

**Time allocation**

**Hon. Steve Clark:** I move that, pursuant to standing order 50 and notwithstanding any other standing order or special order of the House relating to Bill 60, An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025; Bill 33, An Act to amend various Acts in relation to child, youth and family services, education, and colleges and universities; and Bill 40, An Act to amend various statutes with respect to energy, the electrical sector and public utilities;

That when the orders for Bills 60 and 33 are next called, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of each bill without further debate or amendment; and

That upon receiving second reading, Bills 60 and 33 shall be ordered for third reading, which orders may be called the same day; and

That when the order for third reading of Bill 60 is called, two hours shall be allotted to debate, with 36 minutes for the members of His Majesty's government, 36 minutes for the members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, 36 minutes for the members of the third party, and 12 minutes for the independent members as a group; and

That at the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of Bill 60 without further debate or amendment; and

That when the order for third reading of Bill 33 is called, two hours shall be allotted to debate, with 36 minutes for the members of His Majesty's government, 36 minutes for the members of His Majesty's loyal opposition, 36 minutes for the members of the third party, and 12 minutes for the independent members as a group; and

That at the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of Bill 33 without further debate or amendment; and

That when the order for Bill 40 is next called, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill without further debate or amendment; and

That upon receiving second reading, Bill 40 shall be referred to the Standing Committee on the Interior; and

That the Standing Committee on the Interior be authorized to meet for public hearings on Bill 40 on the following dates:

Tuesday, November 18, 2025, from 9:00 a.m. until 10:00 a.m., and from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and

Tuesday, November 25, 2025, from 9:00 a.m. until 10:00 a.m., and from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m.; and

That the deadline for requests to appear for hearings on Bill 40 be 12 noon on Thursday, November 13, 2025; and

That the Clerk of the Committee shall provide a list of all interested presenters to each member of the subcommittee on committee business and their designate as soon as possible following the deadline for requests to appear; and

That if all requests to appear cannot be accommodated, each member of the subcommittee or their designate may provide the Clerk of the Committee with a prioritized list of presenters to be scheduled, chosen from the list of all interested presenters for those respective hearings by 12 noon on Friday, November 14, 2025; and

That the Minister of Energy and Mines be invited to appear as the sponsor of Bill 40 at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2025, and that the minister shall have 20 minutes to make an opening statement followed by 39 minutes of questions and answers divided into two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the government members, two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the official opposition members and two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the third party; and

That witnesses shall be scheduled in groups of three for each one-hour time slot, with each presenter allotted seven minutes to make an opening statement followed by 39 minutes of questioning for all three witnesses, divided into two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the government members, two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the official opposition members and two rounds of 6.5 minutes for the third party; and

That the deadline for written submissions on Bill 40 be 7 p.m. on Tuesday, November 25, 2025; and

That the deadline for filing amendments to Bill 40 be 12 noon on Thursday, November 27, 2025; and

That the committee meet for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 40 on Tuesday, December 2, 2025, from 9 a.m. until 10:15 a.m., and from 3 p.m. until 6 p.m., and from 6:30 p.m. until midnight; and

That on Tuesday, December 2, 2025, at 4 p.m., those amendments to Bill 40 which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved, and the Chair of the committee shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto; and

At this time, the Chair shall allow one waiting period, if requested by a member of the committee, pursuant to standing order 131(a); and

That the committee shall report Bill 40 to the House no later than Wednesday, December 3, 2025, and if the committee fails to report the bill on that day, the bill shall be deemed passed by the committee and shall be deemed reported to and received by the House; and

That upon receiving the report of the Standing Committee on the Interior on Bill 40, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith; and

That upon adoption of the report, Bill 40 shall be ordered for third reading, which order may be called the same day; and

That when the order for third reading of Bill 40 is called, two hours shall be allotted to debate with 36 minutes for the members of His Majesty's government, 36 minutes for the members of

His Majesty's loyal opposition, 36 minutes for the members of the third party, and 12 minutes for the independent members as a group; and

That at the end of this time, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of Bill 40 without further debate or amendment.

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** The government House leader has moved government notice of motion number 9.

Back to the government House leader.

**Hon. Steve Clark:** I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this motion today.

As I said in the motion, we're dealing with three government bills today: Bill 60, Bill 33 and Bill 40. We're time allocating for the scheduling purposes of these three very important priorities for the government. I've gone on at great length in other debates on the use of time allocation by all three parties, and I'm not going to do that today. Instead, I'm going to talk about the importance of the three bills before the House.

Obviously, on Bill 60, our Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in his opening remarks very eloquently talked about the importance of the government delivering on our plan to protect Ontario, to keep workers on the job by cutting red tape, by getting shovels in the ground faster and supporting the construction of new homes, new roads and infrastructure.

The minister also very eloquently outlined the fact that this bill builds upon the foundation that he laid with the building faster and smarter act by continuing to reduce costs in the time it takes to build; continuing to work with municipal leaders, as the minister has done very well with the stakeholders in every corner of the province and also other stakeholders, like home builders; and fighting delays and regulatory burdens. He was responsive to some of the concerns that Ontarians expressed, did the right thing and changed course, but really has a foundational bill that, as he's said and as others on the government side have said, is an important priority for us.

The Minister of Education has done a tremendous job with Bill 33, and has really articulated the priorities of having more accountability in school boards. He said it many times: Parents deserve confidence that school boards are making decisions that are in the best interests of our children's education. That's why he's strengthening accountability and transparency right across Ontario's education system: to ensure that every dollar invested delivers real results for students.

Interjection.

**Hon. Steve Clark:** There you go; there's your applause line—see, he won't even applaud now. You applauded before.

The government, through Bill 33, is making it very clear that school boards must put students first—not politics, not bureaucracy—and they need to act decisively when they fall short of that responsibility. The minister demonstrated that in the Bill 33 over and over again.

The bill that the government is proposing goes to committee is Bill 40, an Act to amend various statutes with respect to energy, the electrical sector and public utilities. Again, my seatmate, the

minister, has articulated very well during debate the importance of this bill to our government. As global competition intensifies, energy demand surges and affordability becomes more important than ever, our province isn't standing still; we're stepping up. I think the minister has, over the time that we've debated Bill 33—and the associate minister, and the parliamentary assistants—talked about the decisive action to build a more competitive, a more resilient and a self-reliant economy by introducing the Protect Ontario by Securing Affordable Energy for Generations Act.

Again, the minister was very clear: He wanted this bill to go to committee. I've talked about this both in the House and outside of the House, that the ministers have done a great job with these bills, piloting them through, but there are some cases where the government has decided that we need some committee hearings.

With that, I'll allow the opposition to get their points forward, and in a couple hours we'll see how this motion does on the floor.

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's always an honour to speak in the House, and today on behalf of the official opposition, regarding another time-allocation motion. I don't think it's going to be a surprise to anyone that we're going to be voting against this.

But I listened very closely to the House leader. I usually quote a few illustrious quotes from the government House leader when he was opposition House leader, and I'm just going to use one today. It's actually dateline November 28, 2017. This is when the opposition House leader, who had the position that I hold now, was talking about a time-allocation motion which, at that point, the Liberal government of the day was putting forward. Actually, it's very appropriate because it could be word for word what I would say. The only difference is, I actually believe it. I'm not sure that he did, because he's doing exactly the same thing: "You know what? That's right. The Facebook ads are running now, the government ads are running now, to promote this bill, yet this government is silent. They don't want to debate it. They don't want it in committee. They don't want to hear from people."

"You know what, Speaker? My party loves to hear from people. We've been talking to people for months. We've had hundreds of volunteers, thousands of ideas. And you know what? If this government doesn't want to listen to people, I'll give them a guarantee. I'll give them, actually," and remember this, people—that was my interjection, sorry. "I'll give them, actually, the People's Guarantee, because we will listen to them, and we will ensure that those Ontarians are being listened to."

My question is, what happened to the People's Guarantee? And now we know what happened to it, because it's in this quote: "We will ensure that those Ontarians are being listened to." And that's important: "those." It didn't say all Ontarians; it said "those." This government likes to pick and choose who they listen to. I think that's becoming very obvious, and now it's even gotten to the point with committees.

They take three bills. Bill 33: As much as I respect the Minister of Education—I actually enjoy spending some time occasionally with the Minister of Education—we don't always agree, right?

**Hon. Steve Clark:** I have a feeling he doesn't agree with this.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I don't agree with his bill.

But the government House leader said they had done such a good job that they were confident that this bill didn't need to go to committee. I think the fact that this bill is not going to committee is actually a lack of confidence, because the government only wants to listen to people who agree with them. But the government should listen to—they don't have to take the advice of the people they disagree with, but they should listen to everyone.

What this government is really afraid of—really, it's not overconfidence. What they don't want to hear is, "I told you so." This government is really afraid of, "I told you so," because no one likes to hear, "I told you so." They've had a lot of failures over the years, and it really hurts when we say, "Well, if you only had listened to the opposition or actually listened to experts or listened to people at committee."

Bill 33: Take it to committee and have teachers—have a few trustees, I don't know, but have teachers, have students come to committee and say, "Have you thought about this?" And then, if the government didn't listen and someone brought something forward that was actually relevant, they could have said, "I told you so." But if you don't allow the people to speak, your ego doesn't get hurt, because no one can say, "I told you so," because no one got the chance to say anything.

That is not how democracy is supposed to work. You are going to get your bills through; I don't think that's a surprise. But you do have the duty to get as much information as possible. So to make that legislation, even though I disagree with it, or we disagree, that's not the—the point is that you owe it to the people of Ontario to give them as much opportunity as possible to discuss those bills. And maybe change one or two things, or maybe not, but at least understand what their views are.

I don't think it's overconfidence; let's make this really clear. It's not overconfidence; it's lack of confidence. The People's Guarantee was—and we all missed that. At least, many of the people who voted missed that, because when I saw all those plaques, "the People's Guarantee," you were already telegraphing that you were only going to listen to some people, not all people. I think a lot of the members on the other side didn't actually run for that, because you know that you need to listen to all views. You might not agree with them. One of the things I like about committee is that sometimes I hear views, I hear things that I had never thought of, and they change my viewpoint. That's the strength of committee.

The fact is that on very important bills, like education bills, changing the complete education system—that you have all the answers, that you don't need to listen to anybody in the committee process.

Come on. You're only fooling yourselves. And the "I told you so" will get a lot uglier—will get a lot, lot uglier, because the mark of a long-lasting government is actually taking everybody's views into account. As this government progresses, it's becoming more and more obvious that that is not the case.

And it's not only the education bill. Bill 60—a housing bill, right? This government is great at blaming the previous government for all the housing problems in Ontario. They forget the fact that they are the previous government. Then they blame the previous, previous government. Who is the previous, previous government? Them.

You've been in government for almost a decade. Housing starts in Ontario are crashing. Food bank lines, homeless people—we have homeless encampments all across the province. When I was first elected, homeless encampments weren't a thing. You've had almost a decade—a decade—to address this issue, successive housing ministers, successive housing bills, and your solution is, "You know what? We're so smart, we're just not going to listen to anybody anymore because we don't want to hear 'I told you so.'"

Are there good things in Bill 60? Yes. Are there some terrible things in Bill 60? Absolutely. Should tenants have the ability to come to committee and put those on the record? That's a pretty big thing here, putting things on the record so that we can learn from our mistakes—and we all make mistakes. And believe you me, Speaker, this government also has their share of mistakes.

If you remember the greenbelt act, one of their first housing acts that was going to give everybody a house in Ontario, it wasn't even about housing. The government House leader knows that very well. It was also one of their suites of fantastic housing bills. And they're not learning. They're not learning. They need to listen to people.

Now they do. Bill 40—they want to listen to people because there will be more people that agree with them. And again, I get that. But why not listen to opposing views so you can form a more balanced view yourself? That is the most egregious—that's a big word for me. "Egregious" is a big word for me.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Yes. Where did you rent that?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I know. I've been here a long time. I'm working up.

But it is one of the saddest things about motions like this, and it happens more and more often. And yes, all parties have used time allocation, and all parties have been wrong, including mine.

But we stand in this place. We are the voices of the people. We work really hard to get elected. And the way this system has been built over decades is to debate opposing views, is to bring bills before committee so people can talk about them. This government is choosing not to do that. They choose to sit limited days. They choose not to do committee on certain bills. Any bill where someone might say, "You know, Minister, have you thought about this?"—that's what they don't want. They don't want to have to admit that they haven't thought about that, or that they have thought about that and, quite frankly, they don't care. That's what they don't want to admit. It's very egregious.

We all love our system. We love Ontario; we love Canada. We are all willing to stand to fight to protect the freedoms that—we're wearing a poppy to commemorate the people who stood and fought for our freedom. I'm very proud of that. It drives me crazy—crazy—when I hear people say that Canada is broken. Canada is not broken. It's one of the greatest countries in the world—one of the greatest countries in the world. I'm so proud to be a Canadian.

But I'm not proud that I have to stand here and make a reasoned argument about why a bill from a majority government should go to committee. You're going to get the bill passed. There is nothing stopping you from getting the bill passed. So you are choosing to ignore the opinion, the intelligence of people who may not agree with your path. You're choosing to do that. You don't want to hear, "I told you so." And do you know who's going to pay the price for that? Ontarians

are going to pay the price for that, not you; the people you represent, the people who put their faith in you to do the right thing.

We may disagree philosophically—I 100% get that, I respect that. But I don't believe that any of us got elected here to basically force our views on other people. We got elected here because we believe in the system; we believe in debate; we believe in bringing bills to committee.

Yet for some reason—that's why I started with the quote from the then opposition House leader—it seems that when you cross the floor, your beliefs disappear. And with this government, I think it's even worse because I don't think that the Premier's office respects this place one bit. This place is a hindrance to the Premier's office. That's why we end up in scandals. It's a hindrance; it's not a tool to them. It should be a tool to make better legislation.

You won an election. You have the power to put your legislation through. This Parliament is a tool to make sure that legislation is as good as it can be, and the fact that you're ignoring that is proof that you just see this as a hindrance—the strength of our parliamentary democracy.

We all proudly wear that poppy, but I'm not sure that we all understand what we're fighting for here and why we're standing here and why we wear it.

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** I recognize the member from Ottawa–Vanier.

**M<sup>me</sup> Lucille Collard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's very nice to see you in the chair.

Here we go again. Wasn't it just last week that we had to defend why time allocation motions are not good for democracy? It seems rhetorical—it keeps coming up. This morning, I don't really want to say that much about this practice that has become business as usual, because I think that time-allocating everything has become something quite ridiculous.

I'll agree with my colleague from Timiskaming–Cochrane; everything he said is on point, and he has had the occasion to repeat those things over and over again. So we understand—we're all coming from this place.

I'll say this: My position that this is not a good idea has not changed. What I said last week about why it's not a good idea, why it's not good for democracy, was probably something that was more or less what was expected.

So today, maybe I'll surprise you, but I'm going to give it to you straight. I think that time allocation motions can actually be good in certain cases, under certain circumstances, and for certain bills; for example, when all parties agree that we have a really good bill where it's worth accelerating the implementation. It happens—not very often, but it does from time to time. However, the time allocation motion for Bills 33, 40 and 60 does not fall into that category—not by far. But the government has a majority and will get its way anyway. So what we say might be meaningless to them. I hope that the public is listening.

I also have to admit that sometimes six and a half hours of debate or more can be too much. And having sat in the Speaker's chair—like you are today, Madam Speaker—for some debates that were repeating the same thing over and over again, I'll admit that I may have contemplated the value to limit debates. When everything has been said and the positions are clear, why continue to use airtime that no one is listening to? That works for certain more simple bills. But Bills 33, 40 and 60 do not fall in that category either. If we want or if the government wants to

pass good legislation, we need to hear from the public. And that's why committee work, with public hearings for the people to express their support or their concerns, is so important.

And to the comment that the member for Timiskaming–Cochrane said about the government wanting to only speak or hear from people that agree with them: It's true, but actually, I wish the government would understand and learn what I've learned with my job, that you actually learn the most when you have conversations with people that disagree with you. It allows you to see another perspective and learn things that will entice you or convince you to make your bill better. But forget it; we're not doing that.

Unfortunately, a time allocation motion not only cuts time to debate—which could be acceptable in certain cases, like I mentioned—but it cuts out the most important part, which is the committee process, which is effectively the public voice that we've been elected to listen to. And they are being told to shut up: "We don't want to hear about you. We know everything, and we're just going to get this bill, and you'll just have to live with the consequences, and if you don't agree, well, too bad, so sad." That's not democracy, Madam Speaker. That's not responsible government. That is, indeed, government arrogance in all its splendour. And it is, frankly, revolting.

So go ahead, have your way. But be assured that people, electors, are paying attention.

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** Further debate?

**Mr. Terence Kernaghan:** It's an honour for me to rise today, although, this motion that we are discussing this morning, motion number 9, is really quite concerning to the people of the province. I've heard so much from my office, so much concern and so much fear and so much angst and anger about Bills 33 and 60. And I'm quite sure the government's own email boxes have blown up. And yet, they still seem to want to rush these through.

We have to ask ourselves the question, Speaker: Why are we rushing so quickly with these bills? What is the government hurrying for? What is their purpose for trying to get this through as quickly as possible? This motion is what I would call authoritarianism covered in grease.

You know, I found it also quite interesting that as my friend the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane was quoting the words of this government when they had been in opposition, many of them were smiling. Many of them were remembering. Many of them acknowledged and recognized their words and their upset and their anger over time allocation. And yet, now that they are on the government side, that has seemingly disappeared. Those concerns are utterly obliterated.

From a very early age, from the age of kindergarten, we get basic, fundamental life lessons that it seems that many people have forgotten in their older years. We learn how to listen. We learn how to share. We learn how to take turns.

And yet this government, through this motion number 9, is refusing to listen. It's not as though they're even pretending to listen. They're not even having these committee hearings on these very disturbing pieces of legislation. And yet, they are not even bothering to pretend. That is hubris; that is pride. And that they should be very concerned about.

But it also begs the question: If the government does not want to open up committee hearings, if the government does not want to hear from the people of Ontario, if they do not want to listen to



the public, then who, Speaker, are they actually listening to? It begs the question of what voices matter to this government.

I can tell you that with schedule 12 and Bill 60, they're clearly not listening to seniors. They're not listening to people living with disabilities. They're not listening to folks on social assistance or folks on fixed incomes. They're not listening to young people just trying to start out in life, and they're not listening to people who are living paycheque to paycheque and are deeply concerned about falling into homelessness.

No, Speaker; they're listening to wealthy corporations. They're listening to real estate investment trusts. They're listening to corporate landlords who don't look at human beings; they look at people as an item on a ledger, a number on an Excel spreadsheet.

With motion number 9—I'm making this go by as quickly as possible—it does make us ask, what is this government also trying to hide from the public? What are their priorities? Why are they doing this?

We often hear the government use the words—and yet they're completely devoid of meaning; they're absolutely destroyed, quite frankly, from their original intention. We hear words like “accountability,” words that should make one think of being responsible, of being forthright, of being open or being able to explain or to justify, being able to defend their positions. But this motion, motion number 9, is a lack of accountability. It's unwillingness to explain, it's unwillingness to defend, it's unwillingness to justify and it's unwillingness to be transparent, open and forthright with the people of Ontario.

Abandoning committee and speeding through debate is really an ethical problem, a huge ethical problem. I did want to before—because debate is being so completely truncated with this government—point out to the government that government members have been heard indicating that in Thames Valley there were trustees who went on the Toronto trip, and I can tell you unequivocally that 18 senior administrative officials went on the Toronto trip; not a single trustee went, not one. They did not vote on that trip to Toronto; they did not participate in that trip to Toronto. And it's just really quite dubious that this government is choosing to reveal facts in such a way as to cast doubt on those trustees when they had no part in that trip whatsoever.

The deficit as well that this government keeps mentioning with Thames Valley has ballooned under supervision. It has gone up astronomically. This government is not paying its responsibility when it comes to statutory benefit increases of CPP and EI. But I did want to shout out a very good, stable, strong, honourable—someone this government could learn a lesson or two from, and that is Bill Tucker. He has currently stepped back into the role with Thames Valley District School Board, and he is a wonderful person. He has been an excellent administrator. He is widely loved and respected by educators, families and the broader public in the Thames Valley District School Board. In fact, I had the opportunity, Speaker, to take piano lessons from his father, who is also Bill Tucker, who is an amazing human being and the definition of a Renaissance man. In fact, he was an accomplished concert pianist. My brother told me the story that when he first had his grade 12 English class, what Mr. Tucker did was take all of the students down to the auditorium and he played a song for them. And he was so moved by the song that he was moved to tears. The kids were moved to tears because he made a piano sing.

I think Bill Tucker Sr. could also teach this government about being honourable, about being forthright, about being accountable and about being responsible. It's a shame that the government has closed their ears.

Through these bills, it does other disturbing things like undermining local control of CAS budgets. They're destroying the ability of parents to advocate for their children with trustees. They're a true, authentic local voice, and they're trying to replace that with an unelected Toronto bureaucrat. It does make us ask the question: How is it possible that someone in downtown Toronto knows the needs of your local school? Will they pick up the phone? Will they answer emails? I highly doubt it. It's yet another opportunity for this government to install one of their failed candidates, one of their donors, one of their cronies, one of their backroom insiders, into a position, all while pretending this is about accountability. Again, this is authoritarianism covered in grease.

If we were time-allocating a bill to restore the \$6.35 billion that this government has stripped from education, I could see a reason to time allocate that, Speaker. If this time allocation was concerning a bill that put more caring adults in classrooms, we could certainly vote for that.

If this was ensuring the government fixed the flawed 1998 funding model, which treats all children the same and does not ensure that kids with special education needs or mental health needs get the funding that they deserve—if this bill made sure that each child was funded based upon their need—that would be absolutely something to time allocate. Getting kids the right supports at the right time will change their life, yet this bill is not about that. This time allocation motion certainly is not about that.

If this bill was to make up for the funding shortfall that the government has created by not funding CPP and EI, those statutory benefit increases, then that would be something that would be easy to vote for and to time allocate, yet it is not.

This bill and this motion are setting the stage for a takeover of public education, and it also is an attack on post-secondary education. It's a distraction to the underfunding of post-secondary education, quite frankly. This government wants to do it quickly and do it fast, and they hope that people blink and don't pay attention. This is a false choice that is being offered through Bill 33, allowing students—who are already financially beleaguered by the cost of everything in life, especially university tuition—the opportunity to opt out of fees that benefit them and benefit the broader school community, such as food banks, mental health supports, sexual violence supports and so many other things that are critically important and vitally important for them and for the student experience. Yet this government, through motion 9, doesn't want people to open their eyes and to notice.

And I haven't even begun to touch upon the disturbing issues that are within Bill 60. The government, in their—hmm—wisdom, decided to remove rent control from buildings first occupied after November 2018. They also did not force landlords to report that people were moving into buildings without rent control, so people, after having lived in a building for 12 months, would be handed an increase that could be any number that that landlord picked, because this government drilled a massive hole in the boat of renter's rights.

It was the exact same that happened under the previous government, which was to bring in vacancy decontrol to allow landlords to charge whatever the market could withstand as soon as a unit became vacant. That was a situation which allowed unethical corporate landlords to kick

good, long-term tenants out because they knew they could jack up the rent. It might have looked okay on paper, but I can tell you this is something that deeply concerns seniors, people living with disabilities, new Canadians, young families, all people living on a fixed income, all the people who are working multiple part-time jobs just trying to survive. And this government—who are they listening to with this legislation?

Further, while the government did backpedal on their consultation to remove the month-by-month tenancy, they also still have things within Bill 60 that are deeply concerning for tenants: Eviction notices can be given seven days after non-payment of rent rather than 14 days. It also allows landlords to declare their own use with 120 days' notice, and then there's nothing that that tenant can do. I want to say, Speaker—we've said this before and we will say it again—what tenant, after being evicted by a landlord based on the landlord's own use, is going to come and check with the new resident to make sure it is indeed the landlord?

Speaker, this government makes a lot of noise about being for the people and listening to the people. This is a clear example: Their ears are shut, their back is turned and they're not listening to the people who are most deeply affected by this time allocation motion.

I urge the government to listen to their conscience and do not vote for this time allocation motion.

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** Further debate? I recognize the member from Ajax.

**Mr. Rob Cerjanec:** Good morning to all of my colleagues, and, again, it's nice to see you in the chair, Speaker.

We're talking about time allocation. And I find it a little bit ironic because we were on a bit of an extended summer break, and I know we were doing work in our communities, in our ridings—at least, I know I was. The federal Parliament resumed a lot sooner than our Legislature did, and that really could have been important time for us to debate and discuss these pieces of legislation, debate and discuss these at the committee level so that we can have an informed conversation. We can do that amongst ourselves, but we can also do that with different stakeholders and interest groups that are going to be impacted by this legislation or have good pieces of feedback and advice for us to improve legislation. Unfortunately, here we are again, and it feels as though this is a government that really doesn't care about the committee process. That's how it feels. I think that's really unfortunate because I came here to represent my constituents, work on their behalf, connect with them and listen to their feedback.

We've had a lot of conversation about the education bill, Bill 33, in here, for example, and had other conversations at the regional level, for example, about Bill 60, even before that bill was introduced, talking about different ideas or thoughts that now we actually do see within the bill. So it's really unfortunate that we're not going to be able to debate this and discuss both Bill 33 and Bill 60 at the committee level, because I think it's a really great opportunity to listen to our constituents and be able to have more opportunity to bring those voices into this chamber.

Around Bill 60, the committee process, I think, is integral, because this was a bill that was just introduced two weeks ago, on October 23. There was a lot of controversy, I think, when this bill was introduced. We saw the government backtrack a little bit on consultations around changing rent control. I think that was really to the testament of the public and people who were very loud and very clear that we should not be ending rent control in this province. But to see that floated

as a trial balloon, to see that in the stakeholder or the briefing materials that were provided, I think, to me, was very, very concerning. While the government right now has said, “No, we’re not going to touch that. We’re not going to make changes there”—we would have had a good opportunity to discuss elements of Bill 60 at the committee level.

I’ll just say this, colleagues, Speaker: to touch rent control in the way that was floated is very concerning. I grew up in an apartment building. I grew up in a one-bedroom apartment, with my mom and I. Frankly, having rent control on our unit—and it can increase year after year, and I think that’s important, because expenses go up, property taxes go up, cost of water and electricity and operating the building and needing to do repairs, those costs go up. So it’s fair that there are increases to rent year after year, but it needs to be done in a way that’s responsible.

Having rent control on our unit, frankly, I think was a lifeline for us. I fear what could have happened if that unit was not under rent control.

I’m very, very concerned about that and very concerned that this was floated in the first place.

The housing bill was introduced two weeks ago. I’m not even sure everyone has had the opportunity to digest elements within that bill, and I think that is really unfortunate. I’m not even sure all of us in this chamber have had the opportunity to digest and understand different portions within that bill. To be able to talk about the bill at committee, to hear from groups, I think would help make this bill a better bill.

The bill proposes landlord and tenant changes. And do you know what? I want us to be able to hear from landlords. I want to hear from large landlords on this. I want to hear from small landlords on this. I want to hear from folks who own a home who might want to rent out their basement apartment, for example—a basement suite—or add a suite within their unit, or add a granny flat, a garden suite, in their backyard, or, if they’re in places with laneways in Toronto, add a laneway suite, and be able to talk about that and what that means and how we help create more rental availability.

As seniors consider downsizing—I know a lot of seniors want to stay in their home because they like their home. It’s where they raised their kids. It’s where they raised their family. But maybe that home is a bit too big. So to be able to add a rental unit in there, I know, for a lot of folks—and maybe some supplemental income to help their kids with, frankly, the high cost of living. I think that is a good thing, and we could be discussing that at committee. We can be discussing ways in which we’re able to add more rental stock and do it in a way that’s fair. If you’re a small landlord—if it’s a unit in your basement, for example, that’s a lot different than a 200-unit apartment building. So we could actually get into that and have those conversations and be able to hear from tenants as well.

A friend of mine has the ability to have a second suite within his home, but he doesn’t rent it out on the long-term market. My friend doesn’t rent out that suite on the long-term market because the HVAC system is shared within that building and his daughter has a lung condition. So he doesn’t rent out that unit because the HVAC system is connected. I know of other friends of mine and other folks as well who have allergies to pets.

So we can be talking about that at the committee level. We can be saying, “How do we make the current system work better? How do we add rental supply into the market?” We could be

doing that, but, unfortunately, we're not doing that with a bill that has been rushed through, and I don't think that is really giving the public an opportunity to be able to participate in this process.

We know that there are changes at the Landlord and Tenant Board, and we know that, frankly, for the last seven years, the Landlord and Tenant Board has been a disaster in its inability to process applications and give a fair hearing to both landlords and tenants.

When I talk to landlords, when I talk to tenants, everybody tells me they want the system to work, they want it to be fair, they want it to be effective, and they want to be able to have their due process without delays. That's what I hear when I talk to folks.

So it's unfortunate that we're not going to be able to have that debate at committee, should the time allocation motion pass, which I suspect it will in the majority government that we have.

Rental starts are doing okay, thanks to some changes through CMHC and federal support and reducing development charges on some pieces. But if we want to look at housing starts overall, they're terrible; they're in the garbage. That's not good. It means our skilled trades workers aren't going to be able to work on—whether it's greenfield development, whether it's infill, we need to be able to ensure our skilled trades folks are able to be out there and working.

This is a government that talks quite a bit about the skilled trades and how much they care about the skilled trades. Well, I care about the skilled trades too, and I want to see them work on job sites. I want to see housing construction go up. I want to see housing construction continue. Because right now, if we look at recent stats around this—we're talking about condo starts, new home starts. In Toronto, for example, you can almost count them on my fingers and my toes and maybe a little bit more and that's about it. That's not a good thing. We could be having those folks there, but we don't.

Yesterday at committee, we were talking with the Minister of Northern Development, and we were talking about the forestry sector. Here in Ontario, the forestry sector is an important part in many communities where we have lumber to build homes. But if we're not building homes, how are we going to support the forestry sector? Not being able to talk about this bill at the committee and ways that the government can actually increase housing starts, increase housing supply, continue to try and bring down the cost of new housing—but we're not really going to be able to talk about that at the committee level. We won't be able to listen to some of those ideas.

So I'll give some of those ideas here in the Legislature. The government could cut the HST off new builds—and not just for first-time home buyers, because I know that's what some of my honourable colleagues will be thinking about: "Oh, well we're going to take the provincial portion of the HST off for first-time homebuyers." That is a very, very small segment of folks that are purchasing new construction homes. I think we want to be able to have folks purchasing a new construction home, if it's going to be your principal residence. I think we want that in this province. And again, we know the taxes and fees on this are so high.

So what the government could be doing is going a lot further and cutting the HST. Maybe it's on the first million, and then a sliding scale to a million and a half, doing it for five years. That's what the government can be doing if we're serious about building housing, if we're serious about ensuring our skilled trades members are able to go and work and not be out of work.

We could—hell, I'll put a different proposal up here. They can remove the provincial land transfer tax on a new build for a period of time. That's something that this government could be

doing. Well, the property has never been transferred before, so why are we charging a land transfer tax on that? And I know some folks, maybe the Ministry of Finance, might be saying, “Well, it’s going to impact revenue.” Well, you’re not going to get that revenue if no homes are being built.

These are, I think, common-sense ideas that this government can take and do to ensure that our skilled trades members are working, to ensure that we are building the housing that we need for our changing demographics, for our changing population. They could cut development charges and make municipalities whole. There are a lot of choices, I think, that the government has, and I don’t think they’re making those choices. We have fancy titles of bills that sound really great. It sounds like we’re doing things, but, frankly, nothing is getting done except for, you know, we’ve got a long bill title that says the government is doing something when the government is not doing something.

Around Bill 60, it would have been really great to be able to discuss, at the committee level, public utilities for water and waste water, to get some public feedback on that. I’ve had conversations in Durham region about that. I think it’s really important that we get people to the committee table to talk about that, to talk about what it means to set up and create a public corporation for water and waste water.

Also, how do we ensure that we have safeguards as part of that to ensure that we don’t see the privatization of water or waste water services? There’s an underlying theme, I would say, with this government. There is a privatization theme. It’s just not out in the open. It’s being done quietly and slowly, creating crises and underfunding systems and wrecking them in some ways. We’ve seen this movie before, folks. We’ve seen this movie before.

It would be really good to be able to put in safeguards and have additional safeguards around that so that public corporations—the public interest is served in all of us. At the end of the day, there’s only one taxpayer. There’s only one taxpayer. If you’re paying waste water fees, well, it’s a fee. It’s a tax. It’s the same thing at the end of the day. How do we ensure that we keep those low? How do we ensure that we have public benefit for the public good? That’s something that we can be talking about at the committee level when we look at Bill 60.

On Bill 33, I look at the post-secondary sector—I didn’t have the opportunity to talk very much about it. I know that there are different groups: student groups; groups representing universities, representing colleges; people who’ve done research in this sector; folks who know a thing or two about our post-secondary institutions and maybe what is also happening around the world and how we strengthen our post-secondary institutions. But we see a big underfunding for our colleges and universities, creating a crisis. There was an overreliance on international tuition—110%. That’s right.

Instead of saying, “How do we fix that?” all I hear from the government side is, “We’re going to point a finger at the federal government.” That’s about it, when the business model itself was broken in the first place. Instead of, “Let’s fix the business model,” it’s, “We’re going to point fingers.” I don’t think that’s a good thing. So it would be good to be able to talk about some of the post-secondary changes that are proposed in Bill 33 at the committee level.

Around ancillary fees, for example: These are fees that students approved by referendum. It’d be really great if we had some student voices at committee talking about student fees, whether pro or against or anything. I think that’s healthy in a democracy. On campuses, students have

that debate. They have that debate when a fee is being put in. They can actually change fees as well. That is something that students have the ability to do. If they don't like the fees, okay, initiate a referendum and change that. That's a democratic right. I think that's a good thing at the college and university level.

I'd love to hear from the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance at committee on this. I'd love to hear from the Canadian Federation of Students at the committee level talking about ancillary fees—folks who are voices of students, who are elected on their college and university campuses to represent students and advocate on their behalf. They're going to be shut out of this committee process, out of even talking on this bill at committee. Yes, there have been some submissions, but there also needs to be changes and consideration, I would say, on the government side.

It would be great to be able to talk at committee about merit-based admissions and what's being proposed and understand how that is going to work. The feedback and the input and the debate that we could have at the committee level on that I think is a really good thing. Are we just looking at grades? Is that all we're going to do around merit-based?

I can tell you, I went and did an MBA. The admission process for an MBA, for example, looks at your GMAT score, your GRE score. But it looks at other aspects of what you can add into the classroom so that there's a diversity of opinion, there's a diversity of thought within the classroom. So I'm not sure what's being suggested here around a merit-based admission process. It would be really great to be able to have that conversation, again, at the committee level.

Around research security: This is a government that wants to reduce red tape. They're adding red tape around research security when there are already federal requirements that our universities strictly adhere to. Universities are important tools to fuel innovation, playing an important part with community. So we shouldn't be diverting resources away from commercializing research and technology to talk about research security when there are already strong provisions in place with the federal level as well.

We're at a global battle. The Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade sometimes says, "We're in a war with the United States." I think we really are, around research and intellectual property and commercializing research and creating new businesses and jobs and opportunity. We are in a global battle around that for the best talent, for the best ideas. We need our universities to be able to be focused on that instead of adding red tape to what they're doing. It's a bit ironic.

On public education: When Bill 33 was introduced, the Minister of Education had many conversations, I know, over the summer, I think meeting in private. I think there were some non-disclosure forms that were signed as well with different stakeholders. The bill was introduced and then the minister has conversations with the sector, with unions, with principals, with directors of education, with everyone in the publicly funded education sector—to have those conversations after the bill is introduced.

I wonder, does, then, the minister think this bill is perfect, that we don't need to make any changes to it after all of those intensive discussions? Because when I talk to those folks, they think there should be changes in the bill. But we're not going to be able to talk about that at the committee level. I think that's really unfortunate. I think the government, in some ways—and this

is, I guess, a warning to the government: Be careful what you wish for, because the changes that you would like to make, that it appears that you'd like to make, to public education, for example, may end up hurting you in the long run. That's why I think it's so important to be able to have this conversation at the committee level.

I'll give one example within Bill 33: There's a public interest provision, essentially, that would allow the Minister of Education to be able to take over a school board. The minister and I had a good debate around that when I spoke about Bill 33 in this House not too long ago. The provision here—and I'll read it out—could give the minister the ability on any of these reasons to be able to take over a board: the delivery of education programs; student achievement and well-being; the financial affairs of a board and its use of resources; the construction, maintenance, management, acquisition and disposition of capital assets; local governance; the day-to-day management of a board; and the engagement of parents and other entities that may have an interest in the activities of a board.

I think the public as a whole has a really big interest in that. This seems very, very broad. Essentially, the minister would be able to take over a board for any reason at any time, even if the board was doing all the right things. And I know in this House we spoke about the issues at Thames Valley, for example, where it was the senior administration team that went to the Blue Jays game, not trustees. I know we spoke about the issues at Brant Haldimand Norfolk Catholic, where it was trustees that changed policy to essentially be able to go on first-class travel to Italy, and that's egregious. That is ridiculous. So I agree, and there are situations where the minister, I think, does need to go in and deal with issues at a school board, but this is really broad.

There are a couple of things that talk about the acquisition or disposition of capital assets, for example. I fear where this government might be wanting to go on that, depending on which insider is able to get the ear of the Premier's office to say, "Hey, there's this parcel of land in this area. We really want that." So then what happens? Well, I guess the minister can just come in and do that and make that happen without local consultation, without involving the community. When school boards make these decisions, especially around the disposition of assets and land, they do that in a way that considers those communities and looks for options. I'd love to see things where we can have better creative thoughts and ideas around how to better utilize our school lands and school facilities to benefit the local communities, because when you build a neighbourhood, the school is put in that neighbourhood. And the park land, which is really the school land in there, is in the neighbourhood for a reason. That is really, really good and really important. Once you get rid of that land, especially that green space, it is gone forever.

So I think there are some really important pieces that we can be discussing at committee here, and it's really unfortunate, with this time allocation motion, that we're not going to be able to do that so that we can enhance the public good, so that we can ensure that all of us in this chamber as the voices of our communities can have that ability to do that.

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ted Hsu:** I've listened to some of the remarks here today, and I want to start out by saying just how disappointed I am that the government is afraid to have the content of their bills looked at in detail during the committee stage. So Bills 33 and 60 will completely skip committee.



But I want to speak to the part of the motion with regard to Bill 40, because it looks like the government is going to bring Bill 40 to committee, but I would call this the illusion of committee. If you look at the motion that we're debating now, government motion 9, there are only two hours and 15 minutes allowed for the detailed consideration of amendments either to correct the bill or to respond to what witnesses tell us about this bill. This motion schedules witness hearings. I think it's really important if you want to respect the public and the experts who come in to talk about Bill 40 and to point out how it can be improved—it's an insult to them to restrict in advance the amount of time that we will take to implement their recommendations. Because it's not only about listening to witnesses—there's time for that—but we have to digest what they say, and we have to propose amendments to implement good points that are brought up, and then we have to debate them to make sure we get it right. I believe in taking the time to make sure that laws, which are supposed to be permanent, get done in as good a way as possible. That's our job, as legislators: to write good laws. I find it especially insulting to any witness who comes, to say that we're only going to talk about their amendments for two hours and 15 minutes, and then we're going to deem every amendment moved and all we're going to do is we're going to vote on the amendments without discussing them—forever, basically.

Because I think we should be respecting witnesses who make the journey to the Ontario Legislature, I move that the motion be amended by striking everything after “until midnight.”

**The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell):** The member for Kingston and the Islands moves that the motion be amended by striking everything after “until midnight.”

Further debate?

**Mr. Ted Hsu:** I'd like to elaborate a bit on this amendment.

Part of the motion that we're debating here was inspired by what happened on Bill 5 back in June. So I have to remind everybody about Bill 5 and why it's such a dangerous bill. One of the reasons why it's dangerous is that it gives this government immense executive discretionary powers—the ability to ignore any Ontario law. That has a lot of people worried. It had a lot of Indigenous communities worried. It had people across Ontario worried. We were considering Bill 5, and it was in committee stage when people were gathered outside here at Queen's Park and gathered at rallies across Ontario to protest Bill 5. Bill 5 also allows the government to ignore protections for endangered species. It also singles out a particular landfill in southwestern Ontario for reopening. So Bill 5 is a dangerous bill.

The government tried to push Bill 5 through committee with its majority. We had a lot of things to talk about in committee because Bill 5 was so dangerous. In fact, the Ontario Liberal caucus had, initially, the largest number of amendments, 20 or 30 amendments—I don't remember the exact number, but we had a good number of amendments to discuss. It took some time. Why? Because Bill 5 was such a dangerous bill. We talked about it until midnight that day. Then the government tried to have an overnight sitting because, for some reason, they wanted to push the bill through committee, even though we could have taken a few extra days of sitting.

The government has had us sit only 28 days in the fall of 2024, only 28 days in the spring of 2025, and now only about 28 days in the fall of 2025. So the government doesn't care how long the Ontario Legislature sits. It doesn't take advantage of the fact that we could come back and consider the legislation the government is proposing and take the time to do it right.

Instead, this government wants to hide from elected MPPs, to hide from the scrutiny that elected MPPs can have on this government because of the tools that we have when the Legislature is sitting. We have question period. We have debates. We have opposition day motions. We have committees. There are many tools that our parliamentary democracy—

Interjections.

Debate deemed adjourned.

### **Government accountability**

**Ms. Catherine Fife:** Speaker, my statement today is a call to action.

Lately it is getting harder and harder to keep track of all the ways this government is undermining democracy in Ontario. The latest example: ramming through legislation that bans speed cameras in the province with zero public consultations, no committee hearings, no opportunity for municipalities or road safety advocates or police or parents to have their say. Just another “we know best; just trust us” moment from a government that seems incapable of transparency and accountability—not to mention yesterday’s article revealing that this government is funding a numbered company that is exploiting women.

Speaker, this is becoming a dangerous pattern. We should not silence the voices of the people that we’re elected to serve. Democracy does not end at the ballot box. It lives in open debate, in public participation and in the willingness to listen. Democracy is messy. It’s participatory and it’s rooted in listening, not in backroom deals and bulldozing legislation through this House.

People in Ontario deserve a government that works with them, not one that governs over them. Our province is fairer when all voices are heard, not just those that pay to access the Premier. People think that what is happening in the US cannot happen here, but it can and it is.

We wear poppies to remember the fight for democracy, but they also are a reminder to stay vigilant and protect the privileges that came with great sacrifice.

### **Youth mental health**

**Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady:** I stand today with deep concern for the future of our children. We are failing them.

Young people are facing unprecedented challenges. Mental health struggles are rising, driven by rapid changes in technology, the isolation of government-mandated lockdowns during the pandemic and the overwhelming pressures of growing up in an uncertain world. Instead of addressing these issues, this government is simply walking away, leaving gaps in mental health support and failing to provide resources all of our kids need to thrive.

For children and youth in care, things are bleak. Children and youth do not have access to timely treatment services. If we invested early, we could avoid crises. Families are not able to access services they need: mental health treatment, children’s developmental services and respite.

Then there is, of course, the Ontario Autism Program wait-list that now sits at around 65,000. Sadly, parents are relinquishing custody to children’s aid societies when they can no longer cope. This is an unimaginable decision for any parent to have to make. This government points

the finger at our agencies; however, the data tells the true story that increased costs are related to the high cost of care for children with high needs and high-risk behaviours.

What are agencies to do when this government fails to acknowledge the truth and there's no financial assistance to provide the proper intervention? It's imperative we be fiscally responsible, but at the same time, we need to fix the cracks in child welfare.

### **Education**

**Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady:** My question is for the Premier.

In my rural riding of Haldimand–Norfolk, over the past week: reports of a student packing heat; a female student holding her urine all day because a male student is allowed to use the girls' bathroom; a call from a dad who says his grade 1 student has twice been hurt by another student since September.

Staff walk around schools in Ontario with walkie-talkies in case another colleague needs help. It's constant noise, a teacher tells me: "I'm crowd control first, a teacher second." A principal tells me his toughest job is balancing the rights of one versus the rights of many.

All of us in this house are hearing these same stories, and it's a matter of time, I fear, before a student in this province is going to be seriously injured.

Public education is failing. No kid is thriving. The system must be reimaged.

Speaker, through you to the Premier: Will he commit to reimagining a system that ensures every single student can access a safe education in this province?

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** Minister of Education.

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** I'm not really sure where the member has been, frankly. We started, actually, with my colleagues back in 2018—Minister Thompson, at the time, put a stop to many of the programs that were pending from the previous Liberal government. It accelerated under Minister Lecce and, of course, under Minister Dunlop.

Before the House, right now, we have Bill 33, which will reassert the province's expectations across the education sector.

Interjections.

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** The Liberal leader is catcalling across, "Why aren't you doing anything?"

Well, under the Liberals, let's not forget that students were continuously—

Interjections.

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** Order. Order.

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** Do you remember discovery math? All of our kids—EQAO results tumbling through the floor. We had a province that was bankrupt. Our students couldn't even read. Our teachers were miserable. That's the record of the Liberals.

To the member: We're fixing—

Interjection.

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** The leader of the third party will come to order.

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** We're reasserting our responsibility, and we're getting it done for teachers, parents—

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** Back to the member for Haldimand–Norfolk.

**Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady:** I'm glad the minister agrees with me. However, teachers are still miserable.

A teacher told me last night that in her school all of the teachers have a calendar marking down their day until retirement.

What this minister refuses to acknowledge is that we cannot continue to stretch limited numbers of EAs, OTs and speech pathologists across every single school in this province. It's failing every student.

Along with physical dangers, there are now psychological obstacles—heightened anxiety in our school environments, not from academic pressures, but from navigating a growing number of social expectations. Classrooms are a place of tension rather than learning and discovery. Students begin to fear making mistakes instead of feeling free to grow and question. Classrooms have shifted from being safe spaces to being places of caution and fear. And the minister should restore the balance.

The definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results—and classrooms in this province are insane.

Speaker, through you to the Premier: Will he be the guy to stop the insanity, to save public education, or will history remember him as the guy who destroyed it?

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** Wow. Madam Speaker, that's quite the damning indictment of the previous Liberal government from this member. Everything she talks about was brought in by the previous Liberal government.

I agree with her. The politicizing of the classroom is not good for teachers. It's not good for students. It's not what parents want. That's why we are depoliticizing the school system—

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** The leader of the third party will come to order.

**Hon. Paul Calandra:** Specifically, to this member: This member has the opportunity to vote in favour of Bill 33, which restores accountability back to the Minister of Education, back to the province, depoliticizes the system, puts resources back into the classroom. And that member is voting against that again. She really falls in line with the Liberals: say one thing in public, but do another thing when it comes to voting.

We're going to vote for students. We're going to vote for parents. We're going to vote for teachers. We're going to build the best education system in the world and restore the balance in the system so that our kids can prosper and they can succeed like they never have done before.

It takes a while to reverse 15 years of Liberal mismanagement, but we're going to get it done. It started in 2018, and we're going to—

**The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly):** Question.