

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

F-3

Journal des débats (Hansard)

F-3

Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs

Protect Ontario Through Free
Trade Within Canada Act, 2025

1st Session
44th Parliament

Thursday 29 May 2025

Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques

Loi de 2025 pour protéger
l'Ontario en favorisant
le libre-échange au Canada

1^{re} session
44^e législature

Jeudi 29 mai 2025

Chair: Ernie Hardeman
Clerk: Lesley Flores

Président : Ernie Hardeman
Greffière : Lesley Flores

Hansard on the Internet

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

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

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

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

Index inquiries

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

Renseignements sur l'index

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

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



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

ISSN 1180-4386

CONTENTS

Thursday 29 May 2025

Protect Ontario Through Free Trade Within Canada Act, 2025, Bill 2, Mr. Fedeli / Loi
de 2025 pour protéger l’Ontario en favorisant le libre-échange au Canada, projet de
loi 2, M. Fedeli.....F-59

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Thursday 29 May 2025

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES FINANCES
ET DES AFFAIRES ÉCONOMIQUES

Jeudi 29 mai 2025

*The committee met at 0901 in committee room 1.*PROTECT ONTARIO THROUGH FREE
TRADE WITHIN CANADA ACT, 2025
LOI DE 2025 POUR PROTÉGER L'ONTARIO
EN FAVORISANT LE LIBRE-ÉCHANGE
AU CANADA

Consideration of the following bill:

Bill 2, An Act to enact the Buy Ontario, Buy Canadian Day Act, 2025 and the Ontario Free Trade and Mobility Act, 2025 and to amend various other Acts / Projet de loi 2, Loi édictant la Loi de 2025 sur le Jour « Achetons ontarien, achetons canadien » et la Loi ontarienne de 2025 sur le libre-échange et la mobilité et modifiant diverses autres lois.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): I call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs to order. We're meeting today to begin clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 2, An Act to enact the Buy Ontario, Buy Canadian Day Act, 2025 and the Ontario Free Trade and Mobility Act, 2025 and to amend various other Acts. We are joined today by staff from Hansard, broadcast and recording, and Catherine Oh from the office of the legislative counsel.

The proposed amendments, which have been filed with the Clerk, have been distributed to the members electronically and in hard copy.

Before we begin the clause-by-clause, I will allow members to make comments on the bill as a whole. Afterwards, debate on the bill will be limited to the specific items under consideration. As always, please wait to be recognized by the Chair before speaking. All questions and comments should be made through the Chair.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: Thank you, Chair, and good morning. I just wanted to say, Tuesday's committee process was one of the best days that I've spent, actually, here at Queen's Park. There was broad consensus around Bill 2. There was even commonality around what the objectives of the bill were amongst people who traditionally don't agree with each other. I think that speaks to the common purpose that we all have here and the agreement around reducing and eliminating interprovincial trade barriers.

There were limitations to the amendments that we could submit because much of this bill is left to regulation, which is an ongoing pattern of this government. However, we do have four amendments before the committee this morning to try to clarify some aspects of the bill, but truly operationalizing Bill 2 will be the real test, because even with the government messaging around Bill 2 around the issue of interprovincial trade and the removal of Ontario's exceptions to the Canada trade agreement, their removal is not actually in the bill itself, as that's a separate process.

So I'm looking forward to the discussion this morning and hopefully securing some consensus on the amendments that we have put forward. Thank you for your attention.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Thank you. Any further comments on the bill, generally? MPP Cerjanec.

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: I echo MPP Fife's comments. The deputations on Tuesday, I thought, were excellent from all of the folks there, and there really was a lot of commonality. It was really great to hear that business, that industry, that labour and that folks that have been talking about interprovincial trade for quite some time have really come aligned that it is about time that we break down internal trade barriers across our country and that we have one market instead of 13. So those I think were some really positive steps, and I think it's something really important now for the government to consider moving forward, because there is a lot of, I think, "trust us" mentality as it pertains to this bill.

We heard from organized labour, the carpenters' union talking about how important it is and how strong Ontario's health and safety standards are on work sites, on job sites, on construction sites, and that we should always take this opportunity as a race to lift up standards as opposed to reduce those standards. So I think, with this bill—and I know there are some amendments that are here—it's going to be really important on how this bill is implemented afterwards.

It's something that I know that, as Ontario Liberals, we've been talking quite a bit about, the need for breaking down these interprovincial trade barriers. I think it was a very strong move by the government in the current trade context with the United States and what is going on around the world, that it's about time that we're doing this. There is no time better than now to do it, but the devil is in the details. And I hope all of us around this table today, and the other ministers who are now going to be impacted by

this, like the Minister of Labour, for example, and like the Minister of Economic Development as well—so I do speak in general support of the bill today. I think there are some really good amendments that I look forward to us diving through.

I think the last thing I'll say is I do have an area of concern. My area of concern surrounds the LCBO and, more particularly, keeping it public as opposed to privatization. It came out in the committee hearings on Tuesday that there was no clear commitment from the minister to keep the LCBO public. Notwithstanding even how we distribute alcohol in this province, but the importance, I think, of the LCBO is in providing a public dividend to taxpayers, a public dividend to the people of this province.

As someone who does go to the LCBO and purchases its products, I actually quite like the convenience of the LCBO. I find that it's in a lot of areas. I don't need to go to a gas station in order to purchase my beer and alcohol, which may interact quite poorly with drinking and driving. So I think that's something that I do have a concern with here and I am concerned that there could be a backdoor way of privatizing the LCBO through this. I really hope not. I think it would be a fight that the government would likely lose in the public's eye. And I think it's important that we maintain and really uphold some of our strong public institutions, and I really do think it is one, when we're talking about responsible alcohol access.

But, overall, again, we need to break down interprovincial trade barriers. It is really important. One Canadian market instead of 13, as I had said.

I'm looking forward to the discussion that we have here at committee today.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Any further general comments on the bill?

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady: I'll be brief. I fully support Bill 2. I can't believe that we haven't broken down these trade barriers in the past, but I digress. We have the opportunity to make this a pivotal chapter in Ontario's and Canada's economic history, but we must get it right. As MPP Fife said at the outset, Tuesday felt good. We had a lot of commonality around this table and it feels good to work co-operatively together.

I would just urge the government members to think about the idea that there should be no monopoly on a good idea. We have amendments before us that could actually strengthen that bill and help us move towards that pivotal moment in Ontario's economic history.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Any further comments? If there are no further comments: As you will notice, Bill 2 is comprised of a preamble, three sections and six schedules. Since the majority of the bill is set out in the schedules, I propose that we stand down the preamble and sections 1, 2 and 3 of the bill to postpone their consideration and start with schedule 1, section 1, if the members agree. Agreed.

We will now begin the clause-by-clause of the schedules. Schedule 1: There are no amendments to sections 1

to 3 of schedule 1. Therefore, I would propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

0910

Is there any debate on sections 1 to 3? No debate. Shall schedule 1, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 1 carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 2—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): My apologies. We have to vote on the preamble of schedule 1 because there are two preambles in the bill. Further debate on the preamble in schedule 1? Any discussion? No discussion. Ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried. And it was followed by the vote we held on the schedule with the preamble.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 2 of schedule 2. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? If there is any debate, are the members prepared to vote on sections 1 and 2? No further debate? I call the question: All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 2 carry? Any debate? All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 1 and 2 of schedule 3. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion is carried.

Is there any debate on the sections? If not, all those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

We're now on schedule 3. Any debate? If not, all those in favour of schedule 3? Opposed? The motion is carried.

Schedule 4: There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3 of schedule 4. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Agreement. Is there any debate? If there is no debate, are the members prepared to vote on schedule 4, sections 1 to 3, inclusive? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 4 carry? Any debate? If not, all those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 4 carries.

There's a new section in schedule 5. It's New Democratic Party. MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: The amendment that we're putting forward, and I'll read it into the record, is:

I move that section 0.1 be added to schedule 5 to the bill:

“Non-application

“0.1 This act does not apply to any profession regulated by the province that had a system to permit interprovincial mobility before the coming into force of this act.”

Just by way of an explanation to the government members: This amendment would ensure that the labour mobility provisions would not apply to professions that already have interprovincial mobility. This amendment is

similar to the one that our New Democrat counterparts tabled in Nova Scotia, so we learned from them. It prevents duplicative processes and ensures that good systems of mobility are not trumped by these new ones. In essence, it's removing barriers to the purpose and intention of the act.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion on the motion? MPP Cerjanec.

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: I think it's an amendment that makes a lot of sense, that if we have a good agreement in place already, why would we want to override it? That work has already been done. I know that this government has a lot of work ahead of it, and I know this ministry is probably going to be very busy, including the bureaucratic staff, so not having that duplication I think would be a very good thing if something already is in place.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion? Are you ready to vote on the amendment?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Begum, Brady, Cerjanec, Fife.

Nays

Kanapathi, Racinsky, Rosenberg, Saunderson, Dave Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): I declare the amendment lost.

There are no amendments to sections 1 to 3 of schedule 5. I therefore propose we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate? Members are prepared to vote? Shall schedule 5, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

In schedule 5, we have a new amendment from the New Democrats. MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I guess we've lost that loving feeling so early in the amendment process.

I'll read this amendment into the record:

I move that section 3.1 be added to schedule 5 to the bill:

“Harmonization

“3.1 The minister shall, in collaboration with the other provinces and territories of Canada, develop a harmonization strategy aimed at identifying and removing trade barriers by harmonizing at the highest provincial or territorial standard,

“(a) standards and approvals for goods to be sold; and

“(b) authorizations for services to be provided.”

By way of explanation to the government members: This would make it so that whenever the minister is developing harmonization strategies for mutual recognition, they are harmonized at the highest standard, similar to the amendment based on Nova Scotia, where they had to go back and change the legislation after it was already

drafted. We took this approach to avoid being overly prescriptive and to mirror the approach the legislation took of it being enabling.

Essentially, as I mentioned in my opening comments, when the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, and Laura Walton, the president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, came before us, they all had a consistent message for us: Protecting Ontario means protecting workers. The health and safety standards we have as a province are our strength as a province, and if we all agree that every worker who goes to work in the morning should come home at the end of the day, we need to ensure that our standards are the marker for where we need to set our goals at.

0920

I did use this example in the opening comments on Bill 2: My son is an electrician. He is a master electrician at the age of 26. If electricians come in from another jurisdiction and they didn't do the eight years as an apprentice in Ontario to be an electrician and they don't have the same health and safety standards, a less-qualified electrician from another jurisdiction working alongside him—or your son or daughter—makes that workplace less safe.

When the chamber of commerce talks about safety standards as a best practice for business and for manufacturing, I think we have a duty and a responsibility to listen to those voices. It was unprecedented, the agreement between those three delegations. I'm still quite astounded by it.

Laura Walton in particular made it really clear that if we want to truly tariff-proof Ontario, we have to ensure that health and safety standards are held to the highest level. She told the story of how she jokes with her Alberta occupational health and safety counterparts that their standards are written on a coaster, whereas in Ontario, ours are a significant bible that was written in blood.

I have to tell you, one of the first issues I took up when I came to Queen's Park in 2012 was the working-at-heights legislation, because the Tony Dean report had done an extensive analysis of the four workers who had died on Christmas Eve. What wasn't happening was the operationalizing of those recommendations.

Nick Lalonde was a young, 23-year-old worker who fell to his death in my riding very soon after I was elected. He would be 35 today.

It's astounding to me that we continue to lose workers. We all fought to make sure that those standards were upheld by employers and that workers were supported and trained appropriately.

The Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters have their new model, which is “Keep Calm and Keep Training.” We need to ensure that those training standards are not just modules that you can do online. When you're talking about health and safety, it has to be a rigorous level of health and safety standards that Ontario now has. I'm proud of that work and I'm proud of this province for having those standards. But when I say our worker safety

is our strength, I think that this is also very much connected to protecting Ontario and protecting our economy.

So I would urge the government to support this amendment. The intention of the amendment is to honour the delegations that came before us and provided very constructive feedback to Bill 2.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further debate on the motion? MPP Saunderson.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: This government takes worker safety very seriously. Ontario has some of the highest standards across the country, and we've just tabled Working for Workers 7.

In the context of this legislation, we will not be supporting the amendment. Mutual recognition is considered a more efficient and less burdensome approach to reducing the impacts of regulatory differences.

We want to get moving forward on this. We're meeting the moment on this issue. We will continue to have the highest safety standards in the country, but for the moment, we need to move forward. And we feel that the mechanisms under the act to strengthen public health and safety have already been built into this act through section 4(2).

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: We do not consider worker health and safety standards to be red tape, and we do not consider those standards to be burdens.

I would urge the government members to consider this: The building trades as a whole say that they are committed to making sure that standards do not get diluted under the guise of harmonization. As mentioned, much of this bill will fall to regulation, so we will be standing shoulder to shoulder with our labour partners to make sure that those standards are not reduced or diluted or watered down.

I would like a recorded vote, please.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): A recorded vote has been requested.

Any further debate? MPP Cerjanec.

Mr. Rob Cerjanec: We're talking about internal trade and, in this case, labour mobility. We shouldn't lose sight of, I think, a foundational principle: Worker safety should be non-negotiable, period, hard stop.

Thinking about the amendment right now and worker safety and the presentations that we received from labour, from folks representing workers who have worked and fought very hard to have strong safety rules in this province—generally, I'm pretty much all for getting rid of red tape, but I don't think worker safety regulations are red tape. People's lives are not red tape.

Ontario has earned this reputation as one of the best in the country, whether that's working-at-heights training for construction workers—we heard on Tuesday that the training is done in person. It's not an online module. It's not something that you can click through. I'm sure all of us have had to do some sort of training every now and then, where it's an online module and you kind of click

through it. Are you really paying attention? I think that's really important.

We've heard about some of the other health and safety standards that we have in this province. Carpenters said day one means walking onto a job site with the training and credentials to keep yourself and your co-workers safe. That's not the case in every jurisdiction, as we heard on Tuesday. Under Bill 2, if mutual recognition is implemented carelessly, we risk importing those lower standards into high-risk environments, and people's lives really are going to be on the line. So we need clear rules. We shouldn't have shortcuts. I think it is a very smart move for us to work with other provinces and territories to go to the highest standard so that every worker is protected in this province and, really, in this country. So if the government is serious about worker mobility, it needs to be serious, in my view, about this as well, because economic growth also can't come at the cost of human lives.

We can look throughout history. There have been plenty of examples, unfortunately, in our country's history, as well, where, frankly, human lives were viewed as expendable, because there were not health and safety standards in place.

We need to safeguard people. We need to ensure that every single person gets to come home to their family at night and then be able to go back out on the job site tomorrow.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: I want to thank my colleague for supporting the amendment as it's crafted.

This is what the building trades submitted on labour mobility for Bill 2—and again, they're not opposed to Bill 2, nor are we. We are just trying to ensure that we prioritize certain aspects—which is worker safety. This is their direct quote: "The council would, however, reiterate that the mutual recognition framework in Bill 2 could potentially sidestep worker protections if a lower standard for training or health and safety is recognized as the standard. The building trades council would like to stress to the standing committee that mutual recognition is acceptable only insofar as the workers are trained to the highest standard."

So this is our effort to make sure that workers go to work and then they come back at the end of the day, and that's definitely worth fighting for.

0930

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further debate? MPP Brady.

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady: I agree. I will be supporting this amendment.

I want to go back to the first day when the minister was here, to Tuesday: I actually specifically asked him about the worry of eroding, diluting our safety standards, and the minister didn't point to 4(2), and he actually told me that he would have to get back to me on how we would ensure the safety standards are upheld and how employers would

bring other folks coming from other provinces up to our standards.

So, leaving it to regulation is a bit loosey-goosey to me. I think we should get it right the first time. Again, no monopoly on a good idea.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion? Is the committee ready to vote?

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Begum, Brady, Cerjanec, Fife.

Nays

Kanapathi, Racinsky, Rosenberg, Saunderson, Dave Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): I declare the amendment lost.

There are no amendments to sections 4 to 9 of schedule 5. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? Is there any debate on these sections? If there's no debate, are you ready to vote? All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Shall schedule 5 carry? Debate? If not, all those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

Schedule 6: There is an amendment in schedule 6. MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I move that section 0.1 be added to schedule 6 to the bill:

“0.1 The Ontario Labour Mobility Act, 2009 is amended by adding the following section:

“Non-application

“0.1 This act does not apply to any profession regulated by the province that had a system to permit inter-provincial mobility before the coming into force of this section.”

Obviously, this is another attempt on behalf of the official opposition to ensure that labour mobility provisions would not apply to professions that already have inter-provincial mobility.

I do want to say to the government: We consulted with other provinces that are ahead of us on labour mobility, and Nova Scotia was one of those provinces that actually had to go back to their legislation and amend it due to consultation—which is always good, when you consult before you write a piece of legislation—and this amendment would prevent duplicative processes and ensure that good systems of mobility are not overridden by these new ones. Perhaps it's an unintended consequence of the crafters of this legislation, but if you have duplication, then it slows down some factors.

It doesn't seem like the government is very amenable to these amendments, but we still have to keep trying, because that's why people send us here: to try to make the legislation better.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further debate to the amendment? MPP Saunderson.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: We listened very carefully to the delegate from the Ontario Physiotherapy Association, and let's be very clear: This legislation is about unlocking our economic potential across the country, and we have said that there is a structure in place that will allow each of these regulated professions to carry out their own mandate. But the issue is to get people here, to get them working, then we will work in collaboration with the associations that have regulatory authority to issue their licensing.

As the physiotherapists indicated, they have a much tighter timeline than we do in the six-month timeline. We don't think this is compromising that ability at all, and it's about making sure that labour can get here and get working.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further debate on this amendment? If not, we can be ready to vote.

Ms. Catherine Fife: Recorded vote, please.

Ayes

Begum, Brady, Cerjanec, Fife.

Nays

Kanapathi, Racinsky, Rosenberg, Saunderson, Dave Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): I declare the amendment lost.

We have another amendment on section 6. MPP Fife.

Ms. Catherine Fife: I move that subsection 1(1) of schedule 6 be amended by adding the following subsection to section 9 of the Ontario Labour Mobility Act, 2009:

“Same

“(2.1) Despite subsection (2), if the Ontario regulatory authority determines that its standards are higher than those of the out-of-province regulatory authority, the Ontario regulatory authority may require that the individual have, undertake, obtain or undergo material additional training, experience, examinations or assessments to the extent of the discrepancy between the Ontario regulatory authority's standards and the out-of-province regulatory authority's standards.”

Speaking to this amendment, Chair: This would ensure that if there is a lower-standard jurisdiction where an employee can use the labour mobility provisions, our regulatory authority would ensure they undergo training for any discrepancies between the standards.

I guess I could give you an example: Nurse practitioners here in the province of Ontario must achieve a very high level of education. Their scope of practice is very different than other nurse practitioners across Canada. Even having a nurse practitioner come into Ontario who has basically almost a diploma standard, say, from Alberta,

and coming to Ontario, that nurse practitioner would have six months to still practise at a lower standard.

What we would like to see from the regulator is to hold up those standards, not only to ensure consumer protection—the client is protected in this instance—but I think that it behooves us to respect the current nurse practitioners who are working in Ontario to very high standards. I think that this amendment, of all the amendments, is something that the government could surely support.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Further discussion on the amendment? MPP Saunderson.

Mr. Brian Saunderson: The wording, “subject to a higher threshold,” is very unclear.

We stand by our legislation and the six-month timeline. It’s about labour mobility. We’re trying to reduce the bureaucracy that’s going to get these things in place and so we will not be supporting this amendment.

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

Ms. Catherine Fife: The loving feeling is really, really gone now.

I just want to say to the members, and I need to get it on the record: Much of what is in this legislation is left to future regulation. It is unclear how expansive or how limited the measures will be, and this is of particular importance on the issue of labour mobility and mutual recognition.

You also have complicated this conversation with Bill 5, by creating economic zones where the same health and safety standards, workers’ safety standards, fiscal due diligence, environmental due diligence, now won’t be applied. This makes Bill 2 and labour mobility even more important—that we are upholding those standards, not only to keep people safe, but also to address productivity.

To my colleague MPP Saunderson across the way: It’s not a stretch to envision someone from another province coming to Ontario, who has responsibility for the health and well-being of citizens here in Ontario and not meeting our standards but having six months to practise and, potentially, to cause some damage.

So we’ve taken a protective position on this, and I think that this amendment may come—I hope it doesn’t, but it may come back to bite you. And for those reasons, I’ll be asking for a recorded vote.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): Any further debate on the amendment? Are you ready to vote? Recorded vote is requested.

Ayes

Begum, Brady, Cerjanec, Fife.

Nays

Kanapathi, Racinsky, Rosenberg, Saunderson, Dave Smith, Triantafilopoulos.

The Chair (Mr. Ernie Hardeman): I declare the amendment defeated.

Shall schedule 6, section 1 carry? Discussion? Schedule 6, section 1—no further debate? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

There are no amendments to sections 2 to 10 of schedule 6. I therefore propose that we bundle these sections. Is there agreement? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Is there any debate on schedule 6? No further debate? Shall schedule 6, sections 2 to 10, inclusive, carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

Shall schedule 6 carry? Any discussion? All those in favour? All those opposed? Schedule 6 carries.

That concludes the schedules. Shall the title of the bill carry? Discussion? If not, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion is carried.

Shall Bill 2 carry? Discussion? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

Shall I report the bill to the House? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

Now, we will go back to the start that we put aside. Shall the preamble carry? All those in favour? All those opposed? Motion is carried.

Shall section 1 of the bill carry? Discussion? If not, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion is carried.

Shall section 2 carry? Discussion? If not, all those in favour? All those opposed? Carried.

Shall section 3, the short title, carry? All those in favour? Opposed? Motion is carried.

That concludes the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill 2 and our business for today. There being no further business, this committee now stands adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 0945.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Chair / Président

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

First Vice-Chair / Première Vice-Présidente

Ms. Doly Begum (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest ND)

Second Vice-Chair / Deuxième Vice-Président

Mr. Rob Cerjanec (Ajax L)

Ms. Doly Begum (Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest ND)

Ms. Bobbi Ann Brady (Haldimand–Norfolk IND)

Mr. Rob Cerjanec (Ajax L)

Mr. Ernie Hardeman (Oxford PC)

Mr. Logan Kanapathi (Markham–Thornhill PC)

Mr. Joseph Racinsky (Wellington–Halton Hills PC)

MPP Bill Rosenberg (Algoma–Manitoulin PC)

Mr. Brian Saunderson (Simcoe–Grey PC)

Ms. Sandy Shaw (Hamilton West–Ancaster–Dundas / Hamilton-Ouest–Ancaster–Dundas ND)

Mr. Dave Smith (Peterborough–Kawartha PC)

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

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Catherine Fife (Waterloo ND)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Lesley Flores

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Catherine Oh, legislative counsel