Davies Howe
LAND DEVELOPMENT ADVOCACY & LITIGATION

Alex Lusty
alexl@davieshowe.com
Direct: 416.263.4522
Main: 416.977.7088
Fax: 416.977.8931
File No. 702568

October 20, 2025

By E-Mail Only to *clerks@springwater.ca*

Township of Springwater
Administration Centre
2231 Nursery Road
Minesing, ON L9X 1A8

Attention: Jennifer Marshall, Clerk

Dear Mayor Coughlin and Members of Council:

Re: Barrie Annexation Proposal
Use of Strong Mayor Powers
Response to Aird Berlis Opinion

We are counsel to the Midhurst Landowner's Group which is comprised of ten respected community builders, being: Sundance Homes, Countrywide Homes, Brookfield Residential, Geranium, Sarjeant Company Ltd., Rose Corporation, Ballymore Homes, Rosehaven Homes, Paradise Developments, and Silvercore Group.

On October 6, 2025 we wrote to advise that the Strong Mayor Powers cannot be used to facilitate Barrie's Annexation Proposal. We read, with interest, the responsive opinions of Loopstra Nixon LLP and Aird Berlis, both dated October 15, 2025. We agree with the conclusion arrived at by Loopstra Nixon LLP. We disagree with the conclusion of Aird Berlis. This letter explains where we disagree with Aird Berlis and why.

Statutory Interpretation: The Legal Principles

We agree with Aird Berlis that in interpreting statute the "modern approach" must be applied and that it reads:

> *… the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.*[1]

[1] Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re), [1998] 1 SCR 27 at 21.

Though not referred to in the Aird Berlis Opinion, one must also be mindful that:

> *…the legislature does not intend to produce absurd consequences…*[2]

Aird Berlis refers to extrinsic aids to legislative interpretation, like the Hansard Reports. It was not referenced by them, but perhaps they had *R. v. Morgentaler*[3] or a similar case in mind as justification for doing so.

Morgentaler has this to say about the use of aids to interpretation that go beyond the "four corners" of legislation:

> *In determining the background, context and purpose of challenged legislation, the court is entitled to refer to extrinsic evidence of various kinds provided it is relevant and not inherently unreliable…*[4]

And regarding legislative debates specifically:

> *…until recently the courts have balked at admitting evidence of legislative debates and speeches… The main criticism of such evidence has been that it cannot represent the "intent" of the legislature, an incorporeal body, but that is equally true of other forms of legislative history. Provided that the court remains mindful of the limited reliability and weight of Hansard evidence, it should be admitted as relevant to both the background and the purpose of legislation.*[5]

Statutory Interpretation: The Housing Crisis Context

The legislative enactments giving rise to the Strong Mayor Powers as they are now found in the *Municipal Act*[6] are:

1. *Strong Mayors, Building Homes Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 18[7]
2. *Better Municipal Governance Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 24[8]
3. O. Reg. 580/22: Provincial Priorities[9]

---

[2] Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re), [1998] 1 SCR 27 at 27.
[3] R. v. Morgentaler, [1993] 3 SCR 463. [*Morgentaler]*
[4] R. v. Morgentaler, [1993] 3 SCR 463 at page 483.
[5] R. v. Morgentaler, [1993] 3 SCR 463 at page 484.
[6] *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c. 25, Part VI.1
[7] *Strong Mayors, Building Homes Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 18
[8] *Better Municipal Governance Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 24
[9] O. Reg. 580/22: Provincial Priorities; note, in our view, O. Reg 530/22 is not particularly relevant to the discussion, so we have omitted it from this list.

These enactments followed the publication of the More Homes, More Choice: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan in May 2019 (the "**Action Plan**").[10] The Action Plan was prepared by the government, is relevant to the Ontario Housing Crisis, and as a written document, is reliable when it comes to its contents. The Action Plan repeatedly refers to the need for more housing in Ontario.

To encourage more housing the Action Plan speaks to making changes to: speed up the land use planning process, address the backlog in planning adjudications, simplify and reduce development charges, simplify the Ontario Building Code, make it easier to train tradespersons, and streamline environmental approvals. These are, broadly speaking, measures to improve the speed of land use planning and the construction process.

The Action Plan makes no mention of an employment land crisis. There is also no reference to a crisis in municipal jurisdictional boundaries or with the municipal restructuring process.

On February 8, 2022 the Report of the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force[11] was issued (the "**Housing Report**"). The Housing Report preceded the legislative enactments giving rise to the Strong Mayor Powers, and it too is relevant and reliable.

The Housing Report continued with the theme of a housing crisis in Ontario and indicated the need for a focus on actionable and concrete measures to get more homes built. The Housing Report recommended the government set the goal of building 1.5 million homes over the next ten years and update land use planning guidance to make it a priority. The Housing Report identifies solutions to the housing crisis like those set out in the Action Plan, though by 2022 the proposed solutions had come to be more crisply described in a series of 55 recommendations for change.

Like the Action Plan, the Housing Report does not identify an employment land crisis or a municipal jurisdictional boundary crisis. There is not a single recommendation in the Housing Report dealing with either of these topics.

Aird Berlis referred to a quote from Premier Ford about giving mayors stronger powers. We agree that the quote indicates Premier Ford supported Strong Mayor Powers. However, that is as far as it goes. Predating the relevant legislation by at least six years, the quote is not relevant to how Strong Mayor Powers would come to be formed through the legislative process. As it lacks relevance, it is not an appropriate extrinsic source for statutory interpretation.

---

[10] More Homes, More Choice: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan, May 2019
[11] Report of the Ontario Housing Affordability Task Force, February 8, 2022.

Statutory Interpretation: Legislative Intention is "Laser-Focused" on Housing

We have set out the record of Hansard Transcripts in Appendix A of this letter.

Consistent with the contents of the Action Plan and Housing Report, the Hansard Transcripts reveal a strong focus on the provision of housing as a provincial priority. In our review of the Hansard Transcripts, we have purposefully limited reference to the other, non-relevant, aspects of the legislation, like the budget power, hiring and firing provisions, or organizational structuring power. We have also intentionally limited discussion about the controversial nature of the legislation, which forms a major component of the legislative record.

We begin by noting the early comments about the purpose of the *Strong Mayors, Building Homes Act:*

> ***Hon. Steve Clark (Then Minister of MMAH)***
> *The bill and the proposed regulations would give new powers to the mayors of Toronto and Ottawa to support our commitment to build 1.5 million new homes to address the housing supply crisis over the next 10 years, and to help advance other priority projects.*[12]

While the reference to the housing supply crisis is obvious, the other "priority projects" referred to are less so. The reference to "other priority projects" is best understood as a reference to all the other aspects of the Strong Mayor Powers not relevant to the Barrie Annexation Proposal, like the budget power, powers over organizational structure, or the hiring and firing powers.

The government continued to explain the purpose for establishing the *Strong Mayors, Building Homes Act:*

> ***Hon. Steve Clark***
> *Our government believes that a strong-mayor system will help address the housing crisis.*[13]
>
> ***Hon. Michael Parsa (Then Associate Minister of Housing)***
> *Along with the dozens of recommendations provided by the task force, they again issued an urgent call to action. They told us that our province does not currently have enough housing to meet the needs of Ontarians, and that if we didn't act we would not have enough housing to meet the needs of our growing population tomorrow. So we used the task force recommendations, along with other consultation feedback, to get to work and to take bold actions. We used the task*

[12] Hansard Transcript, August 10, 2022
[13] Hansard Transcript, August 11, 2022.

> *force report as a foundation to craft a new housing supply action plan designed to make sure all Ontarians can find a home that meets their needs and their budgets.*[14]
>
> ***Hon. Steve Clark***
> *Ontario has a housing supply crisis. There are far more hard-working Ontarians looking for homes than there are homes available. Our government, under the leadership of Premier Ford, is taking action to address the supply crisis head-on. It's with great pride that we offered ourselves to Ontarians with a plan to build 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years.*[15]
> …
> *The provincial priority that I'm talking to the committee about today is the fact that we need more housing supply.*[16]

Clearly the focus of the government – their provincial priority - was solving the housing crisis. The government was also clear that the Housing Report was motivating its actions:

> ***Hon. Steve Clark:***
> *Thanks. We were honest with Ontarians, very transparent during the election. We said that we wanted to build 1.5 million homes over 10 years. We said we were going to use the Housing Affordability Task Force report as our road map.*[17]

The government also clarified the relationship between housing as a provincial priority and the closely related provincial priority of ensuring infrastructure to support housing was provided:

> ***Mr. Kevin Holland (Then Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing)***
> *That's why another provincial priority will focus on the planning, approval, construction and maintenance of key infrastructure, infrastructure such as transit and roads so residents don't have to wait in gridlock, and for utilities such as water and waste water—all to support both new and existing residential development.*[18]
> …
> *When we build more homes, we also need to consider the infrastructure that will support it. Another provincial priority we could lay out in regulation would speed up*

[14] Hansard Transcript, August 11, 2022.
[15] Hansard Transcript, August 25, 2022.
[16] Hansard Transcript, August 25, 2022
[17] Hansard Transcript, August 25, 2022
[18] Hansard Transcript, September 6, 2022

> *the planning, approval, construction and maintenance of infrastructure to support new and existing residential development.*[19]

Later in November 2022, when introducing the *Better Municipal Governance Act,* the Minister is recorded as saying:

> ***Hon. Steve Clark***
> *Speaker, I want to take you back to June. Our government was re-elected with a very strong mandate to help more Ontarians find a home that meets their needs and their budget. Our ministry, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, continues to play an essential role in fulfilling the mandate, under the leadership of Premier Ford, who has made it crystal clear from day one that this issue is an important priority for our government.*
>
> *Let's talk about the housing crisis. Ontario is a prosperous and growing province—I think we can all agree that it's the best place in Canada to live and to call home—but increased demand for new homes and a lack of supply have been driving prices out of reach for too many Ontarians who are struggling to find the right home. This is true for younger people eager to start a family in the community of their choosing; for newcomers who are ready to put down roots and begin a new life here in this great province of Ontario; and for seniors who are looking to downsize but wanting to stay near their family, their community and their loved ones. This is not just a big-city crisis. The housing supply shortage affects all Ontarians, whether you live in a rural or urban or suburban community, whether you live in the north or the south, whether you're young or old. Our government knows that we need to tackle this problem, and we know what must be done. We have to get this under control. <u>That's why we remain laser-focused on policies that get more homes built faster</u>.*[20] (<u>emphasis</u> added)

The Minister, during the committee stage, also addressed the intended scope of provincial priorities intended to be assisted by the creation of Strong Mayor Powers:

> ***Hon. Steve Clark***
> *The powers that we're proposing in this bill, and also in the previous bill, <u>are very narrowly</u> scoped for provincial priorities, things like our housing pledge to build 1.5 million homes over 10 years and the commitment we've made as a government to leverage the billions of dollars we're spending on transit in Toronto and York region. We need to ensure that mayors at that level have the tools they need.*[21] (<u>emphasis</u> added)

---

[19] <u>Hansard Transcript, September 6, 2022</u>
[20] <u>Hansard Transcript, November 17, 2022</u>
[21] <u>Hansard Transcript, November 30, 2022</u>

The point that the Strong Mayor Powers were intended to be strictly focused was further accentuated by the government during third reading of the *Better Municipal Governance Act*:

> ***Mr. Anthony Leardi (Conservative MPP)***
> *I'm taking an opportunity to carefully read Bill 39, as I always do with these bills, and I notice that it says quite specifically, "advance a prescribed provincial priority," and that the head of council may propose the bylaw to council, and that council would consider it and vote on it. These words, "prescribed provincial priority," stand out in the bill, and my impression of that is that this may only be used under very, very, very narrow circumstances—prescribed provincial priority circumstances—and those seem very, very, very rare. So I'm going to ask the minister if he would be kind enough to describe what that means.*[22] (emphasis added)

It may be that this emphasis on the "very narrow" and "very rare" use of the Strong Mayor Powers was made in response to the forceful criticism of the government evident on the record just days prior that the Strong Mayor Powers are anti-democratic.[23]

In our view, the substance of the legislative record indicates that the government was building on the Action Plan and Housing Report in a direct way. The legislative record discloses the government's intention that the Strong Mayor Powers be "laser focused" or focused "very narrowly" on the housing provincial priority. Though other regulations to identify other provincial priorities could have been promulgated, we are not aware of any.

The legislative record does not reveal a concern with resolving an employment land crisis or a municipal jurisdictional boundary crisis as the intended purpose of the use of Strong Mayor Powers.

Statutory Interpretation: The Words and Their Meaning

Understanding the context, it is no surprise that the most germane component of the legislation, being O. Reg 580/222, is about housing as is evident from its wording:

> *1. Building 1.5 million new residential units by December 31, 2031.*
>
> *2. Constructing and maintaining infrastructure to support housing, including,*
>
> *i. transit,*
>
> *ii. roads,*

[22] Hansard Transcript, December 6, 2022
[23] See for example the remarks of the CCLA in the Hansard Report for December 1, 2022

iii. utilities, and

iv. servicing.[24] (emphasis added)

Looking at the grammatical and ordinary meaning of the language O. Reg 580/22 in the context of a housing crisis, there are two noteworthy components. First, the words "building and "construction" are used. These words, like the words "build" and "construct" connote taking action to create something tangible. Second, consistent with the Action Plan, Housing Report, and legislative record, there is a definite focus on "new residential units" and infrastructure to "support housing" and no mention of employment land or municipal jurisdictional boundaries.

Moving away from the language of O. Reg 580/22 and turning to the wording of the *Municipal Act*, much seems to be made of the phrasing that a mayor only needs to formulate the "opinion" that a matter "could potentially" "advance" or "interfere" with a provincial priority.[25] We wish to be clear that the need to formulate an "opinion", which is highly subjective, does not do away with the need to first find jurisdiction in the legislation for invoking Strong Mayors Powers.

Provincial priorities are prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.[26] Mayors do not prescribe the provincial priorities that enable the use of Strong Mayor Powers. It follows, that the opinion mayors are to formulate is not whether they think something is a provincial priority. The opinion mayors are to formulate is whether the contemplated action "could potentially" "advance" or "interfere" with a separately and distinctively described provincial priority. If a contemplated action does not relate to a given provincial priority, then there is no jurisdiction for the use of Strong Mayor Powers, and the mayor is relieved of the responsibility to formulate an opinion.

If a mayor instead begins by formulating an "opinion" about whether something is a provincial priority an error has been made. Whether something is, or is not, a provincial priority is not subjective – it is prescribed. By proceeding in such a fashion, the mayor would be legislating contrary to s. 284.9 of the *Municipal Act* which reserves for the Lieutenant Governor in Council the ability to prescribe provincial priorities. It would also be contrary to s. 2 of the *Municipal Act*, which states that "each municipality is given powers and duties under this Act" confirming that powers are given; they are not invented or taken.

As it is abundantly clear that a mayor cannot legislate their own Strong Mayor Powers, it should also be abundantly clear that efforts to permit a mayor to legislate their own powers

---

[24] O. Reg 580/22
[25] Municipal Act, s. 284.10(1), 284.11(2), 284.11.1(2)
[26] Municipal Act, s. 284.9(1) and (2).

through s. 8(1) and 8(2) of the *Municipal Act*[27] must fail. Subsections 8(1) and 8(2) of the *Municipal Act* resolve doubt about whether to confer authority on municipalities in cases of interpretive uncertainty or ambiguity in favour of municipalities. Here, there is no uncertainty and no ambiguity and recourse to these subsections is a red herring.

Any statutory interpretation that purports to authorize a mayor legislating their own Strong Mayor Powers and jurisdiction contrary to the clear language and intent of the *Municipal Act* must be ignored as an absurdity given the incoherence required to arrive at such a conclusion. The mayor cannot form an opinion that effectively gives themselves unbridled jurisdiction – even the Strong Mayor Powers legislation does not go that far.

Application: Legal Jurisdiction

We agree with Aird Berlis that "Notably, changes to land use planning permissions will not occur as part of the restructuring proposal."[28]

It is clear from the Action Plan, Housing Report, Legislative Record, and the wording of the legislation itself that the purpose of the Strong Mayors Powers is to improve execution of the planning and development process to accelerate the pace of housing and related infrastructure construction.

Given that the planning and development process is not being engaged by the Barrie Annexation Proposal there is no legal jurisdiction for invoking Strong Mayor Powers.

What is being contemplated by Springwater is a decision on municipal restructuring, which the Action Plan, Housing Report, legislative record, and legislation do not indicate as a proper subject for the use of Strong Mayor Powers.

As discussed earlier, a mayor must first find jurisdiction to use the Strong Mayor Powers, then form the opinion that the contemplated action furthers a provincial priority. In the case of the Barrie Annexation Proposal there is no jurisdiction to be found, which puts an end to the question.

This analysis should not come as a surprise as the government, understanding the dangers to democracy the legislation presented, thought the powers would be used "very, very, very, rarely".

Application: Territorial Jurisdiction

Aird Berlis noted that "a comprehensive land use planning exercise is proposed to be undertaken by Barrie following the boundary adjustment." We agree. We go further,

---

[27] Municipal Act, s. 8(1) and 8(2).
[28] Aird Berlis, October 15, 2025 at page 3.

however, and find that statement indicates a territorial jurisdiction barrier to the use of Strong Mayor Powers to implement the Barrie Annexation Proposal.

To confirm, we agree with Loopstra Nixon LLP that there is a territorial jurisdictional problem arising from the operation of sections 2 and 19(1) of the *Municipal Act*[29], which read:

> ***2*** *Municipalities are created by the Province of Ontario to be responsible and accountable governments with respect to matters within their jurisdiction and each municipality is given powers and duties under this Act and many other Acts for the purpose of providing good government with respect to those matters.*
>
> ***19*** *(1) By-laws and resolutions of a municipality apply only within its boundaries, except as provided in subsection (2) or in any other provisions of this or any other Act.*

One of the exceptions in subsection 19(2) is related to a service provided by a single-tier municipality (such as Barrie) on consent. We discuss the cross-border servicing aspect of the Barrie Annexation Proposal in the next section.

For the lands being transferred to Barrie, it is Barrie that will undertake the future planning decisions. Therefore, there can be no claim that Springwater's decision on the Barrie Annexation Proposal involves planning or development control of the transferred lands, as those decisions are beyond its territorial jurisdiction pursuant to s. 2 and 19(1) of the *Municipal Act*. Thus, the Barrie Annexation Proposal remains beyond the scope of the Strong Mayor Powers.

Application: The Infrastructure Component

In the Aird Berlis Opinion there is a strong emphasis on the cross-border servicing component of the Barrie Annexation Proposal as a basis for invoking the Strong Mayor Powers.

The language in the restructuring proposal, which takes the form of an agreement, related to cross-border servicing, is:

> *1.3 This Agreement shall constitute the overarching agreement between the parties and the parties acknowledge and agree that the implementation of this agreement [sic] shall require the parties to negotiate and execute further agreements which include, but are not limited to:*

[29] Municipal Act, ss. 2 and 19(1).

- *Cross Border Servicing Agreement, if requested by the Township pursuant to s. 6.3 [sic] of this Agreement…*

6.4 The City has offered to enter into a cross-border servicing agreement with the Township to address the Township's needs related to the development of lands in the vicinity of the Bayfield corridor. At the Township' request, the parties agree that crossborder servicing will be dealt with in a future agreement which will determine matters, such as but not limited to, the capacity needs of the Township, the ability of the City to meet the Township's request, the timeline of servicing, location of connections, specific infrastructure requirements, responsibility for associated costs, and rates to be applied. All future agreements must adhere to the principle of full cost recovery by the City; this refers to all capital investment required to provide the servicing and ongoing operation and maintenance costs.[30] (emphasis added)

As a practical matter, there is no cross-border servicing arrangement. It is an idea that could be discussed in the future, if the Township were to make a request. None of the pertinent details, like which services are involved, conduit sizing, capacity, phasing, servicing routes, cost, responsibility for project management, maintenance, approval requirements, and the list could go on, have been determined.

As a legal matter, an "agreement to agree" in the absence of known specific terms and conditions is no agreement at all.[31]

It is for these reasons that, in our view, there is no cross-border servicing component to the Barrie Annexation Proposal. That being so, cross-border servicing cannot be used to justify either a component or the whole of the Barrie Annexation Proposal.

Even if one were to accept Aird Berlis' position that the cross-border services arrangement was sufficiently connected to the provincial housing priority, at best, that would justify use of the Strong Mayor Powers to research, veto, or propose, cross-border servicing arrangements, not a broader transfer of lands to the City of Barrie.

Application: The Employment Component

The Action Plan, Housing Report, Legislative Record and legislation all point toward a "very narrow" emphasis on housing as a provincial priority. There is no evidence to support reading-in authority to invoke Strong Mayors Powers in relation to building non-residential areas that would purposefully exclude residential development.

---

[30] Draft Boundary Adjustment Agreement between Barrie and Springwater, s. 1.3, 6.4
[31] *Bawitko Investments Ltd. v. Kernels Popcorn Ltd*., 1991 CanLII 2734 (ON CA) at Page 12

A statutory interpretation that is supposedly based on the ordinary meaning of the legislation as interpreted in context, but that also stretches the meaning of the words to include powers over non-residential building or construction which is plainly absent in the text and not discussed in the record, is internally inconsistent and therefore illogical and incoherent.

It should not come as a surprise that the provincial priority in O. Reg 580/22 does not include decisions about employment land or municipal jurisdictional boundaries as these were not the issues the government sought to address by creating Strong Mayor Powers in the first place.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out before and as supplemented in this letter, we continue to be of the view that the Strong Mayor Powers cannot be used in relation to the Barrie Annexation Proposal.

Yours truly,
DAVIES HOWE LLP



Alex Lusty (he/him)

copy: Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Members of Springwater Council
Clerk's Office, Springwater
Renee Ainsworth, CAO, Springwater
Chris Russell, Director of Planning, Springwater
Trevor Harvey, Director of Engineering, Springwater
Greg Bedard, Director of Finance/Treasurer, Springwater
Warden, Deputy Warden and Members of County Council
Clerk's Office, County of Simcoe
Mark Aitken, CAO, Simcoe County
Rob Elliott, General Manager, Engineering, Planning & Environment
Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning/Chief Planner
Nancy Huether, Director of Economic Development and Airport Services
Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Members of Oro-Medonte Council
Clerk's Office, Oro-Medonte
Sean Binns, CAO, Oro-Medonte
Brent Spagnol, Director of Planning, Oro-Medonte

Appendix A: Hansard Record

Hansard records are available for the *Strong Mayors, Building Homes Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 18 on the following dates:

- August 10, 2022[1]
- August 11, 2022;[2]
- August 17, 2022;[3]
- August 18, 2022[4]
- August 25, 2022[5]
- August 29, 2022[6]
- First August 31, 2022[7]
- Second August 31, 2022[8]
- First September 6, 2022[9]
- Second September 6, 2022[10]
- First September 7, 2022[11]
- Second September 7, 2022[12]
- First September 8, 2022[13]
- Second September 8, 2022[14]

Hansard records are available for the *Better Municipal Governance Act, 2022*, SO 2022, c 24 on the following dates:

- November 16, 2022[15]
- First November 17, 2022[16]
- Second November 17, 2022[17]
- First November 22, 2022[18]
- Second November 22, 2022[19]
- Third November 22, 2022[20]
- November 23, 2022[21]
- November 30, 2022[22]
- December 1, 2022[23]
- December 5, 2022[24]
- First December 6, 2022[25]
- Second December 6, 2022[26]
- First December 7, 2022[27]
- Second December 7, 2022[28]
- Third December 7, 2022[29]
- First December 8, 2022[30]
- Second December 8, 2022[31]

[1] Hansard Transcript, August 10, 2022
[2] Hansard Transcript, August 11, 2022
[3] Hansard Transcript, August 17, 2022
[4] Hansard Transcript, August 18, 2022
[5] Hansard Transcript, August 25, 2022
[6] Hansard Transcript, August 29, 2022
[7] First Hansard Transcript, August 31, 2022
[8] Second Hansard Transcript, August 31, 2022
[9] First Hansard Transcript, September 6, 2022
[10] Second Hansard Transcript, September 6, 2022
[11] First Hansard Transcript, September 7, 2022
[12] Second Hansard Transcript, September 7, 2022
[13] First Hansard Transcript, September 8, 2022
[14] Second Hansard Transcript, September 8, 2022
[15] Hansard Transcript, November 16, 2022
[16] First Hansard Transcript, November 17, 2022
[17] Second Hansard Transcript, November 17, 2022
[18] First Hansard Transcript, November 22, 2022
[19] Second Hansard Transcript, November 22, 2022
[20] Third Hansard Transcript, November 22, 2022
[21] Hansard Transcript, November 23, 2022
[22] Hansard Transcript, November 30, 2022
[23] Hansard Transcript, December 1, 2022
[24] Hansard Transcript, December 5, 2022
[25] First Hansard Transcript, December 6, 2022
[26] Second Hansard Transcript, December 6, 2022
[27] First Hansard Transcript, December 7, 2022
[28] Second Hansard Transcript, December 7, 2022
[29] Third Hansard Transcript, December 7, 2022
[30] First Hansard Transcript, December 8, 2022
[31] Second Hansard Transcript, December 8, 2022