 124 was introduced, and I will tell you that it has had a chilling effect on our health human resources in Ontario, because it is wage-suppression legislation. When the court ruled on Bill 124, the justice found Ontario was not facing a financial situation that justified an infringement of charter rights; in fact, he found that the government didn't provide a rationale at all for needing the legislation to cut costs.

He went on to say, "Ontario has not ... explained why it was necessary to infringe on constitutional rights to impose wage constraint at the same time as it was providing tax cuts or licence plate sticker refunds that were more than 10 times larger than the savings obtained from wage restraint..." So he's pointing out that the government did not have to impose Bill 124, and in the end the people of Ontario are going to end up paying more. In fact, the initial price tag is up to \$8 billion, and those reparations will be coming out court by court by court, and then the government is spending more money on lawyers. The government of Ontario, under the leadership of Mr. Ford, has been to court 15 times and has lost every single time.

In conclusion—because there really is no sense drawing this out any longer, although my colleagues, I know, are really enjoying it—after all of these years, after countless protests, workers are leaving the health sector in droves. There was no justification for Bill 124. The fall economic statement actually was an opportunity for the government to—because you must have known that this was going to happen, because there were no grounds to move forward with Bill 124. But the fall economic statement was a really good opportunity to recognize that wage-suppression legislation which overrides charter rights is pushing nurses out of our hospital system, and the people of Ontario are paying the price for that.

Thanks very much, Chair, for your patience.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion? MPP Bowman.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Just a question, Chair: Is this the time that I should speak to my proposed amendment, or do I do that later?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** This is an opportunity to speak to the bill generally, not individual sections.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Okay. Thanks.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further discussion? MPP Crawford.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** I think the members opposite know we had a budget that came out in August of this year, so just a couple months ago. We ran on that budget in the election in June. We have a larger majority than we've ever received here in Ontario, with over 80 seats, and the people overwhelmingly supported it. The budget that we put out just a few months ago had the largest investment ever in the history of Ontario in health care and education.

With that, this particular bill, the fall economic statement, is filling in a few of the gaps. The guaranteed annual income payment for 12 months for low-income seniors, increasing by 100%. I certainly hope the opposition will support that.

**0910**

Extending the temporary gas by 5.7 cents a litre for an additional year: We've had tremendous feedback on that from individuals, families, businesses. Given the high rate of gas right now and the inflationary environment, it is huge savings to the people of Ontario, and I think they're overwhelmingly supportive of that.

Also, increasing the ODSP allowance: We heard from people in this committee that were hiring people based on this. Some of them in the past couldn't work because the limit of \$200—there was an exemption of \$200, where after that their ODSP would be clawed back. We are moving that to \$1,000. What we're doing by that is (1) helping those folks and (2) helping businesses that have a huge labour shortage in the province of Ontario. Our government estimates up to 25,000 additional people will be brought into the workforce to work more, so it's a win-win-win for Ontario.

I hope the opposition will support us with the fall economic statement. I think it's a good blueprint and a good follow-up to the budget we passed in the summer.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion, debate? No further comments? As the committee will notice, Bill 36 is comprised of three sections and 10 schedules. In order to deal with the bill in an orderly fashion, I suggest that we postpone the first three sections of the bill in order to dispose of the schedules first. This allows the committee to consider the contents of the schedules before dealing with the sections on the commencement and the short title of the bill. We will return to the three sections after completing the consideration of the schedules. Is there unanimous consent to stand down the three sections of the bill and deal with the schedules first? Thank you.

With that, we will begin on section 1 of schedule 1 of the bill. There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 1; therefore, I propose that we bundle the sections. Is there agreement? Are the members prepared to vote—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Oh, yes, sorry. Any debate on sections 1 to 7? Any debate? If there's no debate, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of sections 1 to 7 of schedule 1? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 1 carry? Any debate on the whole schedule? If there's no debate, shall it carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 1 is carried.

Schedule 2: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 2. I therefore propose we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? We'll do that. Is there debate on sections 1 and 2 of schedule 2? Any debate? If there's no debate, shall I put the question? All those in favour? All those opposed? Sections 1 and 2 of schedule 2 carry.

Shall schedule 2 carry? Any discussion? No discussion. All those in favour of schedule 2? All those opposed? Schedule 2 carries.

Schedule 3: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 3. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any discussion on sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3? If there's no discussion, shall I put the question? All those in favour of sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3? All those opposed? Carried.

Is there any discussion on schedule 3? No discussion on schedule 3. Shall schedule 3 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 3 is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 4. Therefore I propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any discussion on sections 1 to 7 of schedule 4? There's no discussion. I'll put the question. All those in favour of sections 1 to 7 of schedule 4? All those opposed? The motion is carried. Sections 1 to 7 of schedule 4 carry.

Is there any debate on schedule 4? No debate. Shall schedule 4 carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Schedule 4 carries.

Schedule 5, section 1: Is there any debate or discussion on section 1 of schedule 5? If there is no debate on section 1, all those in favour? All those opposed? Section 1 of schedule 5 carries.

There is an amendment in section 2. Does anybody want to propose the amendment? It's an independent amendment. MPP Bowman?

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** I move that section 2 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 3 of the Executive Council Act:

“Reduction in case of multiple parliamentary assistants....

“Despite subsection (4), if two or more parliamentary assistants are assigned to assist the same minister, their salary shall be reduced to 7.15% of the annual salary of a member of the assembly.”

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** I'll just ask if we could repeat the numbering in the front of the section.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Oh. “(4.0.1)”.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Debate on the amendment? MPP Bowman.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** I proposed this amendment because this government, as the public knows, has increased the number of parliamentary assistants in this Legislature, up to 43 from 25 in the last Parliament. With all due respect to the PAs in the room, that's a 72% increase in staffing to do the same work. I don't feel that that's either efficient—which this government certainly says that they believe in—nor do I think it's fiscally responsible.

With 18 extra PAs at an increase of \$16,600 each, that's a cost to the taxpayers of almost \$300,000—\$298,800. That's a 14% pay raise for those individuals who are second parliamentary assistants. I think that in a time of, again, when the government is proposing or has restrained wages in other sectors and is concerned about risks in the economic future of the province, that this measure of theirs

is actually a little bit disrespectful to the taxpayers of Ontario. I would like to see them, in good faith, say that since they are now sharing the workload—one position's work is now being done by two people—that those people would share the normal increase of \$16,600, that they would share that increase.

**0920**

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further debate on the amendment? MPP Crawford.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** I'm not sure if the Chair would rule this out of order. The standing order of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on money bills states, “Any bill, resolution, motion or address, the passage of which would impose a tax or specifically direct the allocation of public funds, shall not be passed by the House unless recommended by a message from the Lieutenant Governor, and shall be proposed only by a minister of the crown.” So I'm not sure if you would rule this out of order, but that would be my suggestion.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** We have ministry staff with us this morning. I think it would be appropriate to ask the ministry staff on the legal opinion of whether this motion would be in order.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Chair, may I add a comment?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** MPP Bowman.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Just a comment that this is a reduction in the amount of money spent, not an increase. So I think in the spirit of the orders, perhaps—or that it's talking about increasing, providing new money to programs versus a slight decrease.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** I think if the parliamentary assistant wishes to request the opinion of someone beyond the Clerk of the Committee as to whether the motion is in order—

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** Does the Clerk—

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** So we need a legal opinion to answer your question.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** I've just been advised by the Clerk: The motion is in order because it does not propose a further tax.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** Sorry; it is?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** The suggestion that the member is making would mean that it was an infraction because it was increasing a cost. This is not increasing a cost.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** So it's in order?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Yes.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** So it's the suggestion of the Clerk?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** That's the opinion of the Clerk.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** Okay.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further debate on the amendment to section 2 of the act? MPP Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I wasn't going to weigh in on this, but I think it's very strange and fairly unprecedented that parliamentary assistants would be in a committee and voting on a motion to cut their own salaries. The issue

around MPP salaries is a politically charged one—I think I can honestly say that—and at no time should people who can benefit or be hurt by it be in charge of making a decision around their own compensation. I would be very supportive of an independent third party determining what MPP salaries should be at, but the government has already determined, through this fall economic statement, that that will not be forthcoming. So it's a fairly strange circumstance for MPPs to be in, around determining their own compensation in a committee.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further discussion on the amendment? No further discussion on the amendment. Shall I put the question on the amendment? All those in favour of the amendment? All those opposed? The amendment is lost.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Sorry, Chair. How do we do a recorded vote?

**Interjection:** It's too late.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** When was the time for a recorded vote?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** The recorded vote must be requested before I call the vote.

Now, with that done, going back to section 2 of schedule 5: Any further debate on section 2? If not, all those in favour of section 2? All those opposed to section 2? Section 2 carries.

Schedule 5, section 3: Any discussion or debate on section 3 of schedule 5? If not, is the committee prepared to vote? I'll put the question. All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 3 of schedule 5 carries.

Shall schedule 5 carry? Debate? If not, all those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 5 carries.

Schedule 6: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 6. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Is there any debate on sections 1 and 2? If there is no debate, are you prepared to vote? Shall schedule 6, sections 1 and 2, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Did I do that one?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Debate on schedule 6?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Yes, just very quickly: We did receive some notice from some delegations in written form that this measure should be extended indefinitely. You've extended the guaranteed annual income, I believe until January 2024. We would have proposed extending it and making it permanent, but that would be money; we're limited in making that amendment. So I hope that the government does give some consideration to making that a permanent change.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further debate on schedule 6? If not, are we prepared to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 6 carries.

Schedule 7, section 1 has an amendment put forward. MPP Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 10(6) of the Pension Benefits Act.

I'm happy to speak to that.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Okay. Debate on the amendment? MPP Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** This strikes subsection 1(2) of schedule 7. It strikes a section that would require existing multi-employment plans, known as MEPPs, to convert to target benefit plans. However, MEPPs are already target benefit plans. With this provision, they would have to go through a conversion process and notify their members of the possibility of accrued benefit reductions.

**0930**

This process was adopted in Alberta and BC. It results in a lot of confusion and it incurs substantial costs to various folks. So basically, this schedule—and the minister actually addressed this, when we had the finance minister in front of us. On page 72 of the fall economic statement, the government says that this direction is in order to pave the way for more employers to have pensions. However, target benefit plans have not been rolled out successfully across the country.

In particular, New Brunswick really started this process 10 years ago. They created a structure to operate target benefit plans, but they're called "shared risk pension plans." Over the 10 years, though, it has been fairly messy for that province. New Brunswick has faced legal challenges over the change. Unions note that the pension plan model shifted the risk of bearing financial risk and bearing the financial market volatility almost entirely on the plan members, which actually runs counter to the entire principle of having a pension. A pension is supposed to be a reliable, set amount of money that is adjusted around cost of inflation and other cost drivers.

And essentially, when this happened—and I'm putting this on the record because I can see this potentially being a future issue, especially given what the province went through when the former Liberal government promised pensions for everybody. I don't know if you remember the commercials of people just jumping over a canyon and getting, magically, to a pension. I remember in the 2014 election, a lady said to me, "Well, I want a pension." I said, "Do you work?" She was like, "No, but the Premier has promised me a pension."

Pensions can be a very political, volatile issue for many people, because there is a group of people in Ontario who has them, and there is a larger group of people in the province who don't. The people who have the pensions, though—what they don't know about target benefit pension plans is that employers could move their defined benefit plan and make them targets. So we are putting up the red flag on this and making the case that let's not make the same mistake other provinces have.

In the fall economic statement, the minister outlines that the implementation of a target-benefit-plan framework—the reason I'm nervous is because the Liberal started the process. So I don't want to build a new strategy around pensions on something that the former Liberal government had put in place because I have trust issues on both fronts.

I wanted to make sure that, on a go-forward basis, defined benefit plans won't be converted to targeted pension benefit plans, because, actually, what we've seen



in New Brunswick is that because the cost of living and inflation has driven up the cost of living for those pensioners, their pension no longer meets their needs. In New Brunswick, it's pushing a good number of people into poverty, because it's running counter to the entire idea of a pension.

In fact, the federal government tried to go down this road, but they got pushback from a variety of stakeholders saying that the change was a form of wage theft, as their defined benefit pensions were a form of deferred wages.

So that's the reason why we put forward this motion. It's an indication based on our consultation with a number of unions that this could go sideways very quickly.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion? MPP Bowman.

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** I would just like to say, I support this amendment, and if I could ask the Chair's indulgence to allow me to make sure I ask for the recorded vote at the right time. Thank you.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion? MPP Byers.

**Mr. Rick Byers:** Thanks to the committee for the opportunity to discuss this amendment. Pension plans are important, and with target benefit pension plans, the goal is to provide employees with protection in retirement and predictable contributions for employers. What I really like about what we're doing, what we're proposing here, is that we're proposing a series of consultations.

I think the most important element of these target benefit plans is they allow for multi-employer participation. One of the risks if you're changing jobs through your work career is that you may start pension benefits at one employer but move to another, and they're lost if you haven't had enough time. What I really like about this initiative is we're maintaining the integrity of target benefit plans but we're also opening up realistically the possibility of more participation by employers to give them more certainty in how they manage plans. I think this is important. Obviously, we will watch how this is implemented going forward and make sure it's achieving the goals that we want it to. I look forward to that.

I spent part of my career at the OMERS pension plan and saw pensions first-hand and how they're managed and administered. I very much like what we're doing, and I'm happy to see this fall economic statement for the target benefit initiative move forward.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion? MPP Fife.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** I listened closely to what MPP Byers has said, but the reason we brought forward this motion is that—you've talked about how important pensions are—in New Brunswick the implementation saw the government defined benefit systems transition to the shared-risk pension. So the government was permissive; employers moved to targeted. The risk around targeted pension plans is that they're just that, they're just a target, and so the target can move if the pension plan does not perform well. So in New Brunswick, after 10 years, employee pensions are unable to fund full cost-of-living amounts in 2023.

I understand the government is going to go through a consultation process. I hope that we hear loud and clear from pensioners across the province that moving in this direction will only increase their risk as pensioners, not the employer risk.

With that, I see that the government is not going to support the motion, but in our capacity as the official opposition, we have to make sure that the government understands that we should be learning from other jurisdictions. We don't have to make the same mistakes as New Brunswick; we can actually avoid that. With that, Chair, it's fine.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further discussion on the amendment?

**Mr. Rick Byers:** A quick comment, Mr. Chair, on those comments—two comments from me: Number one, we will look to other experience in other jurisdictions in our consideration of this.

There was momentum here. The member opposite is saying the risk is moving defined benefit pension plans to target. I'd frankly look at the other momentum here. We're trying to increase the access for pension plan availability to workers in Ontario. That's our goal. That's what these consultations, hopefully, will help us do. Thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Further discussion on the amendment? If not, shall I put the question on the amendment?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Recorded vote, please.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** A recorded vote on the amendment.

Any further discussion? If not, I'll put the question.

### Ayes

Bowman, Fife, Kernaghan.

### Nays

Anand, Brady, Byers, Crawford, Cuzzetto, Dowie, David Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** The motion is lost.

Section 1 of schedule 7: Further discussion on section 1? If not, I'll call the question: All those in favour of section 1 of schedule 7? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

### 0940

There are no amendments to sections 2 and 3 of schedule 7. I therefore propose that we bundle those sections. Is there an agreement? Seeing no objection, I'll put the question on sections 2 and 3. Any debate? No debate. Shall I put the question on sections 2 and 3 of schedule 7? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall schedule 7 carry? Any discussion on the section? If not, shall schedule 7 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 7 is carried.

Schedule 8: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 8. I therefore propose that we bundle the sections. Is there agreement? Agreed. Any debate on sections 1 and 2 of schedule 8? No debate. Shall sections 1 and 2 of schedule 8 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried. Sections 1 and 2 of schedule 8 carry.

Shall schedule 8 carry? Any debate? No debate?

**Ms. Stephanie Bowman:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** A recorded vote is requested. Any further debate? I'll put the question.

### Ayes

Anand, Bowman, Brady, Byers, Crawford, Cuzzetto, Dowie, Fife, Kernaghan, David Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Thank you. Schedule 8 carries.

Schedule 9: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 7 of schedule 9. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there any disagreement to that? Everyone agrees. Debate on sections 1 to 7 of schedule 9? If there is no debate, shall I put the question? Shall sections 1 to 7 of schedule 9 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Sections 1 to 7 of schedule 9 carry.

Shall schedule 9 carry? Any debate? If there's no debate, I'll put the question. Shall schedule 9 carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Schedule 9 carries.

Schedule 10: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 10. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there an agreement? If there's no disagreement, then any discussion on sections 1 and 2 of schedule 10?

**Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto:** Chair, can we get a recorded vote on it?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** MPP Cuzzetto would like a recorded vote. Is there any further debate?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Just a clarification. What is the MPP asking for a recorded vote on?

**Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto:** Schedule 10.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** All of schedule 10?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Schedule 10: Is there further debate on that? If not, a recorded vote has been requested on that, so I will put the question.

### Ayes

Anand, Byers, Crawford, Cuzzetto, Dowie, David Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** All those opposed? Sections 1 and 2 of schedule 10 carry.

Shall schedule 10 carry? Debate? Any debate on schedule 10? If not, shall I put the question? All those in favour of schedule 10? All those opposed? Schedule 10 carries.

That finishes the schedules. We're now back to the deferred votes for the set-aside sections. We're at section 1. Discussion or debate on section 1? No debate? No

further debate? I'll put the question on section 1: All those in favour? Opposed? Section 1 is carried.

Section 2: Any debate on section 2? Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Section 2 carries.

Section 3, the short title: Any debate on the title? No debate? All those in favour of section 3? All those opposed? Section 3 carries.

Shall the title of the bill carry? Any debate? If not, all those in favour of the title of the bill? Opposed? Carried.

Shall Bill 36 carry?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** A recorded vote for the bill, Bill 36. Any debate? No debate.

### Ayes

Anand, Byers, Crawford, Cuzzetto, Dowie, David Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

### Nays

Bowman, Fife, Kernaghan.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Bill 36 is carried. Shall I report the bill to the House? Any disagreement on that? No disagreement. All those in favour? Carried.

*Interjections.*

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Oh, you're too late—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Was there a recorded vote requested? I didn't think so.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Chair?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Yes.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Thanks very much. I have a question for the committee: Are you completing this part? Is this part done? Is the painful part done?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Yes.

Shall I report the bill to the House? All those in favour?

**Interjection:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Okay, recorded vote requested.

### Ayes

Anand, Brady, Byers, Crawford, Cuzzetto, Dowie, David Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** The motion is carried.

I thank everyone for all the hard work in getting this bill through the committee this morning before we had to adjourn the morning session. And now we look forward. Is there anyone who has an issue they'd like to bring up?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Just a question. I understand that the finance committee will be travelling for the first time in many years to do our due diligence on budget consultation. I was wondering if we could know the dates for travel as soon as possible, so that we can plan accordingly. And I was curious about the process. Will this be discussed at a future organizational meeting? Is it the

subcommittee? I'm looking for clarity on those questions. Have you got clarity?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** MPP Crawford.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** Further to that, I have a motion. I move that the committee meet in closed session on Wednesday, December 7, 2022, at 1 p.m., for the purpose of organizing committee business.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** We're moving the motion?

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** I moved the motion.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Just hold up for a minute so we all get a copy of the motion.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** Would you like me to present it to you?

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Yes.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** No, we don't need to have a copy. It's a fairly straightforward motion and it makes sense. I think we're in agreement.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** If the committee is prepared to debate the motion without, maybe we can put it on the screen.

Mr. Crawford, if you would like to move the motion.

**Mr. Stephen Crawford:** I move that the committee meet in closed session on Wednesday, December 7, 2022, at 1 p.m., for the purpose of organizing committee business.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Discussion on the motion?

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** This makes sense for us to meet and to discuss the process because it hasn't happened for a number of years. I see no reason for it to be in camera, but that's our usual complaint, so I'm just being consistent with my complaining.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** Any further discussion on the motion? All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

Any other questions or comments before we adjourn this meeting?

**Mr. Deepak Anand:** Chair, I just want to say thank you for your hard work.

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Use the gavel. Let's go.

**The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman):** The committee stands adjourned.

*The committee adjourned at 0953.*

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

**Chair / Président**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

**Vice-Chair / Vice-Président**

Mr. Terence Kernaghan (London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord ND)

Mr. Deepak Anand (Mississauga–Malton PC)

Ms. Stephanie Bowman (Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest L)

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady (Haldimand–Norfolk IND)

Mr. Rick Byers (Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound PC)

Mr. Stephen Crawford (Oakville PC)

Mr. Rudy Cuzzetto (Mississauga–Lakeshore PC)

Mr. Andrew Dowie (Windsor–Tecumseh PC)

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Mr. Terence Kernaghan (London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord ND)

Mr. David Smith (Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre PC)

Ms. Effie J. Triantafilopoulos (Oakville North–Burlington / Oakville-Nord–Burlington PC)

**Clerk / Greffier**

Mr. Michael Bushara

**Staff / Personnel**

Ms. Julia Hood, legislative counsel