

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

---

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

HE-23

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

Helping Homebuyers,  
Protecting Tenants Act, 2023

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

Wednesday 24 May 2023

## **Journal des débats (Hansard)**

HE-23

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

Loi de 2023  
visant à aider les acheteurs  
et à protéger les locataires

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

Mercredi 24 mai 2023

---

Chair: Laurie Scott  
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Présidente : Laurie Scott  
Greffier : Isaiah Thorning

### **Hansard on the Internet**

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

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

### **Index inquiries**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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



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

ISSN 2816-7252

## CONTENTS

Wednesday 24 May 2023

Helping Homebuyers, Protecting Tenants Act, 2023, Bill 97, Mr. Clark / Loi de 2023 visant à aider les acheteurs et à protéger les locataires, projet de loi 97, M. Clark.....	HE-493
Committee business.....	HE-531



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

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

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

Wednesday 24 May 2023

Mercredi 24 mai 2023

*The committee met at 1001 in committee room 1.*

HELPING HOMEBUYERS,  
PROTECTING TENANTS ACT, 2023  
LOI DE 2023  
VISANT À AIDER LES ACHETEURS  
ET À PROTÉGER LES LOCATAIRES

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 97, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing and development/ Projet de loi 97, Loi modifiant diverses lois en ce qui concerne le logement et l'aménagement.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We are here to conduct clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 97, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to housing and development. We are joined by staff from legislative counsel, Hansard, and broadcasting and recording. Please wait until I recognize you before starting to speak. As always, all comments should go through the Chair.

Are there any questions before we begin? Seeing none, the Clerk has distributed the amendment package to all members and staff electronically. Are there any comments or questions to any section or schedule of the bill, and if so, to which section?

Seeing none, we will now begin clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. Bill 97 is comprised of three sections which enact seven 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? MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Just to clarify, that means you're disposing of the title and things like that and we're going to the—that's what that means, right?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes, sections 1, 2 and 3, commencement and short title.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes, sounds good.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** The usual, and then we come back to the clause-by-clause.

We'll begin with schedule 1, the Building Code Act, 1992. There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2, so I propose we bundle them. Everybody agree? Okay. All right, no debate. Thank you.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** So there's no debate on sections 1 and 2, just to clarify? No, no debate. Shall sections 1 and 2 carry? Carried.

Schedule 1 as a whole: Is there any debate on schedule 1? Seeing none, shall schedule 1 carry? Carried.

We'll now move to schedule 2, the City of Toronto Act, 2006. Schedule 2, section 1: I believe we have an NDP amendment, which is 0.1. MPP Bell, please go ahead.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thank you so much, Chair. I'm going to make my opening remarks about this bill now and then I'll move to the schedule itself. Or should I read the amendment first?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Okay, I'm going to read the first amendment. I move that subsection 1(1) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(1) Subsection 111(1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 is repealed and the following substituted:

“Demolition, conversion and repairs and renovation of residential rental properties

“(1) The city may prohibit and regulate,

“(a) the demolition of residential rental properties;

“(b) the conversion of residential rental properties to a purpose other than the purpose of a residential rental property; and

“(c) the repair or renovation of residential rental properties for which the landlord has or will give notice under section 50 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell has moved amendment 0.1. Is there any debate or discussion? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why we're introducing this amendment is because the city of Toronto has an eviction crisis. The number of people that are facing an illegal eviction is on the rise, and that often happens in situations where a landlord says they're going to renovate; therefore, the tenant needs to move out. However, the renovations sometimes are never conducted or, if they are conducted, the tenant never is allowed to return to their unit, which is their right. However, that right is not enforced by the Residential Tenancies Act right now; it's not enforced by the government. Our consultations with experts, including ACTO, who have done a review of LTB decisions over the last few years, have concluded that no tenant gets back, and there's very few fines.

There are two purposes to this amendment: (1) It would regulate renovations so that the city would have more power to ensure tenants can return; and (2) it would deal with the very real issue we're facing in the city of Toronto where developers are looking at purpose-built rentals—often these are big purpose-built rentals of 10 storeys or 20 storeys in height—and they're saying, "We're going to knock this purpose-built rental down and we're going to convert it into a condo." It's almost always converted into a condo.

Right now, the city has the right to negotiate with the developer directly to get an agreement with the developer that the tenants are compensated during the construction period and that the right to return is enforced by the city. They essentially put a lien on the property. That's really important because many of these private purpose-built rental buildings are where the affordable private market rental is in our city. These rents are between \$1,000 and \$1,500 for a one- and two-bedroom apartment. When I've talked to residents in these buildings, some of them have lived in these buildings for 15 or 20 years. I'm thinking of 145 St. George in my riding; I'm thinking of 25 St. Mary in Kristyn Wong-Tam's riding, the MPP for Toronto Centre; and 55 Brownlow. In total, right now the city is negotiating with developers that are looking at demolishing over 3,400 homes.

It is extremely important that we allow the city to continue to regulate the demolition of these purpose-built rentals and to expand it so that we can deal with bad actor landlords who are illegally renovating tenants in small properties. That's why I'm introducing this amendment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate or discussion? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I just echo those comments by my seatmate. Over half of Toronto rents, and we don't stand up and protect our renters enough. We hear so much from organized and well-financed residents' associations and homeowner associations, but we don't hear a lot—you know, it's a struggle to get tenants together. There's so many barriers in organizing, and so that's up to us to protect them.

That's an alarming result from ACTO that basically, from their studies, no tenant seems to be able to return back to their home in the community that they were living in and probably enjoying in raising their children or walking their dog or volunteering. For them to be uprooted and not be able to return is not acceptable, so I'm happy to support this.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** Good morning, everyone. The government recommends voting against this motion. Unfortunately, the motion seeks to permit the city to regulate renovations and repairs of residential rental properties, which are obviously, as you may be aware, under and regulated by the Residential Tenancies Act, the RTA. The RTA has clear rules governing the termination of tenancies due to renovations and repairs, including the stipulation of tenant protection protections and compensation.

## 1010

Bill 97, which we're debating today, introduces additional tenant protections, such as the requirement for landlords to provide, along with an eviction notice, a report stating the rental must be vacated for the renovations; provide written status notification on repairs or renovations; a minimum 60-day grace period for the tenant to reoccupy the unit. So, it is the opinion of the government that we will not support this motion as written.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** It's a pity to hear that. It's important to recognize, MPP Rae, that the Residential Tenancies Act has no requirement in it for a landlord to return a unit in the case of demolition. We have looked at this extensively, and it's a grey area. So there is no requirement in the Residential Tenancies Act to guarantee a tenant has the right to return in a demolition and a conversion.

Second, we did just do a review of Landlord and Tenant Board outcomes and we concluded that tenants are not being able to move back into their units if they are evicted, even if they have the right to do it. And the number of fines that we found that were issued to bad-actor landlords were minimal—maybe 20. Most of the fines, even though they can go very high, are in the \$500 range.

So what we're seeing is that the Residential Tenancies Act that you're relying on is currently not working.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment number 0.1?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 0.1 lost.

Moving now to amendment 0.2, I believe by the official opposition: MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 1 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(1.1) Subsection 111(2) of the act is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (b) and by striking out clause (c) and substituting the following:

"(c) to prohibit the repair or renovation of residential rental properties without a permit; and

"(d) to impose conditions as a requirement of obtaining a permit, including requiring compensation to tenants for moving costs and rental costs during the repair or renovation period above what the tenant had been paying prior to the displacement."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'll explain this in layperson's terms. Essentially what this would mean is if a landlord wanted to renovate a property, they would need to get a building permit to justify that the renovations are actually going to take place. They have to do some work. And then, it would allow compensation to be provided to the tenant while they're waiting for the renovations to be completed.

The reason why we're putting this recommendation in is because ACTO, the provincial legal clinic, has recommended it. Their specialty is focusing on tenants who have been evicted. It has been applied successfully in municipalities in BC that are facing a similar kind of problem that Ontario is facing, where there has been a sharp increase in evictions, including illegal evictions, primarily because rent has just been going up, so the financial motivation for a landlord to evict and bring in a tenant who can pay rent at a higher rate is very high. We looked at what some municipalities in BC are doing—New Westminster, Burnaby—and their municipalities are reporting that requirements like this, where a landlord is required to get a building permit to show they're serious about the renovation and providing compensation to a tenant, have been extremely effective at reducing the illegal eviction rate—it's actually close to zero—which is why I'm introducing this amendment today.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I'm happy to support this. Thank you for doing all that homework and finding out what other municipalities are doing—and doing successfully—to protect tenants. Anything we can do to emulate that and not reinvent the wheel every time, and be solid and strong in our support for tenants, is great. Thank you.

Also, good morning. I forgot to say good morning.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Pang.

**Mr. Billy Pang:** When we're debating, we understand that the Residential Tenancies Act has clear rules governing termination of tenancies due to renovation or repair, including that tenant's protections and compensation.

Changes proposed under Bill 97 will further expand this protection. Bill 97's proposed changes would enable the province to create a balanced regulatory framework governing municipal rental replacement bylaws that would help streamline the construction and revitalization of rental housing while protecting tenants. We don't need to add further more, so I recommend voting against the motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members—sorry, MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote, please.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 0.2 lost.

Moving to amendment 0.3 by the official opposition: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subclause 111(7)(a)(i) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The purpose of this amendment is to limit the power of the minister to restrict or limit the city's rental replacement bylaw.

We have been working with many tenants who are very concerned about the demolition of their purpose-built rentals, and they have been advocating for the city to vote no to the demolition, so that they can keep their homes. What we are finding very challenging is that some city elected officials are saying, "Well, our hands are tied, because we fear the provincial government is going to come in and eviscerate and weaken the city of Toronto's rental replacement bylaw, which means we won't have the power to ensure you have the right to return and that you can get compensation during the construction period, so that you can continue to live in the neighbourhood you call home."

That's why I'm introducing this amendment: because the city of Toronto already has a decent rental replacement bylaw. It could be stronger, but it has a decent rental replacement bylaw, and the city democratically decided to keep it. It is what is protecting thousands and thousands of tenants in Toronto who live in more affordable private-market rentals. That's why I would like you to vote in support of this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government is recommending voting against this motion, Chair. The proposed regulation-making authority that the motion seeks to remove is needed to enable a balanced regulatory framework governing the rental replacement laws that set both the requirements and limits for municipalities moving forward.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** MPP Rae, there is nothing balanced about this housing market. Renters in Toronto are paying as much as people used to pay for a mortgage just to live in a one- or two-bedroom apartment. They're never able to save enough money to buy a home. There is nothing balanced about this housing market. I am curious to know what you think is so balanced and fair about the housing market right now.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 0.3 lost.

**1020**

Moving to amendment 0.4, by the official opposition: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subclause 111(7)(a)(ii) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting the following:

“(ii) prescribing minimum standards for the protection and compensation of tenants and the preservation of the stock of available residential units,”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The one thing that I see positive about Bill 97 is that there is a move to create a provincial standard for tenants who are in a situation where they're looking at having their purpose-built rental demolished and replaced with a condo. Sometimes it's replaced with luxury condos, but almost always it's replaced with a condo. So setting minimum standards to ensure that tenants get compensated, I believe, is important. Ensuring that we have a plan to protect the stock of affordable, available residential units is also extremely important.

There are studies that have done a deep dive into the housing market over the last few years, and what they're concluding is that for every affordable home that we build, which costs about half a million dollars, we're losing about 15 private market affordable units through renovations, illegal evictions and conversions. When we're talking affordable, we're talking rent that is \$1,000 or less. So having some minimum standards to help the renters in Ontario seems like a good idea to me. That's why I've introduced this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government believes the proposed motion duplicates amendments that we are proposing under Bill 97—if passed, obviously—and the proposed amendments in Bill 97 already include the authority to make future regulations to require tenant compensation and payments. As the minister alluded to in his remarks, we're exploring a regulatory framework that could include additional requirements to protect tenants and obviously increase the rental housing stock across Ontario.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, shall—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 0.4 lost.

Moving to amendment 1, by the independent: MPP McMahon, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out clause 111(7)(d) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Essentially, this new subsection would allow the minister to say in an MZO that policy statements, provincial plans and official plans do not apply in respect of a licence permit, approval, permission or other matters required before a use permit by the order that they may be established and that it requires the legislation confirm that policies related to life safety, flood hazards and accessibility continue to apply to all land subject to a ministerial zoning order.

I'm moving to vote this down. We have planning departments for reasons. We have students—youth and adults—going into urban planning courses and degrees. That's their future desired vocation. But why, when now it just seems, with so many things here, that we're just going to have the almighty minister have these almighty powers to take over and reign over everything that experts have worked hard on, developing these plans and processes and, in one fell swoop, just make a decision and not follow the proper process and not have the oversight that's necessary and the transparency? So yes, I would just encourage you to support this amendment that I'm moving.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** Thank you to the independent member for the motion. Unfortunately, the proposed amendment will not achieve the government's direction, so we're recommending voting against this motion.

This requirement would enable the minister to require the city to meet certain conditions or take certain procedural steps that are in line with the government's intention to protect affordable housing, increasing housing supply, and protect tenants. We're consulting on these proposed changes through the regulatory registry, and we'll take, obviously, public feedback through those consultations and considerations when developing future regulations under this section, if any.

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

All those in favour of amendment number 1, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 1 lost.



Moving to amendment number 2, again by MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** All right, here we go again. Let's try for a second one.

I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 111(8) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Yes. The reason I'm doing this is—I'm removing the proposed section—because it is not appropriate, in my humble opinion, for a minister's regulation on rental replacement to be able to override existing legislation, for example, the Ontario Human Rights Code, the Planning Act or the Residential Tenancies Act. I think that's pretty basic, that we don't want that to happen. There's a reason why people fought and worked hard to put these acts into place. Why do we want one person to be able to make these decisions on their own against basic human rights and other acts?

I would love your support on that. Maybe that was something that was overlooked and a mistake, so happy to have your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thank you, MPP McMahon. I also have concerns about this rule.

What MPP McMahon's motion does is it draws attention to an issue with Bill 97 that we have, which is that there is a regulation here to override the Residential Tenancies Act, and it is constitutionally questionable to have the ability for a regulation to override an act, especially when that act is as important as the Residential Tenancies Act.

I will be supporting McMahon's motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** As I mentioned in the most previous motion, those remarks, we're consulting through the regulatory registry, and we'll take public feedback into consideration, obviously, when developing future regulations, if any.

This subsection, in particular: In a case of a conflict, subsection 111(8) would help ensure that future provincial framework governing rental replacement bylaws could be, and can be, implemented. Again, if any regulations are necessary, they'll be posted to the regulatory registry for public feedback and comment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm curious if legislative counsel has any comments on this piece, and if you do see some concerns about having Bill 97 propose that a regulation overrides an act.

**Mr. Eric Chamney:** I think, largely, this is a policy matter for the committee to consider. If your question is whether it couldn't be added to the bill, I think that it can be. There are other provisions in other acts that have regulations that can override acts and other pieces of legislation.

1030

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Just my question back: Do you have concerns about this specific regulation? Is it constitutionally questionable?

**Mr. Eric Chamney:** To my knowledge, I don't believe there is any constitutional impediment to including a provision like this, but it is a policy matter for the committee to discuss whether you want it to be in the bill.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thank you for your answer.

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

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment number 2 lost.

Shall schedule 2, section 1 carry? Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Overall, I have many concerns with the government's decision to make it much harder for municipalities to protect tenants and protect affordable housing stock. We have an affordable housing crisis and a housing supply crisis in Ontario and in our city.

Experts came to committee. They've submitted written testimony saying loud and clear, again and again, that we need to be doing everything we can to protect affordable housing—private-market affordable housing—and protect tenants.

Tenants do not need to be sacrificed in order for us to meet our housing supply targets. They are the victims of this housing crisis; they should not be made the sacrificial lambs. If there are weak provincial regulations to protect tenants in situation like these, then it is more likely these tenants will be evicted. It's more likely these tenants will have to spend even more money to remain housed. It could mean that some tenants never find a home. We will be contributing to the homelessness crisis. That is not good for anyone and it is terrible for our city, so I urge this government to vote against this schedule.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Ditto on that—on voting against this schedule, and also strong protection of renters.

You know, I really take umbrage when the government repeatedly talks about the dream of home ownership, because not everyone wants to own a home. There are a lot of younger-generation people who don't want the headache of shovelling the walk, mowing the lawn and doing

all that. They want to rent and they want to carpe diem. They want to seize the day. They want to travel. They want to live in the moment. They don't want home ownership. We need to respect the rights of all Ontarians.

You look around the world, to Europe, to so many countries, and residents in different countries rent. Montreal, New York City: huge amounts of renters. There is nothing wrong with renters. We need to be promoting rental way more than we are and fighting hard to protect the rental stock and the rights of renters.

You have renters in all your ridings. It's not just Toronto. With the prices of housing going up—and, actually, the prices of rental units going up—it's not possible for everyone to own a home, nor do they want to. So we need to respect all desires and all income brackets and where people are at in their lives. We're not doing that with this bill. We're doing a little bit. There are some good things in this bill. But we're not doing that overall. I would just ask you to reconsider your mindset on this.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 2, section 1 carried.

Moving now to schedule 2, section 2 and amendment 2.1: MPP Bell, are you ready?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Subsection 114(14.1) of the act is repealed.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The purpose of this amendment is that it removes the provision requiring the city to provide a refund for a non-decision of a site plan control application. The reason why is because experts have warned and municipalities have warned that the provision that we currently have, which is that developers can get a refund if an application is not completed within very short periods of time, could actually slow down the permitting approval process because it forces municipalities to send applications to the land tribunal which, like many other tribunals, has a considerable backlog, which is why we are listening to what municipalities are saying. We are asking that this motion be struck so that cities don't have to give a refund. That's the purpose of this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government recommends voting against this motion. It's not consistent with the government's proposal regarding the gradual fee refunds for

zoning and site plan control applications. As the minister and our Premier have made it clear, our goal is to build more housing faster. In addition to the commitment Minister Clark made to the municipalities last December to delay the effective date to July 2023 from the original of January 1. This was after receiving feedback from our municipal colleagues and consulting with them. The intent of these changes, as the minister and the Premier have alluded to with the debate around the More Homes for Everyone Act last fall, is to speed up the planning process and incentivize timely decision-making with these legislative timelines. So we recommend voting against this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question, then? Amendment 2.1: All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 2.1 lost.

Moving to amendment number 3: MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 2(2) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out “July 1, 2023” in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 114(14.1) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting “December 31, 2023”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Yes. It's interesting, right? I heard from my second-favourite government colleague, MPP Rae, that they've consulted with their municipal colleagues. I wonder if we could get a list of those municipal colleagues, because the ones I'm speaking to don't agree with this. Obviously, there's a disconnect there.

You're saying July. Okay, well, let's compare: July 1—I'm just proposing to extend that from July to December, from the summer to the winter. Actually, if I had my druthers, I'd take it out completely, because I think it's kind of ridiculous.

#### 1040

There's this back-and-forth iterative process with planning. I'm sure that some of you were involved in municipal government, so you know when a developer comes in, you have to work with the developer. You have to work with the community. You work with city staff. You try and get the best possible outcome with that building that's proposed, and it takes time. How are you going to do that if you're rushing things? You can't rush a good development; you just can't.

I would take it out completely, but I'm proposing to extend it to December 31. I think that's pretty considerate and meeting you partway. I would love your support, because I think it's something easy for you to support, especially given some of your municipal backgrounds. Thanks, in advance, for your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? MPP Rae, the second-favourite.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** Second-favourite, yes, according to the member from Beaches—East York.

Unfortunately, the government recommends voting against this motion. As my earlier comments alluded to, it's not consistent with the government's proposal regarding gradual fee refunds and zoning and site plan controls.

The member asked who we consult with. As the minister mentioned in his remarks, consultation is us, but we consult a lot, especially with our happy friends in Peel region now. We consult with my municipality, as I met with the town of St. Marys last Friday, I think. I consult very often with my municipal colleagues on a variety of issues.

The goal is to get more homes built faster, and the intent of these changes was to speed up the planning process to incentivize timely decision-making with legislative timelines. The minister heard feedback that the January 1 phase-in wasn't adequate enough, and so he's delaying that until July 1. That is a commitment he made in December of last year, to delay it to then, so we're just honouring that commitment to our municipal colleagues.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I hear people come up to me and say, "Oh, the Conservatives' approach to planning is to move fast and break things." This is pretty typical of that, where with Bill 23, the government didn't even consult with AMO, and radically changed the development fee process, the application planning process and the funding process. It resulted in municipalities falling into chaos. They didn't understand what was coming next. They are uncertain about how to proceed.

The reason why, I'm guessing, the Conservatives have brought in this change in Bill 97 is because they've heard from municipalities who are saying, "Whoa, whoa, whoa. You're acting before thinking." I believe when we're talking about legislation and moving forward with legislation, we should do the consultation in advance, and measure twice and cut once. You're measuring and cutting as you go.

I support MPP McMahon's motion, because it gives municipalities more time to prepare and plan, staff up their planning departments, and implement these very rapid, very quick, very radical planning changes that this government is implementing.

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

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

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

Moving now to amendment number 4: MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Here's my second chance, because I have a few that are still connected to this issue.

I move that subsection 2(3) of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by striking out "July 1, 2023" in subsection 114(14.2) of the City of Toronto Act, 2006 and substituting "December 31, 2023".

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Ditto on what I said before, and I'm going to just say it in maybe a cheerier tone to encourage you to—honestly, it's basic common sense. Who over there has been in municipal politics—a bunch of you, right? So you know, to get a good development, it takes a little bit of time. It doesn't need to take as long as some do; I agree. But you can get it done in a timely fashion by bringing everyone to the table—developers, planners, residents, everyone—but it does require more time than what you're doing. It can't be a drive-through planning process. So let's just extend it a little bit longer, a few more months. In the blink of an eye, you won't even notice.

So thank you again, cordially, for advance notice for supporting my bill, or my amendment—and my bill, hopefully.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** To follow my colleague from Beaches—East York, ditto to my previous comments: The government is, unfortunately, recommending voting against this motion. Again, the goal has been to get more housing built faster. This motion on the floor currently is not consistent with the government's proposals regarding the gradual fee refunds for zoning and site planning control applications.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded vote, please.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment number 4 lost.

Moving to amendment 4.1 by MPP Bell—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'd like to withdraw 4.1.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Amendment 4.1 is withdrawn.

Moving now to amendment 4.1.0 by the official opposition: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 2 of schedule 2 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(6) Section 114 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Penalty

“(21) Subject to and in accordance with the regulations, the city may, by bylaw, impose penalties on the owner of the land for failure to substantially commence development within a timely manner after the plans and drawings have been approved under this section.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any discussion, debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why we’re introducing this motion is because we heard from municipalities that they approve, in some municipalities, approximately double of the approvals that are actually built, and we are also seeing examples of developers choosing not to construct or move ahead with projects that have already been approved.

We see a lot of value in encouraging developers to contribute to fixing the housing supply crisis by providing them with incentives and consequences if they don’t build in a reasonable time frame. Of course, we expect, with a “build it, use it or lose it” policy, that municipalities would create reasonable grounds for why an approval could be extended: Maybe it’s a project in the public interest, maybe the developer can show demonstrated financial hardship, maybe it’s an affordable housing project where the developer or the non-profit developer is having difficulty securing the financing that they originally had. We’d expect that there would be very fair and reasonable arguments that a developer could make where they wouldn’t get a penalty because the project was in the public good or the developer had reasons to delay it.

But we are also hearing from municipalities that there is plan-banking happening, where a developer will build at times where they can maximize their profit, or they’ll get all the approvals and then they’ll want to sell the land with the approval at a good time. And the consequences of that is that we don’t meet our housing supply targets.

**1050**

So I’m introducing this motion to bring in a “build it or lose it” policy so that we can incentivize everyone on all ends to meet the 1.5-million-homes target that all parties agree needs to be met.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government recommends voting against this motion simply because it’s not consistent with government policy. As all members of this committee know, our government has introduced a range of measures to increase housing supply through our housing supply action plan. This included the More Homes for Everyone Act, 2022, and the debate previously on the other motions requiring gradual fee refunds, zoning bylaw, site plan application fees when failing to make decisions within a specified time period. The intent of these changes was to speed up the planning process and incentivize timely

decisions in the legislated time frames. And so we are recommending voting against this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.1.0 lost.

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

There are no amendments to sections 3 and 4. I propose we bundle them. Everyone agree? Agreed. Okay. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 2, sections 3 and 4 carry? Carried. I declare schedule 2, sections 3 and 4 carried.

So now, just to be clear—so I could be clear—we’re asking if schedule 2 as a whole carries. Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Overall, schedule 2, once again, meddles in the ability of the city of Toronto to do its business and to represent the people of Toronto. This is one of many examples that the Conservatives have done over the last five years where they’ve treated Toronto like a punching bag: You’ve meddled with our election process; you’re impeding our ability to protect renters; you’re actually making it harder for development projects to be approved.

You’re sitting in a room with MPPs who have more development taking place in their riding than, my guess is, all of your ridings combined. I could be wrong, but the amount of development that’s happening in downtown Toronto in my riding that we support and approve is considerable. It’s considerable.

So overall, I’m very concerned about this government’s continued track record to make it harder for the city of Toronto to govern itself and represent the people of Toronto.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I have to stand up—I agree with my colleague, and I’m standing up for Toronto. I’m standing up for Toronto as someone who was born and raised in a small town where a lot of Torontonians go now, Collingwood.

Toronto is the economic engine of Ontario. We can’t just totally keep slapping it in the face. As my colleague mentioned, the whole ridiculous “cut council in half in the middle of an election” debacle that happened when that didn’t happen to any other municipality—I would argue

that your municipalities, per capita, probably have better representation, because now most Toronto city councillors are representing 120,000 residents, if not more, whereas other councillors, reeves, deputy reeves in smaller towns have a better connection. They can have a better connection; there's just not enough time.

It's just a consistent lack of respect for Toronto, and I would argue with my colleague MPP Rae—when you're talking about engaging with your municipal colleagues, I would question how much the government engaged with Toronto. We've heard loudly and clearly from the passionate chief planner in Toronto, who came to our committee and has written in, as well as probably other staff. He brought a bunch of people on the Zoom and to committee to plead with us and implore us to do better with regard to Toronto. It's not all about Toronto, of course. I want to protect renters all across Ontario. I just ask again for a rethink of your mindset on this bill and Toronto.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Recorded vote. Shall schedule 2 carry?

#### Ayes

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 2 carried.

Moving to schedule 3: There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2. I propose we bundle them. All in favour? Agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3 carry? Carried.

Shall schedule 3 carry—was there any debate? Sorry, I was supposed to ask that. No debate, okay. Schedule 3 is carried.

Moving to schedule 4, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Act, section 1, I believe there is amendment 4.1.2. MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 1 of schedule 4 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 12 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Publication

“(5) The minister shall ensure the following are published on a website of the government of Ontario:

“1. All directives from the minister to the provincial land and development facilitator and deputy facilitators.

“2. An annual summary of the advice and recommendations made to the minister by the provincial land and development facilitator and deputy facilitators.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Schedule 4 is a real mystery to me, because I listened to your presentations in the Legislature, I read Hansard, and I asked the Minister from Municipal Affairs and Housing directly, “What exactly does schedule 4 mean in the real world? Who is it going to apply to? Who are these facilitators? What does it mean for landowners? What does it mean for municipalities?” All of these questions and, at this point, I haven't received any clear answers.

Does it relate to the divorce happening with Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga? Will it apply to getting rid of regional councils in that area and Waterloo and Simcoe, and all the other regions that the minister has set his sights on? I don't know. I question whether you all know either. Did you get a secret briefing from the minister about what this actually means? Because municipalities don't know. The public doesn't know.

#### 1100

We don't know what the consequences of this schedule are going to be, which is why we are introducing a motion to make this schedule more transparent: What decisions are being made by these facilitators? What does it apply to? Essentially, what are the conversations and the directions given to the facilitator and the minister and vice versa, and that it's simply published on a website so the public can look at it and understand what the government is doing and what is going on: That's the purpose of this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government recommends voting against this motion because it's not consistent with government policy. The Provincial Land and Development Facilitator, or PLDF, and any deputy facilitators would be appointed by the province. It actually exists already; we're just expanding the number, Chair. They and their office play an important role. They help the province, municipalities, developers and community groups resolve issues related to growth, management, land use, infrastructure planning and environmental protection by providing impartial facilitation services by acting as the negotiator in contested issues on behalf of the province.

The PLDF provides confidential advice to the minister on land-use-planning matters that could obviously be commercially sensitive. Therefore, it wouldn't be appropriate to publicize this information on the government of Ontario website.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Exactly. That's my point exactly. People who are appointed by the minister can get to make secret decisions with who knows who and who knows what about matters that should be decided through public consultation processes and by democratically elected officials. It is very concerning that there could be this direct line between the minister, this secret individual and landowners and municipalities.

What does it actually mean? What are these decisions that are being made? Honestly, why can't they be public?

It's a very simple motion. It's concerning to hear the Conservatives say that transparency is not important to them, accountability is not important to them.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** All members of this committee are accountable to the people of Ontario in 2026. We will go to them with our progress at that point, Chair.

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

**Interjections:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.1.2 lost.

Shall schedule 4 of section 1 carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 4, section 1 carried.

Moving to schedule 4, section 2: Shall it carry? Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is a question to the members opposite. I'm curious about the appointment of the facilitators. Is that a process that is going to go through the standing committee so we understand who these facilitators are and what their qualifications are?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm going to assume that a non-answer means you don't know.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? Okay.

Shall schedule 4, section 2 carry? Schedule 4, section 2 is carried.

Shall schedule 4, as a whole, carry? MPP Bell, debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Can we have a recorded vote on the overall schedule?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes. Any debate, first of all? No debate.

### Ayes

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule—  
*Interjections.*

**Mr. Billy Pang:** Point of order: When you said "carried," then we said "carried," and then some members said—

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes, I should have said "debate."

**Mr. Billy Pang:** So which one comes first?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate.

**Mr. Billy Pang:** So when we say "carried"—

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes, we have to give an option for debate. I'll be faster.

I declare schedule 4 carried.

Moving to schedule 5, the Municipal Act, 2001: Schedule 5, section 1 has amendment 4.1.3. MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 1(1) of schedule 5 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(1) Subsection 99.1(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 is repealed and the following substituted:

"Demolition, conversion and repairs and renovation of residential rental properties

"(1) A local municipality may prohibit and regulate,

"(a) the demolition of residential rental properties;

"(b) the conversion of residential rental properties to a purpose other than the purpose of a residential rental property; and

"(c) the repair or renovation of residential rental properties for which the landlord has or will give notice under section 50 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why I'm introducing this motion is because it's not just the city of Toronto that is interested in or that has moved forward with regulating the conversion of purpose-built rentals to condos or the demolition of purpose-built rentals. It's other cities as well. Ottawa was moving forward with bringing in rental replacement bylaws, until Minister Clark changed Ottawa's official plan and eliminated their ability to do that. Hamilton is interested. London also has a big renovation problem. This issue of us needing to protect our private-market affordable rentals is a provincewide issue.

Given the high cost of rent and the need to meet our housing supply targets, we're going to see more and more situations of renters living in purpose-built rentals having an eviction notice slipped under their door because the developer wants to demolish that building and replace it with a condo. In my view, municipalities should augment what the provincial government is doing and use every tool in the toolbox they've got to keep these renters in their homes, living in the neighbourhoods that they care about.

We have over 1.4 million renter households in Ontario. The number of renters in Ontario is on the rise, because you cannot afford to buy a house anymore unless you're earning over \$200,000 a year in the city of Toronto. So we're seeing low-income, moderate-income, middle-income and even sometimes upper-middle-income families, young people and newcomers, being forced to rent longer than they want to. They want the kind of stability and safety that homeowners have.

This motion helps municipalities provide renters with that stability and that affordability that they want, that they're craving for. I think that we should vote for this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate on amendment 4.1.3? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I'm happy to support this. We all want stability in life, and I don't think it's too—definitely things change and we have to roll with that, but underneath it all, you need your foundation. You need your stability, as best you can. I think you would all agree.

1110

I'm not sure if you've had any experiences with your residents being evicted. It's heartbreaking. Kids are uprooted from schools; people are uprooted from their neighbours who they've become friends with, that they have strong bonds with; from community centres, libraries, parks. That's where they've laid their roots. And then for them, against their will, to be uprooted is just an unfair thing to happen. If it's within our power to change that, to prevent that from happening, I think we should do everything we can. We were elected to protect Ontarians, so I think that that's the least we can do.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you for the debate. MPP Rae?

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government is recommending we vote against this motion. The proposed motion would not achieve government direction to enable the creation of a balanced regulatory framework governing municipal rental replacement bylaws. As I alluded to in some of my earlier comments, the Residential Tenancies Act already regulates renovation repair around rental residential properties, and the RTA has clear rules governing the termination of tenancies due to renovations and repair, including the stipulation of tenant protections and compensation. Obviously, this bill, Bill 97, has proposals for additional tenant protections, as I've alluded to in my earlier comments.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.1.3 lost.

Moving on to amendment 4.1.4.: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 1 of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(1.1) Subsection 99.1(2) of the act is amended by striking out ‘and’ at the end of clause (b) and by repealing clause (c) and substituting the following:

“(c) to prohibit the repair or renovation of residential rental properties without a permit; and

“(d) to impose conditions as a requirement of obtaining a permit, including requiring compensation to tenants for moving costs and rental costs during the repair or renovation period above what the tenant had been paying prior to the displacement.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why I'm introducing this motion is very similar to the motion that I introduced to amend the City of Toronto Act. This motion looks at allowing the municipalities across Ontario to have the right to do this too.

It does a few things. One, it would mean that municipalities would be able to better regulate situations where a landlord is looking at evicting a tenant by requiring the landlord to do some additional hurdles to prove that the renovation is actually going to happen. In municipalities, what we're seeing is that there are many good landlords out there. Then there are some landlords who say, “Oh, tenant, you need to move out because I'm renovating,” but they really have no intention to renovate. They want to get a new tenant in who can pay a whole lot more in order to maximize their profit.

This rule would require the landlord to get a building permit—which they would need to do anyway if they were going to do a significant renovation—to ensure that the renovation is going to happen. And it would allow municipalities to require the landlord or the developer to provide compensation to the tenant while the renovations are taking place.

This is balance. When we're talking about balance and having a balanced housing market, making sure that tenants are not out of pocket thousands of dollars is about balance. I gave the example earlier that there are other municipalities that have moved forward with these rules in BC. New Westminster, BC, is a really good example. They have a very healthy construction market and very healthy supply targets, but they're also making sure that they don't lose tenants in the process, that they don't lose tenants who have to then, as Mary-Margaret McMahon said, move out, find a more expensive place, find new friends, move out of the community, have their kids change school because they just got an eviction notice. So this provides more stability to renters, and that's why I introduced this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** Similar to my earlier comments, this motion seeks to prevent municipalities to regulate renovation or repair of residential rental properties, which the RTA already regulates. The bill we currently have

before the committee, Bill 97, proposes additional tenant protections related to renovations and repairs and the protections for the tenants involved in that situation. Hopefully—I have hope that the members of the opposition will support the tenant protections in Bill 97.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** To be very clear, MPP Rae, we spoke very carefully, and we've listened very carefully to experts who spend a lot of time at the Landlord and Tenant Board. They have been adamant that the Residential Tenancies Act does not do an adequate job at protecting tenants who are being evicted because of a renovation. Fines are not being issued—very few fines—and the fines that are issued are very small. I'm going to follow up afterwards with a Landlord and Tenant Board assessment they did, because they looked at all recent decisions. The fines are very small, and tenants never get back into their home. They just don't. They don't get back in.

So if it's not going to be in Bill 97, if you're not going to be supporting these amendments, for the sake of the renters in your riding, I really hope you have a conversation in caucus about what additional measures can be moved forward in future bills to really protect renters, because the Residential Tenancies Act is not doing it right now.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.1.4 lost.

Moving to amendment 4.1.5: MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 5 to the bill be amended by striking out subclause 99.1(7)(a)(i) of the Municipal Act, 2001.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The purpose of this motion is to remove the power of the minister to meddle in municipal replacement bylaws. Many municipalities have an eviction crisis in their area. They're seeing developers come in, having the interest of knocking down purpose-built rentals, replacing them with condos. We're seeing a big rise in illegal eviction activity—it's in London, it's in Ottawa, it's in Peterborough, it's in Hamilton. Municipalities are looking at this and saying, "Look, we need to do more to protect renters." It is very concerning that the minister really wants to limit the power of municipalities to ensure that their regions are affordable.

I can imagine that the minister received some calls from developers who said, "Look, these rental replacement bylaws are really expensive; they're limiting our ability to build, so we want you to do what we think is important,"

and the minister listened to them, but he didn't listen to the millions of people who rent in Ontario or municipalities. And when you listen to municipalities and renters, they're saying, "Hold on. We shouldn't be sacrificed in order for us to meet our housing supply targets." Or, "We shouldn't be sacrificed because our landlord hasn't properly maintained our building for 30 years, even though we've been paying rent for that purpose, and now this building is aging and there's this argument that it needs to be demolished because it's aging, even though we've been paying rent, which should go into maintaining the building." That's very concerning and it's why I've introduced this motion to limit the power for the minister to meddle.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

1120

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government is recommending we vote against this motion. The proposed motion would not achieve government direction. The proposed regulatory-making authority that the motion seeks to remove is needed to enable a balanced regulatory framework governing rental replacement bylaws that sets both limits and requirements for municipalities.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.1.5 lost.

Shall schedule 5, section 1 carry? Any debate? Seeing no debate: All those in favour of schedule 5, section 1, please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare schedule 5, section 1 carried.

Moving to schedule 5, section 2: Shall it carry? Is there any debate? No debate. All those in favour of schedule 5, section 2 please raise your hands. All those opposed? I declare schedule 5, section 2 carried.

Moving to schedule 5 as a whole: Shall it carry? Is there any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Babikian, Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Schedule 5 is now carried.



Moving to schedule 6, the Planning Act: Schedule 6, section 1 has amendment 4.2 by the official opposition. I move to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 1 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Subsection 1(1) of the Planning Act is amended by adding the following definition:

““affordable” means,

“(a) in the case of ownership of housing units, the least expensive of,

“(i) housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 per cent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households, and

“(ii) housing for which the purchase price is at least 10% below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area, and

“(b) in the case of rental housing units, the least expensive of,

“(i) a rental unit for which the rent does not exceed 30% of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households, and

“(ii) a rental unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why I'm introducing this motion is because this is the standard, accepted definition of “affordable housing” that the Ontario government used to have, and it's the definition of “affordable housing” that the CMHC uses as well.

In Bill 23, the government decided to radically change the “affordable housing” definition into an “unaffordable housing” definition, where the definition of affordability was no longer tied to what an occupant could pay to rent or buy, but it was tied to the market: about 80% of average market rent or the average sale price, which isn't anywhere near affordable, especially when you're looking at the sale price for low-, moderate- and sometimes even middle-income households. It's not an affordable definition.

The reason why it's so important for us to have a definition of affordability that makes sense is because in Bill 23, the government decided to give developers this “get out of fee jail” card where, if you built a home that met this new unaffordable definition of housing, you wouldn't have to pay any development fees. So if you wanted to build a one-bedroom condo and sell it for \$440,000 in the city of Toronto, you don't have to pay any development fees, even though that condo is not affordable for most people. Or if you want to build a home in Brampton and it sells for \$800,000, you wouldn't have to pay any development fees, because that also meets the definition of affordability. I think that's very concerning.

I introduced this motion to bring back the standard definition of affordability that the federal government uses, that the Ontario government used to use and that the city of Toronto is looking at using so we have a clear understanding of what's affordable, and it's affordable based on what the occupant can pay.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Pang.

**Mr. Billy Pang:** The government suggests voting against this motion because the proposed provincial planning statement does not include a definition of affordable. It's to provide flexibility for planning authorities to collaborate with their respective service managers to plan for and facilitate the development of a full range of housing options to meet local needs, including housing affordability needs.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 4.2 lost.

Moving to amendment number 5 from the independent. MPP McMahon, please go ahead.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsections 1(1), (2) and (12) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out, please.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP McMahon, we need to get you to reread.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Okay, sure.

I move that subsections 1—am I to say the brackets or no?—(1), (2) and (12) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** The problem is we don't have the (12); we just have (1) and (2).

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Oh, sorry, that must have been my mistake. It must have been “(1) and (2).”

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** That's okay. Yes. We're good then. Debate? Please go ahead.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Gladly. I would love to enlighten my colleagues.

This is about the definition of “area of employment” and the changes you're proposing for that. It's a big, big concern. In my time as Toronto city councillor, we didn't want to touch employment lands. I get that we are looking at more areas to build, but, as I continually, continually say, we need to be bolder and braver and go up on our main streets. Honestly, I'm going to take you guys on a tour of Toronto main streets—it's not just Toronto; it's elsewhere—where, on a subway corridor, we have two-storey buildings, one-storey buildings. Even provincial properties like the LCBO only being one storey is ridiculous. We need to change that. If we're going to be gutsy and innovative, we need to be changing that, and then we don't have to touch the employment lands,

because when they're gone, they're gone. You're not getting them back. It's like our wetlands and our greenbelt. When it's gone, it's gone.

This is a very logical and valuable amendment. The government always talks about how we need to build things in Ontario and grow things in Ontario and support the local business and the local economy and manufacturing in Ontario and bring it all back. Then why would we consider monkeying around with the areas of employment?

Thanks, again, in advance for your dedicated support to all of my amendments.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government recommends voting against this motion. It's not consistent with the government's proposal, obviously, related to areas of employment. The changes brought forward in Bill 97 around the "areas of employment" definition is intended to help our government in its goal to build 1.5 million new homes by 2031 by making it easier to redevelop employment land, where appropriate, while continuing to allow municipalities to obviously protect the very important heavy manufacturing we have in Ontario and the future manufacturing that we are attracting to our province—which seems almost daily—and continuing to also protect areas for large-scale warehousing and our logistics companies in Ontario.

1130

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Are the members ready for the vote? Okay. All those in favour of amendment number 5, please raise your hands. All of those opposed, please raise your hands. Thank you. I declare amendment number 5 lost.

Moving to amendment 5.1 by the government: MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** I move that subsection 1(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(2) Section 1 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

““Area of employment

“(1.1) An area of land designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic uses is an area of employment for the purposes of this act even if the area of land includes one or more parcels of land that are subject to official plan policies authorizing the continuation of a use that is excluded from being a business and economic use under paragraph 2 of the definition of ‘area of employment’ in subsection (1), provided that the use was lawfully established on the parcel of land before the day subsection 1(1) of schedule 6 to the Helping Homebuyers, Protecting Tenants Act, 2023 came into force.

““Same

“(1.2) For greater certainty, the official plan policies referred to in subsection (1.1) shall not authorize a use that is excluded from being a business and economic use under paragraph 2 of the definition of ‘area of employment’ in subsection (1) on any parcels of land in the area on which

the use was not lawfully established before the day subsection 1(1) of schedule 6 to the Helping Homebuyers, Protecting Tenants Act, 2023 came into force.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** I'm reading run-on sentences this morning.

I recommend voting for this motion. I hope my government colleagues will join me in voting for this motion, and the opposition members as part of the committee, if they so choose. This proposed amendment is to clarify the transition provisions with respect to the changes to area of employment. These changes are, as alluded to in my earlier remarks, intended to allow municipalities to continue to protect key employment uses while allowing for more housing in some areas, making it easier to redevelop other lands for mixed-use policies as they deem necessary in their local municipalities.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I see the benefit of relaxing some rules around employment lands in order to meet our housing supply targets, while also proceeding very carefully, because we might have a housing crisis today, but 10 years from now, we might have an access-to-employment-lands crisis in the future. This is especially important because we want to encourage and incentivize manufacturing to return to Ontario. We want to ensure that we have a small, medium, and large, healthy-sized business community. We want to be an attractive environment to small, medium and large businesses.

We also need to be very mindful that our transportation patterns. Our transportation system, as it's currently structured, has transit going into employment lands. So when we're looking at downtown Toronto, we have transit, we have the GO network going into downtown Toronto because that's where people work. We want to make sure that any changes we make will not create a situation where employment lands are in an area where there is no transit anymore because we've made some rash decisions now that affect how we plan and how we move in the future.

I will be abstaining from this motion. I'm still talking to stakeholders about what these changes to employment lands mean. But I have a very open mind to what we keep, how we zone, how we can protect business and employment lands but also meet our housing supply targets. That's where I'm at on that.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? All those in favour of amendment 5.1, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Amendment 5.1 is carried.

Moving to amendment 6 from MPP McMahon: Please go ahead when you're ready.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that—oh, we already did that one. Sorry.

I move that subsection 1(3) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “and substituting ‘38(4)’”.

*Interjections.*

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Is that right?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Could you just repeat the last numbers for us?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 1(3) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “and substituting ‘38(4)’”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** That’s okay. That is what we have.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Okay.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I’m actually giving up on my—I’d just love your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** I just want to note that there’s room on this committee for two independent members. I believe seven of the independent members of the Legislature are Liberal members. Three or four of them are running for leader of the party, I think, to be the Premier of the province. Two of those leadership candidates actually live in Toronto. I was just wondering if there are any other independent members of the committee that would have any comments on this bill and any comments on the amendment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon, would you like to—

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I only speak for myself. I’m here and present.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Are the members ready for the question? All those in favour of amendment number 6, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 6 lost.

Moving to amendment number 7: MPP McMahon, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 1(7) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “and substituting ‘38(4)’”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** No. I just would love your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? Shall amendment number 7 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 7 lost.

1140

We’ll move to amendment number 8. MPP McMahon, when you’re ready.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** This is exasperating.

I move that subsection 1(11) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “and substituting ‘38(4)’”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** No, but it’s partnering with the last one I moved.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Okay. Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? Shall amendment number 8 carry? All those in favour,

please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 8 lost.

Moving now to amendment number 9: MPP McMahon, when you’re ready, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 1(12) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Just your support, ongoing.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? Shall amendment number 9 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment number 9 lost.

Going down to schedule 6, section 1, as amended: Carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 6, section 1, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, section 1, as amended, carried.

Moving down to schedule 6, section 2, shall it carry? Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question? Shall schedule 6, section 2, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, section 2, carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 3, amendment 9.1: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 3 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Section 16 of the act is amended by adding the following subsections:

“Residential unit policies

“(2.1) An official plan shall contain policies that authorize, in areas of settlement,

“(a) the use of additional residential units by authorizing the use of up to four residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse; and

“(b) multi-unit residential buildings of up to four stories.

“Appeals re policies

“(2.2) Despite subsections 17(24) and (36), there is no appeal in respect of the policies described in subsection (2.1) of this section, including, for greater certainty, any requirements or standards that are part of such policies.

“Same

“(2.3) Despite subsection 34(19), there is no appeal in respect of the parts of a bylaw that give effect to policies described in subsection (2.1) of this section, including, for greater certainty, an appeal in respect of any requirements or standards relating to such policies.

“Exception re minister

“(2.4) Subsections (2.2) and (2.3) do not apply to an appeal by the minister.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This motion is a motion that is asking the government to get serious about ending exclusionary zoning. The Conservatives have talked a good game about how they support missing middle housing and how they are in support of helping small developers and building

more affordable homes in areas already zoned for development, in good neighbourhoods, in areas that people want to live in.

This motion is also important because if we are going to meet our housing targets of building 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years, it is absolutely essential for the sake of our environment, for the sake of municipal affordability, that we build homes in the thousands and thousands and thousands of acres that are already zoned for development, because if we continue down the Conservatives' very backward path of building single-family homes in subdivisions, we are locking ourselves into a situation where municipalities have to spend way too much to service these areas, and we're locking ourselves into unsustainable transportation patterns, and we're not building the kind of homes that will address our affordable housing crisis.

We have already introduced this motion within the Legislature, that we are in support of ending exclusionary zoning. I'm asking the Conservative MPPs today, if you're serious about ending exclusionary zoning as well, then this is the time to put your votes where your talk is and support this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** I can tell my colleague across the way that this government is serious about getting more housing built faster across Ontario in all communities. That's why we tabled Bill 23. Unfortunately, the members of the opposition voted against Bill 23, but Bill 23 established as of right—three units across every community in Ontario, and obviously, they voted against it, as my colleague from Brampton North mentioned. We encourage—the minister encourages, the associate minister encourages and our entire government encourages—municipalities to build upon this framework and those initiatives in Bill 23, getting more residential lots built and more housing built. Hopefully, in the future, the members of the opposition will support some of these initiatives we bring forward.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Just for the record, within committee, within Bill 23, I did support that section of the bill, because I'm very much in support of creating the kind of missing middle housing that we need. It means that we create more affordable homes. A townhome is easily half a million dollars cheaper than a single-family detached home. When we're creating duplexes that a family can live in, that are large enough for a family to live in, we really create those more affordable housing options that give young people, newcomers, new families the opportunity to buy. People want the stability of homeownership, which is why I'm such a big fan of really making it much easier to move forward on missing middle housing. I really do urge the government to vote for this motion so all parties can be in alignment on this.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I would just say to my members across the floor that maybe sometimes we

vote against things because they don't go far enough, because you're too timid, the policies are too timid. Three units per lot is not courageous. That's happening already in Toronto—and Toronto just passed their multiplexes proposal to allow four. So if we want to get the 1.5 million homes built, which I do—but it's a whole diverse array of homes; it's not just single-family homes with the white picket fence, not connected to services or transportation and community spaces and centres. So just think, give it some thought, that maybe the reason that some things are opposed is because they don't go far enough, they're not brave enough.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 9.1 lost.

Moving to amendment 9.2.: MPP Bell, when you're ready.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Just because we have the last-minute amendments, there will be some rocky roads when we go through the next new amendments, and I might need some help from the Clerk and the Chair to make sure I'm reading the right amendment. Okay?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** That's fine.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thank you. I have 9.2.

### 1150

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Okay, good.

I move that section 3 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Subsection 16(5) of the act is amended by striking out ‘or’ at the end of clause (a), by adding ‘or’ to the end of clause (b) and by adding the following clause:

“(c) any other area.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** You might be wondering what this motion means. I'm going to explain it to you. This motion means that municipalities would have the right to move forward with inclusionary zoning wherever they see fit.

What's inclusionary zoning? Inclusionary zoning allows municipalities to require developments of a certain size—in the city of Toronto, it's 100 units or more—to set aside a percentage of units as being affordable. So if you've got a building that is 100 units in size, 10% of those units are affordable, or whatever the municipality decides.

The reason why this is so important is because developers need to contribute their fair share to solving the housing affordability crisis. We're not just building new homes, which we absolutely need to do, but we're also

addressing the affordability piece and ensuring that some of the homes that we build are affordable for low- and moderate- and middle-income people.

This is also important because municipalities, in particular the city of Toronto, have been pushing for an inclusionary-zoning law for many years. After years of negotiations and consultations and hearings, the city of Toronto agreed on a moderate inclusionary-zoning plan where areas near transit stations, for buildings 100 units or more—so we're talking the big development here—had a percentage of affordable housing units that needed to be built, and it would be phased in over time, with different amounts for condos and lower amounts for purpose-built rentals, because we all know it's important to incentivize the construction of purpose-built rentals.

It was a compromise agreement. A lot of studies had been done to make sure developers could continue to meet their profit margins—there's no other way to say it—and it was passed. It was passed in 2021, and since then, the city of Toronto has put out over 100 requests to the province to enact inclusionary zoning, and the province continues to say no. You're stopping the city of Toronto from moving forward with inclusionary-zoning legislation so that we could get affordable housing units built.

What is even more troubling is that when I go online and I read articles about what's happening with inclusionary zoning, I see quotes from building industry experts saying, "Well, yes, developers are sneaking in their applications as quickly as they can right now, because they want to be exempt from the inclusionary zoning laws before they're enacted." They know full well that the province—my guess is that they probably talked to you and said, "Hold up. Don't allow the city of Toronto to move forward with the inclusionary-zoning laws, because we want to get our applications in to build big before we have to contribute our fair share."

This motion calls on the provincial government, would allow the provincial government, to give the city the permission to move forward with a law it's already passed, so we can get going and build the affordable housing units that we need. It is shocking to think about how much of a lost opportunity this is. We still have the opportunity to move forward on it.

I recently looked at what Montreal has done. Montreal has had an inclusionary-zoning law since 2005. They've built thousands and thousands and thousands of affordable housing units, where the developer has built them. It hasn't cost the city a lot of money. They have a very healthy housing market, they have a lot of cranes in the sky, but they also have a housing market that's a lot more affordable than ours and they have a lot more affordable housing units than we do.

I think it's time for us to get serious about not just the supply piece, but the affordability piece, and move forward with allowing cities to implement inclusionary zoning. That's the purpose of this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** As members of this committee will know, the ones who were here in the last mandate, our government tabled Bill 108, the More Homes, More

Choice Act, the first bill in our housing supply action plan—I know it seems like so long ago now. Changes were made to the Planning Act that came into effect in September 2019 and focused on municipal discretionary use of inclusionary zoning; for example, as my colleague mentioned, protected major transit areas, or areas where a community planning permit system has been required by an order by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Any city or municipality has been able to submit these requests in protected major transit station areas; for example, through their official plan amendment process, and that continues to move forward.

I wasn't in this place, but I know some of my colleagues were in this place under the last mandate, and again, it was unfortunate that members of the opposition at the time chose not to vote for this first housing supply action bill. But again, I hold out hope that they may vote for future iterations.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** To be very clear, MPP Rae, the city of Toronto, using the process that you've just described, has submitted over 100 requests to the provincial government saying, "We have allocated this area as an area that needs to be an inclusionary zoning area," areas right near transit stations where height—big buildings are going to be built, and the minister has not approved a single one of them.

In my riding, that is—we're seeing the effects of it right now. When I look at Spadina and Bloor, there are big buildings that have been proposed on all corners of Bloor and Spadina, buildings that will have well over 100 units. What I find so troubling is that these proposals should have affordable housing units attached to them, and if the minister or if the ministry approved inclusionary zoning, they would. But they don't, which means affordable housing units aren't going to be built. They're going to be purpose-built rentals or condos that retail for maybe \$3,000 for a two-bedroom unit. It's utterly unaffordable.

That's why I'm introducing this motion. If you're not going to introduce it, then please speak personally to the minister and ask him to approve the city of Toronto's requests to say yes to inclusionary zoning, because they're waiting and we're all waiting.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** A recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Babikian, Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 9.2 lost.

It's 11:58. I think we should probably break now for lunch, if that's okay, before we get the next amendment. So I declare the meeting adjourned till 1 p.m.

*The committee recessed from 1158 to 1300.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Good afternoon, everybody. The Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy will now come to order. We are resuming the afternoon session of clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 97.

We are on amendment 9.3 of schedule 6, section 3. I will go to MPP Bell to introduce it.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 3 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 16 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Large and fast-growing municipalities

“(3.4) An official plan of a large and fast-growing municipality, as may be identified in a policy statement under section 3, shall establish density targets for new settlement areas or settlement area expansion lands, as appropriate, based on local conditions, with a minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs per gross hectare.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason I'm introducing this motion is because—the goal of it is to make sure that we are building in an environmentally responsible way, in a way that is affordable for a municipalities to service. That requires increasing density targets and setting minimum density standards for, in particular, fast-growing municipalities.

I am very concerned that the Conservatives are making a decision to eliminate firm density and intensification targets in the new provincial planning statement. That is the kind of 1950-style backwards planning that we have been moving away from for many years now. When we don't set minimum density targets in areas that are already zoned for development, then we are incentivizing suburban sprawl. We are incentivizing and encouraging the creation of big single-family homes on quarter-acre lots on areas that are currently farmland. That is very concerning. Many of you were here when we had the Ontario Federation of Agriculture come in and speak to the need to preserve our class 1 farmland. We don't have a lot of it in Canada, despite our size.

In Ontario, we are a farming economic powerhouse. It's a huge job creator for Ontario, but we don't have a healthy farming sector unless we protect the farmland that we have. We just don't. We're hearing that very loud and clear from a stakeholder that assumed that you would have their backs. They've been assuming that, so they're very concerned to see this government move forward with endangering farmland. We're already losing over 319 acres of farmland a day and we just can't continue down that trajectory if we want to protect and improve one of Ontario's most thriving economic sectors, and that's our farming community.

This would set minimum density targets, which were in existence until 2020, so it's the density targets that existed in 2018. It's very achievable. If this government is really

serious about meeting our housing supply targets and building not just out but up, in a respectful way, then I think we need to pass this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** I would suggest to my colleague that I think we are building out and up. Through the housing supply action plans that we've put forward previously, we've actually eliminated maximum densities around major transit station areas. I will remind, for the record, that obviously the opposition New Democrats voted against that; I believe the independent members voted against that as well.

What we want to make sure that we're doing is not only making sure we have maximum density where it makes sense, around transit station areas, so people can live where they can travel to and from work; we also want to make sure that we give our municipal partners the flexibility to plan what's best for them, to assess the needs of housing and the housing targets that they've signed on to, but balance that approach with the rest of what they do.

With that in mind, I recommend that government colleagues vote no against this amendment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 9.3 lost.

Moving now to schedule 6, section 3: Is there any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour of schedule 6, section 3, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, section 3 carried.

There are no amendments to section 4 and 5. I propose we bundle them together. Is that agreed? Agreed. Is there any debate on sections 4 and 5? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Okay. Shall schedule 6, sections 4 and 5 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, sections 4 and 5 carried.

We're now going to move to schedule 6, section 6, and amendment 9.4. MPP Bell, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 6 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Section 34 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Agricultural impact assessment

“(9.1) The council of a local municipality shall not pass a zoning bylaw under this section that purports to

change the uses permitted on land that was zoned for prescribed agricultural uses as of the day section 6 of schedule 6 to the Helping Homebuyers, Protecting Tenants Act, 2023 came into force, or the zoning of the land itself, unless an agricultural impact assessment has been carried out in accordance with the regulations.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This motion is part of a bill that my colleague MPP Vanthof developed. The whole purpose of it is to protect one of our largest economic drivers and biggest job providers in Ontario, which is our farming sector, and to also ensure that we move very carefully when it comes to opening up farmland for development.

We are one of the few regions in the world that exports more food. We're a “have,” a growth province, essentially. That's very unique and very important when we're moving into this era where we have a global climate crisis and our global food supply is being threatened by extreme temperatures. We're very lucky to have a healthy farming community here. We don't have a farming community if we don't have access to high-quality farming land, which is why I'm moving this motion to ensure that we do everything we can to protect it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** You know, we hear this language from the NDP about “tread carefully,” and really, what they mean is that they want to delay housing getting built. We know that every month of delay for a housing unit can cost between \$2,600 and \$3,300 per month. You take that over a year and it's almost 40 grand a year. You take that over five years, that's almost \$200,000. That's not land costs, material costs, labour costs; that's just cost of delays.

1310

We hear hyperbole around our agricultural situation. I think farmers across Ontario know that it's the PC government that has their back. Yields are actually up in most agricultural industries, so I think farmers know, Ontarians know, that this government has the right approach to not only ensure that we have a strong agricultural system for years to come but that we're also getting shovels in the ground to build homes. This bill helps us achieve those two objectives, as written. Therefore, I recommend my government colleagues, and all colleagues of the committee, to vote no against this amendment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** We can meet our housing supply targets and protect our farmland at the same time. The government's own hand-picked Housing Affordability Task Force was adamant that access to land is not a barrier in us meeting our 1.5-million housing target goals. It doesn't make any sense to unnecessarily open up farmland for development, given that we have a better alternative—we have a far better alternative—which is why I'm introducing this motion.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 9.4 lost.

Moving on to amendment 10: MPP McMahon, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 6(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “July 1, 2023” in the portion before paragraph 1 of subsection 34(10.12) of the Planning Act and substituting “December 31, 2023”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** You've heard this before many times. It's going to come many more times, and it's just about extending the date a few months. We talked about the reasons why: because we want to build the best possible homes and buildings that we can, and we need to work collaboratively with all partners and all stakeholders, so just a little bit more time. The city of Toronto did suggest that in their submission, and they have the most experience with planning out of any municipality in Ontario—in Canada, I would argue. Well, we know: shovels in the ground, cranes—we have more than the four major US cities put together. So why not heed expert advice?

Thanks again in advance for your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam:** Madam Chair, our government's goal is to build homes faster, and this motion is inconsistent with our government's proposal regarding the gradual fee refunds for zoning and also for the site plan control application. So, therefore, I recommend all colleagues in this committee vote against it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I will be supporting MPP McMahon's motion. Municipalities have been pretty clear that the Conservatives have thrown their planning processes into chaos. There are rule changes, and then there are more rule changes and then there are more rule changes. There's no adequate consultation before a bill is introduced to get it right, and that's why we're seeing these changes here in Bill 97, where you're looking at bringing in the phased-in refunds. Now you're delaying it because municipalities are like, “We can't handle that kind of change that quickly.” This is a very reasonable motion by MPP McMahon to give municipalities more time to bring in some of the changes that you've proposed. I'm going to be supporting it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment number 10?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 10 lost.

Moving now to amendment 10.0.1 from MPP Bell. Please go ahead.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm going to withdraw that motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Withdrawn. Fine. Thank you.

Amendment 10.1: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 6(1) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

“(1) Subsection 34 (10.12) of the act is repealed.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The purpose of this motion is to repeal the Conservatives' decision to craft up a very draconian fee-refund measure that throws municipalities' planning departments into chaos. A lot of work—a huge amount of work—goes into approving an application, especially if it's for a big building. It requires talking to multiple different departments, including the provincial government and provincial departments. It requires lots of studies: traffic studies, infrastructure studies. It takes time. There needs to be consultation.

Creating a “stick” approach where municipalities are punished for doing their best doesn't make a lot of sense. Municipalities have already said pretty clearly that this kind of refund system could actually slow down the approval process. We heard a mayor come in and give testimony talking about how municipalities are requiring developers to do the back and forth and all the pre-studies before the clock starts because they need to make sure everything gets done right, before they assess it.

We're also hearing municipalities say, “Look, it could create a situation where we're not even going to seriously consider an application if we don't think we can meet the deadline”—maybe because they're understaffed—“so we're just going to send it to the lands tribunal,” which delays everything even further. It's having this unintended consequence of delaying the approval of projects and making sure we do the study that we need to do before we approve them. So I'm introducing this motion to repeal the refund process.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Sabawy.

**Mr. Sheref Sabawy:** Thank you very much to the member from the opposition. I don't know how you can continue trying to protect the delays, protect the slowness or slow the process. According to the president of the mayors' association, when he was in a hearing in one of the housing bills here, from the day the developer acquires the land to the day they sell the unit, it's 11 years. I don't think that this is something worth—that we defend it and we keep holding on. There's a two-year appeal process. Only the appeal process is two years.

I think that what this bill is doing is trying to reasonably accelerate the process, putting some mandates for the cities, the municipalities to be able to serve the mandate. We need more housing. We cannot delay that.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 10.1 lost.

Moving to amendment 11, MPP McMahon, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 6(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out “July 1, 2023” in subsection 34(10.13) of the Planning Act and substituting “December 31, 2023.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I'm going to sound like a broken record, but I think that's what it's going to take to wake people up, because I don't think anyone in this room can attest to being a planning expert—correct me if I'm wrong. But we are hearing from the experts, from the city of Toronto. Give them a bit of wiggle room. Give them a bit of time to build the best-possible buildings, sustainable buildings and the proper type of housing in the proper location. What's a few months to do the right thing and have buy-in from most people and build a better Ontario? What's wrong with that?

1320

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Smith.

**Ms. Laura Smith:** I think what is happening is kind of a repeat of a broken record. We're doing this so that housing and shovels can get in the ground. We need to speed up the planning process, and I would actually argue—I think my colleague said 10 years. I've seen 15 years for it to go from the beginning to concept to building. So we need to get things moving, not regress.



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

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 11 lost.

Moving on to amendment 11.1: MPP Bell, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm going to withdraw that motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Withdraw? Okay.

We'll now move to ask the question. Shall schedule 6, section 6 carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are we ready for the vote? All those in favour of schedule 6, section 6 passing, please raise your hands. All those opposed to schedule 6, section 6? Schedule 6, section 6 has carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 7: Shall it carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 6, section 7 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 6, section 7, carries.

Moving to schedule 6, section 8, amendment number 12: MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 8 of schedule 6 to be bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"8. Subsections 38(3) to (6.1) of the act are repealed."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any discussion? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** A new topic you'll be excited about—it's not the extension—is the illustrious interim control bylaws. For those of you not familiar, it's a moratorium on building. I had this proposed, actually, by some of my residents when I first got elected, along Queen Street, when there was a six-storey application being submitted. I actually stood tall and stood up for the six-storey application. I also helped my residents understand planning, on my journey to understand it too, as a new city councillor, and then we ended up doing a planning study along Queen Street, and then, from that, many other city councillors saw the benefits in doing planning studies, and they did them in their wards as well.

But you've seen the submission by the city of Toronto. They do not support appeals to the interim control bylaws upon their enactment as the proposed changes have the potential of focusing efforts at a litigated tribunal hearing rather than channelling energies and addressing the identified potential issues through a vital planning study. Again, we want to work collaboratively with everyone, with the residents of Ontario; we want to work with

planners; we want to work with the developers, for the best possible outcome. We don't want to be wasting our time, energy and money in unnecessary tribunals. So I would ask that you support my amendment. Come on. Give it a chance.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** On that note, is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 12 lost.

Shall section 8 of schedule 6 carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise their hands. All those opposed, please raise their hands. I declare schedule 6, section 8, carried.

Moving now to schedule 6, section 9, amendment number 13: MPP McMahon, please, when you're ready.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Sure. As your punishment, we're going back to the dates again. Here we go:

I move that subsection 9(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "July 1, 2023" in the portion before paragraph 12 of subsection 41(11.1) of the Planning Act and substituting "December 31, 2023".

You know the drill. Thanks for your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment number 13 lost.

Moving to amendment number 13.1: I'll turn to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** We'll be withdrawing that motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you.

Moving to amendment 13.2: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 9(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out and the following substituted:

"(2) Subsection 41(11.1) of the act is repealed."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is very similar to the other motions that have been introduced. We don't believe that the forced refund process is a wise way to speed up planning approvals. In fact, we're hearing from municipalities that it could lead to delays. It could mean that project applicants will move to the lands tribunal for approval, which is only one part of the construction process, and that could not lead to fast and wise approvals where public consultation is conducted and the best project is built, which is why I'm introducing this motion to repeal the refund process.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 13.2 lost.

Moving now to amendment 14: MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Back at it again.

I move that subsection 9(3) of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by striking out "July 1, 2023" in subsection 41(11.2) of the Planning Act and substituting "December 31, 2023".

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** It's only a few months. It's not 11 years. Development in my time, in my ward, never took 11 years, so it can be done.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment number 14, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 14 lost.

Moving to amendment 14.1: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I will be withdrawing this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you.

Moving to amendment 14.2: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 9 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(6) Section 41 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"Penalty

"(15.4) Subject to and in accordance with the regulations, a municipality may, by bylaw, impose penalties on the owner of the land for failure to substantially commence development within a timely manner after the plans and drawings have been approved under this section."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is known as a "use it or lose it" policy, which motivates developers who are sitting on a

parcel of land to move ahead and construct the project that they said they would.

### 1330

We are finding that municipalities are approving far more projects than are actually built. Also, municipalities are understandably pretty concerned when the provincial government points the finger at municipalities but doesn't look at all the reasons why we are having some difficulty in meeting our housing supply targets. It's like some people get rewarded, but other people get punished.

That's why we're introducing this motion. It was recommended by people who came in and spoke in committee, as well as the written submissions that we received. We think it would be wise for municipalities to set up some reasonable conditions for why an applicant would be exempt from a "use it or lose it" policy. Maybe it's an affordable housing project and they're having difficulty getting financing; or a developer can show real financial hardship and that's why they're not proceeding; or it's a project that's in the public interest, maybe a hospital expansion project. "Use it or lose it" policies wouldn't apply in situations like that.

Where they would apply is in situations where developers had a long period of time to build and they're not, maybe because they're land banking or they're involved in speculation and they're not using the land for its best use, constraining supply, which is a problem in 2023. That's why I'm introducing this motion, and I encourage to you support it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** This is a fantastic amendment, and I give credit to my colleague beside me, MPP Bell, for this. We've all seen this in our areas: basically, a big hole, an empty lot; the building's already been razed and it's just sitting there, left to rack and ruin. Neighbours are talking, people are wondering what the heck's going on. I totally agree with that.

There are lots of complications and reasons why there are minimal delays—not 11-year delays—but this would absolutely help achieve the goal of 1.5 million homes in 10 years. It's exactly what you guys are saying: Stop with these delays. This is exactly on par with what you are saying, so there would be no reason to oppose this whatsoever. It makes complete sense.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready for the vote? It's a recorded vote on amendment 14.2.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 14.2 lost.

Moving to amendment 14.3, I'll turn to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 9 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(6) Section 41 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Projects with 10 or fewer residential units

“(17) Despite anything else in this section, a municipality may continue to use site plan control for projects with 10 or fewer residential units to the extent necessary for the implementation of applicable provisions of the Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan or any other prescribed plan.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason we're introducing this motion is because we've heard loud and clear from Ontarians that they care about the water quality of the Great Lakes. They care about the greenbelt. They want it to be protected. They care about the Niagara Escarpment. They want it to be protected.

We're also hearing from municipalities that having site plan control in areas that affect the greenbelt and the Niagara Escarpment and the Lake Simcoe area matters. This is why I'm introducing this amendment, to make sure we achieve a balance, we protect our water, we protect our precious greenbelt and the Niagara Escarpment region as well. It makes a whole lot of sense, and I urge you to support it.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 14.3 lost.

Shall schedule 6, section 9 carry? Any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise your hands, on schedule 6, section 9. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 6, section 9 is carried.

Going to schedule 6, section 10: Shall it carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 6, section 10 carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 6, section 10 is carried.

Moving to schedule 6, section 11, amendment number 15: I'll turn to MPP McMahon, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 11 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Section 47 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Life safety, floods etc.

“(4.0.2) For greater certainty, an order made under subsection (1) cannot override any policy statements issued under subsection 3(1), any provincial plans or any official plans, including those that relate to life safety, flood hazards and accessibility.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I think we all want to keep our residents safe. That's our duty. Again, we're not planners, unless someone here is a planner—just let me know; shout it out. So I'm not sure why we're using this sledgehammer approach of just having one person, the minister, in charge, basically, of planning for all of Ontario. We might as well call up the universities and colleges and just say, “Cancel all your urban planning courses, because there's no need. There's a new authoritarian in town, the minister, who's going to make all the decisions.”

Personally, I would just say to any youth—even your own kids might want to study planning—“You know what? Go for it. But you're going to have to do it outside of Ontario, because where's the role for you?” Even though the minister said the other day at committee that we need more planners, they're looking for more planners, but why, when all the regulations, all the authority is going to fall on the minister's desk and basically no one else's is what you're saying?

Honestly, let's keep Ontarians safe. Let's support my amendment.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thank you, MPP McMahon. I think this is an excellent amendment. When people look to buy homes, it's such an emotionally laden process. They put their life savings into buying a home, everyone wants to make sure that home is not built in a flood plain so they're not subject to surprise and extraordinarily expensive flooding, which can really disrupt lives. I think about some of the floods that have taken place in Canada over the last decade because there wasn't adequate planning and foresight into flooding and the impact of flooding. The costs are astronomical. In the case of Calgary, it was upwards of \$6 billion. That's how much it cost in terms of property damage because of the floods there.

Ontario and the GTA is really lucky. Because we have the greenbelt and sensible water protection measures, and, until now, we've been pretty careful about avoiding building on wetlands and flood plains, we haven't seen those kinds of extreme, catastrophic, extraordinarily expensive floods that we have seen in other regions.

#### 1340

But then, when we see bills like Bill 23 and now this Bill 97, where the minister gets to override official plans and any provincial law they want and municipal laws in order to approve a project, even if it's on a flood plain, even if it could affect accessibility or safety, that's pretty

concerning. That's planning by donor; it's not planning in the public interest. I'm going to be supporting this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** I just want to state for the record, for any prospective planning students that are watching committee today, despite the hyperbole from the members opposite, we do need more planners in Ontario. There are lots of planning jobs coming, so please continue your studies. Don't drop out because of some of the reckless hyperbole that you've heard here from some members of the committee today.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** For sure. I want to encourage every youth to go after their desired vocation. But when the government is squashing policies and practices and the need for conservation authorities, for planners, then it's talking out of both sides of your mouth. It doesn't make sense. There was a city councillor who proposed a member's motion to get rid of the planning department at the city of Toronto the other month. It was in jest, it was tongue in cheek, but it was basically because of what the government of Ontario is doing to the planning process. You're wreaking havoc.

That's what I would say to kids. I would say to them, "Okay, maybe not urban planning, but run for office so we can set the ship straight again."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** We need more planners. We have a shortage. Please stay in school.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate, anybody? Are we ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 15 lost.

Moving now to amendment 15.1: I'll go to MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 11 of schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(2) Section 47 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"Agricultural impact assessment

"(20) The minister shall not make an order under this section that purports to change the uses permitted on land that was zoned for prescribed agricultural uses as of the day section 11 of schedule 6 to the Helping Homebuyers, Protecting Tenants Act, 2023 came into force, or the

zoning of the land itself, unless an agricultural impact assessment has been carried out in accordance with the regulations."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell for debate.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is similar to the motion that I raised earlier. It was a motion developed by MPP Vanthof. His riding has a big farming community. Many of his constituents, like many of your constituents and my constituents, are very concerned about the Conservatives' move to really threaten the future of farmland in Ontario by doubling down on sprawl with no density requirements. You've eliminated all density requirements—you're potentially going to—and that's a shame.

This motion is saying, "Look, hold on. We need to protect one of our biggest economic drivers, our farming sector, by doing an agricultural impact assessment. Before we issue an MZO or move forward with allowing some kind of development—a factory, a warehouse, a bunch of single-family homes on half-acre lots—we need to look at how this is going to affect our farmland as well."

Your own Housing Affordability Task Force was very clear: We can protect our farmland; we do not need to access new land that isn't zoned yet for development in order to meet our housing targets. You've been hearing from stakeholders loud and clear that we can't continue down this path of losing over 300 acres a day of farmland—we just can't—which is why I'm introducing this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Happy to support this great motion. We hear from stakeholders all the time at this committee about how vital farmland is, and we know it—we should know it, because we all eat—and also in detail about the types of soil that we have in Ontario and the class 1 farmland and whatnot and how lucky we are to live in a province that can grow as much food in as great conditions as we have in Ontario. So we don't want to look the golden goose in the face and just throw it away. We need our farmland. We know how much we're losing on a daily basis.

Again, I'm not sure anyone is a farmer in this room—but correct me if I'm wrong—so why not heed the advice of experts? That's what we're here to do: to listen and to act accordingly, so I'm supporting this.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** I'm not a farmer, but my dad is a farmer, for the member from Beaches–East York, so I grew up on a farm; I'm very well aware of it and represent a farming community.

Bill 97 is about helping homebuyers and protecting tenants. I encourage everyone, as I've told many people in my riding, to submit a comment on the proposed provincial planning statement on the Environmental Registry of Ontario, open until June 5. I know many people are commenting on it, which is great to see. The government encourages everyone on all sides to submit comments to that.

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

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Laura Smith, Rae, Sabawy, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 15.1 lost.

We'll now move on to schedule 6, section 11. There were two notices filed that don't need to be read, just to let you know. So is there any debate on schedule 6 and section 11? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** We're assuming that we're going to do these notices together. They're the same thing. Okay.

Yes, I'm very concerned about section 11. Essentially, section 11 allows the minister to issue an MZO—and it is an MZO on steroids. I've said this many times, because there have been so many bills where it's like the minister forgot and was like, "Oh no. We need an MZO that's even stronger, because what about this little barrier we need, or what about this little barrier we need?" So once again, we see a section where an MZO is given even more steroids so that it can bypass municipal planning processes, official plans. Now, it can bypass a provincial policy statement and provincial laws—essentially anything that gets in the way of an MZO being issued.

Now, I just want to be clear: I'm not opposed to MZOs point-blank. We have MZOs in University–Rosedale that have been approved by the city of Toronto, requested by the city of Toronto, for projects that are in the public interest. We had an issue at 877 Yonge, where the parking minimums were really excessive. It was a supportive housing project; they didn't need that many parking spots. And an MZO was issued there. I wholeheartedly support it.

There's a matter we face right now with Toronto Western, where it's a really busy hospital. I visited. It's a hard hospital; its emergency rooms are often full. And Toronto Western is looking at doing an expansion of the emergency room, and there was interest in having an MZO there. I fully support it—great. The community wants an expanded emergency room.

1350

But what I'm concerned about is when we have an MZO process which creates some kind of two-tier planning system, where—I'm just imagining this—a developer wants an approval to go ahead and they don't want to go through the public consultation process or deal with elected officials—so, imagine they just want the right to call up the minister and say, "Look, I've given you a lot of money in the last election. I've helped you out, and now I want this project approved and I want it approved fast." What that does is it creates this two-tiered planning system where we have potentially PC Party donors going to the

front of the planning queue and getting their projects approved without any due diligence or conversations with elected officials, the public, and then we have everyone else waiting. I don't think that's right, so I am recommending that we vote against section 11.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Okay. Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Sure. Great minds think alike, because we both had the same amendment, MPP Bell and I. MPP Bell has done a great job explaining it, and I'll just add some more context to it, because I'm sure you are eager to hear about the city of Toronto's stance on this.

Bill 97 proposes to provide the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing with new powers—we know that—under the Planning Act when issuing an MZO. Bill 97 would give the minister the power to order that policy statements, provincial plans and official plans do not apply to downstream approvals, such as licence/permit approval or permission, and that's required before a use is permitted by the MZO. Downstream approvals related to the MZO could not be denied for the reason of non-conformity to provincial policy or municipal official plan policy.

For example, an MZO may permit residential uses in an area where the official plan does not and will proceed through the approval process regardless of municipal policies. This has serious implications, setting a speculative unpredictable planning regime in Ontario, detached from long-range planning objectives. Yes, I think planning students would have some concern with this in their studies.

You know that Toronto city staff do not support the minister's ability to make regulations and orders related to planning functions that would otherwise have been directed by local municipalities. So it's basically robbing municipalities of their say in the game as well, and then city staff recommend that the legislation confirm that policies related to life, safety, flood hazards and accessibility continue to apply to all lands subject to an MZO order.

We've talked about that. We've heard about the flooding in Alberta. We know that the price tag on flooding in BC was \$9 billion. I'm not sure Ontario wants to fork out that kind of dough. We've been very lucky because of the greenbelt and because of the tremendous oversight from the conservation authorities, but we're meddling with both of them, and then I could throw in Bill 56 just for the heck of it, my private member's bill on flooding awareness and emergency preparedness that wasn't supported. There's no reason not to support this to keep Ontarians safe.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I want to read into the record what the Ontario Federation of Agriculture said about section 11:

"As a strong advocate for the protection of Ontario's farmlands for their long-term ability to produce food, fibre, fuel, flowers, and nursery stock, OFA is unable to

support amendments to the Planning Act that would give the minister or any other planning authority the ability to make planning decisions which are not consistent with the PPS 2020.” That’s the provincial planning statement. “On balance, the policies of the PPS 2020 represent the minimum standard in support of protecting the environment, farmland and public health and safety....

“We are concerned that amending the Planning Act in a way that would allow for planning decisions that are inconsistent with the PPS 2020 could open up the flood-gates for a rash of developments that run counter to our overarching philosophy of farmland preservation, which is paramount to our mission of ‘Farms and Food Forever.’”

I agree with that statement.

I listened to MPP Rae mention that there’s essentially a difference between the Conservatives’ changes to the growth plan and the provincial planning statement and Bill 97. There is; there are two different changes that are happening concurrently. However, there are sections in Bill 97 that are related, that affect how we plan and how we build in Ontario, and section 11 is one of them, which is why we are raising these issues around farmland and the need to really curb expensive sprawl in this section.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** For the record, farmers in Ontario know that the PC government has their back. We heard from one of the PC members on the committee who actually comes from a farming family, is a farmer and represents a farming constituency. I know New Democrats have 30-odd seats and there are some New Democrats that actually represent agricultural communities. They are entitled to three members on this committee. I know this topic is important to those members and I’m wondering if we have any New Democrats here today that represent an agricultural constituency that would like to weigh in on this debate.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I have introduced motions today that were developed by MPP Vanthof and it’s my job as an MPP to make sure that when stakeholders come in that represent areas that aren’t University–Rosedale, I seriously consider the proposals that they have or the concerns that they have. I do my best to represent them here, and that’s what we’re doing with section 11 today.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** I just want to restate again: New Democrats are entitled to three members on this committee, so I’m just wondering again—I have a tremendous amount of respect for MPP Bell. As MPP Bell mentioned, she represents downtown Toronto. I’m wondering if there’s any New Democrats that represent farmers and represent a farming constituency that are here today that want to weigh in on the bill.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I’m not sure about this line of questioning that’s come out all morning from

MPP McGregor, because I’m not sure you’ve brought all your Conservative farming members to committee either. I feel that the opposition party has put their faith in their member of provincial Parliament here, who is a member of this committee. MPP Bell is competent and clever and creative and collaborative, in my experience with her on committee. I’m sure, as she mentioned, she worked with her colleagues with a farming background.

I would just question: If that’s your line of questioning, where are your Conservative MPPs who have a farming background? Besides MPP Rae, who’s family has a farming background, which is great.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** If there’s any further debate, I’ll just remind members maybe to go through the Chair. Seeing none, is everyone ready to vote on schedule 6, section 11? Shall it carry? Is there any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 6, section 11 carried.

Moving on to schedule 6, section 12: There is an NDP notice for section 12 of schedule 6. MPP Bell, if you would like to have any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Section 12 is similar to what was raised earlier. It relates to the provincial land and development facilitator. It gives the minister and the provincial land and development facilitator body an extraordinary amount of power.

What’s also concerning is that I’ve introduced motions to shine a light into this opaque process, to put some transparency into how these decisions are made, and the Conservatives chose to vote that down.

#### 1400

What we were asking for was pretty standard: What is the facilitator recommending to the minister? What is the minister recommending to the facilitator? What agreements are they signing with landowners? How much does the landowner have to pay? What kind of developments are going to be approved? It seems pretty sensible. We want a transparent and accountable government. We all do. Making sure that these decisions are public, especially when it could override our municipal processes or impose conditions on a landowner that maybe they don’t want—it seems like a bit of transparency would make sense.

I mentioned this, also: It is really not clear what these new powers are going to be used for. Is it related to the divorce with Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga? Where exactly is this going to be applied? I’m pretty stunned that this bill was introduced a few weeks ago and I’ve raised these questions in the Legislature and directly with the minister, and we still don’t have any clear answers.

I'm going to be recommending that we vote against section 12 of schedule 6 to the bill, because it's just too much power in the hands of one person. It really is.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate on schedule 6, section 12? Are the members ready for the question?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare section 6, section 12 carried.

We'll now move to schedule 6, section 12.1. We have amendment 15.2 for MPP Bell, when you're ready.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that schedule 6 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

"12.1 Section 70 of the Act is amended by adding the following clause:

“(b) for the purposes of sections 34 and 47,

“(i) prescribing agricultural uses, and

“(ii) governing agricultural impact assessments;”

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Oh, I apologize. I would like to withdraw this motion. It was only relevant if the other motions passed. I'm sorry.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you very much. We're just catching up on that. Amendment 15.2 is withdrawn.

We'll now move to schedule 6, section 13. This is amendment number 16. MPP McMahon, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that subsection 13(2) of schedule 6 to the bill be struck out.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP McMahon, any debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I just would love your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment number 16?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 16 lost.

We'll now move to schedule 6, section 13. Is it to be carried as a whole? Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 6, section 13 carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Is there any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I will be voting against the changes to the Planning Act, schedule 6. The reasons are pretty simple. I know we need to be protecting our farmland, and schedule 6 really disregards evidence-based planning principles.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, shall schedule 6, as amended, carry?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 6 carried.

We'll now move to schedule 7, which is—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Wait a minute. Sorry, we'll just pause for a second.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** We'll resume schedule 7, the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006. Schedule 7, section 0.1: We have amendment number 17. MPP McMahon, when you're ready, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 0.1 be added to schedule 7 to the bill:

"0.1 Section 6.1 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 is repealed."

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Committee members, the proposed amendment is out of order. As Bosc and Gagnon note in the third edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice, "an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill." So that is out of order.

MPP Bell, do you have a point of order?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** MPP McMahon, I'd like to call for a vote to see if we can discuss this now. I believe it can be debated if there's unanimous consent.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** You'll need to ask to seek unanimous consent. MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm asking to seek unanimous consent to debate this motion to bring back rent control on all units, including units that are built after 2018. I see MPP Sabawy shake his head. I'll tell you who shakes their heads: It's the residents who contact us who are getting—

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, it was just seeking unanimous consent—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes, okay.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Do we have unanimous consent? We don't have unanimous consent, so we'll now be moving on to amendment 17.1 from the NDP. MPP Bell, you can go now.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“0.1 Section 6.1 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 is repealed.”

This would bring back rent control on all units—it doesn't matter when they were built—including units that were built after 2018. We do not need to sacrifice housing affordability in order to meet our housing supply targets, and that's what this motion does.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, I have to make a ruling that the proposed amendment is out of order—same reasons as before. Do I need—

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I'm sorry. I'll read it out. As Bosc and Gagnon note in the third edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice, “an amendment is accordingly out of order ... if it is inconsistent with a decision that the committee has made regarding a former amendment,” which we just did. So it's ruled out of order.

We're now moving on to schedule 7, section 1, amendment number 18. MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 1 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 36.1 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006:

“Landlord to reimburse costs

“(3.1) The landlord shall reimburse the tenant for the costs of installing a window or portable air conditioner in accordance with this section.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate, MPP McMahon?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Absolutely. It's pretty self-explanatory. It's actually my favourite amendment today. We all, I think, are in agreement that we're in a climate emergency. Extreme heat is upon us. The best thing about Bill 97 is the air conditioning, and thank you for putting that in. But I don't feel that the cost should be on the backs of renters. The air conditioning units can remain in the residential units as part of the property owner's property, so I think that it should be covered by the landlord as it is a piece of equipment that will remain in the unit, similar to a fridge or a stove and whatnot.

1410

Thank you for putting this in and for caring for renters as far as extreme heatwaves and whatnot, but let's just take it a little bit further. All right? Thank you.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Smith.

**Ms. Laura Smith:** Some leases have prevented tenants from installing their own air conditioners, and that's why we're taking these steps to solve these problems: to clarify and provide tenants with more choice. If we would allow

this, then we would also place an undue financial burden on the landlords that's not within their direct control, and it could, in turn, increase the cost of a unit.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate that wants to be in Hansard? Seeing none, are we ready to vote on amendment number 18?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Amendment 18 is lost. Moving on to amendment 18.1. I go to MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** I move that section 1 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to 36.1 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006:

“Reasonable inspection”—

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Can you just reread from “subsection” again?

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** —by adding the following subsection to section 36.1 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006:

“Reasonable inspection

“(3.1) For greater certainty, a reasonable inspection by a landlord for the purpose of determining compliance with paragraph 3, 4 or 5 of subsection (3) is a circumstance for which a landlord may enter a rental unit under paragraph 4 of subsection 27(1) of the act,”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP Rae.

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** The government is proposing this motion and hoping members of the committee will vote for this motion. It provides greater certainty around when a landlord, obviously with proper notice, can enter the rental unit to verify that the AC unit was installed safely and securely, ensuring that there's this clarity within the legislation. It also helps address potential liability landlords may face for unsafe or improper installation of an AC unit, just building on that and providing greater certainty to our landlords in Ontario.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Amendment 18.1 is carried.

Moving to amendment 18.2. I'll go to MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 1 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out subsections 36.1(4) to (9) of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This motion aims to do away with the Conservatives' decision to allow landlords to have tenants pay for the increase in electricity in order to install an air conditioning unit and run an air conditioning unit in the



hot months of the year. There are a few reasons why we're concerned about this. One is that there's a lot of gray area with how this new law is going to be rolled out. What happens if a tenant has had an air conditioning unit in their home for years, the landlord has known about it, but it is not in their lease? What happens in situations like that? Do they pay a seasonal fee? It's not clear.

Could this mean that the 1.4 million renter households that use an air conditioning unit—let's say a percentage of them do. Are all of them going to see a bill in their mailboxes come early June, an extra rent hike, because of this law, even though what they're doing is just wanting to stay safe? So what does this mean? Who does it this apply to? Who doesn't it apply to?

Then the other thing is that the Residential Tenancies Act explicitly bans seasonal fees, so we're very surprised to see changes to the Residential Tenancies Act that allow fees for some utilities that you use. Could this mean that landlords or this government are looking at cracking open this door even further and saying, "Okay. Well, renter, if you want a dishwasher, you're going to have to pay an extra electricity charge as well." It's a slippery slope; that is correct. The Residential Tenancies Act is very clear about that.

The other thing the Residential Tenancies Act is very clear about is that it's the renter's responsibility to pay rent and renters are paying record high rent right now. In some cases and in some cities, they're paying more than what a homeowner—especially one that bought more than 10 years ago—is paying in a mortgage, but they're not getting equity out of that. They're just paying off someone else's mortgage.

So renters are in a really tough spot right now. They're paying a whole lot for not a lot. But they pay their rent on time and, in return, the landlord has an obligation to ensure the tenant has reasonable enjoyment of their unit. That's the agreement we already have. So when landlords actively stop a tenant from installing an air conditioning unit, in many people's view, they're violating the reasonable enjoyment of the tenant's right to that unit. Tenants should already have the right to install an air conditioning unit, and they are already paying enough rent—record high rent—to live in that unit. So I'm very concerned about this idea of allowing some landlords to impose even higher fees. That's very concerning.

What I don't see in Bill 97, which I'm also concerned about, is the second half of the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal's ruling. You've implemented half of the tribunal's ruling, which is around the right to tenants to have air conditioning units, but what is missing is this need to have a maximum temperature bylaw that landlords must follow. It's what Toronto and Ajax and Mississauga already have. Just like there's a minimum temperature in winter—homes have to stay above that so tenants aren't too cold—it's time for us to have a maximum temperature in summer as well, and I'm surprised and disappointed that Bill 97 doesn't have that.

In essence, with this motion, we're calling for there to be no seasonal fees introduced if a tenant wants to stay safe

and protect themselves and not be miserable in summer by installing an air conditioning unit.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you. Is there further debate? MPP Smith.

**Ms. Laura Smith:** This is a new service, and this gives choice to the tenants, and just like any other new service or amenity added to a lease, a tenant would be responsible for paying their installation and use of an air conditioning unit. It gets back to why this bill was brought forward. Some leases have prevented tenants from installing their own air conditioner, and this now allows them to do that as long as the right circumstances are in line. This is a new installation that wasn't built into the original lease; therefore, I submit that it should actually be paid by the tenant.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** I'm a tenant—not by choice, like some members have said. I'd certainly love to be a homeowner; I certainly hope to be one, one day. My hydro bill goes up in the summer and it goes down in the winter, and my natural gas bill goes up in the winter and it goes down in the summer. I'm able to make it through. I am somebody that can make choices on my spending and budget accordingly, and I don't think it's wholly unreasonable. For that reason, I'd just recommend my colleagues vote against this amendment.

1420

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Only the Conservatives would turn a Human Rights Tribunal ruling into a rent hike.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment 18.2?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahan.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 18.2 lost.

We'll now move to amendment 18.3. MPP Bell, when you're ready, please go ahead.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is related.

I move that section 1 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out subsection 36.1(5) of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 and substituting the following:

“Exception

“(5) Subsection (4) does not apply if the tenancy agreement does not,

“(a) expressly prohibit installation of a window or portable air conditioner; or

“(b) expressly provide for a rent increase if a window or portable air conditioner is installed.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The reason why I'm introducing this motion is that there are many tenants who already have the implicit right to install an air conditioning unit. Maybe they've already installed one. The landlord might know about it; the lease doesn't explicitly oppose it. And chances are, they're paying a lot of rent to live in that home. The challenge with Bill 97 is that it allows the landlord who might already know a tenant has an AC unit to charge an additional fee. This would just provide clarity and say if a tenant already has an air conditioning unit, and it's not explicitly prohibited by the lease, then they don't have to pay an additional seasonal fee.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** A recorded vote on amendment 18.3.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 18.3 lost.

We'll now ask, shall schedule 7, section 1, as amended, carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, all those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7, section 1 carried.

Moving now to schedule 7, section 2, amendment number 19, I'll ask MPP McMahon to begin.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 2 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Section 50 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Same

“(2.1) A notice under subsection (1) is not valid unless it is provided alongside a copy of every permit the landlord requires in order to complete the demolition, conversion, repair or renovation work.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Surely. I think, like everyone, we all want clarity, we all want stability and we want to not be involved in a guessing game, so this amendment would satisfy most tenants' doubts as to why they're being asked to leave. It's about the genuine intention of the landlord to actually undertake the stated work that they are proposing, and I think that's fair. It's quite simple, this one, because it's not asking a landlord who is acting in good faith to do anything more than they're already doing. Like everything, there are bad apples in the mix, and so this is just ensuring that landlords are doing things for the right reasons. For good landlords

who are already doing this, it's not a big deal. So it removes the guessing game and alleviates a lot of the stress for these tenants. Thank you for your support.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I will be supporting this motion. It makes a lot of sense to require a landlord to get the building permits in advance and present them to the tenant as part of their application before an eviction order proceeds. The reason why this is important is because the landlord already has to—if it's a significant renovation that will require a tenant to leave, a landlord is already going to have to get those building permits. So it's no unnecessary extra hurdle. But what it does do is that it stops those bad actor landlords who are moving forward with illegally evicting a tenant because they want to raise the rent to what the market rate is in order to maximize their profit. Unfortunately, it's the tenant that suffers.

It's a very sensible and reasonable motion. Many of the ACTO and FMTA—organizations that represent tenants at the Landlord and Tenant Board and represent tenants politically have been calling for this for some time.

We've also seen moves like this work very effectively in other municipalities to curb the rate of illegal eviction. Canada, unfortunately, has—a new report came out; I think it was issued by CMHC. It indicated that Canada is the eviction capital of the Western world. Our eviction rates are so high because we just don't do enough to protect tenants and make renting safe and affordable. They're often prey, and they're spending far too much money—I don't know how anyone can save. If you're a renter in Toronto, I don't know how anyone can save for a home that they own, that they want no own.

Protecting tenants from illegal eviction: I'm going to do everything I can to protect them, and this is a motion that achieves that. I urge to you support it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate amendment on amendment 19? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 19 lost.

Going to amendment 19.0.1: I'll turn to MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'll be withdrawing this motion because it's the same as 19.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you.

Moving to amendment 19.1: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 2 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection to section 50 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006:

“Offence

“(3.2) Any person who submits false or misleading information in a report under clause 50(3)(b) is guilty of an offence.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell for debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Bill 97 has done something a little good, which is to require a landlord to get a report showing that an eviction is necessary for renovations to proceed. However, unless there’s teeth in Bill 97, it could create a situation where false or misleading reports could be written that justify an eviction when an eviction isn’t really necessary.

This is a very simple change. It just puts teeth to this schedule and says that if you are tasked with the responsibility of writing a report to justify an eviction—you’re talking about someone losing their home—then we need to make sure that report is accurate. In order for that report to be accurate, it needs to be an offence for misleading or false information to be in that report. We’re talking about someone’s home. We’re talking about someone losing their home.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on amendment 19.1?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes, recorded vote, please.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 19.1 lost.

Moving now to amendment 19.2: I’ll turn to MPP Bell. 1430

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is similar to 19.1, so I am going to be withdrawing 19.2.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** We’ll now move to schedule 7, section 2. Is it carried? Any debate? Seeing no debate, all those in favour of schedule 7, section 2, please raise your hands. All those opposed to schedule 7, section 2, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7, section 2 carried.

Moving on to schedule 7, section 3, amendment 20: I’ll turn to MPP McMahon, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I move that section 3 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out “at least 60 days after the day the rental unit is ready for occupancy” in subsection 53(2.2) of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 and substituting “at least 60 days after the day the tenant is notified that the unit is ready for occupancy”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I think it’s fairly self-explanatory. It’s good, this addition of 53(2.2), but it’s just kind of semantics. Instead of 60 days’ notice to the tenant that their unit is ready for them to return, it just kind of rejigs that. We do note that there’s a disconnect in the language, and that could create ambiguity and could lead to misuse or misinterpretation of the intention. It’s basically “60 days notice after the day the rental unit is ready for occupancy” switched to “60 days notice after the day the tenant is notified.” C’est tout.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I will be supporting this motion, because it’s one of the many measures that needs to be changed in Bill 97 and in the Residential Tenancies Act to ensure that tenants get their guaranteed right of return into their home once renovations are complete or if the Landlord and Tenant Board finds that a landlord has illegally evicted a tenant.

The reason these are all extremely important is because the right to return is not being enforced. I’m going to give one example, because it’s just a great case study of what’s happening all across the province. We have some tenants in our riding who live in a building on Walmer Avenue, right near Bloor and Spadina. They were told to leave their apartment back in 2019, because the landlord and the property manager, Cromwell, said that they needed to renovate the building. They did all the right things, they filed all their paperwork that said they wanted to exercise their right of return and they moved out. We’re still working with two of them, Delroy Curling and Caitlin Gowans. Both of them live nearby so they’ve been anxiously watching the renovations over the past few years. One of them, Caitlin, can see the building from her apartment window.

What we found is that the renovations, for all intents and purposes, have been complete now. There’s no more construction scaffolding, there are no more workmen walking in and out and on site from 9 to 5 and there’s a sign out in front of the building saying, “Hey, new units are available to be occupied.” If you go online, they’re advertising this building as having units available.

We’ve actually called the leasing agent and asked if units are available and they’ve said, “Yes, yes, yes. We’re moving people in.” In fact, one of my colleagues, MPP West, has moved into the building. Caitlin has been watching U-Haul trucks line up outside of Walmer Avenue and students moving in. Meanwhile, they’re still waiting for Cromwell to give them permission to move into their unit. Both of them have contacted the property manager many times and the property manager said, “We just need to put an oven into your specific unit, or a refrigerator. That’s all we need to do.” But months have gone by and they still are not allowing these tenants to move in. Months have gone by.

We have raised this issue in the news. We’ve contacted the Rental Housing Enforcement Unit. We’ve talked to lawyers to see if we can motivate this property manager to

move these tenants in. We're not getting very far. The property manager refuses to return calls now. Caitlin and Delroy are still waiting. That's why I find it's so important that we strengthen the Residential Tenancies Act to ensure these tenants can get in. This idea of having the landlord or the property manager contact the tenant once occupancy is available is all part of that process to ensure tenants can get in. It's not the only thing, but it's all part of that process to get these tenants back in.

When I think about how effective this government is at helping tenants, I constantly go back to what is happening with Caitlin and Delroy, because they're on the front lines of what is available to tenants when a property manager chooses not to follow the law—because they're still waiting, even though the law is on their side and the Residential Tenancies Act very clearly says they've got the right to return. But right now, they're living in another apartment and watching their vacant unit, hoping that it doesn't get filled. So I'll be supporting this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment number 20 lost.

Now, we'll move on to schedule 7, section 3. Is there any debate? All those in favour of schedule 7, section 3, as a whole, carrying, please raise your hands. All those opposed? Schedule 7, section 3 is carried.

Moving on to schedule 7, Residential Tenancies Act, section 4, NDP motion 20.1: When MPP Bell is ready, you can start.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 4 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.1) Paragraph 1.1 of subsection 57(3) of the act is amended by adding ‘or the monetary benefit that was acquired by, or that accrued to, the landlord as a result of the contravention, whichever is greater’ after ‘not exceeding the equivalent of 12 months of the last rent charged to the former tenant’.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes. I would like to just explain this motion. This motion just increases the amount of penalties that a landlord can get if it's found that they are illegally evicting in bad faith. This will not apply to landlords who follow all the rules, good landlords. It applies to landlords who illegally evict. The penalty in this case is related to how much profit the landlord makes, which is why it has whatever the “greater” is if the landlord has profited from

a bad faith eviction. That's why I'm introducing this motion: to really crack down on bad-faith evictions.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? Seeing none, are members prepared to vote on amendment 20.1?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.1 lost.

Moving to 20.1.0, I'll go to MPP Bell again.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 4 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“0.1 Section 57 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

“Minimum total specified sums

“(3.1) If the board finds that the landlord gave a notice of termination in bad faith,

“(a) the board shall make an order or orders under paragraphs 1, 1.1 or 1.2 of subsection (3), or under any combination of these paragraphs; and

1440

“(b) the total of specified sums in the order or orders shall not be less than \$35,000.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes. The reason why I'm introducing this motion is that, if a tenant is illegally evicted and the tenant makes it all the way to the Landlord and Tenant Board to make their case, which most tenants don't do—they don't do it. The reason why they don't do it is because they have to act like a private investigator and a good Samaritan and gather all this evidence to prove that they've been illegally evicted. Most people are working, raising families; they don't have the time to do that. Then they need to wait upwards of two years to get their case heard at the Landlord and Tenant Board because this government has decided to create a two-tiered LTB system where landlords can get their case heard in a shorter period of time and tenants are waiting up to two years, double the amount of time, to get their case heard.

So they have to wait a long time, and then when they get to the Landlord and Tenant Board and they make their case, what happens is, if an adjudicator rules that the tenant was illegally evicted, the tenant pretty much gets nothing out of it. The fine that a landlord is going to be fined goes to the government. It doesn't go to the tenant. The maximum a tenant can get is the difference in rent for about 12 months. That's if they spend two years volunteering to make their case.

What this motion says is that there should be a minimum amount of fine that goes to the tenant, because the tenant is the one that suffered the hardship, the tenant

is the one that has lost their home, because they never get back in, and it's the tenant who has spent two years taking this case to the Landlord and Tenant Board on the slim hope that they're going to win.

So this is saying the tenant should be properly compensated by the landlord for being illegally evicted and losing their home, and I urge you to support it. It's just simple justice.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Wow, this is really innovative. I really like it. It makes sense, and there is precedent, because you have, for example, the Ontario Municipal Board when they go after costs. So it's not out of the blue. It's not some wild and woolly idea that has never been done before. It has been done before. It's practised. It has precedent.

I think this is really, really innovative, really smart and a great way to, again, protect and support and assist with tenants all across Ontario, and maybe beyond, when you support this today.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** When we're talking about fines and the amount of fines the landlord gets if they're illegally evicted, the government has made a decision to double the amount of fines for individuals or corporations who violate a section of the Residential Tenancies Act. The Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario took the time—I've mentioned this already—and they went into CanLII and they looked at LTB decisions to get a better understanding—because the fines were already quite high—of what kind of fines landlords actually get in real life. I want to read out this section in the hopes that you better understand why this motion is necessary so that there's a minimum standard and that tenants are properly compensated. What's happening in real life is not good.

“When Bill 184 was announced, it was lauded for its toughest administrative fines that would deter bad landlords and protect tenants.” That sounds familiar. It's similar language to what is happening in Bill 97. “They did not work, which is why Bill 97 is proposing to hike fines even higher. As we submitted then, fines are not a deterrent for landlords acting in bad faith. Instead, we must address the root cause” of “bad faith evictions—the vacancy decontrol loophole.” Rest assured, there will be a motion coming on that shortly.

“There isn't a transparent and readily accessible way to track the number of administrative fines issued against landlords. ACTO conducted a CanLII search of the T5 applications for notice of termination given in bad faith from July 2020, when Bill 184 was enacted, to the present”—so a chunk of time, three years—“to assess the administrative fines issued by the board.” Get this, okay? I hope you're listening. “There were 74 T5 applications in the database.” That's not a lot. Most tenants don't bother. They give up. They know the Landlord and Tenant Board isn't their friend, so they don't apply, so, very few applications. It's 74 very motivated people. “Only 14 of these

applications included an administrative fine as a remedy requested by the tenant.” Most people wanted their home back; they never get it. “Of these applications that were decided in the tenant's favour—the board declined to issue an administrative fine in half the cases.” Okay, 1.4 million households, and we're down to 20 cases here. “In the other half of the cases where the board did issue an administrative fine,” which means they found the landlord was acting in bad faith, “the fines only ranged from \$500 to \$3,000. At the end of the day fines are meaningless if the board never fully utilizes them.”

So, you see a situation where a landlord is going to kick out a long-term tenant who is being rent-controlled and maybe they run the risk of maybe having that tenant go to the LTB—maybe, a slim chance—and the fines they will get are \$500 to \$3,000. A landlord could make that back in one to two months. So there's no reason why a landlord wouldn't illegally evict if they wanted to increase their profit margins and violate the Residential Tenancies Act, and there's nothing I see in this bill that's going to address that, which is why we're introducing this amendment. There's a portion of the money that goes to the tenants, so they're compensated for their two years' volunteer time, and we're going to start talking about proper minimum fines.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP Smith.

**Ms. Laura Smith:** Through you, Chair: Bill 97 is already proposing to increase the maximum fine for residential tenancy offences. This is precisely why we're doing this, to protect the rights of the tenants. We're proposing the highest maximum fines for the country for residential tenancy offences. This is why we're doing this, and I would ask everybody to support this.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote, please.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.1.0 lost.

We're moving now to amendment 20.2, and I'll go to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I like it when you open up the Residential Tenancies Act.

I move that section 4 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(0.2) Subsection 57(5) of the act as amended by striking out “or” at the end of clause (d), by adding “or” at the end of clause (e) and by adding the following clause:

“(f) knew or reasonably ought to have known at any time between the date of the section 48 notice and the date

of the eviction that there was, or within a reasonable time period would be, another vacant unit in the building able to reasonably serve the purpose for which the section 48 notice was issued.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I’ll explain what this motion means. Essentially, what it would mean is that, in order for an eviction to proceed, a landlord would need to offer a tenant who is being evicted another unit in that building if it’s available. The reason why we say that is because sometimes landlords illegally evict—we know this; some of them do—and they illegally evict because they want to increase the rent to market rent. So if you’re a tenant, you’ve been in your building for a while, you’re protected by rent control, maybe you’re paying \$1,500 a month for a one- or a two-bedroom unit, what some landlords do, especially financialized landlords, corporate landlords, is they will say a home needs to be renovated, the tenant needs to move out, and they will do it so that they can increase their rent to a total of maybe \$3,000. That’s the going rate for a two-bedroom apartment in Toronto today. So they make a whole lot of money. What we’re saying is that if another unit is available in the building, then the tenant should have the option to move into that other vacant unit and that the landlord should offer it to them. That ensures that the tenant gets to keep their rent-controlled apartment—maybe it’s in a different section of the building—and they get to continue to live in the neighbourhood they love. The kids get to go to the same school; if they’re a senior, they get to stay connected to their services, nearby to their doctor if it’s nearby, nearby their friends—they get to stay in their community. That’s really what this is all about.

1450

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** This totally makes sense. I don’t know why anyone would oppose it. It’s, again, helping the hardship that the tenants are going through and alleviating stress. It’s not a big deal; it’s just a different unit in the building. It’s not a big deal for the landlord—it shouldn’t be, if they’re a good-faith landlord. I’m sure you all have tenants who have faced this, so why not support it? Thanks in advance.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? Okay, are members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**Ayes**

Bell, McMahon.

**Nays**

Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.2 lost.

Moving now to amendment 20.3: I’ll go to MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I’m going to withdraw motion 20.3.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Amendment 20.3 is withdrawn.

We’ll now move to schedule 7, section 4 to carry. Is there any debate? Yes, MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Overall, the Residential Tenancies Act and the rights tenants have in it, including the fines that landlords face and the rights that tenants have—we’ve got some problems here. I’ve said it time and time again, it’s not working; tenants aren’t able to get back into their units if they are illegally evicted. Evidence clearly shows that bad landlords are getting away with illegally evicting tenants and that there’s not enough enforcement of the fines to motivate them to do the right thing.

There are some improvements in this section of the act, but experts are telling us loud and clear, and evidence is being presented very clearly, that it doesn’t go far enough.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on schedule 7, section 4? All those in favour of schedule 7, section 4, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7, section 4 carried.

Moving on to schedule 7, section 5: Shall it carry? Any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? Shall schedule 7, section 5 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Schedule 7, section 5 is carried.

Moving on to schedule 7, section 6, amendment 20.4: I will turn to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** This is where it could get a bit like a rocky road. Just with the amendments—

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** —it got a little rocky. Okay, 20.4: I’m just going to read it out. Hopefully we have the same thing.

I move that section 6 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Section 72 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Other vacant unit

“(5) The board shall not make an order terminating a tenancy and evicting the tenant in an application under section 69 based on a notice of termination given under section 48 if there is, or within a reasonable time period will be, another vacant unit in the building reasonably able to serve the purpose for which the section 48 notice was issued.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, would you like to debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Same thing: This motion applies to the situation where a landlord is saying, “Look, I want to renovate” or “I want to move in,” and they’re taking the case to the Landlord and Tenant Board. This directs the board essentially to say, “Look, we’re not going to evict this tenant, because you, the landlord, have another vacant unit in the building, and that means that you can move the tenant to that other vacant unit.” They can continue to live

in a rent-controlled apartment in that building and renovations can proceed in the now-vacant unit. Everyone is happy, the renovations get done and the tenant isn't evicted. They don't lose their home, and they still get to have the rent-controlled unit. Then, once the renovations are done, the tenant can move back.

So this is really about balance, and this would give the board extra power to ensure a tenant isn't unnecessarily or illegally kicked out.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.4 lost.

Moving now to amendment 20.4.1, and MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Thanks. This is very similar.

I move that section 6 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(4) Section 72 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Order for offer of vacant unit

“(5) With respect to an application under section 69 based on a notice of termination given under section 48, the board may order the landlord to offer the tenant the first available vacant unit of similar size in the same building at the former rent.””

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes. The language in this pretty much explains it. The reality is tenants do not get to move back into their home if they are illegally evicted. It literally never happens.

We've had situations in University–Rosedale. Shortly after I got elected, we had a tenant contact us. He was forcibly evicted, he and his roommates were, by a landlord who just bought the property. The landlord assaulted one of the tenants. We were working with our Kensington-Bellwoods legal clinic. We went to the police. The police were very concerned that an assault had happened, but they said, “Our hands are tied,” about getting these tenants back into their unit who were forcibly evicted, even though it was clear this was an illegal eviction.

We called the Rental Housing Enforcement Unit. I don't know if you've tried to call them before, but they don't have the capacity to get involved. So even though the Rental Housing Enforcement Unit should uphold the Residential Tenancies Act—that's their job—they said, “Look, we can't do anything. You've got to go to the Landlord and Tenant Board.” The Landlord and Tenant

Board application began, but in the end it didn't go anywhere, because this individual ended up in a homeless shelter on Bathurst Street. He didn't have the capacity or the time. He was just trying to survive. He didn't have the time to take this to the Landlord and Tenant Board. It was a real tragedy.

So this gets to the real issue of how we need to make sure that tenants aren't illegally evicted in the first place, and if they are, the board has the power to move the tenant back into the same building, into the first available vacant unit at about the same rent, so we can really start enforcing that right to return. That's exactly what this motion does. If you're really serious about protecting people and helping ensure they keep their homes, then you'd support this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.4.1 lost.

Now, shall schedule 7, section 6 carry? Is there any debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Thank you. Schedule 7, section 6 is carried.

Moving to schedule 7, section 7, amendment number 20.4.2: I'll go to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm withdrawing this motion. It's similar to the one that I already introduced.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Okay.

We will now go to the question: Shall schedule 7, section 7 carry? Any debate? All those in favour can please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7, section 7 carried.

**1500**

Moving to schedule 7, section 7.1, amendment 20.5: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following section:

“7.1 The act is amended by adding the following section:

“Exception, s. 113

“113.1 Subject to section 111 and despite section 113, the lawful rent for the first rental period for a new tenant under a new tenancy agreement for a unit that was previously rented is,

“(a) if the rental unit was rented in the last 12 months, any amount that is equal to or less than the last lawful rent

charged or that ought to have been charged to the previous tenant; or

“(b) if the rental unit was not rented in the last 12 months, an amount that is equal to or less than the sum of,

“(i) the last lawful rent charged or that ought to have been charged to the previous tenant,

“(ii) all increases to the rent that the landlord would have been permitted to make under this act if the rental unit had been occupied, and

“(iii) all decreases to the rent that the landlord would have been required to make under this act if the rental unit had been occupied.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** The essence of this motion is to implement the Rent Stabilization Act that we have introduced on numerous occasions into the Legislature. This is about bringing stability to rental prices, just like we have with electricity, where there is rent control on all units and there is a cap on how much the rent can be raised if a tenant leaves and a new tenant comes in.

This isn't radical or new. Ontario had vacancy control for many years, until former Premier Mike Harris decided to revoke it. Vacancy control is also in existence in Quebec and it's also in existence in Manitoba. Quebec, in particular, has a very healthy construction sector. It is a myth that vacancy control is a huge detriment to the construction of new homes, and it's also a truth that there are many ways that we can stimulate the construction of new housing supply without sacrificing housing affordability and renters at the same time.

It is a very important measure. In my view, it is the single most effective thing we can do to make our housing market more affordable. It will curb the rapid increase in housing prices, and it will also ensure that we don't see these big rent hikes that we're seeing year after year and month after month right now.

In Ontario, a new report just came out by rentals.ca and Urbanation showing the extent to which we're seeing rent hikes. In Toronto, we're seeing an 18% rent hike; in Scarborough and Peel region, we're seeing upwards of 20%. I don't know anyone who can afford a rent hike of 20%. I don't know anyone who can afford that.

It is common sense to stabilize rent and make our province and city affordable again, and I encourage you to support this motion.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, McGregor, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.5 lost.

We will now move to schedule 7, section 8, amendment 20.6. Can I just ask the members: Do you want to have a bit of a break right now, at the two-hour point? Okay. Let's have a 10-minute break, and we'll resume this. Thank you.

*The committee recessed from 1504 to 1518.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** We'll resume committee now. We're going to amendment 20.6. I'm going to turn it over, when she's ready, to MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that section 8 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(2) Subsection 206(3) of the act is repealed and the following substituted:

““Restriction

“(3) In an order under subsection (1), the board shall not order that the tenancy be terminated or include a provision allowing for an application under section 78.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Thank you, MPP Bell. Any debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Bill 184 enacted a provision allowing landlords to have tenants sign a repayment agreement—often they were pressured into it—that allows for an eviction order without a hearing. This amendment repeals that provision. In order to protect tenants, it should only be the Landlord and Tenant Board that issues an eviction. That's what we're calling for the reinstatement of here in motion 20.6.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate on amendment 20.6? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of amendment 20.6, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare amendment 20.6 lost.

Shall schedule 7, section 8 carry. Is there any debate? All those in favour of schedule 7, section 8, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare schedule 7, section 8 carried.

Moving to schedule 7, section 9, amendment 20.7: I'll turn to MPP Bell, please.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 9(1) of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out “\$100,000” and substituting “\$200,000 or twice the monetary benefit that was acquired by, or that accrued to, the person as a result of the offence, whichever is greater.”

1520

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, any further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes, thank you. The purpose of this motion is to really get serious about the maximum fines for individuals and corporations—this one is about individuals—under the Residential Tenancies Act. The housing sector is one of the biggest economic drivers in Ontario, and it's extremely important that a tenant's right to live in a safe and well-maintained home is upheld and they're not illegally evicted, just as there are landlords out there who are making a profit, and there needs to be a balance. The Residential Tenancies Act is that law that sets out rules and responsibilities for both sides, and if there's a violation of those rules, then there need to be serious consequences, not just with the fines but also within the actual enforcement, and we're seeing issues with both.



**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Okay. Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Recorded vote on amendment 20.7.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.7 lost.

Moving to amendment 20.8: MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I move that subsection 9(2) of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by striking out “\$500,000” and substituting “\$1,000,000 or twice the monetary benefit that was acquired by, or that accrued to, the corporation as a result of the offence, whichever is greater”.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Once again, this is a motion that really aims to strengthen and increase the fines that corporations face if they break a section of the Residential Tenancies Act. This is especially important when it comes to corporations in particular, because what we’ve seen in the United States and also in Canada and in Ontario is that there has been a move for Bay Street and Wall Street for companies that are traded on the stock exchange to invest in the housing market, and their normal order of doing business is to evict rent-controlled tenants in order to increase the rent. That’s what they do; it’s the normal order of business. And we see this in University–Rosedale a lot, because we’ve got many very valuable purpose-built rentals in a very desirable part of Toronto, and we’re seeing the same thing happen again and again and again, where good tenants who pay their rent on time are being evicted through no fault of their own. In many cases, these evictions are illegal, which is why we want to increase the fines to provide further incentive for corporations in particular to just follow the rules, to keep things fair.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 20.8 lost.

Moving now to amendment 21, I’ll ask MPP McMahon, please.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Saving the best to last, here we go.

I move that section 9 of schedule 7 to the bill be amended by adding the following subsection:

“(3) Section 238 of the act is amended by adding the following subsection:

““Publication of fines, etc.

“(3) The minister shall maintain a list of any fees or other penalties that landlords and tenants are required to pay under this act and shall make that information available to the public.”

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any debate, MPP McMahon?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Sure. This is just setting up a tracking system—a better tracking system, let’s just say. We do have the Rental Housing Enforcement Unit, which is great, that it’s already in place, but it just needs more attention and more funding to be effective, because it can’t possibly do what it needs to do properly to benefit tenants. And, really, with the funding revenue from the RHEU, the additional funding revenue, that can help. If we allow them to fund them properly and they can be more proactive and investigative, it would help the province, the government, as well, because it would be an additional revenue source than would currently exist. So that should be an incentive, if nothing else is. We know that what is measured gets done and gets tracked.

Again, we don’t want the renters to have to figure this out on their own. We want to have a proper tracking system. I think the government does, too, from what they say. They don’t want to support bad-faith landlords. Clear and concise and an additional revenue generator: Why not? Let’s do it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate on amendment 21? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote?

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** Recorded.

#### Ayes

Bell, McMahon.

#### Nays

Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare amendment 21 lost.

Shall schedule 7, section 9, carry as a whole? Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Schedule 7 should have gone further to protect tenants, but it’s better than the status quo and I will be supporting this section.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** With a lot of the government bills, there are some good things in there; some of the things don't go far enough. We know that. We know that with the tenants' rights here. We know that in other bills, where we're not being bold with housing initiatives, there are things that could be supportive and then there are other things that are absolutely egregious, that cannot be supportive. So I just hope in future bills we can work more collaboratively for Ontarians.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Recorded vote.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** —we'll have a recorded vote on schedule 7, section 9.

#### Ayes

Grewal, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

#### Nays

Bell, McMahon.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Schedule 7, section 9, is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 10 to 12. I propose we bundle them. Is everyone agreed? Agreed.

Shall schedule 7 carry? Oh, just 10 to 12.

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** You almost got it in there. Sorry.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Help me out here, Chair. Are we just doing the bundling or are we doing the whole?

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I misspoke. It's the bundling that we're voting on now. Shall schedule 7, sections 10 to 12, carry?

*Interjection.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Yes, we agreed to bundle already. Yes, this is the bundle. Debate? Seeing none, are you ready to vote? Shall schedule 7, sections 10 to 12 carry? Schedule 7, sections 10 to 12 carried.

Now we'll to schedule 7 as a whole. Shall it carry? Any debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** My apologies. Schedule 7 as a whole is—we are going to support this schedule, because it does bring in modest improvements to protect tenants, but it is not significant enough to address the crisis that tenants are facing right now, and I urge this government, in future bills, to really work with us and work with stakeholders and the public to bring in the kind of measures we need to ensure that tenants can live in safe and affordable housing and can get to keep their homes.

1530

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate? Shall I call the question now? Shall schedule 7, as amended, carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands.

*Interjections.*

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** She did? Okay. There was a request for a recorded vote in time, so recorded vote.

#### Ayes

Bell, Grewal, McGregor, McMahon, Pang, Rae, Sabawy, Laura Smith, Thanigasalam.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** I declare schedule 7, as amended, carried.

We're going to return to the first page to vote on sections 1, 2 and 3. Shall section 1 carry? Any debate? No debate? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 1 carried.

Moving to section 2: Shall section 2 carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare section 2 carried.

Section 3: Shall section 3 carry? Debate? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Yes. I'm just going to make some final comments, because we're about to close voting on the bill.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** This is just on the short title, and then you will have an opportunity—

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Oh, and then we're doing the whole thing? Okay, I'll wait.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** This is section 3, on the short title: Carry? All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. Section 3 is now carried.

Now, we'll move back to the title. Shall the title of the bill carry? All those in favour, raise your hands. All opposed? Carried. The title of the bill is carried.

Shall Bill 97, as amended, carry? MPP Bell, debate?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** We've been sitting here for a few hours now to debate Bill 97, and then it's going to go back to third reading. The Conservatives like to say this bill is going to solve the housing crisis, and that is not true. Bill 97 doesn't do much to help renters, and it makes it a lot easier for big developers to pave over farmland with expensive sprawl. The reality is this: Despite the talk, the Conservatives have had five years to fix the housing crisis, and it's never been more expensive to rent or buy a home. That's your legacy, and I don't see a lot here that addresses the crisis that we're facing.

We've introduced many amendments today to bring in inclusionary zoning, to have a good and fair definition of "affordable housing," to end exclusionary zoning, to really crack down on the scourge of illegal eviction activity that is happening in Ontario, and to do more to protect our farmland so that we're building in the right places, in areas that are already zoned for development, and also doing everything we can to protect a huge economic driver in Ontario, which is our farming sector, and to protect our greenbelt as well.

If we are going to get serious about solving our housing affordability crisis, my hope is this: that in future bills, you take seriously the feedback and the motions and the

amendments that we have presented today and the feedback that you've been given by many stakeholders who have dedicated a lot of their time and their energy and their expertise to provide their insight into how this bill affects them and us, from community legal clinics to the Advocacy Centre for Tenants Ontario, to the city of Toronto, to numerous municipalities, to AMO—that came in and gave testimony—to the building sector, to the Toronto Region Board of Trade, to Don Valley Community Legal Services, the Ontario Home Builders' Association, tenants who are affected by the rental replacement bylaws, and the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. They gave us a lot of feedback, and I'm not seeing the feedback in this bill. I'm just not seeing it. My hope is that in future bills, you do bring in some of the very valuable advice that they've given us today.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? MPP McMahon.

**Ms. Mary-Margaret McMahon:** I didn't do the count of how many amendments were proposed today—and actually, I'll do a tally of how many have been proposed at this committee by your colleagues and voted down.

It's almost our one-year anniversary, for some of us, June 2, and I came here to work collaboratively together, and a lot of these amendments are just basic common sense. They help your residents, as well as my residents and our residents. So I don't know if it's just the source of where the amendment is coming from—which should be shameful, because I don't care where the good ideas come from as long as they come.

Your bill has some tenant supports, which is great. Again, it doesn't go far enough, but there's something there, so that's a stroke, but it has other proposals that, quite frankly, have planning departments all over Ontario alarmed and concerned, which would be an understatement. I just don't know why we ask people to come to committee.

My second-favourite government MPP, MPP Rae, said he did a call-out for people to still add submissions. That's great. I was thinking that's so great, lovely for you to advertise that, but will you listen? I'm sure you read them, but will you listen? Will you heed the advice of the experts? You don't have to agree with everything they say, but that's their bailiwick, right? It's not ours. So I'm not sure why we're not listening to stakeholders, why you're not listening to your colleagues across the table.

The planning part is concerning, the farmland part is concerning and the employment lands part, quite frankly, is concerning, and I'm just getting wind that that could really affect the film industry in Toronto, so I'm going to look into that more.

But we have to be really careful about what we're doing. We definitely want to get the housing built, but there are other ways to do it.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there further debate? MPP McGregor.

**Mr. Graham McGregor:** Just one last time for the record: The independents, of which most are Liberals, are entitled to two members on this committee. The official

opposition, which are the NDP, are entitled to three members on this committee. If you look at the recorded votes of this committee, it was 7-2 votes. The PCs are entitled to seven members on this committee. So while we hear from Liberals and NDP that housing is important to them, we hear that they have feedback on Bill 97, where were they when it was time to speak to clause-by-clause items and vote on the bill?

I know where the PC members were. We're on the side of every new Canadian, every millennial, every senior who can't find housing that they can afford, every tenant that deserves the right to AC in their unit. We're on their side; we've been on their side in this committee. Leadership is about showing up, speaking up. I'm very disappointed, frankly, for the staff who were all here, for everybody tuning in, that we didn't hear more New Democrats or more Liberals today speaking up. The PCs were here, and we're going to continue to be here.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further debate? Seeing none, are the members ready to vote on Bill 97, as amended? Okay. All those in favour, please raise your hands. All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare Bill 97, as amended, carried.

Shall I report the bill, as amended, to the House? All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? It shall be reported back to the House.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Is there any further business of the committee today? MPP Thanigasalam.

**Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam:** I move that the committee meet for the purpose of considering the estimates of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing at the following times: on Thursday, June 8, 2023, from 2 p.m. until 4 p.m.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** We're just going to circulate the motion, so we'll just take a few moments for the Clerk to be able to do that, to the members.

I believe the motion has been distributed to everyone. Any debate on the motion? MPP Bell.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I'm curious, MPP Thanigasalam, what would be the agenda for the meeting for Thursday, June 8, from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Would it be the same agenda that we already agreed upon or would it be a new agenda? Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing speak for 20 minutes and then there would be back and forth following the usual protocol? I'm just curious about that.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Further debate? I see no further debate.

Yes, MPP Bell?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** I don't understand. I'd really like to know what this proposal means, and I think it's important to explain what is actually going to happen on that day. Who is coming? How long do we each get to speak? I know that was spelled out in the previous motion, so I'm just curious what this entails.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Just if you can give us a moment, we can you provide you with what the previous motion said.

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** Sure. Thank you. I'm just genuinely curious.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Rae, further debate?

**Mr. Matthew Rae:** Same agenda as agreed to before.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** MPP Bell, do you still want the previous agenda then?

**Ms. Jessica Bell:** No. That was my question.

**The Chair (Ms. Laurie Scott):** Any further debate, then? Are the members ready to vote? All those in favour of MPP Thanigasalam's motion, please raise your hands.

All those opposed, please raise your hands. I declare MPP Thanigasalam's motion passed.

Just to recap, committee members: Pursuant to standing order 63(c), the order of selections made for the 2023-24 estimates on May 11, 2023, has been altered as follows:

The Ministry of Infrastructure and the Ministry of Transportation are on June 7;

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is on June 8;

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism are on September 13.

There being no further business, the committee now stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Wednesday, June 7, 2023.

*The committee adjourned at 1544.*







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

### **Chair / Présidente**

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

### **Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente**

MPP Laura Mae Lindo (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre ND)

MPP Jill Andrew (Toronto–St. Paul’s ND)

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

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

Mr. Kevin Holland (Thunder Bay–Atikokan PC)

MPP Laura Mae Lindo (Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre ND)

Mr. Graham McGregor (Brampton North / Brampton-Nord PC)

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

Mr. Billy Pang (Markham–Unionville PC)

Mr. Sheref Sabawy (Mississauga–Erin Mills PC)

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

Ms. Laura Smith (Thornhill PC)

Mr. Vijay Thanigasalam (Scarborough–Rouge Park PC)

### **Substitutions / Membres remplaçants**

Mr. Aris Babikian (Scarborough–Agincourt PC)

Ms. Jessica Bell (University–Rosedale ND)

Mr. Matthew Rae (Perth–Wellington PC)

### **Clerk / Greffier**

Mr. Isaiah Thorning

### **Staff / Personnel**

Mr. Eric Chamney, legislative counsel

Mr. Bruno Falardeau, legislative counsel